OXFORD

The Spatiality of Boundary Work: Political-Administrative Borders and Maya-Mam Collective Identification

Jeffrey A. Gardner[1] and Patricia Richards[2]

[1]Sam Houston State University, [2]University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

How does the collective identification of indigenous peoples who span contemporary state borders align with and diverge from those borders? This article analyzes how the Mam, an indigenous people divided by the Guatemala-Mexico border, identify collectively. We further existing sociological literature on collective identity "boundary work" by demonstrating how it is shaped by spatial, and not just symbolic, boundaries. Mam individuals and organizations define symbolic boundaries that sustain political-administrative borders (such as municipal divisions within Guatemala and Guatemala's border with Mexico) in some cases and conflict with them in others. We suggest that state borders and collective identification boundaries become incongruous and contested as social contexts shift and conclude that the symbolic struggle of how to identify as a collectivity has material, and potentially spatial, consequences.

KEYWORDS: boundary work; collective identities; indigenous peoples; Mam; cross-border nations.

Social scientists frequently tie societies, cultures, and nations to specific states, failing to articulate conflicting boundaries between some nations and states (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Lamont and Molnár 2002; Rosaldo 1989). In fact, many indigenous nations are fragmented—geographically, socially, culturally, and politically—by state borders. Indeed, conceptualizing peoples as nations bounded within state borders is especially problematic for indigenous nations that span state borders (such as the Mapuche across the Chile-Argentina border, the Tohono O'odham across the Mexico-U.S. border, and the Maya-Mam across the Guatemala-Mexico border). These peoples can be characterized as "cross-border nations" (Warren 2013).

Struggles to gain recognition as cross-border nations do not typically involve a demand for statehood. Rather, they entail seeking collective rights such as territory and self-determination, consultation and informed consent (on the part of governments from both countries) about projects that will impact their territory and the natural resources therein, and the ability to develop and maintain

relationships across the border for cultural, political, economic, or social purposes (United Nations 2008). How do state borders, as well as forms of collective identification that emerge in relation to them, impede or facilitate the collective rights of cross-border nations? Addressing this question calls for understanding how the boundary work entailed by processes of collective identification occurs in relation to constructed spatial boundaries, rather than merely symbolic or metaphorical ones. To take on this task, we bridge sociological literature on collective identification and the interdisciplinary literature on indigenous peoples. The literature on indigenous peoples helps us understand that collective identification is spatially rooted in ancestral territories (Basso 1996; Silko 1981). But this work frequently treats collective identity as a given, failing to account for how the indigenous actively construct the boundaries of their collective identification. In contrast, the sociological literature helps us understand that all collectivities create, modify, and maintain symbolic boundaries to define who is and is not part of the collective (Nippert-Eng 2002; Owens, Robinson, and Smith-Lovin 2010). Indeed, social networks continually shape identification (Stryker 2008). However, unlike the literature on indigenous peoples, sociologists rarely address how place, space, and scale shape identification. By addressing ongoing efforts to construct and gain recognition for cross-border indigenous nations through a perspective that bridges these two literatures, we demonstrate that while historical political-administrative borders may constrict indigenous peoples' collective imaginings, some forms of collective identification can challenge those political-administrative divisions.

We do not wish to reify political-administrative borders, however. We recognize that these borders are products of sociopolitical and historical processes involving the construction of symbolic boundaries around notions of "us" and "them." Nonetheless, the geopolitical character of these borders has important material effects on how people carry out their everyday lives and identify collectively. By integrating the spatial and the symbolic in our analysis, we show how they are, in fact, co-constituting. We examine the relationship between state borders and collective identification through the case of the Maya-Mam, an indigenous people divided by the contemporary Guatemala-Mexico border. Part of a larger project addressing both sides of the border, we focus here on the Guatemalan side. Specifically, we ask: how does Mam collective identification in Guatemala align with and diverge from the state's political-administrative borders? And how do these alignments and divergences hinder or facilitate Mam rights as a cross-border nation?

Our theoretical contribution lies in pointing out that boundary work is not just symbolic, but is often contextually shaped by physical borders or other geographical places. The case of the Mam demonstrates that existing political-administrative borders may facilitate or restrict particular imaginings of the collective. But it also shows that the symbolic struggle involved in defining the boundaries of collectivity has material significance linked to indigenous rights. This symbolic struggle may have spatial consequences as well, since it involves notions of territorial belonging that transcend the segmentation of geographical space produced by state borders. As Nancy A. Naples and Jennifer Bickham Mendez (2015) point out, spatial borders and other geographical places frequently become important objects of contestation in the symbolic struggle about how to define the boundaries of collectivity. They, therefore, merit careful consideration in scholarly work trying to make sense of collective identification.

In what follows, we first provide some background on the history of the Guatemala-Mexico border about the Mam. Then we review the interdisciplinary literature on indigenous collective identification in Latin America and Guatemala in particular, as well as sociological scholarship on collective identity boundary work. We explain how bridging these literatures highlights the limitations of sociological perspectives that view boundaries as metaphorical or symbolic alone. We then describe our methods. Next, we turn to our findings, first showing how political-administrative borders constrict Mam collective identification. We argue that the state has been effective in promoting forms of identification that impede the construction of the cross-border nation. Often Mam individuals identify in ways that do not recognize the cross-border character of their people, restricting their understandings of collectivity to the boundaries enforced by the state. Nevertheless, considering not only how nationhood

is imposed by the state (from the center outward), but also "the role of local communities and social groups in shaping their own national identities" (Sahlins 1989:8), in a second findings section we show that narratives of Mam collective identification shift depending on context. We show that Mam individuals weave in and out of different scalar narratives, denaturalizing state borders in the process. We also show that Mam organizations promote acknowledgment of the incongruity of these symbolic and spatial boundaries and signal the Guatemala-Mexico border as a site of contestation. In the conclusion, we discuss the implications of these findings for efforts to establish the rights of cross-border indigenous nations and call for greater attention to spatial issues among sociologists studying collective identity.

THE MAM AND THE GUATEMALA-MEXICO BORDER

Ancestral Mam territory encompasses part of western Guatemala (in the regional departments of Quetzaltenango, Retalhuleu, San Marcos, and Huehuetenango) and part of the border state of Chiapas, Mexico. But the Guatemala-Mexico border itself has shifted over time. Chiapas was part of what was known as the "Kingdom of Guatemala" from the middle of the sixteenth century until 1821, the year both countries achieved independence from Spain (De Vos 1994). For a brief period in the late 1830s, several western Guatemalan departments and Chiapas together seceded and declared themselves to be Los Altos, the sixth state in the Federal Republic of Central America. With the collapse of this short-lived federation at the beginning of 1840, Guatemalan leaders continued to demand Chiapas' return from Mexico (De Vos 1994). After decades of territorial disputes, Guatemalan and Mexican officials signed the Tratado sobre Límites (Boundary Treaties) in 1882. In the first article Guatemala "forever renounced the rights it believed it had to the territory of the State of Chiapas and its District of Soconusco" and the third article plots the contemporary borderline ("Tratado sobre Límites" 1882). Yet contention over the border region and Chiapas, in particular, persists to this day (Zorrilla 1984). While several authors have addressed the contested character of the Guatemala-Mexico border region, few give significant consideration to how this shifting border affects the indigenous peoples who live there.

