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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Throughout recorded history there has been a continuous worldwide migration of people. In the recent past, decolonization, democratization, economic liberalization, and globalization have significantly affected migratory patterns in sending and receiving states. Scarce resources, environmental degradation, ethnic and religious conflicts, (lack of) economic development and employment will have a growing influence on intra and interstate migratory patterns. Meanwhile, advances in transportation, communication, and finance continue to facilitate the movement of individuals engaging in intra and interstate migration. Though causal factors and methods of migration may shift over the years, states remain a central agent in the explanation of: who migrates, where people migrate to, why people choose to migrate, and how long they stay. Sending and receiving states have retained their ability to influence intra and interstate migratory patterns through a variety of positive or negative incentives, policies, and laws.

Frequently, attempts to accurately explain and predict a pattern of intra and interstate migration has been hindered by the depth and breadth of the migration literature. The migration literature does not have a central theorem uniting the many disciplines working within the field. Nevertheless, the participant disciplines have experienced convergence around a few select topics and theoretical approaches to the detriment of other topics and approaches. A majority of the migration literature is dominated by topics and subtopics concerned with interstate immigration issues; the literature on emigration tends to be relatively overlooked. Similarly, developed, receiving states tend to dominate the case study and comparative work; developing, sending states are more rarely examined. Finally, rational actor models, push-pull models and social network frameworks are the methods and theoretical approaches most commonly applied or analyzed in
the migration literature; systematic testing of alternative models or frameworks is lacking within the migration literature.

This case study will contribute to the smaller subset of the migration literature by applying an alternative framework for analyzing migration in a developing, sending state. The broad research question this paper examines is: how do sending and receiving states directly and indirectly influence intra and interstate migration? Three specific questions will be addressed: (1) how does official economic development policy in a developing state affect intra and interstate migration? (2) how does state sponsored violence affect intra and interstate migration? (3) what is the relationship between economic development, state sponsored violence, and migration?

This case study utilizes several migration frameworks presented in the literature; linking economic development, state sponsored violence and intra and interstate migration in sending states. The frameworks in the literature are combined and further developed to create a comprehensive framework for examining intra and interstate migration patterns. The patterns predicted by the framework offers answers to the questions posited above. The framework predicts that economic modernization or economic development necessarily leads to an increase in state sponsored violence, essential for the initiation or maintenance of economic reforms, resulting in an increase in intra and interstate migration. Interestingly, in Guatemala the predicted pattern does not always emerge; there are several instances when the pattern is temporarily disrupted, or when the pattern is entirely contradictory to the outcomes predicted by the selected frameworks. The case study suggests that intra and interstate migration respond differently to state sponsored violence and that intrastate migration may be bounded by a saturation effect. Meaning that at a certain level of political violence intrastate migration levels off, as the population no longer perceives a utility to migrating. Furthermore, the study suggests that
beyond a simple threshold the intensity of state sponsored violence affects the volume and duration of total migration.

The examination of Guatemala offers a unique opportunity to add to the migration literature. While the availability and reliability of migration data present a challenge to studying migration in Guatemala, the data which is available offers a clear indication of the types of patterns that exist between economic development, state sponsored violence, and intra and interstate migration. Several similar case studies have examined economic development, state sponsored violence, and migration in Guatemala, but none of the studies focused on all three topics from the 1950 to 1995 time period and none of the studies focused on both intra and interstate migration. This particular case study can provide evidence linking the previous Guatemalan case studies. Additionally, this study will provide a detailed account from the perspective of a developing, sending state, which has experienced high levels of either intra and/or interstate migration since its independence.

The thesis is presented in the following seven chapters: the review of the migration literature is provided in Chapter 2. The major themes, topics, and subtopics are presented along with the migration frameworks utilized by this study. Chapter 3 contains a description of the methodology, including limits on the reliability and availability of data, sources of data, definitions and operationalization of the variables. Chapter 4 offers a brief history of Guatemala, encompassing the Pre-colonization, Colonization, Independence and Democratic periods in Guatemala leading up to the 1950s. Chapter 5 covers the current situation in Guatemala, regime types and domestic politics, the social conditions, and the level of foreign intervention in Guatemala from 1950 to 1995. Chapter 6 contains the data and analysis for economic development, state sponsored violence, and intra and interstate migration from 1950 to 1995. Chapter 7 summarizes the data and the conclusions from the case study.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This case study will apply a framework for migration, in order to establish a predictable pattern of intra and interstate migration regarding a developing state, Guatemala. The literature review surveys the major themes and case study work contained in the migration literature. It highlights the scarcity of detailed case study work with regard to emigration, intrastate migration, and sending states in the developing world. In order to build a framework for explaining migration in Guatemala, the literature review will also delve into relevant theories of economic modernization and state sponsored violence, as well as theories and case work detailing the relationship between violence and (forced) migration. Based on the literature for the three selected topics (migration, economic development and state sponsored violence, and violence and migration) it is anticipated that the following causal pattern will emerge in the Guatemalan case study: (1) periods of economic modernization and expansion, (2) followed by an increase in the incidence of state sponsored violence, (3) resulting in an increase in intrastate and interstate migration.

Overview of Migration Literature:

“there is no coherent theory of international migration”- Douglas S. Massey 1993

Within the migration literature there is no common uniting migration theory; as a consequence the disciplines examining migration are often disconnected from one another. The result of this disengagement is that different disciplines examine the same topics, producing similar studies that overlap in terms of content and foci. Regrettably, even with many competing disciplines, there are topics and regions that have been largely unexplored in the migration literature. As explained in detail below, the topics of immigration control, immigration and electoral politics, and the effects of immigration on wages, pensions and welfare benefits in
receiving states (predominantly developed democracies) dominates many of the disciplines producing migration literature. Missing in the literature are many studies of emigration, along with detailed comparative case studies exploring emigration from underdeveloped or developing sending states in the Global South, with the notable exception of Mexico. Furthermore, there has been a lack of systematic theory testing, leaving competing theories weakly supported while inadequate theories survive unchallenged.

Despite this situation, there have been attempts to unify the divisions within the literature, and to create more coherent theories which would analyze the initiation and perpetuation of migration at micro and macro levels. Previous attempts by Massey et al (1993), Massey et al (1994) and Brettel and Hollifield (2008) to sort out the field have been used to organize this literature review. The disciplines involved in the study of migration are varied and include: anthropology, sociology, history, demographics, geology, political science, economics, and law. While each discipline has its own level of analyses, research question(s), theories, and variables they examine, there is still considerable room for cooperation and collaboration within the fields. Thus far the major sources of divergence arise from the level of analysis employed “within and between disciplines,” meaning that theories, hypotheses, and predictions are a function of the level of analysis selected by the researcher (Brettel and Hollifield, 2009, 17). There are two levels of analysis: (1) macro, including states, whole populations, economies, entire social classes, political systems, networks and (2) micro, individuals, (ethnic) groups, and households (Brettel and Hollifield 2008). As stated by Brettel and Hollifield (2008) the unit of analysis affects the research design, the data used, and the types of theories that are developed. The four types of theories most commonly used are: transnational, structuralist, rationalist and institutionalist. A short description of each of the theory types follows immediately after a brief review of the varied topics within the migration literature.
As explained by Brettel and Hollifield (2009) in their review of the theoretical migration literature, transnational theories explore the notion of identity and membership in the sending and receiving states, emphasizing “the links between the homeland and the notion that emigration did not necessarily mean definitive departure in the minds of the migrants” (Brettel and Hollifield, 2009, 17). Transnational theories are frequently utilized by the disciplines of geography and anthropology. Structural theories examine the structural forces, economic, political, and social, that have an effect on migration. Structuralist theories tend to be used by anthropology, geography, and sociology. Rationalist theories are built on the notion of self-selection, or deliberate choice by a particular individual, group, organization, or state. Rationalist theories are utilized by demography, economics, law, and political science. Finally, institutionalist theories are utilized by political science, law, and sociology; they allow for the examination of rules, norms and social behaviors created and maintained by formal and informal political and social structures and groups (Brettel and Hollifield, 2009, 4). As a discipline, history tends to shun formal theory testing of any type.

Despite the divergent starting points, or levels of analysis, and the range of theoretical approaches utilized by the disciplines researching migration, there is still considerable overlap in terms of content within the migration literature. As referenced in the preceding section, the topics comprising the majority of the migration literature focus on the social, economic and political effects of immigration in receiving states. The dominance of immigration in the migration literature is evidenced by the recurrent interchangeable use of the terms migration and immigration. Several authors, at more than one juncture in their writing, use the terms immigration and migration interchangeably, when they are referring to immigration specifically.  

---

1 This tendency is seen in Boswell, Guiraudon & Lahay, Castles, and Hollifield.
Topics in the immigration literature include: immigration control and security issues, the economic effects of immigration, the effects of immigration on welfare benefits, electoral politics in receiving states, the regulations and rules regarding citizenship in receiving states, and gender. Recently several new topics have gained traction and recognition within the migration literature, including remittances, brain drain, human trafficking, and rural and urban development. Topics that continue to be overlooked within the migration literature include the effects of migration in sending and receiving states, the political effects of emigration in sending states, the formation, regulation, and enforcement of emigration policies in sending states, the political influence of receiving states on sending states, forced migration, the notion of economic refugees, and detailed comparative case study work from a variety of sending states (Gaurnizo and Smith, 2003).

**Immigration: Traditional and Contemporary Themes**

Within the migration literature there are certain issues that tend to produce the largest volumes of work, these issues help to constitute the themes in the migration literature. The wide range of themes, vary in terms of their level of analysis, the state, the individual and the community, as well as the area of examination, economic, security, policy, or society. A few of the themes have a tendency to overlap, for example: the enforcement of immigration policies and the security of the state, and rules delineating citizenship, public policies and welfare benefits. The themes, which follow immediately below, are ordered to highlight the overlap between certain themes and subtopics.

**Immigration: Enforcement of Immigration Policies in Receiving States**

The first distinct theme in the migration literature is focused on the enacting and enforcement of immigration policy in receiving states. Within this particular topic scholars assume state is an independent actor shaping and enforcing immigration policy because it has its own expansionist or restrictive preferences and goals (Massey 1990; Simmons and Keohane...
State preferences and goals may be related to security, population, available labor resources, and economic growth (Cornelius 2005). Furthermore, Boswell (2007) believes the state pursues its preferences and goals more aggressively during “state building, industrialization, and modernization” (Boswell, 2007, 80.). It is during these time periods when the state is most vulnerable to claims challenging its capacity to rule (Boswell, 2007, 80). Furthermore, it has often been posited that the state plays a role in enacting and enforcing immigration policy in order to legitimize the state (Simmons and Keohane 1992; Hollifield 2004; Ellermann 2006; Boswell 2007). The legitimacy of the state is often dependent on providing physical, social and economic security to citizens; thus, immigration control is seen as an unending duty of the state (Mayo 1888; Guiraudon & Lahav 2000; Meyers 2000; Hollifield 2004; Boswell 2007). Sassen (1996), using the globalist’s challenge, adds to the state legitimacy debate by arguing that the state is in the process of losing legitimacy and autonomy in regards to enacting and enforcing immigration policy.2 However, many migration researchers have rebutted the claim made by Sassen by pointing out the monopoly the state continues to hold over the granting of civil liberties, legal entry, issuance of work visas, student visas and passports, granting of asylum, naturalization and deportation processes for immigrants (Dowty 1987; Zolberg 1989; Freeman 1998; Joppke 1998; Guiraudon & Lahav 2000; Meyers 2000; Hollifield 2004; Cornelius 2005; Daniels 2006; Ellermann 20063).

---

2 Virginie Guiraudon and Gallya Lahav, “Reappraisal of the State Sovereignty Debate,” *Comparative Political Studies* 33, no. 2 (2000): 164. They cite Joppke (1998) to help define the term globalist as “scholars who emphasize the blurring of domestic and international boundaries in an interdependent world, which relies on the free flow of goods, money, people, and ideas or norms.”

3 Antje Ellermann, “Street-level Democracy: How Immigration Bureaucrats Manage Public Opposition,” *West European Politics* 29, no. 2 (2006): 294, 303. She claims that deportation as an embodiment of state “capacity” is “virtually ignored by the literature.” She believes this is due to deportations “heavy-handedness” and impracticality as a comprehensive solution for immigration problems. She uses Germany in the 1990s as a case study to show public displeasure for forced deportations. Granting of civil liberties is often accomplished and facilitated by a functioning judicial system. Alas, Hollifield (2000) believes that these liberties or “rights” can come to interfere with state control of migration policy.
Security is a related sub-topic within the immigration enforcement literature. Since the provision of security is a means to legitimize state rule, and a preference of the state as an independent actor, there is ample incentive for the state to “securitize” immigration policy, meaning the issue of immigration is increasingly tied to terrorism, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and crime, all of which are occurrences that citizens need protection from (Boswell, 2007, 11). Unsurprisingly, researchers appear to be in disagreement over the types of security threats presented by the aggressive or passive enforcement of immigration policies. Furthermore, there is the notion that (perceived) threats are cyclical, that they mirror domestic elections, and stem from cultural fears (Freeman 1998; Cornelius 2005). Joppke (1998) argues the reoccurring security imperative is essentially a political tactic used in receiving states; he bases this claim on the notion that states have purposefully never fully secured their borders. An example of the types of prognostication made by those seeking to securitize immigration is provided by Goldsborough (2000); consequences of not enforcing immigration policies, due to a lack of capacity or a lack of political will, will be higher crime rates, lower wages, less resources, higher unemployment and increased social conflict. Many of the issues raised by Goldsborough and those wishing to securitize immigration will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. Whether immigration security threats are real or simply perceived makes no difference; the result is the same since the state drives the enactment and enforcement of immigration policy (Guiraudon and Lahav 2000; Freeman 2007). Guiraudon and Lahav (2000) argue that even when immigration control has devolved to the level of municipal, city or region the state still exercises the ability to influence policy. Moreover, they argue that any powers ceded to NGOs or local

---

4 Boswell (2007), 10-11 and Castles (2002). Castles declares the issue of border control an essential state goal, and Hollifield (2004) believes that after 9-11 it is more than ever the job of the state to provide security for its citizens and a means to that end is to control [im]migration policy.
governments have been given with the consent of the state, for purposes and goals previously established by the state (Guiraudon and Lahav, 2002, 177).

The economics and effects of enforcement is the last sub-topic within the immigration enforcement literature. The questions addressed by this literature center on three types of inquiries: (1) the amount and type of resources dedicated to immigration enforcement, (2) the effects of successful and unsuccessful immigration enforcement for the domestic populations and for immigrant populations attempting entry, and (3) the effect of increased enforcement on the level of immigration. In response to the first and second line of inquiry, the agencies charged with the task of regulating and enforcing immigration policies, such as the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) or Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in the United States, do not have access to unlimited budgets or personnel. As a result, agencies make strategic decisions regarding the enforcement of immigration policies, which have effects on domestic and immigrant populations. One of the most significant effects of this strategic funding is the location of immigration enforcement. While Davila et al (1999) argue that interior enforcement and border enforcement are both important aspects to immigration control, very often the agencies in charge of enforcing immigration policies favor spending their finite resources on border enforcement over interior enforcement.5 Davila et al (1999) argue that interior enforcement, or employer based enforcement, would have a greater value toward decreasing unwanted immigration since it would drive down the availability of employment. Furthermore, Davila et al (1999) posit that the INS spends a disproportionate amount of income on border control since this type of activity produces verifiable results: apprehensions. Since there is no established formula that can reliably predict the number of undocumented immigrants the agency (INS, ICE) is

---

sheltered from having to justify the numbers of undocumented immigrants actually residing within the state. Kossoudji (1992) would agree with the underlying theme of the Davila et al.
(1999) arguments; she contends that strategic temporal and monetary shortcuts taken by INS post-apprehension may actually increase the long-term costs to immigration enforcement, and may possibly increase the quantity of immigration and length of stay. By returning immigrants directly across the United States-Mexico border, instead of returning them to their point of origin within the sending state, the INS inadvertently increases the number of attempts to cross the border. As a result, the INS acts more as a “spigot” than a barricade (Kossoudji, 1992, 162).

There are several arguments that increased enforcement does not necessarily lead to decreased immigration (Kossoudiji 1992; Donato et al 1992; Djajic 1999). The results from Kossoudiji’s (1992) study indicate that increased enforcement and increased apprehensions by INS lead to longer stays by undocumented immigrants with less movement across the border, but do not necessarily lead to decreased immigration. Donato et al (1992) find similar results, despite increased resources (funding and personnel) and increased apprehension rates, the INS was not able to decrease the number of immigrants successfully crossing the border. The findings of the Donato et al (1992) study seem to show that as more resources are dedicated to enforcement, more apprehensions do take place, but so do more attempts to cross the border, thus negating the increased resources and apprehensions by the receiving state. Djajić (1999) presents similar outcomes from increased enforcement of immigration policies along the borders in receiving states. He argues that as enforcement is increased in geographic areas (border areas) and in certain types of employment (agricultural jobs, construction jobs) migrants then spread out into new geographic areas and new sectors of the economy where they will be less likely to be detected by the enforcement mechanisms employed by the state. Once settled the migrants will form migrant networks from their newly employed physical locations, as a consequence drawing
in more immigrants to new areas. Djajic’s (1999) argument ties back to Davila et al (1999), as immigrants move inland and into new sectors of the economy there becomes a need to emphasize interior immigration enforcement over border enforcement. Lastly, the immigration enforcement literature briefly examines whether increased resources dedicated to enforcing immigration policies has resulted in an increase in the use of coyotes, and an increase in the fees charged to immigrants using their services; this topic is debated within the literature. Kossoudji (1992) argues that the use of coyotes has increased in recent years, while acknowledging that data (price, usage) on coyotes is difficult to attain. Donato et al (1992) argues that the price of a coyote has remain unchanged since the passage of IRCA and the probability of using a coyote increases with age and income, not with increased enforcement mechanisms in the receiving state.

Immigration: Effects of Immigration-Public Sector & Welfare Systems in Receiving States

The economic effects of immigration on the public sector and welfare systems in Europe and in the United States comprise a large portion of the migration literature. Within this topic area the literature tends to be dominated by theories and models drawn from the economic disciplines; theories examining the effects of immigration at a macro level of analysis. The literature provides many individual time series case studies examining the effects of immigration in specific European states, as well as many comparative studies examining the effects of immigration on the public sectors and welfare systems in economically developed receiving states. The questions addressed by this literature tend to focus on a few sub-topics: (1) the age of the immigrant populations and the age of the domestic population (Freeman 1986; Hu 1998; Storesletten 2000 & 2003; Coleman & Rowthorn 2004; Schou 2006), (2) the educational and skill level of the immigrant populations (Khoo 1994; Sarris and Zografakis 1999; Coleman &

---

*A coyote is a person that is paid to escort or guide a migrant across the border. A coyote is typically paid half of his or her fee at the beginning of the trip and the other half once the migrant has been turned over to family members in the receiving country.*
(Rowthorn 2004; Kemnitz 2003; Storesletten 2000 & 2003), (3) length of stay of the immigrants (Freeman 1986; Borjas & Trejo 1991; Khoo 1994; Schou 2006), (4) tax burden and welfare benefits in a specific state (Freeman 1986; Hansen and Lofstrom 2003; Storesletten 2003), (5) sustainability of debt burden in a given state (Coleman and Rowthorn 2004), and (6) level of immigrant integration in the receiving state (Borjas & Trejo 1991; Khoo 1994; Sarris & Zografakis 1999; Hansen & Lofstrom 2003; Schou 2006).

The positive and negative effect of immigrants in receiving states has been and continues to be debated vigorously within the migration literature. The empirical evidence provides both positive and negative explanations of the effects; additionally, there may be positive and negative effects within a given state that are subject to fluctuation over time (Ekberg 1999). The empirical evidence seems to provide support to the arguments that younger immigrants, ages twenty to thirty, with higher education have the most positive impacts on a given receiving state (Storesletten 2000; Coleman & Rowthorn 2004). Older immigrants, ages fifty and over, and very young immigrants, aged less than twenty years, tend to incur higher costs in the receiving state. Similarly, if immigrants have a higher birth rate than the domestic population higher costs may be incurred in a given state (Khoo 1994; Hu 1998; Ekberg 1999; Hansen and Lofstrom 2003; Schou 2006). Also, immigrants or refugees who are low-skilled or poorly educated can be costly to receiving states in the long-term (Khoo 1994; Ekberg 1999; Sarris & Zografakis 1999; Hansen & Lofstrom 2003; Kemnitz 2003). As a general rule, immigrants who are integrated into the receiving states’ economies bring more long-term benefits to the receiving states than immigrants who are unemployed or are employed in the informal economy for the long-term (Khoo 1994; Schou 2006). Most of the literature seems to provide evidence for the argument that low-skilled immigrants do depress the wages of domestic low-skilled workers in similar sectors of the economy in receiving states (Sarris and Zografakis 1999; Coleman and Rowthorn 2004).
However, these low-skilled workers may simultaneously provide gains to middle and upper class workers; thus, providing a net gain to the domestic population depending on the distribution of low-skilled workers and immigrants in the receiving state (Kemnitz 2003, Peri 2007). It is also generally agreed upon within the literature that immigrants to the United States may provide more benefits to the state in the long-term since the United States provides fewer welfare benefits to its domestic population than European states to their domestic populations (Blau 1984; Simon 1984; Freeman 1986).

**Immigration: Migration Policy and Electoral Politics in Receiving States**

Though the salience of immigration policy on a given state’s national agenda may fluctuate over time, the enacting and enforcing immigration policy is never entirely disregarded by political parties, business interests, civil society organizations, or national electorates. Those in power and the groups and coalitions seeking to influence those in power will always have a perennial interest in immigration, due to states “defining themselves through the official selection and control of foreigners seeking permanent residence on their soil” (Tichenor, 2002, 1).

Furthermore, Tichenor (2002) argues the competition between ideologies, domestic groups, political parties, and international interests has “culminated in dramatic policy innovations that set distinctive regulatory patterns for extended periods of time” (Tichenor, 2002, 1-2). Coalitions and alliances between the domestic and international groups participating in the formation of immigration policy in sending states can be dynamic, fleeting, entrenched, unstable, paradoxical, or incredibly difficult to forge (Tichenor 2002; Body-Gendrot and Schain 2006). The questions commonly addressed by this literature are: (1) how and why do the groups or coalitions form, (2) once the groups and coalitions have formed what is the outcome, are immigration policies restrictive or liberal, and (3) do the new policies have any effects, if so what are they? The
decision by a state to develop restrictive or liberal immigration policies is more complex than the national frame of mind; several additional factors are significant. Additionally, the formation of groups and coalitions is dependent on a variety of factors, including but not limited to, preferences on immigration policy, economic conditions, business interests, social and cultural values, political affiliation, region, and socioeconomic status.

One of the factors influencing the formation of immigration policy is the structure and scope of a state’s government (Body-Gendrot and Schain 2006). The power and scope of any given state can range from governments with immense powers at federal, state, and local levels to governments with strong federal, weak state/municipal powers, to governments with weak powers at all levels; the ability of the judicial system to overrule policies is another important factor. States, whether by design or by capacity, with a weak and limited scope of government may not desire highly restrictive immigration policies, since restrictive policies require an expanded, interventionist role for the state, while liberal policies may allow the state’s role to remain limited (Tichenor 2002). Another factor influencing the formation of immigration policy and groups and coalitions is the prevailing economic conditions in a given state; although, periods of economic downturn or growth do not appear to have a direct effect on the adoption of restrictive or liberal immigration policies (Tichenor 2002). Tichenor (2002) details several instances in the United States where expansionist policies were adopted during economic downturns and several instances when restrictive policies were adopted during economic growth.

**Immigration: Concepts of Citizenship and Identity in Receiving States**

Within the migration literature examining the concept of identity and citizenship, each of the disciplines examining migration are represented. Each discipline shares an interest in explaining the rules and regulations for attaining citizenship and establishing identity in a given
state, the process of acquiring citizenship, and the effects of becoming a citizen or being denied the opportunity. The influence of a micro level of analysis is strongly felt as the concepts of transnationalism or identity are thoroughly explored. A macro level analysis also exists, as concepts of social justice, equality under the law, human rights, politics and citizenship, and the role of institutions are topics explored in the literature. The most common and most thoroughly explored issue within the literature is transnationalism and identity.

As a starting point for the discussion of transnationalism, a definition from Basch et al (1994), transnationalism is “a process by which migrants, through their daily life activities and social, economic, and political relations, create social fields that cross national boundaries” (Basch, 1994, 22). Castles et al (1998) contend that transnationalism and has partially developed out of the notion that within this current era individuals are more mobile and have access to faster and cheaper means of transportation than in past eras; consequently, the scope of transnational migration is unlike any other period. However, many researchers (Faist 2000; Olsson 2001; Portes 2003; Smith 2003; Guarnizo 2003) note that migrants do not always migrate in one direction nor do they stay indefinitely in the receiving state. Furthermore, they note that the phenomenon of transnationalism, while not a new occurrence, has only recently developed out of a renewed examination of the available migratory data. Intuitively, as individuals migrate to a receiving state(s) they might develop new loyalties, and as a result their identities become tied to more than one state (Beck 2000). In order to address concerns about immigration, identity and assimilation, certain receiving and sending states have developed policies allowing for dual or multiple citizenships (Portes et al 1999; Faist 2000; Kolowski 2000). Dual or multiple citizenships could be conceived as an official state recognition of transnationalism; immigrants and domestic populations are affected by transnational activities. The types of individuals, and the effects of transnationalism and dual or multiple citizenships shown in the literature include:
(1) transnationalism increases among individuals and groups which include married males, immigrants from rural areas, immigrants with access to capital, immigrants with higher education, does not necessarily decrease with length of stay (Rumbaut 2002; Portes 2003); (2) individuals may develop “dual or multiple national bonds [that] may be useful or enjoyable” to migrants (Fustafson, 1995, 7; (3) individual migrants may retain their “emotional” ties to their sending state while simultaneously gaining “practical” ties to their receiving state (Gustafson, 2005, 12; Hammar 1985, Basch 1994); (4) individuals with dual or multiple citizenships may feel they can only be fully loyal to one state at a time, possibly prolonging or hindering linguistic and cultural integration in the receiving state (Gustafson 2005) and lastly; (5) groups opposed to transnationalism or dual citizenship might increase the levels of xenophobia and racism in the domestic populations as the native populations react to individuals and groups embracing other languages, cultures and customs (Gustafson 2005).

During the transnational debate there have been a few practical questions raised, the solutions are for domestic policymakers to sort out. Some of the practical issues include the existence of diplomatic privileges, whether voting rights should be extended in both states, and whether or not service in the military should be allowed. Additionally, the examination of transnationalism offers a brief interlude from the majority of the migration literature, due to the definition of transnationalism the literature by necessity focuses on the experience of the immigrant in the context of both the sending and receiving state. Case studies in the literature are quite diverse and include: Dominica, China, Israel, Cape Verde, Burundi, India, Lebanon, El Salvador, and Mexico.
The issue of immigration and gender has generated a considerable amount of research. There are several well established theories and models that have been applied across a variety of case studies. One of the most applied models is the human capital model, developed by Sandell (1977) and then Mincer (1978) as an extension of human capital theory. The premise of the human capital model is that household decisions to migrate are “entirely egalitarian, completely symmetrical and based on the relative earning potentials of spouses” (Cooke, 2003, 339). Meaning that both partners agree on the relative gains or losses anticipated by the household if migration were to occur, based on that information they then choose whether or not to migrate (Sandell 1977). Typically in the application of the model men have higher potential income in the receiving state and women have lower potential income in the receiving state. The result is that married women lose out on income by migrating; a single woman with the same options would not choose to migrate, but for the benefit of the household the married women choose to migrate (Sandell 1977). In Sandell’s (1977) study single women who chose to migrate did experience an increase in income, but not the married women. As Cooke (2003) and Cooke and Bailey (1996) point out, there is a rich literature providing evidence that when married women migrate, regardless of the net gains made by the household unit, the women tend to experience a drop in labor force participation, a drop in employment, a drop in weeks worked per year, a drop in hours worked per week, a drop in income, and a drop in their attitudes toward employment (Cooke, 2003, 339). A second model for examining gender and migration exists, though it has been applied less in the literature. The gender-role model does not predict an egalitarian decision making process. Instead the model predicts that the decision to migrate is asymmetrical; the male of the household exercises decision making powers even when the female has a “high paying job”
or opportunity to receive higher wages or prominence over time (Bielby and Bielby 1992; Boyle et al 2000; Cooke, 2003, 339).

Whether the gender-role model or the human capital model is applied the results are similar, women migrants face considerable challenges when entering the labor force in a receiving state. This situation is often directly exacerbated by immigration policies in receiving states. There is a wide range of immigration policies enacted by states that discriminate based on gender, including: (1) policies that allow for one primary applicant, typically the male; (2) prohibitions on the spouses of immigrants working; (3) temporary work permits that prohibit spouses from entering; (4) family reunification programs for female spouses but not for males; (5) highly restrictive guest worker programs that do not allow for permanent settlement or citizenship; (6) refusal to recognize training, education, and certification of immigrants; and (7) policies that allow for the entry of skilled workers while excluding low-skilled or unskilled workers (Hyndman 1999; Kofman 1999; Mills 2003; Dodson and Crush 2004).

The challenges facing women in receiving states is also indirectly exacerbated by the gendered recruitment of labor and the gendered division of labor in the labor market (Mills 2003). Female migrants are typically overrepresented in informal markets or as part-time workers. Due in part to their dual role as laborers and as the primary caregivers for children and family members and in part to patriarchal social and political structures in sending states, female migrants may not have had access to education or other training in their sending states that would facilitate their move into the skilled or formal labor market in receiving states. The outlook for female migrants is disheartening; they lack the ability to vote or participate in the election of their representatives, they lack political power as a domestic interest group, and as immigrants they suffer from a general dislike from the majority of the population. Their lack of political appeal
has resulted in female migrants historically being excluded from domestic women’s movements (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2000). Unfortunately, female migrants may often be tolerant of their poor treatment in the receiving state since they view informal, part-time, or underemployment as a mechanism for social and economic mobility, relative to their previous situation (Feldman 2001; Mills 2003).

**Emigration: Traditional and Contemporary Themes**

As previously explained, the majority of the migration literature covers topics concerned with immigration; the emigration literature is smaller and more fragmented. Similar to the immigration literature, within the emigration literature the term migration is used interchangeably to describe the process of *emigration* and *immigration*. Each of the disciplines contributing research to the emigration literature examines similar topics with different levels of analyses; similar to the patterns found in the immigration literature. European case studies dominate the emigration literature, with primary foci on (1) European emigration to the New World beginning in the 1700s, accelerating during the Napoleonic Wars and tapering off at the time of the Great Depression and (2) unskilled emigration to Europe post decolonization and again after the end of the Cold War. There are fewer case studies out of Asia, the smaller collection of case studies deals primarily with emigration to Hong Kong and Chinese emigration to the United States in the 1900s. With a few notable exceptions, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East are largely non-existent in the emigration literature; although this tendency is slowly transforming.

Within the last decade there has been a renewed interest in the role of the sending state. As a result, emigration has slowly moved to a position of greater prominence in the literature. The examination of several topics has facilitated the move; remittances, brain drain, development and human trafficking are all topics that require at least a cursory examination of the effects of
migration in sending states. While many of the studies associated with the aforementioned topics
still focus on the effects in the receiving states, most also include a significant portion dedicated
to the effects on the migrants and the effects in the sending states. Previous trends in the
emigration literature are summarized immediately following, more contemporary trends in
emigration are subsequently analyzed.

Emigration: Traditional Themes

There are two time periods that receive the most attention in the emigration literature,
the first is during the 1700s, 1800s and early 1900s when the emigration of mass populations
primarily moved from Europe to the United States and Canada; to a lesser extent, there were
Spanish emigrants landing in Central and Latin America during this time period. The second
time period is toward the end of colonization (1950s-1980s) in Africa and Asia, emigration
patterns had shifted and different types of emigrants were now migrating in the direction of
Europe, the United States, Canada, Japan, and Australia. However, regardless of the time
period examined, European and United States’ single case studies dominate the emigration
literature; specifically, studies examining emigration from England, Ireland, Spain, and Norway
and emigration to Sweden and the United States.

A significant portion of the literature is devoted to analyzing the number and type of
emigrants leaving a particular state (Bærre 2001; Baines 1994). The case studies vary in
description, from the application of complex mathematical models to historical narratives. The
variables found in most case studies include the effect of emigrant skill level(s), age, family ties,
resources, marriage status, and education; each variable is seen as significant with the ability to
affect the decision to emigrate, and influence the length of stay in the receiving state (Kurian
Roopnarine 2003; Nekby 2006). Emigration may also be affected by conditions in the receiving state, such as wages, employment opportunities and enforcement of immigration policies (Norström 1988; Roopnarine 2003). Throughout the two historical periods most commonly examined, unskilled workers with very few resources, and no family ties or networks as well as highly skilled workers with resources and family ties and networks have engaged in short and long-term emigration.

Cornelius (2005) and Harvey et al (2005) believe that the relative shortage of emigration research, compared to immigration research, may be due to the fact that many developed, liberal, democratic states have de facto “right to leave” or “rights of exit,” many even have these rights written into their state’s constitutions. Cornelius (2005) and Harvey et al (2005) further contend that the right of exit is a fundamental human right long recognized in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and also recognized and monitored by numerous institutions, international governmental organizations (IGOs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch. Therefore, Cornelius (2005) and Harvey et al (2005) believe that in many instances restrictive state emigration policies would be redundant or deemed unconstitutional, possibly limiting the scope of emigration case studies. The paradox of the rights of exit is that many developed, liberal, and democratic states feel it is the duty of developing states to control emigration.

It is essential to note that a state may have restrictive emigration policies in effect that do not physically prevent people from leaving a region or country. Restrictive emigration policies may consist of positive or negative incentives, such as taxes, subsidies, land reforms, refusal to grant dual citizenship, refusal of re-entry; any combination of these policies function to keep
individuals from emigrating. Additionally, states may purposefully construct unrestrictive emigration policies; in either circumstance emigration data exists, and is available to be analyzed.

**Emigration: Contemporary Themes-Expanding the Existing Literature**

Recently there has been a shift in the migration literature to examine several topics that are related specifically to emigration, namely remittances, development and brain drain. These topics are interrelated to one another; each having significant impacts on the sending state. As skilled and unskilled migrants emigrate from their sending states, they take with them various skills and resources that would otherwise be available, but not necessarily utilized, in their sending state. Once in the receiving state migrants may remit a portion of their wages to their sending state, these resources may or may not be used to develop infrastructure and capital projects, smooth consumption and alleviate poverty, and invest in education. The impact of remittances, the prospect of development, and the problem of brain drain have led to debates by policymakers in sending states as to the best methods to manage the impacts of each of these topics. Restrictive emigration policies may retain highly skilled workers, but they may simultaneously restrict the amount of remittances to sending states and hinder economic development. Unrestrictive emigration policies may result in the loss of highly skilled and educated workers, reduce unemployment in certain sectors, and provide remittance resources to sending communities. However, neither policy option produces consistent results over time in every type of sending state.

**Emigrant Remittances**

The practice of remitting has increased in intensity and extensity in recent years, correspondingly the issue of remittances has gained prominence in the migration literature. Stark and Bloom’s (1985) “new economics of labor migration” facilitated the movement of remittances
and the impacts of remittances into the migration literature. They established the household as a unit of analysis in migration; previously the individual had been the unit of analysis for any economic models of migration. Their contribution lead to new debates in the literature, regarding (1) the impact of remittances in sending states, (2) the role the state should play in managing remittances and emigration.

**Impact of Remittances:** Research appears to demonstrate that the impact of remittances on sending states varies from state to state, impacts even vary within states depending on region, municipality, city, and within family or household networks (Jones 1998; van Dalen et al 2005). Remittances have been shown to reduce poverty in sending states, yet have not had an impact in reducing the income gap on a global scale (Jones 1998; Adams and Page 2003). Additionally, remittances may produce undesirable behavior in households and individuals that receive remittances such as, working less, saving less, consuming more, engaging in riskier investments, and eventual emigration (Odimuko and Riddell 1979; van Dalen et al 2005). Sending states may also be concerned that remittances will create long-term issues with depressed national economic growth, as argued by Chami et al (2005). Lucas and Stark (1985) and van Dalen et al (2005) argue that much of the impact of remittances is determined by the intentions of the person sending the remittance. For example, migrants anticipating a short-term migration often expect their funds will be spent strategically as investment or insurance for the household, individuals who are planning on long-term migration or resettlement in the receiving state do not hold their households to the same expectations (Quinn 2005). Lastly, the impact of remittances is at times determined by the location of the sending community and the socioeconomic level of the receiving household (Jones, 1995, 1998). Rural and poor households tend to spend remittances more equitably within the household on local goods and services, while urban and middleclass
tend to spend remittances less equitably within the household on imports, business ventures and education (Russell 1986; Jones 1998).

