Women's Political Consciousness and Empowerment in Local, National, and Transnational Contexts: Guatemalan Refugees and Returnees

Patricia R. Pessar

This study of Guatemalan refugees and returnees contributes to the small corpus of work that interrogates gender and migration/exile from the vantage points of women's political consciousness and empowerment. In taking up these issues, it also seeks to broaden feminist thinking about citizenship by engaging not only local and national contexts in which women's citizenship are forged, but also transnational ones.

Acknowledging that gender operates simultaneously on multiple geographical scales, the article examines how contexts as diverse as bodies, states, and refugee camps become strategic sites for struggles over women's and men's human rights and citizenship. The study reveals that in the transnational context of refugee camps, the agency of Guatemalan women was greatly enhanced by the fact of their being female and indigenous. This, in turn, facilitated their membership in broad political coalitions that cross national borders. Unfortunately, these very same social locations (i.e. female and indigenous)--and women's newfound identities as transnational subjects—proved highly disadvantageous once the refugees returned to the "fold" of local communities and the Guatemalan nation-state. This study attributes the erosion in returnee-women's rights and overall empowerment to several factors: the disciplining arm of the Guatemalan state, which seeks to resubjugate its new transnational subjects, a duplicitous male refugee leadership pleased to regain its traditional gender privileges,

Identities, Vol. 7(4), pp. 461–500
Reprints available directly from the publisher
Photocopying permitted by license only

© 2001 OPA (Overseas Publishers Association) N.V.
Published by license under
the Harwood Academic Publishers imprint,
part of The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.
Printed in Malaysia.

and transnational organizations and social movements that often fail to honor their commitments to those who had previously dared to think and act beyond the patriarchal confines of the nation-state.

Key Words: Gender, Guatemalan refugees and returnees, Transnational contexts, Citizenship, Women's rights

Conventional wisdom holds that refugee women are victimized, dependent, and dispirited (Malkki 1995; Martin 1992). Guatemalan refugee women, such as the 8,000 who joined the feminist organization Mamá Maquín, challenge these popular assumptions.[1] While in Mexico the members of Mamá Maquín were the beneficiaries of a host of internationally funded programs, covering such matters as literacy, the Spanish language, and women's health, and they routinely attended workshops on human rights and women's rights.[2] Indeed, members of Mamá Maquín felt so empowered by their experiences in exile that they wrote, "As a result of the Organization [Mamá Maquín], women realize that they have rights. Now no one says: We can't talk because we are women. Now we know that women are equal to men" (Mamá Maquín/CIAM 1994: 65, translation mine).[3]

As reflected in this statement, in exile many Guatemalan refugee women found themselves no longer satisfied with the prevailing gender order. They insisted upon significant transformations in gender relations and meanings as ways to gain full autonomy and equality. In tracing these changes in women's perceptions and practices, this study belongs to a small corpus of work that interrogates gender and migration/exile from the vantage points of women's political consciousness and empowerment (Billings 1995; Peteet 1991; Shukla 1997).

Gendered citizenship has been central to these women's struggles. Historically, most struggles for women's citizenship rights have emerged and unfolded within local and national contexts. Guatemalan refugee women also focused their attention on local community structures and on the Guatemalan state. Where they differed, however, is that they first learned of their broad-based citizenship rights as women and developed their political strategies within refugee camps—sites that privileged global discourses based on human, feminist, and indigenous rights, and that functioned as transnational entrepôts for the refugee leadership, officials of international governmental and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and members of international feminist, human rights, and solidarity groups.

This study explores the ways in which the refugee camps contributed to the creation of "new transnational subjects": individuals who were able to think and act beyond the hegemonic constructs of national citizenship, including its male bias (Smith 1994). I concentrate on those Guatemalan refugee women who came to claim full citizenship, not only in local communities and in the Guatemalan nation-state, but also well beyond. They imagined themselves as members of global communities and learned to fashion transnational citizenship practices that tied them to larger feminist, solidarity, and pan-indigenous collectives. In taking up these issues, this study aims both to broaden feminist thinking about citizenship (Lister 1997; Yuval Davis 1997) by engaging the transnational contexts and processes through which women's citizenship may be forged, and to bring gender more centrally into our analyses of transnational contexts and transnational subjects.

If we might gloss the first part of this study, which deals with the more-than-ten years the refugees spent in exile, as "women imagine a transnational form of citizenship and gain some rights along the way," the second half relates a far sadder tale. In returnee communities, women have seen their hard-won gains in citizenship eroded, if not reversed. One dimension of the women's current plight is anticipated in the writings of Michael Peter Smith (1994), when he asserts that the late modernist state will attempt to discipline and "resubjugate" those new transnational subjects who dare to operate outside the officially constructed categories of identity. What has been largely neglected, however, in the generally celebratory treatments of transnational subjects and transnational grassroots politics is the ways transnational organizations and social movements sometimes fail their "new subjects." This article documents just such an instance. It considers those Guatemalan refugee women who, after their return to the "fold" of local communities and the nation-state, were largely abandoned by those Mexican and international organizations that had earlier encouraged and facilitated the women's empowerment.[4]

ENGAGING THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

In the literature on gender and migration/exile, scholars have focused on issues of continuity and change in gender beliefs and practices, and debated whether migration is a vehicle for women's empowerment (Morokvasic 1984; Pessar 1999). Many works have gauged social change by comparing observed behaviors in one

"receiving" community against informants' recollections of gender relations at "home" (Castro 1986; Schwartz-Seller 1981), or more ambitiously by conducting research in a paired set of sending and receiving communities (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). In my view, both analytical frameworks encourage a streamlining of a far more complex reality.

In the case of the Guatemalan subjects featured in this study, contests between the sexes over access to, and control over meanings, social relations, and arenas for agenda-setting range over a multiplicity of geographical scales. These same scales come into play both as the refugees/returnees rely on social memory to conjure up past "gender regimes" and when they attempt to imagine alternative gender ideologies and practices. For these reasons, I have constructed an analytical framework that is multi-sited, translocal, transnational, and diachronic. The phenomena I consider range in size and complexity from individual bodies, indigenous villages, and guerrilla encampments to transnational refugee camps, intergovernmental organizations, and transnational solidarity groups.

In addition to diversifying and amplifying the geographical scales considered in studies of migration and gender, we also need to rethink our overall approach to social localities. All too often in migration studies, "home" and "host" communities are treated as an unproblematic grounding for the "real" stuff that must be analyzed. This assumption misses the crucial fact that locality is a social production—and one that must be continually replicated through such public acts of placemaking as participation in official censuses, crowning local beauty queens, and donning localized dress (Berger 1979). The study of the social production of localities is particularly apposite in our contemporary times when the forging of place is often a contested affair pitting subnational, national, and transnational interests against each other for the inhabitants' imaginations, loyalty, and labor (Appadurai 1996). My work adds the important, though often neglected feature of gender to our overall understanding of the social production of locality (Massey 1994). As we shall see, when competing interests contend for control over the social production of locality, gender becomes one of the axes around which the terms of belonging, entitlement, and laboring are negotiated and contested. My goals in this study are not only to facilitate an understanding of how gender operates in a multiplicity of geographical contexts. I also interrogate whether and how gender relations and ideologies are reaffirmed, reconfigured, or both across transnational spaces. Before

embarking on this important task, it is useful to introduce several of the difficulties I have faced along the way, and how I have attempted to resolve them.

Perhaps the most logical way to begin to gauge continuity and change in gender ideologies and relations over the course of the Guatemalan refugees' many years in exile is to begin to reconstruct their gendered lives immediately prior to the violence and mass displacement. As it turns out, such an attempt to establish a baseline is daunting and highly problematic. First, the refugees originated from scores of indigenous, rural communities located predominantly in the western highlands, in the recently colonized lowlands (the Ixcán Grande region), and Petén. Each community had its own distinct history, political organization, and systems of production and social reproduction. The refugees were also members of a multiplicity of ethnic groups with their own gender norms and practices.

Second, within the limited corpus of literature on pre-1980 indigenous communities, controversy exists over whether or not indigenous Mayan women enjoyed significant degrees of autonomy and authority. Those who report a high degree of parity between the sexes point to bonds between men and women based on complementarity and interdependence, especially within the realms of cosmology, subsistence production, and kinship ideology (Billings 1995; Bossen 1984; Burgos-Debray 1984; Wilson 1995). By contrast, Tracy Ehler's ethnographic study of a Mam highland community uncovered scant evidence of complementarity and equity. Rather, she finds: "Women... are expected to subordinate themselves to male domination, while at the same time being skillful and independent workers. They are socialized to accept a secondary status, to be obedient, and nurturing. Yet the family productive system is often based on their work, their cottage industry, and their market trade" (Ehlers 1990: 2).

It is the latter, more critical, rendering of gender relations that emerges in those publications that feature refugee women's "voices." For example, a representative of a Canadian-based international development organization quotes one refugee woman as saying:

> Some people and agencies mistakenly see our indigenous communal approach, where both women and men participate in many tasks, as a sign that women have a sense of their value in the community. This isn't usually so. Women participate as part of the community but their self-esteem remains low. They aren't motivated to learn new skills. They don't realize the value of their own contributions nor their capacity to learn new skills and assume new roles (Arbour 1995: 10).

And a young refugee woman told her interviewer:

> Before we left Guatemala, when I was 19 years old, I helped my father work the fields. If we didn't work hard enough he hit us. When this happened we had no right to question him or say anything. At home, the woman had no right to speak nor to complain that there was too much work. And it was worse in the community where only the men make community decisions. They thought that women were only there to have children and serve them. We had to put up with the drinking and hitting and people thought that women weren't worth the same as men. All of this seemed normal.... Now it's different. We know that we have rights and that in order for these rights to be respected we have to carry out the struggle among all of us (Billings 1995: 225).