The Council of the Mam Nation, which is the umbrella council for 5 regional councils (4 in Guatemala and 1 in Mexico), as well as several other Mam organizations, contend that the Guatemalan and Mexican states have officially erased from collective memory how state borders have divided the Mam *pueblo* (people or nation). [1] Although one historical narrative posits that the Mam were never politically united (even in the pre-Hispanic era), another, shared by many of the participants in this study, suggests that the political unification of the Mam was and continues to be fragmented by state borders. Whether or not Mam political unification actually existed at some point in the past is less relevant than the fact that these contemporary organizations and councils seek to promote a sense of unification across the Guatemala-Mexico border and across political-administrative borders within each country by educating their people about how state borders divide them. The Council of the Mam Nation also pursues recognition of Mam territory on both sides of the border to defend it better from national and transnational companies involved in mining and hydroelectric activities. The Council seeks institutional recognition as *the* political body to be consulted and resolve issues related to the imposition of programs, projects, and policies in Mam territory on both sides of the border (Council of the Mam Nation 2014). Along with other Mam organizations and activists, the Council fights for recognition of the cross-border status of the Mam people to right historical wrongs and address contemporary dispossession and environmental degradation.

---

1 *Peoples* or *pueblos* is an inherently political term because in reference to indigenous peoples, it signifies nationhood and the collective rights that entails, such as the return of territory, control over natural resources, self-determination or political autonomy, and the safeguarding and development of language, education, and cultural practices (Richards and Gardner 2013). Less political terms, such as *socio-cultural groups* (Agreement on Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples 1995) and *Maya ethnolinguistic identities* (French 2010), focus on specific characteristics such as language and culture.

Image 1. Guatemala-Mexico Border Dividing Tacaná Volcano. Photo taken from Pavencúl, Mexico (Guatemala to the left and Mexico to the right) by first author.

Of course, in an important sense, the Mam cross-border nation already exists. The mere imposition of state borders crossing Mam territory does not erase the longer history of Mam living out their lives in that territory. Nonetheless, we refer to the "construction" of the Mam cross-border nation throughout this article. We do so to capture the fact that efforts to achieve recognition of the cross-border Mam nation are ongoing, vis-à-vis the Guatemalan and Mexican states as well as the Mam people.

INDIGENOUS IDENTIFICATION IN LATIN AMERICA

Collective identification is typically understood according to primordialist, instrumentalist, and constructivist views (or a combination thereof) (Arthur 2011). The primordialist view uses stable essentialism to define identity as unchanging, such as seeing the contemporary Maya stuck in a timeless past; it treats "ethnicity as a given" (Corntassel 2003:83). In response to the primordialist view, instrumentalists see ethnicity as something that can be purposefully created (Corntassel 2003). The instrumentalist view suggests that individuals can freely choose their identities, which are neither timeless nor unchanging (Arthur 2011). Stemming from the influence of Fredrik Barth's seminal work (1969), instrumentalists see identity as a tool for resistance to be used against dominant sectors of society (Hernández Castillo 2001). Lastly, a constructivist view understands identities as not simply chosen by individuals, nor as timeless and unchanging, but rather, as made through social relationships and institutions in which people are embedded (Arthur 2011). Our approach is constructivist. We understand Mam collective identification as constrained by social relationships, histories, organizations, and the state, but we also recognize the agency of the Mam, individually and collectively, in shaping their ongoing processes of collective identification.

Indeed, collective identity is not something simply inside people's heads. Rather, it is an interactive and shared definition constructed among people within a field of opportunities and constraints

(Melucci 1995). Marta Elena Casaús Arzú (1998) writes: "Identity is a process of constant change and reconstitution, and the boundaries of identities are found in permanent modification based on historical conjunctures" (p. 192). Collective identities are not fixed, but the product of a process always in construction (Hall 1996; Mallon 1996; Nagel 1994; Nelson 1999; Wade 1997).

Just as collective identification is processual and socially constructed, the boundaries that mark difference along lines of race, ethnicity, and nation are created through "marked juxtapositions in daily interaction" (Barth 1969:10; Taube 2012). In other words, individuals and collectivities negotiate the boundaries of their collective identities through everyday social interactions. Within Guatemala these interactions involve negotiating the boundaries of the persistent indigenous/ladino dichotomy. Indigenous identification is relationally constructed in opposition to *ladino* (non-indigenous) identification; each is defined in terms of the other (Nelson 1999; Smith 1990).

Identity boundaries are also negotiated through everyday social interactions *among* the indigenous Maya population, which is complex and heterogeneous. In Guatemala, the Maya population is made up of at least 21 distinct peoples with varying languages, histories, cultures, dress, ancestral territories, etc. (Del Valle Escalante 2008; Mac Giolla Chríost 2003).[2] While today language seems to be one of the more dominant distinguishing features among Maya peoples, in some cases this diversity is also rooted in ancient territorial rivalries (Carmack 1995; Watanabe 1995). However, not only are the Maya not homogeneous, but different Maya peoples themselves are also not internally homogeneous. Indeed, referring specifically to the Mam, Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo (2001) writes that their lives "challenge any definition of 'the culture' as an integral, unified, and homogenous whole" (p. 11).

To be identified as indigenous, any individual must both self-identify and be recognized by others as a member of that group (Martínez Cobo 1982; Nelson 1999). At a collective level, external recognition is also important. The self-identification of the Mam as an autonomous nation spanning the Guatemala-Mexico border constitutes a fundamental criterion for achieving formal recognition of the Mam as a people with territorial rights, or even more moderate rights to self-governance. The Mam nation is constructed in part through self-identification as a distinct nation with its own territory, culture, language, and political authorities (Hernández Castillo 2012), and in part through recognition by others. Both of these processes are unsettled, contested, and in formation.

Unsurprisingly, tension often exists between indigenous movements promoting collective rights and states that seek homogenization through a nation state framework (Eriksen 2002; Iyall Smith 2006; Smith 2002). In Guatemala, state discourses about the meaning of the nation have been less radical than those of other Latin American states, such as Bolivia and Ecuador, which have recognized their plurinational character. For example, after Guatemala's civil war, which lasted from 1960-1996 and left hundreds of thousands missing or killed, the state and guerrilla groups signed peace accords, including the 1995 Agreement on Identity and Rights for the Indigenous Population (also called the Indigenous Rights Accord). The Accord defines the Guatemalan nation as multiethnic, multilingual, and culturally plural (Sieder 2001). It reads:

> That, because of its history, conquest, colonization, movements and migrations, the Guatemalan nation is multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual in nature; that the parties recognize and respect the identity and political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Maya, Garífuna and Xinca peoples, within the unity of the Guatemalan nation, and subject to the indivisibility of the territory of the Guatemalan State, as components of that unity.