**Managing Remittances and Emigration:** Since migrant workers are often the source of substantial remittances to the sending state many researchers have come to the conclusion that the state should not engage in any activities that would restrict outward migration (Orozco 2002; Kapur 2003; Kupfer 2004; Fitzgerald 2006). However, many others disagree with this finding (Schrieder and Knerr 2002; Dalen et al 2005; Tanner 2005); they believe the state should actively participate in managing emigration and remittance resources. Schrieder and Knerr (2002) believe a role for the state is necessitated due to the uneven distribution of resources in sending states. Tanner (2005) also believes that reliance on remittances is an impractical development path for any developing state; he expands on themes in Leinback and Watkins (1998) and Schrieder and Knerr’s (2002) pieces. Tanner’s (2005) argument is based on five premises, he hypothesizes that remittances (1) are related to length of stay in the receiving state, length of stay is correlated with a decrease in the amount remitted, (2) vary significantly based on a given sending state, region, urban-rural designation, (3) are predominantly used for “private daily consumption” not for long-term development in the community, (4) are not distributed evenly throughout a society, poorer segments of society receive less remittances, and (5) lead to dependency in the sending society, not long-term independence (Tanner, 2005, 55-56).

There are less restrictive degrees of state involvement in emigration and remittance resource management (Orozco 2002; VanWey et al 2005; and Grammage 2006). The role played by the sending state, and in some instances regional institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), varies from financial assistance, to bureaucratic support, to technical assistance for sending communities. Researchers have provided details of state sponsored
outreach programs in sending communities where the state works to develop local projects, funded with remittances and at times government issued bonds to match remittance funds (Orozco, 2002, 15; Van Wey et al, 2005, 84). These programs, while initially and most notably successful with Mexican migrant workers, are also being established with varying results in Central America, Pakistan, India, Turkey, Brazil, and the Philippines (Koc and Onan 2004; Grammage 2006). Orozco (2002) and Van Wey (2005) believe that outreach programs can allow sending states to indirectly address emigration issues. They believe that prolonged local development projects could lead to (1) increased employment opportunity in sending states, (2) increased security, (3) increased educational opportunities, (4) increased return migration, (5) increased infrastructure projects, (6) more jobs created with less emigration, leading to an overall increase in the tax base, allowing the state to offer more public services.

Emigration and Development

A brief description of the aforementioned local development projects leads to the essential question at the core of the migration development literature; does migration help or harm development in the sending state? Within the migration and development literature there are ongoing debates as to what criteria should constitute a definition of development, measures of economic growth, investment and savings, health, education, access to shelter, employment, and infrastructure are criteria that are often included in discussions about development. Due to debates on how to define development and productive investments, there is not always a clear answer to the question (Koc and Onan 2004). Similar to the impact of remittances, the literature provides contradictory evidence to support claims that development occurs as a result of migration and remitting; development appears to be uneven at best, with results varying across communities, regions, and states. The literature provides evidence that (1) remittance resources
have been used for small scale development projects in sending communities, (2) migration requires an initial investment of funds, since funds may not always be readily available in the sending community, migration can leave the sending communities saddled with debt(s), (3) remittance resources are primarily spent on private consumption increasing a given state’s dependence on imported goods and services, (4) increasing private consumption may lead to development, since individuals and households having their basic needs met are then able to engage in productive activities, (5) traditional family structures are disrupted, resulting in new challenges for family members left behind to provide education, healthcare, and security for the remaining members, and (6) migration of skilled workers hinders long-term development in sending communities (Odimuko and Riddell 1979; Jones 1998; Leinback & Watkins 1998; Conway and Cohen 1998; Koc and Onan 2004; Ghai 2005; Quinn 2005; Grammage 2006).

Emigration and Brain Drain

The term ‘brain drain’ describes a migration crisis facing many developing states; describing the inability of developing states to retain their highly educated and skilled workers. These workers immigrate to more developed states where they will receive higher wages (Portes 1976; Torbat 2002; Ghai 2005). The literature devoted to the brain-drain issue tends to focus on emigration policies in states or regions with high levels of brain-drain, such as Africa and Asia. Policymakers in affected states are concerned with preempting the brain-drain, as well as with efforts to lure home their highly skilled migrant workers (Torbat 2002). A highly educated individual opting to emigrate represents a substantial loss to the state; the state loses out on its financial investment in that individual’s education as well as their future contributions to the community and state (Torbat 2002). Unfortunately for sending states, the higher an individual’s educational level the more likely that individual will chose to emigrate (Hart 2006; Zweig 2006).
Crush (2002) provides an example of the size of a state investment; he explains that a doctor trained in South Africa represents a US$150,000 investment by the state. Crush (2002) cites a single instance in South Africa when approximately 80 doctors left South Africa for Canada, representing an approximately $10 million dollar loss for South Africa. He also illustrates the “raiding” phenomenon, raiding is composed of a series of events (1) highly skilled workers leave Canada and resettle in the United States due to United States’ immigration policies encouraging skilled migration, (2) Canada in turn enacts state immigration policies to encourage highly skilled emigration from other less developed states, in this case South Africa, to fill the deficiencies in its domestic market, (3) [presumably] South Africa would then raid highly skilled migrants from other African states (Crush, 2002, 1-3).

Since multiple incentives for highly skilled migrants exist, the sending states are highly motivated to retain these individuals. Several authors have examined the strategies utilized by states to keep highly skilled migrants (Crush 2002; Kupfer 2004; Tanner 2005; Fitzgerald 2006; Zweig 2006). In addition to traditional restrictive methods for controlling emigration, state emigration policies also include: providing ample security for citizens, opportunities for education (all members of the household), housing, healthcare, employment and business formation, ease of exit and return, dual citizenship, political freedoms, tax incentives, appeals to nationalism, and salary guarantees (Crush 2002; Kupfer 2004; Ghai 2005; Tanner 2005; Zweig 2006). Crush (2002) argues that the safety and security issue is especially salient among would be emigrants. Though the emigration literature is dominated by analyses of high skill labor emigration, the policies enacted to retain highly skilled migrants are also applied to low skilled emigration policies, although not as frequently.

Many researchers believe the actions of the sending state are less important since their ability to enact emigration policy is restricted by actions in receiving states (Castles 2004;
Cornelius (2001) believes that at times receiving states have very liberal immigration policies towards highly skilled migrants and low skilled migrants making it nearly impossible for a sending state to control or influence emigration. A second related issue is the relatively less examined ‘brain push.’ Brain push is the emigration of highly skilled workers due to political instability, restrictions on individual liberties, or lack of opportunities provided by the source country (Baldwin 1970; Campos and Lien 1995; Torbat 2002).

**Theories of Economic Modernization and Violence**

While the migration literature does not have a common unifying theory of migration, the literature does offer several distinct theories, frameworks, and approaches that are complimentary; these frameworks, approaches and theories can be combined and utilized to examine migration in a variety of settings. Theories and frameworks describing the processes of economic development, political violence and intra and interstate migration are presented in the following sections. Theories, frameworks, and approaches from Paige (1975), McCreery (1994), Morrison and May (1994) and Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) are used to assemble a comprehensive framework for examining Guatemalan migration.

Theories of economic modernization and violence are abundant in the literature; most often the theories and case studies focus on the modernization of a society’s agricultural sector and the probability or the occurrence of revolution or rebellion (violence) from the peasant classes directed at the elites or the state. Theories and case studies describing economic modernization and violence perpetrated by the state, prior to revolution or rebellion, are less common in the literature. Jeffery Paige (1975) in *Agrarian Revolution* offers a simplified theory of agrarian revolution with a role for the state. He explains that agricultural development, or the
movement from subsistence agriculture to export agriculture, leads to conflict. His theory is illustrated below in figure 2.1.

**Figure 2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Development</th>
<th>Conflict (Violence)</th>
<th>Revolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Movement from production for subsistence to production for export)</td>
<td>(State, Peasant, Elite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paige (1975) asserts that conflict arises from agricultural development because each group (landless or landed, cultivator or laborer) will attempt to protect their interests (land, wages, and profits). Those individuals without economic means (peasants) will pursue the protection of their interests politically and those with economic means will pursue their interests economically and politically. Paige (1975) believes the state has a role in managing the conflict(s); revolution may occur, if the state does not redistribute, protect, or aid the disaffected groups. In Paige’s (1975) theory the influence of the state on conflict is almost secondary to the conflict generated by elites and peasants. However, there are several theories on economic development and violence that place the state as a central actor; able to influence outcomes at each level.

These types of theories have been explored in a variety of case studies, David McCreery (1994) examines the pattern of economic development and state sponsored violence in Guatemala from 1760-1940. He claims that the widespread shift to the production of coffee for export in the nineteenth century devastated subsistence farming in Guatemala. Land ownership became even more concentrated as private and communal lands were seized or sold without the consent of the prior occupants. Newly landless peasants were coerced into the seasonal migratory workforce through debt peonage and forced labor. McCreery (1994) claims that the “political ideology and
the industrial goals of society reinforce each other” as the state seeks to maintain power. Any groups, whether they are political, social, or economic, who do not fit into the state’s economic development plans or who do not fit into the ideological frame of the state are ostracized. McCreery (1994) contends that individuals migrate between departments and out of state to avoid violence in highly repressive departments. He predicts and explains a similar pattern of state behavior and movement of people for each wave of economic development or diversification. The pattern is illustrated below in figure 2.2.

**Figure 2.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Modernization</th>
<th>State Sponsored Violence</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Export agriculture, free trade, industrialization)</td>
<td>(Forced labor, debt peonage, repression of organized labor and political parties)</td>
<td>(Intrastate, Interstate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In McCreery’s (1994) example, at point A the newly landless peasants are not willing to work as wage workers even though their ability to engage in subsistence farming has been or is being destroyed. Simultaneously, the owners of the plantations or fincas are unified in their concern and frustration by a perceived abundance of unemployed and unwilling labor in neighboring departments or regions. The state operates as an agent of the owners of capital or the landowners and provides the mechanisms of coercion; forced migration is the result. Occasional infighting among the coffee growing elites does not dissuade the group from presenting a united front to the state. McCreery (1994) reports in the years prior to 1900, it was difficult for the small and relatively disorganized military to patrol for labor scofflaws in rural areas. As a result the Guatemalan state introduces the use of militias; by 1900 there were “173 militia detachments” operating in rural Guatemala (McCreery, 1994, 181). McCreery (1994) notes the labor laws put into place at the behest of the owners of coffee plantations, laborers would be allowed three
designations, (1) Colonos, or the laborers who lived year round on the plantations, they were bound by four year contracts and were not permitted rights of exit; (2) Seasonal laborers who received advances, bound until they had paid back their advance; (3) Seasonal workers receiving no advances, not bound and rare in the population (McCreery, 1994, 181). Discipline for not participating in the system was facilitated by each migrant’s labor book they were required to carry year round detailing the days worked. Violators of the labor policies were put in jail, punished with state work detail, or physically punished by the militias or state. McCreery illustrates the pattern of economic modernization, the introduction of coffee for agricultural export, the resultant methods of coercion and violence used by the state, and the resulting (forced) migratory flows in Guatemala nearly two hundred years.

**Theories of Violence and Migration**

Within the literature examining the relationship between violence (state actors, non-state actors) and migration, the ensuing movement of peoples is often referred to as forced migration, not simply migration. Forced migration is a often a catch-all term used to describe a (rational) decision to flee violence; it is also used as a descriptive term used to explain a particular mechanism which results in the creation of refugees and internally displaced persons. A unique aspect of forced migration is an inescapable level of state involvement not previously seen in the dominant economic and sociological theories based on the individual or household. Unsurprisingly, the approach most commonly used to explain violence and migration or forced migration begins with a macro level of analysis; assuming the state or state institutions influence forced migration. Surprisingly, though well suited for the field of political science forced migration has not been well studied within the field despite having been extensively examined by a variety of other academic disciplines. Moore and Shellman (2004) offer a critique of the political science literature within the topic of forced migration, they argue that the existing
literature is (1) “idiographic,” meaning that most of the empirical work involves single case studies or events, with little or no comparative work, (2) uses only a macro unit of analysis, disregarding the micro level used in most of the rest of the voluntary literature, and (3) the case studies have only examined instances of forced migration, there has not been a comparative focus on states that have not produced forced migrants (Moore and Shellman, 2004, 724).

Schmeidl (1997, 2000) and Clark (1989) suggest several broad theoretical approaches for the study of forced migration within the field of political science. The first approach is to examine the “root causes” of forced migration, such as structural inequalities in land ownership, education, and access to credit. The second theoretical approach is significant to this study examining the “proximate conditions,” such as state sponsored violence and repression. Moore et al (2003) provides further explanation of proximate conditions by describing the threats to liberty and life leading to migration of individuals from their state or their community; the threats are produced and countered from competing groups within a state. Moore and Shellman (2004) expand on Moore et al (2003) and argue that forced migration, as measured by the number of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP), occurs as people weigh the differences between freedom and income; decisions are influenced by the amount and type of information individuals are able to access. Moore and Shellman (2004) explain further clarifying the point from Moore et al (2003), freedom and income may be threatened by four different groups in a society, (1) government forces, (2) dissident forces, (3) interaction of one and two, and (4) military personnel from external states. Moore and Shellman (2004) conclude that the influence of the third group (government forces and dissident forces) threatens freedom more powerfully than the other variables and is a more powerful influence on forced migration than any income lost or gained. In their study the presence of a democratic government or the potential for income gained or lost have a much smaller impact than violence. A similar approach is described by Schmeidl (1997,
2000) and Clark (1989) examines the “intervening factors” such as the influence of external actors or the influence of the state on development, repression or migration.

William Deane Stanley (1987) offers a case study, El Salvador, from 1976 through 1984 examining whether the causes of interstate migration from Guatemala could be attributed to violence or economics. The results of Stanley’s (1987) case study provide evidence that violence is a motivating factor for interstate migration from El Salvador to the United States, even when adjusting for seasonality. Also, he also explains two significant findings, the first is a lag time of one to four months from the period of the onset of violence to migration and destination in the receiving state, and the second is that military sweeps in rural areas had more of an impact on interstate migration than killings in the same areas. Opportunities for employment were not statistically significant in this case study.

Morrison and May (1994) and Morrison (1993) also study the effect of state sponsored violence on migration; the authors examine interstate migration in Guatemala during the late 1970s and the early 1980s using an individual rational choice model. Morrison (1993) finds there is a “nonlinear” relationship between violence and migration. Migration increases significantly as the level of violence increases; the low threshold for violence is a finding echoed in the companion article (1994). In the four waves of violence detailed by Morrison (1993), the variable for quantity of assassinations had the strongest influence over migration. Morrison and May (1994) acknowledge that economic and political violence variables are not easily distinguished from each other; yet in times of high political violence there is greater migration directly attributed to violence. Morrison and May (1994) establish a threshold for violence which corresponds with increased migration. Within each department in Guatemala the threshold for
violence is approximately 6-10% of the total of the most violent department in any given year.7 For example, between the years 1980 through 1983 the average number of deaths needed to reach the threshold would have been 75; from 1980 through 1983 the average number of deaths per year due to political violence in Guatemala was 10,296, far above the threshold. The threshold of violence equates to approximately .001% of the population being killed in any given year. As another example, using the population of the United States, the threshold for violence would be the equivalent of 300,000 individuals per year being killed. As Morrison and May (1994) describe, since the violence was pervasive over a long period of time, it only required a small increase in the number of killings to influence the level of migration. Figure 2.3 below illustrates Morrison (1993) and Morrison and May’s (1994) findings.

Figure 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Conditions</th>
<th>Intrastate migration explained by economic variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence (low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Conditions</th>
<th>(Increased) Intrastate Migration explained by variables for violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence (high)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 As measured by the number of politically motivated killings and corpses found. At the time of Morrison and May’s (1994) study neither the REMHI, nor the CEH had been published. The number of killings from specific departments from 1976-1981 became available after the publication of these documents.
Figure 2.3 illustrates that when violence is low, economic variables hold higher explanatory power. When violence is high, or over a threshold, the economic variables no longer explain increases to migration.

**A Framework for Economic Development, Violence and Migration**

One of the most comprehensive frameworks for the qualitative or quantitative examination of economic development, violence, and migration is provided by the comparative study provided by Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991); they combine the three theoretical approaches described in the preceding section (root causes, proximate causes, intervening causes). Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) utilize migration in Central American to illustrate their structural framework; El Salvador is the highlighted case study. Their framework would also be able to accommodate Moore and Shellman’s (2004) theory of forced migration. The framework is illustrated in figure 2.4 below.8

**Figure 2.4**

---

8 In terms of capital penetration the state may be a willing or reluctant partner, leader, or subordinate.
Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) acknowledge that within the study of economic
development, violence and migration it is at time difficult to establish causal relationships due to
the influence of multiple variables. Nevertheless, they establish a framework that begins with
capital penetration, or as it has been previously referred to, economic modernization, agricultural
modernization, or economic development. Capital penetration in Central America involved the
introduction of cash crops for export, the slow or rapid destruction of subsistence agriculture, and
the growth of wage labor. In Hamilton and Chinchilla’s (1991) framework the state plays a
significant role as it responds to capital penetration. In theory, the state has many options in
response to capital penetration. The state may choose to actively alleviate disruptions to the
subsistence farmers by encouraging land reform, providing education and training in other
sectors, instituting guarantees for minimum wages and labor organizing, or engaging in resource
redistribution. The state may also choose not to act, allowing a free market to determine wages,
to determine who is able to purchase land, have access to credit, and to determine which
businesses fail or succeed. Finally, the state may choose an aggravating or intensifying action,
passing legislation or decrees allowing for the concentration of land ownership, granting
concessions to investors, artificially keeping wages low, restricting organizing, or engaging in
violent behavior toward the domestic population. Regardless of the state’s response, the state
directly and indirectly effects migration. If the state response is violence then migration is a
direct outcome. The state may also influence migration indirectly, if the state’s response is to
allow for the accumulation of land and an unequal distribution of resources then over time those
factors can lead to rebellion or revolt, which can lead to state repression and violence, and then
migration. The influence of foreign intervention is similar to the role of the state in Hamilton and
Chinchilla’s framework. At any point in the framework foreign intervention can alleviate,
aggravate, or prolong the effects of capital penetration, the associated structural changes, and migration.

The Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) framework also offers another explanation for migration in the absence of the initiating capital penetration and state sponsored violence it predicts the establishment of migrant networks in receiving communities. Networks facilitate the migration in receiving communities by providing resources to incoming migrants: employment, housing, culture, language, and safety. In their conclusions they contend that the introduction of agricultural goods for export, industrialization, and the creation of CACM have followed a similar pattern of (1) introduction of crop or institution, (2) state sponsored violence, (3) intra and interstate migration. While their (1991) study offered a framework for explaining the relationship between economic development, violence and migration in all of Central America, they were only able to detail the Salvadoran experience.

**Guatemalan Development, Violence and Migration**

This study focuses on intra and interstate migration in the developing state of Guatemala. Examining Guatemala as a case study helps to fill several gaps in the migration literature. As explained in the preceding sections, sending states, developing states, emigration, intrastate migration, forced migration, and political violence have been overlooked in the migration literature by political science. In this study I extend and combine several of the approaches previously described. McCreery’s (1994) work on economic modernization, violence and migration in Guatemala is extended to include the 1950-1995 time period. Hamilton and Chinchilla’s (1991) framework for studying migration in Central America is expanded with the examination of Guatemala in the same detail as the El Salvador case study included in their work. And finally Morrison (1993) and Morrison and May’s (1994) work on internal migration and violence in Guatemala in the late 1970s and early 1980s is expanded to include 1950-1995,
interstate migration and the effects of economic development strategies, not simply economic indicators. This study contributes to the migration literature by helping to determine whether a useful pattern or framework for economic development and migration in developing states has already been, or can be developed. Table 2.1 details the frameworks and theories that contributed to the development of the framework being utilized by this case study.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Framework Begins with the observation of:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paige (1975)</td>
<td>Agricultural development: movement from subsistence production to export production</td>
<td>Conflict between the elite and peasant classes</td>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCreery (1994)</td>
<td>Economic Modernization: export agriculture, industrialization</td>
<td>State Sponsored Violence</td>
<td>Intrastate, interstate migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison and May (1994)</td>
<td>High or Low Political Violence within a state</td>
<td>Increased interstate migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor (2010)</td>
<td>Economic Development: (1) the movement from subsistence agriculture to export agriculture and (2) neoliberal economic policies</td>
<td>Structural changes to economy and society</td>
<td>Conflict between state and populace</td>
<td>Increases to intra and interstate migration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This study will demonstrate a pattern between economic development, state sponsored political violence and increasing intra and interstate migration. The pattern is established by examining a case study, Guatemala, from 1950 to 1995. This chapter provides definitions and summaries of the variables examined, an operationalization of the variables, and an explanation of the limitations of the available data. To begin, several of the hypotheses, causal relationships, and frequently used explanations that are examined and tested in the migration literature are listed below. One can summarize explanations of migration in the literature as follows:

1. Decisions to migrate are based around [only] the rational economic considerations of the household or individual with consideration given to:
   a. Wage differentials
   b. Earning potential of the entire household
   c. Unemployment rates
   d. Type of employment available in sending and receiving states
   e. Cost of migration

2. Decisions to migrate are based on strong social networks or social capital in sending and receiving states.

3. Decisions to migrate may be based on political factors in sending and receiving states.

In the process of testing these relationships several biases have developed in the migration literature. The first is that the term migration almost always implies a measurement of interstate migration; very rarely do measurements include intrastate migration. The second is that
migration is almost always a rational economic decision made by an individual or household, more rarely migration is attributed to force or coercion by actors outside of the household unit. Lastly, individual independent variables are often wholly credited for the variations displayed in the results, i.e. migration is a result of economic factors; very rarely do studies conclude that migration is a result of many converging factors.

This study will attempt to accomplish several tasks, including the demonstration of a pattern of economic development, state sponsored violence and intra and interstate migration. The study also highlights the complex relationships between economic development, violence, and migration and elucidates the difficulties in constructing a framework for explaining migration in developing states. Migration is very rarely the direct or indirect result of a single independent variable. Lastly, the study demonstrates the importance of examining intrastate migratory patterns in addition to interstate migration. The pattern expected to develop from this case study is illustrated in this framework:

1. Economic “modernization” or development is implemented in the state [Guatemala],
2. Resulting in an increase in state sponsored violence, necessary to initiate or maintain the economic reforms,
3. Resulting in an increase to intra and interstate migration.

The study presented in this paper is a qualitative, time series case study. The study will attempt to examine the patterns of economic modernization or development, state sponsored violence and intra and interstate migration in Guatemala during the years 1950-1995. As previously mentioned in the literature review, historically there has been a shortage of detailed studies focusing on patterns of intra and interstate migration and the state’s role in shaping, regulating and enforcing migration policies throughout Central and Latin America. A paucity of
migration data may be partially to blame for this trend and will be discussed in the forthcoming sections. In addition to challenges presented by the availability and reliability of migration and census data there is also the issue of selecting a single case study. An explanation for the selection of the case study is presented in the following section, along with a discussion of the reliability of the quantitative data, definitions and the operationalization of the variables. As previously mentioned the impetus for this study comes from previous work on Guatemala, migration, development and violence particularly the already highlighted research by David McCreery, William Deane Stanley, Hamilton and Chinchilla, and Morrison and May.

**The Challenges and Benefits of Case Studies**

This study utilizes the case study of Guatemala (1950-1995) in a non-quantitative time-series research design. The use of a case study can present several challenges to the validity of a study, the research design, and the explanatory power of the findings. Nevertheless, case studies can also offer an in depth examination of a specific topic and contribute to overall theory testing and knowledge of an issue and area. Guatemala was selected after examination of the literature, in order to add to a causal pattern of events and to incorporate the two Guatemalan studies on political violence, conducted by Morrison (1993), Morrison and May (1994) as well as the work of McCreery (1994) and Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991).

A criticism of case studies is that they often are thought of as “single data points and hence incapable of revealing anything about cause-and-effect relationships” (Geddes, 2003, 117). However in this research design the time period will include observation points over fifty-five years. A non-quantitative review of all intra and interstate migration trends, all state sponsored violence, all economic development strategies and indicators, and relevant domestic and international factors has been undertaken. By disaggregating migration to interstate and intrastate the number of observations within each interval increases.
A second criticism of non-quantitative case study research is that it is often difficult to measure the causal factors in the exact same manner as they have previously been defined or in a manner that will contribute to the literature and the validity of the findings (Geddes, 2003, 117). In this case study the definitions used by previous researchers, especially those in Guatemala, have been utilized. Similar techniques for measuring and classifying economic development, state sponsored political violence and migration were employed throughout the study.

**Availability and Reliability of Migration Data**

There are several significant challenges to researching migration in Central and Latin America, the most critical is the scarcity of migration data. However, where data does exist there are serious issues with the classification of migration data, the reliability of available data and the underenumeration of available data. The scarcity of data and the challenges of the available data are discussed in detail below. Despite these challenges, it is possible to create and execute a research design that utilizes the available data and contributes to the migration literature by testing existing theories.

There are several national and international agencies and groups responsible for collecting and reporting migration data within Central and Latin America. Data is collected at different time intervals through national censuses, border and immigration control offices, surveys at the local and national level, and specialized international and local agencies that operate throughout Central and Latin America. Each method of collection presents certain benefits and problems. The inter-state migration literature predominantly draws on data from national censuses, border control offices, and demographic projections from agencies within international organizations. While the intra-state migration literature does make use of national censuses, it also relies on surveys and questionnaires completed by governmental and non-governmental organizations at the national and local levels.
National Census Data

Most often, national census data is the most comprehensive data available for a given state. However, certain states within Central and Latin America did not undertake national censuses at regular intervals using modern techniques until the 1960s and 1970s. Additionally, states within Central and Latin America frequently did not employ a standard definition for migration when conducting their national censuses. Categories included in one census were omitted in the next census. Furthermore, ethnic populations, rural populations and undocumented populations are frequently underenumerated in national censuses.

Guatemala instituted its first national census using “reasonably accurate” modern techniques in 1950, and conducted subsequent censuses in 1964, 1973, 1981, 1994, and 2002 (Micklin, 1990, 163-64). However, as Michael Micklin outlines in the International Handbook on Migration (1990), there are several issues to consider when relying solely on Guatemalan census data for migration research: (1) Guatemala did not have a “standard definition of migration in official use” until the 1970s, (2) the 1950 and 1964 censuses classified persons on a “de facto basis,” a person’s physical location on the day the census was taken, this included seasonal agricultural workers who were counted at their places of employment and not at their residences, (3) the smallest unit of measurement in the Guatemalan census is the departamento, the municipio level data is “rarely published” and rarely analyzed, (4) urban, rural and municipio designations have changed over the years the census was administered, (5) Guatemalan census data is underenumerated, especially for rural Mayan populations, and (6) different categories of information are collected certain years and then not collected in the following census (Micklin, 1990, 163-65).

Once Guatemala began to define migration in its census it did so using three broad designations: lifetime migrants, recent migrants and intermediate migrants (Micklin, 1990, 164).
Lifetime migrants are defined as “people whose place of birth differs from the place of residents at some later date” (Micklin, 1990, 164). Recent migrants are defined as people who’s “current place of residence differs from that five years earlier” (Micklin, 1990, 164). And intermediate migrants are defined as people who “show a difference between place of birth and place of residence five years preceding the census” (Micklin, 1990, 164). The categories in the census do not clearly show migration movements from year to year, or carefully track seasonal migration.

Using census data from states within the region (United States, Mexico, Belize, Honduras, Canada, and Costa Rica) to analyze inter-state migratory patterns can also prove to be problematic. Mexico and the United States are the two largest recipients of Guatemalan migrants, yet in each of their national censuses they aggregated the data for all Central American migrants until the 1980s. After the 1980s when the data is disaggregated in the censuses there is still the underlying issue of significant underenumeration of undocumented Guatemalan migrants in states throughout the region.

Border Control and Immigration Offices in Receiving States

The benefit of data collected from border control and immigration agencies in receiving states is that the information is almost always reported on an annual basis. However there are several issues to consider when using this data: (1) border control and immigration agencies do not capture or process all migrants crossing the territorial boundaries into receiving states, (2) until recently, certain agencies, including the United States immigration and border control agencies aggregated their data for Central American migrants, (3) at times when apprehended, migrants will not state their true country of origin to immigration officers, instead offering a closer state as an alternative to be deported, and (4) not all states consistently publish or report statistics on the number of apprehensions at border crossing areas. The product of the aforementioned issues is that migration data is often unavailable or unreliable from the various
border control agencies in the receiving states during the same years that Guatemalan census data is missing or incomplete; the result is that there are several time periods where there is no reliable migration data for Guatemala.

**International Organizations, Specialized Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations**

International organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), such as the United Nations (UN), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) all collect demographic data pertaining to migration. A few of the benefits of data collected by these agencies is that the data is widely available, regularly published, and generally disaggregated. Almost all of the data available through these organizations and agencies is published annually, available electronically and without fees. Yet, with regard to seasonal migration and intra-state migration, there is still the issue of incomplete and unavailable measurement. Furthermore, most, if not all, of these organizations and agencies compile their annual data by utilizing national census data; mathematical formulas are applied to make predictions about population growth and movement in the intervening years. There are advantages to using information provided by these types of organizations; one is that many will continue to update their information as new information is discovered. And the second is that most of these organizations and agencies take into account the serious underenumeration of ethnic and rural minorities and have adjusted their data accordingly, in a transparent and clearly elucidated manner.

**Intrastate Migration Data: Surveys and Questionnaires**

There have been attempts by academics, policy makers, and NGOs over the years to measure and publish data that would accurately assess seasonal and intrastate migration at the national and local level in Guatemala. As previously mentioned there are a few issues with such data, (1) surveys and questionnaires are not performed on a regular basis, (2) the designation for
rural and urban has changed over the years, (3) the borders of certain municipios has changed over the years with new municipios being added, (4) a survey of a certain departamento in Guatemala may not be generalizable to the rest of the departamentos in Guatemala due to large differences between the departamentos in: population density, agricultural output, ethnic composition, socioeconomic composition, geographic proximity to neighboring states, and agricultural or urban employment opportunities, (5) municipio level data is rarely published by the Guatemalan government, (6) intrastate migration data is not readily available and is completely missing for large segments of time, and (7) municipio level data tends to be the most undernumerated of all the migration data.

Migration Data in Research Design

The migration data used in this research design will predominantly be comprised of the national census data for all years that are available. The national census data will be examined alongside the yearly reports by the Demographic Yearbook published by the United Nations; the Demographic Yearbook receives data from Member States, voluntarily on an annual basis. The United Nations migration and census data is based off of national census data, but has been adjusted for undernumeration and is expanded to include every year. The national census data from Mexico, Canada, and the United States will also be used when appropriate (disaggregated). Migration data from border control agencies, surveys and other NGOs will be used as supplementary material when necessary to fill in for years with no data is presented by the primary sources.

Availability and Reliability of Political Violence Data

Political violence has been a persistent issue in Guatemala since the state’s original discovery by the Spaniards. Precise records detailing the exact number of individuals who have had human rights violations committed against them are not always available. However, there are
two important databases for the measurement and record of violence in Guatemala. The first is the Recovery of Historical Memory Project (REMHI), put together for the Human Rights Office of the Archdiocese of Guatemala. The report was published in 1999 and it details firsthand accounts of political violence in each department in Guatemala from 1960 to 1996. Data is disaggregated by year, department, type of violation, and the perpetrators of the incidents. The REMHI also provides a detailed historical account of political violence dating back to 1871. The other database which recorded and published evidence of the political violence in Guatemala was the Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification (CEH, 1999). The CEH was formed in 1994 through the Accord of Oslo to document the political violence that occurred in Guatemala. Similar to the REMHI the CEH also took thousands of firsthand accounts and testimonies from victims, family members, politicians, military personnel and guerrilla members. An accurate measurement of political violence in Guatemala might never be established, incidents taking place in remote and rural villages, incidents with no records, and incidents where the perpetrators will not speak out results in an underenumeration of violations. As a result, neither the REMHI nor the CEH claim to be an exact measure of the political violence in Guatemala. However both databases do offer a very close approximation of the levels of political violence experienced in a given year, by a given people, in a certain manner. For this case study the focus will be state sponsored violence; in Guatemala this accounts for approximately 93% of the violence in Guatemala (Sanford, 2003, 42).

**Independent and Dependent Variables: Definitions and Operationalization**

The independent and dependent variables utilized in the study are listed below. During the time period 1950-1995 each of the independent and dependent variables will be examined in detail. The single case study with a time series design will allow for the control of other
independent variables such as regime type, domestic groups, and social conditions. Each of these variables will be discussed in the following section prior to the analysis.

1. **Independent Variable: Economic Development**

   Economic development or “modernization” is discussed using the following indicators:

   a. Official development policy changes emphasizing the production and/or diversification of agricultural products for export rather than for domestic subsistence consumption
      
      ii. Land reforms
      iii. Subsidies for export industries
      iv. Lowering tariffs on imports necessary for export production
      v. Reform of tax codes, especially with regard to export industries
      vi. Crop diversification as measured by the output in certain agricultural sectors (coffee, bananas, cotton, cattle)

   b. Growth of GDP, GDP per capita, increase in total exports

   c. Industrialization

   d. Opening interstate trade, within the geographic region and beyond

   The examination of economic development always begins with the official policy of the state. Over the years certain Guatemalan presidents clearly stated the official economic development goals of the state. Other administrations were less clear on official policy, instead choosing to maintain the policies, goals and strategies from a previous administration. The indicators listed as (a-d above) are simply indicators used to measure the efficacy and outcomes from the official economic development policies of the state.

2. **Independent Variable: State Sponsored Violence**
State sponsored violence is measured qualitatively and quantitatively by the number of actors, the number of incidents, and the visibility of such crimes:

a. The types of actors include:
   
   i. Police
   
   iii. Military
   
   iv. Paramilitary
   
   v. Military acting in conjunction with PACs
   
   vi. Foreign political actors operating with state consent

b. The type of violence includes:
   
   ii. Direct and indirect deaths: the purposeful killing of an individual and the death of individuals due to the withholding of a life sustaining item (food, water, healthcare, medicines, shelter)
   
   iii. Massacres: multiple killings of three or more people (REMHI, 1999, 295).
   
   iv. Non-authoritative violence: violence committed by those individuals that are not part of the existing economic or political power structure (Morrison and May, 1994, 113).
   
   v. Assassinations or high profile killings: Murder for political motives “one of series of acts that collectively are intended to produce a psychological state of fear and uncertainty within the general population…in an effort to direct political activity through intimidation” (Premo, 1981, 429).
   
   vi. Forced Disappearances: the arrest and detention of any person, “whose fate is unknown because the detainee either becomes
entrapped in a clandestine detention network or is executed and the body concealed” (REMHI, 1999, 294).

vii. Assaults, Torture, Threats

3. Dependent Variable: Intra and Interstate Migration

Measures for intra and interstate migration in Guatemala have varied over the years, definitions have changed, the units being measured have changed (rural-urban), and measurements are not reliably taken. Nonetheless there are several definitions to consider:

a. Refugees: In 1951 the United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (and the 1967 Protocol) defines refugee(s) as “a person outside of his or her country of nationality who is unable or unwilling to return because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution” (United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees).

b. Migrants: used as an adjective and a noun to describe people or animals who migrate from place to place to seek food and work.

i. Migrant is also defined as a migrant worker or farm laborer, someone who moves to harvest crops as the seasons change; within Guatemala three definitions are in use:

ii. Lifetime migrant: Defined in Guatemala as “people whose place of birth differs from the place of residence at some later date,” measured yearly when data is reported to the Demographic Yearbook (Micklin, 1990, 164).

iii. Intermediate migrant: defined in Guatemala as people who “show a difference between place of birth and place of residence five years
preceding the census, measured yearly when data is reported to the
Demographic Yearbook (Micklin, 1990, 164).

iv. Recent migrant: defined in Guatemala as people who’s “current place of
residence differs from that five years earlier,” measured yearly when
data is reported to the Demographic Yearbook (Micklin, 1990, 164).

c. Intrastate migrants: Lifetime, intermediate or recent, documented or
undocumented migration between urban-rural, rural-rural, and urban-urban
areas within the formally recognized borders of one country.

i. Rural has several definitions within census work:

a. Census Dictionary defines rural as “sparsely populated lands
lying outside urban areas;” typically rural areas are designated as
having “populations living outside places of 1,000 [people] or
more” (Du Plessis et al, 2002, 8-9).

b. OECD has a stricter definition, stating that rural designations are
for “population densities below 150 inhabitants per square
kilometer” (Du Plessis et al, 2002, 10-11).

c. Due to data constraints, in this study rural areas are defined as
populations and or persons living outside of towns and
municipalities (municipios) who do not actively commute into
urban centers for work.

ii. Urban definition is more uniform through the census data:

a. Most often defined as metropolitan areas with a population of
greater than 100,000 people.

b. In Guatemala this includes: Guatemala City, and Quezaltenango.
d. Interstate migrants: Lifetime, intermediate or recent, documented or undocumented migration across the formally recognized borders of two countries.

e. Undocumented migrants: Any interstate migration that does not take place at designated entry and exit checkpoints between two countries.
Chapter 4

BRIEF HISTORY OF GUATEMALA

Introduction

For hundreds of years the social, economic, and political structures within Guatemala have created and maintained a large landless, unemployed, under-educated, and politically weak population who has been continuously oppressed and exploited for the benefit of a select few. The social and political systems of the indigenous Mayans were later usurped by Spanish colonial powers. The criollo elites and foreign investors further exploited the existing social and political systems; such systems are important antecedent variables to consider when examining inter-state and intra-state migration in Guatemala. The legacy of colonization left a profound impact on contemporary issues, such as the mechanisms for economic growth, foreign investment and influence, migration, political violence, human rights, equality and justice. Furthermore, the century long conflict between the Conservatives and the Liberals established and hardened the existing framework, leading to the decades of political violence, migration, and depravation within Guatemala.