Some might be tempted to regard such statements by refugee women as clear confirmation that highly patriarchical gender relations predominated in many, if not all, indigenous communities prior to exile. I am not ready to assert such a claim. I am, nonetheless, convinced that for many refugee/returnee women this is now *their prevailing vision*: one that was crafted, in large part, with the tools for critical gender analysis provided by the internationals they met in refugee camps.[5] Consequently, while pre-exile, ethnographic accounts of gender relations in indigenous communities are useful in pointing out (likely) variations in gender ideologies and practices, and in documenting patterns that may be reconstituted in returnee households and communities, they are only part of the picture. The refugee/returnee women's social memories are equally important, if not more so. It is against these potent images of patriarchal men and victimized women that many returnee women (and men) now gauge how far they have come in constructing more equitable gender relations.

Finally, let me say something about my research methods. While my analytical framework includes multiple local, national, and transnational settings over the course of some thirty years, my own ethnographic research has been far less sweeping. I could not have been at all of the sites I consider in this study simultaneously, nor did the war encourage multi-sited ethnography. Moreover, I became actively involved in the ethnographic research for this study in the summer of 1998 and the spring of 1999, only after the refugees had returned. Therefore, in my treatments of earlier times and of pre-exile and camp settings, I have had to rely either on others' ethnographic research or on material I gathered while interviewing returnees. Because much of the information presented here was

gathered second-hand, a certain amount of ethnographic "thick description" has been admittedly forfeited.

VIOLENCE AND EXILE

Guatemalan refugees were displaced by a bloody war that raged for more than thirty-five years until an internationally brokered peace agreement was signed in December 1996. The insurgency was ignited by a grossly inequitable distribution of income and land, a brutal history of ethnic genocide and discrimination, and the elite's unwillingness to entertain peaceful organizing around civil reforms and economic rights. Initially, in the 1960s and 1970s, social activists (many of whom were indigenous catechists and/or members of agrarian unions and the cooperativist movement) were targeted for repression, disappearance, and murder. In the early 1980s, when such selective violence proved incapable of stemming popular reformist struggles, and at a time when some were even predicting the imminent victory of the guerrilla forces,[6] the Guatemalan government responded with its horrific Scorched Earth campaign, which targeted the western highlands and adjacent lowland areas (Carmack 1988; Falla 1994). At least 100,000 civilians were killed and more than 400 villages razed. Some 150,000 to 200,000 people, the vast majority of whom were indigenous, fled to neighboring Mexico (U.S. Committee for Refugees 1993).

Sometimes traveling in entire community groups, thousands of victims of the Scorched Earth campaign began crossing into Mexico in the early 1980s. Many settled in Chiapas, and it was this group that benefitted from the Mexican government's agreement to recognize a subset of the Guatemalans as refugees. This group of 43,000 was permitted to settle in camps in southern Mexico, where individuals and families were assisted by the Mexican government's refugee agency (Commission for the Assistance of Refugees), the Catholic church, the UNHCR, and international NGOs (Aguilar Zinzer 1991).[7]

In many instances, refugee families had to rent the lands they lived and worked on from their Mexican owners. Wages were needed both to pay this rent and to supplement the inadequate food aid received from the Mexican government and UNHCR. In the pursuit of wages, women found themselves at a distinct disadvantage. In Guatemala women had been able to contribute income as artisans and traders. By contrast, in the early years of exile, women found their access to local markets in rural Mexico severely limited. Similarly, wage work

was generally hard to find, and the travel and lodging expenses for a couple and their children often outweighed the extremely low wages women were paid.[8] As a consequence, women tended to be left at home by their wage-earning husbands (Billings 1995).

Women's self-esteem plummeted as the pre-exile pattern of economic interdependence and complementarity between the sexes was jettisoned (Bossen 1984) and replaced by women's increasing dependence upon male partners. In 1992 a 32-year-old Chuj woman told researcher Deborah Billings: "When I cry I say to myself, 'what a shame that I am a woman.' If I weren't I could walk where I want and with money in my hand." And a 35-year-old Chuj woman lamented: "We have no way to help ourselves. We can't go out and earn anything. We see the men. They can earn and we're dependent on them" (1995: 174).

THE CREATION OF FEMALE REFUGEE SUBJECTS

If in these early years Guatemalan refugee women found themselves particularly adrift and needy, they were to meet up with an international refugee regime poised to acknowledge this condition and determined to turn it around dramatically. The women were extremely fortunate because, earlier and worldwide, most female refugees had encountered indifference on the part of local and international personnel charged with administering refugee programs (Martin 1991). It was only in the 1980s that activists in the international women's movement managed to gain the attention of high-ranking officials of the United Nations and convince them to treat refugee women as persons with special needs and potentials. Consequently, it was not until 1991, some forty years after the founding of the UNHCR, that the U.N. Guidelines for the Protection of Refugee Women were finally issued. This achievement followed on the heels of international feminist struggles and accomplishments, such as the proclamation of 1976–1985 as the U.N. Decade for Women and the 1985 Nairobi meeting in which refugee women first emerged as a special category of migrant (Martin 1991).

The fate of Guatemalan refugee women and men was significantly shaped by the convergence in time between their arrival in Mexico and the growing conviction within international circles that refugee women required assessment through research, management through special personnel (such as the U.N. Senior Coordinator for Refugee Women), and intervention through special programs of

human rights education, protection, and assistance (Martin 1991). As a UNHCR representative who worked with Guatemalan refugees observes:

> [W]omen were singled out to implement small economic projects. Even when these were unsuccessful economically, [they] brought refugee women together. NGOs, UNHCR, and the women's organizations eventually approached their work with refugees with a defined agenda of empowering women as a necessary step to ensuring women's participation in creating durable solutions for themselves, their families and the community (Worby 1998b: 6).

In no small measure, the impetus to go on to form Mamá Maquín grew out of the experiences refugee women had in creating and maintaining such small, income-generating projects in camps throughout southern Mexico. In the words of one of the original founders of the organization:

> On May 20–25, 1990 in Palenque, 47 of us representing women from the three states of Chiapas, Quintana Roo, and Campeche met. We assembled initially with only the aim of sharing our experiences working in the projects. There we saw that we could learn from each other and it was very important to form the organization. We elected our leadership and made the commitment to go back to our camps to see how many women we could organize to join the next meeting set for August. Now we women had made a great commitment without knowing how our husbands or children would react to it. By the time we went public on the 15th of August, we had over 2,300 members. It was a very great effort we had made![9]

FROM FEMALE CONSCIOUSNESS TO FEMINIST CONSCIOUSNESS

It certainly merits our attention that the refugee women were able to build upon, yet moved well beyond, this initial phase of participation in modest income-generating projects to create a unified, feminist organization that at its heyday boasted some 8,000 members. The women took a courageous step when, shortly after the creation of Mamá Maquín, they alerted powerful entities, like UNHCR and international NGOs, that an assistance plan based on simple women's projects was no longer acceptable.

> Our demands should not be reduced to small economic projects, but rather to become ourselves—active subjects, women with a consciousness about gender, ethnicity, and class—in order to participate in social and national projects where we women play an active role, side-by-side with men (Billings 1995: 261).[10]

We see a significant change in women's political consciousness in this decision to move beyond women's projects and to create a feminist organization. That is, many made a transition from a "female consciousness," which places human nurturing above all other social and political requirements (Kaplan 1982), and from actions based on "practical interests" (Molyneux 1985) centered around family survival, to a "feminist" and "strategic consciousness" (Molyneax 1985). These women concluded that all struggles for equality must be connected to a broader, strategic struggle for women's rights. These were notions of female personhood and of struggle that emerged in exile. While still in Guatemala, some of the refugee women had participated in progressive religious organizations such as Catholic Action and the Committee of Campesino Unity (CUC) (Sinclair 1995). Although these entities emphasized equity in ethnic and class relations, they were largely silent on matters of gender oppression and certainly did not see the fostering of feminist consciousness as central to their mission.[11]

It is noteworthy that several of my interviewees had "emic" categories quite similar to the constructs of female and feminist consciousness. They could, and did, readily distinguish between those women who, in their words, "had full consciousness" of women's oppression and the need to organize collectively to redress this wrong and those who were attracted to organizations like Mamá Maquín "only for the projects."[12] Moreover, there was general agreement among my informants that those most politically aware and committed to the feminist struggle were the leaders of the several refugee women's organizations[13] and younger women whose formative years were spent in the camps.

Although I explore in this section the historical and social roots of Guatemalan refugee women's feminist consciousness, I certainly do not believe that a rigid dichotomy exists between pragmatic/female interests and strategic/feminist ones. Rather, I conceive of women's consciousness as dynamic and fluctuating along a continuum spanning these two positions. Our challenge becomes one of determining how women's consciousness develops and how fluctuations in consciousness are explained by such factors as life-cycle phasing (Peteet 1991), social location (e.g., race, class, sexuality), and the gendering of specific social localities where women reside.

In part, many refugee women developed a feminist consciousness as a response to their earlier, pre-exile confrontations with state-sponsored violence. It will be recalled that during the initial phase of selective repression and killing, the army and death squads focused

on popular leaders who operated in such arenas as community cooperatives and local government, sites that rural and indigenous Guatemalans perceive as "public" and "male." Although women, either as activists or as wives and mothers of male victims, suffered greatly during this initial phase, they became far more implicated and terrorized over the course of the government's Scorched Earth campaign. In this later period the state aimed to separate the insurgents brutally from their popular base; in practice, this meant destroying the quotidian infrastructure through such acts as massacring *campesino* families, and/or burning their homes and *milpas* (small farming plots). In these acts of broad-based destruction, the army invaded women's personal spaces and denied them their most important role: to maintain *la lucha* (the struggle), i.e., what women must do simply to keep their families alive from one day to the next (Ehlers 1990: 46). I would suggest that this state-instigated intrusion into domestic space dissolved the appearance of a fixed boundary between male/public and female/private spheres. This erasure would later increase the receptivity of refugee women to the feminist precept that the private is political.[14]

During their attacks, the army specifically targeted indigenous women and teenage girls who were frequently raped and then, often, murdered. Other atrocities included ripping the unborn from their mother's bodies and smashing them against house beams and trees. There were also incidents of ritual burnings of indigenous women's clothing: woven articles of dress that symbolized both women and their ethnic communities (Billings 1995). In the many acts of rape, indigenous women confronted state collaborators who wantonly and violently transgressed the most intimate divide between female self and other. Moreover, these strangers crossed a boundary that, ever since childhood, women had been disciplined to honor and to protect (Burgos-Debray 1984). The terrorized women also perceived that while indigenous cultures valued women for their procurative and nurturing powers and for their role in cultural maintenance (Billings 1995; Burgos-Debray 1984), the ladino-controlled state had embarked on a genocidal project that rendered indigenous women especially vulnerable and disposable.