2 In the late 1980s and early 1990s, in the context of increased indigenous mobilization throughout Latin America, the Pan-Maya movement and idea of the "Pueblo Maya" emerged. The Pan-Maya movement is an effort to unite all Maya linguistic groups in Guatemala as a single people in order to increase its political power (Urkidi 2011; Warren 1996). Yet, regardless of whether they identify with this movement politically, "indigenous people tend to identify themselves as Quiché, Mam or Kaqchikel [some of the 21 Mayan peoples in Guatemala] rather than as Maya" more generally (Urkidi 2011:562). In this article, we refer to the Mam pueblo or people because this is the designation our participants used.

Although the agreement depicts Guatemala as a multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual nation, it still sustains a singular nation-state framework or "a project of a multicultural nation" (Casaús Arzú 1998:121).[3] As Casaús Arzú (1998) has written, the political and ethnic boundaries established in the accord do not correspond to the plurinational social reality of Guatemala. Nor do they account for the ongoing reality of cross-border migration. During the Guatemalan civil war, thousands of Mam individuals and families, along with other Mayan peoples, resettled in Chiapas as refugees. More recent decades have seen a wave of economic migration, as Mam individuals seek work in Chiapas (Hernández Castillo 2012).

Despite the divisive character of the nation-state framework and state borders, indigenous nations continue to mobilize to seek collective rights. For example, some indigenous peoples have developed "counter-mapping projects" to contest and rework hegemonic geographies (Wainwright 2008). Naples and Bickham Mendez (2015) point out that borders and other boundaries can be both the reason behind social movements' demands and grievances and the specific targets for their actions. Mam activism contesting the Guatemala-Mexico border is a compelling case in point.

ADDING A SPATIAL ANALYSIS TO "BOUNDARY WORK"

A significant trend within the sociological literature on collective identity focuses on its role in social movements (Laraña, Johnston, and Gusfield 1994; Melucci 1989; Owens et al. 2010; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Turner 1969). However, relatively few sociologists address indigenous movements or indigenous identity more generally (for exceptions, see Golash-Boza 2010; Richards 2004, 2013; Warren 2013). One line of research on collective identification focuses on what Christena E. Nippert-Eng (2002) has called "boundary work." Boundary work consists of the "strategies, principles, and practices we use to create, maintain, and modify cultural categories" (Nippert-Eng 2002:79). Boundaries define who is and is not a member of a given collective (Owens et al. 2010). Boundary work involves drawing lines between realms (and identities), and maintaining them in such a way that we can transition between them (Nippert-Eng 2002).

However, sociologists' usage of boundary work to demonstrate how collectivities create, modify, and maintain symbolic boundaries is predominantly aspatial. The symbolic boundaries of identification are not defined in relation to geographic, political-administrative, or geopolitical boundaries (or at least, the extent to which they are is not highlighted in the sociological literature). This is the case even as sociologists like Francesca Polletta and James M. Jasper (2001) have called us to consider the importance of place in the construction of collective identities.

As a corrective, we examine how boundary work is simultaneously constructed through social relationships *and* spatialized political realities, such as being rooted in ancestral territories (Basso 1996; Silko 1981). Leslie Marmon Silko (1981) notes that stories shape identity and "cannot be separated from geographical locations, from actual physical places within the land" (p. 69). Together these two bodies of literature help us consider how spatialized political realities shape symbolic boundaries, which may impede certain collective rights (e.g., territory and recognition). But these literatures also help us ponder how collectivities might use the symbolic to contest the political realities that deny them these rights.

While the state promotes a framework for national belonging that elides indigenous rights, Mam organizations promote ways of identifying that denaturalize state borders to achieve recognition of cross-border collective rights. But how do Mam individuals make sense of this context? To what extent do their notions of collective identity align with or diverge from state political-administrative borders?

---

3   The multicultural depiction of Guatemala also has been criticized to the extent that state-driven multiculturalism merely highlights some of the country's diversity while sidelining more substantive indigenous rights (Hale 2002).

METHODS

Between May and August 2011, the first author conducted ethnographic fieldwork and semi-structured qualitative interviews in two Guatemalan *municipios* (municipalities), Comitancillo and Tacaná. Both of these municipios are located in the Department of San Marcos, which borders Chiapas, Mexico. This article also draws from ongoing fieldwork conducted in 2013, 2014, and 2015, including participant observation at protests, ceremonies, meetings, and workshops held by Mam councils and NGOs.

In Tacaná the first author performed fieldwork in two rural border communities. The community in which he worked in Comitancillo is also rural, but it is farther from the border than Tacaná. In the Tacaná communities almost everyone speaks Spanish as a first language and very few speak Mam aside from the elderly. On the other hand, Mam is the primary language spoken by most people from Comitancillo, though many also speak Spanish. Although participants from Tacaná occasionally self-identify as Mam and discuss their Mam ancestors, speaking about Mam collective identity is more common in Comitancillo. Additionally, most "traditional" Mam customs practiced in Comitancillo are not practiced in the Tacaná borderland communities. While these sites were selected to establish whether there were differences among communities in the region regarding the definition of collective identification boundaries, no significant differences were found. Therefore, this article is not conceived of as a comparative study between these communities, but rather, a single-case study of how Mam individuals in Guatemala construct collective identification.

Collective identification is by definition a process engaged by collectivities. Here, however, while we address how Mam organizations construct collective identification, we also focus on individuals. We do so because we seek to understand how Guatemalan political-administrative borders are manifest in the narratives of Mam in their everyday lives and how they might challenge those borders. Much of our attention is thus focused on how collective identity is actively constructed through social interactions among individuals.

Participants were selected through snowball sampling, beginning with the first author's previously existing networks in Comitancillo. He spent about a month and a half in each municipio. Teachers from Comitancillo, who had been working at a school in Tacaná for the previous eleven years, facilitated access there. Interviews ranged from brief conversations to lengthy dialogues lasting hours regarding what it means to be Mam in the contemporary world. They were carried out in Spanish, with a sprinkling of Mam interspersed. They took place in a variety of settings, including state offices, pathways to NGO meetings, living rooms, kitchens, cornfields, and barns. Participants included fifteen men and nine women. They ranged in age from 18 to 47, and their education levels ranged from no formal schooling to university graduates. Some participated in community or political organizations while others did not. They included farmers, university students, state officials, teachers, NGO leaders and workers, unemployed individuals, and others.