Pre-Colonization: 2000 B.C. to 1524

Traces of human life in Central America can be traced as far back as 10,000 B.C. However the permanent settlement of peoples throughout the territory now known as Guatemala is generally thought to have begun in 2000 B.C. The beginning of Mayan civilization is believed to have started in 2000 B.C., throughout the states now known as Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, and El Salvador. The earliest period of Mayan development is known as the Pre-classic period; 2000 B.C. through 250 A.D. During this time period the Mayans began to engage in complex communal agricultural practices, such as, crop rotation, fertilizing, utilizing raised
beds and continuous cultivation of crops. Improved agricultural yields with a variety of crops facilitated the construction of cities with large scale agricultural projects such as the pyramids in the most populous city, El Mirador. Also, during the Pre-classical period the Mayans began using stone in their buildings and were able to manufacture pottery and textiles. Furthermore, during the Pre-classical period the Mayans created a kin based-chief led ruling system that would become the framework for their future political and social systems. During the pre-classical period, within Guatemala, Mayans were concentrated in the Northern Petén region and along the Southern coast near the Pacific Ocean.

The next period is termed the Classic period and it lasts from 250 A.D. through 900 A.D. This is the apex of Mayan civilization. During the Classical period the advances from the Pre-classical period are further developed. Mayans become skilled in mathematics, astronomy, writing and the creation of elaborate calendars. Teotihuacán, located in modern day Mexico, becomes the most important and largest Mayan city. Additionally, each of the larger city-states becomes more strongly linked through trade networks. Merchants play an increasingly important role in society as goods are moved from costal and agricultural lowlands to the interior urban areas. During the Classical period Mayan population increases significantly, as do new Mayan cities such as Tikal, Copán, and Piedras Negras. An increase population and growth in cities allows for new opportunities to cooperate and trade, as well as increased opportunities for competition and occasional warfare. Also during this time period, the social stratification between the classes becomes apparent. Hereditary kings rule over smaller settlements and large city states. Alongside the priests, their families become the noble classes in Mayan society. These noble classes adorn themselves and their households with elaborate clothing, jewelry, mosaics, paintings, stone sculptures and engage in organized sports and learning. During this time period the lower classes are required to pay tribute to the noble classes with two thirds to
three quarters of their agricultural output. The noble classes then managed the resources of the entire community. Everyday life for the lower classes remains relatively unchanged from the Pre-classic period to the Classic period (10,000 B.C. to 250-900 A.D.). Agricultural output still consumes the majority of their time; although, the lower classes are also participants and observers in the elaborate ceremonies and games engaged in by the noble classes. Slaves are utilized by the noble classes during this time period; they are predominantly criminals, individuals captured in war, and those sold into bondage. While the Classical period contains the apex of Mayan civilization, it also contains the seeds of its decline. The decline of Mayan civilization begins at the end of the Classical period. There is no single agreed upon causal factor responsible for this decline. Several factors are frequently debated, including: drought, revolts of the lower classes, natural disasters, deforestation, warfare, epidemic illness, and depletion of natural resources used in agricultural cultivation.

The last period is known as the Post-classic period and lasts from 900 A.D. through the Spanish discovery and conquest in 1524. As previously mentioned, the decline of Mayan populations in the large cities of the Classical period is thought to be in part related to drought, deforestation and depletion of prime agricultural lands resulting in two important effects. First, the remaining Mayan cities become more interdependent on each other for resources and goods, the level of trade increases between cities. Guatemala was the home of several important Mayan cities during the Post-classical period, including Tayasal and Topoxté in Northern Guatemala. In the Post-classical period cities and populations that flourished tended to be found next to rivers and waterways. Correspondingly the Mayans of the Post-classical period were known for their trade and commerce on rivers and in the ocean; heavy canoes were used to transport goods over long distances relatively quickly. Increased trade in the Post-classical period produced a significant middle class, comprised of skilled craft workers and trade merchants. The noble or
elite classes during this period continued to be comprised of hereditary rulers and religious leaders. Most often the hereditary ruler was also the highest religious leader, although a complex system of priests and students existed below the ruler. Life for the lowest classes, similar to the Pre-classical and Classical periods, does not change significantly in the Post-classical period. Agricultural output consumes the majority of their time and energy, and though substantial tributes are paid to elites during these three time periods there is not widespread malnutrition for Mayans in the lowest social classes (Vanden, 2002, 254). There was however increasing class tensions between the lower class, the middle class and the noble or elite classes and between competing city-states. Due to the increase and the scope and duration of warfare the elite classes were experiencing a transformation during the Post-classical period. Rulers in competing city-states developed their militaries and fortified their city-states with stone walls. As a result of their increasing importance, military warriors began to gain access to the elite classes.

Colonization 1524-1821: “Great was the stench of the dead” - Annals of the Cakchiquels

At the time of Spanish conquest and colonization in Guatemala the Mayan population is estimated to have been two million peoples; one hundred percent of the population was Mayan (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 407). Spanish conquistadors landed in modern day Cuba, Dominican Republic-Haiti, and Mexico somewhat earlier than Guatemala. The Spanish conquistador Pedro de Alvarado, the first lieutenant to Hernan Cortes, arrived in Guatemala in 1523 and led approximately one hundred horsemen and three hundred foot soldiers to conquer the territory for Spain. Alvarado’s small group of military men were able to accomplish this undertaking due in part to their temporary alliance with the soon to be ostracized Cackiquel (Kaqchikel) nation, who agreed to fight their rivals the K’iche nation. The Spaniard led coalition was able to win military
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battles against selected Mayan populations; however, conquest of the region was largely due to the introduction of new and deadly diseases to which the indigenous Mayan populations had no immunity. A combination of smallpox, plague, typhus, and measles decimated the local populations between 1520 and 1625. The most significant loss of life occurred in just thirty years, between 1520 and 1550. During this time the Mayan population plummeted from two million to 427,850 (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 400). The lowest Mayan populations recorded were in 1625, at this time there were approximately 128,000 Mayans in Guatemala a loss of approximately ninety-four percent of the previous population.  

High death rates disrupted Mayan society and contributed to widespread fear and panic among the local populations (Lovell, 1992, 426-443). Within Guatemala the Northwest (Atitlán) and Pacific regions were the most affected by the introduction of disease and colonization. In the Atitlán area the Mayan population decreased from 72,000 in 1520 to 5,300 in 1575. The Northwest and Pacific regions were in highly desirable geographic areas for cultivating export crops. Surviving populations were used as forced labor, slave labor, had high tribute demands placed on them, were forced to migrate and resettle in adjacent areas, had their communal lands expropriated, and were subjected to “intense economic exploitation” by the Spanish owners of the large encomiendas (Lovell, 1992, 434). The Mayans in the farthest Northeast areas and the Northwest were largely spared due to the mountainous terrain and lack of perceived economic incentives in the region (Lovell, 1992, 434).

By the late 1600s Mayans constituted only seventy percent of the population in Guatemala, this percentage held steady through 1880 (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 400). The remaining thirty percent of the population was comprised of Spaniards, ladinos, mulattoes, and blacks (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 401). Post conquest and throughout colonization until 1770 the

---

10 Vanden (2002) Throughout Central and Latin America it is estimated that two thirds of the entire indigenous population was killed as a result of the conquest, either directly through warfare or indirectly through disease and starvation (255).
enumeration of the Mayan population was conducted primarily by using the tax and tribute records paid by the Mayan populations.\(^{11}\) The size of households was determined by the amount and frequency of tributes. After 1770 the Catholic dioceses throughout the colony began to undertake a more systematic approach to counting the Mayan population. Although, the official population data during this time period underenumerated the Mayan population, as Archbishop Pedro Cortez y Larraz stated, there were a number of “infidel Indians” that were “living as fugitives in the mountains” (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 401).

Guatemala was a colony of Spain for nearly three hundred years from 1524 until 1821. Soon after their arrival in 1521 it became apparent that Guatemala did not contain the same gold and silver riches that were being mined in Mexico. As a result, the Spaniards focused on cultivating agricultural products for export, utilizing the great expanses of fertile land; surplus financial and material capital and resources were exported from Guatemala back to Spain. Under Spanish colonization a system of *latifundias* was established; the distribution of land shifted from communally held lands to ownership concentrated in the hands of few select individuals (Vanden, 2002, 255). The owners of the *latifundias*, or large estates, favored cash crops and mono crops intended for export. Demand in the international markets determined the prices and the production from Guatemala. The financial success of the latifundias directly related to the practice of using forced slave labor. Large landowners were dependent on slave and forced labor to cultivate their crops; at this point in time the export crops mainly consisted of cacao and indigo.

In areas where the Mayan population had been completely destroyed Spaniards imported African slaves (Vanden, 2002, 255). The Spaniards exploited the existing Mayan social system,

\(^{11}\) It is possible that these records were consistently undernumerated, since there were Mayas residing in rural areas outside of the reach of the church and state.
by replacing the traditional nobles and elites in Mayan society. Within Guatemala skin color and class position were directly related, the light skinned Spaniards (*criollos*) comprised the elite classes, *ladinos* (mestizos) typically comprised the middleclass, dark skinned Mayans (*indios*) and African slaves comprised the lowest classes. The Spanish elites were so dependent on enslaved and forced labor on their latifundias that in 1663 when the Spanish monarch moved to abolish the use of slaves in the Spanish colonies the *criollos* “fought fervently to ensure that forced labor continued to be practiced well into the 20th century” (IOM-Guatemala).

**Independence: Spain-1821, Mexico-1823, the United Provinces of Central America-1847**

Guatemala issued its first declaration of independence from Spain three weeks after Mexico declared independence from Spain in September 1821. At this time the Mayan population had risen slightly, to 416,500 (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 400). The criollo elites from the five Central American provinces voted to declare their independence from Spain and to ally themselves with Augustín de Iturbide and the newly independent Mexican state in 1821. However, during the following year the Mexican empire collapsed, Iturbide fled, and the leaders of the five Central American provinces again declared their independence, this time from Mexico in 1823 (Vanden, 2002, 255). Although the movement for Guatemalan independence was supported by each of the classes, everyday life for the lowest classes in Guatemala was not noticeably altered by the three declarations of independence. Independence did create a change in trading partners and allowed for exposure to new markets, facilitating a shift in Guatemala’s export crops. The shift in exports would prove to be the most beneficial to the elite criollos and middle class ladinos, but devastating for the indigenous Mayans. For a brief period the British became the favored and dominant trading partner, but over time the British were replaced by the United States and Germany (Vanden, 2002, 255). Eventually, as a result of Guatemala’s access
to foreign investment and foreign involvement in the Guatemalan economy, Guatemala begins to cultivate and export coffee beans. As described below, under the leadership of the nationalist Conservative dictator Rafael Carrera, Guatemala declares its third independence in 1847 from the United Provinces of Central America; Carrera would be one in a long line of caudillos to rule over Guatemala.

Independent Guatemala: Liberals and Conservatives Vie for Power 1821-1945

In post-independent Guatemala, the criollo elites were able to establish consensus on several critical issues, chief among them was (1) a perceived need to promote economic growth by focusing on agricultural exports, (2) a desire to avoid democratic governance or political participation by the lowest classes, (3) a need to preserve the existing social and labor system as it existed at the end of colonization; violence was an acceptable mechanism of coercion, and (4) rule by caudillo, or dictator was an acceptable political framework. However, there were also important points of conflict among the criollo elites including (1) disagreement over the role of institutions especially the Catholic Church, the state, and the military, as well as (2) the need to focus on progressivism, accomplished in part by abandoning indigenous and Hispanic heritage and culture (Weaver, 1999, 133-135). In a post-independent Guatemala the Conservatives and Liberals waged real and ideological battles for more than a century. The political and social means of controlling the population, as previously established during Spanish colonization, were strengthened and expanded during the reign of the Conservatives and the Liberals.

Initially, as a member of the United Provinces of Central America, Guatemala was under Liberal rule, as they were again during the Liberal Revolution in 1871. Several important antecedent conditions were reinforced and several new conditions were established that are pertinent to this study during this time period. The antecedent conditions that were established by
Spanish colonization and reinforced by the Liberals in Guatemala, include, (1) the acceleration of land appropriation, (2) increased use of forced labor and migrations for agricultural output, (3) increased dependence on agricultural exports, especially coffee, indigo and cacao, and (4) increased reliance on foreign investors and corporations.

Beginning in 1871 during the Liberal Revolution, the Liberals instituted four new strategies that have had significant effects on migration and political violence in the time frame examined by this study. The first change was a systematic decrease and dismantling of the role and functions performed by the Catholic Church; including the disestablishment of the Catholic Church as the official religion of the state. During the initial Liberal rule, and again during the Liberal Revolution, there were attempts by the Liberals to secularize Guatemala. The Catholic Church was disestablished and freedom of religion was instituted. The previous duties of the Catholic Church (education, marriage, record keeping) were severely curtailed, clergy were persecuted and exiled, and parishes were destroyed and disbanded during the Liberal Revolution (Weaver, 1999, 134-135). Additionally, Liberals attempted to remove any traces of Mayan and Spanish culture deemed to be holding back progress (Weaver, 1999, 133-135). The belief was that if Mayan and Spanish culture and heritage could be eradicated then the country could be better unified and would benefit in the long-term. Liberals viewed the Catholic Church and the military regime as “nonprogressive” institutions; organizations deemed too difficult for criollo elites to directly influence or control (Weaver, 1999, 129-158, 133).

By consolidating the military under the federal leadership of a single caudillo and dismantling the functions of the Catholic Church the criollo Liberals believed they would be able to reclaim the predominant role in society; the individuals in charge of creating and maintaining the social and economic order (Weaver, 1999, 133). The Liberal Revolution endured longer than
the Liberal’s initial rule in post-independent Guatemala. In post-independent Guatemala, Liberal policies alienated and angered indigenous Maya populations, as well as the Conservative criollo elites and ladinos who valued a role for the state and the Catholic Church as the arbiters of social and economic policy. Uprisings and revolts were common among the peasant classes. The uprisings were often violent; such uprisings were put down by the military or by the plantation militias.

The second change concerns the Guatemalan military in 1870s. There was a federal consolidation of power over the military, an increase in the size of the federal military, and an increase in military violence against domestic labor uprisings. Throughout the Liberal Revolution state sanctioned military violence was increasingly used to enforce forced labor policies throughout the state (Vanden, 2002, 255). Under successive Liberal dictators, the Guatemalan state mandates and enforces the movement of “at least 100,000 highland Maya workers” to migrate each season for weeks and months at a time to harvest coffee beans on the large coffee plantations alongside the Pacific Ocean (Lovell and Lutz, 1996, 403). The Guatemalan state enacted the Reglamento de Joraleros (Regulation of Day Laborers) and the Ley contra la Vagancia (Vagrancy Law) in 1877 and 1888 respectively. Under the laws Mayans were forced to work “100 to 150 days per year on the coffee plantation” (REMHI, 1999, 181). Forced labor meant the plantations could keep wages low, women earned half a real per day and men earned one real per day (REMHI, 1999, 181). In the southern coffee growing region alongside the Pacific Ocean the plantation owners would frequently boast that “a man is cheaper than a mule” (Galeano, 1973, 98). Frequently plantation owners would refuse to sign or authenticate the cards the migrants carried, keeping the migrants in continuous debt bondage. Unfortunately for the indigenous Mayans living in Quetzaltenango, San Marcos and Alta Verapaz their communal lands were prime for agricultural production (REMHI, 1999, 181-182). As their land was
appropriated, these groups were forced into the highlands; they were continually the targets of the forced labor laws (REMHI, 1999, 181).

The third change was a strategy instituted during the Liberal Revolution, that persisted throughout the twentieth century was the increased use of militias in the rural areas. In the rural areas the centralized military was not able to easily target and enforce the forced labor laws. The plantation owners increasingly (forcibly) recruited ladinos and indigenous Mayans to serve in their militias; these paramilitary groups were given “military…civil and police powers” (REMHI, 1999, 182). The militias were responsible for tracking down workers who had not reported for duty or who had not completed their allotted time for the year. In Guatemala all of the “Indians” were required to keep a work book on their person at all times, the book would “list his [or her] days of work”, any Indian that was “deemed insufficient” was to be punished with jail time or six months of free labor (Galeano, 1973, 122). The militias were also responsible for enforcing the punishments for avoiding forced labor. They would return the Indians to the coffee plantations for their month long (or longer) deployments, as well as give out physical punishments and “in many cases death” was the punishment (REMHI, 1999, 182).

The fourth change was also a strategy put into practice during the Liberal Revolution was the increasingly common practice to exile political opponents and to use state sanctioned violence against perceived political enemies. As the Conservatives and Liberals became more entrenched in ideological warfare “exile, confiscation, and killing became common elements of the competitive repertoire” (Weaver, 1999, 133-134). As an example, in 1898 two “prominent businessmen from Quetzaltenango” were ordered to be executed [state sanctioned] after their involvement in a failed plot to assassinate a local political chief (REMHI, 1999, 182).
The Conservatives were unable to establish a significant presence at the federal level until José Rafael Carrera Turcios came to power. Carrera was an illiterate ladino from a humble background, who had suffered personal tragedy at the hands of the federal government. He brought the Conservative criollos temporary relief from the Liberal reforms in the mid 1880s. Carrera was a charismatic military leader, and a devoted Catholic. In 1837 he incited a Conservative rebellion against the United Provinces of Central America; the rebellion culminated with Carrera taking de facto control of Guatemala in 1838. Carrera in addition to being ladino and a Conservative was also a committed nationalist; as a result, he enjoyed the support of both criollo elites and the indigenous Mayan populations. His nationalist policies appealed to Guatemala’s Conservative criollo elites, who had been growing increasingly outraged by the United Provinces of Central America’s newly levied (high) taxes. Meanwhile the indigenous Mayans had also been growing increasingly angry; they witnessed their continued appropriation of their communal lands and the bestowment of such lands on foreign elites. Carrera’s declared independence from the United Provinces of Central America in 1847, this action helped to quell the anger of the criollo elites and the Mayan populations. Once Carrera was in a position of power, he returned the Catholic Church to a position of prominence and authority within Guatemala. Correspondingly, the Catholic Church endorsed and facilitated Carrera’s rule by acting as the arbiter of the established social order.

Over the years Carrera provided certain benefits to the vast majority of the criollo elites, including: (1) the appropriation of communal land from indigenous populations, (2) the creation and imposition of laws to coerce indigenous populations into forced migrations, resettlements, (3) the enforcement of slave and forced labor, (4) quelling of domestic uprisings against the established social order, (5) the separation and segregation of the indigenous populations, and (5) the prevention of any establishment of democratic governance (Weaver, 1999, 129-158). While
Carrera provided important privileges to all of the criollo elites within Guatemala, the criollo Liberals did not look favorably at having their political power and influence usurped by institutions they viewed as independent, rival establishments. Eventually the Conservatives were overthrown by the Liberals; Carrera’s successor, General Vincente Cerna was ousted from office in 1871 (Weaver, 1999, 133-134). The successful Liberal coup was led by Miguel Garcia Granados and Justo Rufino Barrios. Once the Liberals had reclaimed power they persisted and accelerated the process of confiscating the communal lands owned by the indigenous Mayan populations. In addition, the Liberals began to confiscate large land tracts owned by the Catholic Church. Much of the newly acquired land was used to grow the newest agricultural export, coffee beans. The landless peasants, relieved of their communal lands, were forced into agricultural labor on the large latifundias (Vanden, 2002, 255). The Mayan population had increased to 756,000 by the time of the Liberal Revolution, but despite gains in population the quality of life for the lowest classes in Guatemala was deteriorating.

The 1823 passage of the Monroe Doctrine in the United States significantly shaped the relationship between the United States and Central and Latin American states throughout the 1800s and 1900s. One of the most noteworthy changes post-Monroe Doctrine was the composition of firms operating in Central and Latin America; European firms were increasingly pushed out in favor of firms from the United States. Streeter (2000) believes that in the early 1900s Guatemala was dominated by three corporations, including the United Fruit Company, International Railways of Central America (IRCA), and the Electric Bond and Share (EBS) which controlled agricultural exports, the railways and utilities, respectively; as previously mentioned one of the hallmarks of the Liberal Revolution was a commitment to encouraging foreign investment in agricultural exports. Diplomatic and business contacts between Guatemala and the United States had already been established long before the introduction of the United Fruit
Corporations from the United States had begun exporting “modern farming equipment” to Guatemala under the Barrios regime from 1873 to 1885 (Streeter, 2000, 9). Additionally, President Barrios had representatives from the New York City police department “reorganize the Guatemalan police department” creating a “vital link between U.S. and Guatemalan security forces.” Yet, the investment and growth of the United Fruit Company in Guatemala would turn out to be the most significant development for Guatemala in the early 1900s.

The United Fruit Company, a company from Boston, Massachusetts, arrived in Guatemala in 1901 to begin cultivating and exporting bananas. In 1904 the Guatemalan dictator, Manuel Estrada Cabrera, granted the company a ninety-nine year lease to build and operate a railroad in Guatemala. The lease granted the United Fruit Company 165,532 acres for their railway, and “exemptions from export taxes for thirty-five years” (REMHI, 1999, 182). Additionally, the lease granted the United Fruit Company the power to finish the incomplete railway system in Guatemala. Under the contract the United Fruit Company, already the largest landowner in Guatemala, received “the entire railroad track, including a 100-foot right-of-way on either side; telegraph lines between the port and capital; exemption from taxes for ninety-nine years” (Streeter, 2000, 10). Furthermore, additional concessions under the 1904 contract granted the United Fruit Company a “monopoly on rail transportation; free use of material such as stone and lumber…exemption from taxes on the export of agricultural products (except coffee) for 35
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12 Streeter, 9. Keith was the vice president of United Fruit Company, and was the “most active [of the United Fruit Company’s executives] and dominated Central American operations.” (Handy, 79) Keith was acting vice president of United Fruit Company only because he had merged Tropical Trading and Transport Company with the more financially viable Boston Fruit Company. The owner of the Boston Fruit Company, Preston, was named the president of the new United Fruit Company. (Also, Handy 79 and Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala (Doubleday & Company: New York 1982), 67. Neither Preston nor Keith lasted through the 1930s (Keith had passed away); at this point Sam Zemurray took over operations for the company after the stock price for United Fruit dropped 85% (Schlesinger, 69).
years...the right to control water that encroached on railway lands...the sole and exclusive
government on the railway and [to never] be subject to the intervention of the government”
(Handy, 1984, 80). Approximately twenty years later the United Fruit Company was the largest
employer, exporter, and the largest landowner in Guatemala. United Fruit Company’s
monopoly on bananas, monopoly on transportation and position as the largest employer meant
that it could set prices for wages, conditions and working hours on the job, transportation and
agricultural goods within Guatemala; the company begins to act as a “state within a state”
(Vanden, 2002, 256; Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 70-71). However it was a joint effort
between the Guatemalan government and Untied Fruit Company that kept wages low and
workers forcibly pacified. Thousands of Mayan laborers lived out their lives on the large
banana plantations in Guatemala. Housing and food, of extremely poor quality, was provided at a
marked up cost to the laborers by the plantation owners, many laborers did not earn enough
money to pay for the supplies they were charged for and lived their lives in debt peonage. The
United States consumed eighty percent of Guatemalan exports and provides seventy percent of
the imports to Guatemala in the 1920s (REMHI, 1999, 182). For most Guatemalans there was no
need to discern between United Fruit Company and the United States government, the two
entities were perceived as one in the same (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 73).

The 1920s and 1930s continued to be turbulent times for Guatemala. As the number of
Guatemalan workers participating in unions and worker associations increased there was a

13 Handy, 94. The relationship between Guatemala and the U.S. was further strengthened-by the 1940s the
United States was purchasing “90% of Guatemalan produce.”
14 An example of Guatemalan government interference on behalf of United Fruit Company is the rewritten
1878 Anti-Vagrancy Law, the 1934 Anti-Vagrancy Law “stipulated that peasants work at least 150 days
per year on the plantations, with the number of days they worked to be written down in the passbook they
were required to carry. If a peasant was found without his passbook or if it was determined that he had not
worked the required number of days, he faced jail, public whipping, or road labor” (Ropp et al, 131-2). The
Anti-Vagrancy Law specifically targeted “Indians who owned no land or less than a prescribed amount”
this ensured that the Anti-Vagrancy Law targeted Indians not landowners (Gleijeses, 1991, 13).
corresponding increase in state sanctioned violence used to put down workers uprisings. As the Conservative and Liberals struggle for power at the local and federal levels, General Jorge Ubico Castaneda (1931-1944) is elected ruler in Guatemala. General Ubico came to power in Guatemala in 1930 after the coffee prices collapsed on the world markets. Elites and ladinos were looking for a ruler that would “prevent restive, unemployed laborers from gaining an upper hand;” Ubico was just the person (Cullather, 1999, 9). In April of 1932 Ubico, “sympathetic to landowners’ concerns,” under Decree 1816 sanctioned the murder of any persons that were deemed a threat to landowner’s goods or land (Gleijeses, 1991, 13). General Ubico rules Guatemala with the explicit support of the United States, including the support of United States’ Congressmen, Ambassadors, and Presidents.

The worldwide economic depression of the late 1920s and the 1930s had several effects in Guatemala, the quetzal continued to depreciate, there was rampant unemployment in the Mayan populations, and a significant decrease in available credit to the middle classes. The Ubico regime responded to the crisis by strengthening the existing repressive social, economic and political frameworks. General Ubico continued to encourage economic development by furthering the practice of (1) appropriating and leasing land to foreign companies, (2) cutting the wages of the workers in order to keep expenses low for exporters, (3) forcing the Indian population to labor on federal projects (roads, telegraphs) and large coffee and banana plantations for little or no pay, (5) relying on militias in rural areas to repress labor and solidarity movements, (5) increasing the size and scope of the military and using it to reduce social unrest. General Ubico continued to oppress and terrorize lowest classes, rural populations, and groups without access to political power. He replaced local political leaders with military generals, he enforced and encouraged racial stratification, and he used brutal tactics against political adversaries, including extensive use of the so called “flight law” where detainees were routinely executed
while allegedly trying to escape custody (REMHI, 1999, 183-184). General Ubico also instituted two significant changes to the Guatemalan military, he worked to professionalize the junior officer corps by setting up a training system modeled after West Point in the United States and he introduced austerity measures in the military, cutting the pay of the junior officers.

General Ubico was the last of the Liberal authoritarian leaders of this particular era; he ruled from 1931 until a series of events led to his unceremonious ouster in 1944; his resignation was preceded by Guatemala’s largest protests. General Ubico’s last acts of violence were directed toward a “series of non-violent demonstrations by schoolteachers demanding higher pay and democratic government” (Calvert, 1985, 4). General Ubico responded with his usual violent tactics in an attempt to aggressively break up the teacher’s strike, he ordered his cavalry to charge the demonstrators, “killing or injuring over 200 of them,” including a female school teacher who became a symbol for the movement (Calvert, 1985, 4). This particular violent eruption was coupled with the assassination of a prominent Guatemalan journalist; it was the beginning of the end for General Ubico. After the student protests hundreds of Guatemala’s elite and “professional businessmen” presented General Ubico with a petition demanding his removal from office, the petition cited “311 leading citizens joined in a letter to the President expressing their support for the teacher’s aims” (Grieb, 1976, 532; Calvert, 1985, 4). However, General Ubico’s removal from office and the subsequent purging of the military officers loyal to Ubico from Guatemalan government would not have been possible without the support of the professionalized junior military officers, the expanding business and middle classes, and the student organizations. General Ubico resigned shortly after receiving the petition.
Democracy in Guatemala: Juan Jose Arévalo 1945

The small middle class in Guatemala was pushing for a more inclusive government, a more democratic or “participatory system” where citizens would be able to vote and influence state policies (REMHI, 1999, 184). In 1945 Juan Jose Arévalo was elected president of Guatemala and a new constitution was created and disseminated throughout Guatemala (Skidmore and Smith, 2005, 348). There were many challenges facing the new democracy in Guatemala; military, social, and economic factors weighed heavily on the Arévalo presidency. The military overtly challenged the presidency, with “no less than twenty-seven coups d’état against his civilian government”; the social and economic ills facing the country presented less clear and contained challenges (Perera, 1995, 282). One of the chief reforms of the new presidency was the enacting of new labor codes; abolishing the vagrancy laws, allowing for collective bargaining, the right to strike, and the formation of unions. Furthermore, President Arévalo began the movement toward land reform, established a pension system, allowed for freedom of expression, and instituted literacy programs targeting the entire population (Burnett, 1989, 207, 211). While the Arévalo presidency began with broad support from the middle classes, business owners and the more junior officers in the military, these groups grew increasingly disenchanted with the Arévalo administration. By the end of his term he was forced to rely increasingly on the support of the leftist factions of the country and his administration (Burnett, 1989, 213).

Historical Summary

By the beginning of the 1950s Guatemala had a clear history of rule by a small oligarchy. The ruling oligarchy had been composed of hereditary Mayan rulers and religious leaders, Spanish colonizers, and most recently criollo elite families and the military. Similar to the ruling structure, the economic structures in Guatemala are a vestige of particular types of Mayan
agricultural frameworks and tribute that were adopted and expanded by Spanish colonizers and later the criollo elites. Another vestige of Spanish colonization is Guatemala’s economic dependency on agricultural exports; specifically, mono-crops resulting in land concentration in the hands of a few elites and corporations. The mono-crops require seasonal agricultural employment in specific regions of the country. The social system in Guatemala at the start of the 1950s is largely a de facto caste system, with a very select few criollo elites and military officers at the top, the ladino middle and business classes occupying the larger middle class, and the indigenous Mayans occupying the largest group at the bottom (Handy, 1984, 205). The social system is result of Spanish colonization, and was hardened by years of authoritarian rule by the Guatemalan military and the criollo elites. Within Guatemala the effects from the ruling, economic and social systems are deeply entrenched; chronic and seasonal unemployment, underdevelopment, illiteracy, poor health, malnutrition, political alienation, (forced) migration, and political violence are widespread heading into the 1950s.
Chapter 5

CURRENT CONDITIONS

Guatemala: Regimes, Social Conditions, Foreign Intervention; 1950-1995

In Guatemala there are a wide variety of factors with the ability to influence migration; yet, for over five decades regime type, social conditions and foreign intervention have remained relatively similar. Democratic and authoritarian regimes have dealt with the same issues with similar outcomes; both types have struggled to exert civilian control over the military and been equally susceptibility to coups and to foreign influences. The social conditions in Guatemala have remained extremely poor throughout the period being examined; especially for indigenous populations, women, children, and migrants. These variables will be discussed prior to the analysis of the economic development, state sponsored violence, and migration indicators. The remaining variables will be highlighted in Chapter 6 and in Table 6.1, also located in the appendix.

Controlled Variables

“Guatemala is governed by two chief executives, one of whom holds a gun to the head of the other”-Juan Jose Arévalo

Controlled Variable: Regime

In 1950 Guatemala experienced a peaceful transition of democratically elected Presidents. Jacobo Arbenz was elected to the presidency of Guatemala, leading a center-left coalition to victory. After President Arbenz took over the presidency from President Arévalo, he continued the political, social and economic reforms begun by his predecessor. During this brief democratic period many of Guatemala’s draconian laws and practices were abolished. Under President Arévalo and President Arbenz forced labor was ended, minimum wages were instituted, the rights of workers to organize into unions was instituted, as well as the right to form political
parties. There were also attempts by President Arbenz to increase the amount of available
domestic infrastructure; work on an Atlantic coast port was initiated, as well as expanded work on
Guatemala’s highways. However, it was the attempts by President Arbenz in 1952 to institute
land reform that was met with open hostility from foreign business interests and domestic landed
interests. Land reforms instituted in 1952 led to the CIA backed coup of President Arbenz in
June of 1954. Colonel Carlos Castillo Armas took over as president of Guatemala in 1954 and
held a national plebiscite with an oral, public yes/no vote to legitimize his rule; the plebiscite
passes with 95% approval (Handy, 1984, 151). Colonel Armas immediately abolished the
reforms and laws from the October Revolution (1944); instituted by the two previous democratic
regimes to guarantee economic, social and political freedoms. Colonel Armas also instituted
several new punitive measures, including the banning of all political parties, banning illiterates
from voting, banning all 533 unions, limiting the right to strike, firing teachers and rescinding
literacy programs and engaging in a political witch hunt for communists. Colonel Armas ruled
Guatemala until his assassination in 1957. At the time, powerful rivalries within the military
establishment in Guatemala provided two short-term transitional rulers, Lopez and Avendano,
before the election of General Miguel Ydígoras Guentes in 1958. General Ydígoras was elected
with 25.9% of the votes from eligible voters, although during this election only 19.6% of the
population was deemed eligible to vote and another 33.1% of eligible voters abstained from
voting, meaning that General Ydígoras was elected by approximately 5% of the Guatemalan
population (Encyclopedia of Latin American Politics, 123).

Between 1950 and 1960 there was high instability in the Guatemalan state government.
Guatemala was ruled by eight different individuals over ten years; three were elected, the first
two of them elected legitimately, Arévalo (1950), Arbenz (1951-1954) and Ydígoras (1958).
Three individuals briefly come to power as a result of the 1954 coup, Diaz (1954), Monzon
and Armas (1954-1957). The final two individuals were a result of the assassination of Armas, Gonzalez (1957) and Flores (1957). While Guatemala had a brief democratic interlude, begun under the term of President Arévalo and finished under President Arbenz, from the 1954 coup until the end of the period in 1960 marks Guatemala’s return to authoritarian rule.

By 1960 General Ydígoras was at the midpoint of his presidential tenure. General Ydígoras was known for his close ties to Ubico and his two previous attempts at the presidential office. He was initially the preferred candidate of the military establishment; finally elected in 1958 after initial accusations of electoral fraud he soon alienated the younger officer corps with his regime’s “rampant corruption” (Black, 1984, 19). The younger officers were further offended with General Ydígoras’ permissive attitude toward the U.S. military operating within Guatemala. A substantial number of officers staged an unsuccessful coup in 1960, later in the spring of 1962 many of these officers reorganized with students and labor leaders to lead massive strikes throughout the state. In only a few years General Ydígoras had managed to alienate nearly all sources of potential support. A second coup was attempted in 1962 by elites and members of the air force. By the end of 1962 students, public sector workers, labor unions, the business sector, members of the military, the Catholic Church, all three opposition parties, and leadership in the United States all abandoned support for the leader.15 After allowing Arévalo to return to Guatemala for a possible presidential candidacy, with the consent and possible assistance of the United States government, General Ydígoras was removed definitively from power by the military in 1963 (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 242-243).