For some women the process of feminist conscientization, initiated in exile, helped to convert these unthinkable acts of terror and violation, and the accompanying emotions of helplessness and shame, into powerful structures of meaning and action.[15] Moreover, the feminist agenda, that groups like Mamá Maquín insisted upon affixing

to the other collective struggles based on class and ethnicity, held out the promise that future generations of women might escape such state-supported violence as well as the more subtle, everyday acts of female oppression within indigenous families and communities. Consider the words of Petrona López Domínguez[16], a 32-year-old Chuj woman, as she described her decision to join Mamá Maquín:

> When I heard the leaders talk about our lifetimes of suffering at the hands of men, and of our history of oppression and violence at the hands of the ladinos, I recalled how scared I was when we fled our village—how I feared being raped and murdered. Several of my friends were murdered. They were spotted by soldiers who raped and killed them. To better protect me, my mother insisted that I discard my colorful *traje*, dress in black, and put dust on my face so I would look like an old lady. [I remembered] how unnatural it felt to be out of my *traje* and dressed in black. . . . I saw in my own life that Mamá Maquín was right in saying that we needed to struggle together as women and as indigenous. . . . I never wanted to see my own daughters suffer the way we women did in the violence.[17]

In sum, if their social locations as women who were indigenous, young, and poor conspired to make many Mayan women targets of state-orchestrated violence, later these intertwined statuses rendered them particularly receptive to a project of feminist conscientization. Moreover, certain settings, like guerrilla encampments and refugee camps, proved especially conducive to this project.

GENDER RELATIONS AND PRACTICES IN GUERILLA ENCAMPMENTS

It might be said of some female guerrillas that a feminist consciousness evolved indirectly and unexpectedly, since the struggle for gender equality was never central to the guerrilla organizations (Colom 1998; Solorzano 1989). As Irma, an ex-combatant expressed it:

> [W]ithin the [guerrilla] organizations, and the popular movement in general, there has never been a sector specifically concerned with women's issues. Instead, we women have been involved in the struggle against capitalism, the crisis and repression, without discovering our own demands. This has meant that these have not been dealt with by the [guerilla/URNG] organization either" (Hooks 1993: 123–124).

What many female and male guerrillas did experience, however, was a far greater flexibility in gender roles. "The *compañeros* were so often on the move that everyone had to pitch in equally to build new shelters, find food to eat, cook it, stand guard: men and women

equally, each had two arms after all," one woman recounted.[18] And a male guerrilla explained that not only did he experience greater flexibility in gender roles, but he alleged that in his unit a "universalistic" norm of meritocracy prevailed:

> The women [guerrillas] worked in health, as couriers, fought and did counter-intelligence. The women fought and the men fought. The men also made food and did wash, just like the women. We all did the same work; for us there was no distinction.... My unit leader was a woman; then, it was a matter of individual capacity.[19]

For certain young, indigenous women who had been taught to keep their ambitions modest and in the service of their "primary" roles as daughters, wives, and mothers, membership in the guerrilla could also prove particularly liberating. Having refused assignments to the more stereotypically female, nimble-fingered tasks of sewing uniforms and assembling explosives, María recounted:

> I told them straight out, 'I would like to be a combatant'.... As a woman combatant, in the beginning I really felt that I was out of place, But, I began to believe that women have every capacity that men have.... In my village, men would always say, 'I am the man and I can do everything. You can't do anything. The only thing you can do is have children.' So in the mountains, everything is different because everyone knows that everyone is capable of doing whatever a man does.... I want my daughter to understand this, that she is on an equal plane with men (Sanford 1997: 25, 27).

Although women like María gained a degree of confidence and personal empowerment previously unknown, they also confronted structural limitations to further actualization. Irma described her humiliation at being branded "disloyal" by her male commanders for having maintained liaisons with more than one man. "It wasn't necessary to sit me down with the two men and confront me in front of everybody," she stated. "[I]t was horrible. And I wonder if I were a man, would I have been treated in the same way for going out with two women!" (Hooks 1993: 124). For many other woman, the parting of the ways came when they found themselves pregnant, vulnerable, and abandoned by their male partner who had either been sent to another unit or had taken up with another woman.[20]

In light of such disillusioning experiences, women like Irma concluded that her earlier belief that "when the revolution triumphed women would automatically be liberated as well" was erroneous (ibid).[21] Instead, she and many other disgruntled ex-combatants elected to leave the guerrilla movement and go into exile. There they

frequently found themselves attracted to feminist organizations like Mamá Maquín. Indeed, some of the first members of that organization apparently emerged from these ranks.[22] Although ex-combatants might retain the belief that class struggle was needed to create the objective conditions for women's liberation, they now complemented this project with a feminist one, or as Irma explained, "The revolutionary process must be accompanied by a profound ideological struggle to change the mentality of both men and women to construct a new world and a new humanity" (Hooks: 125).

FEMINIST CONSCIOUSNESS AND GENDER WITHIN A TRANSNATIONAL ARENA

If struggles for gender equity were peripheral to the popular guerrilla movement, such struggles and the forging of feminist consciousness were high on the agendas of many of the internationals the refugee women would encounter in exile. They encouraged the Guatemalan women to imagine and fashion modes of belonging and participation that included full membership in local, national, and transnational collectivities, such as those linked to human rights, women's rights, and indigenous rights. These rights-based initiatives were often coordinated by a joint commission formed by members of UNHCR, refugee women's organizations, and a group of Mexican and international NGOs.[23] Not infrequently, the refugee women were introduced to transgressive, new meanings and roles. A goodly number, after all, came from communities in which women's access to public discussions had come through indirect channels, such as their influence upon husbands and sons (Billings 1995). A highly visible public role for women also challenged popular assertions that held that women who frequently interacted with nonfamilial men (especially at night) were prostitutes or witches (ibid; Burgos-Debray 1984).

To counteract and challenge such constraining and disciplining messages, representatives of the joint commission introduced the refugee women to an alternate set of images and discourses drawn from relatively progressive, supranational organizations and legal regimes. For example, women who attended workshops on women's rights hosted by Mamá Maquín were given instructional brochures that contained line drawings that simply, but eloquently, positioned indigenous Guatemalan women—with their subordinated quotidian lives—alongside official empowering national and international legal documents. One brochure, for example, shows a musing indi-

genous woman who asks, "What is my reality?" Beneath a picture of men attending a public meeting, she is instructed, "Public positions are almost always held by men, based on the inequity between men and women. This impedes our participation." She counters, "And how could it be?" The question is "answered" by a drawing of women proclaiming, "We Win!" And beneath it is article 7–8 of the U.N. Convention to eliminate Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which reads, "All countries should take measures such that women participate in political life equally with men" (Billings 1995: 285).[24] In another example, in 1993 on International Women's Day, pamphlets were distributed in the camps stating, "All of us women have the right to struggle for equality, which is a human right. We take our example from Rigoberta Menchú, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992, who struggles for the indigenous and for human rights" (ibid: 278).

The discursive elements contained in these and scores of other similar texts belong to that globalized genre of meanings that Arjun Appadurai calls "ideoscapes." By this term, he refers to the travelling concatenation of tropes "that are often directly political and frequently have to do with the ideologies of states and the counterideologies of movements explicitly oriented to capturing state power or a piece of it" (1996: 36). The ideoscopes refugee women were exposed to exhorted them to widen their horizons, and to state claim to "pieces" of local and state power that unbeknown to them were already legitimately theirs.

"Generic" ideoscopes must, of course, be rendered familiar and authentic for their audiences. This was frequently accomplished in the refugee camps by inserting the relatively new tropes of human rights and women's rights into the "traditional" Latin American oral genre of the *testimonio*. *Testimonios* emerged as a favored vehicle with which to contest official renderings of indigenous women refugees as ignorant and manipulated by outsiders and to link the narrator's personal experiences compellingly to wider structures of gender, ethnic, and class oppression (Hooks 1993). Another way in which indigenous women challenged the notion that they were being duped by foreign feminists was by pointing to an original Mayan "cosmovision" based on gender symmetry and parity. They alleged that this once hegemonic vision of gender relations was violently suppressed by the Spanish colonizers who, in turn, introduced patriarchal norms that were soon embraced by indigenous male collaborators (Montejo 1998).

Women's alternative truths often emerged powerfully in workshops held in the camps on such topics as violence and women's

rights as human rights. What Jennifer Schirmer writes about the Guatemalan organization of war widows, CONAVIGUA, applies equally well, I believe, to many of the refugee women in Mexico:

> Their sense of 'knowing,' of learning from each other's experience, which was in conflict with 'the [State's official] truth,' was continually reconstituted, especially as patterns of violence against them began to emerge. [They queried] 'If they say we are mothers who should be respected, and yet treat us and our daughters with rape and torture, who are these men who sexualize us, soil us, and degrade us?' In this process of questioning first 'the truth,' and then the 'claimers of that truth,' class and ethnicity gained and lost their centrality to gender, sometimes returning in the form of gendered ethnicity or gendered class, but increasingly seen through the optic of gender (1993: 63).

Such contestation of "official" truth and an insistence upon braiding gender, ethnicity, and class in order best to understand Mayan women's oppression is reflected in Julia's comment during a Mamá Maquín sponsored workshop on violence:

> In our country it was the rich who kicked us out and made us leave. They rule the army. Indigenous men violate women's rights, yes, but it's not their fault. The rich have put the idea in their heads that women are only good for taking care of children. They say that a woman is only a woman when she's in the house. But we women have no rights to decide what should be done in our homes, and then in our country we women have no rights to decide or participate. Because of this we women suffer more than the men. But the rich have tried to fool all of us for many years. None of us knew our rights so we weren't able to defend ourselves (Billings 1995: 233–234).

