UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
For Every Indio Who Falls: A History of Maya Activism in Guatemala, 1960–1990. By Betsy Konefal.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/443769jh

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(2)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Carey, David, Jr.

Publication Date
2012-03-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

that Sioux children do not lack culture: what they and their families lack is power, that is, the power to run their own program to suit their own needs. Wax's analysis provides a transition from the ill-fated and ill-named "termination" policy to the emerging "self-determination" policy. Deloria's self-described "manifesto" launches self-determination with a vengeance. In his scathing attack on anthropologists, the BIA, churches, and other Indian "friends," Deloria calls for "retribalization," and as he predicted, the landmark legislation of the 1970s, including the Indian Child Welfare Act, Indian Education Act, and Indian Self-Determination Act, all set the stage for transferring the locus of power from top-down, white-run organizations to newly organized Indian-controlled communities, reservation and urban.

Ruby's *A Doctor among the Oglala Sioux* is a valuable source for scholars interested in the history of service in the BIA or in white attitudes toward Indians during the 1950s when major policy shifts were being undertaken. The introduction in particular contains a gem, a concise history of Indian health policy as it relates to one reservation from the nineteenth century to the present. It could stand alone if included in a course on the history of Indian policy, medical anthropology, or general public policy.

Ann Metcalf
Mills College

For Every Indio Who Falls: A History of Maya Activism in Guatemala, 1960–1990. By Betsy Konefal. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2010. 264 pages. $28.95 paper.

Fascinated by a newspaper photograph of Mayans protesting military violence that appeared on July 30, 1978 in *El Gráfico*, a Guatemalan daily, historian Betsy Konefal set off on a journey, one that ultimately guided the research informing her book *For Every Indio Who Falls: A History of Maya Activism in Guatemala, 1960–1990*. The protests were in response to the killing of at least thirty-five people and the injury of dozens more when the army opened fire on hundreds of Q'eqchi' Maya in the town of Panzos in Alta Verapaz. Occurring just a few months later, this public protest against the government and military was extremely risky. As documented by the United Nations and the Catholic Church, the military committed acts of genocide over the next few years en route to destroying hundreds of Mayan communities. Konefal's search for the Mayan activists who appeared in the photograph resulted in a detailed study of the myriad ways the Maya understood the root causes of official violence and how they responded to it.

For Every Indio Who Falls is a welcome addition to the rich literature on Guatemala's civil war (1960–96) and Mayan understandings of it. Building on Greg Grandin's fine study *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War* (2004), Konefal expertly draws connections between the agrarian and revolutionary protests and the culturalist and linguistic movements guided by Mayan intellectuals (adeptly analyzed by anthropologist Kay Warren in *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*, 1998). Addressing these movements together enables Konefal to demonstrate how each pushed the other to sharpen and, at times, expand their critiques and strategies.

The tension between class and ethnic identities is at the heart of Konefal's study, particularly as they are used to explain oppression. In contrast to Ladino (nonindigenous Guatemalan) and some Mayan revolutionaries, who argued that economic exploitation was the primary source of the nation's injustices, many activists insisted that racism was the most toxic force facing the Maya. Although most activist groups recognized that oppression was not singular, they also tended to pursue agendas that prioritized one source of repression over the other. At times these perspectives became polarized to the point of defying resolution: some leftists accused Mayas who advocated for indigenous rights of being counterrevolutionaries. Often, differences played out more subtly. For example, though dominated by Maya, the Committee for Peasant Unity worked hard not to appear solely indigenous. Konefal's astute analysis eschews essentialist portrayals of these different approaches by demonstrating the ways Mayan activists understood the multiple oppressions they faced even as they prioritized their battles.

Because of growing divisions within Mayan communities, and particularly the exploitation of working class and poor denizens by Maya elites, most Maya had nuanced understandings of the multiple forms of racial and class discrimination. In her 1974 farewell speech, one K'iche' *reina indígena* (indigenous queen) called for "the well-being of our campesino brothers who are vilely exploited, not only by foreigners but also by our own race" (92). By the late 1970s, some activists such as Victoriano Alvarez and Ricardo Cajas proposed dismantling Guatemala's class and racial barriers in tandem. The 1978 protest photograph in *El Gráfico* is but one example of Maya who differed in their perspective on how to address Guatemala's injustices, but together opposed a violent state. As Konefal points out, however, such alliances generally rested on shaky ground. In the 1980 Declaration of Iximché, indigenous leaders articulated multiple forms of oppression and explicitly allied themselves with agrarian and armed revolutionary movements. Yet afterwards, while these movements increasingly embraced Mayan perspectives and concerns, they remained reluctant to welcome Maya as movement leaders.

One fascinating aspect of Konefal's study is how Maya co-opted the otherwise derogatory term *indio* by using it to identify themselves and their movements and in the process inverting the word's meaning. This appropriation was already underway in early twentieth-century courtrooms and municipal offices, but by the 1970s it played out on a national stage. As Antonio Pop Caal explained in a 1972 article in the Guatemalan journal *La Semana*, accepting *indio* as a word that "brings us honor rather than denigration . . . signifies nothing less than a challenge to Ladinos" (61).

In contrast to her fine-grained analysis of class and ethnicity, and although the actions and words of *reinas indígenas* and other women play a central role in her study, Konefal's gender analysis is less effective. Her rich descriptions of the *Reina Indígena* pageants, extensive quotes from contestants' speeches, and attention to the way they deployed *traje* or traditional dress shed light on how, prior to the 1980s, Mayan women were able to use their positions as symbols of indigenous and national identity to protest state violence without being seen as subversive—a unique position men did not enjoy. Yet Konefal steers clear of addressing gender discrimination within the movements, even though the case of female informants raises complex issues. As the Kaqchikel Maya activist and former congresswoman Rosalina Tuyuc notes: "It shouldn't be the men who speak for our pain and certainly not the government who speaks for what we suffer: illiteracy, misery, poverty, illness, repression. It is we women who must tell the world about the reality we live in" (168). Konefal provides a forum for women's perspectives of national politics and the civil war, but does not fully analyze the internal workings of activist and revolutionary organizations from a gendered perspective.

Newspapers and indigenous activists' writings inform her book, but much of her primary source material comes from interviews. Readers of this journal may be disappointed that she does not address how her interview methodology affected her research. Although most of her interviewees were Maya, Konefal conducted the interviews in Spanish. For researchers who work with Maya in Guatemala (and indigenous peoples more broadly), the relationship between language and power is crucial, and a consideration of how linguistic limitations affected her findings and analyses would have been helpful. Further, language is a common concern among Maya. For example, Q'anjob'al Maya speaker asked geographer and historian W. George Lovell, "How is it possible to write a book about our people without knowing our language?" (*A Beauty That Hurts: Life and Death in Guatemala*, 2001, 3). This is a question that should be addressed by researchers. Of course, because her informants spoke such diverse languages as Q'anojb'al, K'ichee', and Tz'utujil, learning each of the languages of her informants would have added years to her research. Nonetheless, learning one might have enhanced her rapport with those who spoke others.

Because Konefal neglects to situate her study in a longer trajectory of Mayan and Guatemalan history, at times it seems ahistorical. Historians in the United States and Guatemala have documented Mayan organizing and their relationship to national leaders and governments during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet chapter 2, "Mayas Mobilized," suggests that Maya first began to mobilize and develop connections to national politics during the mid-1940s. Placing her findings within a broader longitudinal context would have allowed Konefal to contribute to historical debates about how Mayan relationships with the state, Ladinos, and each other have changed over time.

These omissions notwithstanding, *For Every Indio Who Falls* is a rich and insightful book. Engagingly written, and grounded in the voices of Mayan activists, it will help scholars rethink the role ethnicity played in Guatemala's civil war.

David Carey Jr.
University of Southern Maine

Getting Good Crops: Economic and Diplomatic Survival Strategies of the Montana Bitterroot Salish Indians, 1870–1891. By Robert J. Bigart. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010. 304 pages. $39.95 cloth.

A life-long resident of the Flathead Indian Reservation of Western Montana, and long-term editor at the Salish Kootenai College Press, also on the Flathead Indian Reservation, historian Robert Bigart is supremely qualified to write a book about the history of the Salish people. *Getting Good Crops* focuses on the Bitterroot Salish, a group who resisted moving to the Flathead Indian Reservation after the Treaty of 1855 because, according to their interpretation of the treaty, the US government allowed them to retain their homelands in Western Montana's Bitterroot River Valley as their permanent residence. Government interpreted the treaty differently (as did the white immigrants who then moved into the Salish territory), arguing that all Salish, or the Flathead as they were mistakenly called, should join the Kootenai and the Pend d'Oreille at the Flathead Indian Reservation. Bigart focuses his book on the last two decades when the Bitterroot Salish were still in their beloved homelands, trying to carve an existence amid government removal efforts and often-hostile immigrant whites.

Bigart argues that the Salish people's determined diplomatic dealings with the government and immigrant local whites, as well as their economic survival strategies, helped them to maintain a peaceful coexistence with whites that against all odds allowed them to maintain residence in their homelands. It