General Peralta Azurdia took over the presidency after the ouster of General Ydígoras; he was approved by the Guatemalan military and the United States government. President Peralta, a Guatemalan nationalist, continued the tradition of authoritarian rule. He successfully
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15 Handy, 153. General Ydígoras was never the preferred presidential candidate of the United States.
consolidated the military’s power and further dismantled the remaining democratic structures and mechanisms in Guatemala. Under Peralta’s presidency certain political parties were abolished, the Congress was disbanded, military courts were set up to try crimes against the government, and laws were passed that criminalize any communist propaganda, communist party membership, and any activities deemed as terrorist activities (REMHI, 1999, 195). Peralta formed the Democratic Institutional Party (PID), fashioned after the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) in Mexico, in an attempt to widen his base of support. As promised, elections were held in 1966, when a civilian, Julio Cesar Méndez Montenegro, was elected to the presidency with 43.7% of eligible voters abstaining (Black, 1984, 21). President Méndez was the brother of a centrist civilian candidate to the presidency, Mario Méndez Montenegro, who was either killed or committed suicide immediately prior to the election (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 245). The military tried twice, unsuccessfully, to oust President Méndez from office; the first attempt occurred immediately after he won the election. However, international pressure, especially from the United States, forced the military to reevaluate its immediate goals; a bargain was struck between President Méndez and the military. President Méndez survived the coup and began his term “under a state of siege,” threats to his presidency were both external and internal. The external threats to the Guatemalan government include strikes, coups, kidnappings of government officials and assassinations. The internal threats come almost entirely from the military leadership who, after the unsuccessful coup, are using fear as a weapon to control President Méndez. Military control over the presidency allows for the military to carry out operations within the Guatemalan state without any civilian oversight (Handy, 1984, 160). The military was the most active in the eastern regions of Guatemala, the guerrilla movement suffered defeats, alliances between the FAR and PGT began to break down.
President Méndez’s term ends with the 1970 election of Colonel Arana the “jackal of Zacapa” running on the PID platform. During the 1970 elections there is a 46.2% absentee rate; Colonel Arana is elected by 22.1% of the eligible voters and 4.7% of the total population (Encyclopedia of Latin American Politics, 123). As Colonel Arana came into his presidency prices for agricultural commodities were dropping significantly and the CACM was disintegrating. The elite classes and foreign investors were clamoring for a strong state response to the growing social unrest. In response the unrest President Arana declares a state of siege for one year of his presidency; the PGT is the target of massive government repression, the majority of its leadership is killed or disappeared. Colonel Arana was elected by a coalition between PID supporters and MLN supporters, both of whom desire an end to guerrilla activity. Similar to General Ydígoras, Arana’s presidency was fraught with corruption and nepotism; his presidency lasts until 1974. Colonel Arana’s exploits prior to his presidency, during his time as the military commander in Zacapa, is discussed in the political violence section below. Similar to the 1950s the 1960s are dominated with authoritarian rulers and an unstable state government. Between 1960 and 1973 Guatemala was ruled by four different presidents, three of whom were from the military establishment and one of whom was a civilian. There were multiple coup attempts, along with political assassinations, and substantial strikes throughout the civilian population.

President Colonel Arana’s term ended in 1974 and General Kjell Laugerud became president. General Laugerud, also a PID candidate, was elected in a fraudulent election. Prior to becoming president General Laugerud served as a cabinet minister and chief of staff under President Arana. While an acting member of the presidential cabinet General Laugerud served on a four person committee, responsible for controlling the activities of the paramilitary death squads. In the 1974 elections General Laugerud ran against General Efraín Ríos Montt. General Laugerud previously replaced General Montt in the Arana administration after General Montt
“clashed” with President Arana (Handy, 1984, 170). The questionable election results were immediately protested by General Montt, his party the National Opposition Front (FNO), and the Christian Democrats (DCG). Leaders of the MLN brought thousands of armed protesters to the city to support General Laugerud’s election. Eventually, after General Arana intervened with General Montt, General Laugerud was confirmed to the presidency with the electoral support of 4.9% of the population; out of the 298,953 votes for General Laugerud it was alleged that 180,000 were tampered with by the military (Handy, 1984, 171). General Laugerud’s presidency continued the trend of placing military personnel in bureaucratic positions within the Guatemalan government. One striking difference of the Laugerud presidency was the exclusion of MLN supporters to positions in the government. In order to further alienate the MLN and consolidate power President Laugerud forged a coalition between the DCG, the PID, and the PR. At the beginning of his term President Laugerud was described as a technocrat, someone more concerned with strengthening the military’s role in the government and the economy than exercising power through political violence. Yet, the paramilitary death squads still existed and were active during his regime; they were left mostly unchecked and they operated in a more fragmented manner then during the Arana regime. Effects from the 1976 earthquake, along with renewed labor, peasant organizing and the formation of the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP), prompt President Laugerud’s regime to return to a more repressive rule.

Despite his previous close ties to Colonel Arana and high rank, General Laugerud’s presidency was punctuated by disagreements and violent conflicts between members of the military’s ruling coalition. These types of disagreements carried over until the 1978 elections, General Romeo Lucas García was supported by the PID, PR and Central Aranista Organization (CAO), and his competitors were General Peralta Azurdia (MLN) and Colonel Peralta Méndez (Christian Democrats). This election, similar to the preceding elections had significantly poor
voter turnout. Eligible voters ignored compulsory voting laws and either abstained from the pools or refused to participate; 20% of those voting sabotaged their ballots, only 15% of eligible voters participated in the election (Handy, 1984, 176). General Lucas was elected by 4.1% of the populace. At the time of the election there were massive strikes in Guatemala related to price increases in public transportation. President Lucas responded with prolonged repression and political violence directed at a wide swath of the population.

The 1982 elections were besieged with violence before they had even begun; the two candidates representing the United Revolutionary Front (FUR) were assassinated in January and March of 1979 as they attempted to officially register their party. Despite having twice the signatures needed to officially register a political party the FUR, a party made up of Social Democrats, was denied official status for many years. The assassination of Fuentes Mohr and Colom Argueta were only the beginning of the campaign against the FUR. By 1980 the Social Democrats were all but disbanded and exiled due to prolonged political violence; the Christian Democrats were in a similar situation. However, there were also growing divisions within the military establishment, President Lucas and the more junior officers were increasingly at odds. Significant problems with inadequate conscription, insufficient supplies, and rampant corruption within the highest levels of the military, lead to the coup of President Lucas by junior level officers in 1982. The catalyst for the coup was another fraudulent election in 1982 where the selected PID candidate, General Angel Anibal Guevara, was elected. However, General Lucas was removed before the new president could take power. General Montt bought out the other members of the junta and took over the presidency, thus ending the reign of PID presidents. General Montt was unconcerned by his non-democratic rise to office, he stated to the Guatemalan nation on a radio broadcast in 1982 “Do you know why I am a true political leader? Because I am here without your votes.” General Montt’s reign was brief and extremely violent; he was
overthrown in a military coup in 1983 led by Oscar Humberto Mejía Víctores, the former minister of defense. General Víctores ruled Guatemala with a civilian-military administration until 1986; General Montt’s military commanders in the “major military zones” were replaced as was the army chief of staff (REMHI, 1999, 243). The military viewed the 1983 to 1985 period as one of restructuring, reform and rebuilding to bring stability to the state. President Víctores introduced the “Plan Stabilization 84” to address the guerrilla movement. The repressive strategies used by prior generals remained; however, Víctores strategy also included “a public show of concern for the Mayan communities’ welfare” (Perera, 1995, 107). It was an effort to appease foreign aid donors and allied states by concealing the abuses and utilizing more “sophisticated” strategies of repression such as “psychological indoctrination”; establishment of model villages were central to his strategies (Perera, 1995, 107).

The military generals serving as president from the 1950s through the 1980s left a legacy of poverty and inequality, corruption, destruction, and a crippled social movement. The impact of nearly 90% of the population living below the poverty line, increasing urbanization, and a loss of “fifteen years of growth” during the 1980s may have facilitated the rebuilding of the social and labor movements in Guatemala in the late 1980s (Vanden, 2002, 266). Included in the regeneration of social movements were groups seeking justice for human rights violations, groups representing the majority indigenous populations, and groups representing women. A new constitution was implemented in 1985 and elections were held. The military believed its position was solidified enough to withstand a civilian president and Vinicio Cerezo a civilian, and member of the Christian Democrats was elected. Cerezo was elected with a 70% majority over the center-right candidate; furthermore, he was elected despite the strong opposition of the business elites (Perera, 1995, 284). He immediately set about negotiating with more moderate military leaders to ensure his presidency had at least one ally. Factions in the military attempted two coups
against President Cerezo resulting in large “concession[s]…to the hard-line military” (Perera, 1995, 283). President Cerezo’s term turned out to be remarkably similar to President Méndez; he served only with the consent of the military from 1986-1991. The first dialogue between the government and UNRG took place in 1987 in Spain. For the first time the government indicated there may be a negotiated end to the conflict in Guatemala. President Cerezo was able to disband the Department of Special Investigations (DIT) and he signed the regional peace accords, the Esquipulas Accords in 1987. However, the disdain of the military toward President Cerezo was palpable, a statement by the Army Chief of Staff shows the challenges facing President Cerezo, he stated that the army was “underappreciated”, and that things could “get out of hand for the government if not for the army” (Central America Report, 1986, 202). The military responded to the 1987 Accords by claiming that Guatemala was not bound by the Accords; President Cerezo did not challenge the military’s claim. During Cerezo’s presidency the military continued to pursue the guerrilla groups located in the Ixil Triangle with increased counterinsurgency efforts in 1987. Then in 1988 and 1990 two massacres took place in the Chimaltenango and in Santiago Atitlan. In the first massacre twenty-two people were killed, in the second thirteen, the perpetrators were never caught or persecuted. President Cerezo’s administration was duly tainted by the two incidents. Furthermore, he was not able to break up the military’s intelligence units or prosecute any of the top military personnel for crimes committed in earlier years or investigate any of the well known massacres and assassinations (Perera, 1995, 284-285). President Cerezo officially ended his term at the end of 1990, although his ability to enact policy ended much earlier. His attempt to increase the minimum wage to US$2 per day was quickly rejected by the business elites.

The 1990 elections pitted former president General Montt against Jorge Serrano Elias. Montt’s campaign was ruled unconstitutional prior to the election due to his prior participation in
a coup resulting with Montt taking power. Similar to the previous elections no leftist parties were permitted to run a candidate; additionally, in 1990 only one third of Guatemala’s eligible population turned out to vote in the run-off between Serrano and Jorge Carpio Nicolle. Yet, Guatemala had its first democratic transition of elected civilian presidents in 1991 since Arévalo and Arbenz in the 1950s. President Serrano began his presidency with a conciliatory tone by appointing “opposition leaders to head his cabinet,” and calling for a “Social Pact” between business interests and labor unions (Perera, 1995, 332). President Serrano’s conciliatory tone had a practical cause; he lacked support in the National Congress since only 10 seats were won by his party. The calls for a negotiated end to the conflict were growing throughout society, those advocating for a negotiated peace process were societal, religious and community groups; government talks with the UNRG continue. Unfortunately, President Serrano’s initiatives were quickly derailed as reporters critical of his presidency were arrested, labor unions put an end to unproductive talks with business elites, and violence in the highlands reached levels “unknown since Lucas Garcia’s presidency” (Perera, 1995, 333). The increase in violence did produce one benefit; it united many disparate groups in Guatemala, and pushed the government toward a peace agreement. The major point of contention between the negotiating groups was accountability for crimes committed. During President Serrano’s tenure the situation in Guatemala deteriorated rapidly. Death squads increased and carried out threats to members of the press, drug traffickers increasingly used Guatemala as a conduit for cocaine and heroin from Colombia to the United States, and violence continued to be carried out against peaceful protestors.\footnote{SALA reports 1988-1993 as the years with the highest opium and cannabis production in Guatemala.} In May 1993 President Serrano attempted to suspend the constitution and abolish the Congress and Supreme Court, his attempts to seize control of the state were, “repudiated by virtually all sectors of civil society and the international community” (Vanden, 2002, 217).
Ramiro de Leon Carpio, the former Human Rights Ombudsman was appointed president of Guatemala by the National Congress in 1993 after President Serrano was removed by the military from office and flees the country. De Leon enjoyed initial support from a broad base; he was able to return the state to the official peace negotiations monitored by the United Nations. In 1994 the Commission for the Historical Clarification (CEH) and the United Nations Verification Mission in Guatemala (MINUGUA) was established. He also signed a pledge with the National Congress to reform the constitution and to hold elections in 1995. Elections were held in 1995 and Alvaro Arzu Irigoyen was elected.

From 1950 through 1995 there were twenty-one separate administrations that governed Guatemala. Between 1950 and 1995 sixteen administrations were military-authoritarian, four were considered democratic with civilians holding office and one was a civilian holding a transitional office. Ten of the administrations ended in a coup, although many more coups were unsuccessful. Two of the civilian administrations (Méndez and Cerezo) operated with very limited control over the state. One of the remaining civilian presidency’s (Serrano) ended with an attempt by the president to seize power. Each administration in Guatemala from 1950-1995 was either part of the military or was unable or unwilling to exert complete control over the military. Additionally, the twenty-one administrations appear to be equally powerless to influence the elites in a manner they were not already inclined to support. Corruption and impunity were rampant throughout the period, although there notable periods where the levels are elevated (Lucas). In nearly every administration the social, political, economic perspective of the indigenous population was completely disregarded.

Controlled Variable: Foreign Intervention

The United States continued to influence Guatemala during the 1950s similar to the patterns established in the first half of the century. The most dramatic example of external
influence on the internal affairs in Guatemala during the 1950s was the 1954 coup of President Arbenz. The coup was planned, supported and carried out by the CIA, the State Department of the United States government and a small group of Guatemalan military exiles. Examination and analysis of the Arbenz coup is the most widespread topic throughout the political science literature on Guatemala. More recently the United States government released secret correspondence and CIA memorandums detailing the level of U.S. involvement in the coup. As previously described in the historical and economic sections of the paper, a high level of United States involvement in Guatemala did not begin with the 1954 coup. Corporations from the United States had been embedded in Guatemala since the beginning of the 1900s. Additionally, the United States was both a model for training military personnel and at times it provided the training for Guatemala’s military personnel. The United States government had been exerting its influence on Guatemala’s economy, labor, and politics for nearly fifty years prior to the coup. The ongoing Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union provided the necessary justification for the coup; a single event with long-lasting effects. The combination of Guatemala’s geopolitical proximity and substantial U.S. business interests meant the U.S. felt Guatemala was well within its sphere of influence; therefore, any intrusion into internal Guatemalan affairs was justified in a balance of power scenario.

The ouster of General Ubico in 1944 left the United States with a steep drop in the access they were accustomed to receiving from Guatemalan heads of state. A dearth of accurate information, knowledge about the region, and conflicting internal reporting did not stop the United States from forging an aggressive interventionist foreign policy in Guatemala. Rather than weighing concrete intelligence, the United States relied on a combination of “United Fruit Company employees,” U.S. citizens (businessmen) living in Guatemala, disgraced Guatemalan
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17 Gleijeses (1991) states that Eisenhower, both Dulles brothers, Peurifoy, and Patterson all had very little knowledge of “the third world” (235-236).
military personnel, and preconceived biased opinions about Soviet Communism to form foreign policy decisions (Gleijeses, 1991, 100-101). Documents recently produced by the State Department and CIA reveal there was ample evidence available to the U.S. government that Guatemala was neither a communist threat to the United States nor was it affiliated with the Soviet Union. Yet, accusations against communism began during the Arévalo regime, at a time when the United States knew that “communists faced formidable obstacles in Guatemala… [the communists] were fewer than five hundred, and their influence rested on the personal patronage of Arévalo” (Gleijeses, 1991, 122).\(^{18}\) Moreover, when Guatemalan elites claimed communist subversion was widespread in Guatemala the United States State Department’s Office of Intelligence and Research reported that “there is better reason to believe that Communist infiltration is non-consequential” (Gleijeses, 1991, 122-123). Ironically, when Arbenz was first elected to office he was viewed as an “opportunist” who could be a “bulwark against communism” rather than a Soviet sympathizer (Gleijeses, 1991, 127).

Nonetheless, after the ouster of Ubico, U.S. corporations, specifically United Fruit Company, worked with the U.S. State Department to incite U.S. action in Guatemala. In 1953, in an attempt to brand Arbenz a communist, United Fruit Company assembled a publication titled “Report on Guatemala,” this report was distributed to all members of Congress, all members of relevant bureaucratic committees and press corps. A portion of the United Fruit Company’s publication states, “A Moscow directed Communist conspiracy in Central America is one of the Soviet Union’s most successful operations of infiltration outside of the Iron Curtain countries” (De Soto, 1978, 244). Additionally, United Fruit Company paid for U.S. journalists to travel to

\(^{18}\) Ibid, 122. This was from a United States Embassy report.
Guatemala and tour their facilities, the subsequent reports were sympathetic toward the United Fruit Company and derogatory toward Guatemala and Arbenz in particular.\(^{19}\)

Through the work of United Fruit Company, the State Department, the U.S. Ambassador working in Guatemala, and the CIA the United States government came to believe that direct intervention, regime change, in Guatemala would bring about several desirable outcomes (Cullather, 1999, 35). These outcomes included the creation of a deferential and welcome investment atmosphere in Guatemala for United States companies, such as United Fruit Company. The immediate and total reversal of the 1952 agrarian reforms, as well as a reversal of the 1947 labor codes protecting the right to organize and strike. Additionally, the intervention would facilitate the complete removal of all communists from positions in the Guatemalan government and a complete disbanding of communist unions in Guatemala, thus returning Guatemala to its perceived sphere of influence. The intervention would also rid Guatemala of the communist threat, while setting an example for the rest of Central America and the world. And finally, allow for a real life opportunity to “test” a “prototype” for fighting communism that could then be used elsewhere (Cullather, 1999, 35).

The involvement of the United States in Guatemala did not end with the successful coup of Arbenz; economic and military ties between the two states lasted several decades. Under Colonel Armas the United States increased its financial contributions to Guatemala by way of official development assistance, grants, military aid, and loans. Under Colonel Armas Guatemala was given approximately US$80 million in the three years after the coup (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 232-233). After Colonel Armas was assassinated the United States continued its support of

\(^{19}\)Gleijeses, 367 and Cullather, 18. Cullather (1999) reports that Bernays, on behalf of United Fruit Company sent “correspondents from Time, Newsweek, the New York Times, and Chicago Tribune to report on Communist activities in Guatemala” (18). Additionally, in 1954 NBC News ran a documentary titled “Red Rule in Guatemala,” Cullather (1999) reports there were further articles in Reader’s Digest and the Saturday Evening Post (56). The director of public relations for Bernays was Eisenhower’s personal secretary’s husband (Gleijeses, 361).
the counterrevolution’s “Liberation” in Guatemala by sending the U.S. military to the National Palace in Guatemala after the election of General Ydígoras, to legitimize his presidency (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 238). The U.S. position on Guatemala became even more steadfast with the success of the Cuban revolution in 1959. Subsequently, the United States requested land for the development of temporary U.S. military bases in Guatemala; to provide a location to train and use as air bases for the Bay of Pigs invasion (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 238-239). While General Ydígoras gave his approval the Guatemalan military was not as amendable to the situation. In 1960 a group of nationalist military members incited a rebellion at the site of the bases; the United States military and the Cuban exiles in Guatemala worked in concert to put down the rebellion (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 238-239). During the 1950s the level of outside intervention and influence was very high. The U.S. government and its military were involved in state affairs, while U.S. corporations were involved in the economy; both had significant impacts on the social and economic indicators during the time period.

External influences continued to play a critical role in Guatemala during the 1960s. Tumultuous events in Central and Latin America, as well as the perpetual influence and direct intervention from the United States continued to play a role shaping economic and social development in Guatemala. Economic development, land reform, unemployment, underemployment were problems facing Guatemala and they were also issues present in neighboring states. El Salvador and Honduras both had issues related to inequitable distribution of land; land was concentrated in the hands of foreign corporations and landed elites in both states. Hundreds of thousands of Salvadorans were migrating from the smaller and more populous El Salvador to the larger and less populous Honduras in the 1960s in search of land. Honduras had become increasingly frustrated with El Salvador’s complacency with regard to the Salvadoran migration, and El Salvador was increasingly irritated with the perceived poor
treatment of its migrants. In the late 1960s Honduras began forcibly removing Salvadorans who were legally and illegally occupying land in Honduras; approximately 300,000 Salvadorans were forcibly displaced. El Salvador became increasingly hostile over the treatment of Salvadorans in Honduras, tensions between the two states increased until El Salvador attacked Honduras in July of 1969. El Salvador utilized aircraft and personnel provided by the United States as the OAS worked towards an immediate cease fire. Though a cease fire was negotiated four days after the onset of hostilities, the conflict brought an end to the CACM. Guatemala had benefited the most from the establishment of the CACM; the disintegration of the CACM would reestablish Guatemala’s dependency on the United States.

During the second period the guerrilla movement and the Guatemala state were both influenced by the successful Cuban Revolution. The United States government, in conjunction with the Guatemalan government, used the Cuban Revolution as an example of what would happen if the state allowed the incipient guerrilla movement to exist. The CEH reports that Cuban revolutionaries did have a “political, logistical, instructional and training” influence on Guatemalan guerrillas operating inside and outside of Guatemala (Mexico).20 Guerrilla groups in Guatemala who embraced Marxist ideology viewed the Cuban Revolutionaries as a group with a similar set of circumstances and one sympathetic to their cause. Any similarities or ties between the Guatemalan and Cuban guerrilla movements was cause for alarm and sufficient reason for the anti-communist National Security Doctrine adopted by Guatemala under General Peralta.

The United States continued to directly and indirectly exert its influence in Guatemala through an effort titled the Alliance for Progress, instituted by President Kennedy in 1961.

20 CEH, The Tragedy of the Armed Confrontation: The Guatemalan insurgency, the armed struggle and the Cuban influence, 1999.
President Kennedy addressed Latin American Diplomats and the United States Congress in March of 1961 to describe the goals of the Alliance for Progress. He acknowledged the problems in Latin and Central America were “staggering in their dimensions” and the United States response to these “daily degradations of hunger and poverty” would have to be “equally bold” in order to “complete the revolution of the Americas, to build a hemisphere where all men can hope for a suitable standard of living and all can live out their lives in dignity and freedom” (The Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, 471-474). President Kennedy further stated that “to achieve this goal political freedom must accompany material progress” (The Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, 471-474). He set out ten goals and strategies for Central and Latin America during this period, (1) all goals were to be accomplished during the decade of democratic progress, (2) goals would be accomplished by using an alliance of states and organizations, (3) the U.S. Congress would be asked to approve a US$500 million appropriation bill to address illiteracy, disease, education and infrastructure projects in the region, (4) increasing economic integration between “fragmented” states, (5) addressing the volatility in the commodities markets that plagued Central and Latin American states, (6) increasing the use of food distribution programs, (7) increasing science and technology programs in the region, (8) increasing education throughout the region, (9) defending the independence of states in the region through collective institutions such as the OAS, and (10) increasing exchange programs between the United States and Central and Latin America (The Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, 471-474).

Approximately one month later the United States commenced the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba, leaving President Kennedy’s stated goals and strategies for the Alliance for Progress somewhat contradictory to actual U.S. actions during this period. During the 1960s and 1970s the United States would intervene repeatedly in Central and Latin America states to topple or prevent the election of left-wing candidates, in certain states, Brazil, Dominican Republic,
Chile, El Salvador, Bolivia and Guatemala there were multiple interventions. President Kennedy’s successor, President Nixon, drastically reduced the amount of U.S. aid channeled through the Alliance for Progress and was openly disdainful of the program.

The Alliance for Progress was the United States’ public face of intervention in Guatemala, but the military assistance, training, and direct involvement in counterinsurgency efforts in Guatemala remained much more clandestine. Beginning in 1960 the United States began to increase its military aid, allowing the Guatemalan military to increase the number of personnel significantly. By 1963 the United States had increased its Guatemalan military aid by ten times that given in the 1950s; approximately 29% of total U.S. military aid was channeled to Guatemala in the 1960s (Handy, 1984, 156). In 1966, the year Colonel Arana was appointed to Zacapa, the United States channeled US$6 million to the army and another US$11 million in military equipment (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 245). The Guatemalan military employed several strategies aimed at retaining the highest number of personnel and capturing the most aid resources. One of these strategies was to be in charge of implementing the development programs and infrastructure programs in Guatemala; even the task of implementing the literacy programs was given to the military, further increasing their presence in rural areas. Additionally, military officers were allowed to hold concurrent posts, one military post and one government post in an effort to increase their incomes. The military integration into the political realm would make it difficult for any civilian to exercise control over the military for decades.

Under the presidency of Méndez in 1966 the United States provided Green Berets to train Guatemalan military personnel in counterinsurgency efforts, and provided the military with “advanced new technology such as remote sensing and night-vision scopes” (Black, 1984, 72). The estimated number of Green Berets in Guatemala ranged from “several hundred to 1,000” during this time (Jonas, 1991, 70). U.S. planes taking off from Panamanian bases carried and
dropped napalm on rural villages in northeaster Guatemala (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 246). Guatemalan officers also received assistance and training from the United States CIA to “modernize the intelligence operation” in Guatemala (Jonas, 1991, 70). The United States Embassy and United States military advisors assisted in the creation of the 1966 memorandum creating the paramilitary death squads and the subsequent formation and organization of the death squads (Jonas, 1991, 70). The United States also channeled funds to Guatemala to increase the number of police officers, the number of personnel increased from 3,000 to 11,000 in four years (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 247). The amount of funds dedicated to training and retaining police officers to the needs of the domestic population was wildly disproportionate; Guatemala received “the second largest American police assistance program in the hemisphere” (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 247). The United States faced little pressure domestically to alter or reduce their intervention in Guatemala, in 1966 at the outset of the Méndez presidency the New York Times claimed the United States had found a “willing partner in Guatemala” (Schlesinger and Kinzer, 1982, 247)

The effects of the formation of CACM and the Alliance for Progress as well as the subsequent disintegration of the CACM and the Alliance for Progress were complex; both programs provided advantages and disadvantages. The advantages under CACM were that trade between Central American states increased, decreasing Guatemala’s export and import dependency on the United States; also, foreign investment increased under the CACM and Alliance for Progress during the 1960s. However, there were many disadvantages to catering to private enterprises including, a prolonged period of rising unemployment, a decrease in the percentage of overall industrial employment, a worsening of income distribution, increasing urbanization, and a continued reliance on agriculture as the primary export sector during the CACM and Alliance for Progress period.
The relationship between Guatemala and the United States was purported to have transformed under President Jimmy Carter (1976-1980). In reality human rights groups and certain members of the international community had already begun pressuring President Ford in 1975 to reduce or eliminate military aid and weapons sales to Guatemala. President Carter attempted to impose human rights conditions on military aid sent to Guatemala. The United States Congress passed the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act in 1978 that directly tied the receipt of military aid to improvements in human rights conditions. Guatemala responded by refusing any aid with human rights conditionality and assassinating the centrist candidates supported by the Carter administration. The United States never truly eliminated all aid to Guatemala during Carter’s term, “more than $34 million worth of US military equipment wormed its way into Guatemala…under contracts licensed by Department of Commerce” (Black, 1984, 147).

From 1950-1995 Guatemala had been largely dependent on the United States as a source for ODA, for the training of military personnel in counterinsurgency techniques, and as a purchaser of exports and supplier of imports. However, Guatemala also received support from a variety of states throughout the world. Argentina, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, China, South Africa, and Spain were a few of the states purchasing exports, and acting as a source of ODA and military arms (Black, 1984, 153). One of Guatemala’s more enduring relationships was with Israel. Guatemala’s relationship with Israel began in 1948, “Guatemala provided one of the three United Nations commissioners charged with overseeing the creation of the Jewish state;” the commissioner was Jorge Garcia Granados a “close political associate of General Lucas” (Black, 1984, 155). However, it was not until the United States State Department report in 1977 and the subsequent action by the Carter administration that Guatemala began to rely more exclusively on Israel for the purchase of arms for the military. Israel played a key role in the
counterinsurgency effort during Plan Victoria 82; acting as an arms supplier, technical advisor, military advisor, offering police force training, providing economic aid, facilitating the transfer of academics, and supplied computer software to the military and civilian sectors. Due to the partnership between Israel and Guatemala the partial cutoff of aid from the United States from 1977 through 1982 had “little effect on the Guatemalan military.”

Economic and military aid from the United States fully resumed in 1982-1983 under President Reagan after Guatemala was removed from the list of human rights offenders. Their removal from the list was made possible by intense lobbying and subsequent claims that General Montt would be able to remedy the plethora of unsavory issues created by Generals Laugerud and Lucas. At a minimum the United States was briefed on and approved of the coup placing General Montt in the presidency in 1982. Economic and military aid from the United States, World Bank and IMF poured into Guatemala post-1982. From 1984 through 1990 development aid, food aid, other economic support and military aid increased substantially. The United States provided approximately US$20 million in aid to Guatemala in 1984; by 1990 the amount had increased to approximately US$162 million (Jonas, 1991, 205). The level of United States’ involvement in the late 1980s had increased to include U.S. military actively participating in the transport of troops in Guatemala, the training of Guatemalan military personnel, and the involvement of the CIA and Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in the highlands of Guatemala (Jonas, 1991, 206). The United States had several policy objectives in the late 1980s. It used the lure of significant financial aid to entice Guatemala into isolating Nicaragua and remaining neutral and passive during the invasion of Panama (Jonas, 1991, 207). The temptation of substantial aid from the United States in exchange for conformity nearly led to a military coup of the Cerezo administration.

21 Handy, 174. South Africa also played a role supplying Guatemala with military aid.
The United States has had a long history of contradictory foreign policy objectives in Guatemala, i.e. a purported desire for democracy throughout the world alongside their continued support for the military generals who ruled Guatemala for decades. This pattern was typified in the mid 1980s and the early 1990s. During President Victores administration prior to the 1985 elections the United States lobbied to reinstate aid to Guatemala with large increases for military training and security assistance. The rational for providing the Guatemalan military, who was committing the vast majority of the human rights violations, with more resources was that “increased economic and military aid will serve to reinforce democratic tendencies [the elections]” (Central America Report).

Another example of contradictory goals was provided during the last year of President Cerezo’s administration. The United States, under President Bush, began to increase pressure on Guatemala, particularly President Cerezo, concerning the ongoing human rights violations. Yet, in 1988 and 1989 the United States had sold to Guatemala’s military US$13.8 million worth of M-16s (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 185). One year later, the United States’ State Department issued a relatively “scathing denunciation” of the human rights abuses by the military in 1990 (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 182). Furthermore, in 1990 the United States strengthened its ties to the Guatemalan military as the United States sought Guatemala’s assistance for the eradication of the drug trade and for the implementation of development strategies in Guatemala. The United States viewed the military as the organization capable of carrying out the mandate for such programs.

President Bush did not restrict aid to Guatemala until the murder of Michael DeVine, an American innkeeper working in the Petén. Yet, even after the “cut off [of] overt military aid and sales” in 1990, the military intelligence units in Guatemala continued to receive aid and training under President Bush (Human Rights Watch, 1996, 99). Aid to Guatemala continued to be
funded secretly through the CIA. A portion of the funding had been used to directly compensate a Guatemalan officer who was responsible for the murder of Efraín Bámaca, a guerrilla leader and Michael DeVine. When the relationship between the CIA and Guatemalan officers became known President Clinton suspended aid to Guatemala in 1995. The remaining funds already allocated to security in Guatemala in 1995 were channeled through MINUGUA to support the official peace process. Aid for anti-narcotic efforts and police training was still permitted in 1995 under President Clinton.

**Controlled Variable: Social Conditions**

During the Ubico regime the quality of life for the majority of Guatemalans, especially the Mayas, was extremely poor. Peasants were forced to migrate for work a set number of days a year. They were expected to carry a passbook at all times detailing the hours they had worked and they worked for little to no wages on government infrastructure projects. Additionally, the peasant population was not allowed to vote, plantation owners had state sanctioned authority to kill any peasant workers who were deemed a threat to property or person, and the military was routinely used to violently put down any attempts at labor or social organizing. At the start of the revolution in 1944 and throughout the 1950s there was considerable animosity between ladinos living in urban areas and Mayas or indigenous peoples living in rural areas; the former generally regarded the latter as “low, lazy and despicable” (Smith, 1992, 148). This made organizing social and political movements between rural and urban sectors very difficult, if not impossible. The continued exclusion of the Mayas, by revolutionary and counterrevolutionary political and social groups, contributed to their low position throughout society. The only value attributed to the Mayas was their perceived value as a source of labor necessary to maintain the export led growth in Guatemala. Though 90% of all agricultural laborers were from rural areas, very little effort went into organizing the rural countryside (Jonas, 1991, 24). Education, social and political
assimilation of Mayas into Guatemalan life was not a priority of the revolution. Although there was concern at the time that Mayas, if given the opportunity and resources (literacy, voting, and access to political power), would rise up, violently, and become the majority oppressors. As a result, there were calls to bring basic health care and access to food for the Mayas, however most of these calls to action stemmed from the desire to nourish the population so they would “produce more efficient work” in the fields (Smith, 1992, 151). When middleclass ladinos and midlevel military officers began to withdraw support first from President Arévalo and then from President Arbenz, there was a fleeting moment when the Mayas were perceived as a more important political, social, and economic population.

The agrarian reform passed in 1952 was the event that catalyzed social and political organizing in rural Mayan communities. The violent reaction of landowners to the agrarian reform resulted in an even greater number of rural community organizations. By the time of the coup in 1954 there were active “campesino unions in every major village and in many smaller aldeas in Guatemala” (Smith, 1992, 170). Despite the rise in peasant organizations, the agrarian reform also had the unintended consequence of turning peasants against one another. Under the official agrarian reform law, the laborers who worked on a particular finca had the first opportunity to settle any expropriated land. Since it was quite common for laborers to work on fincas that were not near their place of residence it created animosity between laborers and local peasants who believed they should have first rights to land expropriated where they resided (Handy, 1984, 131; Smith, 1992, 174). The violent reaction of foreign and domestic landowners, coupled with the growing animosity in the rural areas between peasants, threatened to disrupt life in rural and urban Guatemala. As a result, the middleclass ladinos, military members, and union members in urban areas, many of whom had previously supported the goals of the revolution, now decried the efforts to redistribute land and began to withdraw support for President Arbenz.
By the end of the 1950s the deep-rooted societal framework and corresponding separation of classes and ethnic groups, first modeled by the Mayas then replicated and reinforced by the Spaniards and the elites in an independent Guatemala, was still deeply entrenched.

By the end of 1960 President Armas and President Ydígoras had abolished and rescinded the modest gains made by indigenous groups, women, and the peasant classes during the Revolution. At the start of the 1960s there were literacy restrictions on voting, decreased access to education, and the Catholic Church was once again involved in developing and implementing educational programs. The ongoing attempts to diversify agricultural exports contributed to the already poor social conditions suffered by the majority of the population. There was a decline in food security as domestic food production continued to drop. There was also an acceleration of the appropriation of indigenous communal lands and the further subdividing of remaining communal lands until the plots were too small for subsistence farming. These actions created even more unemployed and underemployed landless peasants; the total number of individuals living in poverty increased. Attempts to diversify agricultural exports served to strengthen the ties between the elite classes, the military, and foreign investors; a report on Guatemala by the CIA “referred to the military-oligarchy alliance as the most extreme and unyielding in the hemisphere” (Jonas, 1991, 93). Guatemala was not simply comprised of a peasant class and an elite class, there was also a small urban, ladino, and bureaucratic class who worked for and subsisted off of the elites and the state apparatus. This group was not a “traditional” middle class, but they did give the “illusion of social mobility” in Guatemala (Jonas, 1991, 94). Guatemala continued its social crisis into the early 1970s (Jonas, 1991, 94).

In the early 1970s there was a continuation of the restrictions on civil and political liberties, increasing inequality between the classes, and increasing land concentration in the hands of the elites. Attempts by the Guatemalan state to diversify agricultural exports and to
industrialize the economy were not attempts to create a middle class or to redistribute wealth from the elite classes to the masses at the bottom. Agricultural diversification, modernization and industrialization had little negative impact on the elite classes, yet the peasant classes were heavily impacted by these efforts. The complete lack of political representation for the mass majority of Guatemalans was a critical barrier to resolving or alleviating the issues prolonging and exacerbating suffering in Guatemala.