It is noteworthy that as indigenous refugee women critically examined the intersection of gender, class, and ethnicity, some began to chafe at the fact that when participating alongside ladino female and male activitists in international fora, indigenous women were deemed "suitable" only to bear witness through *testimonios* rather than to participate in the more "objective" phases of analysis and policy formulation. Elena, a 23-year-old Ixil activist, expressed anger about an indigenous woman who was part of a Guatemalan delegation visiting New York and was instructed that she should not accompany the larger group because "this time it wasn't about giving testimony." Elena went on, "Presenting women as 'victims' goes hand-in-hand with discrimination.... We can continue to give testimony, but we can also provide analysis and even write books. We must become the protagonists in our own struggle" (Hooks 1993: 74).

In addition to being a destination for globally circulating discourses, refugee camps were also transnational entrepôts where refugee women met internationals whose actions showcased alternative ways of leading gendered lives. The camps also afforded the women opportunities to expand greatly the geographic reach of their material base and social relations. For example, on any given day, camp residents might receive visits from representatives of UNHCR, the European Economic Community, or international NGOs like OXFAM,[25] meet with international solidarity delegations from Witness for Peace and the National Coordinating Office on Refugees and Displaced of Guatemala (NCOORD), and consult with international women's groups like the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children.[26] Occasionally these visits resulted in invitations to refugee women to participate abroad in speaking tours and in international solidarity or feminist meetings. Isabela López Pérez had this to say about her involvement in a feminist women's conference (sponsored by a church group) in New York:

> Going to that conference was important. The other women were eager to learn about and to support our struggles; I learned that it was not only in Guatemala, but in many countries where women faced discrimination. When I went back to Mexico, I shared my experiences. . . . I realized it was important to keep struggling and to animate others, as well. . . . One woman I met from Chicago later brought a delegation from her community to Mexico. They visited our camp and donated food and money for our little day care center, because I had told her that the center helped the women attend Mamá Maquín classes and workshops. . . . I also had the opportunity to speak to people about conditions in Guatemala and our struggle for a collective return. They promised to carry my words to their people so that we could struggle together for peace in Guatemala and for equality for women, the indigenous, and the poor.[27]

We see in this example, and in numerous similar occasions in which refugee women transversed the check-points of camps and national borders on their way to feminist, solidarity, and pan-indigenous reunions, instances of what Michael Peter Smith calls "the globalization of grassroots politics" and "transnationalism from below." These actions also seem to confirm Ruth Lister's claim that, "We are today witnessing the emergence of a global civil society, in which women are playing a central role" (1997: 18).[28]

There is no doubt that such grassroots global politicking was encouraged and facilitated by the special contexts the camps represented. Through the comings and goings of internationals and owing

to the presence of modern technology, the refugees experienced a marked quickening in the pace and intensity of movement and communication across space, as well as the geographical stretching out of social relations (Massey 1994). This is a phenomenon social theorists refer to as "time-space compression." While overall, such conditions did characterize camp life, clearly not all categories of persons who lived in, or passed through the camps benefitted equally from the potential rewards such contexts might afford. Doreen Massey introduces just such a caveat with her concept of "the power geometry." Her point is that "different social groups, and different individuals are placed in very distinct ways in relation to these flows and interconnections.... [M]obility, and control over mobility, both reflects and reinforces power" (1994: 148, 150). In the case of Mexican refugee camps, the refugees and the internationals differed greatly in their mobility, in their access to transnational flows of people, ideas, commodities, and services, and in their control over the content and directionality of these flows. Clearly, the internationals held the reins of power—a hard lesson the refugee women would learn when they returned to Guatemala, still needing their aid.

Nonetheless, while they remained in exile, women's ranking as a special category of refugee typically ensured that they were privileged within the camps' power geometry. This did not always sit well with certain male refugees. Some, for example, denounced Mamá Maquín as an inauthentic creation of foreign women, foisted on a naive group of refugee women (Billings 1995). And in El Porvenir camp (in Chiapas), the men initially refused to contribute their much-needed labor to build a clinic and outreach center (called "provocatively" *la casa de la mujer* (women's house)) that was funded by the European Economic Community (Sullivan 1996).[29] For the most part, though, the male refugee leaders made strategic use of the fact that a large segment of the international community had chosen to support and validate empowered, indigenous, refugee women, such as Rigoberta Menchú and the leaders of Mamá Maquín. They, therefore, did not stand in the way as growing numbers of women came to participate in public decision-making within the camps.[30] They also worked side by side (although often, more reluctantly) with the few women who assumed positions as health and educational promoters (Billings 1995). The male leadership recognized that the women who participated in transnational grassroots politics drew broader attention to the refugees' common goals to end the war in Guatemala and to convince the Guatemalan government to accept

their demands for a voluntary and collective return (Morel 1998; Worby 1998a). Moreover, the women attracted funding and valuable commodities that could be partially skimmed off for men's activities or re-channeled by some of the men to the guerrilla forces in Guatemala.[31]

In sum, women found in refugee camps transnational actors and institutions that encouraged them to imagine themselves as full citizens within and across multiple political landscapes; and they were furnished with services and goods that allowed them to put these new subjectivities into practice. The women's new identities and actions underscore how feminist consciousness and the feminization of civil society may evolve and be fortified within such transnational settings. Unfortunately, for these women, the limitations of such supra-national forms of power and civil participation became clear when the refugees entered into formal negotiations regarding their collective return. Their key political interlocutors became not transnational entities, but instead officials of the Guatemalan state. At this crucial juncture, when matters of gendered citizenship within the context of the nation-state were at issue, both the male refugee leadership and the women's previously stalwart supporter, the UNHCR, failed them miserably.

THE TRANSNATIONAL MEETS THE NATIONAL: THE ABANDONMENT OF REFUGEE WOMEN

Despite women's objections, men totally dominated the ranks of the Permanent Commissions, the elected body charged with negotiating, alongside representatives of the Guatemalan and Mexican governments and officials of the UNHCR, the terms of the refugees' collective return (Billings 1995; Morel 1998; Worby 1998a).[32] UNHCR assumed a key role in financing the activities of the Permanent Commissions and had it so chosen, it might have asserted financial leverage to insist upon and facilitate a greater role for women. In an extremely frank admission, Terry Morel, a UNHCR representative who worked closely with the refugee women in Mexico, publicly decried this failure of political will when she wrote:

> Initially UNHCR did not take up the matter of women's participation in the representational structures responsible for the refugees' return. I am daring enough to state that this owed to our institutional difficulty in immediately defending the rights of women within traditional spaces of

> power. [Although we financed the representatives during their negotiations,] we never questioned the absence of women. This means that we [actually] fortified male leadership at the expense of the women's organizations (1998: 16).

In addition to this lack of vision and will, UNHCR and other international entities managed far more effectively over the years to link the women to supporters in North America and Europe than to potential allies back in Guatemala. Had the refugee women been able to establish these latter contacts, they might have come to recognize more fully the challenges being faced by organized Guatemalan women back home, and consequently, they might have intensified their demands for equitable representation within the Permanent Commissions.[33] Moreover, had the organized refugee women proved more effective in forging ties with allies in Guatemala prior to their return, they might have had a national constituency of supporters in place to defend them against the reprisals and disappointments they have experienced since their return. The tribulations refugee/returnee women have experienced in their struggles to gain joint titles to land in return communities illustrate these failures and oversights.

REFUGEE WOMEN AND LAND TITLES: PROMISES MADE AND BROKEN

The Guatemalan government's agreement to help refugees recover property occupied by others, and to obtain land for all landless adult refugees, is a unique and internationally unprecedented feature of the October 8, 1992 Accords. In the context of the larger struggle for land, it was not immediately self evident that women should "complicate" the already delicate negotiations by insisting upon joint ownership. They did so only after analyzing the extreme vulnerability of women (and their children) who were abandoned by their partners and often deprived of the families' land and belongings.[34] As Mamá Maquín's leadership expressed their position:

> We realized that women who were married or in common law unions were not taken into account in regards to the right to land, [o]nly men, widows and single mothers.... That is when we decided to fight for the right to be joint owners of the land for our own security and that of our daughters and sons, so that we will not be left out in the street if the man sells the land or abandons his partner. This also means recognizing the economic value of the work that we carry out in the house and in the fields (cited in Worby 1999: 1).

There were early signs that these demands would not be easily won. With all the controversial concessions the Permanent Commissions sought to extract from Guatemalan authorities, the provision to provide women explicit rights to land was hardly an item that the all-male negotiating team was eager to press. Indeed they did so only at the last moment to placate an insistent female UNHCR official.

While this was a victory of sorts, female returnees have faced a host of obstacles in their attempts to have this concession formally institutionalized. First, since their return, many male returnees have failed to make good on their pledge to support the women's access to land titles. As one man explained to me, when I asked if his wife was officially registered as a co-owner of their land in the Ixcán Grande community of Los Angeles: "Why should she be? My name is there on the title, and I represent her and our children." In fact, it took me several tries before this man even understood the gist of my enquiry. His initial bafflement and subsequent remarks underscore how deeply entwined, in indigenous peasant communities, are notions of Mayan masculinity, patriarchal authority in the household, and control over land (Wilson 1995). The male returnee leadership similarly reneged on its promise to joint ownership, a guarantee that some observers believe was extended in an opportunistic fashion to take advantage of international sympathies for the indigenous Guatemalan women and to gain international support for the overall return and its provision for land (Worby 1999). Indeed, in a few of the original return communities, women who pressed for their rights to land were threatened by male cooperative leaders with rape and expulsion from their communities (Project Counseling Services 2000).

If many returnee men developed "social amnesia" regarding their agreement to extend co-ownership of land to women, so too, have Guatemalan state officials. As a UNHCR official explained to me, "Government authorities and government lawyers have never 'understood' the need for this initiative. Consequently, they have proven reluctant to design and implement administrative policies and practices to facilitate joint ownership of land."[35] Although correct, I would suggest that this noncompliance has deeper, more troubling roots.