MAM BOUNDARY NARRATIVES

Participants used three dominant narratives when defining the boundaries of Mam collective identification, each of which was linked to spatial scales:

1. Defining the boundaries of Mam collectivity as localized within certain municipal borders;
2. More broadly defining the boundaries of Mam collectivity as extending beyond municipal borders and throughout western Guatemala to the border with Mexico;
3. Even more broadly defining the boundaries of Mam collectivity as transcending the border and flowing throughout southern Mexico.

In this section, we provide examples of these narratives, showing how state political-administrative borders (such as municipal divisions) and the state's construction of history shape how Mam

individuals define their collective identification boundaries and effectively limit cross-border understandings of Mam nationhood.

The first narrative narrowly localizes Mam collectivity within the borders of certain municipios. This way of defining Mam collective identification associates municipal borders with the boundaries of Mam collectivity; Mam collectivity is simply mapped onto political-administrative borders. Some municipios are understood to be Mam while others are understood to be ladino.[4] This rigid association assumes that those who reside within the borders of Mam municipios are Mam, and those who live within ladino municipios are ladino/a.

Historically, the state has defined indigenous and ladino boundaries as coterminous with municipal ones. For instance, on October 13, 1876, President Justo Rufino Barrios signed Decree 165, legally declaring that all the indigenous of San Pedro Sacatepéquez were now officially ladinos/as (Comisión de Oficialización de los Idiomas Indígenas de Guatemala 1998). Some current politicians continue to label entire towns "ladino" and "Indian" in their campaigns. And like many of our participants, scholars of Guatemala frequently define indigenous collective identity boundaries within territorialized municipal borders (French 2010; Hendrickson 1995; Tax 1937, 1941; Watanabe 1992, 2004; Wolf 1955) even though these boundaries divide the indigenous politically (Cojtí Cuxil 2005, 2007; Warren 1998). Here we affirm that in many contexts the municipio is the locus of identity for Mam individuals, a tendency that is reinforced by the Guatemalan state's historical and contemporary use of the municipio as the primary unit for interacting with citizens (Jiménez Sánchez 2008).

Claudia, a grandmother and farmer in her forties from Comitancillo, is a member of a Mam NGO and several women's groups. She usually describes being Mam in terms of being from Comitancillo. Sitting in her adobe kitchen one afternoon with several of her grandchildren playing nearby, she described how "we, the indigenous" from Comitancillo are ridiculed by the ladinos of another municipio, San Pedro Sacatepéquez, when selling chickens there. As Claudia relates this story and her anger for being mistreated, her voice gets louder and a couple of her grandkids stop playing and look up at her from across the room. She recounted, "Well, there are times that ladinos, even worse, the San Pedranos, say to avoid the indigenous...They say, 'Don't buy chickens from [those from] Comitancillo!' The people say... 'You are *Indios*!'(Indians, a pejorative term). 'Indios!' the ladinos yell at us." Laden in Claudia's story, as in many others, are conflations of racial, ethnic, and cultural boundaries with municipal ones. Her account reveals an implicit understanding of identity as bound within specific municipios: Comitancillo is understood as indigenous and San Pedro Sacatepéquez as ladino.

Claudia's account also exemplifies how identifying collectively is a relational process between herself, as an individual, the Mam collectively, and ladinos/as. Her narrative transitions from "I, a Mam woman" to "we, the indigenous." Claudia's lived experiences of confronting ladino racism hardened the boundaries between "us" and "them" and between San Pedro Sacatepéquez (ladino) and Comitancillo (Mam). Claudia may or may not be aware of the history of San Pedro's ladinoization by the state. We are not suggesting the Mam conflate their boundaries of collectivity with municipal borders because they necessarily recall certain historical events. But such state declarations have contributed to and sustain this way of defining the boundaries of collectivity.

How did the conflation of Mam identity with particular municipios come to be and why does it remain so significant? Ajb'ee Odilio Jiménez Sánchez (2008) argues that in Guatemala the municipio is a colonial construction that to this day divides indigenous peoples, like the Mam, geographically and politically (see also Cojtí Cuxil 2005, 2007). He suggests that a hegemonic logic persists whereby the Mam must belong to and identify with a municipio because, as a political-administrative unit, the municipio is the point of contact through which individuals and communities gain access to state

---

4 Participants occasionally associated Mam collectivity with other, even narrower, political-administrative borders, such as *aldeas* (villages) and *caseríos* (hamlets).

programs and projects and are effectively legitimized as citizens.[5] Today when the state interacts with citizens it primarily does so at the municipal level (through mayors and other officials). One Mam political candidate for a municipio in Quetzaltenango explained that for the state to be willing to interact with the Mam pueblo, Mam individuals must take office as municipal authorities and participate within the political-administrative limits of the municipio. This candidate noted that traditional Mam authority structures are not considered legitimate in the eyes of the state, in large part because the Mam are politically fragmented into distinct municipal units (a situation put into place by the state long ago). The narrative that defines the boundaries of Mam collective identification as tied to the municipio persists and is salient at least in part because it is only through such administrative divisions that indigenous citizens have been permitted to engage with the state and have some of their claims addressed.

A broader way some Mam define the boundaries of collectivity is by *transcending* the fixedness of municipal borders and describing the Mam as an indigenous people throughout western Guatemala. Rather than referring to municipios as "Mam" or "ladino," some Mam described municipios by saying, "there are indigenous people there," "there are ladinos there," or "there aren't many Mam there." This broader way of defining the collectivity still maintains some of the bounded character of the former, particularly to the extent that this way of defining the collectivity is still mapped within the nationalist project of the state by ending at the Guatemala-Mexico border. Imagining the boundaries of collectivity in this manner still envisions spaces as Mam or not-Mam; but rather than referring to municipios, it involves the use of topographic markers to identify such spaces.

Artemio is a farmer in his late forties. He is from Comitancillo and participates in a few community service organizations. Artemio's home is situated on a mountainside, not uncommon for homes in Comitancillo, where several mountains can be seen in different directions along with the volcano Tajumulco. Rather than dichotomously naming municipios as either "ladino" or "Mam," Artemio used hand gestures to indicate certain mountains that could be crossed to encounter other Mam spaces. He observed, for example, "Behind those mountains the Mam are too."

One afternoon Artemio and the first author talked while sitting alongside his *milpa* (cornfield). He grabbed a stick to draw a map of western Guatemala in the dirt as he described Mam territory. While Artemio's sketch did not represent a "traditional" map of Guatemala, it indicated that the Mam spread throughout the mountains of western Guatemala, ending at the border with Mexico. When asked about the Mam in Mexico, Artemio quickly shook his head as if to convey disbelief or confusion at the question. He explained that he has never been across the border, but knows there have never been any Mam in Mexico.