The rising and persistent unemployment in Guatemala had several manmade causes and one natural cause. The first cause was the advance in agricultural mechanization during the 1970s; the need for workers in certain sectors, harvesting, packing, bottling, and jarring decreased. The second cause for unemployment was a worldwide recession decreasing the demand for agricultural exports from the developing world. Decreased demand led to a decline in the prices of agricultural commodities. Guatemalan landowners planted less of particular crop(s) when their yields on the international market dropped. At the same time, land speculators drove up the price of land after the discovery of oil in Guatemala; large plantation owners would sell land to speculators for a profit instead of using the land to cultivate crops. A third cause for rising unemployment was a decrease in available credit to domestic businesses. As commodity prices fell domestic producers were unable to secure financing to continue planting year after year when the prices for the harvested crops did not provide sufficient profit. Seasonal and full time workers were laid off or not hired. The fourth cause for rising unemployment was due to the rise in exports that required less manpower than the typical agricultural commodities, such as coffee and cotton. Raising livestock and mining were less manpower intensive than industries involving the cultivation of agricultural crops in the 1970s and 1980s. The cultivation of coffee was one of the few agricultural industries where hiring was not harmed by mechanization, the hillside harvest of coffee in the highlands was almost impossible to mechanize. As a result, employment on the
coffee plantations was affected more by the price of coffee in the international market than by mechanization. Lastly, increasing unemployment in the 1970s and 1980s was related to the declining industrial sector. While employment in the industrial sector had never matched the initial expectations, the situation in the 1980s was even worse.

Unemployment was driven higher in rural and urban centers by the 1976 earthquake. Approximately 25,000 people perished as a result of the earthquake, 70,000 were injured and 1.25 million were left without homes or shelter when their homes were destroyed in the earthquake (Jonas, 1991, 95). In many of the smaller cities and towns every single building was destroyed; the highest number of homeless unemployed earthquake survivors migrated to Guatemala City. The population of the capital city nearly doubled from the 1960s to the 1980s. The city did not have the necessary infrastructure to deal with the massive influx; peasants living in shanty towns on the edge of the city did not have access to sanitation, potable water, healthcare, or educations.

Individuals who were able to maintain employment through the period saw their wages decline throughout the decade. Laborers in 1979 earned just “74% of the real wage they had earned in 1970…rural workers earned 54% compared with 1970” (Jonas, 1991, 95). Furthermore, wages between all agricultural laborers were not equal, permanent laborers made double the wages of seasonal laborers. There were serious wage inequities between subsistence farmers and migrant laborers, the subsistence farmers earned US$43.34 per year while the migrant laborers earned US$28.64 per year (Dunkerly, 1988, 182). Decades of economic dependency on a few agricultural commodities resulted in corresponding decades of underemployment in Guatemala. Between 1972 and 1985 only “35% of the economically active population is fully employed year-round” (Jonas, 1991, 96). The percentage of underemployed was higher in rural areas; in 1979 81% of coffee workers are employed only during the coffee
harvest (Jonas, 1991, 96). The large number of unemployed and underemployed laborers underscores the importance of the skewed land tenure system in Guatemala. Seasonal workers, or the “semi-proletariat”, are those laborers unable to support themselves year round with their seasonal wages; they need access to land to engage in subsistence farming during the remainder of the year (Jonas, 1991, 96). For the select number of laborers who were employed on the large plantations there were critical issues besides low wages and poor treatment. Laborers frequently became ill from the increased use of pesticides in the 1970s and 1980s. Plantation owners sprayed their crops with more than “50 times a year” using chemicals that had been “long banned in the United States” (Handy, 1984, 200). Crops were routinely sprayed when the workers were harvesting crops and workers were not given opportunity or means to wash the pesticides off of their bodies at the end of a shift.

The poor distribution of land in Guatemala impeded social gains in Guatemala. None of the generals who ruled Guatemala in the 1970s and 1980s considered land reform or land redistribution programs a viable option to alleviate social or economic problems within Guatemala. In reality the opposite occurred, land concentration increased during the 1970s and 1980s. From the 1960s into the mid 1980s the amount of “cultivated land held in units of less than seven hectares [fell] from 37.5 to 16%” (Dunkerly, 1988, 182). In 1985 Guatemala had most unequal distribution of land in Central America and the only “unreformed land tenure system in Latin America” (Jonas, 1991, 88). Land concentration was especially evident in the northern Petén region of the state. The region was inhabited by approximately 120,000 indigenous peoples; however, land was held communally and the indigenous people had little recourse over the years as they were forcibly removed from their land by the state. The confiscated land was granted to foreign corporations, members of the private sector, or military. Absurdly enough, after removing the original inhabitants Presidents Arana, Laugerud, Lucas and Montt all believed
that significant portions of the unemployed and landless peasants from other regions throughout Guatemala could be (forcibly) coerced into resettling in the northern Petén region. Peasants who did choose to relocate to the Petén were faced with harsh conditions; the land not suitable for farming, small plots of land made subsistence farming extremely difficult, and there were widespread labor abuses by the livestock owners who employed peasants in the area. By 1978 the military had begun forcibly relocating thousands of peasants to the Ixcán, the northern most area in the Petén.

Rising inequality and poverty made improving the social conditions in Guatemala during the 1970s and 1980s extremely difficult. Poverty in Guatemala had reached massive proportions in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Approximately 87% of the population lived below the poverty line during this period and the Gini Index for Guatemala was 85.05 in 1979 the highest inequality in Central America. The group most likely to be living in poverty was female, indigenous and rural. Although the high incidence of poverty in Guatemala meant that both genders, all ages, and nearly every ethnic group was affected. Poverty was especially evident in Guatemala City where the population had nearly tripled between 1975 and 1985. Shanty towns were constructed around the outskirts of town with people living on top of and around the garbage dumps surrounding the city. Thousands of unemployed peasants roam the dumps in search of bottles, cans, cardboard or metal that can be turned in for money. Poverty affects children in particular, “eight of every ten Guatemalan children are undernourished, and infant mortality…is the highest in the Western Hemisphere” (Perera, 1995, 25). In the urban areas the shanty towns are filled with youth gangs and “basurero rats,” children with little education, whose parents have been killed or who have been abandoned, or who are addicted to drugs (Perera, 1995, 25). The same situation was replicated in the highlands, in 1984 there were approximately 120,000 children missing one or both parents (Perera, 1995, 78).
In the early 1980s the effects from the scorched earth policy of President Montt were obvious. Approximately “440 highland villages” were completely destroyed and “at least 1 million people” were displaced (Jonas, 1991, 95). In addition to killing the inhabitants and destroying villages the military would often burn the crops, “creating severe food shortages” (Jonas, 1991, 95). Instead of offering support to the newly homeless and hungry populations, the government cut the already meager social spending in order to fund the counterinsurgency efforts in the early 1980s. Under General Víctores in the mid 1980s the government began to institute social programs aimed at the populations residing in rural areas. The programs gave the pretense that the government was actively engaged in efforts to address the suffering of the masses. However, ten years after the earthquake Guatemala was still suffering from massive housing shortages. The homeless population often squatted on land or crammed into substandard housing units near the capital. Lack of potable water within these temporary communities greatly increased the incidence of typhoid fever and other intestinal diseases. Shanty neighborhoods built onto the side of mountains or in ravines are frequently destroyed and lives are lost in mud and landslides after heavy rains.

The poor social conditions in Guatemala are typified in two separate instances occurring at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s. First, in 1989 Guatemala experienced a measles epidemic that killed over a thousand lives. The measles outbreak was a direct result of deficient health services throughout the entire state, poor immunization programs and inadequate access to hospitals. The second was an instance where local residents in Peronia took over the school, taking the teachers as their hostages. The parents were protesting the crowded conditions at the school; the school was built for 400 but had over 1000 attending, the classes being taught outside due to lack of room in the school, and lack of supplies, one desk for every eight students. The teachers rallied on the side of the parents despite their hostage status.
Guatemala had been described as being in a “chronic social crisis” with “staggering problems of poverty and racism”; social indicators over forty years would reflect that sentiment (Vanden, 2002, 270). The life expectancy for an average Guatemalan was 42 years in 1950 and by 1995 had risen to 66.3 years. Infant mortality was 141/1000 live births in 1950 and had risen to 46/1000 live births in 1995; in the rural areas it remained at 84/1000 live births. Literacy rates were 29.7% of the population over 15 in 1950 and 38% of males and 51% of females in 1995. Illiteracy often excluded individuals from being allowed to vote in elections, after the coup in 1954 76.1% of all women and 95.2% of indigenous women were excluded from voting due to literacy requirements (Jonas, 1991, 23). The low literacy rates were rates unsurprising since Guatemala spent considerably less of its budget on education; 2.2% in the 1960s, dropping to 1.6% by the 1980s. Urbanization had risen from 25% in 1950 to 42% in 1995. Most of the newcomers to Guatemala City lived in the shanty towns on the periphery of the city, poor access to sanitation and potable water led to waterborne diseases. Communicable diseases in the rural and urban areas were compounded by the low number of physicians to the general population. In 1950 there was one physician for every 9000 people; by 1980 there was one physician for every 2,500 but by 1990 the number had increased to one physician per 3,300. The indicator, physicians per capita, was a somewhat misleading statistic since in rural areas there was one physician per 25,000 Guatemalans. The care provided by hospitals was extremely poor, most hospitals stock would only purchase two weeks worth of supplies at a time; there was not enough food to feed patients a regular diet.

While some of the social indicators for Guatemala do improve over the four decades they most often do not improve substantially in the rural areas and they continue to compare poorly to the rest of the region and the world. For example, in 1960 Latin American states reported a life expectancy of 56.2 years while Guatemala reports a life expectancy of 47 in the same year. By
1995 Latin American states were reporting a life expectancy of 70 years to Guatemala’s 66.3%. Social indicators were worse for the indigenous populations; life expectancy often lags “fifteen years behind that of ladinos,” infant mortality, hunger and malnutrition, and income were also substantially worse than the ladino populations (Human Rights Violations, 549). For more than four decades Guatemala remained below average for the region in nearly every social indicator directly or indirectly related to poverty.

The type of regime, the social conditions, and the influence of foreign intervention had an impact on social, economic and political outcomes within Guatemala between 1950 and 1995; however, the impact was been relatively constant. Each of the Guatemalan administrations from 1950-1995 were relatively unstable, experienced many coup attempts, had little control over each section of the entire military, and were predominantly authoritarian. Additionally, the influence from foreign intervention, nearly always the United States, into the political, economic and social realms in Guatemala was persistent and pervasive. Guatemala was continuously dependent on different forms of aid; therefore, the different regimes and sectors in society were very susceptible to the expectations, conditions, and demands placed on aid from foreign donors. Lastly the social conditions in Guatemala have remained relatively poor, they have increased over the time period, but most social indicators have remained below the averages for the region.
Chapter 6
DATA AND ANALYSIS

The issue of intra and interstate migration in Guatemala will be examined by combining and further developing the models detailed previously in the literature review. The model is customized for the Guatemalan case study and is illustrated in figure 6.1

Figure 6.1

If the model is correct at predicting a certain outcome, then a pattern of behavior should arise beginning with (1) new economic development strategies (2) leading to structural changes (economic, societal), (3) the use of violence by the state to ensure the reforms or strategies are implemented, resulting in (5) increases to intra and interstate migration.
Recent Background Information

The Counterrevolution

The October Revolution 1944-1954 brought many changes to the domestic political and social landscape in Guatemala. After the restrictions on political parties were lifted in 1944 the number of official political parties increased to thirty. Organized labor also experienced major gains in membership, the General Confederation of Guatemalan Workers (CGTG) increased its leadership to ninety thousand, and by the start of the period in 1950 there were approximately 92 registered unions (REMHI, 1999, 185). The increase in participation in domestic groups and coalitions did not always produce peaceful outcomes, at the beginning of the 1950s there was brief turmoil when Francisco Arana was assassinated during the last half of 1949. Arana’s supporters in the military led an uprising and they were met by opposition groups comprised of students and urban laborers; the supporters of Arévalo were able to subdue the uprising carried out by Arana’s supporters.

The subsequent election in 1950 was considered a success because it was competitive and legitimate. In the election there were three main candidates for office, Arbenz, Ydígoras, and Granados. Arbenz’s successful election was due to support from his party, the Party of Revolutionary Action (PAR); in 1950 this party had wide support from labor groups, peasant leaders, and midlevel military officers. His two opponents split the remaining 37% of the votes between right-wing groups and center-left supporters. At the time of Arbenz’s 1950 election the Communist party, the Guatemalan Labor Party (PGT), was relatively small with “four thousand members in the entire country, [it] had only four congressmen and had no representatives in the cabinet” (Calvert, 1985, 78). Yet, during the remainder of the Arbenz presidency the mere existence of an active Communist party was to have a disproportionate impact on domestic politics.
While Arbenz initially enjoyed the support of certain portions of the military, midlevel officers that had trained with him, even that support began to erode with a rise in peasant organizations. The military had long controlled the rural populations and rural militias using the military commissions set in place by Ubico in 1938; but a rise in peasant organizing resulted in the military’s influence in the rural areas. Peasant organizations, growing in strength and political clout, were able to request out-transfers for military commissioners with whom they had conflicts; the military sensed their loss of autonomy and repeatedly requested that Arbenz limit the activities of the Communist party as well as rural labor and social organizing, he refused (Handy, 1984, 134-135; Smith, 1992, 178).

Domestic groups began to coalesce when the divisive issue of agrarian reform was proposed and passed by the Congress. Predictably, large land owners or finqueros, rejected Arbenz’s movement toward land reform, they were joined by the “nonlanded bourgeois, the Catholic church, and many of the petty bourgeois professionals and military officers who had participated in the Revolution of 1944” (Jonas, 1991, 28). Members of the domestic opposition actively planned and supported the Guatemalan exiles living in Honduras and Nicaragua plotting with the United States to overthrow Arbenz. As previously mentioned, agrarian reform and the movement against it prompted indigenous groups to organize in numbers that had never been seen in the rural areas. The opposition groups, especially the military and the elite business class, with the consent and help of the United States were ultimately successful in overthrowing Arbenz.

After the 1954 coup of President Arbenz, Colonel Armas banned all labor and community organizing, restricted the right to strike and “canceled the registration of 533 unions” (Jonas, 1991, 41). The participation in the labor movement went from nearly 100,000 individuals in 1954 to 27,000 just one year later (Jonas, 1991, 41). In addition, Colonel Armas abolished the
Communist party and instituted the Committee of National Defense Against Communism and the Preventative Penal Law Against Communism. The former was tasked with hunting down alleged Communist supporters, leaders and sympathizers. The latter was used to prosecute and execute those accused of crimes associated with Communism. The Armas regime arrested and imprisoned approximately 12,000 opposition supporters, exiled approximately 2,000 opposition leaders, and killed approximately 8,000 peasants in the first two months of his regime, in an attempt to crush the opposition movement (REMHI, 1999, 189). An expanded discussion of the political violence during this period is described in more detail in the following section. The domestic groups who retained power and influence under the regime of Colonel Armas and General Ydígoras were the “agro-export elites,” the petty bourgeoisie living in the urban areas and the Catholic Church (Jonas, 1991, 43). As the counterrevolution continued to introduce and encourage industrialization, and expand exports to the Guatemalan economy the old elites were compelled to merge with new members from the industrial and cotton growing sectors. There was also a small ladino petty bourgeoisie employed in the urban areas and working for elites, they too enjoyed privileged status during the counterrevolution.

At the start of the counterrevolution in 1954 Colonel Armas abolished all labor groups, political parties, and social organizations. Labor and union groups suffered persecution, membership in labor parties declined significantly throughout the 1960s, from a peak of nearly 100,000 members in 1954 to 27,000 in 1961. Urban ladinos, who had previously comprised the bulk of the military and who accounted for the majority of the membership of the urban labor unions, student groups, and revolutionary parties, now explicitly and tacitly supported the counterrevolution. Some ladinos had been alarmed by the radicalization of the peasant groups during the revolution; others were pacified by their perceived position in society, as members of the socially and economically mobile middle class (Jonas, 1991, 44). Most were concerned with
losing their employment, since many urban ladinos were dependent on the bureaucracy and elites for employment. Regardless of the reason, the “backbone of the revolution” quickly disintegrated after the 1954 coup (Jonas, 1991, 44). The revolutionary movement went underground for several years in Guatemala during the communist purges under Colonel Armas. The departure of the ladino middle class from the revolutionary movement significantly altered the composition of the movement for years to come.

The Incipient Guerrilla Movement

Coalition building and mixing between domestic groups was a hallmark of the 1960s and early 1970s. There were two distinct sides to the ongoing struggle, one set of groups comprised the guerrilla movement (former revolutionary movement) and the other set of groups comprised the counterinsurgency (counterrevolution). The domestic groups and coalitions exerting the most influence in Guatemala during the 1960s and early 1970s were the PGT, Revolutionary Movement “November 13” (M-13), the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR), Mano Blanca, Ojo por Ojo and the official Guatemalan military and its subsidiaries.

In the 1970s and the 1980s there were several new domestic groups able to wield considerable influence at the state level. The newly formed guerrilla and union groups included the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP) in 1972, the Organization of People in Arms (ORPA) in 1971, the National Committee of Labour Unity (CNUS), the Peasant Unity Committee (CUC), the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG), the Democratic Front Against Repression (FDCR), and the Guatemalan Committee of Patriotic Unity (GCUP). The groups from the previous decades still existed, political parties included the PID, PR, MLN, PGT, and the Christian Democrats, the established guerrilla and paramilitary groups also still existed, such as the FAR, M-13, Mano Blanca, and Ojo por Ojo. During the 1970s domestic groups increasingly engaged in coalition building and alliances between new and existing likeminded
groups. Domestic groups formed in response to the earthquake in 1976. The state had been unable or unwilling to respond to the massive destruction; reconstruction groups were given more leeway to organize. The FDCR established in 1978, comprised of over 170 domestic groups and organizations, was one of the umbrella organizations that sprung up after the earthquake. Many of the established or existing groups from the earlier period went through a rebuilding or reexamining phase between 1972 and 1985. The PGT had suffered the loss of the majority of its leaders and its members during 1960-1973; it was not until the 1980s that the PGT officially joined with other existing labor groups.

**Guerrilla Movements:** In the early 1960s, the military began experiencing internal division under the presidency of General Ydigoras. General Ydigoras had allowed the United States government to use Guatemala as a training center, and allowed the construction of temporary bases for the invasion of Cuba. In doing so he ostracized many of the junior officers who felt the United States presence was an affront to national dignity. Furthermore, many military members were concerned with the growing social unrest, the declining popularity of the government, and the blatant corruption and nepotism throughout the Ydigoras regime. In November of 1960 a revolt against General Ydigoras was staged at a military base in Puerto Barrios; following their success the army rebels continued on to Zacapa. Ultimately a week later the army rebels were thwarted by a combination of bribery to the other branches of the military, force by the Guatemalan government, cooperation and assistance from Cuban exiles and the United States government. The number of military personnel taking part in the revolt was much smaller than the number that sympathized with the rebels motivations; nonetheless. Approximately forty-five of the seventy of the exiled officers maintained contact with political parties in Guatemala (PR, MND, DC) and continued to plot (REMHI, 1999, 191). Eventually the rebels, exiled officers and the Guatemalan Labor Party (PGT) formed an alliance. The PGT had
been banned after the coup in 1954, surviving members had been operating underground for several years. The new alliance between the PGT and the rebel groups was led by the *trecistas*, Lieutenant Colonel Augusto Loarca, Lieutenant Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, and Second Lieutenants Luis Augusto Turcios Lima and Luis Trejo Esquivel.22 Early in 1962 the rebel movement took action in Guatemala City, killing the Chief of the Department of the Judicial Police; believed to be responsible for the killing of one of the rebel military officers in the months earlier (REMHI, 1999, 192). This new rebel group named themselves after their fallen officer, they were the MR-13 or the Insurrectional Front Alejandro de Leon Aragon-13 de Noviembre. In the beginning, the guerrilla fighters primarily focused on acts of sabotage, attacks on military outposts, and targeted killings. The military and police actively engaged the guerrilla fighters, in some instances the military completely crushed small groups of guerrillas. The PGT, MR-13, the MR-12 de Abril (university students), M-20 de Octubre, and Patriotic Youth Workers (JPT) were among the groups that began to collaborate on guerrilla training and planning during the summer of 1962 (REMHI, 1999, 193). During the summer of 1962 the distinctive rebel groups did not yet fully trust one another, but by December of 1962 the rebel groups overcame their reservations and formed the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR). The FAR adopted a three point plan of attack beginning in Izabal, Zacapa and Sierra de las Minas and Yon Sosa was named the leader of the FAR. General Ydígoras was overthrown shortly thereafter, his successor, Colonel Peralta, tightened the restrictions on political parties, suspended the constitution and criminalized any communist or guerrilla activities. Three significant events would strengthen the resolve of the FAR, the PGT and the MR-13 in 1966, (1) the “case of the 28,” (2) the Constituent Assembly’s decree announcing amnesty for “all members of the government army and police forces…who, after July 3, 1954, carried out, in order to repress or prevent subversive activities of any nature…”, and (3)

22 REMHI, 192. Trecistas, the three players.
President Méndez’s signed pact with the military (REMHI, 1999, 196-197). After President Méndez took office the guerrilla movement was facing a much more serious threat; a focused, extended, and brutal counterinsurgency effort that would extend throughout Colonel Arana’s term. At the end of the 1960s violence broke out between the FAR, the PGT and the government forces and the death squads. A chain reaction of deaths and kidnappings after the rape, torture and killing of Rogelia Cruz left several U.S. military advisors, PGT leaders, government ministers, ambassadors, and FAR leaders dead. The counterinsurgency effort received considerable support and training from the United States throughout the period and as a result of prolonged and intense political violence the PGT and MR-13 would not survive the end of the period.

One of the most important and powerful guerrilla groups was established during 1972, the EGP. Former members of the FAR were intent on engaging the rural Mayan peasants in a prolonged military, political and social campaign against the ruling powers. The EGP had its base in the Ixcán region, northwest of the Zacapa and Izabal regions that had formerly been the source of guerrilla activities; they were also active within Guatemala City. The EGP felt it had learned a hard lesson about guerrilla activities in the earlier periods, too much publicity about leadership, goals, and strategies combined with a failure to organize the aggrieved populations. The EGP worked with more stealth to organize willing indigenous peasants in western Guatemala. The grievances held by indigenous peasants were clearly related, there was disappointment from failed land reform in the 1950s, anger over poor wages and poor treatment on elite owned fincas, and the refusal of the government to enforce or investigate any claims made by indigenous peoples against landowners. After a series of murders, the first carried out by the EPG and then a series of retaliatory murders by the military, the EPG quickly gained supporters in the highlands. The murder of cruel employers and landowners, Luis Arenas Barrera
the “Tiger of Ixcán” and Enrique Brol, were calculated moves by the EGP to gain support from local oppressed indigenous peoples (Jonas, 1991, 137). The EGP frequently engaged in acts of aggression not directed at individuals, they engaged in economic sabotage, blockades, and attacks on police stations. The success of the EGP was noted by the Guatemalan military, the military adopted several of the tactics used by the EGP in order to turn domestic populations against the EGP. Finally after several years the government effort to crush the EGP was nearly successful. Surviving members of the EGP were displeased with the structure of the existing group; they then formed the Octubre Revolucionario (Op No. 15) (Jonas, 1991, 189).

The ORPA was formed in 1972 many of the initial members were former members of the FAR. Similar to the EGP, the ORPA operated in Southwestern Guatemala much closer to the Mexican border and the Pacific Ocean. Members of the ORPA were committed to organizing indigenous peoples in rural areas; their efforts were successful within the year ORPA’s membership had grown substantially and was 90% Mayan (Handy, 1984, 249). Recruitment to the ORPA was facilitated by the ongoing counterinsurgency effort which had been increasing in the western highlands. The army and paramilitary groups were increasingly infiltrating the area, increased disappearances and killings resulted in increased cooperation and membership with the ORPA. Members of ORPA believed the struggle to achieve their objectives would be accomplished through armed revolution; therefore, sufficient time would be needed to strengthen their numbers and their positions within the rural communities before they could publically attack their foes (Handy, 1984, 249). Initially the ORPA was successful in the Southwestern region of Guatemala, by the early 1980s they were in control of the areas surrounding Lake Atitlan, a popular tourist destination. General Montt’s presidency beginning in 1982 and the corresponding brutal counterinsurgency campaign brought an end to ORPA’s largely uncontested success in the western highlands. While ORPA did engage in coalitions and alliances with labor groups it did
not form a political party, nor did it engage in political alliances. ORPA did eventually join the URNG with the intent of negotiating a peace agreement.

The URNG was formed in 1982; it was a coalition of the PGT, the ORPA, the EGP and the FAR. The four separate movements were not fully realized as one movement until several years later. The URNG had several objectives, (1) to eliminate violence against populations and enforce human rights, (2) to install a representative government, (3) addressing income inequality and redistributing resources to those in need, (4) promotion of Guatemala’s independence, economically and politically, and to (5) end inequality between ladinos and indigenous peoples. Outside of the URNG the EPG exerted the most influence, but within the alliance the FAR and the ORPA were more influential.

During the 1980s and into the 1990s there was mounting pressure on the state from a variety of sources. The levels of poverty had grown to nearly 90% of the population, there were massive internal and external displacements of people, and the ongoing counterinsurgency campaign had killed thousands. These factors had led to an increased recruitment of indigenous, women, and urban ladinos into social and political organizations, now pressuring the government for a negotiated cease fire and peace agreement. The larger umbrella organizations such as the ORPA and the URNG took the lead during the peace negotiations; the elites and the army boycotted many of the overtures by the URNG. Disarmament and amnesty were two of the most contentious issues during the negotiations. Eventually through the work of the United Nations, the UNRG, members of the CACIF (only initially participated); the Assembly of Civil Society (ASC), and the Catholic Church, a series of agreements were reached. The 1987 Central American Peace Accords, the 1994 Framework Accord, the Resettling of Displaced Populations
(1994), a Truth Commission, the Human Rights Accord (1994), and the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1995) were the mechanisms for achieving the Final Peace Accords in 1996.

**Counterinsurgency Movements:** Members of the Guatemalan elite landowning class and members of the openly fascist political party the MLN formed Mano Blanca, or the White Hand, in 1966. Sandoval Alarcon, leader of the MLN, proudly proclaimed the role of MLN leadership in the creation of the death squad, describing it as a “necessary part of the global struggle against communism” (Handy, 1984, 162). Mano Blanca was a right-wing terrorist death squad operating with impunity in the rural and urban areas in Guatemala. Under the presidency of Colonel Arana membership grew to include members of the Congress and Cabinet level ministers. The members of Mano Blanca who carried out the killings, disappearances and torture of opponents were often off-duty members of the military and police forces. The national police chief was the alleged director of the Mano Blanca; other members of Mano Blanca were Colonel Rafael Arriaga Bosque and Colonel Carlos Arana Osorio, future president of Guatemala (REMHI, 1999, 199).

The targets of Mano Blanca were former revolutionary leaders, known revolutionary sympathizers, leftist or center-left Congressmen and politicians, students, professors, and union leaders with alleged communist ties, and the laborers and peasants living in rural areas. The University at San Carlos was one of the favorite targets of Mano Blanca, students, union leaders and professors were continually targeted for their support for political reforms. The tactics utilized by Mano Blanca were highly visible assassinations, torture of well known individuals, indiscriminant mass arrests and disappearances, and dumping of corpses in public places. The government forces would frequently conduct house to house searches for subversives in Guatemala City during Colonel Arana’s presidency. During the 1960s and early 1970s Mano Blanca was known for the torture, rape and murder of a Guatemalan beauty queen, the assassination of a handicapped Congressman, the kidnapping of the Archbishop of Guatemala
and the murder of thousands of peasants, students and organizers. The goals of Mano Blanca were to “maintain a permanent state of fear and uncertainty” and to “blur the distinction between official repression and death squad terror” (Jonas, 1991, 64). Under Colonel Arana, divisions between the MLN and the military bring about the end of Mano Blanca in 1973.

The breakdown of Mano Blanca was not the end of right-wing paramilitary death squads in Guatemala. Ojo por Ojo, or Eye for an Eye, emerged in the late 1960s as Mano Blanca was falling apart. Unsurprisingly, many of the members of Ojo por Ojo were former members of Mano Blanca. Similar to Mano Blanca, Ojo por Ojo received funding and aid from landowners, the MLN and the government (Encyclopedia of Latin American Politics, 128-129). Members of Ojo por Ojo included the minister of the interior Jorge Arenales Catalan, the defense minister General Leonel Vassaux Martinez, and Congressman Mario Sandoval Alarcon, leader of the MLN. Ojo por Ojo continued to target center-left politicians, students, organizers and peasants. The University at San Carlos continued to be a popular target for Ojo por Ojo. Mano Blanca and Ojo por Ojo were two of the more well known death squads, but there were many more that existed during the late 1960s and early 1970s, Rosa Purpua, El Buitre Justiciero were two more of the death squads that worked in conjunction with the New Anti-Communist Organization (NOA) (Black, 1984, 46-47). The death squads and the NOA openly operated out of the military bases, the chain of command easily traceable to the highest government offices.

The Guatemalan military had their own official counterinsurgency movement within the military; the Mobile Military Police (PMA) was formed in the early 1960s. The PMA had a centralized command structure and counterinsurgency units scattered throughout Guatemala, with concentrations of units in rural areas. The military preferred to increase the number of military police rather than increasing the domestic police force and creating competition for itself. The military was actively recruiting and training during this period, the United States continued to
infuse Guatemala with funds for the counter-guerrilla tactics training of the military through the Military Assistance Program (MAP). During this period Guatemala added eight thousand in their army, one thousand in the military police, and nine thousand rural commissioners (REMHI, 1999, 198-199). The increase in the influence of the military and the prevalence of right-wing paramilitary death squads grew in part out of Decree 283 in 1964, granting any local commissioners the right to bear arms; at the time there were 9,000 local commissioners throughout Guatemala (REMHI, 1999, 199). The ratio of commissioners to local individuals in some departments in Guatemala was one commissioner for every fifty men (REMHI, 1999, 199). Local commissioners became an intelligence gathering and enforcement arm of the state government. Between 1966-1968 seventeen new death squads emerged, they were comprised of off duty policemen and military and funded by local elites (Morrison and May, 1994, 117).

The use of paramilitary death squads continued into the 1970s and 1980s. New death squads were formed as different Generals come to power in Guatemala. In addition to the existing paramilitary death squads, under President Lucas the Secret Anti-Communist Army (ESA) was formed. The ESA had ties to military members in the president’s administration; the targets of the ESA were entire mass movements of people, not just labor or political leaders. The army was the central entity involved in the counterinsurgency and in 1974-1975 they opened two new training grounds in the Petén. Elite soldiers called the Kaibil, and whose motto is “the Kaibil is a killing machine,” were trained at the sites (CEH, 1999). The soldiers were trained in counterinsurgency tactics and were known for their extreme brutality towards the general population and amongst themselves. The CEH reports that Kaibil frequently forced recruits to bite the heads off of live animals and drink their blood “to show courage” (CEH, 1999). The Kaibil were a physical manifestation of the state’s goal, to use “extreme cruelty as a resource [to] intentionally produce and maintain a climate of terror in the population” (CEH, 1999).
The army and the death squads were not the only actors engaged in political violence, there was also the development of the Civilian Defense Patrols (PACs) by General Montt in the 1980s. The PACs were composed of civilians, former army, or death squad members. In rural villages any “able-bodied man between the ages of 15 and 60” was forced to serve in the PACs; although, it was common to have children ages 10-11 serve in the PACs (Black, 1984, 139). In 1982 the military claimed to have recruited 40,000 individuals to serve in the PACs (Black, 1984, 139). Twice weekly service in the PACs was rewarded with food, not monetary compensation and refusal to participate would label the offender a guerrilla. Those PAC members needing to migrate for work were required to receive permission from the army to leave for seasonal employment. Civilian members of the PACs were not trusted by the military; as a result they patrolled with wooden clubs and machetes instead of guns. As described below in the violence section, members of PACs were often instructed to kill any persons encountered on patrols, whether family or friend, since these people were considered guerrillas and subversives.

The counterinsurgency progressed through a variety of incarnations, beginning with the rural militias in the 1950s, to the paramilitary death squads of the 1960s through the 1980s, to the formation of the PACs in the early 1980s, and back again to the formation of armed militias in the early 1990s. In the 1990s local bosses or landowners created armed patrols to restrict the return of migrants and refugees from their communities of origin. In 1993 a regional militia called ARAP-KSI frequently used “death threats, assaults, and hostage taking to intimidate Guatemalans and international officials involved in the repatriations” (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 186). Human rights violations committed by ARAP-KSI did not result in arrests or prosecution despite the abundance of evidence in support of the complaints. By the 1990s there had also been a change in the offices controlling the counterinsurgency efforts. Previously counterinsurgency was orchestrated out of the official defense department, in the 1990s the duties had shifted to the
119

G-2. The G-2 was a military intelligence unit that was supposed to coordinate the fight against narco trafficking and the cultivation of narcotics; however, the unit is “widely considered the brain center of repression in Guatemala” (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 186).

The Catholic Church: The Catholic Church actively opposed all of the policies of the Arbenz government; Archbishop Mariano Rossell Arellano was a rabid anticommunist and an ardent supporter of Spanish fascism and was opposed to democracy and literacy for indigenous populations, arguing that “books are too fragile a staircase for our Indians to climb to civilization” (Handy, 1984, 132). Leadership in the Catholic Church further claimed that it was “divine permission for the wealthy to be masters and fathers of the less fortunate” (Handy, 1984, 133). As a result of their beliefs and their prominence the church was able to influence domestic policy toward alleged communists during the 1950s in Guatemala. In the 1960s and early 1970s the Catholic Church underwent several changes that moved it from a singularly anti-communist organization to one devoted to a more pastoral focus, explaining the structural causes of poverty, addressing growing political violence, and addressing the serious consequences that result from unequal land tenure. The Catholic Church, through a variety of missions began to integrate into the rural areas, offering assistance and resources to address health and education needs as well as facilitating the formation of agricultural cooperatives, “peasant leagues, pro-improvement committees, and the construction of schools and basic infrastructure” (REMHI, 1999, 204-205). The Catholic Church also formed several new organizations that would be influential in the coming years, the Guatemalan Religious Conference (CONFREGUA), the Guatemalan Bishops’ Conference (CEG) and the Association of Community Health Services (ASECSA) (REMHI, 1999, 204-205). During the 1960s the Catholic Church began as an anticommunist agent of the authoritarian state and began transformation to an organization embracing of Liberation Theology and working to fill the needs of the peasants living in rural Guatemala.
During the 1970s and into the 1980s the Catholic Church no longer acted as a monolithic entity, taking orders from the top down. The 1976 earthquake highlighted divisions between the church hierarchy, still staunchly conservative, and the parish priests, who were more willing to embrace tenets of Liberation Theology. While Liberation Theology had already begun to take hold in Latin America, including in Guatemala, during the previous decade, the 1976 earthquake was the catalyst fusing the ideological tenets of Liberation Theology with the deteriorating social conditions experienced by a majority of Guatemalan’s. The Catholic Church created many smaller subsidiaries and organizations to address the natural disaster, and in doing so provided many opportunities for sympathetic priests and nuns operating at the local levels to be influenced by and react to the worsening social conditions in rural Guatemala. Catholic Action was one of the groups that worked to organize cooperative movements in the rural areas, local indigenous movements promoted literacy, healthcare, and worked toward gaining political representation. The Cardinal in Guatemala did not approve of or support the work of parish priests and nuns organizing the rural proletariat. Priests and nuns were routinely exiled for openly disagreeing with church hierarchy. In 1978 after the massacre at Panzos Catholic priests were blamed by the Defense Minister for inciting “Indian unrest”, the priest participating in the march was deported (Human Rights Violations, 549). In 1979 seven bishops resigned to protest the increasing military violence against priests and nuns, but Cardinal Casariego refused to denounce the violence against the church. When the Pope visited Guatemala in 1983, during General Montt’s short reign, he denounced the violence against the indigenous populations and supported their efforts to oppose such treatment. The Pope’s sharp criticism of General Montt added momentum to the movement to overthrow General Montt. The church hierarchy in Guatemala would not officially support the position of those working on the ground in rural areas until the late 1980s.
In the 1990s the Catholic Church joined with the Council of Ethnic Communities (CERJ) and the Mutual Support Groups (GAM) to protest the use of PACs and the forced entry of men into military service. The CERJ, the GAM and the National Committee of Guatemalan Widows (CONAVIGUA) were formed in the late 1908s. They were primarily concerned with advocating for the victims of state sponsored violence. The groups pushed for investigations in to disappearances and murders. The group members frequently became the targets of death squads, PACs, and the military. The state frequently attempted to label all CERJ and GAM members as subversives.