While the refugees in Mexico were involved in fashioning gender relations in a somewhat more equitable fashion, many of their counterparts back in army-controlled villages were experiencing a hardening of patriarchal values and norms. Matters of nationalism and war were

at play; and Guatemala, a nation at war against guerrilla insurgents, chose to equate masculinity with patriotism and national belonging. Before the violence indigenous males were largely disparaged and forgotten by the state. They found themselves surprisingly "rehabilitated" by the elite and pronounced patriots—that is, as long as they agreed to serve in the army or in the ubiquitous civil patrols. In this capacity, indigenous men were charged with protecting rural communities and the Guatemalan nation against the guerrilla enemies of the state. Even women were drawn into highly masculinized displays of loyalty. For example, in a community in the department of Alta Verapaz, the local representative from the army's civic affairs office ordered all the village's women and children to line up in front of the Guatemalan flag post in the main square. As one observer writes:

> [I]n what appeared to be a well-rehearsed pantomime, the women, all of them dressed in *traje* (indigenous dress), flung themselves reluctantly forward, feigning combat against a non-existent aggressor, their imaginary rifles poised in empty, outstretched arms (Americas Watch 1986: 17).

In other communities, women were required to obtain passes from the army to travel to local markets, and they were transported in army trucks. In this way, masculine discipline and policing were imposed on a set of practices and public spaces in which women had, until recently, experienced a far greater degree of control and autonomy (Bossen 1984; Ehlers 1990). Upon return, refugee women bumped up against the norms and practices of this highly-masculinized regime when they requested that government authorities make good on their promises to the organized women.

RETURNEES TO THE GUATEMALAN STATE

For over a decade, then, Guatemalan officials had invested heavily in the production of nationalistic, state-surveilled rural citizens and localities. They now confronted thousands of suspect Guatemalan nationals who not long ago had been publically branded as subversives by high ranking government officials.[36] And to "complicate" matters even further, the refugees returned home along with an entourage of U.N. officials, international accompaniers, and international donors and NGOs—all eager to build a civil society. It is not at all surprising, then, that one of the most contentious and controversial provisions of the 1992 repatriation accords was the one that permitted such international accompaniment for the returnees.

Government officials might well have envisioned the need for a "strong-armed" approach to reimposing the state on the returnees. Paradoxically, though, in many cases it has been the returnees who have been the instigators of a closer relationship with the state. This is often the case, because—as a consequence of their experiences in exile—both returnee women and men have come to view themselves as full Guatemalan citizens and modern subjects who have grown used to the amenities and up-to-date transportation, communication, and social services they enjoyed in exile.[37] The challenges the returnees face is to make their rural communities conform to these new subjectivities, and to do so they have turned increasingly to the Guatemalan state. They have needed government officials to help them litigate land conflicts with "recalcitrant" (non-returnee) neighboring villages, and to obtain such modern amenities as roads, electricity, and licensed teachers (Stepputat 1997).

As the returnees have pursued political entitlements and modernity, the state has found a formidable ally in the *male* returnee leadership. This new alliance poses significant problems for returnee women. As we have seen, for the most part, they have had little success in penetrating male-dominated, local and national power structures. Moreover, their allies are often representatives of the very transnational entities—such as U.S. solidarity groups—that the state distrusts and seeks to marginalize. To illustrate, let me turn to the case of the Ixcán Grande Cooperative—home of a large number of the returnees.

RETURNEES TO THE IXCÁN GRANDE COOPERATIVE

The Ixcán Grande Cooperative (IGC), located in the tropical lowlands of northern Quiché, had been one of the most progressive communities in all of Guatemala.[38] The five communities that comprise the IGC were sites of early guerrilla organizing in the 1970s, and of brutal state-orchestrated violence in the 1980s. Many members of the cooperative were murdered, joined the guerrilla movement, or were forced into exile (Falla 1994). The cooperative's male leaders were among the earliest and most influential authorities in the Mexican refugee camps, and many served as representatives in the Permanent Commissions. It is thus with great dismay that Guatemalan and international supporters have watched these male leaders make common cause with "the enemy." For example, with the blessing of government officials and military authorities, male (returnee) leaders

have actively pursued a brand of development that involves attracting foreign oil interests and privatizing cooperative lands (Davis 1998).

In 1997, as part of a move aimed at consolidating power and at removing all challengers, the IGC's male leadership accused the members of Mamá Maquín of being guerrilla sympathizers. Moreover, in flagrant violation of the provisions for free association in the Peace Accords, the cooperative's leaders declared "illegal" any group like Mamá Maquín that held meetings in the community without their permission. This threat was soon followed by the burning of Mamá Maquín headquarters in the Ixcán Grande community of Pueblo Nuevo. Reflecting on the refugees' years in exile, Paula Worby has written: "[Once] the women began to take charge of their own organizations and consciousness-raising to demand visible and formal roles in decision-making, this may have been perceived by men, consciously or unconsciously, as overstepping the acceptable limits they had prescribed for women's roles" (Worby 1998b). What likely constrained male leaders from retaliating earlier against the "uppity" women were, of course, the public relations benefits all the refugees accrued in international circles from images of fully participatory refugee women. The burning of Mamá Maquín's headquarters represented a flagrant act of erasure directed at the women's only public space within the community. It is sad evidence that once the refugees had returned home and their male leaders had allied themselves with the state, women's "visibility" was no longer needed nor even tolerated.

Although the men sought to return the organized women to their previous state of public invisibility, the leadership of Mamá Maquín based in Guatemala City had other plans. They released a communiqué shortly after the destruction of their headquarters in Pueblo Nuevo that stated: "The reason for this aggression against our organization and our right to free association is due to the fact that we do not share some of the political stances held by the [community's cooperative] directorate, [since] these opinions relegate women to second place in social and community participation" (Mamá Maquín, communiqué, June 11, 1997, reproduced in Worby 1999: 13). With this and other urgent dispatches addressed to "the Guatemalan government," "the people and governments of the world," "the national and international press," and "the popular movement in general," they called upon their transnational allies to support them. To the women's surprise and dismay, very little, if any, effective pressure was brought to bear.[39]

Reluctantly, then, many of the members of Mamá Maquín in the Ixcán Grande communities have succumbed to the intimidation of the male leadership and to the urging of their husbands and neighbors to drop out of the organization completely (Worby 1998a: 9). In the cooperative community of Los Angeles, Mamá Maquín has been entirely replaced by a women's development committee that is controlled by the male leadership (the directorate); as one man explained, the directorate comes up with the ideas for women's projects and "writes up the requests, and then we get the women to sign them."[40] And a woman stated, "We women really don't understand such things as daycare centers," in an effort to explain why the male leadership had rebuked national leaders of Mamá Maquín when they had recently offered to fund such a center in Los Angeles.[41] She claimed such "collective" naivete for "we women" despite the fact that a large number had belonged to Mamá Maquín, and some had even assumed leadership positions while in exile.

The weakening, if not total abandonment, of Mamá Maquín is not the only political loss these returnee women have endured. Contrary to the women's understandings prior to their return, only men and widowed women have been granted official membership in the IGC: the official body that governs the returnee communities and controls their land. Thus once again, women with partners have found themselves excluded from full citizenship within their communities. Under such unfavorable circumstances, women have seen their interests trampled upon. In one particularly egregious case, the male directorate exacted a far more severe punishment on a man who had stolen a cow than on another who had raped a female member of the community.[42]

For many women in the IGC cooperative, then, social memories of women's past empowerment have been blunted if not totally erased. Even those who would like to continue to struggle for women's rights may find themselves isolated and dispirited. It would appear that many of the returnee women have chosen (at least momentarily) to pursue short-term, female interests rather than broader, feminist ones. Theirs is a strategy aimed at avoiding potential conflict with a now powerful male leadership determined to make common cause with the Guatemalan state and the military.

CERTAIN GAINS REMAIN

To end on such a resigned note would be inaccurate and would misrepresent the overall struggle to which many refugee women and

men remain committed. If we accept the feminist precept that "the political" resides in all cultural and social relations and contexts, then women seem to have made their greatest strides in the micro-politics of the household and kinship spheres—not within community politics, as they had anticipated prior to their return (Mamá Maquín/ CIAM 1994). In Los Angeles and Chaculá (Huehuetenango), the two returnee communities I have studied,[43] several couples pointed with pride to such practices as equity between partners in household budgeting and in reproductive decisions. They also noted the reduced incidence of domestic violence against women and their greater spatial mobility. Along these same lines, a recently completed study of four returnee communities (including Chaculá) found that women reported greater male collaboration in housework and childcare than had been the case prior to exile (Project Counseling Services 2000).

It is striking that the majority of my returnee informants employed a human rights discourse when they described more equitable gender relations in their own homes. Evaristo López Calmo, a 30-year-old Mam resident of Chaculá reflected:

> In the old days when a couple married the woman became the property of the man. In this way he dominated all the decisions because he was the head of the household. And that's what we were taught from the time we were little; but then the situation changed.... In exile the women learned that they had rights equal to men. There's no difference. Before we never practiced this, women were treated like animals.... Now when I earn money I don't put it in my pocket like my father did. I bring it to the house and my wife and I decide together how to spend it.[44]

And Petrona López García explained:

> It used to be that the woman is a woman and the man is a man. She has to feed him, wash his clothes, care for him; and while he's in bed resting, she's there working until 8 or 9 at night, still giving and giving. But [Mamá Maquín] taught us that the woman has ten fingers and the man has ten fingers.... It's not that the man is worth more or the woman worth more; they're equal. My husband gives me liberty to work in whatever job I choose.[45] Now this seems strange to those who remained in my village and continue to follow the old ways. Even my own mother says to my husband, "Aren't you afraid she will find another man and do bad things because you allow her to go wherever she pleases?"[46]

As these statements suggest, the refugees' participation in human rights and women's rights workshops, and more generally their exposure to these global discourses, provided them with alternative ways of imagining and fashioning gendered lives.

Although many women and some men in both communities publicly express consternation over the women's failure to participate more fully and equally in the community's political and economic affairs, these individuals do hold out hope for the future. They point admiringly to their daughters who have higher education levels compared to other Guatemalan rural girls, and who have often chosen to marry later and/or delay childbearing in order to pursue their educations or careers. In writing about such practices, Worby concludes: "In this way they are varying the roles played by women and subsequently increasing recognition among men as to their different capabilities" (Worby 1999: 6).