Some Mam organizations also use a similar narrative. For example, one NGO in Comitancillo holds workshops that occasionally serve as spaces for active collective identification construction. One such workshop focused on what *tx'otx'* (territory) means to the Mam. A workshop participant defined tx'otx' as a concept within the Maya Cosmovision that included land, but also encompassed everything else—the sky and all living and non-living beings, all of which are understood as interconnected. The other participants then discussed the concept. Some described how their relationship with each other and territory is not confined to Comitancillo. Others explained that this broader way of thinking about territory and the people is important because the Mam throughout Guatemala need solidarity in the struggle to defend their territory from mining companies. Like Artemio, participants in this workshop collectively imagined the Mam as a people with boundaries extending beyond municipal borders, but still mostly defined within the borders of the state. This narrative is broader than the first, but still limiting in the sense that it reifies the nation-state framework, which may impede the Mam from gaining cross-border rights and recognition.

---

5 We agree with Jiménez Sánchez (2008) that while political-administrative divisions serve to oppress the Mam, in a paradoxical fashion the municipio can also be "a space from which counter-hegemonic struggles are developed" (p. 4).

Nevertheless, some participants defined the boundaries of their collectivity even more broadly, by viewing the Mam as a people spanning the Guatemala-Mexico border. This way of defining the collectivity does not rely on boundaries defined by the state, and thereby challenges the nation-state framework. This narrative is embodied by Diego, a highly educated man in his forties who works for Guatemala's Ministry of Education. On several occasions, Diego revisited a story about a meeting in Unión Juárez, Mexico:

> So I've seen in a meeting, we had a project that I worked on for bilingual education, and there was a meeting, an invitation for me, in Chiapas [. . .]. I was invited to a meeting in Unión Juárez [. . .]. I spoke. But I said, "I am Mam." And I said a few words. At the end, in the audience a tall person asked to talk with me. And he climbed on stage, I had the microphone. And we spoke. . .and he said, then, how he heard that I was Mam. Then he told me that he was Mam too. And then we started to speak in Mam. A few minutes later I saw his face with tears rolling down his cheeks. [Diego uses his index finger and runs it from his right eye down his cheek, signifying tears rolling down the face.] I also felt a bit sentimental, because then he said, "How is it that they split our territory? How? How were they so unfair to leave some of us on one side and others on the other side, when we are the same? We are Mam and Mayan." [. . .] [The border] line divides us, but it is important to try to communicate and come closer. Well, I was the same as him.

This interaction has greatly influenced how Diego views the boundaries of Mam collectivity. Although describing themselves as a nation spanning the border does not require such experiences, for Diego and others, a cross-border understanding was facilitated by personal interactions with Mam from Mexico.

Through his work, Diego shares this broader definition with others. One afternoon, while visiting in his office, Diego gave the first author a copy of his team's latest version of a Mam language manual, soon to be published and distributed to teachers in the department of San Marcos. He proudly pointed out a statement that he and his Mam colleagues included in this version, which was not in the previous curriculum:

> The Mam people are a sociolinguistic community divided by two states, Guatemala and Mexico, since the colonial political division did not take into account the territorial borders of the original peoples, therefore, a part of the people remained in Guatemala and the other in Mexico. Currently, about 50,000 speakers of Mam live in the State of Chiapas.

He adamantly observed, "The Guatemalan map was made, was constructed, by the colonizers, by the invasion, and it doesn't correspond with the Mayan territory." While some Mam may be unaware of state discourses and practices that have historically influenced how the boundaries of Mam collectivity are delimited, others are very conscious of this process as well as how people can challenge official histories by envisioning the Mam as a collectivity transcending the border. Diego's words demonstrate how political-administrative borders can be challenged by the symbolic boundaries of collectivity imagined by the Mam.

Of the three scalar narratives, this broader view of the Mam as a nation that spans the Guatemala-Mexico border was the least common among participants. The most common narrative narrowly localized Mam collectivity within the borders of particular municipios, followed by the narrative that the Mam are a pueblo in western Guatemala that ends at the border with Mexico. This suggests that the Guatemalan state has been quite effective in fomenting forms of identification that limit people's understanding of Mam nationhood. Political-administrative borders have long served to divide the Mam politically, and yet, by adhering to these narrower definitions some Mam respondents may

inadvertently legitimize those divisions and undermine political efforts to construct the cross-border nation.

WEAVING IN AND OUT OF SCALAR BOUNDARIES

Nevertheless, there is more to this story. Although the Guatemalan state has been effective at restricting Mam definitions of collectivity, and thereby constraining demands for cross-border rights, our findings suggest that depending on the situation at hand, Mam individuals and organizations imagined the spatial boundaries of their collective identity differently. This signals that Mam collective identification boundaries are not hardened realities but, instead, are shifting and context-driven. For example, in some contexts The Council of the Mam Nation and other organizations promote acknowledgment of the incongruity of the boundaries of Mam collective identity with political-administrative borders, revealing the Guatemala-Mexico border as a particular site of contestation. In this section, we provide examples of how Mam participants weave in and out of the three scalar narratives when discussing what it means to be Mam in the contemporary world. These examples demonstrate an ongoing symbolic struggle between the Mam and the Guatemalan state regarding the boundaries of Mam collectivity.

The three scalar narratives discussed in the previous section are not generally used in a mutually exclusive manner. The same individual may express the boundaries of collectivity quite narrowly in some circumstances and more broadly in others. Over the course of several conversations or even a single conversation, depending on the context at hand, an individual may express various combinations of these three narratives. The complexities of collective identification are manifest as Mam continuously weave in and out of these three boundary narratives.

For instance, César is in his late thirties and leads a small Mam group that works on community projects such as planting trees and building barns in Comitancillo. In one conversation, he illustrated how Mam individuals may define the boundaries of collectivity differently in varying contexts. César recounted how he and a Mam friend from another department, Huehuetenango, were conversing in the Mam language while waiting for a taxi in San Pedro Sacatepéquez. Overhearing these men speak in Mam, a ladina woman from San Pedro burst into a racist rant: "Get out of here! Get out of here [or] we're going to beat you! Go, go, go! [. . .] Leave!" César relates how he told the woman that he and his friend are Mam, and although they speak both Spanish and Mam, their "own language," as he describes it, is Mam. He asked, "Why should we leave? We have always gone [to San Pedro], we are going to speak the same [in Mam]."

As he spoke, César used "them," "ladina," and "Shecana" (meaning from San Pedro) interchangeably. He associated being ladino/a with being from San Pedro as he identified ladino identity as localized within the boundaries of that municipio. But he also weaved into a broader narrative of boundaries by using "us," "our," and "Mam" as signifiers of collective identification transcending Comitancillo and even the boundaries between the departments of San Marcos, where San Pedro Sacatepéquez is located, and Huehuetenango. As we have shown, administrative divisions within Guatemala have long served as instruments of domination by politically fragmenting the indigenous and failing to recognize indigenous authority that spans such divisions. These divisions are often internalized as essentialized spatial identities, and thereby contribute to state goals related to assimilating Mam subjects as part of the Guatemalan nation. But in this context César recognizes that he and his friend are part of a collectivity that transcends certain political-administrative borders. By weaving in and out of these scalar understandings of identity, César, in effect, de-essentializes these spaces.