**Labor and Community Based Groups:** The CNUS was formed in 1976 as a result of a long battle between laborers and the Coca-Cola Company. The CNUS represented 65 labor organizations including the largest labor union the National Workers’ Federation (CNT); the CNUS threatened a national strike in 1976 unless the company would agree to rehire the 152 workers fired for demanding higher wages and the ability to unionize. As a result of the threat, the Guatemalan government pressured the Coca-Cola Company to rehire the fired laborers. A year later the leader of the CNUS was assassinated by the government. Mario Lopez Larrave’s death set off a series of protests across the state, the number of unionized workers grew from 1.6% of the population in 1975 to 8% in 1976 (Handy, 1984, 228). The CNUS was able to increase the number of supporters and members by attempting to organize labor as well as unemployed slum dwellers, which after the earthquake in 1976 were thousands of people. The CNUS formed an alliance with the CUC in 1980, to protest the low wages found in the agricultural sectors, specifically sugar and cotton. The Guatemalan state, when faced with the reality of 75,000 striking workers, yielded and raised the minimum wage to US$3.20 per day; the wage is raised only after promises to landowners that it will not be enforced (Handy, 1984, 229). The CNUS was a frequent and vocal critic of the death squads operating in Guatemala; they often
accused the Guatemalan Association of Agriculturalists (AGA) and the Comite Coordinador de Asociaciones Agrícolas, Comerciales, Industriales y Financieras (CACIF) of collaborating with and running death squads in rural Guatemala (Black, 1984, 49).

The CUC was established around the same time as the CNUS, from 1976-1978. The CUC was a national peasant organization. The goals and strategies for the group included securing representation for indigenous people, land reform, ending the violence, and the upholding of civil and political liberties for indigenous peoples. Members and leaders of the CUC were frequent targets of government repression, nonetheless the organization helped coordinate some of the largest strikes in Guatemala during the late 1970s and early 1980s. The method by which the CUC believed their goals would be accomplished and the tactics employed by the CUC were far more militant than other labor and community groups; their slogan was “clear head, heart of solidarity, combative fist” (Black, 1984, 99). As a result the CUC was far more secretive with regards to leadership and meetings. The CUC had the most success organizing in rural areas, highlighted by a strike of 75,000-110,000 sugarcane and cotton workers in 1980. Massive strikes such as this one helped to forge a link of solidarity between urban labor organizers and organizations and rural groups and organizations (Jonas, 1991, 129).

The election of a civilian to the presidency in 1986 ignited the labor movement. In August and September of 1986 the Syndicate of Guatemalan Workers Unions (UNSITRAGUA) and the Guatemalan Workers’ General Coordinator (CGTG) brought a set of demands and reforms to the government. The labor groups were pressing for reforms to the process for union recognition, reforms to the process for filing a labor complaint, reforms to the process for firing workers, clarification on retirement benefits, changes to the minimum salary. In 1985-1986 the labor movement had been striking frequently in Guatemala City and Quezaltenango; grievances
included the murder of labor leaders, physical violence to striking laborers, failure of firms to increase wages, failure of the government to respond to demands. Increasing repression of labor groups in the late 1980s and early 1990s inevitably led to declines in labor solidarity, a decrease in national media coverage, and the frequent assassination of union leaders.

Yet, the early 1990s were a time for renewed social organizing. Initially, President Serrano’s administration publically called for an end to impunity for political violence offering hope to many of the groups demanding investigations into the disappearance or murder of a loved one. There was international pressure and pressure from the United States for the Guatemalan state to decrease or eliminate human rights violations by the military. Migrants and refugees had begun returning in small numbers and there was considerable pressure from Mexico to return many more refugees. Groups representing refugees, the Catholic Church, and affiliated community groups were highly motivated by the prolonged social disaster in the rural areas of Guatemala. Unfortunately, the state ultimately responded with violence against any groups it believed were affiliated with URNG and was increasingly belligerent to demands from the United States.

The purpose of this case study is to determine whether the framework developed out of the migration literature explains and correctly predicts the events and forces which influence migration patterns in Guatemala (1950-1995). The framework developed out of the migration literature is depicted in figure 6.1 and is described below in table 6.1.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Framework Begins with the observation of:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
<th>Leading to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victor (2010)</td>
<td>Economic Development: movement from subsistence agriculture to export agriculture and/or the introduction of neoliberal economic policies</td>
<td>Structural changes to economy, society</td>
<td>Conflict between state and populace, conflict is predominantly state sponsored violence</td>
<td>Increases to intra and interstate migration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The framework provides the initiating factor, economic development, which results in structural changes to the economy and the society, these structural changes often necessitate and result in a violent form of enforcement which is carried out by the state, the increase in violence leads to increases in migration. The framework provides the end point this case study is attempting to explain, changes in intrastate and interstate migration within Guatemala.

Economic Development and Structural Changes

The explanation of economic development and structural change will be organized loosely by the policies adopted during specific presidential administrations. The successive presidential terms at times demonstrate an overlap of preferred economic policies in the years 1950 to 1995, and at other times remain distinct policies. The Arbenz administration (1950-1954)

---

23 Each of the frameworks utilized by this study, to build the framework being applied, used a slightly different term to describe essentially the same economic phenomena (i.e. agricultural development, economic modernization, capital penetration, neoliberal economic policies); this case study makes use of the term economic development to denote the first step listed in each of the frameworks.
carried over significant social and economic changes from the Arévalo administration. The Armas administration directly followed the Arbenz administration, and it instituted significant changes from the Arbenz administration; those changes remained in effect during the administrations of General Ydígoras and General Peralta (1954-1979). The time period covered by the five successive administrations (Armas, Ydígoras, Peralta, Arana, and Laugerud) could conceivably be grouped into one time period since all of the administrations pushed for increased crop diversification, injection of foreign capital, and state involvement in the economy. However, General Arana appears to focus his economic development efforts in a specific region in Guatemala, instead of the entire state. So the periods have been divided, General Arana, and General Laugerud, focused on economic development in Guatemala by development of the Franja region in Guatemala (1971-1976). The Lucas administration had its own set of distinct economic policies (1978-1982) as did General Montt’s. General Montt’s policies were in part carried over to the Victores administration (1982-1985). The Cerzo administration clearly demarcated a new set of economic policies, which were also adopted by the Serrano and Carpio administrations (1985-1995). The change in economic development policies leads to approximately six distinct periods between 1950 and 1995 in Guatemala.

The frameworks predict that economic development policies will include: (1) a move from subsistence agriculture to agriculture for export, (2) modernization of agriculture, (3) diversification of exports and the introduction of new industries, and (4) introduction of neoliberal economic policies. Each of the economic development policies and accompanying structural changes occurring during each of the Guatemalan presidents’ administrations are listed in table 6.2 at the end of the section.
President Arbenz (1950-1954):

Economic Development through Export Led Growth through Economic Modernization

The ouster of Ubico in 1944 marked the official start of the revolutionary movement in Guatemala. Under President Arévalo and President Arbenz significant economic changes were instituted in an attempt to lessen the influence of the two dominant and overbearing economic players, the “foreign monopolies and the landed oligarchy” (Jonas, 1991, 26). The two most important items to be rectified were modernizing the agricultural sector, including diversifying agricultural production, and increasing the autonomy of the Guatemalan economy. A few years after the revolution Guatemala was still heavily dependent on the United States for investment and purchase of exports; it was also still dependent on a select few mono-crops for export, coffee, cotton, and bananas. In the early 1950s Guatemalan coffee constituted 80% of all Guatemalan exports; the United States consumed 83.2% of all Guatemalan exports and provided 62.9% of all imports to Guatemala. Post Ubico, the Guatemalan leadership desired diversified foreign investments, national decision making ability in regards to the economy, diversified agriculture, and an ability to redistribute state resources. President Arbenz believed the path to independence could be achieved through import substitution industrialization, a route endorsed by the World Bank and the United Nations, with an emphasis on the natural resources available to Guatemala. Arbenz instituted upgrades to domestic infrastructure, including building or improving upon a national highway, an Atlantic port, and a hydroelectric plant; the goal of the infrastructure projects was to enable Guatemalan firms to compete with the foreign firms already in Guatemala. Arévalo and Arbenz did not attempt to remove the capitalist structures in place in Guatemala, rather they sought to increase competition between foreign and domestic interests, as well as to modernize and diversify the Guatemalan economy.
In 1945 under President Arévalo the Vagrancy Laws were eliminated. Peasants were no longer forced to work a certain number of days on the coffee plantations and no longer were they required to work for weeks or months on state projects without compensation. However, the reality in Guatemala was that agriculture still provided nearly 70% of all laborers with employment; an even higher percentage in the rural departments. Peasant laborers living in rural areas had few if any other choices for employment other than the seasonal harvest of coffee, cotton, sugar, and bananas. The majority of existing infrastructure was built for and designed around the movement of people and goods to and from the large plantations and the urban areas. Unsurprisingly, even with the vagrancy laws abolished (1945) and agrarian reforms attempted (1952) a substantial portion of laborers migrated seasonally for employment.

The ability of workers to organize and strike was met with gains and losses as workers flexed their newfound civil and political freedoms. Wages rose in the urban and rural sectors and organized labor frequently took large corporations to court to enforce new labor legislation. Although workers were prevailing in the judicial system, the largest employer in Guatemala, United Fruit Company, responded to strikes and demands for higher wages by firing thousands of workers. This type of push-pull between economic gains and losses were the norm after the revolution; additionally, economic gains were often unevenly distributed among the population. The middleclass workers and students, the most vocal supporters of the revolution, gained the most after the revolution. Increases in the minimum wage, equal pay for equal work, right to organize and strike, access to education, and electoral rights were the most widespread. There were several important economic changes that affected women and indigenous Mayans including full citizenship, access to social welfare benefits, and agrarian reform; yet, Mayans were relegated to the fringes of the economic structures even under the revolutionary governments.
The economic development policies with the ability to most significantly impact the Mayan populations were the reforms most resisted by the landed oligarchy and the foreign corporations; agrarian reform. Since the revolution in 1944 land reform had been researched and discussed, in 1952 agrarian reforms were proposed, approved by the Congress, and instituted by Arbenz in late 1952 and into 1953. Agrarian reform was a result of several reports and investigations into the distribution of land resources in Guatemala, perhaps one of the most compelling arguments in favor came from the 1950 census which found that “2 percent of the population “controlled slightly over 74% of arable land whereas 76% of the nation’s farms had access to only 9 percent of the land” (Handy, 1984, 127). Furthermore according to the census, 40% of all farms were owned by just 23 families and there were a reported 250,000 landless peasants (REMHI, 1999, 185). The push for agrarian reform was meant to stimulate the Guatemalan economy, by encouraging small farmers to produce for domestic markets and for export markets. Agrarian reform was supposed to increase efficiency and increase the growth of small independent and privately owned farms, furthering economic development in Guatemala. The agrarian reforms meant that (1) expropriated land could be taken from landholders who held more than 233 acres, and those landholders holding more than 488 acres would lose a portion of their land (2) land would be expropriated only if it was not being currently used, (3) land was to be paid for by government bonds, (4) land was to be valued by the amount claimed by the owners for the 1952 taxes, and (5) land was to be given to peasants who would own it or use it for life (Jonas, 1991, 27; Handy, 1984, 128). During the few years of the agrarian reform program approximately 100,000 landless peasants were given title to land, or were working within cooperatives on land that had been expropriated. Successful agrarian reform had the ability to transform the Guatemalan economic structure, decreasing labor supply in the rural areas and increasing rural agricultural wages as well as decreasing domestic food supply issues;
unfortunately, agrarian reform was halted before it could be fully implemented. The large land owners and foreign corporations resisted the reforms, in many instances the resistance ended with physical violence on both sides. Post 1954, the counterrevolutionary government’s abolished land reform and returned expropriated land to the previous owners. The failed agrarian reforms, and ultimately the U.S. sponsored coup in Guatemala, meant that Mayans were in a similar if not worse economic position in 1954 than they experienced in 1944.


Economic Development through Export Diversification and Development in the Petén

Colonel Armas began to implement his economic development policies immediately following the coup of President Arbenz. His first actions as president were to grant tax holidays for the large plantation owners, repeal regulations for oil drilling, and grant the construction of Guatemala’s new hydroelectric plant a firm based in the United States (Dunkerly, 1988, 437). He also quickly reversed the limited land reforms implemented by the Arbenz administration and returned the expropriated lands to the former owners; guaranteeing an abundance of landless unemployed laborers for the future (Handy, 1984, 206). Colonel Armas was also interested in the notion of agricultural export diversification, and though the movement away from mono-agricultural exports had begun under the revolutionary governments of Arévalo and Arbenz, the movement to diversify exports continued under the counterrevolutionary governments of Colonel Armas, General Ydígoras, and General Peralta. In Guatemala export diversification meant the devotion of more land to the cultivation of cotton, sugar, and cattle. Diversification did not usually extend to all sectors of the entire economy. Guatemala’s continued reliance on agricultural exports meant the structure of the workforce remained largely unchanged from the previous period. Large seasonal, migratory workforces were needed to harvest the coffee, cotton, and bananas grown on large plantation style farms owned by the agricultural elites and a few
foreign corporations. After the Arbenz coup the largest banks in Guatemala called in close to 90% of their outstanding loans, this was a crushing blow to the smaller farmers who relied on the loans to carry the household between harvesting seasons (Calvert, 1985, 124). Access to credit or capital for small farmers or middle class households became increasingly restricted during this time period, “90% of all bank credit was monopolized by big export growers” (Jonas, 1991, 46).

Colonel Armas, General Ydígoras and General Peralta were cognizant of and concerned by the declining worldwide price for coffee and other agricultural exports. Since the 1950s, the competition from coffee producing states had driven the price of raw coffee beans down each year, as states became more efficient producers of coffee. The decline in price per pound offset any additional earnings from increased production. As a reaction to fluctuating prices for primary commodities, Colonel Armas, the elites, and the members of the military establishment, began to push for increased state involvement in economic development. As a result, the National Council of Economic Planning of the Presidency of the Republic (CNPE) was founded as an advisory body to the president in 1954. The purpose of the National Council was to give direction and cohesion to the development of the economy from a national perspective. The council itself had no power, but rather exerted influence through recommendations to the president. The council’s first report was issued in the early 1960s; much of the analysis and recommendations came directly from World Bank (IBRD) studies. The Second, Third and Fourth Plans were released during the 1960s and early 1970s. Reforms and recommendations called for by the CNPE included the development of infrastructure, electrical power plants, growth in forestry and diversification of agricultural sectors (Calvert, 1985, 157). Furthermore, all three of the plans released during the 1960s and 1970s emphasized the need to create jobs, spend more resources on public financing of projects with a regional distribution of funds, and to correct the imbalance in the distribution of resources throughout the state. Many of the recommendations by the CNPE
went unheeded. President Arana’s administration actually moved in the opposite direction; strengthening protections and subsidies for coffee growers (Calvert, 1985, 157).

Guatemala’s attempts at economic diversification did not include widespread industrialization; though there was modest growth in the industrial sectors between 1950 and 1960. General Ydígoras had overseen the implementation of the Industrial Promotion Law in 1959; a liberal foreign investment law. The industrial promotion law “offered generous fiscal incentives in the form of exemptions from income taxes and from import duties on machinery and raw materials” (Jonas, 1991, 48). These types of incentives were similar to those already given to the elites who monopolized the agricultural export sector. The same elites participated in the manufacturing and industrial sectors in Guatemala. Foreign investors responsible for financing growth in the manufacturing and industrial sectors were the same entities and individuals who were already investing in Guatemalan agricultural exports. Guatemalan elites did begin to engage in more partnerships with U.S firms during this time; however, they were content to be the “junior partners” in the relationships (Jonas, 1991, 43).

The Industrial Promotion Law had negative consequences for the development of domestic industries and availability of state resources. Access to credit in industrial production was prioritized to large foreign investors, imports were “favored” over domestic supplies and resources, and the state suffered losses of government revenue as it paid out incentives and failed to collect taxes (Jonas, 1991, 48). Furthermore, industrial development did not result in substantial gains to the domestic population, due to the fact that the industry employed few people, relative to agricultural exports, and that wages rose very slowly in industry and manufacturing. From the 1960s up into the 1980s employment in the industrial sector hovered around 10% of the economically active population (Dunkerly, 1988, 207). The Guatemalan government was partially responsible for the downward pressure on wages, the
counterrevolutionary governments of Colonel Armas and General Ydígoras had eliminated or severely curtailed all rights to unionize, organize or strike.

Modest industrialization was not adequate to address the increasing unemployment in urban areas. Despite a doubling of foreign investment from the United States between 1959 and 1969 from $137 million to $285.25 million, the percentage of laborers employed by foreign companies was only 2% of the labor force (Jonas, 1991, 48-49). And yet, by 1969 foreign investment in Guatemala accounted for 32% of the total foreign investment in Central and Latin America (Jonas, 1991, 50). Foreign corporations were able to make their influence felt in the Guatemalan political sector. They successfully shaped domestic economic development policies in their favor; lower taxes, fewer regulations, restrictions on labor organizing, and restrictions on wages (Jonas, 1991, 49). Guatemalan elites continued to benefit from the modest industrialization while the “gaps in income distribution widened” and the peasant classes bore the cost of “highly regressive sales taxes” (Jonas, 1991, 51). Modest industrialization led to increased mechanization in certain agricultural sectors and a corresponding loss of jobs. Yet, Guatemala remained one of the “more backward” states in terms of mechanizing the harvest of agricultural exports throughout the 1960s and 1970s (Dunkerly, 1988, 192).

The most basic issue contributing to a lack of widespread industrial development was a lack of existing infrastructure. An absence of necessary infrastructure was directly related to Guatemala’s inability to secure financing for infrastructure projects unrelated to the specific needs of a particular multinational corporation. The World Bank repeatedly turned down financing for road projects within Guatemala. New roads would have meant competition for the railway owned by United Fruit (Calvert, 1985, 141). The construction of electrical power plants also faced the same credit restrictions as infrastructure projects. During the 1960s there was a virtual monopoly on the supply of electricity in Guatemala. A subsidiary of a U.S. corporation,
American and Foreign Power Company, supplied almost all the power in the capital city (Calvert, 1985, 136). It was not until the early 1970s that Guatemala was able to secure financing in order to utilize the hydroelectric resources within Guatemala.

General Ydígoras, compared to Colonel Armas, was conservative in terms of economic reforms or innovations. His administration preferred to maintain the status quo set under Colonel Armas with two exceptions; the first was the introduction of the Central American Common Market (CACM) and the second was the increase in corruption by government and military officials. The CACM treaty was signed in 1960 and instituted in 1961. The treaty was an attempt to facilitate trade between Central American states by lowering tariffs and protecting fledgling industrial sectors throughout Central America. The CACM did increase trade between its members; it also decreased some of Guatemala’s export and import dependency on the United States. However, since most agricultural products remained highly protected under the CACM, there was little change in the overall structure of the economies of the Central American states participating. Agricultural exports, rural employment in agriculture, and mono-crops dominated the economies throughout Central America. The CACM was relatively short-lived; collapsing after the soccer war in 1969 between El Salvador and Honduras. The treaty collapsed partly because of the uneven levels of economic development between members of the CACM, in part due to massive migrations of peoples from El Salvador to Honduras, and in part because Guatemala and El Salvador to restructure the CACM in 1969 as requested by Honduras. The other change ushered in by General Ydígoras’ administration was rampant corruption. He frequently rewarded his supporters with political and economic favors in the form of political appointments and land grants.

General Peralta took a similar approach to the Guatemalan economy as the other concurrent dictators in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay. Peralta’s administration more
closely implemented the recommendations of the World Bank and the IBRD. He believed that industrialization could be built through the CACM and private enterprises. In term of economic development policies, General Peralta was more closely aligned with Colonel Armas. Although, he did attempt to establish a minimum wage, regulate industry, and levy an income tax (REMHI, 1999, 195). Unsurprisingly, the AGA and the Coordinating Committee of Agricultural, Commercial, Industrial, and Financial Associations (CACIF) opposed all of these changes (REMHI, 1999, 195). Guatemala became the last state in Central and Latin American to institute the income tax. The income tax implemented in Guatemala was very low; a family of four people (two children) would “pay only 4% on an income of 15,000 Quetzals a year” (Calvert, 1985, 140). This would be the approximate equivalent to an income of US$15,000 and paying US$600 a year in income tax.

The implementation of a small income tax in Guatemala did little to change the source of government revenues. The largest source of government revenues (47%) still came from export and import duties. The remainder of government revenues came from taxes on alcohol and tobacco (20%), stamp duties (10%), and a profits tax on corporations (9%) (Calvert, 1985, 140). The reliance on export and import duties meant the Guatemalan government still found itself in an insecure revenue position, due to the price fluctuations on the world market for raw agricultural products (Calvert, 1985, 140). One option, favored by the state was the settlement and development of the Petén region. A development program titled, the Empresa Nacional de Fomento y Desarrollo Economico de Petén was begun under General Ydígoras, neglected, and then restarted under General Peralta. Eventually it would be General Arana who would pursue the project with “obsessive” fervor (Black, 1984, 36). The development project was supposed to be a means to alleviate concerns and pressures regarding agrarian reform and a means to produce new economic growth in a previously unexploited area. However, the revenues from the minerals
and timber contained and extracted from the Petén region were much lower than expected, due in part to a world recession in the early 1970s (Calvert, 1985, 150). Moreover, a lack of arable land and necessary infrastructure kept any significant numbers of voluntary settlers out of the Petén region (Calvert, 1985, 150-151).

In the first and second periods the efforts to modernize the economy and diversify exports had a positive or non-negative impact on Gross Domestic Product (GDP), GDP growth rates, per capita incomes, and total exports. The Guatemalan economy grew during the first and second periods; from 1950 to 1960 GDP had more than doubled from US$447,000,000 to US$1,021,000,000. The growth rate for GDP averaged 3.8% for the entire decade. But, the largest increases in GDP growth rate occurred under Colonel Armas; between 1955 and 1956 the GDP growth rate increased from 2.5 to 9.1. Per capita income at the start of the decade was US$147 by 1960 it was US$257. Also, during the decade Guatemalan exports rose from 85 million (Quetzals) to 131 million (Quetzals).\footnote{At this time the Quetzal was pegged 1:1 with the U.S. dollar.} Unfortunately, one of the economic indicators that could best describe how the level of economic growth affected the entire Guatemalan population, the Gini Index, was not in use during the 1950s. Furthermore, per capita measurements and national aggregate data can provide an indication as to the quality of life, but are not measurements of the distribution of resources within a population. As a result, while the available economic indicators for the first and second periods are nearly all positive two important items must be considered, (1) the very low starting point of each of the economic indicators and (2) the distribution of resources within the Guatemalan population. The level of total external debt increased during the decade, from US$19 million to US$68 million. The level of Official Development Assistance (ODA) also significantly increased from US$156,000 to
US$15.8 million. The official inflation data did not begin until 1961 and official remittance data did not begin in 1977.

Positive economic growth continued during the 1960s and into the start of the third period. Under General Ydígoras Guatemala had a GDP of US$1.02 billion and by the early 1970s it had more than doubled to US$2.17. The growth rates in the 1960s and early 1970s were positive, with higher growth rates during certain years, especially 1963-9.5%, 1968-8.8%, and 1972-7.3%. By the early 1970s GDP per capita had increased to US$389. Exports grew exponentially during the second period and into the third period; increasing from 131 million Quetzals to 536 million Quetzals in 1973. Inflation remained extremely low during the period (-1.8 to 5.0), though Guatemala’s total debt rose, from US$68 million in 1960 to US$219.9 million in 1973. Levels of Official Development Assistance (ODA) increased during the period and maintained higher levels throughout. In 1960 Guatemala had received US$15.8 million a year; by 1972 it received US$27.1 million.

The percentage of total eligible workers employed in agriculture remained high throughout the decade; approximately 68% were employed in agriculture. The agricultural sector contributed to 35.5% of GDP in 1950 and by 1960 the percentage had decreased to 33.4%. While the percentage of laborers engaged in agricultural production decreased over the first period, a majority of the labor force remained engaged in agricultural production. By 1960 there were 66.7% in agriculture and by 1973 there were 59.9% in agriculture. The statistical data showing unemployment rates, inflation rates, and remittance data for the period is not widely available, nor is it considered reliable. Guatemala collected and reported unemployment data only for those individuals officially registering as unemployed, only for individuals who resided in Guatemala City, and only during certain years. In spite of continued economic growth during the time period, wages remained low in the agricultural sectors where the majority of workers toiled. The
highest agricultural wages were those paid to laborers on the large lowland fincas. In 1965 in this region workers were paid approximately sixty cents per day, while the highland agricultural work paid fifty cents per day (Handy, 1984, 207). Even after extensive strikes and the implementation of standards and regulations for piecework, wages and minimum wages were easily manipulated by finca owners and were not enforced by the government of Guatemala.

**General Arana, General Laugerud (1971-1976):**

**Economic Development through State Subsidies and Decentralization of Government**

Guatemala faced several economic issues during the 1970s, all of which had been developing for several years. The collapse of CACM, a worldwide recession, and civil wars throughout Central America led to “industrial collapse” and “disinvestment during the 1980s” (Jonas, 1991, 77). The economic ills could perhaps have been negated if the military leadership in Guatemala had motivation to reform the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy. Instead a succession of military presidents embraced and attempted to implement untested development plans allowing for the maintenance of the status quo; while at the same time offering increased benefits to allies within and outside of the military. As previously mentioned, one of the preferred development plans of President Arana, was the issue of economic development in the northern Petén region. Specifically, the *Franja Transversal del Norte*, a region located near the Mexico and Belize borders. Several times President Arana attempted to relocate landless peasants in the region, but the land was very poor for agricultural cultivation, more suited for the cultivation of livestock. Newly relocated peasants, found themselves unable to set up farms. Instead they became laborers on the large livestock ranches that had sprung up across the Franja. President Arana’s vision for developing the Petén was continued under President Laugerud, who forcibly relocated peasants to the Ixcán to increase the number of available laborers. Ultimately the process of forcibly relocating peasants backfired on the
Laugerud administration when newly relocated peasants began to establish agricultural cooperatives, decreasing the availability of laborers for sugar and cotton in the mid 1970s. Despite the problems with forcibly relocating peasants to the Franja, the region continued to be a destination for military investing and enrichment. The region earned the nickname “The Zone of the Generals.” During 1972-1982 all three presidents rewarded their supporters, military or PID, by giving land titles and business subsidies in the Franja region. Furthermore, any domestic or foreign corporations establishing a presence in the Franja received a five year exemption on state taxes and a one year exemption on any import taxes (Black, 1984, 30). Economic development for private gain in the Franja was paid for by the Guatemalan state.

The 1973 oil embargo restarted the efforts to find oil in Guatemala, Mexico and Belize. Substantial oil fields were discovered in Guatemala in 1974 under the presidency of General Arana. It was first estimated that the amount of oil discovered would be enough to render Guatemala self-sufficient and to provide oil for export to the United States; however, in the long-term Guatemala’s needs exceeded the amount produced and it was unable to refine its oil, so it had to import refined oil from the United States. The inability to produce electricity continued to hinder industrial development. Industrial output had increased during the late 1960s up until the early 1970s. Output then began to decline from 1972 to 1977. Industrial output also decreased from 33.2% of exports to 23.3% of exports (Black, 1984, 35). In the 1970s industrial output only contributed to approximately 16% of gross domestic product; up from 11% of gross domestic product in 1950 (Jonas, 1991, 76; Dunkerly, 1988, 202). Light industrialization during the 1960s-1970s in Guatemala did not lead to a decrease in import dependency; rather, it led to an increase in dependency on parts and equipment from the United States.
Efforts to diversify the Guatemalan economy during the previous decades had been moderately successful. The export economy had moved from reliance on a single agricultural export crop, coffee, to reliance on several crops. Coffee as a percentage of total exports had fallen from 73.9% of exports in 1956 to 31.7% of exports in 1973 (Handy, 1984, 197). Cotton, sugar and livestock cultivation had grown from .1%-.5% of exports in 1960 to approximately 19%, 4.1% and 6% of exports in 1973, respectively (Handy, 1984, 199). The growth of the cotton, sugar and livestock industries was not a result of free market capitalism. Cattle ranching and nickel mining received more than US$100 million each in subsidies and incentives during the 1960s and 1970s (Handy, 1984, 199, 219). The cotton and nickel industries received tax breaks on the production and excavation of cotton and nickel. Taxes on cotton exports were less than 1% of the total value of the exports. Competition for tax breaks, access to credit and land between the existing economic sectors was a zero sum game. The new elites in cotton, sugar and livestock industries frequently found themselves in competition with the old coffee elites for influence and favors from the government. Intentionally or unintentionally the military was not very adept at managing these budding intra-class conflicts. Elite conflicts were hardly the most salient economic issues facing the Guatemalan state, more pressing issues included the declining price of agricultural commodities, increasing dependency on the United States for the purchase of exports and the supply of imports, increasing domestic inflation, and worldwide economic recession.

As a result of these issues the economy came to play an increasingly important role in politics in the 1970s. Three decades of sustained economic growth and the Guatemalan economy was still largely dependent on the agricultural export sector. Approximately 60% of the labor force was still employed in agriculture and approximately 60-70% of all exports were agricultural (Black, 1984, 35). Official statistics often excluded subsistence farmers who were not selling crops for consumption or export, therefore has been alleged that the 60% of the population
engaged in agricultural output is an underenumerated figure (Calvert, 1985, 129). During the 1970s the agricultural sectors with the greatest earnings were coffee, cotton, sugar, cardamom, bananas and beef (Calvert, 1985, 129; Jonas, 1991, 76). The amount of land devoted to growing coffee and bananas had increased between the 1950s and late 1970s by 40% and 72% respectively. The land devoted to cotton and sugar showed much more significant growth from the 1950s to the 1970s; 95% and 63% respectively. Bananas were the only agricultural export to decline in yield while increasing in total production. The amount of beef available for domestic consumption fell as Guatemala increased the cultivation of cattle for export; rates dropped from 50% to 37% between 1960 and 1974 (Dunkerly, 1988, 194). The land used for cattle grazing was not appropriated from the more fertile lands used by coffee, cotton or banana plantations. Rather, it came from the less fertile subsistence farming land in the Zacapa, Matagalpa, and Franja regions in Guatemala. The state frequently engaged in the removal of subsistence farmers from their land in order to grant it to foreign corporations, military personnel or political allies “provoked popular discontent to a degree equal to if not greater than that in Nicaragua” (Dunkerly, 1988, 466). The recipients of land in Zacapa and the Franja were frequently civilian and military partnerships. Four individuals who had served in the Laugerud and Lucas administrations (1976-1978) owned 285,000 hectares in the Franja (Dunkerly, 1988, 467). Agriculture and the cultivation of cattle remained the dominant export sectors; although, the timber and textile industries experienced modest growth over the same period. The unregulated export of timber continued until the earthquake in 1976, at which point in time timber exports were prohibited.

Economic Development and National Reconstruction through the use of Foreign Aid

General Lucas was one of, if not the largest beneficiary of the military’s practice of self-enrichment. The practice of rewarding allies and supporters in the military with economic opportunities in the private sector led to considerable infighting and competition within the military and between the private sector elites and the military. The tactics used by the military in the political arena to repress and control the population, the systematic murder or disappearance of any political adversaries or competition, was used more prolifically in the economic arena as politics and economics became closely tied. In 1981-1982 the lines between favored and out-of-favor were clear; Guatemalan business elites, members of the MLN, the middle class, U.S. business investors, and junior officers had grown increasingly incensed by the rampant corruption during a period of economic recession and internal warfare. As the Lucas regime displayed even more openly corrupt, violent and economically unstable behavior segments of the elite population began to distance themselves from the Lucas regime; further cultivating their close ties with the United States government and American business elites. This involved intense lobbying efforts in Washington D.C. by Guatemalan elites. It also involved the strengthening of ties between like institutions in each state; such as the Chamber of Commerce. Finally it involved increasing the partnerships of U.S. firms and Guatemalan firms in ventures outside of agriculture.

In search of new revenues the Lucas administration siphoned funds designated for infrastructure projects, widely inflating the construction costs of existing projects, and increased taxes on coffee exporters (Black, 1984, 119). The United States government and the IMF sent conflicting signals to General Ydígoras; the United States continued to send aid to the Guatemalan government. Also, the IMF continued to lend to Guatemala, US$110 million. IMF conditionality on loans required Guatemala to cut their already “lowest per capita in Central
America” spending on social programs (Black, 1984, 119). The level of public debt soars during this period, from US$190 million in 1972 to US$2.65 billion in 1985.

The United States, IMF, and World Bank repeatedly encouraged Guatemala to increase the amount of government revenue from taxes placed on the private sector. Taxes on the private sector were only 20% of total government revenues. However, the Guatemalan state caved into pressure from the private sector and the “private sector’s share of taxes actually declined between 1980 and 1986” (Jonas, 1991, 81). Stagflation in Guatemala, a recession combined with inflation, began under General Lucas and continues under General Montt and General Víctores. The austerity measures recommended by the IMF and World Bank during this time included, (1) devaluing the quetzal, (2) eliminating tariffs and protections for domestic industries, (3) implementing a “wage ceiling”, and (4) cuts to social programs (Jonas, 1991, 83).

Under President Lucas the economy began a sharp downward trajectory as the GDP growth rate fell from 5.0 in 1978 to -3.5 in 1982. Total exports and GDP per capita had previously increased nearly every year since 1950; but from 1981-1983 GDP per capita decreased as did the number of total exports. The level of external debt increases from US$549 million in 1980 to US$1,187 in 1983 (Dunkerly, 1988, 212). President Lucas and the military were unresponsive to demands from the bulk of society, instead they continued to use any available resources to build businesses and monopolies owned by and controlled by the military. During the Lucas regime the military ran “46 semiautonomous state institutions” including a pension fund, named the Institute for Military Social Security, and a bank established by the army (Black, 1984, 52). The Institute for Military Social Security (IPM) initially funded the army bank under President Arana; started with US$5 million (Black, 1984, 52). The army bank continued to be funded under the Lucas regime; in 1981 the administration approved a US$20 million dollar
appropriation of state funds to be used by the bank. These funds were then lent to the cattle farmers and industrialists and the military (Black, 1984, 52). The IPM and the army bank collaborated with Bank of America to lend themselves millions of state dollars to fund start up businesses; the development projects included luxury condominiums, parking garages, and cement companies. The military ventured into lucrative sectors of the economy, using state funds to compete in sectors where established local companies already existed. The repressive power exercised by the Guatemalan government, combined with the extensive ties between the military and corporate interests in Guatemala, was strong enough to hold off challenges by the general populace and the owners of small to medium sized local businesses for a time; however, in the early 1980s the Lucas regime tested the balance.

In 1981 while the prices for exports were plummeting, the prices for imports were rising. Agricultural export commodities, such as coffee and cotton, had dropped in price by 36% and 22%, respectively, in 1981 (Black, 1984, 118). Another of Guatemala’s domestic industries, tourism, had been damaged by the years of internal conflict. Many of the natural sights, roads, and buildings had been physically destroyed by the conflict. Also, Guatemala had been labeled a high risk state by many developed states and travel was discouraged; tourism revenue dropped by 15% in 1980, 35% and 1981 (Handy, 1984, 202). Foreign investors began to pull capital out of Guatemala while domestic investors channeled their money abroad. The amount of foreign investment in Guatemala dropped by 900%, between 1976 and 1981 (Handy, 1984, 202). The military had monopolized the available credit in Guatemala, the middle class and domestic elites were increasingly cut off from credit and denied opportunities to restructure existing loans. Decreases in foreign and domestic investment, high inflation, poor access to credit and a decrease in the demand for exports led to the closing of 3,300 businesses in Guatemala and a corresponding drop in employment (Jonas, 1991, 82).

Security over Economic Development

A fraudulent election in 1982 combined with endemic corruption of the Lucas administration led to a military coup toppling General Lucas. His successor, General Montt, was more concerned with eliminating any subversive elements in Guatemala than with issues in the economy. His economic development plans did not include urban areas; instead he focused on the rural departments. General Montt’s economic strategies focused on the establishment of rural resettlement camps for captured and repentant peasants; these were named development poles. The idea was developed out of General Lucas’ Third National Development Plan which called for “118 model settlements in areas affected by the guerrilla insurgency” (Black, 1984, 141).

General Montt also instituted food distribution programs, feeding indigenous and ladino peasants in exchange for their military service. The motto of the army at the time was “If you are with us, we will feed you. If you are against us, we will kill you” (Perera, 1995, 330). The food was provided by the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) and distributed by the military. General Montt frequently used the growing numbers of landless and unemployed indigenous laborers as forced labor on state infrastructure projects for little to no wages. Laborers were forced to clear new rural roads and reforest areas decimated by the unregulated logging before 1976 (Black, 1984, 140). The Montt administration declared the rural resettlement programs a success and claimed the production of 60,000 jobs; although the creation of the jobs does not cost the administration any additional resources since the labor is coerced (Black, 1984, 140).