Finally, although most of the women in Chaculá and Los Angeles are not co-owners of their cooperative's lands, officials of UNHCR and leaders of Mamá Maquín did reflect critically and productively on these, and other equally disconcerting, cases. And, the hard lessons they have learned about gender politics have redounded to the benefit of many female refugees who have returned to Guatemala from late 1996 onward. As if to make amends for both UNHCR's earlier abandonment of the refugee women during key negotiations, and their and other international organizations' failures to anticipate the initial backlash directed against the female returnees, UNHCR officials have managed more recently to take up the cudgel for refugee women. They did so, for example, in 1995 when they sponsored a meeting in Guatemala with returnee leaders. There male leaders were persuaded to sign a document affirming the lack of legal impediments, as well as the desirability of making men and women equal owners of the lands to be negotiated in the future. This document was subsequently presented by refugee women leaders to officials of relevant state agencies who were asked to respond formally to the women's request to be included as joint-owners of land (Worby 1999: 10). On the one hand, due in large part to these efforts, women in one-half of the 50 return communities are now co-owners of their cooperative's lands. On the other hand, while these women are now eligible to hold offices in their communities' governing directorates, only a handful have been elected to such leadership positions (Project Counseling Services 2000).

CONCLUSION

This study has sought to broaden our understanding of gender and migration/exile, gender and transnational contexts and processes,

and gender and citizenship. I have explored how gender operates within and among multiple scales ranging from women's violated bodies to transnational organizations and social movements that champion women's participation in global civil society. My multi-sited approach breaks with the common convention of studying gender and migration/exile from the vantage point of but one receiving community or two, paired contexts. It is my contention that we come to appreciate the diverse origins of gender change, as well as its unevenness and contradictions, only when we acknowledge that for many immigrants and refugees, gender is constituted through encounters of the imagination, as well as through exchanges of a more social and material sort, in and through multiple national and transnational sites.

In addition to suggesting that we augment the number of geographical scales we examine, I have also called for the adoption of a more complex, and gender-inflected approach to social localities. My work points to the fact that when competing local, national, and transnational interests contend for control over the social production of locality, gender becomes one of the axes around which terms of belonging, entitlement, and laboring are negotiated and contested. Thus, to the discomfort of many male refugees, while in exile women became the privileged subjects of certain transnational actors and institutions. These encouraged the women to envision the scope of their rights and to frame their actions far beyond the confines of their individual households, the camps, their home communities, and even bounded nation-states. In contrast, in its attempts to separate its national subjects from transnational ideologies of third world struggle and to sever all forms of external social and military support for the insurgents, officials of the Guatemalan state fashioned highly masculinized rituals and practices of local and national belonging. And in keeping with this pattern, Guatemalan government and military officials have subsequently courted and won over many male returnee leaders; both groups have colluded to deny returnee women access to the entitlements they had struggled for in exile, and that they believed they had firmly secured.

This study has also sought to bring scholarship on women's political consciousness and citizenship practices more centrally into the study of gender and migration/exile. In exploring Guatemalan refugee women's political empowerment, I have found the analytical constructs of female consciousness and feminist consciousness useful. As the women's lives before, during, and after exile reveal, women's consciousness is dynamic and it often fluctuates between

the two poles. In this article I have explored how women's consciousness is impacted by social position (e.g., age and ethnicity) and by the gendering of specific social localities in which female subjects are found. With respect to gender and social localities, clearly feminist consciousness and practices were supported in the type of transnational contexts that refugee camps represented. The social localities refugee women have returned to, contrastively, mitigate such beliefs and actions. The analytical construct of time should also be brought into our discussion of women's empowerment. Guatemalan women experienced a relatively short period in exile: most had little more than a decade during which to develop and solidify new feminist subjectivities. This relatively brief engagement with feminist precepts and practices left most women woefully ill-prepared to counteract the backlash directed against them by male refugee leaders and officials of the Guatemalan state.

My research also contributes to a newly-emerging body of work that documents similarities and differences in the ways in which women and men pursue and gain access to transnational identities, institutions, and resources. It has often been assumed (or implied) that male immigrants and refugees are more inclined, and better positioned, to operate successfully within transnational social fields (Graham 1997; Ong 1993). The case of Guatemalan refugees complicates this "reading" significantly. First, both Guatemalan men and women were strategically positioned while in exile to become players in transnational arenas. Nonetheless, the men concentrated on cross-border ties back to Guatemala while the women were encouraged to forge links to international supporters in North America and Europe. As we have seen, the differences in the location of women's and men's cross-border interlocutors and the types of exchanges they transacted have had profound, and largely negative, impacts on the women since their return.

The case of return migration to Guatemala is, therefore, a cautionary tale for those who are over-zealous about the transgressive and emancipatory promise of transnational and global structures, processes, and discourses. Such zeal captured the imaginations and hopes of many refugee women who came to view themselves as players in supranational arenas, and as wards of the international community. Accordingly, one of Mamá Maquín's leaders wrote:

> Now as more and more of us are returning to our homes, we are encountering new difficulties and pressures, and we need the protection of UNHCR more than ever. At the international level, we wish to maintain

> contact with NGOs, popular organizations, and other women who demand respect for women's rights, so that they may learn about our situation, needs, struggles and work (García Hernández and García 1996: 264).

At certain critical junctures, trusted members of the international community sadly failed to live up to these expectations for continued protection, advice, and solidarity.

Returnee women's concerns to present a unified front to the Guatemalan government understandably constrained their female leaders from immediately pressing their male counterparts to make good on such key concessions as co-ownership of cooperative lands and full membership in their communities' governing bodies. While the women's international supporters, too, may have felt some reluctance on this score (Mercedes Olivera, former director of CIAM, Chiapas, Mexico, personal communication), it is also the case that most internationals severely underestimated the hardships and reversals the female returnees would soon face. This oversight is all the more baffling and distressing in light of the now long and well-documented record of women's failures (in many parts of the world) to institutionalize effectively during times of peace and reconciliation those gains in female autonomy and gender equity exacted over the course of war (Bernal 1998; Molyneux 1985; Yuval-Davis 1997).

To exacerbate matters further, the unprepared female refugees were accompanied home by only two of the many NGOs that had worked closely with them in exile (Project Counseling Services 2000). This left a vacuum, as yet unfilled by Guatemalan NGOs, due in part to the shortage of national institutions addressing women's issues, their generally urban focus, and the fact that the returnee women were not previously in contact with these national NGOs. While it is true that of late, certain UNHCR officials have stepped into the breach, the organization is severely restricted by its own mandate to intervene on behalf of the returnees. Moreover, the agency currently has only one office in Guatemala City with limited funding and operations (Project Counseling Services 2000).

As for Mamá Maquín, in those few instances when members of the organization have been physically threatened,[47] and when they have called upon the international community to make good on its discourse of human rights and women's rights, the leaders of Mamá Maquín have found themselves largely isolated in cyberspace, e-mailing and dispatching faxes to distant entities that either would not, or could not, provide the assistance the women so desperately

sought. Their plight raises several questions related to transnational politics, citizenship, and gender. What strategies can be promoted to sustain global humanitarian intervention and to make good on universal, human rights and feminist discourses once refugees have willingly returned home? Who are the global citizens and institutions responsible for defending returnee women against abuses to their rights as women and citizens? And who will put an end to the "give-backs" that have demoralized so many Guatemalan returnee women? Put bluntly, what are the transnational entities with sufficient legitimacy and power to discipline individuals and states that disregard women's rights and human rights?

Finally, my study belongs to the small corpus of transnational research and theorizing that builds on feminist scholarship on citizenship, while attempting to extend it beyond the confines of the nation-state (e.g., Goldring 1999; Grewal and Kaplan 1994; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Shukla 1997). My findings are consistent with Luin Goldring's (this volume) research on Mexican state policies and immigrant organizations that operate transnationally. In Goldring's research on migration between Zacatecas and California, she finds that men enjoy a privileged arena for the practice of citizenship in those migrant organizations that have recently been courted by the Mexican state, which seeks to retain the loyalty and remittances of its nationals abroad. Goldring argues that the marginalization of Mexican immigrant women from Mexico-oriented citizenship leads many to engage in practices of social citizenship in the U.S., such as organizing around issues of family welfare, schooling, and the local environment. This involvement, she suggests, leads to household tensions and to a divergence in couples' long-term settlement plans, with women militating for permanent settlement and men favoring the family's return.

I, too, see tensions mounting among returnee couples in Guatemala. Several women I interviewed were clearly frustrated by their loss of political voice. As they seek ways to shore up their power in the household and in their communities, they look northward to those individuals and organizations that earlier had embraced them as equals. Consequently, many women are attempting to sustain these ties, in the hope that they may assist them should they elect to re-emigrate someday. It does not take great imagination to envision ex-members of Mamá Maquín and their daughters following the path of an earlier cohort of Guatemalan women who are currently working in the U.S. as domestics, nannies, and factory workers

(Hagan 1994; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997). It will be fascinating to see how the conceptions and practices of citizenship forged by these women in Mexican exile—and frustrated back home in Guatemala—play out in the United States. What will be the women's role in struggles for social citizenship within immigrant and ethnic communities? How will they respond to unionization drives within the workplace? And, having once been burned, will these women struggle to ensure greater control over the transnational organizations that link immigrants to ongoing economic and political initiatives back in Guatemala?

NOTES

Patricia Pessar
American Studies Program
Yale University
P.O. Box 208236
New Haven, CT 06520–8236

1. The organization was named in honor of Adelina Cal Maquín, an elderly indigenous (Kekchi) woman, who was killed by Guatemalan soldiers in 1978. They opened fire on a crowd of peasants who had peacefully assembled to demand land then occupied by the army.
2. The ethnographic research presented in this article was obtained over the course of the summer of 1998 and the spring of 1999. In both interviewing and collecting archival materials, I was greatly assisted by Andy Davis and my husband and colleague Gil Joseph. In his research in the returnee communities of Chaculá (department of Huehuetenango) and Los Angeles (department of Quiché), Andy drew upon a reserve of trust and knowledge accumulated over seven years of development work in solidarity with members of these communities both in exile and after their return. He also laid a foundation of trust and acceptance from which Gil and I benefitted enormously when we joined him to conduct research in the two sites.