Like César, Eliseo, a primary school teacher in his early twenties who plays soccer for the Comitancillo selection team, also occasionally refers to Comitancillo as a Mam municipio. But he too weaves into broader definitions of Mam boundaries. In his accounts, especially those that center on his personal interactions with Mam in regions beyond Comitancillo, he sometimes refers to the Mam

as a collectivity extending throughout western Guatemala and ending at the border, even as he recognizes differences among them, such as variation in how they speak the Mam language:

> ELISEO: Because in different places there are indigenous people. But their language [he pauses] they pronounce different than the Mam language here. In other words, all the Mam languages are different. They are not all the same.
> JEFF: So the Mam language is different in different places?
> ELISEO: Yes. At the moment of pronouncing the words, the difference is there.
> JEFF: For example, the Mam [language] of those in Huehue[tenango] is different?
> ELISEO: [M hm] Yes.
> JEFF: So then are they the same indigenous pueblo. . .
> ELISEO: Yes! [he says emphatically over Jeff's question]
> JEFF: . . .Or are they a different indigenous pueblo?
> ELISEO: No, it is the same indigenous pueblo.
> JEFF: So everyone feels they are the same then, the same Mam pueblo?
> ELISEO: M hm [nodding affirmatively].

Eliseo attributes this broader understanding of Mam boundaries, which diverges from the state's administrative divisions, to his personal interactions with Mam beyond Comitancillo's borders when playing soccer in those regions. But he says he is unsure if the Mam pueblo extends through Mexico because he has never been there. This again suggests that collective identification is context-driven. The fluid and shifting character of collective identification may align with political-administrative borders in certain interactions and diverge from them in others.

Hearing about social interactions across political-administrative borders also helps produce broader understandings of the boundaries of Mam collectivity. For example, Raúl, an elementary teacher in his twenties from Comitancillo, would often say "Comitancillo is Mam" in his stories, narrowly localizing the boundaries of Mam collectivity within municipal borders in Guatemala. However, one evening after playing soccer, Raúl and the first author were reminiscing about their childhoods. Raúl related stories his father shared with him about his travels to Chiapas, where he had worked on coffee plantations. Raúl recounted that his father was once surprised to meet a Mam man from Mexico:

> A man from there, who lived on the *finca* (plantation), came and spoke to my father in Mam. 'You understand?' he asked [my father]. 'Yes,' my father said, and then they began to exchange words [in Mam] and become friends. . . In that time they understood, we're speaking here about [. . .] '90, '92, '93. But still today they speak it [Mam], I believe that still, because there are ancestors [from Mexico] that exist. . . Because the Mam from San Marcos [in Guatemala], *todo* [everything and everyone] is Mam, [just] like Tapachula [in Mexico], according to the history.

Even though Raúl did not personally interact with this man, his father's stories have shaped how, at least in some contexts, he defines Mam collectivity boundaries more broadly.

Diego also frequently weaved in and out of different spatial scales when talking about Mam identity. One afternoon, Diego and the first author discussed how he began working in bilingual education and some of the challenges his office deals with in promoting bilingual education. Diego transitioned from talking about the Mam as a people transcending the Guatemala-Mexico border to discussing Mam identity issues throughout western Guatemala (associating identity boundaries with nation-state borders) and within municipios (associating them with municipal borders). He did this by situating himself differently based on his multiple ways of identifying (e.g., activist, father,

community leader, state employee). As Diego's various group affiliations intersect differently in distinct contexts, different ways of defining boundaries of collective identification are actively constructed.

For example, when describing his work as a young teacher and activist, Diego said, "We strengthened the bilingual issue throughout all the highlands of San Marcos, in all the municipios. And we made texts . . . and we initiated some awareness raising because [we were] *being Mam*. At that time, many other teachers wouldn't listen to us [because we were Mam]." This excerpt highlights Diego's definition of the Mam as a pueblo extending throughout the western highlands, beyond municipal borders. Situating himself as an activist and passionate educator earlier in his career, Diego was able to give meaning to his activism and Mam language education throughout the western highlands. Later in the same interview Diego situated himself as a state employee when he described current challenges for promoting Mam language education. His primary identification shifted from describing himself as an activist and educator to discussing his current dilemmas as a state employee because the interaction at hand, our conversation, transitioned into a new direction. In this latter way of identifying, Diego expressed frustration that some "Mam municipios" near the border, like Tacaná, no longer identify as Mam, so teaching the Mam language is a challenge there. Thus, depending on the context, Diego also sometimes defines the boundaries of Mam collectivity as coterminous with particular municipal borders. Diego's multiple identifications, and the intersections among them, lead him to define the boundaries of Mam collective identification differently in different contexts.

His experiences as a young teacher and his current circumstances include relationships with Mam at various socio-spatial scales, and these relationships shape different expressions of the Mam as a collectivity. That is, he envisions the boundaries of Mam collectivity differently depending on which of these scales he is working at.

Weaving in and out of these various scalar narratives may not necessarily be intentional. Nonetheless, these examples demonstrate that Mam collective identification is not static but context-driven. This suggests that even if Mam narratives often align with state political-administrative borders in ways that reinforce political divisions, shifting social contexts can create openings for the Mam to contest these borders.

Indeed, activist efforts have challenged state borders by mobilizing Mam individuals around the idea that that the Mam are a nation spanning the contemporary Guatemala-Mexico border. One example took place in 2014, when Mam leaders and community members met in San Marcos to discuss the mining that is ongoing in San Miguel Ixtahuacán and Sipacapa (towns located in the department of San Marcos) and to revisit earlier accords in which communities had voted against such mining. Mam activists rooted their opposition to the mines in a discourse of their collective rights as a nation spanning the Guatemala-Mexico border. Carlos, a leader of a Mam NGO in San Marcos, asserted to the more than 60 individuals present:

> The constitution says we are little indigenous groups; the [Guatemalan] government doesn't recognize us as pueblos, as nations. But the pueblo Mam is *único* [singular], there is no other pueblo Mam. There are [Mam] in San Marcos, in Huehue[tenango], and southern Mexico, but we are one. It is the pueblo Mam. We were divided. But it is not some coincidence that there is now . . . the pueblo Maya-Mam. We have accomplished a lot. But there is still more [to accomplish]. But the pueblo is advancing.