The economic development plan implemented by President Montt was actually developed under General Lucas. The plan was titled the National Development and Security Plan, and was developed by the National Planning Commission (SEGEPLAN). The plan stressed the need for security over development, military control over all areas of the state, especially the
rural areas, and the implementation of the Civilian Defense Patrols (PACs), Interinstitutional Coordinating System (IIC) and Development Poles. The IIC was created to receive and approve of proposed development projects throughout the state. In the first two years of the IIC the number of proposed projects received compared to the number of projects approved was 1,070 to 200 (Central America Report, 1985). The development poles were to be created in the areas where the guerrillas enjoyed the greatest support. The official purpose of a development pole was stated as:

“An organized population center with an infrastructure permitting substantial elements of rural social welfare to be mobilized in the poorest areas, in order to give a new dynamic to the surrounding region and to the whole country. These will also be a means to correct the socioeconomic underdevelopment and better the living standards of the Guatemalans, forming part of the developmentalist strategy. This will be carried out with the full participation of the government and the army, by means of the National Departmental Coordinators” (Central America Report, 1986).

Over time it became apparent that the development poles were not voluntarily settled, nor were the basic needs of their inhabitants being met (Central America Report, 1986). The development poles were structured very differently from traditional village life. The new villages were constructed on a grid pattern with the houses built in rows along a road to provide access for military vehicles. This was quite different from the traditional layout of villages where people were more dispersed throughout the village with a leader or village chief at the center of life in the village. In the new villages the individual in charge was not a cultural or religious leader, but rather an individual the army had entrusted to be in charge of the village. Model villages were
home to “one, and often two, military detachments of 150 soldiers who were permanently housed in army garrisons built within the village” (Sanford, 2003, 139). The entire infrastructure of the model villages was constructed with forced labor from returning villagers; working on the villages in exchange for food and water. Local patrol leaders frequently turned into mini-despotic rulers over their villages abusing the local population, at times the army would remove these individuals, usually with an accommodation.

Under General Montt the economy was in serious decline, security over economic development did little to address the economic issues. Furthermore, his security first strategies were unpopular with the business elites and large landowners as well as the middle class. A new proposed tax structure was opposed by the elites. The coffee producing elites were especially keen on keeping the tax reductions granted to them by President Lucas. The demand for exports was down, prices for agricultural commodities were down and interest rates were rising rapidly. Years of conflict and current instability had damaged the tourist industry and led to the flight of foreign and domestic capital. Additionally, the years of borrowing had begun to catch up to the Guatemalan government as national debt soared. As President Montt’s presidency continued the large landowners grew more suspicious of his intentions. The state was increasingly expropriating land belonging to political rivals, the government granted licenses and subsidies to political allies while shutting out rivals.

General Victores was tasked with ending the growing economic depression in Guatemala after the removal of General Montt from power in 1983. He engaged in attempts to return Guatemala to its previous economic growth patterns. At the start of his presidential tenure the state had very little rural infrastructure and thousands of homeless landless peasants. The state also had a poorly conceived and implemented model village system comprised of development
poles in rural areas. From 1983 to 1985 the military establishment began to restructure and reorganize the government and the economy. General Victores attempted to reduce the amount of government expenditures by at least 10% in 1985. The budget cuts did not affect military spending, instead the funding cuts largely fell on the “finance” sector. This was the sector frequently used and abused by General Lucas and his military allies as they purchased goods and services with state funds (Central America Report, 1985, 158). The United States offered a variety of financial assistance to Guatemala in the mid 1980s. The financial aid for development was channeled through the military, funds for rural agriculture, education, healthcare, administrative reforms, and food aid were all dispersed by the military, usually in exchange for peasant cooperation.

**President Cerezo, President Serrano, President Carpio (1986-1995):**

**Economic Development: Privatization, Government Austerity, Structural Adjustment**

After President Cerezo was elected, he instituted an “Economic Reordering Plan” in April of 1986. Part of the Economic Reordering Plan called for the creation of emergency employment in the rural departments. The business sector and the elites immediately opposed this portion of the development plan and this part of the program was abandoned before it was implemented. The remainder of the Economic Reordering Plan suffered from a lack of resourced dedicated to development. Fierce competition between domestic groups for the meager development funds that were provided by the plan erupted immediately. President Cerezo attempted to reduce the government’s operating budget and similar to President Victores the majority of financial cuts came from the investment portion of the state’s budget. However, President Cerezo’s plan to reduce government expenditures was sabotaged by President Lucas’ previous development decisions. One such example was the expensive and poorly constructed Chixoy Hydroelectric Project, a dam built on the Rio Negro. Years of rampant corruption by the
military-civilian contractors working on the project caused the dam project to overrun estimated costs by millions of dollars. President Cerezo maintained the development poles and the use of PACs to keep the rural populace repressed during his administration.

There were other strategies attempted by President Cerezo, he transferred the IIC to civilian control and in 1988 he promoted the National Reorganization Plan. This plan called for an increase in taxes on commercial and industrial energy use by 40% and an increase in the minimum wage. The introduction of the National Reorganization Plan led to a coup attempt of President Cerezo in May of 1988. The business community refused to acquiesce to these types of reforms. President Cerezo’s response to the coup attempt was to reprioritizes funds meant for “modernization projects” to the counterinsurgency efforts (REMHI, 1999, 258). Additionally, the administration’s discretionary funds were then channeled into purchasing military equipment during the late 1980s.

At the end of President Cerezo’s term Guatemala’s economy was a jumble of growth, decline, promising starts and corresponding setbacks. There was a slight increase in total exports, mostly due to growth in sugar, cattle, and textile industries. Coffee prices had dropped considerably in 1990, but then the government devalues the quetzal giving the coffee exporters a chance to recuperate their profits. However, in 1990 “70% of the coffee farms produce less than 14% of the coffee, while 4% of the farms produce 68% of the total,” the devaluing of the quetzal was a benefit felt mostly by the elite owned coffee plantations (Central America Report, 1990, 293). The devaluing of the quetzal impacted small farmers and peasants by making the purchase of necessary light equipment and food stuffs that was imported more expensive. The United States continued to purchase approximately 30% of all Guatemalan exports and supplies 38% of all of Guatemala’s imports (SALA, v. 35, 777-778). However, while the percentage of exports
purchased by the United States over the next five years remained constant, the number of imports from the United States grew to 45% of all Guatemalan imports (SALA, v. 35, 777-778).

Guatemala’s total aid from the United States declined by 21% at the end of the 1980s and the early 1990s. In July of 1990 inflation in Guatemala reached 50%. There were repeated attempts to raise government revenues, including tax increases, but those attempts were watered down by domestic and foreign business groups.

After his election in 1991 President Serrano introduced the Social Pact. The Social Pact was an attempt to bring together unions and labor, the government and the business interests to settle many of the disagreements plaguing the agricultural and industrial sectors, for the betterment of the whole society. The Social Pact fell apart almost immediately, as the business elites started to fragment on economic policy prescriptions. Some portions of the elite class would have preferred to keep the old system of state led development policies and other portions would like to increase privatization in Guatemala with a minimized state presence. After the disintegration of the Social Pact, President Serrano did not attempt to implement any significant development policies in Guatemala. He did spend a considerable amount of time rotating military leadership in an attempt to keep his hold over the presidency and win the war against the guerrillas. From 1993 to 1995 the IADB provided financial aid to Guatemala, 88% of the aid is allocated for economic growth projects and 12% is given for social projects. No funds were allocated for the improvement of governance in Guatemala (Central America Report, 2005). Funds allocated for economic growth projects from the IADB include a US$132 million for a Financial Sector Modernization Program. The goal of the modernization program was to promote financial sector liberalization, to increase access to credit and to improve the financial system’s solvency; an issue that had plagued Guatemala for many years. Unfortunately none of the IADB funds were used to implement financial sector regulations; financial liberalization without any
regard to the establishment of appropriate regulations is thought to be one of the precursors to the future banking disaster in Guatemala (Central America Report, 2005).

The first major instance of the privatization of a government owned enterprise was the sale of the National Institute of Electricity (INDE) to the U.S. corporation Enron. As a state owned enterprise INDE had provided 83% of the electrical power in Guatemala. After the sale of INDE there were allegations from the state that Enron had not paid its public debts to Guatemala; furthermore it was revealed that Enron did not pay taxes in Guatemala. Under Enron’s ownership state subsidies for electricity to consumers in Guatemala ended. The government suggested 47% price increases for electricity, thousands of protestors descended on the capital city; ultimately the government retreats from the price hike. President Serrano attempted an auto-coup in 1993 under the pretext of fighting corruption. He suspended the constitution and dismissed the National Congress and Supreme Court. His actions, ruled unconstitutional by the courts, momentarily unite the military and business elites in their opposition to his auto-coup.

This momentary unity was immediately tested under the new President Carpio; there were increasingly strong pressures from the business elites to continue privatizing state enterprises. The business elites began to realize that the process of privatizing was directly inimical to the interests of the military, since military personnel either own or operate the state owned enterprises. The benefits to privatizing would be captured by the business elites and the costs would fall on the military who are directly engaged in the ownership or management of the enterprises. There was a concerted effort by the business elites to purge the military of the older officers, those most likely to be involved in the graft of the 1970s and 1980s. The number of kidnapped and murdered businessmen begins to increase as the efforts for privatization continue.
The Framework: Initiating Economic Development and Structural Changes

The framework developed out of the literature review and applied to the Guatemalan case study should show across each of the six periods a propensity for economic development policies to (1) show a movement from subsistence production to export production, (2) modernization of agriculture, (3) diversification of agricultural exports, and (4) implementation of neoliberal economic development policies (see table 6.2 for a summary).

In the first period, between 1950 and 1954 the Arbenz administration continued to implement the economic development plans first put into operation by President Arévalo. The most significant economic development policy was reform of the land tenure in Guatemala, a move to increase production off of unused land, increasing food production for domestic and foreign markets. Policies also included: modernizing infrastructure for industry and agriculture, attempts to diversify agriculture, increasing the rights of workers to organize and strike. The Arbenz administration fits the framework, since Arbenz did attempt to increase for export, modernize agriculture, and diversify Guatemala’s agricultural exports. The second period, consisting of Colonel Armas, General Ydígoras, and General Peralta also fits the framework. Colonel Armas was responsible for the most radical changes to economic development policy while General Ydígoras and General Peralta maintained policies set in motion by Colonel Armas. His economic development policies included subsidizing the large agricultural exporters, introducing new agricultural export crops and developing the Petén region. Structural changes included abolishing the land reform efforts, expropriating new lands and restricting rights to organize and strike. The framework also correctly predicts and explains economic development during the third period, given that there is a slight overlap between economic policies between the second and third periods this is unsurprising. In the third period, under General Arana and General Laugerud, there was increased support given to the diversification of agriculture for
State support was focused on any businesses, private or public, operating within the Franja. The main difference between the second and third periods is the concentration of government resources within a given region, the Franja, and efforts directed at specific industries, cattle cultivation and cotton.

The economic development policies in the fourth and fifth periods deviate from the first second and third. General Lucas’ administration used the foreign aid from the earthquake to stimulate economic development. But, the economic development was not concentrated at diversifying agricultural exports or modernizing agriculture. Instead the economic development policies were almost solely focused on business ventures for members of the military establishment, areas of the economy the military entered were not restricted to agriculture; finance, construction, industrialization were a few of the business sectors the military began to monopolize. General Montt’s economic development policies, and to a lesser extent General Victores, offer the largest departure of any of the time periods. Economic development policies between 1982 and 1985 were prioritized below state security and were viewed as a means of maintaining state security. Policies for economic development involved considerable state involvement in setting up and monitoring development poles in rural areas. This time period does not exactly fit the pattern of the framework.

The fallout from the excesses of President Lucas and President Montt were reflected in the economic policies adopted by President Cerezo, President Serrano, and President Carpio’s administrations. Each economic development policy had elements of austerity, reform, and adjustment. The willingness and ability of the state to play an interventionist role in the economy was greatly restricted during this time period. In the late 1980s and early 1990s attempts to achieve economic development focused on removing tariffs, opening markets to trade, increasing
the state’s exports—not just agricultural exports, and the receipt of remittances from migrant laborers. This time period does fit the framework since Guatemala is moving from subsistence to export and modernizing agriculture while experiencing significant structural changes. The structural changes in the last period are easily distinguished: privatization of government entities, reducing the role of the state, deregulating, lowering tariffs, restructuring the tax codes, and removing price controls on food stuffs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Economic Development Plan</th>
<th>Economic Policies and Structural Changes</th>
<th>Framework Predicts Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Efficient use of land and labor resources  
3. State intervention in the economy                                                                   | Yes                                                                        |
2. Emphasize agricultural exports and cattle  
3. Subsidies: coffee, bananas, cotton, sugar  
4. CACM  
5. Land Tenure-concentration, expropriation and subdivision of munifundia  
6. 1959-Officially developing the Petén  
7. Eliminates right to strike, unionize                                                                 | 1. Yes  
2. Yes  
3. Yes |
2. Administrative reforms  
3. Trickle down effects  
4. Creation of 15 decentralized govt. institutions  
5. Increase in non-traditional exports (cattle)  
6. Land Tenure-concentration  
7. Subsidies for coffee  
8. Development in the N. Transverse Strip                                                                 | 1. Yes  
2. Yes  
3. Yes |
| 1978       | General Lucas                    | National Reconstruction Committee (CRN)                                                    | 1. Coordinate foreign aid  
2. Use foreign aid to rebuild state  
3. Further the state’s reach into rural areas  
4. Land Tenure-concentration  
5. Military competes with domestic business                                                               | 1. Yes  
2. Yes  
3. Yes |
2. Development is subordinated to security  
3. Military control over rural populations  
4. Institute PACs, Development Poles, IIC  
5. Anti-corruption campaigns  
6. Land Tenure-concentration  
7. Replace municipal government with military  
8. Food and water in exchange for compliance  
9. Forced labor for infrastructure  
10. Development budgets decreased                                                                       | 1. No  
2. No  
3. No |
| 1986-1995  | President Cerezo, President Serrano, President Carpio | Economic Reordering Plan - Economic and Social Adjustment Program (not fully implemented) - National Reorganization Plan Neoliberal Structural Adjustment | 1. PACS (officially only voluntarily)  
2. Development poles remain  
3. IIC is replaced with development council  
4. Austerity measures for government  
5. Cheap labor for exports  
6. Remittances  
7. Increasing non-traditional exports  
8. Tax reform-tax increases  
9. Minimum wage increases  
10. Neoliberal Structural Adjustment Policies:  
    a. Reducing state role, deregulation  
    b. Devaluing the Quetzal  
    c. Lowering tariffs, export taxes  
    d. Removing price controls on food  
    e. Reducing social services, domestic development, reliance on remittances  
    g. Privatization of state owned enterprises  
11. Increasing non-traditional exports                                                                 | 1. Yes  
2. Yes  
3. Yes |
State Sponsored Violence

“It is easy to lose sight of the enormity of terror when it is reduced to numerical tabulation of deaths, refugees, orphans and disappearances.”-James Dunkerly

The following section details the state sponsored violence in Guatemala from 1950 to 1995 is chronologically presented. As mentioned at the start of chapter six, the framework being applied offers explanations and predictions for the causes of state sponsored violence. State sponsored violence is an effect of economic development policies which emphasize agricultural diversification, agricultural exports over subsistence, land concentration in conjunction with aggravating responses by the state. In the following section state sponsored violence in Guatemala is detailed and the connections between economic development policy and violent state reactions are highlighted.

As discussed in the previous historical section violence has been a factor in Guatemalan life since the time of the Spanish conquest. State sanctioned violence has been used to remove indigenous populations from their communal land, to force peasants to toil as laborers, and to quell domestic uprisings (labor, social, economic) for hundreds of years. During the early 1950s there were brief periods of violence, the brutal crackdown on alleged communists after the Arbenz coup, as well as high profile assassinations, such as the murder of President Arana, and the subsequent three day confrontation between his supporters and Arévalo’s supporters.

Violence perpetrated by both sides of the agrarian reform battle began to escalate in Guatemala after the 1952 agrarian reforms were passed. Peasants began to invade and take over farms not necessarily slated for expropriation; at least thirty farms were seized in such a manner (REMHI, 1999, 186). The General Association of Growers (AGA), the Committee of Anticommunist University Students and large landowners began organizing opposition to
agrarian reform in 1952. The student group led a rebellion in Salamá, north of Guatemala City, and the landowners organized the Committees to Defend the Land and Civic Unions with the express goal of “killing agrarian leaders” (REMHI, 1999, 186). Once the CIA backed coup of President Arbenz was successful the level of violence increased dramatically. Under the Armas regime and with the help of the United States the National Liberation Movement (MLN), the Preventative Criminal Law against Communism, and the National Committee for Defense Against Communism were established. Efforts to eradicate communism from Guatemala were blessed by the Catholic Church hierarchy. After the coup of Arbenz 1,000 labor and political leaders escaped Guatemala and applied for asylum outside of the state. Another 17,000 alleged supporters were arrested, taken prisoner, and in many instances tortured. Approximately 2,000 were exiled and 8,000 peasants were killed.\textsuperscript{25} The National Committee for Defense Against Communism had the task of arresting any individual engaging in any activities that could be considered communist. Once an individual was placed on the list they were “barred from government office or employment;” six months after the coup there were “seventy-two thousand people on the committee’s list” (REMHI, 1999, 189).

The purges of labor leaders, students, professors, communists and community organizers after the 1954 coup led to an increase in civilian rebellions. The November 13 revolt and the subsequent revolts in 1961 resulted after the military killed Lieutenant Alejandro de Leon Aragon on the 13-de Noviembre. His death served as a catalyst for different rebel groups, who then began to form coalitions. These new groups became the target of government forces and endured new rounds of political violence during President Ydígoras’ term in office. When the military was able to locate rebel groups most often they would wipe out the entire group. This was the case with the twenty three members of the 20 de Octubre Guerrilla Front in March of 1962.

\textsuperscript{25} Cited in Jonas and REMHI.
Colonel Peralta replaced General Ydígoras in a coup in 1963 and immediately tightened the restrictions on behaviors deemed subversive; such as the generation of communist propaganda, participating in communist activities, or any crimes that could be considered terrorism. Underpinning the intensification of political violence was the growth of rebel and guerrilla groups, the tightened restrictions on civil liberties, and significant increases to the funding, training and absolute numbers of military personnel.

Between 1960 and 1973 the REMHI records over five hundred instances of state sponsored violence in Guatemala. Often one incidence of violence involved multiple victims, as was the Case of the 28, which actually involved 32 individuals. In March of 1966 thirty two members of the Guatemalan Labor Party (PGT), Rebel Armed Forces (FAR), and MR-13 were forcibly disappeared by the Guatemalan military. The FAR retaliated by kidnapping the vice president of the National Congress, the president of the Supreme Court, and one more government official. The FAR then ransomed the kidnapped government officials for information on the disappeared guerrillas. The fate of the disappeared guerrillas was not known until July 1966, when two government officials stated the 32 rebel leaders and party members had been tortured and murdered, their bodies dropped in the Pacific Ocean (REMHI, 1999, 196). During the same month an additional twenty-eight union leaders were captured and killed by the military (Dunkerly, 1988, 452). The perpetrators acted with impunity, as was most often the case.

State sponsored violence intensified during 1966 when the death squads, such as Mano Blanca and Ojo por Ojo, began their campaigns of terror throughout Guatemala. The paramilitary death squads would publish and circulate death lists with the names of PGT party members and the names of labor and peasant leaders. The death squads would then kidnap, torture, and execute

---

26 As noted by the REMHI, “each event may produce more than one victim, and a single victim may suffer more than one human rights violation” (302).

27 The disappeared are referred to as the Case of the 28, but were actually numbered 32.
individuals on the lists. The death squads targeted the national University of San Carlos throughout the 1960s, killing student leaders and professors alleged to have communist ties. The death squads carried out several high profile kidnappings, tortures and executions; Rogelia Cruz Martinez, Miss Guatemala in 1968, and handicapped Congressman Adolfo Mijangos in 1971 were two of the victims. However, the largest numbers of victims came from the rural areas in Guatemala, “an estimated 8,000 [peasants] from 1966 to 1970” were killed by the death squads (Jonas, 1991, 63). Colonel Arana, soon to be president Arana, was the commanding officer at the base in Zacapa led the effort to eradicate any alleged communists; any members of affiliated organizations along with the alleged supporters or sympathizers of the left, labor, or peasant organizations were targeted in the campaigns of terror.

State sponsored violence continued and intensified during the 1960s and early 1970s. The type and targets of violence during this period were varied; a combination of high profile political targets and unarmed and unaffiliated peasants. Furthermore, the attacks were varied in their outcome. Most of the attacks resulted in death (47.92%), others were tortured (8.05%), physically attacked (10.56%), arbitrarily and indefinitely detained (9.69), forcibly disappeared (7.43), and still others were threatened and intimidated (8.81%).28 Finally, the perpetrators of the attacks varied; although the state was by far the usual perpetrator. At times the responsible parties were the military, paramilitary groups or death squads, and guerrilla groups. The Recovery of Historical Memory Project (REMHI) conducted by the Archdiocese of Guatemala estimated the government was responsible for 89.65% of all incidents (Army 62.9% and Army with paramilitary 20.22%), guerrilla or rebel groups were responsible for 4.81% of all incidents, and paramilitary groups acting alone were responsible for 6.53% of all incidents.

28 REMHI, 289-290. The number of rapes for the period is 152, but this number is thought to be underreported, the number of forcibly disappeared is a separate statistic from those killed. Many of the forcibly disappeared were never found and no account exists to explain their fate.
In the 1970s Colonel Arana concentrated his efforts to eliminate resistance in Zacapa and Izabal in the Northwestern sections of Guatemala. In addition to Guatemala City, these areas housed the greatest support for the guerrilla’s causes. Colonel Arana earned his monikers, “the butcher of Zacapa” and the “Jackal of Zapaca” for his counterinsurgency strategy in the two areas. He initiated the “draining of the sea,” a term used to describe the mass killings of peasants in order to capture or force out members of the FAR, PGT, or M-13 (Jonas, 1991, 68; Handy, 1984, 164). The scorched earth offensive was adopted from the United States’ counterinsurgency efforts in Vietnam the tactics left entire villages annihilated and abandoned. Killings were carried out with the use of aerial bombings of napalm and death squads on the ground.

In addition to the eight thousand peasants killed during Colonel Arana’s military offensive several guerrilla leaders were also tortured and killed: Edgar Ibarra, Alejandro Leon, Yon Sosa, and Otto Rene Castillo (Jonas, 1991, 68). Furthermore, in 1968 members of the MLN kidnapped the archbishop of Guatemala. Their plan was to place blame on the FAR and strengthen the counterinsurgency efforts; however, the plan turned out to be a failure and prominent right-wing supporters were implicated in the kidnapping. The debacle temporarily displaced Colonel Arana to Nicaragua where a sympathetic Anastasio Somoza was the dictator. The debacle also led to the removal of the police chief and head of Mano Blanca. The reprieve was temporary as Colonel Arana was to be elected to the presidency two years later in 1970. The lead up to the 1970 election was a time of further terror and repression in Guatemala; the military commissioners “threatened to burn down whole villages that did not vote for the MLN [party]” and polling places in unsympathetic neighborhoods were closed for the election (Handy, 1984, 167). Several high profile political kidnappings and assassinations took place in the weeks before the election. Voter turnout was especially low during the 1970 election, the killings combined with calls to boycott the election and fear in the general populace meant that it only took 4% of
the population to elect Colonel Arana to the presidency (Handy, 1984, 167). State sponsored violence continued when Colonel Arana replaced President Méndez, death lists were again circulated, the universities were placed under siege, and labor organizers were assassinated. In the six months after Colonel Arana took office there were “700 political killings in Guatemala” and in the 1971 there were “483 people disappeared…nationally known figures-intellectuals, trade union officials, moderate party leaders” (Black, 1984, 30; Handy, 1984, 168). The bodies of those who disappeared were often dumped in public places with notes attached detailing why they were killed. In 1972 eight leaders of the FAR were executed, crippling any growth of the group (Dunkerly, 1988, 460). Domestic groups tracking the violence in Guatemala, such as the Committee of Relatives of the Disappeared, allege that 15,325 people were killed between 1970 and 1973.\(^{29}\) The counterinsurgency had its own internal conflicts, Oliver Castaneda Paiz the leader of Mano Blanca along with four other MLN party members were assassinated in 1972. The assassinations were a result of President Arana consolidating power after he was elected to office in 1970. He eliminated members of the MLN including the leaders of the Mano Blanca death squad to prevent rival groups from challenging his rule in the future. In the beginning of his administration General Arana also had members of the Christian Democrats, professors at San Carlos University, and student leaders assassinated. The REMHI recorded over 300 incidents with multiple victims during General Arana’s regime.

The earthquake in 1976 was a turning point for the worse in Guatemala. The new president, General Laugerud, had slightly relaxed the restrictions on social and community organizing in order to address the fallout from the earthquake. However, the formation and activation of indigenous, peasant and labor organizations after the 1976 earthquake agitated the military, the elites, and foreign investors. Consequently, the government’s violent response over

\(^{29}\) Dunkerly, 460. The CEH (1999) does not report this number for the same time period.
the next few years was severe and sustained. The violence culminated in 1978-1983 under the regimes of General Lucas and General Montt. Similar to the 1950s and 1960s during the late 1970s and 1980s the state was responsible for 93% of the political violence; although, the composition of the responsible parties shifts to include the Civilian Defense Patrols (PACs). The Commission for Historical Clarification (CEH—also termed the Truth Commission) found that PACs were responsible for 18% of all political violence during the early 1980s; 85% of the incidents were carried out under direct army orders. The amount of violence attributed to the guerrilla groups drops to 3% of the total violence. Exacerbating the violent situation in Guatemala were the soaring crime rates in the overcrowded urban areas. Murders, kidnappings, thievery and general lawlessness combined with perpetrator impunity in the shanty towns compounded the fear and tension felt by the local populace.

General Laugerud’s presidency was believed to have been more lenient toward organizing, and less violent than previous or subsequent regimes. However, state sponsored violence existed prior to the earthquake; the Secretary General of the Guatemalan Labor Party (PGT) was assassinated in 1974 and there was increasing military repression in the Ixcán and Ixil areas. State sponsored violence also continues after the earthquake, the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP) killed Luis Arenas Barrera, a well known despotic landowner; the military retaliates by killing members of cooperatives and local organizations in rural Guatemala. General Laugerud has over 100 peasant leaders, village leaders, and priests killed in 1977. In 1978 the massacre at Panzos Alta Verapaz takes place. Approximately 60-100 men, women, and children were killed while peacefully protesting in the town square. Beginning in 1978 the Christian Democrat Party (DCG) was increasingly targeted; approximately 300 DCG activists were killed between 1978 and 1985. The violence continues through his regime in 1979 there were “1,371 political murders and abductions…2,264 in 1980…and 3,426 in 1981” (REMHI, 1999, 211).
Almost immediately after President Lucas was elected and assumed the presidency the Lucas regime engaged in violence against perceived enemies. The first targets were those individuals and leaders protesting the rise in public transportation rates. During the transportation protests forty people were killed, 300 injured and 1,500 were arrested (REMHI, 1999, 212). After assuming the presidency in 1978 “five hundred corpses were found, two hundred of which showed signs of torture” (REMHI, 1999, 212). The Lucas regime targeted any and all perceived enemies whether they were rural or urban, peasants or students, unions or unemployed, attending large gatherings or alone. In June of 1978 the priest from the San Jose Pinula parish was assassinated and one day later a CNT leader Jose Alberto Alvarado was assassinated. Student leaders, politicians, and union leaders were frequently assassinated in broad daylight in urban settings. The violence was shocking and terrifying even in a state plagued by violence for decades.

Labor leaders were an early and preferred target of the Lucas regime. On Labor Day May 1, 1980 thirty-two people were abducted from Guatemala City. On June 21 twenty-seven CNT leaders were abducted, on August 24 seventeen more CNT leaders are abducted; in total during 1980 there were 110 labor leaders killed by the Lucas regime (REMHI, 1999, 212-213). In the 1980s the Lucas regime focused its counterinsurgency efforts in the southwestern highlands where the ORPA was operating. The Guatemalan military killed 60 people at San Juan Cotzal and another 17 CNT leaders in August of 1980. Hundreds of villagers suspected of being sympathetic to ORPA were kidnapped and killed.

In a particularly horrifying incident in 1980 there were thirty-nine people burned alive inside the Spanish Embassy. The victims were peasants from El Quiche who had come to the capital to protest the disappearance of their fellow villagers and demand the removal of the army
from their villages. A Frente Unido de la Revolucion (FUR) party member interceding on their behalf was assassinated. Shortly after his assassination the peasants appeal to the Spanish Ambassador. The Spanish Ambassador was believed to be sympathetic to their cause since at the time most priests were from Spain and the Ambassador knew priests from their area. The Spanish Ambassador warned the Guatemalan government to keep police and military out of the Spanish Embassy. His warnings were not heeded, hundreds of military and police surrounded the embassy, shots were fired and the building was burned down while the police were filmed standing outside watching the building burn (Black, 1984, 99). In addition to the ambassador one peasant survived the fire, he was later abducted from the hospital, tortured, executed and his body dropped at the University of San Carlos (Black, 1984, 99). Seven months later sixty men were gunned down in public square in the Ixil region. Highly visible acts against unarmed civilians solidified a growing connection between the peasant populations and urban ladinos.

Strikes in the sugar, cotton, and coffee sectors in 1980 brought more than 75,000 workers out in solidarity. Striking workers were punished with layoffs, several leaders were assassinated. As the guerrilla groups attracted more followers the repression became more widespread. Counterinsurgency campaigns shifted over the years from primarily targeting leadership and alleged sympathizers to targeting entire villages with no regard for linkage to guerrilla activity. Though they were responsible for very little of the total political violence the guerrilla groups also increased violent activities. In addition to military and police targets, guerrilla groups would target alleged government informants; kidnapping or killing them.

The Lucas administration was responsible for the proliferation of the PACs in 1981. In addition to the physical violence perpetrated by the PACs there was a long lasting psychological violence unleashed by the use of PACs. Civilians were forced to patrol in areas that contained
unarmed and innocent civilians; the individuals were their peers, family members, friends, neighbors, and fellow villagers. The army controlled the PACs, often forcing PAC members to “rape women, torture, mutilate corpses and kill” (CEH, 1999). The purpose of such heinous behavior was to produce “social disintegration” among the indigenous peasant class (CEH, 1999). The CEH records one such instance of combined physical and psychological violence, in the eastern rural region of Guatemala an army controlled PAC comprised of 800 men was “chastised” for failure to find any subversives during the previous weeks. They were sent out again in search of guerrillas, upon returning to their village empty handed the military showed them the corpses of “four PAC members and two local women” (Sanford, 2003, 130-131). The military then “accused the local PAC chief of being a guerilla,” the two men who defended him were likewise accused. PAC members were told to line up as the men were tied to a tree, they were instructed to take a machete, and kill or be killed. The PAC members were instructed by the military “not hit the men with lethal blows because their deaths should be slow to extend their suffering” (Sanford, 2003, 130-131). PAC members were told to bury the bodies when the men were finally killed. A patroller reported to the CEH that “we came home very cold, very frightened. Some of the older men were crying the entire walk…we were all crying” (Sanford, 2003, 130-131).

General Montt’s brief and brutal presidency began at the height of the state sponsored violence in Guatemala. His presidency corresponded with the uniting of the guerrilla and opposition groups. The EGP, ORPA, FAR and PGT joined forces in 1982 to form the Guatemala National Revolutionary Front (UNRG). The united groups publicized their demands, calling for the end to widespread inequality, violence, dependency, and repression. They also called for the establishment of a democratically elected and representative government. In a similar vein the Democratic Front Against Repression joined with the Popular Front and forms the Guatemalan
Committee of Patriotic Unity (GCUP); they too supported the goals of the UNRG, further calling on the international community to condemn the Guatemalan genocide (Handy, 1984, 254).

The Montt regime responded to the highland organizing and opposition with Plan Victoria 82, or Victory 82. Plan Victoria 82 was General Montt’s strategy to break the coalition between the EGP, ORPA, FAR, and PGT. The army employed a scorched earth method for wiping out any and all guerrillas and sympathizers. The army systematically moved through each department known for guerrilla activity; kidnapping, killing, bombing and otherwise terrorizing local populations. PACs were established to keep the order with surviving peasants once villages had been burned or their inhabitants forcibly relocated. Many massacres occur during 1982, including the massacre at Nentón, where 350 people are massacred on a plantation. Another massacre took place in Plan de Sanchez, where the Guatemalan military executed 184 of the villagers and another 84 from a neighboring village. The total killed included infants that had been baptized the same day, children who had been raped and buried alive, and approximately 50 adults who were burned alive in a house (Central America Report, 2005). The villages were attacked after some of their residents had refused to join the PACs.

Under Plan Victoria 82 it was estimated that “5,000 to 10,000 unarmed campesinos were massacred” (Black, 1984, 165). In 1982 the government of Mexico alleged that the Guatemalan military repeatedly crossed the border to attack and kill refugees residing in Mexico. The Mexican government responded by moving the refugees and migrants further inland away from the border. During the 1981 and 1982 both the REMHI and the Guatemalan International Center for Human Rights Research (CIIDH) found that 12% of the victims of state sponsored violence were under the age of 15 years, reflecting the government’s propensity to attack civilians (Central America Report, 1999). The effects of the brief Montt regime were felt in the rural areas for
many years after his removal from office. Villages were destroyed completely, or the villages that remained were populated with orphans, widows and half of their original populations.

Although the number of attacks dropped by nearly 90% after the coup of General Montt, the level of state sponsored violence remained high as General Victores assumed the presidency in 1983. As president, General Victores “encouraged an expanded U.S. presence in the region” and moved quickly to issue internal reforms in the Guatemalan military; retiring any military personnel with outside employment in an attempt to reduce the rampant corruption among the ranks of the officer corps (Handy, 1984, 274). The PACs continued to play a significant role in state sponsored violence and death squads once again roam the highlands. In 1984, under General Victores, the army claimed to have 900,000 members in the PACs accounting for 40% of the male population over 15 (Central America Report, 1990). Patrollers were expected to be on duty for 24 hours at a time a few times a week. During the summer of 1985 there was a period of escalating violence between the guerrillas and the military; attacks on military bases by the EGP and ORPA became more frequent.

Guatemalans were somewhat hopeful after the election of a civilian to the presidency in 1985. In 1986 when President Cerezo took office many in the guerrilla movement were concerned with his choices for cabinet members, nearly all had previous experience in the former military regimes. His defense minister was a former commander in the northern Quiche department and several other officers serving in the Defense department were trained in the United States and are from command posts in the Petén. Perhaps not surprising to many, in January of 1986 President Cerezo announced Decree 8-86, which granted amnesty for all “political and related common crimes committed from 1982-1986” (REMHI, 1999, 246). He blamed the continuing political violence on the “deteriorated” police force. Cerezo’s
administration insinuated that the military had kept the police force ill equipped to control political violence in the urban and rural areas. In April of 1986 as the level of political violence rose the army claimed that the violence was in response to an increase in guerrilla activity in the north, northwest, and southwest of Guatemala. In May of the same year there were 24 killed and seven disappeared in politically related violence. In June the government initiates the “Master Emergency Plan,” calling for a more professionalized police force and the hiring of more police officers to combat the increasing political violence. In the one month following President Cerezo’s announcement to reconstitute the police force there was a rash of political violence including the murder of priests, government workers, family members of government workers, teachers and professors, members of the business sector, President Cerezo’s personal pilot, new military recruits, and ten members of a family in Jutiapa. The victims of the violence were linked by their direct or indirect ties to the investigation of corruption and previous violence. Interestingly, the national police were increasingly implicated as the perpetrators of violence against community organizers and union members and leadership. The violence continued into 1986 as guerrillas and military clashed, 15 guerrilla members, including “Comandante Augusto” of the ORPA were reported killed by the military in the month of June (Central America Report, 1986, 202). By the end of 1986, one year into Cerezo’s civilian presidency, Mexico was pressuring for the return of the more than 40,000 Guatemalan refugees living in and around Campeche and Quinta Roo. However, the continued violence in the areas where Guatemalans would return to limited the amount of Guatemalans returning. During the last three months of 1986 there were “165 killings and 454 kidnappings” (Central America Report, 1986, 380). Also impeding the return of refugees and migrants to their original communities was the continued use of PACs and development poles.
President Cerezo’s term produced mixed results for ending state sponsored violence. When the president was provided with reports from Amnesty International detailing the level and type of human rights violations occurring, he appointed a new human rights ombudsman and renamed several of the offices implicated in the massacres. However, during his tenure the international treaty against torture was signed and ratified, but funding for the investigation of human rights violations and funding for government entities assisting families of state sponsored violence remained low. In 1989 when an American nun, Sister Ortiz, was kidnapped, raped, tortured and finally escapes, the military and national police alleged that her lesbian lover tortured her. The United States Ambassador to Guatemala told the U.S. Secretary of State he believed her abduction and torture story to be a hoax. When faced with international criticism of the human rights situation in Guatemala President Cerezo continuously blamed the violence on “common criminals” and claimed that “to date no political or labor leaders have been attacked.” During President Cerezo’s time in office there was a single successful prosecution of an “extra judicial” killing out of “more than 3,000 registered” killings during his four years (Central America Report, 1990, 357).

State sponsored violence increased again in 1990. The month of June averaged approximately one violation every hour for more than two weeks. The perpetrators and victims were the familiar players, the military controlled PACs, the police and the military were responsible for the vast majority of the political violence, the students, union members, journalists, and opposition party members and leaders were the victims. In the first ten months of 1990 there were “276 political murders and 145 disappearances.” In one particularly flagrant episode 13 villagers were killed with machine guns as 1,500 civilians protested a previous shooting in Santiago Atitlán (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 172). The military continued to use

30 Cited in both the Central America Report for November 1990 page 330, and REMHI 251.
forced recruiting to increase the ranks of the military. In May of 1990 civilian military commissioners kidnap or coerce more than 900 males aged 16-25 into army barracks where they are held against their will. The boys and men were held until the human rights ombudsman arranges for their release. At times the individuals serving in the PACs were victims of violence; on three separate occasions the military killed civilian patrollers without provocation while the individuals were on duty.

The violence in 1990 climaxed near the election and tapered off immediately prior to the election in the presence of international election monitors. Of those killed prior to the election, many were leaders in political parties; some were journalists and community leaders. The violence renewed as soon as the elections were completed. The PACs continued to terrorize the rural regions, attacking innocent civilians and covering up assaults and murders with fabricated allegations linking civilians to guerrilla groups. The growing numbers of international human rights observers operating in Guatemala during the 1990s were becoming a frequent target of the PACs and the military. In 1990 thirteen workers were killed, they were mostly from the CERJ and the GAM, both groups worked to investigate past killings and disappearances. Maria Mejia was one of the members of CERJ who was killed; her husband was also shot and left for dead. The surviving husband identified the shooters and gave eyewitness testimony in court; yet, the shooters were released due to insufficient evidence. Members of the CERJ in areas close to Mejia were threatened with death until they left the area.

One of the most high profile murders to take place in the early 1990s was the murder of Myrna Mack. Mack was a prominent anthropologist and the “foremost researcher on the condition of the internally displaced population”; the mastermind of her murder was captured in the United States, but the other officers and individuals who carried out the stabbing were not
charged (Human Rights Watch, 1990, 178). Luis Miguel Solis Pajarito of the National Council of Displaced (CONDEG) was also kidnapped during this period. He and his family members were repeatedly targeted for their work with refugees; returning refugees and migrants were often a target of the PACs and the military, the military would frequently detain refugees returning with the allegations that the individual was a guerrilla. The individuals who were detained would never be seen again and their whereabouts would remain unknown.

In 1991 President Serrano introduced the Comprehensive Peace Plan. The initial plan called for a cease fire by all parties and a surrender of the guerrilla groups with negotiations over their representation in the political sphere occurring only after they had surrendered. The guerrilla groups viewed the Comprehensive Peace Plan with trepidation due to President Serrano’s perceived weak position. Nevertheless, the plan was still significant since it officially labeled the groups participating in the peace process. However, peace negotiations were derailed soon after the introduction of the Comprehensive Peace Plan when the military began targeting guerrilla groups with renewed fervor in the summer of 1991, under Plan Victoria 93. The UNRG was unwilling to enter into peace negotiations with a government who appeared unable or unwilling to control the military. President Serrano tried unsuccessfully to cull the violence by appointing new military leaders. Despite his efforts the military continued its renewed attacks on guerrilla groups, civilians, justices, and journalists. The military maintained its hold over the domestic police force, as military commanders were appointed to positions with capacity to launch operations.

In 1993 the level of political violence had dropped considerably from the previous year, although the President’s cousin was killed, relatives of previous victims are continuously harassed and threatened and the prosecutors for their cases are nearly assassinated. A group of
armed civilians, the ARAP-KSI, similar to the death squads from earlier periods, routinely took hostages from returning groups of migrants and refugees as they attempted to return to their homes. As a result of the ongoing efforts to resettle the refugee population, Guatemala was often host to hundreds of international human rights observers located throughout the state. Yet, the human rights situation in Guatemala was still rather precarious. The UN mission in Guatemala, MINUGUA, and Human Rights Watch both reported “numerous cases of torture, extrajudicial execution, and disappearances by the security forces” (Human Rights Watch, 1996, 94). Many of the victims were the same types of individuals targeted in earlier decades, students, labor leaders, community organizers, professors, and individuals declining to take part in the PACs. There were also new categories of victims, those individuals bringing a human rights claim against the government forces, the witnesses, judges, attorneys, and investigators participating in the justice system. In June the coordinator for the human rights office in Kakchiquel, Manuel Saquic Vasquez, was disappeared. Subsequently his corpse turned up two weeks later showing signs of torture; his spouse was subsequently threatened until she left the area. Following Vasquez’s death the local security forces delivered a death list to another human rights office with the names of additional human rights investigators apparently marked for death. Investigators homes were routinely attacked, their family members threatened with physical violence and death. Additionally, during 1993 through 1995 the number of businessmen kidnapped increased as the military and business elites realized their economic goals were at odds with one another. The younger military believed they could benefit from privatization, while the older military leaders pushed to keep state owned enterprises from privatization. In October of 1995 the largest massacre of civilians since 1990 took place in the central-northern department of Alta Verapaz; eleven refugees returning from Mexico were massacred by the military. The military continued to harass and threaten journalists, union members and homeless children living in the urban areas.
The final findings of the CEH report in 1999 echoed that of the REMHI report, 200,000 people died in the conflict, and ultimately at least 93% of the killings were attributed to the state, 3% were attributed to the guerrillas, and 4% were undetermined. The state was responsible for 626 separate massacres, the UNRG for 32. The CEH interviewed witnesses concerning over 40,000 violations; their findings implicated not only the state and the guerrilla groups but also the United States, the CIA, the G-2, and the Presidential Military Guard (EMP). The CEH report highlighted the horrors of the political violence, especially the treatment of women and children throughout Guatemala. The CEH noted the frequent use of rape, torture, and the removal of fetuses from the womb before the women were killed. Children were frequently beaten to death, set on fire, had their limbs cut off, were impaled, or thrown into pits alive with the corpses of their parents thrown on top. The CEH report found that the state identified indigenous Mayas as an “internal enemy” to be “exterminated” justice for the victims of the state sponsored violence was not likely, the commission “was prohibited from specifically naming human rights violators under the peace accords agreed by the government and the URNG” (Central America Report, 1999). Though there were technically exceptions to the 1997 Law of Reconciliation, nearly every individual was granted immunity for crimes committed during the 36 year conflict. The slight opening in the Laws of Reconciliation and the findings of the CEH led the Center for Human Rights Legal Action to decide to pursue genocide charges against General Montt. General Montt’s response was to issue the following statement in response to the CEH and the allegations of genocide, “I was never, ever informed of any acts of this nature [genocide]…I never ordered a massacre…I did not consciously do anything against the law” (Central America Report, 1999). The Guatemalan state dismissed the findings of the CEH as “redundant” and refused to comment on the document for several days, the leading newspapers in Guatemala responded similarly to the document. The United States offered a response similar to General Montt’s denial, regarding
its involvement in the conflict, the United States Ambassador states, “everyone knows the historical context in which the conflict took place, but that doesn’t obscure the fact that the violence was committed by Guatemalans against Guatemalans” (Central America Report, 1999). Figure 6.2 below illustrates the levels of political violence between 1950 and 1995 and is described below.

**Figure 6.2**

![Political Violence: Guatemala](image)

In Figure 6.2 the threshold line appears as a nearly constant linear line and was calculated using Morrison and May’s (1994) finding that the threshold for high political violence appears at incidences totaling .001 percent of the population.\(^{31}\) Using the official census numbers the threshold for each year was calculated and entered into the table. The incidences of political violence were taken from the REMHI and the CEH, since neither the REMHI nor the CEH covers

\(^{31}\) Based on Stanley’s (1987) findings, (military) rural sweeps had the same if not more effect on migration, the calculation for the threshold utilized all state sponsored violence as reported by the REMHI and CEH.
the earlier period in the 1950s the numbers for political violence were gathered using a combination of published work. The only large increase in political violence, not directly attributed to the REMHI or the CEH, was the large increase in 1954. This was a result of the purges after the 1954 coup, it was estimated that nearly 8,000 peasants were killed after the coup when Colonel Armas came to power. The measurement for state sponsored violence refers to all political violence perpetrated by the state directly (military) and indirectly (paramilitary death squads and PACs).

**The Framework: Economic Development and State Sponsored Violence**

The framework predicts a causal relationship between economic development and state sponsored violence. The initiating step in this framework was economic development policies which demonstrate a movement from subsistence production to export production, along with modernization of agriculture, diversification of agricultural exports, and implementation of neoliberal economic policies. Within nearly every administration, although with varying degrees of success, this initiating incident occurred. When the state initiates economic development, as previously defined, the next step predicted by the framework is conflict between domestic constituencies, the state responds to this conflict with violence. To further investigate the usefulness of the framework, the following hypotheses are examined: (1) economic development policies matching the framework exist, and are followed by violence and conflict, (2) economic development policies matching the framework exist, and are not followed by violence and conflict, and (3) economic development policies do not match the framework, yet violence exists.

**Initiating Economic Development and High Violence: Pattern Exists**

---

32 Including: Jonas, Black, Handy, Calvert.
33 As mentioned in the previous sections, this figure is supported by multiple authors writing on Guatemala.
Instances of economic development policies matching the framework are found in the following administrations and initiated in the following years: Arbenz in 1950, Armas in 1954, Arana in 1971, Lucas in 1978, Cerezo 1986. In the case of the Armas and Arana administrations the effect of their policies continued long after they held office, as previously explained their successors changed little about economic development policy of the previous administration.

President Arbenz instituted an economic development policy which fit within the framework, yet from 1950-1954 state sponsored violence was low. The violence that did occur during the Arbenz administration was not state sponsored, rather it was elite driven. However, economic development and low violence can be explained by the framework, the contribution from the Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) framework maintains that states can either soothe or aggravate changes to social or economic structures; Arbenz’s administration instituted policies which soothe the economic development and resulted in low violence. President Armas also instituted new economic development policies which fit the description of the framework and from 1954 to 1956 there was a dramatic increase in the amount of state sponsored violence. The predicted pattern was clear during this time period; the state was the perpetrator and the violence occurs following the implementation of a significant change in economic development policy. Although the pattern emerges it was less clear that the state sponsored violence is exclusively tied to the implementation of the economic development policy. Under President Armas the state targeted labor groups and leaders, community organizers, students, professors, and peasants; it was unclear that the destruction of each of these groups was tied solely to the implementation of economic development policies, there appeared to be clear political considerations as well.

President Arana’s institution of economic development policies in 1971 were also accompanied by a corresponding increase in state sponsored political violence; this too fits the pattern predicted by the framework. During President Arana’s administration it was clearer that the victims of state
sponsored violence were linked to economic development policies, the greatest number of victims comes from the areas the state was targeting for agricultural export diversification and forced resettlements. President Lucas in 1978 continued the implementation of economic development policies which fit the framework and were accompanied by high levels of political violence. Again, as was the case with President Armas, there appeared to be a more complicated explanation for the state sponsored violence under President Lucas, than simply the implementation of economic development policies. Most certainly there were many victims of state sponsored violence directly tied to the implementation of economic development policies, for instance striking workers, labor leaders, and community organizers protesting the appropriation of land; yet there were many more that were not as clearly connected. In 1986 President Cerezo implemented a new type of economic development policy, compatible with the framework, and there were corresponding high levels of state sponsored violence. This too fits the pattern but it should be noted that the state sponsored violence under President Cerezo appeared to be indiscriminant to its targets.

Initiating Economic Development and Low Violence: Pattern Does Not Exist

During several periods, given the economic development policies, we would expect to observe high levels of state sponsored violence and instead we observe low levels. From 1955 to 1965 the administrations of President Armas, President Ydígoras, and President Peralta implemented economic development policies which fit the initiating framework. Yet the levels of political violence remained low during these years. It is possible that the violence perpetrated by the state at the beginning of the period in 1954 was sufficient to subdue the domestic population throughout the Ydígoras and Peralta administrations. Also from 1973 to 1974 the level of state sponsored violence was low, despite the implementation of President Arana’s economic
development policies targeting export diversification and development of the Franja. Again, it is conceivable that the spike in state sponsored violence in 1971 subdued the domestic population for a period that extended past the period of state sponsored violence. The final period where there were economic development policies which should have been accompanied by high state sponsored violence, but had low levels of state sponsored violence was in 1993 and 1994 under President Carpio. In this instance it is possible that enough time had passed since the implementation of the economic development policies, that it was no longer necessary to maintain high levels of state sponsored violence.

No Economic Development Policies, High State Sponsored Violence: Pattern Does Not Exist

The lone instance of an economic development policy not matching the framework is in the Montt administration in 1982.\(^{34}\) His economic development policies did not fit the framework and there was the highest levels of state sponsored violence in Guatemala over the entire period. Clearly a portion of the state sponsored violence was by some means related to economic development policies, but since economic development was a function of security it was less clear that this administration fits the pattern developed by the frameworks.

\(^{34}\) This period would also include the administration of General Victores.
Dependent Variable: Intra and Interstate Migration

The end point for the framework being examined is increases and decreases to total migration. As discussed in the previous section, the framework offers two outcomes for the proposed pattern between economic development policies, state sponsored violence, and migration. The first pattern is that economic development proceeds and necessitates state sponsored violence, which in turn leads to an increase in total migration. The second pattern is that economic development is initiated, outcomes are managed by the state, and migration does not increase. The examination of migration in Guatemala 1950-1995 is presented chronologically in the following sections. An examination of the three frameworks follows immediately after the description of migration.

There were few states in the world monitoring and maintaining detailed, well-defined, disaggregated interstate and intrastate migration data during the 1950s. As explained in the methodology section, the migration record for Guatemala is at many times incomplete, poorly classified, and presented as aggregated data. Nonetheless there is a portion of data that can be gleaned from the Guatemalan literature on Mayas, agriculture, demographics and economics. In any particular year seasonal intrastate migration, intrastate migration, interstate migration, refugee, asylum, or internally displaced persons data is more readily available than in other years.

During the 1950s approximately 99,000 Guatemalans migrated seasonally for intrastate employment. By 1960 the number of migrants had risen to 152,000 (Smith, 1978, 590). Factoring in the growth in the total population during this same time period approximately 3.27% of the population was migrating for seasonal employment in 1950 and 3.83% in 1960; resulting in a 14% increase for 1950-1960. The 1960s and early 1970s show similar patterns of seasonal intrastate migration. General Arana led attempts to diversify agricultural exports with the introduction of cotton, a highly labor intensive agricultural crop. Cotton crops did not grow
equally well in all regions of Guatemala. In the higher humidity departments crops tend to be more susceptible to diseases, cotton in particular. The cultivation of cotton was most successful in the dry regions, such as Zacapa. Although, more humid areas like Escuintla and Retalhuleu were also known for their cotton cultivation, heavy use of insecticides had allowed cotton to grow well in these areas (Calvert, 1985, 156). Approximately 300,000 to 400,000 laborers were needed each season to harvest cotton; all cotton was harvested by hand in Guatemala during this time period (Calvert, 1985, 156). The recruitment of migrant workers for the harvest of cotton was more difficult than the other crops. Harvesting cotton was described as “harder and of shorter duration, [and] the living conditions are worse” than with other crops (Handy, 1984, 206). The seasonal migrants work long hours, fourteen hours a day, and were frequently poisoned from frequent and prolonged aerial fumigation in the more humid departments. Additionally the harvest of cotton was shorter than the harvests for coffee; cotton typically lasted seventy-four days and coffee lasted ninety-nine days (Dunkerly, 1988, 192). Seasonal intrastate migration increased during the 1960s and 1970s to approximately 400,000-1,000,000 seasonal migrants per year. This represents approximately 8-20% of the population; the change in seasonal migration from the 1950s to the 1960s and 1970s was significant.

There were additional crops, such as sugarcane and bananas which also seasonally bring migrant workers to the southern coast of Guatemala for three to four months at a time. Men, women and children were transported on flatbed trucks and railways to the large plantations. The migrants were then confined to dormitories described by the ILO as “totally unacceptable with regard to hygiene, health, education and mortality” (Black, 1984, 34). Shelters were often open air; the electricity, food, and water were most often supplied by the migrants themselves. Approximately “7% of coffee workers and 30% of sugarcane and cotton workers” were infected with Malaria and suffered from other diseases related to unsanitary conditions (Handy, 1984,
Migrants, and their children, routinely died during the harvest and back home, from pesticide poisoning, malaria, and other waterborne pathogens from unsanitary living conditions. Due to increasing poverty and landlessness and despite the poor conditions, migrant workers continued to meet the employment demands of the agricultural sector. During the 1960s and 1970s the migration of 400,000 to 1,000,000 laborers per annum represented a movement of approximately 8%-25% of the population in 1960s and 7%-17% of the population in the 1970s. The total amount of seasonal migration had increased significantly from the earlier periods marked by forced seasonal migration. Over the same time period the number of permanent laborers, those individuals living and working on plantations, dropped from 80,000 to 74,000 despite an increase in total population.

An indicator signifying lifetime migration or long-term migration could be measured in part by the rate of urbanization. Urbanization in Guatemala had consistently increased since the 1950s. Most urbanization occurred as laborers migrated to Guatemala City. Migrants often set up residence in the shanty towns located minutes outside of Guatemala City. The urbanization rates in Guatemala were 25% in 1950, 33.6% in 1960, 35% in 1970, 37.4% in 1980, 39.4% in 1990 and 42% in 1995. Urbanization continued to increase despite the high levels of unemployment, underemployment, and participation in the informal sector. Approximately “56 percent to 70 percent of the total urban population” in Guatemala City was unemployed or underemployed (Jonas, 1991, 64). The high levels of unemployment and underemployment, beginning in the 1960s and continuing through the 1990s, were due to the levels of urban growth rates greatly outpacing urban employment opportunities; “the employable population increased seven times faster than the number of urban employed” (Jonas, 1991, 65).

Patterns of intrastate migration show long-term movement away from the east, west, and north central regions. According to Guatemala’s 1981 national census the east region lost
223,901 persons, the west lost 121,388 persons and the north central lost 34,007 from the last census in 1973 (Micklin, 1990, 170). Regions gaining population within Guatemala include the north, central and southern regions with 105,358, 241,055, and 32,883 respectively (Micklin, 1990, 170). By the early 1990s the population in the Petén had increased from approximately 25,000 in 1964 to 300,000 in the 1990s. Guatemala City was the largest recipient of short and long-term migrants and displaced persons with an addition of 245,650 (Micklin, 1990, 170). Patterns of intrastate migration indicate that non-Indian, ladino populations migrated at significantly higher rates than indigenous populations.

Interstate migration during the 1960s and early 1970s demonstrated a negative emigration rate every year, meaning more people left Guatemala than entered. The emigration rate ranged from a low of -.4 in 1970-1972 to a high of -1.6 in 1966 (Peterson, 52). The average rate for the 1960s was -1.28 and -.79 in the 1970s; approximately 68,619 Guatemalans emigrated from Guatemala (Peterson, 50). This was similar to the other Central American states during the same time period, other than Costa Rica. Each Central American state had a negative net emigration rate for the 1960s and 1970s (Belize -5.28, El Salvador -.29, Honduras -2.64, Mexico -2.30, Nicaragua -1.83, Panama -1.35) (Peterson, 52). Interstate emigration rates increased substantially in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1980 and 1981 the net emigration rates were skewed by the entry of approximately 180,000 Salvadorans.35 After adjusting for the influx of Salvadoran refugees the net emigration rate in the 1980s was approximately -3.47% and in the 1990s it was -6.9%.

Seasonal interstate labor migrated to the United States and Mexico, in the 1990s approximately 87,000 Guatemalan laborers were working legally in Mexico and approximately 160,000 more were working as undocumented laborers (MPI, Guatemala).

35 In the 1980s El Salvador was in the midst of a violent civil war pitting small rebel groups against government forces.
Detailed monitoring of displaced persons and refugees was not readily available prior to the 1970s. The movement of the number of refugees and displaced Guatemalans takes place in the 1980s. Estimates from the United Nations, U.S. State Department, and domestic institutions and groups vary from one million to one and a half million refugees and displaced persons during the early 1980s. In 1982 the Catholic Church released their estimate of the displaced population, claiming that one-seventh of the population had been displaced within and outside of Guatemala. Approximately 70% had returned to their departments after General Montt declared amnesty in 1982. The remainders of the refugees were to be resettled in Guatemala; the Guatemalan state government created the Special Commission for Repatriate Assistance (CEAR) in 1986 and worked with the United Nations and Mexico to develop programs to facilitate return migration, or resettlement, of refugees and displaced persons. Most often returnees were placed in model villages, or development poles, designed and managed by the military. The model villages held many more internally displaced persons compared with refugees. Under the National Plan for Security and Development the army forcibly relocated “42,000 people in the Ixil Triangle alone…the entirety of the population in the affected area” are placed into model villages (Asociacion para el Avance de las Ciencias Sociales en Guatemala, 13). In 1987 there were an estimated 800,000 people living in model villages throughout Guatemala with “plans to extend the program to other areas” (Micklin, 1990, 181). In 1985 there were 46,000 refugees that were officially recognized in Mexico by the Mexican Commission for Assistance to Refugees (COMAR). There were an estimated 150,000 additional refugees that were not officially recognized; 60,000 in Chiapas alone (Salvado, 1988, 1). Fewer Guatemalan refugees were also found in Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Belize and Panama; the United States State Department gave the lowest estimate at 1,000 and the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees estimated 7,000 (Salvado, 1988, 3). Part of the issue with securing an accurate
displaced persons and refugee measurement is that individuals are at times classified as refugees and at other times they are classified as migrant laborers. In 1985, of the over 300,000 refugees living in Mexico and the 500,000+ displaced persons in Guatemala, only 18,000 have been officially resettled by the military (Central America Report, 1985, 269). Return migration was difficult since migrants are often labeled as subversives and are attacked or killed as they return. Migrants returning in 1987 to the department of Huehuetenango were required to sign an amnesty form clearing the military of any violations (REMHI). In 1986 the Guatemalan state created the Special Commission for Repatriate Assistance (CEAR). Additionally, in the mid 1980s Guatemala was a receiving state for refugees from El Salvador and Nicaragua, until 1986 when the number of refugees from the two states dropped to approximately 12,000.

Figure 6.3 illustrates the total amount of intrastate migration, interstate migration, and internally displaced persons/refugees over time. The level of intrastate migration remained steady between 1950 and 1955. Intrastate migration levels then increased steadily from approximately 1955-1956 through 1976. From the mid-1970s until 1986 intrastate migration hit a plateau and then increased into the 1990s. The level of interstate migration grew steadily from 1950 through 1980, albeit at much smaller amount than intrastate migration in every year. In 1980 the level of interstate migration began to increase steadily, in 1986 the increases in interstate migration began to taper off, although interstate migration does not completely plateau. The numbers of internally displaced persons and refugees in Guatemala was low from 1950 to 1970, at which point it increases dramatically at the start of the 1980s. The numbers of internally displaced persons and refugees remained high, though declining throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s. From 1950 to 1970 total migration closely follows the reported levels of intrastate migration. In the 1970s the level of total migration increased to match the significant increases in internally displaced persons and refugees.
The monitoring and maintenance of internally displaced persons and refugees prior to the 1970s was nearly non-existent in Guatemala. The data kept by neighboring states was often aggregated data from the entire region. As a result, from 1950 to approximately 1970 there is no reliable data for this study. The steep increase from approximately 1971 through the early 1980s, may not have been as steep of an increase given the number of internally displaced persons and refugees in and outside of Guatemala that may have existed in the periods prior.
Chapter 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This case study addressed three questions: (1) how does official economic development policy in a developing state affect intra and interstate migration? (2) how does state sponsored violence affect intra and interstate migration? (3) what is the relationship between economic development, state sponsored violence, and migration? The framework did offer explanations to the questions posited above; however, clear patterns did not always emerge. At least half of the time the predicted patterns were temporarily disrupted or were to some extent contradictory to what was predicted by the framework. The relationships between development and violence, violence and migration, and economic development, violence, and migration are summarized in table 7.1 on the following page, and are discussed in the sections immediately following.
Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1. Administration</th>
<th>2. Economic Development</th>
<th>Political Violence High/Low</th>
<th>Total Migration</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Pattern Exists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950-54</td>
<td>President Arbenz</td>
<td>Export led growth through economic modernization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>405,528</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Armas</td>
<td>State intervention in economy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>408,524</td>
<td>Intrastate &lt;1% Interstate 64% Total Increase .74%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ydígoras</td>
<td>Crop diversification Land concentration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>808,938</td>
<td>Intrastate 49% Interstate 89% Total Increase 50%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Peralta</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,012,563</td>
<td>Intrastate 21% Interstate 18% Total Increase 20%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-78</td>
<td>General Arana</td>
<td>Increase in non-traditional exports Land concentration Subsidies for coffee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1,149,552</td>
<td>Intrastate 12% Interstate -54% Total Increase -54%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Laugerud</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2,610,145</td>
<td>Intrastate 19% Interstate 43% R/IDP 98% Total Increase 56%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-82</td>
<td>General Lucas</td>
<td>Land concentration Development in the Franja</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2,276,922</td>
<td>Intrastate -1% Interstate 64% R/IDP -33% Total Decrease -13%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-85</td>
<td>General Montt</td>
<td>Security over development Development poles</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2,288,875</td>
<td>Intrastate -2% Interstate 47% R/IDP -5% Total Decrease -5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-95</td>
<td>President Cerezo</td>
<td>Austerity Neoliberal Structural Adjustment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2,168,875</td>
<td>Intrastate 23% Interstate -12% R/IDP -64% Total Decrease -5%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development and Violence

The framework predicts that economic modernization or diversification in agriculture and the economic development policies implemented by the state result in violence perpetrated by the state. The Guatemalan case study seemed to provide ample evidence of this same pattern. Colonel Armas’s economic development policies included the reversal of land reform and the diversification of export crops to include cotton and sugar, both of which led to the concentration of land. Political violence was high during the first year of the implementation of the program. Approximately 15 years later, in 1971, General Arana instituted a new economic development policy. His strategies included developing the northern transverse strip, introducing the cultivation of cattle and the promotion of non-traditional exports while subsidizing coffee production and export. There was a corresponding rise in state sponsored violence between 1971 and 1972 during the introduction of this development policy. In 1978 General Lucas also pursued aggressive development in the Franja along with substantial state subsidies for private-military ventures; this economic policy resulted in a substantial movement toward the concentration of land ownership. General Lucas’s administration frequently used state sanctioned political violence to accomplish economic goals. However, it should be noted that violence was high before General Lucas took office and implemented his development strategy; it is less clear in this instance that General Lucas’s policies contributed to or were a causal factor for the increased violence. In 1982 General Montt introduced the notion of security over development and the extensive use of the development poles in rural areas. Similar to General Lucas in 1978, the level of political violence was already high when General Montt implemented his economic policies. Although in General Montt’s case it was clearer that the rise in state sponsored violence was related to efforts to increase security and not to development policies. President Cerezo’s 1986 austerity measures and President Serrano’s 1989 neoliberal structural adjustment policies also
coincided with high levels of political violence; although again the violence is ongoing. At the very least, there appeared to be a relationship between the introduction of economic development policies and an increase or maintenance of a high level of state sanctioned violence. With the exception of President Arbenz’s administration, there were no instances documented during the 1950 to 1995 time period when significant economic policies were implemented and levels of political violence were low, during the first year of implementation.

**Violence and Migration**

The framework predicts that high levels of political violence have an effect on the amount of intra and interstate migration. When violence is low economic variables provide more explanatory power. In the Guatemalan study there were periods of high violence which corresponded with increasing total migration, such as 1966-1967, 1976-1980, and 1986-1990. There are also periods of high political violence that correspond with decreasing migration such as 1982-1985 and 1991-1992; although in these periods total migration remains significantly higher than the rest of the periods. In the mid-1980s a large decline in the number of displaced persons reduced the total movement of individuals and offset any increases to interstate migration. Additionally, low political violence does not always correspond with low migration, during 1955-1965, 1968-1970, and 1973-1974 there was low political violence and increasing migration. A possible explanation for the divergent results from Morrison (1993) and Morrison and May (1994) is that their studies measured only the effect of violence on interstate migration. In this study total intra and interstate migration was measured.

However, these findings seem to indicate a few additional explanations for the increases and decreases to migration beyond simple economic factors. In addition to the lag time described by Stanley (1987), between the peak of political violence and the peak of migration, there may be strong residual effects from high levels of political violence that effect migration patterns for
years following the violence, as appears to be the case during the regimes of Armas, Peralta and Arana. Each administration was responsible for a significant increase in political violence during the first year in office and total migration remained high for many years following the violence. This phenomenon may extend Morrison and May’s (1994) reasoning, in that a certain threshold of violence may spur migration for a length of time proportional to the violence; intense violence over the threshold of total violence may result in prolonged migration. Also, the findings seem to indicate that the effects of political violence may be different for intra and interstate migration; intrastate migration might be subject to a saturation effect. This saturation effect might mean that at certain levels of state sanctioned political violence individuals do not perceive any increased utility in intrastate migrating; no safe places remain within the state so individuals stop migrating. It is also possible that the large numbers of migrants over an extended period of time have depleted the possible pool of intrastate migrants to a point where those who remain lack the necessary resources to leave the area. The separate effects for intra and interstate migration and the saturation effect can be seen during the administration of General Lucas and General Montt. During both administrations state sanctioned violence remained high throughout, yet total migration decreased (intrastate decrease, interstate increase) over the period. An alternative explanation to the saturation effect may be that the state has achieved total control over the movement of people; there are those who would engage in migration but are unable to do so due to state control in a given department. This explanation seems less likely since migrants are still able to engage in interstate migration during these periods.

Development, Violence, and Migration

In Table 7.1 shown above, the elements of the previous tables and illustrations have been merged. Table 7.1 illustrates how researchers could come to different conclusions about migration if they were only measuring intrastate migration, or interstate migration, or refugees
The predicted patterns of economic development, violence and migration are not always clearly distinguished. In Hamilton and Chinchilla’s (1991) previous study the framework was very generally applied to each of the states in Central America, with El Salvador as the case study. Hamilton and Chinchilla (1991) claimed to have clearly linked capital penetration (economic development), the reaction of the state(s), and intra and interstate migration. They provided evidence that in states where capital penetration was accompanied by land reform and social spending (soothing effects) state violence and total migration was lower (Costa Rica); in states where capital penetration was accompanied by land concentration and repression of labor (aggravating effects), state violence and total migration was higher (El Salvador). In some instances the Guatemalan case study mimics the Salvadoran case study; both states often chose to antagonize or accelerate the negative aspects of economic development by (violently) facilitating land concentration, offering subsidies to large plantation owners, (violently) repressing labor and community organizing, and both states subsequently experience increasing levels of total migration. However, there were an equal number of times when the pattern did not appear to emerge as obviously in Guatemala. During certain administrations, General Ydígoras, General Peralta, and General Arana, the expected patterns were visible only for a short time period. During these periods there was often economic development, a high level of state violence, and a decrease in total migration. In each of these instances total migration was decreasing, but the overall levels of total migration remained significantly higher than in other periods.

An ability to predict the duration and magnitude of the effects of state sponsored violence on total migration is lacking in the framework. Since the framework does not seem to predict duration or magnitude there are several instances where the pattern appears not to exist; yet, intuitively it seems entirely plausible that the effects of intense political violence were still driving total migration even though the total number of violent acts being committed had dropped
below the threshold for that particular year. This case study illustrates the need for a more comprehensive comparative study, to determine under what conditions and for what length of time the predicted patterns are likely to emerge. Furthermore, this case study illustrates the need for further examination of the effects of economic development and violence on interstate and intrastate migration. By simply focusing on receiving states more than half of migration patterns are overlooked. If domestic populations are susceptible to saturation effects then intrastate migration may play an important role in shaping the flows of interstate migration, especially during periods of prolonged violence.
APPENDIX A

Table A.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Regime Type</th>
<th>How it ended/Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1951</td>
<td>Juan Jose Arévalo</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Election/4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1954</td>
<td>Colonel Jacobo Arbenz</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Coup/3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1954 to September 1954</td>
<td>4 Military Juntas with multiple members</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Consecutively replaced by new military juntas until resigned in favor of Colonel Armas/2 days-2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1957</td>
<td>Colonel Armas</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Assassinated/11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Gonzalez-Lopez</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coup/3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Military Junta</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Congress appoints new leader/4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1958</td>
<td>Flores-Avendano</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coup/4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1963</td>
<td>General Ydígoras</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coup/5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1966</td>
<td>General Peralta</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Elections/3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1970</td>
<td>Méndez Montenegro</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Elections/4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1974</td>
<td>General Arana</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Elections/4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1978</td>
<td>General Laugerud</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Elections/4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1982</td>
<td>General Lucas</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coup/3 years, 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>General Rios Montt</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Coup/1 year, 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1986</td>
<td>General Mejía Víctores</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Elections/2 years, 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1991</td>
<td>Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo</td>
<td>Semi-democratic</td>
<td>Elections/5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1993</td>
<td>Jorge Serrano Elias</td>
<td>Semi-democratic</td>
<td>Dismissed/2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1996</td>
<td>De Leon Carpio</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Elections/2 years, 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GDP US$ (million)</td>
<td>GDP Growth Rate</td>
<td>GDP Per Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>(1949) 447</td>
<td>1950-1960 3.8</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>600 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>200 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>100 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1348.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1422.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1481.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>300 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1611.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>600 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1687.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1783.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1883.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2021.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2174.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3,161.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3,645.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4,365.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5,480.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6,070.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6,902.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7,878.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GDP US$ (million)</td>
<td>GDP Growth Rate</td>
<td>GDP Per Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8,607.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>8,716.9</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>9,050.0</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>9,470.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>9,721.6</td>
<td>-.6</td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7,231.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>7,084.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>7,841.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8,410.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7,650.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9,406.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>10,440.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11,399.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>12,983.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14,656.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15,781.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>17,788.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19,393.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18,317.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,290.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18,701.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20,776.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21,915.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24,037.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27,270.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,024,000</td>
<td>1950-1955 42.0</td>
<td>1950-1955 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3,189,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3,264,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,356,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3,452,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3,545,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3,643,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,742,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>1955-1960 44.2</td>
<td>1955-1960 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,969,000</td>
<td>1960-1965 47</td>
<td>1960-1965 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4,094,000</td>
<td>1960-1965 47</td>
<td>1960-1965 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4,220,000</td>
<td>1960-1965 47</td>
<td>1960-1965 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>4,343,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4,470,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4,595,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4,861,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4,996,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5,129,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,262,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,407,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5,572,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5,743,000</td>
<td>1965-1970 50.1</td>
<td>1965-1970 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5,58</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>5,74</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6,05</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6,24</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6,43</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6,36</td>
<td>1975-1980 56.2</td>
<td>1975-1980 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Year   | Population | Life Expectancy | Infant Mortality
(1000 live births) | Adult Literacy | Access to Clean Water | Urbanization | Population Per Physician | ODA US$ (million) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>240.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>235.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>262.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>212.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>208.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male-38 Female-51%</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>208.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


***International Migration Statistics in the 1966 Statistical Abstract of Latin America did not keep migration numbers for Guatemala, only Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, and Venezuela
Figure A.1 CEH Violence Indicators

Principal human rights violations and acts of violence
GUATEMALA (1962-1996)

NOTE: The lines of the vertical scales – number of violations – follow a progression of multiples of ten.

SOURCE: CEH Database
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