   This article has also benefitted greatly from the efforts of many readers who have commented critically on earlier drafts. They include Hazel Carby, Andy Davis, Josh De Wind, Nina Glick Schiller, Sarah Mahler, Diane Nelson, Mercedes Olivera, Alicia Schmidt Camacho, and several anonymous reviewers. Gil Joseph not only contributed to the research on which this paper is based, but he also carefully and thoughtfully read and commented on several drafts of this article. Throughout this project, Paula Worby has most generously shared her tremendous insights about Guatemalan refugees and has provided me with valuable research materials.
3. All translations from the original Spanish are mine unless otherwise indicated.
4. Between 1989 and 1992, organized Guatemalan refugees in Mexico began pressuring the Guatemalan government to commit to guarantees for a so-called "collective and organized" return. The majority insisted that Guatemala was still unsafe for refugees, but they were, nonetheless, determined to return collectively, in the

hopes of pushing the peace process forward. In October 1992 the refugees signed a historic agreement with the Guatemalan government that laid out the terms of their return (see Ochoa García 1996). Three years of intensive collective returns followed, with about 20,000 refugees repatriating (roughly half to their lands of origin and the rest to new land purchased through the government) (Worby 1998a).

5. I employ the term "internationals" rather than transnationals—which in many cases is an equally, if not more appropriate, term—because it is the nomenclature conventionally used in writings about members of international NGOs, solidarity groups, and intergovernmental agencies. It is also the term that these individuals commonly adopt to refer to themselves.
6. Over the course of the war there were several armed organizations. These united in 1982 to form the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG).
7. Owing to their often having departed as entire communities or extended families, the male to female ratio in the camps was 1:1, rare in most refugee movements (Billings 1995: 21).
8. Male refugees who worked on the coffee plantations in Chiapas earned an average of $1.50 (U.S.) per day for a six-person family. This was well below the Mexican minimum wage. Guatemalan women workers on the plantations received even less than their male counterparts (Billings 1995: 168).
9. Interview #10, Chaculá, July 20, 1998.
10. Similarly, far from critics' claims that organized women were becoming indiscriminate consumers of a hodge-podge of Western and "universal" rhetorics, members of Mamá Maquín revealed that they could be decidedly discriminating. For example, a woman who was participating in an NGO-sponsored workshop on violence and human rights surprised many of the assembled when she asserted that men's dominance over the return process was itself a violation of *women's* human rights. She added, "Violence is when it is said that women aren't worth anything and that men know everything. This keeps us from participating and is a violation of our human rights" (Billings 1995: 221).
11. The fact that some women participated in literacy classes and took courses on human rights sponsored by Catholic Action apparently did have some impact on the creation of Mamá Maquín, however. Jacalteca women who had earlier learned to speak Spanish and were schooled in human rights moved to the forefront of organizing refugee women into Mamá Maquín and in representing the organization before members of the international community (Billings 1995: 95).
12. Similarly, in Deborah Billings' interviews with women in refugee camps, several praised Mamá Maquín for arranging women's projects and helping them to obtain labor saving devices. Others focused exclusively on the ways in which the organization helped them to value their status as mothers. For example, one woman stated: "We hope that the organization will continue with us [after our return] so that the government will respect us as mothers of our children" (Billings 1995: 259).
13. Other smaller women's organizations included Madre Tierra and Ixmucané.
14. For other recent studies that explore this dimension of women's politicization, see Julie Peteet's (1991) *Gender in Crisis: Women and the Palestinian Resistance Movement* and Sarah Radcliffe and Sallie Westwood's (1993) *'Viva': Women and Popular Protest in Latin America*.
15. See Manz (1995) for a discussion of terror and fear among Guatemalan refugees.

16. Pseudonyms are used for all informants, although the accompanying information on the speaker's age and ethnic group is correct.
17. Interview #6, Chacuiá, July 18, 1998.
18. Interview #6, Chaculá, July 18, 1998.
19. Interview #9, Chaculá, July 20, 1998.
20. The former combatant quoted above stated, "To a certain degree, the fathers were irresponsible towards their children" (Hooks 1993: 123).
21. In her book Rigoberta Menchú states, "I came up against revolutionary *compañeros, compañeros* who had many ideas about making a revolution, but who had trouble accepting that a women could participate in the struggle not only in superficial things but in fundamental things" (Burgos-Debray 1984: 221).
22. Interview with Gustavo Meono, Guatemala City, March 8, 1999.
23. Among the international NGOs the Center for Research and Action for Women (Centro de Investigaciones y Acción para la Mujer, CIAM) was the most directly involved and influential. CIAM's staff included Mexican, North American, and European women, and it was committed to adding a gender perspective to refugees' human rights education. In addition to its office in Comitán, Chiapas, CIAM also has an active branch in Managua, Nicaragua. Much of CIAM's funding for its work in Mexico came from UNHCR, in keeping with that organization's commitment to support women's projects (Billings 1995).
24. The women were also informed that Guatemala is a signatory to this law.
25. The leadership of Mamá Maquín often used these meetings to gain donations in money and in kind. One of their goals was to acquire time and labor-saving devices, such as mechanical corn grinders and fuel-conserving stoves. These were needed both to demonstrate concrete gains to recalcitrant male partners and to free up time to allow the women to attend programs and workshops aimed at improving women's communicative skills (e.g., literacy and Spanish language training), their income generating potential, their knowledge of their rights, and women's health (Billings 1995).
26. This organization (founded in New York in 1989 under the auspices of the International Rescue Committee) sent a delegation to El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and southern Mexico in 1992. Their policy recommendations were later presented at FoReFem, the first regional conference organized by UNHCR and the United National Development Program to discuss problems facing refugee, displaced, and repatriate women. Representatives of women's refugee and repatriate groups, including Mamá Maquín, attended the Guatemala City meeting in February 1992.
27. Interview #36, Guatemala City, July 21, 1998.
28. Although the male refugees were also involved in activities, such as solidarity work, that connected the camps to the "first world," they concentrated far more than the women on building and maintaining cross-border ties back to Guatemala. Consequently, the men were more likely to be recruited by guerrilla operatives within Mexico either to serve as the guerrilla's representatives with the camps (i.e., *responsables*) or to cross into Guatemala to fight with the insurgents (Pessar 1999).
29. See Sullivan (1996) for a description of how the women ultimately cajoled the men into providing the needed manual labor.
30. Mamá Maquín assumed an important role in this empowerment. It both encouraged women to participate in political meetings and helped them learn Spanish,

the lingua franca of such public events. According to a survey conducted in the camps among refugee women in 1990–91, some 29 percent were indigenous, monolingual speakers. Illiteracy was also high, with 66 percent reporting that they could neither read nor write (Mamá Maquín/CIAM 1994: 22, 27).

31. Several of the returnee men I interviewed in Chaculá claimed that this rechanneling of funds to the guerrillas routinely occurred with donations Mamá Maquín had received from international funders.
32. There was, apparently, interest early on in having some female representation. This interest waned soon after the first group of women were selected. According to an advisor to the Permanent Commissions, the male commissioners complained that the women could not "manage" the difficult working conditions (e.g., clandestine travel to camps in Mexico and camping with large groups of men), and most were found wanting by their male counterparts owing to an alleged lack of experience and training. This same advisor added that the male commissioners were also extremely reluctant to have the women become privy to the men's "leisure-time" activities (Paula Worby, e-mail, April 9, 1999)!
33. Instead, the leadership of Mamá Maquín chose to present a unified front with the Permanent Commissions, as the following statement shows: "Mamá Maquín has always had a close relationship with the Permanent Commissions . . . and has always had the objective of supporting and backing their petitions" (Mamá Maquín/CIAM 1994: 68).
34. In some Guatemalan communities, family problems, such as male abandonment, may be brought before an elders' council (of men) and/or respected community authorities. Although the man may be instructed to leave the family house and/or land to his children and former wife, such an outcome is by no means assured. Redress through the legal system tends to be time-consuming, expensive, and particularly intimidating for indigenous women, especially if they do not speak Spanish (Worby 1999).
35. Interview #37, Guatemala City, July 21, 1999.
36. For example the Minister of Defense, Héctor Gramajo, publicly labeled the returnees as "subversives" (Manz 1988).
37. Returnees in the community of Chaculá refer to themselves as "*gentes formales*" (formal people), while their "backward" neighbors are depicted in such unflattering and "pre-modern" terminology, as "*animales*" and people without reason ("*a ellos no llegan razón*") (Stepputat 1997).
38. The Ixcán Grande region was settled in the mid-1960s by peasants from Huehuetenango at the urging of Maryknoll priests. Each family was given approximately 40 acres after a probation period. Ultimately the inhabitants grouped themselves into five savings and credit cooperatives, Mayalán, Xalbal, Pueblo Nuevo, Cuarto Pueblo, and Los Angeles. These five communities are all part of the larger Ixcán Grande Cooperative (IGC).
39. It is probably the case that a good deal of the inaction resulted from the fact that Mamá Maquín and its local supporters were involved in a factional conflict within the guerrilla organization (URNG). This left international observers and supporters generally confounded and reluctant to step in.
40. Interview #5, Los Angeles, March 15, 1999. Most of the former members of Mamá Maquín have refused to join this group, but its existence has clearly demoralized many of these women.
41. Interview #9, Los Angeles, March 18, 1999.