Carlos recognizes the Mam in Guatemala and Mexico are part of the same nation. Additionally, he recognizes that the construction of the "pueblo Maya-Mam" was not revived through happenstance, but rather was an accomplishment of the people, achieved through significant effort. Those present—from diverse organizations representing Huehuetenango, San Marcos, and Quetzaltenango—were witness to this assertion of cross-border identification.

It was through a series of similar meetings in 2011 in Pavencúl, Mexico that the Consejo Mayor Mam, today known as the Council of the Mam Nation, was organized, composed of Mam Councils from Huehuetenango, San Marcos, Retalhuleu, and Quetzaltenango in Guatemala and from Chiapas in Mexico (Hernández Castillo 2012). The Council of the Mam Nation continues to engage in symbolic boundary work to challenge the Guatemala-Mexico border. For example, in December 2014 leaders from the Mam Council in Chiapas, Mexico (El Consejo Regional Indígena Maya-Mam del Soconusco) and from the Mam Council in Huehuetenango, Guatemala (El Consejo Mam Saq Tx'otx') convened in Huehuetenango to explore how they could be better united in addressing political, social, and cultural issues as a cross-border pueblo. One pressing concern was that Mam leaders from both sides encounter problems with border officials each time they attempt to meet as a cross-border council, including the day prior to this meeting. An idea that resulted from the meeting was to create a credential for Mam council leaders to have easier access to convene on either side of the border. Such a credential would make it easier for Mam individuals and organizations to cross the border to visit sacred sites (such as Zaculeu in Guatemala and Izapa in Mexico) for ceremonies and to organize social, cultural, and political events on either side of the border. The idea to create a credential (a tangible object with potential spatial consequences) emerged while interpreting the border as a site of contestation and discussing the symbolic struggle of the Mam as a cross-border nation. This example demonstrates that potential spatial consequences may stem from the symbolic struggles of collective identification.

Following this meeting, council representatives from both sides were tasked with sharing in several communities the primary message from this meeting: the Mam will continue to strengthen its alliance as a cross-border nation. Lench, a leader from the Mam Council in San Marcos (El Consejo Mam te Txe Chman), explains that the Council of the Mam Nation recognizes the need to discuss this vision of Mam collectivity transcending the Guatemala-Mexico border with various communities in order for it to gain wider acceptance among the Mam. Lench describes the issues addressed at these community meetings: "We speak of unity, of autonomy, we speak of self-determination of the pueblo Mam, of the nation. That's to say the Mam Nation has its own system of justice, its own political system, its own economic system, its own spiritual-religious system, [and] we have our own cultural system even though they have divided us into caserios, municipios, departments, and countries."

Together with such efforts, the context-driven character of Mam collective identification indicates that a Mam cross-border nation is being actively imagined, even though the details of this project are still in formation. Mam leaders seek the meaningful recognition of their people's collective rights to autonomy, territory, self-determination, and the legitimate existence of the cross-border nation (both among the Mam population and through the state's institutional structures). They do so in order to construct a sense of national belonging that promotes Mam society and culture, to advance contact and cooperation among the Mam across the Guatemala-Mexico border, and to better defend their territory from mining and hydroelectric activities that contaminate the Mam and their territory.

SPATIAL SCALES AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY

State borders can be impediments to political demands as well as targets for sociopolitical action (Naples and Bickham Mendez 2015). This is certainly true for cross-border indigenous nations; forms of collective identification that are lost as a result of ongoing colonial intervention (expressed in part through the imposition of political-administrative borders) may be rearticulated through active political efforts. Identification is not just about recuperating ideas or identities, but is an ongoing project that can contribute to the construction of alternative futures. In the case examined here, the Mam may gain political and cultural rights as a cross-border nation, even though not all Mam, and certainly not most representatives of the Guatemalan and Mexican states, view the Mam in these terms right now. The symbolic struggle over collective identification is significant because it has material consequences linked to Mam rights in both countries and across the border.

While this article has focused on the Maya-Mam, these findings are relevant to other peoples that span state borders. Long-standing historical, social, and political boundaries may continue to shape how such peoples identify. Yet, cross-border peoples can contest and denaturalize hegemonic boundaries by engaging in activities such as sharing cross-border experiences and interactions, developing counter-mapping projects, and forming networks among indigenous authorities. These symbolic efforts have the potential to lead to political rights that transcend these contemporary divisions, such as the facilitation of cross-border political meetings among indigenous leaders, consultation with them on development projects in their territories, and enablement of indigenous individuals to visit sacred sites across state borders.

Borders are not the only places that play a significant role in identity construction. While other types of boundaries such as the Berlin wall, walls in the Palestinian territories, and peace walls in Ireland, also merit investigation regarding how borders affect identity construction, research should also consider how places other than borders shape boundary work. For example, research on living next to a toxic site or within a gentrifying neighborhood would also likely demonstrate how place matters significantly in identity construction and the shape of activism. Sociologists can advance research in these areas by addressing how shifting social and political contexts affect how these places both shape and are shaped by collective identification.

Spatial concerns are afforded too little attention in sociological work on processes related to collective identification. In this article, we demonstrated the importance of taking the spatial into account by focusing on political-administrative borders and indigenous identification. We have shown that state borders literally map over the historical relationship of indigenous people to particular spaces, places, and landscapes and influence how the indigenous themselves identify collectively. But in addition, we have shown that shifting social and political contexts shape symbolic struggles over collective identification, and individuals and collectivities may engage in counter-hegemonic social and symbolic processes to contest state borders and reclaim territories and access to places with special significance. Thus, symbolic struggles over collective identification may have material, and potentially even spatial, consequences.

Spatial and symbolic boundaries are co-constituting. State borders shape collective identification, and symbolic boundary work may entail the imagination—or re-establishment—of other territorial boundaries that conflict with those established by states. Research on collective identification can be strengthened by understanding its spatial rootedness and relation to concrete places as well as its symbolic processes. Boundaries are more than a metaphor.

REFERENCES

Agreement on Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples. 1995. Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/services/cds/agreements/pdf/guat12.pdf).

Arthur, Paige. 2011. *Identities in Transition: Challenges for Transnational Justice in Divided Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barth, Fredrick. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Carmack, Robert M. 1995. *Rebels of Highland Guatemala: The Quiché-Mayas of Momostenango*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Casaús Arzú, Marta Elena. 1998. "Reflexiones en Torno a la Legitimidad del Estado, la Nación y la Identidad en el Marco de los Acuerdos de Paz en Guatemala." Pp. 116-39 in *Guatemala after the Peace Accords*, edited by R. Sieder. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Cojtí Cuxil, Demetrio. 2005. *La Difícil Transición al Estado Multinacional: El Caso del Estado Monoétnico de Guatemala: 2004*. Guatemala: Cholsmaj.

——. 2007. "Indigenous Nations in Guatemalan Democracy and the State: A Tentative Assessment." *Social Analysis* 51(2):124–47.