42. Interview #32, Nenton, July 27, 1998.
43. In Chaculá, too, women have not gained joint ownership of their land nor are they members of the male-controlled cooperative. In one particularly disheartening incident, the male cooperative leaders asked the women to form a committee to request food from a foundation. When none of the women present at the meeting volunteered, the head of the cooperative said, "Oh, perhaps the problem is that the men have not given their wives permission to form a committee. Men, raise your hand, if you give your wife permission" (Interview #3, Chaculá, July 15, 1998). A clear sign of the women's demoralization is that the membership in Chaculá's branch of Mamá Maquín has dropped in four years from a high of 200 to a low of 3.
44. Interview #12, Chaculá, July 20, 1998.
45. While this woman perceives herself to be a very modern, self-actualized woman, it is significant that she views her *husband* as the one who possessed, and continues to possess, the right to give her freedom and to allow her to work at whatever job she chooses.
46. Interview #6, Chaculá, July 18, 1998. It should be noted that there is a vocal minority that disputes such assertions about increased gender parity. It includes a nun who has lived in the community since its founding. She characterized local gender relations as "99.9 percent sexist, machistic [and] patriarchal," and she backed up this statement with recent examples of domestic violence, abandonment, and bride price (Interview #3, Chaculá, July 15, 1998).
47. In June 1998, after its third general assembly meeting (which was held in the Ixcán), 40 participants and ten of their children while enroute home were forced by gunpoint out of their bus by 16 male assailants. The terrified women were robbed and threatened with rape and murder. They saw their organization's documents ripped up before their eyes, and they were subjected to threats and curses that included, "Those of Mamá Maquín are lazy old whores." As is often the case in Guatemala, the identities of the assailants were never determined.

REFERENCES

Aguilar Zinzer, Adolfo
1991 Repatriation of Guatemalan Refugees in Mexico: Conditions and Prospects. *In* Repatriation Under Conflict in Central America. Mary Ann Larkin, Frederick C. Cuny and Barry Stein, eds. pp. 57–114. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University, Center for Immigration Policy and Refugee Assistance.

Americas Watch Committee
1986 Civil Patrols in Guatemala. New York: Americas Watch Committee.

Appadurai, Arjun
1996 Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Arbour, Francis
1994 Voices of Women: A New Force Shaping the Guatemalan Return. Refugee 13: 16–17.

Berger, John
1979 Pig Earth. New York: Pantheon Books.

Bernal, Victoria
1998 Women, Liberation, and Development: Women Guerilla Fighters and Eritrea's Cultural Revolution. Paper presented at Yale University's Program in Agrarian Studies, April 24, 1998.
Beverley, John and Marc Zimmerman, eds.
1990 Literature and Politics in the Central American Revolutions. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Billings, Deborah
1995 Identities, Consciousness, and Organizing in Exile: Guatemalan Refugee Women in the Camps of Southern Mexico. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
Bossen, Laurel Herbenar
1984 The Redivision of Labor: Women and Economic Choice in Four Guatemalan Communities. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Burgos-Debray, Elisabeth, ed.
1984 I, Rigoberta Menchú: An Indian Woman in Guatemala. London: Verso Editions.
Carmack, Robert, ed.
1988 Harvest of Violence: The Mayan Indians and the Guatemalan Crisis. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Castro, Mary Garcia
1986 Work Versus Life: Colombian Women in New York. *In* Women and Change in Latin America. June Nash and Helen Safa, eds. pp. 231–255. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers.
Colom, Yolanda
1998 Mujeres en la alborada: guerilla y participación feminina en Guatemala, 1973–1978. Guatemala: Artemis & Edinter.
Davis, Andy
1998 "Biting at Each Other, Rolling in the Dust:" Homegrown Counterinsurgency in Ixcán Grande. NCOORD Newsletter 7(3): 4–8.
Ehlers, Tracy Bachrach
1990 Silent Looms. Boulder: Westview Press.
Falla, Ricardo
1994 Massacres in the Jungle: Ixcán, Guatemala, 1975–1982. Boulder: Westview Press.
García Hernández, Guadalupe and Navidad García
1996 Mamá Maquín Refugee Women: Participation and Organization. *In* Development and Diaspora: Gender and the Refugee Experience. Wenona Giles, Helene Moussa and Penny Van Esterik, eds. pp. 258–267. Ontario, Canada: Artemis Enterprises Publication.
Graham, Pamela
1997 Reimagining the Nation and Defining the District: Dominican Migration and Transnational Politics. *In* Caribbean Circuits: New Directions in the Study of Caribbean Migration. Patricia Pessar, ed. pp. 91–125. Staten Island, NY: Center for Migration Studies.
Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia Pessar
1991 Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Grewal, Inderpal and Caren Kaplan, eds.
1994 Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gugelberger, Georg, ed.
1996 The Real Thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America. Durham: Duke University Press.
Hagan, Jacqueline
1994 Deciding to Be Legal: A Mayan Community in Houston. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette and Ernestine Avila
1997 "I'm Here, But I'm There": The Meanings of Latina Transnational Motherhood. Gender and Society 11(5): 548–571.
Hooks, Margaret
1993 Guatemalan Women Speak. Washington, DC: EPICA.
Kaplan, Temma
1982 Female Consciousness and Collective Action: The Case of Barcelona, 1910–1918. Signs 7(3): 545–566.
Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink
1998 Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Latin American Perspectives
1999 If Truth Be Told: A Forum on Stoll and Menchú, Issue 109, 26(6).
Lister, Ruth
1997 Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis. Feminist Review 57: 28–48.
Malkki, Liisa
1995 Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things. Annual Review of Anthropology 24: 495–523.
Mamá Maquín and Centro de Investigación y Acción para la Mujer (CIAM)
1994 De Refugiadas a Retornada. Comitán, Chiapas, México.
Manz, Beatriz
1988 Repatriation and Reintegration: An Arduous Process in Guatemala. Washington: Georgetown University, Center for Immigration Policy and Refugee Assistance.
1995 Fostering Trust in a Climate of Fear. *In* Mistrusting Refugees. E. Valentine Daniel and John Chr. Knudsen, eds. pp. 151–186. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Martin, Susan Forbes
1991 Refugee Women. New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.
Massey, Doreen
1994 Space, Place, and Gender. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Molyneux, Maxine
1985 Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua. Feminist Studies 11(2): 227–254.
Montejo, Victor
1998 Mamá Maquín en la lucha por el derecho de la mujer a la propiedad de la tierra y la participación en la Organización Comunitaria. Paper prepared for UNHCR conference, Lessons Learned in Work with Guatemalan Refugees and Returnees and Future Challenges. Guatemala, October 9, 1998.
Morel, Terry
1998 Mujeres Guatemaltecas Refugiadas y Retornadas: Su participación en las estructuras comunitarias y los procesos de toma de decisiones. UNHCR, Guatemala.

Morokvasic, Mirjana
1984 Birds of Passage Are Also Women . . . International Migration Review 18(4): 886–907.
Ochoa García, Carlos
1996 Refugees and the Guatemalan Peace Process. *In* International Migration, Refugee Flows, and Human Rights in North America, Alan Simmons, ed. pp. 309–328. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
Ong, Aihwa
1993 On the Edge of Empires: Flexible Citizenship among Chinese in Diaspora. Positions 1(3): 745–778.
Pessar, Patricia
1999 Refugees as Political Subjects. MS, in author's files.
Peteet, Julie
1991 Gender in Crisis: Women and the Palestinian Resistance Movement. New York: Columbia University Press.
Project Counseling Services
2000 Guatemalan Refugee and Returning Women: Challenges and Lessons Learned in Camps and During Repatriation. Final end-of-project report for Promoting Women in Development Program (PROWID) to the International Center for Research on Women, Washington, D.C.
Radcliffe, Sarah and Sallie Westwood, eds.
1993 "Viva": Women and Popular Protest in Latin America. New York: Routledge.
Sanford, Victoria
1997 Mothers, Widows and Guerilleras. Life and Peace Institute: Uppsala, Sweden.
Schirmer, Jennifer
1993 The Seeking of Truth and the Gendering of Consciousness: The CoMadres of El Salvador and the CONAVIGUA Widows of Guatemala. *In* "Viva": Women and Popular Protest in Latin America. Sarah Radcliffe and Sallie Westwood, eds. pp. 30–64. New York: Routledge.
Schwartz-Seller, Maxine
1981 Immigrant Women. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Shukla, Sandhya
1997 Feminisms of the Diaspora Both Local and Global: The Politics of South Asian Women Against Domestic Violence. *In* Women Question Politics. Cathy Cohen, Kathleen Jones and Joan Tronto, eds. pp. 269–283. New York: New York University Press.
Sinclair, Minor, ed.
1995 The New Politics of Survival. New York: Monthly Review Press.
Solorzano, Silvia
1989 Mujer alzada. Barcelona: Sendai Ediciones.
Smith, Michael Peter
1994 Can You Imagine?: Transnational Migration and the Globalization of Grassroots Politics. Social Text 39(15): 15–33.
Stepputat, Finn
1997 Repatriation and Everyday Forms of State Formation in Guatemala. MS, files of the author.
Stoll, David
1999 Rigoberta Menchú and the Story of All Poor Guatemalans. Boulder: Westview Press.

Sullivan, Kathleen
1996 Constructing "La Casa de la Mujer". *In* Development and Diaspora: Gender and the Refugee Experience. Wenona Giles, Helene Moussa and Penny Van Esterik, eds. pp. 268–279. Ontario, Canada: Artemis Enterprises Publication.

Taylor, Clark
1998 Return of Guatemala's Refugees: Reweaving the Torn. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

U.S. Committee for Refugees
1993 El Retorno: Guatemala's Risky Repatriation Begins. Washington, DC: USCR.

Wilson, Richard
1995 Mayan Resurgence in Guatemala. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children
1992 We Have a Voice and We Can Speak. Report on Central America. New York: Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children.

Worby, Paula
1998a Organizing for a Change: Guatemalan Refugee Women Assert Their Right To Be Co-owners of Land Allocated to Returnee Communities. Paper prepared for the Kigali Inter-Regional Consultation on Women's Land and Property Rights Under Situations of Conflict and Resolution, February 16–19.
1998b Return as "Lucha": Organized Guatemalan Refugees Go Home. Working Paper M and N 02, Yale University, Center for International and Area Studies Studies, New Haven, CT.
1999 Guatemalan Refugee and Returnee Women Petition for their Rights: The Fight for Joint Ownership of Community Land. MS, files of the author.

Yuval-Davis, Nira
1997 Gender and Nation. London: Sage Publications.