Comisión de Oficialización de los Idiomas Indígenas de Guatemala. 1998. *Propuesta de Modalidad de Oficialización de los Idiomas Indígenas de Guatemala*. Guatemala: Nojib'sa.

Corntassel, Jeff J. 2003. "Who is Indigenous? 'Peoplehood' and Ethnonationalist Approaches to Rearticulating Indigenous Identity." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 9(1):75-100.

Council of the Mam Nation. 2014. "La Nación Mam Decidimos nuestra Autonomía y Autodeterminación." Official document from the Assembly of the Mam Nation. August 5th, 2014.

De Vos, Jan. 1994. "Chiapas, Central American Frontier in Mexico." Pp. 58-71 in *World Boundaries: Volume 4, The Americas*, edited by P.O. Girot. New York: Routledge.

Del Valle Escalante, Emilio. 2008. *Nacionalismos Mayas y Desafíos Postcoloniales en Guatemala: Colonialidad, Modernidad y Políticas de la Identidad Cultural*. Guatemala: FLASCO.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2002. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.

French, Brigittine M. 2010. *Maya Ethnolinguistic Identity: Violence, Cultural Rights, and Modernity in Highland Guatemala*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2010. "Does Whitening Happen? Distinguishing between Race and Color in an African-Descended Community in Peru." *Social Problems* 57:138-56.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Cultural Anthropology* 7:6-23.

Hale, Charles R. 2002. "Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34:485-524.

Hall, Stuart. 1996. "Who needs identity?" Pp. 1-17 in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Hall and P. du Gay. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Hendrickson, Carol. 1995. *Weaving Identities: Construction of Dress and Self in a Highland Guatemala Town*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hernández Castillo, R. Aída. 2001. *Histories and Stories from Chiapas: Border Identities in Southern Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

——. 2012. *Sur Profundo: Identidades Indígenas en la Frontera Chiapas-Guatemala*. Mexico: Publicaciones de la Casa Chata.

Iyall Smith, Keri E. 2006. *The State and Indigenous Movements*. New York: Routledge.

Jiménez Sánchez, Ajb'ee Odilio. 2008. Los Caminos de la Resistencia: Comunidad, Política e Historia Maya en Guatemala. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, The University of Texas at Austin.

Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-95.

Laraña, Enrique and Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mac Giolla Chríost, Diarmait. 2003. *Language, Identity and Conflict: Ethnic Conflict in Europe and Eurasia*. New York: Routledge.

Mallon, Florencia. 1996. "Constructing Mestizaje in Latin America: Authenticity, Marginality, and Gender in the Claiming of Ethnic Identities." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 2(1):170-81.

Martínez Cobo, José R. 1982. "The Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations." UN document E/CN.4/Sub.2/ 1982/2/Add.6. Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/MCS_v_en.pdf).

Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

——. 1995. "The Process of Collective Identity." Pp. 41-63 in *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by H. Johnston and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41:152-76.

Naples, Nancy A. and Jennifer Bickham Mendez. 2015. *Border Politics: Social Movements, Collective Identities, and Globalization*. New York: New York University Press.

Nelson, Diane M. 1999. *A Finger in the Wound: Body Politics in Quincentennial Guatemala*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nippert-Eng, Christena E. 2002. "Boundary Work: Sculpting Work and Home." Pp. 79-86 in *Cultural Sociology*, edited by L. Spillman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Owens, Timothy J., Dawn T. Robinson and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2010. "Three Faces of Identity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:477-99.

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283-305.

Richards, Patricia. 2004. *Pobladoras, Indígenas, and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

———. 2013. *Race and the Chilean Miracle: Neoliberalism, Democracy, and Indigenous Rights.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Richards, Patricia and Jeffrey A. Gardner. 2013. "Indigenous Movements in Latin America." In *Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by D.A. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans and D. McAdam. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1989. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis.* Boston: Beacon.

Sahlins, Peter. 1989. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sieder, Rachel. 2001. "Reframing Citizenship: Indigenous Rights, Local Power and the Peace Process in Guatemala." *Accord* 10. Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://www.c-r.org/sites/c-r.org/files/Accord%2002_6Reframing%20citizen ship_1997_ENG.pdf).

Silko, Leslie M. 1981. "Language and Literature from a Pueblo Indian Perspective." Pp. 54-72 in *Opening up the Canon*, edited by L. Fiedler and H. Baker. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, Anthony D. 2002. "When is a Nation?" *Geopolitics* 7:5-32.

Smith, Carol A. 1990. "Origins of the National Question in Guatemala: A Hypothesis." Pp. 72–95 in *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540–1988*, edited by C. Smith. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Stryker, Sheldon. 2008. "From Mead to a Structural Symbolic Interactionism and Beyond." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:15-31.

Taube, Rhonda. 2012. "Manufacturing Identities: Masking in Postwar Highland Guatemala." *Latin American Perspectives* 39:61-81.

Tax, Sol. 1937. "The Municipios of the Midwestern Highlands of Guatemala." *American Anthropologist* 39(3):423-44.

———. 1941. "World View and Social Relations in Guatemala." *American Anthropologist* 43:27-42.

Tratado Sobre Límites Entre México y Guatemala. 1882. Mexico. Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://cila.sre.gob.mx/cila sur/images/stories/tratado1882mexguat.pdf).

Turner, Ralph H. 1969. "The Public Perception of Protest." *American Sociological Review* 34:815-31.

United Nations. 2008. "Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://www.un. org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf).

Urkidi, Leire. 2011. "The Defense of Community in the Anti-Mining Movement of Guatemala." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 11(4):556-80.

Wade, Peter. 1997. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America.* Chicago: Pluto Press.

Wainwright, Joel. 2008. *Decolonizing Development: Colonial Power and the Maya.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Warren, Kay B. 1996. "Indigenous Movements as a Challenge to the Unified Social Movement Paradigm for Guatemala." Pp. 165-95 in *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Re-Visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by S.E. Alvarez, E. Dagnino and A. Escobar. Boulder: Westview Press.

———. 1998. *Indigenous Movements and their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Warren, Sarah D. 2013. "A Nation Divided: Building the Cross-Border Mapuche Nation in Chile and Argentina." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 45(2):235-64.

Watanabe, John M. 1992. *Maya Saints and Souls in a Changing World.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1995. "Unimagining the Maya: Anthropologists, Others, and the Inescapable Hubris of Authorship." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14(1):25-45.

———. 2004. "Culture History in National Contexts: Nineteenth-Century Maya under Mexican and Guatemalan Rule." Pp. 35-65 in *Pluralizing Ethnography*, edited by J.M. Watanabe and E.F. Fischer.Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Wolf, Eric R. 1955. "Types of Latin American Peasantry: A Preliminary Discussion." *American Anthropologist* 57(3):452-71.

Zorilla, Luis G. 1984. *Relaciones de México con la República de Centro América y con Guatemala.* Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa.