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Abstract

In Latin America, Indigenous peoples still exhibit markedly lower qualities of life compared to their nonindigenous peers. One of the most direct ways to change this cycle is through reforms to existing and implementation of new systems of education, such as intercultural bilingual education (EIB), to reflect a greater understanding of and sensitivity to Indigenous linguistic and cultural needs. Through an exploration of EIB in Peru, Bolivia, and Guatemala countries, this study determines some of the primary conditions necessary for EIB’s success to be: national and regional stability; governmental support in both legal and fiscal terms; funding and resources; community support and participation; and system design, program adaptation, and flexibility. If these prerequisites are met, EIB can be an effective way to provide an education to Latin America’s Indigenous peoples in such a way that it is adequate according to local, national, and international standards while simultaneously fulfilling the Indigenous groups’ articulated desire and need for an educational system that appropriately respects, preserves, and fosters the distinct languages and cultures existing within a multicultural state.
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Over the years, Indigenous rights have emerged as a more relevant topic in the international arena. This has occurred, in part, through increased formal recognition of Indigenous communities’ cultural distinctiveness and the establishment of the particular rights which they should be guaranteed on this basis of distinctiveness. The status of Indigenous peoples around the world has greatly advanced through such mechanisms as broader ratification of such documents as the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) Convention no. 169, more widespread inclusion of the language of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) into national constitutions, and other means.

Indigenous peoples in Latin America have been asserting their rights over the past few decades, demanding that governments reconsider the ways in which they provide education to Indigenous populations. With an elevated recognition and awareness of Indigenous rights, more and more Indigenous peoples have been able to access an education that is appropriate for their linguistic and cultural needs.

To some extent, the region of Latin America is still plagued by the festering wounds left by colonialism, both external and internal. For the countries that have upheld the rights of Indigenous peoples, including the right to alternative educational programs, we can see
Chapter One

this as a way to effectively move towards healing and “decolonization” through the preservation, restoration, and encouragement of indigenous languages, cultures, and traditions. This shift is a great victory for Indigenous peoples and their advancement.

Education is widely recognized as a key part of individual development, human development in general, and the social cohesion of a society or subgroup. In Latin America and other developing areas, education is an important way for the population to improve its quality of life in an honest, scholarly and sustainable way. Ideally, if the majority of the population does the same, a community—or entire country—can be raised from poverty and the problems that it generates, arriving at a state of greater social equality with less segregation, reversing the marked tendency towards the inheritance of poverty. If those from the political sphere wish to achieve their goals of joining the developed world, resolving the disparity of access to the same quality of education under adequate circumstances specifically fitted to the community of the individual is of paramount importance.

Intercultural bilingual education (Educación Intercultural Bilingüe in Spanish, referred to hereafter as EIB) is one such educational system that can greatly benefit Indigenous peoples and communities. However, EIB is not infallible, nor even always a welcomed or long-lasting initiative. Attempts at implementing EIB in order to remedy the disparity of education between Indigenous and non-indigenous students have been met with varying levels of success, depending on the country and the school in question. There are several explanations for this, which will be systematically examined throughout this study.

By studying multiple countries, their policies, and even specific schools, we can begin to develop the overarching narrative of EIB in Latin America, as well as identify what makes for an effective EIB program. Successful EIB programs hold certain factors in common,
demonstrating specific shared qualities. In general, EIB can be established in countries at peace, with governmental support (as demonstrated through policies and funding), and through collaboration with organizations both within and without the state in question. For a school to thrive, there must be adequate and appropriate facilities, materials, and, probably most importantly, faculty and administration. Additionally, most of the more long-lived and fruitful programs have the support of the community, especially of parents, and seek active community participation in school decision-making processes.

In this study, I will investigate the reality of education among Indigenous peoples within Latin America: its strengths, weaknesses, recent advances, and potential improvements. Delving into the topic of Indigenous education, and more specifically the system of EIB, can additionally provide insight into the broader context of the current situation of Latin America’s Indigenous peoples. This study explores how EIB meets a specific need in Latin America, the extent to which it has been efficaciously employed, as well as the limits and challenges it faces as a method. To do this, I will focus on case studies from three countries that have both large Indigenous populations and established EIB systems, namely Peru, Bolivia, and Guatemala. I will investigate the histories of Indigenous peoples and their education, state policies regarding Indigenous education and EIB, the systems themselves, and the system or school results, depending on available information. In order to operationalize this, I will analyze texts to establish background information, as well as records of school attendance/retention rates, test scores, literacy rates, poverty rates and other similar indicators when available for the population or country in question.
Chapter One

Education in a Latin American context: Successes and shortcomings

There are various visions of what “Latin America” is, some defined by maps, others by widely shared cultural characteristics. By its most common definition, this region is comprised of the predominantly Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries of the Americas.\(^1\) In order to limit the scope of this paper and allow for greater detail, I will generally treat Latin America as the predominantly Spanish-speaking countries of Central, North, and South America, excluding the Caribbean.

For the most part, the only type of education that is obligatory in Latin America is the “basic cycle” of primary and lower secondary school.\(^2\) For example, while the majority of Latin American countries require that children attend primary school, Honduras and Nicaragua don’t require attendance of lower secondary school. Additionally, there are at least fifteen countries that do not oblige their students to continue with their education at the higher secondary level (which usually begins at fourteen or fifteen years of age and lasts 2-4 years).\(^3\) In spite of this, in merely fifteen years, there has been an impressive increase in the rate of school attendance in Latin America, partly in an attempt to bring the region into alignment with the Millennium Development Goals. In the first cycle of education, for example, attendance passed from 45 to 69 percent, while in secondary school the rate almost doubled—from 27 to 47 percent.\(^4\) This is admirable progress, but there are still gaps to be closed in the educational system.

---

\(^3\) CEPAL 2007, page 159 Recuerdo III.1 “Duración de los ciclos educativos, obligatoriedad de la educación secundaria y indicadores utilizados para medir la desigualdad educativa”
\(^4\) CEPAL 2007, 162.
Though an education that is free, obligatory, and available to all figures among the fundamental elements for “the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms,” according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), it is nevertheless obvious that there still remain discrepancies regarding the access to and quality of education in the world today. The distribution of education has been skewed for years for a variety of reasons including discrimination based on socioeconomic standing, location, race, and gender, among others. This study will explore the conditions necessary to counteract this legacy and the ways in which EIB has served to fulfill the need for education among Latin America’s Indigenous peoples.

**The State: Peace and recognition**

On the most basic level, conditions of peace are necessary in order to establish successful EIB systems. Without peace, it is difficult for such programs to attract the attention necessary to be officially sanctioned or restructured, to obtain resources allocated by the State, or to find support among the populace. As seen in Guatemala, for example, there was limited support of or attendance at bilingual schools during the civil war, since supporting Maya-related initiatives was seen to be the sort of risky behavior that could threaten a person’s life or livelihood.

Beyond these basic conditions of peace, there are other enabling conditions for establishing EIB. Countries, such as Bolivia, that are dedicated to promoting a pluricultural society that does not conflict with a national identity show greater commitment to exploring

---

and developing EIB than those with a more assimilationist or homogenizing view.

The reception and success of EIB programs can largely be due to governmental support and educational reforms, and can be dependent on the goals underlying the development and implementation of said reforms and programs. Countries like Bolivia, Peru and Mexico historically maintained that linguistic minorities should achieve literacy through their primary language in order to “facilitate” language transition to the second language “as soon as possible.”

Countries like Guatemala, however, have instituted policies supporting EIB without specifying any determined end, “transitional or otherwise.”

Over the course of the past few decades, however, there has been a marked shift from transitional systems to maintenance systems in such countries as Bolivia, as indicated by reforms and decrees supporting increased access to EIB with a greater emphasis on the indigenous language component. As shown in the three cases examined, when the government, its policies, and constitutional and educational reforms reflect support for Indigenous rights to appropriate education, especially when this support is clear to the Indigenous peoples in question, an EIB initiative is more likely to be successful.

As more countries in Latin America begin to recognize the importance of education to their citizens and, moreover, the distinct needs of Indigenous peoples with respect to education, there is increased need for reforms to policies, constitutions, and established educational systems in order to further the abilities of Indigenous students to access the education that is right for them. Undergirding this must be an ideological support. Because ideologies change, EIB and other alternative educational programs pass in and out of vogue.

---

Indigenous education in Latin America, an introduction

There must be a climate conducive to the cultivation of ideologies that promote the growth and flourishing of educational programs that take into account the needs of Indigenous communities in the region.

**Access to funding and resources**

A state’s support of EIB must run deeper than policy reforms, extending to provision of funding and resources. Bolivia, Guatemala, and Peru are ranked no. 25, no. 125, and no. 143 in the world, respectively, in terms of their national spending on education. The amount of financial support programs in Bolivia receive from the state is indicated by the country’s greater ability to adapt to the needs of communities and enact successful reforms. The consequences of having comparatively limited funding available for educational initiatives like EIB can be seen in places like Peru, when PEEB-P couldn’t expand into further communities based on a lack of fiscal resources.

As this demonstrates, one of the greatest determining factors in a country’s or region’s ability to successfully implement an EIB program is these schools’ access to resources, often provided by fiscal support from the state or interested nonprofits. Established EIB programs have the needs of any school system, such as facilities and classroom supplies, but EIB systems need additional resources to thrive. For example, an EIB school requires texts and classroom materials written in the languages appropriate for that community. This poses a logistical challenge for any state that chooses to support EIB-type endeavors, especially in cases where the language in question has traditionally been a primarily oral language without a written component. Schools that have failed or programs that have stagnated, as seen in Guatemala, have often done so in part because of shortages
Sometimes these resources are acquired through transnational cooperation, which, in some cases, can play a vital role in the development of EIB programs. A program can spark imitation or duplication in other countries that are searching for their own answers to questions of indigenous language education. This is especially true in cases where an Indigenous group, linked by ethnicity or language among other factors, ranges beyond one or more national borders, as can be the case both with Andean and Amazonian peoples. Bolivia, which extensively modeled its program PEIB on Peru’s PEEB-P, was able to build a relatively successful program by taking advantage of existing materials already developed in Peru.

In addition to this kind of transnational cooperation, international cooperation may play another role in establishing effective EIB programs. Especially considering how the regions most in need of EIB are often among the most impoverished in their respective states, foreign aid can prove to be key to the development of alternative educational programs, though it depends on the state in question. Bolivia, for example, was highly dependent on foreign aid in order to enact many of its state initiatives, including educational reforms. These situations can seem to be “borrowing trouble” when considering that those providing foreign aid to fund a project can exert a powerful influence on the direction in which the project develops and how it is instituted. At the threat of losing foreign aid, the government or organization as beneficiary must, to some extent, comply with and concede to the demands of the source of foreign aid.
Communities and participation

The ability of the greater society to recognize, at some level, the inherent value of Indigenous peoples and their distinct languages and cultures is central to EIB’s success. Not only does this sort of foundation enable a nation to support government initiatives that provide an appropriate education to students from indigenous communities, it also helps end the use of education as a means to achieve internal colonialism, “Castellanización,” forced “modernization,” or other goals that are not in accordance with the perceived best interests of Indigenous peoples, as articulated by members of these communities themselves.

That is not to say that countries with large Indigenous populations must do everything within their power to maintain their distinctive communities as a sort of “living museum” for anthropologists. Rather, in countries where EIB has been successful it has allowed some degree of Indigenous participation in the development of appropriate educational structures. Whether this means collaborating to plan a school calendar flexible to the needs of the community or having input as to the educator hiring process, parental participation in developing EIB that is suitable for their community and culture is one of the best ways to develop an effective and valued educational program.

One of the goals of involving parents or members of the community in the program’s planning is to found EIB systems that do not create a dichotomy that brings education and preservation of culture into conflict with one another. Establishing the understanding that education does not have to threaten or erode a community’s distinctive culture, especially among the parents of the community, is vital to garner local support and, ultimately, to provide for the success of EIB in that community.
The involvement of parents can help the community in question to recognize the value of education, intercultural bilingual or otherwise, a key step in the effectiveness of EIB. Another way to foster this understanding is through a degree of exposure to Spanish-speakers or non-Indigenous peoples. The result of this kind of exposure is often that the parents of school-aged children may feel more inclined to support an educational program that would encourage bilingualism, seeing the utility of being able to communicate both with one’s Indigenous community and outsiders with a different mother tongue. This is especially applicable at the moment with the issue of internal migration, particularly from primarily Indigenous rural areas to primarily Spanish-speaking urban areas, which underscores the ability to communicate as a precursor to finding success in a new environment or situation.

**System design**

Early EIB programs were primarily assimilationist in nature, attempting to further subjugate or dissolve the Indigenous peoples by absorbing them into the mainstream national culture through educational programs that would replace native languages and change the role of culture altogether. Programs like these instituted “submersion” tactics of *castellanización* (Hispanization) and systematic erosion of cultures already perceived as “vulnerable” as part of their view that “suppression” of Indigenous peoples and languages was “a prerequisite for building up a unified nation state.” These programs ultimately lacked the support of the communities in which they were instated. In some cases, this resulted in the schools’ premature closing due to relatively complete loss of interest.

Other programs such as SIL, some of its Catholic counterparts, and certain

---

government literacy initiatives, maintain a similar vision of integrating and adapting
Indigenous peoples to life in the modern state, but sought to do so through different means.
These types of programs advocated for the preservation of indigenous languages and
cultures with the “ultimate aim of uniting nation and state” through “transitional” programs
in which “the Indian language played a subordinate, instrumental role as language of
instruction and for initial alphabetization,” and was seen as “a useful tool for cultural
transition,” though there was a noted absence of programs geared towards the actual
“maintenance” of the languages and cultures of Indigenous peoples. These transitional
programs were the next phase in most countries’ adoption of EIB, but they were also
frequently rejected by the communities in which they were developed. These types of
transitional programs were better able to address the usage of the mother tongue in the
classroom; they did so with the end goal of making students fluent in Spanish. This
contributed to an eventual erosion of the students’ first language. At the very least,
transitional programs enforced the idea that Spanish was superior in its utility, sometimes to
the extent that students became essentially monolingual in their adopted language.

Since the 1970’s, however, there have been great changes to bilingual education
programs. This has been achieved through increased valorization of pluriculturality and
inclusion of intercultural curriculum content that has greater respect for the cultural
distinctiveness of the different Indigenous peoples. Instances of these changes can be found
in cases of EIB implemented in Peru, Bolivia, and Guatemala. In order to be most effective
as a system, EIB should be designed with an eye towards the maintenance of the indigenous
language. That is not to say that it is entirely the responsibility of the educational system, or

its financial backers, to “save” languages that are, to some extent, “endangered,” but rather that EIB systems should at least attempt to dignify the language of the community by using it appropriately in educational settings.

This is part of what made Bolivia’s program unique: it focused on educating students who are monolingual in an Indigenous language instead of quickly transforming them into bilingual and then primarily Spanish-speaking students. To do this, the PEIB schools used the local Indigenous language as the primary language of instruction through the first five years of schooling, providing a continuity that reinforced and supported the Indigenous students’ existing knowledge and utilized it to later effectively transition into a state of bilingualism. Through continued restructuring, the efforts of ETARE, and increasing state support, as demonstrated by various decrees and ratified conventions, Bolivia’s EIB system became more effective at delivering an appropriate and useful education to Indigenous children in ways that were more integrated than other models, most notably by reforming curriculum, pedagogy, institutions, and administrations. Bolivia’s new method both honored and encouraged a greater sense of identity among these students and their communities.

**Access to teachers**

One of the most prominent ways to establish an EIB school that meets the needs of its students is to ensure that it is staffed with teachers who are adequately trained, well-equipped with the appropriate training to effectively deliver the curriculum. The teachers must be flexible to the needs of the community and be sensitive to avoid trivializing the cultural aspects of the curriculum. Because of the need for this sort of sensitivity, even hypersensitivity, it is often helpful for the teacher to have a personal background with, or at least relatively extensive familiarity with, the indigenous culture of the community in which
he or she is teaching. In cases where the teacher is a member of the same ethnic group, speaks the native language, or participates actively in community life, as is found in the town of Itavera, Bolivia, the program is better received.

**Program adaptation**

Along these lines, it is vital that programs be adapted to the specific communities in which they are established in order to be welcomed by and effective in these same communities. Peru’s program, for example, was groundbreaking in being one of the first to provide an education that was specifically catered to addressing the distinct needs of Indigenous students with different language abilities than their monolingual Spanish-speaking peers in traditional school systems. This change established the standard for new systems and systemic reform in other educational programs and policies in the region. The degree to which the program took into account the regional or community specificities greatly contributed to the success of and embrace of EIB, as sites that were slower to adopt a more particularized approach were shown to be less well-received.

In spite of this, it is difficult to develop the sort of curriculum that would be embraced by a community. There have been instances, such as Puerto Alegre, Peru, in which the program failed in part because, while to some extent it accounted for the local community, it was rendered apparently invaluable to parents, who reasoned their children could learn about their environment and culture outside of textbooks in the classroom.

In order to facilitate the adaptation of programs to their environments, it is necessary that they do not expand too rapidly. As the example of Bolivia shows, the quick expansion of a national EIB program can sometimes fail to take into account the particularities of each community and, by their subsequent failure to adapt, can experience failure.
Chapter One

**Roadmap**

EIB can provide an adequate and appropriate education to Latin America’s Indigenous peoples in such a way that it is in accordance with local, national, and international standards while simultaneously fulfilling the Indigenous groups’ articulated need for an educational system that respects, preserves, and fosters distinct languages and cultures. These themes will be investigated and developed in the following chapters. Chapter 2 explores the concept of “Indigeneity,” the role of collective and minority rights, as well as international documents and conventions that ensure these rights before focusing on Latin America’s substantial Indigenous population. Chapter 3 establishes a more detailed understanding of “Indigenous education and Educación Intercultural Bilingüe” as a general system and presents some of the challenges it faces in Latin America. Chapters 4 through 6 examine the countries of Peru, Bolivia, and Guatemala as case studies. In these pages, I detail the educational history of these countries’ Indigenous populations. In the cases of Peru and Bolivia, I describe specific schools and their successes and failures. In the case of Guatemala, I explore a comparison study between an EIB and mono-lingual Spanish school from nearby in order to use more concrete data to analyze the potential effectiveness of EIB programs and their utility to students in the learning process and life post-graduation. Chapter 7 concludes the findings of the previous chapters, determining that, while certain necessary conditions must be met, EIB is one of the most effective ways by which to implement the changes necessary to improve the quality of life for Latin America’s Indigenous populations.
Teodosio Condori is a shaman from Pocobaya, Bolivia who does not consider himself Indigenous or Aymara. He is monolingual in Aymara, so he is often other-identified by nonmembers of his community as “Indigenous,” but he reserves the term for those who live in the Amazon. Instead, Teodosio considers himself jaqui, a member of the community living in right relationship with the living and the dead of his community. This identity is highly localized, further enforced by place- and community-attached rituals. Because of this, Teodosio and others from Pocobaya are not very politically involved, as they do not see an association between themselves and broader identities or movements. Teodosio stands as a prime example of the difficulties in defining indigeneity in Latin America and the world.¹

There are various understandings as to who is and who is not Indigenous. Teodosio, as mentioned, entirely denies being Indigenous, but there are other people who proudly claim indigeneity based on the fact that they have one drop of indigenous blood in their body. How then, do we determine, or even begin to describe, who is Indigenous? The most common definitions have to do with blood, territory, language, and culture, but what is

becoming increasingly important is the role of self-identification.

Globally, there are more than 370 million people who can be considered “indigenous.” The world’s Indigenous people are comprised of at least 5000 distinct peoples, whether the hunter-gatherers of the Amazonian river basin to the Inuit of the Arctic, predominantly living in remote regions.²

Indigenous peoples are generally distinguished by their “cultural distinctiveness” from the national identity, using their own languages, cultures, social and political institutions, etc., that are not necessarily in alignment with the “mainstream.” Because of this distinctiveness, Indigenous peoples are especially vulnerable, in different ways than other ethnic minorities, as challenges to their rights often mean that their fundamental identity is also called into question or threatened.³ Questions of indigeneity and Indigenous rights are often complicated for groups, States, and international bodies, not least because there are many conceptions and definitions of what constitutes a group of “indigenous peoples.” In order to resolve this discrepancy and establish a standard for this study, I present three commonly accepted “working” definitions used widely throughout the international community.

The first definition is found in Article 1 of the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) Convention no. 169, which defines Indigenous peoples as “tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;” as well as “peoples in
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independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonisation or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions.”

Highly significant is the Convention’s emphasis on “self-identification as indigenous or tribal” which is “regarded as a fundamental criterion for determining the groups to which the provisions of this Convention apply.”

This is the definition on which I will primarily base my claims throughout the paper.

The second definition comes from the Martinéz Cobo Report to the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination of Minorities in 1986. This report identifies Indigenous peoples in the following way:

“Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems.”

The Martinéz Cobo report further defines the historical continuity of the Indigenous group by such criteria as occupying ancestral lands, maintaining “specific manifestations” of at least certain cultural aspects, and language, among others. Martinéz Cobo also holds that self-identification is fundamental to a person’s or group’s inclusion among Indigenous peoples.

Self-identification, according to this report, must meet the following criteria:
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On an individual basis, an indigenous person is one who belongs to these indigenous peoples through self-identification as indigenous (group consciousness) and is recognized and accepted by the group as one of its members (acceptance by the group). This preserves for these communities the sovereign right and power to decide who belongs to them, without external interference.”

The third definition comes from Mme. Erica-Irene Daes, the Chairperson of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations. According to Daes, people are Indigenous based on three main principles: (1) “they are descendants of groups which were in the territory of the country at the time when other groups of different cultures or ethnic origins arrived there;” (2) “their isolation from other segments of the country’s population [has allowed them to preserve] almost intact the customs and traditions of their ancestors which are similar to those characterised as indigenous;” and (3) “they are, even if only formally, placed under a State structure which incorporates national, social and cultural characteristics alien to theirs.”

Notably, Mme. Erica-Irene Daes neglects to include any reference to conditions of self- or other-identification as Indigenous as a qualification for being Indigenous, unlike the previous two definitions presented here. The omission of self-identification is probably the most notable shortcoming of Daes’ definition, and one that discredits it to some extent.

**Collective and minority rights**

With this basic understanding of indigeneity, we can delve more deeply into the collective and minority rights for which Indigenous peoples strive. There are seven classes of “collective rights,” six described by Paul Sieghart and one added by James Crawford, which we can divide into two broader categories. The first set pertains to rights ensuring the existence—whether actual, cultural or political—of groups and includes “the right to self-
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determination, the rights of minorities, and the rights of groups to existence (i.e. as a minimum, not to be subjected to genocide).”

The second group of rights are those that treat “issues relating to the economic development and the ‘coexistence’ of peoples,” including “rights to permanent sovereignty over natural resources, rights to development, to the environment and to international peace and security.”

These collective rights are valued to varying degrees in different communities across the world, but they take on a special significance among the world’s Indigenous peoples. Indigenous groups not only seek the basic rights guaranteed to them by their own States and international documents, but also often attempt to claim their own set of “collective” or “group” rights as a minority group, distinguishing themselves from the national majority by their cultural distinctiveness. Part of the impetus behind this is that there are different foci, and even ends, for internationally recognized human rights and Indigenous group rights. Most “traditional human rights doctrines are based on the idea of the inherent dignity and equality of all individuals,” while those preoccupied with “group” rights may tend to “treat individuals as the mere carriers of group identities and objectives, rather than as autonomous personalities capable of defining their own identity and goals in life.”

Group rights can “supplement and strengthen human rights, by responding to potential injustices that traditional rights doctrine cannot address,” putting them into a
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category that Will Kymlicka calls “‘good’ group rights.” On the other hand, there are “illiberal groups [that sometimes] seek the right to restrict the basic liberties of their members,” taking advantage of “‘bad’ group rights,” in ways that are sometimes “intolerable” enough that “the larger society has a right[,] or perhaps an obligation[,] to intervene to stop them.” In many cases, however, the State must “tolerate” these unjust practices by a minority group, as it is not always clear how to determine the boundary between “bad” and “intolerable” or when it is time to interfere.

Kymlicka divides group rights themselves into two primary types: the first “involves the claim of an indigenous group against its own members;” the second “involves the claim of an indigenous group against the larger society.” Both these kinds of rights are attempts at “protecting the stability of indigenous communities” through addressing “different sources of instability”: the first deals with “internal dissent” or “the decision of individual members not to follow traditional practices or customs” (referred to by Kymlicka as “internal restrictions”); the second seeks to protect the community “from the impact of external decisions,” especially the larger society’s decisions regarding economics or politics (referred to by Kymlicka as “external protections”).

The result of relying upon a combination of rights guaranteed to the group, the State, and to human beings universally means “an individual might have rights as a member of a minority which coexist with rights that person enjoys as a member of (the same or a broader) group properly classified as a ‘people,’” a series of overlapping rights that can be a
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great source of confusion, even conflict, depending on the situation in question. Because of this, while the previously mentioned measures may have intended to fortify and encourage Indigenous cultures around the world, they have, in some cases, led to factionism within the community in question.

One potential cause of this is the difference between the broader category of minority groups and the subcategory of Indigenous peoples. In general, most ethnic minorities attempt to protect their rights as individuals, as exemplified by the efforts of African Americans during the Civil Rights Movement in the United States. Indigenous peoples, to the contrary, typically have different priorities. While some do pursue individual rights, “indigenous peoples have always stressed the need to recognize their collective rights.”\(^{16}\) This can be damaging for minorities of minorities, including religious or ethnic minorities within a community and women. These minorities of minorities can struggle to assert their individual human rights in the existing system, even finding themselves restricted by community authorities, especially when individual rights are seen as contrary to the cause of group rights. Short of restricting the liberties and rights of individuals in a community in such ways that can be considered unjust, indigenous rights activists should be lauded for their efforts towards maintaining respect for tradition, protecting and preserving their unique cultures for future generations. In order to better understand these rights and their complexity, I shall examine several landmark documents on the rights of Indigenous peoples.

**The International Labour Organization and Convention 169**

The International Labour Organization (ILO), a United Nations agency, took an
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early interest in Indigenous rights. Based on the ILO’s belief that the “dispossession” faced by Indigenous peoples in Latin America was primarily a “labor” problem that should be addressed by formulating a convention designed to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples as land-owners and workers, it created the Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Populations (no. 107) in 1957. This document is significant in being the “first international human-rights treaty to recognize indigenous peoples as a distinct concern.”\(^\text{17}\) In spite of the fact that it was the only existing official “international mechanism” to resolve land disputes with Indigenous peoples, and that it was ratified by 28 countries at the time, ILO Convention 107 was not much used by Indigenous peoples themselves. This can primarily be attributed to the fact that the “internationalization of the indigenous movement had barely begun,” something that would change drastically with the onset of the 1980’s. 1988 saw the “partial revision” of Convention 107, after Indigenous rights activists “rejected [the convention’s] emphasis on the gradual ‘integration’ of indigenous peoples into national life” and demanded officials “re-orient” the wording of the convention to be in greater alignment with Indigenous peoples’ “aspiration for self-determination by securing their right to exercise ‘as much control as possible over their own social, economic and cultural development’.”\(^\text{18}\)

From this stemmed the ILO Convention of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (No. 169), adopted in 1989. ILO Convention 169 is a “legally binding international instrument” which deals with the specific rights of “indigenous and tribal peoples” whose “social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community”;


whose “status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations”; and who “irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions.”19 In a promising step forward for Indigenous rights, as of this writing, 22 states have ratified the Convention.20

At the time of its adoption, Indigenous peoples were pushing for the right to “self-determination and decolonization,” issues which the Convention did not address directly.21 Despite this, ILO Convention 169 includes sections that provide the means for both, as well as improving the socio-economic status of Indigenous peoples as a whole. Prominent among these are the right to non-discrimination; access to special measures “to safeguard the persons, institutions, property, labour, cultures and environment of these peoples [in such a way that they do] not go against the free wishes of indigenous peoples,” recognition and protection of unique cultures and identities; proper “consultation and participation...on issues that affect [indigenous and tribal peoples]”; and the right to “decide their own priorities for the process of development as it affects their lives, beliefs, institutions and spiritual well-being and the lands they occupy.”22

In order to further the recognition and protection of indigenous cultures, Part VI of ILO Convention 169 establishes the particular rights of Indigenous peoples with regards to education, affirming that “measures shall be taken to ensure that members of the peoples concerned have the opportunity to acquire education at all levels on at least an equal footing with the rest of the national community” (Article 26). Additionally, Article 27 states that
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“education programmes and services for the peoples concerned shall be developed and implemented in co-operation with them to address their special needs, and shall incorporate their histories, their knowledge and technologies, their value systems and their further social, economic and cultural aspirations.”

Because of these, and other, articles within ILO Convention 169, nonindigenous scholars often cite the Convention as a key defense of intercultural bilingual education (EIB). However, the greater part of EIB activists, nonindigenous and Indigenous alike, rely on other justifications, such as technical and economic rationales, rather than political claims to which governments must adhere. The abundance of literature and documentation on the correlation between illiteracy, indigeneity, and poverty in Latin America establishes the need for policy changes, such as those that can be wrought through ratification of ILO Convention 169.

Documentation on EIB indicates that, when properly implemented, these systems demonstrate higher retention rates, improved test scores, and the promise of higher-quality education. This indicates EIB as a clear solution to problems of “poverty and exclusion,” especially prevalent in rural areas or among primarily monolingual Indigenous populations. EIB in these regions has the particular ability to impact women and girls who are statistically less likely to speak Spanish and have more limited access to opportunities like those afforded to persons with Spanish language abilities. EIB, in theory, would allow for the more rapid decolonization demanded by Indigenous movements, the needed poverty reduction, and the
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promotion of access to opportunities to those groups most traditionally disadvantaged.\footnote{Bret Gustafson, \textit{New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia}, 16.}

**UNDRIP: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**  

This is reflected in the wording of the first article, which guarantees Indigenous persons the “full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law,” an effective way of ensuring that Indigenous peoples are protected in the same way as non-Indigenous peoples.\footnote{United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), 2007, (accessed April 9, 2012), www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf. 4.}

Beyond ensuring that Indigenous peoples “are free and equal to all other peoples and individuals” (Article 2), they are additionally assured the right to self-determination (Article 3), autonomy or self-government in local matters (Article 4), among many other rights. We begin to see where membership in multiple communities can become cloudy and problematic in Article 5, which ensures Indigenous peoples “the right to maintain and
strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural institutions, while retaining their right to participate fully, if they so choose, in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the State.”\(^{30}\) The confusions and complexities of overlapping spheres of identity cannot be quickly resolved and often result in embittered intragroup conflicts.

In the face of this challenge, however, it is important to consider the great value of ensuring that “Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture” (Article 8).\(^{31}\) This protection arises, in part, from the concern “that indigenous peoples have suffered from historic injustices as a result of, inter alia, their colonization and dispossession of their lands, territories and resources,” which have precluded them “from exercising, in particular, their rights to development in accordance with their own needs and interests.”\(^{32}\) Out of this history, Indigenous peoples are now guaranteed the right to practice and cultivate their own traditions, customs, religions, histories, educational systems (Articles 11-14), a right made more precious by past experiences, like the return of a long-lost but beloved family heirloom. In forty-six articles, the UNDRIP lays out a series of rights that are similarly prescriptive to those found in ILO 169, spanning a broad range of important and applicable topics from the right to land (Article 8) to the rights of “indigenous elders, women, youth, children and persons with disabilities” (Article 22).\(^{33}\)

Most importantly, with respect to this study anyways, UNDRIP provides guidelines for the education rights guaranteed to Indigenous peoples around the world. Article 14
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explicitly states that:

(1) “Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.”

(2) “Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.”

(3) “States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language.”

These stipulations, combined those listed in Article 15, which guarantees the right of Indigenous peoples “to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information,” explicitly reinforce the ideas of Indigenous education set forth in ILO Convention 169.

While ostensibly useful as an international recognition of the rights of Indigenous peoples, because UNDRIP is nonbinding, it is not, ultimately, one of the most useful documents to Indigenous peoples.

**Indigenous peoples in Latin America**

When discussing the “original inhabitants of the Americas,” finding a term that is respected and recognized by both the writer and the group of people in question can be challenging, though using the names of particular “groups of Indians” or the “social categories used to classify those groups” is the most common answer. In North America, for example, the term “Indian” was changed to “Native American,” or “Amerindian” over time, though there is still no unified consensus within the very group to which the name
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refers. Russell Means, for example, has said: “I abhor the term Native American…We were enslaved as American Indians, we were colonized as American Indians, and we will gain our freedom as American Indians, and then we will call ourselves any damn thing we choose.”)\textsuperscript{36}

Anecdotally, individuals “of indigenous descent” in Latin America tend to say that “Aquí somos indios…Los ‘americanos nativos’ viven solamente en los Estados Unidos” (“We are Indians here. ‘Native Americans’ live only in the United States.”)\textsuperscript{37}

Historically, “the inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere [of the 10\textsuperscript{th} Century] regarded themselves as belonging to their immediate group” rather than a “collective hemispheric entity,”\textsuperscript{38} though as discussed earlier in this chapter, there are criteria by which to identify and define Indigenous peoples more broadly for practical purposes in the modern era.\textsuperscript{39} When possible, in discussing specific case studies, I will try to use the names preferred by the particular groups of people to which I am referring (like the Arakmbut of the Peruvian Amazon, for example). To address the broader social category of people of this heritage, I will primarily use the term “Indigenous,” as it “has gained international currency

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Charles Mann, \textit{1491: New Revelations of the Americas before Columbus}. 388.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

\textbf{Julian Burger's 1987 “criteria by which indigenous people are defined[\ldots]}

1. are the descendants of the original inhabitants of a territory which has been overcome by conquest;  
2. are nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples, such as shifting cultivators, herders and hunters and gatherers and practise a labour-intensive form of agriculture which produces little surplus and has low energy needs;  
3. do not have centralized political institutions and organize at the level of the community and make decisions on a consensus basis;  
4. have all the characteristics of a national minority: they share a common language, religion, culture and other identifying characteristics and a relationship to a particular territory, but are subjugated by a dominant culture and society;  
5. have a different world-view, consisting of a custodial and non-materialist attitude to land and natural resources, and want to pursue a separate development to that proffered by the dominant society;  
6. consist of individuals who subjectively consider themselves to be indigenous and are accepted by the group as such.”
as a term of reference for the colonized peoples of the world who are prevented from controlling their own lives, resources and cultures” and is slightly more culturally sensitive than the commonly used term “indios.” Other more “sensitive” terms like “pueblos originarios” or “original peoples” are gaining popularity as the “most correct” in places like Argentina.

While Indigenous populations vary from country to country, as an entire region, Latin America is home to an estimated 40 million persons who self-identify as Indigenous and/or speak an Indigenous language. Indigenous peoples comprise an estimated 10 percent of the Latin American population, and remain behind the rest of the population with respect to various human development indicators including income, education and health conditions, among others. Some countries, like Costa Rica and Brazil, only claim an Indigenous population of less than 3 or even 1 percent of the total national population. In other countries, like Bolivia and Guatemala, the Indigenous population is prevalent enough to constitute a clear national majority of more than 50 or 60 percent respectively.

Politically, Latin America pretends to have avoided, and in some cases eliminated, discrimination between the distinct “ethnic, cultural and linguistic” groups that undeniably comprise the basis for the region, choosing to represent themselves instead as “homogenous and uniform nation-states.” Many states chose to gloss over or ignore any commonly acknowledged racial distinctions, instead homogenizing their populations by of a shared
mestizaje culture. Instances of this, whether real or invented, can be found in countries like Ecuador, with its entirely mestizo population, and Mexico, with its raza cosmica or “cosmic race”. Cuba, for example, was even declared “free of prejudice” by Fidel Castro in 1961 and has since eliminated any official distinction between races, even in census taking procedures. In daily life, however, we are presented with a different story as Latin America’s Indigenous have neither actually disappeared nor been “absorbed” entirely into the national majority.

Indigenous populations report high levels of “poor education, malnutrition and bad health, unemployment, discrimination, and other subjects that [are generally] constitutive of ‘poverty,’” qualifying them as a marginalized group within the greater Latin American context. Even studies that control “for other common predictors of poverty” indicate that the very fact of “being indigenous increases the probability of being poor.” In spite of all of this, Indigenous groups “also consider themselves to be rich [with respect to] a set of cultural and spiritual traditions that larger societies generally may emphasize less, and which cannot be measured numerically.” This reality is still true, in spite of the many policies and organizations that have been created in attempts to change this probability of being measurably disadvantaged.

In various countries across Latin America, the political situations of the Indigenous...
societies have essentially been described as “apartheid” situations. While this is a concept not traditionally applied to this region, it is appropriate given that “a clear and often publicly conceded intention of eradicating Indigenous ethno-cultural differences underlies” policies and decision-making in the region and that a tradition of “ethnocide—whether admitted or not—has always been a part of Latin American republican history.”

Legislative changes and inevitable progress since the end of colonial regimes in the region have certainly advanced the causes and rights of Indigenous peoples. Notable among these is the movement Xavier Albó nicknamed “El retorno del indio” or “the return of the Indian,” which took place during the 1970’s. During this time, Indigenous organizations and leaders began to gain power, there was a “resurgence of ethnicity,” and an increase in demands for Indigenous rights in the region. Since then, most countries have undergone constitutional reforms to acknowledge “the multiethnic, multicultural and multilingual nature of their societies as well as the right of indigenous peoples to education in their mother tongue.”

Most Latin American countries either “legally endorsed” or practically embraced the “proposals and strategies of contemporary liberal multiculturalism” during the 1990’s, however a great majority of the region’s population, most particularly the “ethnic and social sectors in power,” continue to conceive of “cultural and linguistic diversity as a problem and an obstacle that jeopardizes national unity” and can even endanger the “process of consolidating the nation-state.” After centuries of social and economic exclusion from the
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public realm, Latin American Indigenous movements, both national and international, can be described as highly political. 57

One of the political means by which Indigenous movements seek to achieve their goals of advancements and recognition is through the valuation, knowledge, skills and opportunities provided by access to an appropriate education of quality. This means of self-advocacy, and some of the benefits which can ensue from it, will be developed further in the next chapter and subsequent case studies.

Chapter 3: Indigenous education and Educación Intercultural Bilingüe

The demands for increased education and literacy among Indigenous populations are thus deeply entrenched in greater politicized movements for self-determination and increased access to rights. One goal that Indigenous organizations have pushed for, and achieved, was educational reforms and the implementation of intercultural bilingual systems, a type of education that has “contributed to increased political awareness and organizational processes among indigenous people.”

Indigenous education, especially in Latin America, has been “looked upon with concern and distrust, practically from the moment [these] countries became independent and adopted the principles of classical European liberalism.” From the perspective of the majority group, Indigenous education threatened national unity, bringing up questions of class and ethnicity that, in some cases, even turned ugly. Indigenous populations themselves may “have denounced formal education for jeopardising their languages, their knowledge systems and their ways of life,” but the Indigenous rights movement “has relied on educated individuals to combat infringements of human and indigenous rights by lobbying governments, fighting court cases and working with support groups.” Models and strategies of education are commonly based upon or influenced by “a clear-cut political orientation or
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tendency which reveals the nature of the society at which the model aims.” While in most cases it is true that previous educational strategies in Latin America were designed to continue the subjugation of Indigenous peoples, today these politically-oriented “tendencies” have altered their trajectories. Arguably, a compelling new agenda for educational models and the policies that support them is to preserve and forward the interests, cultures and languages of Indigenous groups.

A great barrier to education among Indigenous populations is the fact that, especially in rural areas, there are many groups that speak little or no Spanish. Latin America, as a region, is home to over 700 distinct indigenous languages, some with few living speakers while others, like Quechua or Aymara, are spoken by millions. Traditional education systems require that these students learn the national language of Spanish, as it is the sole or predominant language of instruction, regardless of the students’ mother tongues. This proves frustrating and difficult for many students, and detains them from mastering the curriculum at the age their Spanish-speaking peers gain access to the knowledge and materials presented therein. This provides a disadvantage to non-Spanish speaking Indigenous children from the first day of school, perpetuating cycles of disparity and poverty if this student becomes discouraged enough to abandon school or if this initial gap cannot be overcome by subsequent years of education.

One way to address this is through the system of intercultural bilingual education (Educación Intercultural Bilingüe in Spanish, or EIB). There are various names for the use of Indigenous languages in schools, including “Indigenous language-medium education,
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bilingual intercultural education, intercultural bilingual education, Indigenous education, mother tongue education, IBIIE, or heritage language education,” but EIB is the name I will primarily use here. The goal of these EIB systems is to “contribut[e] to the students’ equal opportunities and also [to help] them overcome the deficiencies of the system.” One of the most basic objectives is that students do not have to learn the official language of the country before they begin the process of learning the curriculum and basic skills, such as reading and writing. Additionally, these types of school systems play an important role in “Indigenous language revitalization and the empowerment of Indigenous communities,” though these systems often fall short of “includ[ing] the Indigenous understanding, goals, purpose, and voice.” While it may have been true that more than half of Latin American countries did not have bilingual programs designed for Indigenous students as of 1980, by 2004 the majority had made some sort of bilingual education program available for Indigenous students. These findings clearly show that access to bilingual education has had an impressive increase, “though it is [still] not universal among indigenous children, and it continues to have low quality and poorly qualified teachers.”

**An education of quality**

It is not sufficient merely to have an education—rather, it should be one of quality. The goals of education, according to UNESCO, are based on four fundamental pillars: to learn to know, to “deepen knowledge in a small number of materials [and] to enable students to take advantage of the possibilities offered by education in the bigger picture of their lives;”
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Chapter Three

to learn to do, to “acquire…a competency that allows the individual to face a great number
of situations and to work in a team;” to learn to live, to develop “an understanding of others
and a perception of the forms of interdependence…to realize common projects and to
prepare oneself to treat/face conflicts…[and to respect] the values of pluralism, mutual
understanding and peace;” and learn to be, in order to “better develop and flourish as an
individual personality and to be in work conditions with a growing capacity for autonomy,
judgment and personal responsibility.”

Additionally, a fundamental goal of education is “to learn to learn,” or develop the
ability to think for oneself with the knowledge of the manner by which to “organize the
whole group of available data [in a sensible manner, and] to select the most important, to use
these data, and to incorporate this learning as a part of a permanent knowledge.” By doing
this, a person with education assimilates strategies of thinking and of logical organization and
is enabled to solve problems both within the world of academia and in real life.

The ultimate objective of an education is for people to learn to think in an
autonomous and independent way. An education tries to “develop the capability to reflect
critically about the facts themselves and, more importantly, about one’s own learning.” By
doing this day after day, this “work/exercise [is converted] into a personal adventure upon

aprovechar las posibilidades que ofrece la educación a lo largo de la vida;” to learn to do in order to “adquirir…una
competencia que capacite al individuo para hacer frente a gran número de situaciones y a trabajar en equipo;” to learn to live, to
develop “la comprensión del otro y la percepción de las formas de interdependencia…realizar proyectos comunes y prepararse para
tratar los conflictos…[y respetar] los valores de pluralismo, comprensión mutua y paz;” and learn to be, in order to “florecer
mejor la propia personalidad y se esté en condiciones de obrar con creciente capacidad de autonomía, de juicio y de responsabilidad
personal.”

importante.”

12 CEPAL 2007, 178. Original version: “desarrollar la capacidad de reflexionar críticamente sobre los hechos propios y, por
tanto, sobre el propio aprendizaje.”
which depends the exploration and knowledge of one’s personality.”

This learning has a much broader application than the classroom—it helps the students to “adapt themselves to economic, social and cultural changes in this new society of knowledge/knowing,” to promote human rights, [and defend and propagate] the ideals of a just, equitable and peaceful world. To these ends, attempts to establish EIB in Latin America were necessary, especially for Indigenous children.

**Origins of EIB in Latin America**

EIB began in the early 20th century in Mexico, Peru, and Ecuador among teachers working with Indigenous populations. EIB was originally intended to assist in the assimilation of Indigenous communities into the greater national population, so most of the policies adopted by governments and curricula implemented can be considered part of “early-transition strategies” (López, 2006b). The countries with the greatest Indigenous populations in the region—namely Mexico, Peru, Guatemala, Bolivia and Ecuador—were home to massive EIB projects, “providing important evidence regarding the advantage of initially resorting to the pupils’ [primary languages].” Seminal publications emanated from Mexico and Peru, where “more intensive work in the field” was done. There is a close link between “the prominence of [EIB] in these countries [and] the national policies of state
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indigenismo that also had an academic impact” during this period.\(^\text{19}\)

In 1977, there was an important meeting in Barbados between anthropologists, linguists and indigenous leaders and intellectuals from across Latin America. This reunion transitioned “indigenism” from a “top-down” approach to a “more grass-roots and critical approach.”\(^\text{20}\) This, in turn, led to a more active involvement of indigenous organizations in forming and influencing decisions regarding EIB programs and was met with positive feedback.

An early model for EIB was founded by Mexico’s \textit{Alianza Nacional de Profesionales Indígenas Bilingües Asociación Civil}, or the National Alliance of Indigenous Bilingual Professionals (ANPIBAC). Created in 1977 “to campaign and work for a bilingual and bicultural education that would reflect the reality of the different indigenous groups in the country,” ANPIBAC demanded “appropriate education and freedom of cultural expression within the context of a wider claim for the recognition of indigenous rights and for a reorganization of interethnic relations.”\(^\text{21}\) ANPIBAC established the working definition of what was then known as “bilingual-bicultural education” in a position paper produced at the First National Seminar on Bilingual-Bicultural Education in Vicam, Mexico in 1976.

According to ANPIBAC, the control of these EIB programs should belong to the Indigenous peoples, who deserve the right to “develop their communities within their own cultural system and grounded in their world view and way of life.”\(^\text{22}\) An appropriate EIB curriculum or policy should “serve to create an aware society which respects the

\(^{19}\) López and Sichra, \textit{Intercultural bilingual education among indigenous peoples in Latin America}, 3.

\(^{20}\) Ibid.

\(^{21}\) Aikman, \textit{Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study}, 16.

\(^{22}\) Aikman, \textit{Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study}, 17.
environment and other people, which ensures the existence of the family and the community, which promotes the interests of the group over the individual and where people work for the benefit of the collectivity and not for individual gains.”

As for the structure of this educational system, ANPIBAC prescribes that the students learn the “linguistic and grammatical structure of each indigenous language” first before “they will be taught to speak, read, write and understand the linguistic and grammatical structure of Spanish as a second language,” though the timing of introducing the second language depends on the preparedness of the students and the “degree of difficulty in the teaching-learning process.” With regards to the intercultural aspect of this education, the first priority must be to “teach and strengthen the indigenous culture then introduce values of other cultures,” permitting primacy first to “indigenous philosophy…and afterwards other philosophies.” According to ANPIBAC, the teaching “methodology[,] to be determined by the Indigenous peoples themselves[,] should arise out of the experiences which we have had as a group but also draw on other pedagogical developments which will support our education without threatening our ethnic and cultural identity.”

Prescriptions by ANPIBAC and programs piloted in other countries showed promising results. One of the first experimental programs, a research project in Chiapas, Mexico demonstrated that Indigenous children in second grade scored better than their peers on the same assessment in their second language when enrolled in a bilingual education.
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program. Comparable results were found in similarly controlled studies in different countries at primary education levels. Students with proficiency in two languages (more specifically, an Indigenous language and Spanish) achieved at comparable or higher rates in other subjects than their Indigenous peers in monolingual Spanish education systems in fourth grade classes in Puno, Peru. Also in the same part of Peru, studies showed that bilingually educated Quechua students managed their primary language in a more complex way than their peers in monolingual Spanish classes, even after the first two years of school.

What’s more, the linguistic skills and abilities developed by students in their primary language, including reading comprehension and writing abilities, transfer to their secondary language (Spanish), as demonstrated by studies in rural indigenous schools in Mexico. Other studies, like that of Peruvian Aymara-speaking children in EIB programs, show that students can produce written work in their secondary language of Spanish at a higher, or more complex, grammatical and rhetorical level than they could produce orally in Spanish, showing that first-language literacy transferred into the second language.

Given the positive results of test programs in five countries with high Indigenous populations during the 1980’s and 1990’s, in addition to increased activism, there has been

---

great expansion of EIB programs. By 2006, EIB systems could be found, in various stages of development, in 17 countries. In some countries, like Bolivia, EIB has been changed from a pilot project tested in a few areas to national policy, though as a system in the region EIB has not generally expanded beyond formal primary schooling.\textsuperscript{32}

The increase in EIB led to a greater valuation of indigenous cultures, as the emphasis of the system shifted from a simpler bilingual system that did not include cultural elements in a Western-focused curriculum to a program that includes an “intercultural” aspect which allows more attention and respect to be given to “indigenous knowledge and practices.”\textsuperscript{33}

One of the “most pressing demands from Indigenous leaders” is for “intercultural education for all,” as historically “indigenous people have always had to learn from the non-indigenous but the opposite has never been the case.”\textsuperscript{34} More recently, this has led to development of two-way intercultural programs across the region. However, these two-way EIB systems are not widely instated or accepted. In certain instances, these programs have even been met with vehement opposition, as in Peru where the parents of white/mestizo students from the bourgeoisie reacted violently upon hearing their children were asked to learn Quechua in school.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{Challenges for EIB in Latin America}

The development of EIB in Latin America has raised regional awareness about the current status of indigenous languages as well as the need to develop writing systems in

\textsuperscript{32} López and Sichra: \textit{Intercultural bilingual education among indigenous peoples in Latin America}, 4.
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order to develop a curriculum in said language.\textsuperscript{36} This process of *normalization* required linguists and teachers to collaborate in the “language elaboration processes” and to create “unified writing systems in line with linguistic standardization” in order to produce textbooks in languages that, in some cases, were previously strictly oral.\textsuperscript{37} This was a process of “indigenous self-recognition and empowerment,” as Indigenous teachers were directly involved in the process of authoring these texts and developing these lexicons for EIB systems.\textsuperscript{38}

While in theory EIB sounds like an ideal answer for the question of education among Indigenous populations in Latin America, the primary leaders, intellectuals and organizations representative of the indigenous causes in the region identify five key problems with the system. First, the demand for this system far exceeds the ability of the government to provide these services to those in need in rural areas, in spite of the “search for equity and cultural relevance, bilingual schools and the intercultural and bilingual approach” recognized as valuable by governments in the region. Second, the EIB system needs to be applied to cities and more densely populated towns, as it is increasingly common that Indigenous populations are present in or moving to these “urban environments,” as in Mexico City, Lima, Santiago de Chile, and Buenos Aires, among others. Third, Spanish-speaking populations typically do not also benefit from this Indigenous bilingual education and need to become aware of language and cultural diversity within their own countries, as well as become more sensitive to Indigenous issues such as discrimination and racism. Fourth, the official curriculum must be modified to “acknowledge[,] accept[,] and include[ ]

\textsuperscript{36} López and Sichra: *Intercultural bilingual education among indigenous peoples in Latin America*, 5.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
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Indigenous sociocultural practices and ways of life as integral to an alternative knowledge system.” Finally, there is the question of the “obligation to make decisions and take action towards the rescue and revitalization of endangered and highly vulnerable Indigenous languages,” and the unclear responsibility that education and/or politics should have in this process. These are just a few of the existing concerns connected with EIB, already noted in literature, which I plan to investigate further.

**Spanish as a second language**

One of the greatest and most problematic tasks for ministries and research centers is how to learn and teach Spanish as a second language. Policy-makers and students both feel a certain degree of “social pressure” to learn and “master” Spanish “in order to have better chances in life,” as traditionally Spanish enjoyed educational priority “under a clear assimilationist scheme.” Changing the educational norms demands a shift in educational methods, a tall order for policy-makers and teachers in the classroom alike, as will be developed later.

**Monolingualism and migration**

At the dawn of EIB’s adoption, “indigenous monolingualism was relatively high and most of the Indigenous population inhabited rural areas that were either isolated or difficult to reach.” This situation has drastically changed by now, thanks to “roads, migration into cities, telecommunications and political and legal transformations and democratic openness” which have “transformed the historical invisibility of Indigenous peoples and the physical and
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mental distance that separated Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.” Indigenous people are more widely dispersed than ever, a situation that makes the sort of education provided by EIB more important in terms of ensuring Indigenous peoples are as well-prepared as possible to prosper in a primarily Spanish-speaking world, bringing as much of their languages and cultures with them as they please.

**Teacher training**

In addition to programs’ “construction and implementation,” teachers are instrumental to the success of an EIB initiative. They must be specifically trained and prepared to “assume a personal and collective commitment to struggle against racism and discrimination” in their teaching, as well as aiding in “transforming Latin American Countries into multinational entities.”

One of the most fundamental problems facing the EIB system is the inadequate training provided for teachers. Slow reforms over the past few decades have tried to address and improve this situation, but it remains a pressing problem that threatens to asphyxiate schools and whole initiatives. “[N]ew teachers do not show the professional and political strength needed to convince parents and communities of the advantages of [EIB],” nor do they “seem to be able to break away from rote-learning, blackboard copying and dictation” as teaching methods (King, 2001). Existing teachers who may be hesitant to or resistant to adopt new classroom strategies or adapt the curriculum itself only serves to compound the situation. Additionally, there is a problem with Spanish-speaking teachers who are employed
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at, or assigned to, EIB schools with only a cursory mastery of the community’s Indigenous language. This approach has, at the very least, been met with coldness or indifference, if not open hostility at what can be perceived as yet another instance of internal colonization where an outsider arrives to “save” the poorer, darker, less-educated Indigenous peoples of the country.

To address these challenges, there has been a gradual transition to training programs that place greater focus on “pre-service education” of teachers, as it has proven that “in-service teacher training” as it stands “is insufficient.” These new or restructured EIB teacher training programs, such as FORMABIAP in the Peruvian Amazon, aim to prepare “professionals to respond to the needs and aspirations of Indigenous peoples and simultaneously stimulat[e] a dialogue amongst indigenous knowledge and value systems vis-à-vis mainstream traditions, in order to structure an intercultural perspective that could contribute to the sustainable development” of the region, or the sub-region in this instance.

**Responsibility to disappearing languages**

The “revitalization of vulnerable languages” and endangered languages “on the verge of extinction” presents another dilemma for EIB systems. There are two components EIB must satisfy to achieve the requirements needed for language “revitalization”: (i) EIB must be “reinvent[ed]” to “respond to situations in which the indigenous language needs to be reactivated” by establishing “very close links [between] communities and schools”; and (ii) education must be placed in the broader context of “indigenous sustainable development” or “development with identity,” as it is now called by Indigenous peoples themselves, “since
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educational projects are to contribute to the community’s life plan and aspirations.”

To achieve this, using a bottom-up approach, “good practices” must be identified, cultivated, and spread “in order to promote attitudes of respect towards the interests of indigenous communities and to support projects with real, positive and long-lasting effects.”

Demand for EIB can even be found among communities that have lost “active use of [their] indigenous language,” as activists insist that “The school should return to us the language it deprived us of.” This understanding is based on “overemphasiz[ing] the role the school can and should play in linguistic revitalization, while underestimating the importance of other domains of language use.”

**Validation of Indigenous peoples, cultures and languages**

Part of the beauty of establishing EIB as a priority is the recognition and validation it gives to Indigenous populations “by regarding [them] as an integral part of the state and promoting their social and political participation,” taking steps to fight “against social exclusion” and subsequently “triggering an ideological relocation of linguistic and cultural diversity that has an impact on every citizen of a multiethnic society.” In order to transform EIB into a system that fully contributes to this cause, it is seen as imperative that EIB is no longer viewed as a “compensatory” system, but rather as “an approach for better educational quality in general,” expanding the system beyond the primary and rural schools in which EIB typically operates.

Today, EIB is “recognized as part of the indigenous patrimony,” playing a role in
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“rescuing [Indigenous] values, relocating their languages and cultures, [by] assigning them at least the same status in schools that hegemonic languages and cultures enjoy.”\textsuperscript{55} This represents a grand shift in the structure of the classroom, which traditionally excludes, or even flagrantly “denies,” that another language or culture could or does exist in the classroom.\textsuperscript{56}
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Chapter 4: Peru, a case study

Demographics

As of July 2011, Peru is comprised of 29,248,943 citizens, placing it as the 42nd most populous country in the world.1 Peru’s population is 45% Amerindian, 37% mestizo (mixed Amerindian and white), 15% white, and 3% other races (including Black, Japanese, Chinese, and other).2 Peru’s two official languages are Spanish (84.1%) and Quechua (13%), though other languages also represented include Aymara (1.7%), Ashaninka (.3%), other native languages (.7%; including many minor Amazonian languages), and other languages (.2%).3

Peru spent 2.7 of the GDP on education in 2008, ranking it no. 143 in the world.4 Literacy, defined as the ability of the population age 15 and older to read and write, is 92.9% nationally, with 96.4% of the male and 89.4% of the female population considered literate.5 The school life expectancy from primary to tertiary education is fourteen years, however both male and female populations demonstrated an educational life expectancy of only 13 years.6
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2 CIA World Factbook: Peru.
3 Ibid.
4 Estimated GDP in 2011: $301.5 billion. CIA World Factbook: Peru.
**History of Indigenous education in Peru**

A “small intellectual elite” called for educational reform during the 1930’s. In this period, there were various movements to further the causes of Indigenous peoples and their education, legal moves, “various articles of the 1933 Peruvian Constitution in favor of indigenous peoples using their mother tongue in school.” Unfortunately for the intellectual elites who called for these reforms and for the students who would have benefited from them, these effectively remained “dead letters” for years.

With the rising role of indigenistas, education for Indigenous children became a cause to be championed on a smaller scale through experiments in the Andes (Citarella 1990b). Indigenistas “broke new ground in indigenous schooling” and, after seeing the success of some of these experiments, “the government subsequently provided legislative support.”

Characteristic of the early experiments in the Andes, and many programs in place today, were the programs’ “respect for indigenous languages, advocacy of human rights, Spanish literacy to promote a politicization of indigenous leaders and a reevaluation of indigenous culture.” While these experimental schools had begun to yield results, there was insufficient financial support to expand the programs at the time. Things began to change in the 1940’s, however, under Luis Valcárcel, the Education Minister with an indigenista agenda. Valcárcel founded “rural school nuclei” for Andean indigenous children in certain areas of the
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Highlands, however educational systems specifically catered to Indigenous students did not become widespread at this juncture (Gonzalbo, 1996). In 1972, President Velasco instituted a system-wide structural educational reform that intended on “promoting a new ethos of self-criticism, creativity and cooperation” in such a way that “would build up the Peruvian nation along humanistic, democratic and nationalistic lines.” This reform intended to provide a “flexible and diversified education that would take into account the social and regional variety of the nation, without giving privilege to any particular member, but with a broad spirit of justice” (Pozzi-Escot, 1981). This began the trend away from what is known as the “transitional model of bilingual education,” which uses the mother tongue “as a bridge to Spanish” and a move towards “the practice of bilingual education as a means of strengthening indigenous language and culture,” though this was not, by any stretch of the imagination, actualized until years later. This shift was key for Indigenous activists and for the increased interest in and development of intercultural bilingual educational systems in Peru, establishing “the rationale” to mandate bilingual education.

In 1975, Quechua was officially declared the second national language of Peru. Teaching Quechua in schools became obligatory, as it was a “living language for over 1.3 million mono-lingual Quechua speakers above the age of 5, plus an estimated 7.8 million
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bilingual Quechua/Spanish speakers” (Alfaro and Zegarra, 76). These reforms were short-lived, however, as Velasco’s revolutionary government was replaced in a coup by a conservative branch of the military in 1975. The recognition of Quechua as an official language of Peru provides an appropriate illustration for what happens when a law, even one that is well-intentioned and articulated, “represents very little if grass root organizations, the vernacular speakers themselves, and especially those who speak the dominant language do not feel touched by it and are not willing to participate in a change that should ideally involve a multilingual society at large.” In fact, President Belaunde went so far as to reverse these reforms in the year 1980, setting back education of Indigenous peoples.

Peru received assistance in 1979, when UNESCO undertook the “Major Project.” This project aimed to confront a few of the more “glaring educational problems in the region,” including such issues as “unequal access, low achievement rates and high wastage.”

The objectives of the Major Project were to:

1. “Ensure a minimum of 8-10 years’ schooling for all children of school age by 1999;
2. eliminate illiteracy by the end of the century and develop and increase educational services for adults;
3. improve the quality and efficiency of the educational systems through the necessary reforms”

UNESCO actively aided governments in their plans to achieve these objectives, even hosting a “Technical Seminar on the Policies and Strategies for Education and Literacy among Indigenous Populations” in Oaxaca, Mexico in 1982.

---
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Chapter Four

**PEEB-P and further development of EIB in Peru**

The *Proyecto Experimental de Educación Bilingüe-Puno*, or the Project for Experimental Bilingual Education in Puno (PEEB-P, or the Puno Project), was initiated in 1977 and continued through the 1980’s with support from the Peruvian Ministry of Education’s National Institute for Educational Research and Development (*Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación*, INIDE), the Departmental Board of Education of Puno, and *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* (GTZ, or the German Agency for Technical Cooperation).  

Puno itself is one of the Peruvian departments with the highest Indigenous populations. At the time the Puno Project came into existence, 50% of Puno’s population spoke Quechua and 39% spoke Aymara (of the total population of 750,000). Because of this variety within the region, PEEB-P attempted to create bilingual programs that were appropriate for both Aymara and Quechua students at the primary education level, honoring the Indigenous mother tongue of the students and introducing Spanish as a second language later. Even so, there was never an attempt to “accommodate” the “various communicative needs of children living in areas where more than one vernacular was spoken,” a potential shortcoming that was perhaps founded in a logistical necessity. The curricula for the Quechua and Aymara schools were essentially designed to be the same, though they were translated into the appropriate language for the community with the aid of local and foreign specialists.

In 1980, the Puno Project was instituted in 100 participating schools, all chosen by specific “community-based criteria” including “degree of Quechua/Aymara monolingualism,
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socioeconomic and educational situation, exposure to and participation in development programmes; and teacher-related criteria” like the “level of training, knowledge of Quechua/Aymara, and experience in rural schools.”27 The project focused on research, curriculum development, the creation of educational materials, the professional development of educators, and “community outreach,” seeking to appropriately respond to “the two indigenous languages and cultures within their compass”.28

During the 1980’s, PEEB-P was able to impact the lives of about 4 percent of Quechua- and Aymara-monolingual students at the primary school age.29 Plans to expand PEEB into an even greater number of communities to reach “hundreds of thousands of children,” both in Puno and similar departments also in the “southern highland” area (including Apurímac, Arequipa, Ayacucho, Cuzco, and Huancavelica), were cut short in 1989 when the World Bank ceased providing loans to the country of Peru.30 While PEEB may have officially stopped running its program in Puno in 1990, PEEB-P helped establish a model for the region, especially for improved professional development for EIB teachers in the region.31 Because of the impact PEEB-P has had on other programs in the region, and the way in which other countries developed their own programs aping PEEB-P’s strategies, by some accounts the Puno Project cannot be considered a “failure,” even though today there may be next to no activity in any of the schools originally served by the program.32
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From the “Puno experience,” Cenoz and Genesee draw some “useful lessons” applicable for “multilingual education initiatives, particularly those involving indigenous or other minority languages,” both in Latin America and the world in general. Figuring among these “lessons” are the “practical responses to technical linguistic and pedagogical challenges,” the impact of “the local language being introduced into the school [and] incorporating local linguistic and cultural knowledge into the curriculum,” and “the importance of community participation and a favourable political climate” in order to ensure “long-term survival of any particular educational programme” or any of its “spin-off” projects.

In 1989, Peru established the Directorate of Bilingual Education (DIGEBIL) within its Ministry of Education, demonstrating a commitment to the cause of bilingual education and increasing access of Indigenous populations to an education of quality on par with that of their monolingual Spanish-speaking peers. While DIGEBIL has made great progress in its attempts to address the concerns of the Indigenous peoples of Peru, it has ignored certain problems such as broader equality, the “internal domination of ethnic groups by a mestizo elite” and “the nature of the interculturality within the society as a whole.”

In 1992, Peru went even further in its approval of alternative educational systems catered to the needs of Indigenous populations by approving a five-year National Policy for Intercultural Education and EIB. While this system was limited by its small staff and budget, this was a pivotal moment for intercultural relations in Peru and in Latin America. This
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policy officially “recognized Peru as a multiethnic, pluricultural and plurilingual country” in which the state had a “duty to allow its citizens to affirm themselves culturally and socially on the basis of their own paradigms and socio-cultural matrices” (Ministerio de Educación 1992: 5).\textsuperscript{37}

The Programa de Formación de Maestros Bilingües (The Program of Education of Bilingual Teachers) sought to guarantee “indigenous peoples’ rights to develop their own curricula and to articulate these through their own learning processes and practices.”\textsuperscript{38} This program developed training programs for educators “to equip them with the knowledge and skills of the national society in order to participate more fully and equally,” taking into account that Indigenous populations need to cultivate an understanding of the broader national society in order to better advocate for themselves and their particular needs as Indigenous communities.\textsuperscript{39}

El Ministerio de Educación (the Ministry of Education) has said “interculturality ought to be the guiding principle of the entire education system.”\textsuperscript{40} It also recognizes that the role of education should be to “strengthen the cultural identity and self-esteem of all the different cultures” and that “the adoption of interculturality is essential” in order to make “social, economic and cultural progress” at the local, regional and national level (1992: 8).\textsuperscript{41} Intercultural education provides a setting to stage a “dialogue which recognizes and values the wealth of cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity in the country, promotes the affirmation and development of the different cultures which coexist in Peru and constitutes an open
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process towards cultural exchange within the global society” (Foro Educativo, Peru 1995).\textsuperscript{42}

It allows for more equal interactions and relationships between “social actors belonging to different cultural universes on the basis of recognition of diversity” and works “to overcome dichotomies, particularly that of indigenous/nonindigenous” people (Seminar on Intercultural Education in Latin America, Cusco 1995).\textsuperscript{43}

DIGEBIL, the Department of Bilingual Education within the Peruvian Ministry of Education, was closed in 1994.\textsuperscript{44} Those who remained hopeful for intercultural bilingual education programs turned their attention to the Inter-ethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP) and the Loreto Teacher-Training College. These two groups began to collaborate and “forged a unique and exciting alliance between indigenous peoples and education specialists, anthropologists and linguists, and has not only produced a radically new training course for indigenous bilingual teachers but is also trailing a new primary curriculum produced in conjunction with indigenous teacher-trainers and trainee teachers,” centralized in the northern rainforest city of Iquitos.\textsuperscript{45}

Over the years, with support from UNESCO’s Major Project, the national government and NGO’s, Peru was able to develop various programs geared towards bilingual and, eventually, intercultural bilingual education, as indicated in the following table.

\textsuperscript{42} Aikman, “Interculturality and Intercultural Education: A Challenge for Democracy,” 469.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Aikman, \textit{Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study}, 38.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
Table 1. EIB Projects in Peru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program for Experimental Education for Quechua-speaking children</td>
<td>Plan for Linguistic Development, the ncenter for Applied Linguistics (CILA) of San Marcos University</td>
<td>1966-1984</td>
<td>Quinua, Ayacucho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project for Experimental Bilingual Education in Puno (PEEB-P)</td>
<td>German Development Cooperation (GTZ) and Ministry of Education</td>
<td>1977-1991</td>
<td>Puno: Quechua and Aymara communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for Rural Andean School (ERA)</td>
<td>Radda Barnen Stockholm (Save the Children) and Ministry of Education</td>
<td>1988-1995</td>
<td>Cusco and Puno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for Bilingual Intercultural Education of the High Napo (PEBIAN)</td>
<td>Missionaries in the Angosteros community</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Napo Kichwa and a Secoya community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education project with the Candoshi</td>
<td>Terra Nova</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Chuinda, Chapuri, and Huitoyacu rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project for Bilingual Intercultural Education for the Ashaninka</td>
<td>Amazonian Center for Anthropology and Practical Applications (CAAP)</td>
<td>1983-1987</td>
<td>Tambo river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Training of Bilingual Teachers for the Peruvian Amazon (FORMABIAP)</td>
<td>Loreto Teacher Training Institute AIDESEP</td>
<td>1988-2004</td>
<td>Central and Northeast Amazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project in Bilingual Intercultural Education in Andahuaylas Chicheros</td>
<td>Anton Spinoy Foundation</td>
<td>1990-2002</td>
<td>Andahuylas and Chincheros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Teacher Training Program—Bilingual Intercultural Education (PLANCAD-EBI)</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Executing agencies under contract</td>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>Seven departments or regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Project for Rural Areas (PEAR)</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>Canas, in Cusco, Frías and Suyo in Piuria and El Dorado in San Martín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to better understand the reality of EIB in Peru, which has been encouraged by measures like those listed in the table above, I shall examine two schools from the same region with students of the same Indigenous ethnic and linguistic group. They are interesting and valuable to this study because, while they served similar communities, they had entirely different results in their implementation, success, and longevity.

**Madre de Dios: “Lost Paradise” and the Arakmbut**

By the 1960’s, Peru had been divided into the “modernized coastal area” and the “Andean region,” while the Amazon “barely featured in the national consciousness.”

Comparatively speaking, among Amazonian regions, Madre de Dios figures as a “backwater” in almost every way, including “economically, educationally and in terms of national development, infrastructure and social services.” It has somehow managed to mostly avoid the “guerrilla activities” of the Shining Path and was even left unscathed by the cholera epidemic in 1990, both of which destroyed many lives in the Central Rainforest region. So, while it may seem to be “backwards” to some, through the 1980’s Madre de Dios is often described by scholars as a “lost paradise,” largely unexplored with great tracts of essentially virgin land “literally forgotten by the Spanish colony and the Republic, buried between its immense rivers and solemn and dense forests.” However, this idyllic vision has been interrupted by a “cruel, violent, migratory exploitation of rubber and alluvial gold [which] converted its forests into merchandise at gunpoint and through terror,” through an
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unregulated process that proved devastating to the “ecological, environmental and spiritual bases of the indigenous peoples” of the area.\textsuperscript{52}

One of the largest and most visible groups in the Madre de Dios area is the Arakmbut people. The Dominicans were some of the first to interact with the Arakmbut and undertook a mission to care for the religious, social, cultural and moral lives of the Arakmbut. They sought to do this through “de-education,” or the “unlearning and eradication of indigenous values and beliefs,” dedicating themselves to the subsequent “re-education,” or the learning of the values and beliefs that the missionaries considered essential.\textsuperscript{53} The Dominicans were entirely in charge of this process—they made all decisions regarding the teaching material and the most appropriate ways in which to instill this new knowledge or these new values, often resorting to coercion. The missionaries were highly focused on teaching the Arakmbut the Spanish language because they believed “the savage language closes the soul to the light” and “prevents [them] from entering fully into civilization, religion and the life of the nation.”\textsuperscript{54} The view of Indigenous peoples as inferior, as demonstrated by the opinions and actions of the missionaries, was widespread and continued through other assimilationist oriented educational schemes throughout Peru’s history.

**Puerto Alegre and SIL involvement in the region**

The Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), now called SIL International, is a famous and relatively controversial U.S.-based organization of Protestant linguist-missionaries. SIL became involved in both Peru and Mexico during the 1950’s and 1960’s, hoping to create

\textsuperscript{52} Aikman, *Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study*, 39.
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\textsuperscript{54} Aikman, *Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study*, 41.
“alphabets, literary primers, dictionaries and practical grammars.” One of SIL’s primary goals was also to produce Bibles translated into Indigenous languages, an end that caused the organization to draw much criticism for “hiding its Christian missionary work under a linguistic guise,” or bushel, as it were.56

More specifically, SIL became increasingly active in the Madre de Dios region. These linguist-missionaries were dedicated to the concept of bilingual biliterate education, believing it to be highly beneficial to the students and communities involved. At the time, SIL highly valued local Indigenous teachers that could speak the Indigenous language of the community, especially those with personal relationships and connections to the community itself (Larson 1981: 25).57 This is why, when SIL established a school in Puerto Alegre in the 1970’s, program organizers chose a teacher from within the community with some knowledge of Spanish, in this case gained by briefly attending the Dominican primary school at Shintuya’s mission. This teacher worked with a SIL linguist to write literary primers in the Harakmbut language, responding to fill the dearth of texts available in the students’ first language. However, the Arakmbut in Puerto Alegre were disinterested in the school because they “saw little relevance in their children learning to read about the forest and about Arakmbut culture when their knowledge of, for example, the forest already exceeded that contained in the textbooks.”58 This was a key failure on the part of those planning materials for the classroom, especially as the promotion of these texts came at a time “when Arakmbut knowledge and skills were being debased and devalued through contact with

56 Aikman, Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study, 33-4.
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frontiersmen, particularly gold panners, loggers and traders. The boom in gold prices created an influx of gold panners that coincided with the arrival of Geophysical Services Intercontinental, exploration for oil in lands traditionally considered to belong to the Arakmbut, and the establishment of a village depot to accommodate the needs of these additional people. All of these factors placed heavier pressure on the Puerto Alegre community to adapt to these changes and adopt the educational programs that were becoming available to them.

This rush greatly increased the interaction between the Arakmbut and the outside world, meaning that the SIL school was primed for success from the start. However, the Puerto Alegre SIL school ultimately failed for a variety of reasons. First, it was based on the SIL-model, not a model specifically catered to the socio-cultural and economic factors and needs of Puerto Alegre. Second, this system did not take into account that the Arakmbut students needed to learn literacy and communication skills in Spanish rather than in Harakmbut. Third, the SIL school had minimal support from the community, which found it inessential if not worthless. The combination of these factors led to the premature closure of the school before the administration had established a transitional system of Spanish-teaching. Had the school altered its curriculum and methods in this way, it could have easily made the school a viable option for Arakmbut children and a valued part of Puerto Alegre.

San José and RESSOP

The Dominicans founded the Red Escolar de la Selva del Sur Oriente Peruano, or the School Network of the Jungle of Southeastern Peru (RESSOP) in response to the efforts of
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the Protestant group SIL. RESSOP, partly created from the Association for Secular Missionaries (MISEMA) group of mobile educators, gained approval and recognition from the Ministry of Education for schools established by the Diocese. With this, they began to engage in communities around Peru, including with the Arakmbut community in San José, located just down the river from Puerto Alegre. The teacher in the San José school was a member of the Arakmbut community, as well as a graduate of a Dominican boarding school established by RESSOP. While the school had limited resources and the teacher relied heavily upon the rote method of instruction, the school was much more successful. Literacy was taught in Spanish, though the teacher used Harakmbut and Spanish interchangeably in spoken language “as he felt appropriate” for his students, who were mostly monolingual in Harakmbut.”\footnote{62 Aikman, Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study, 44.} Being Arakmbut himself, the teacher was “sensitive to the rhythm of community life” and would allow for the continuation of important cultural aspects for those who chose to engage in formal schooling, doing such things as cancelling school to enable children to go on traditional hunting trips with their family.\footnote{63 Aikman, Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study, 44.} While the methods and materials employed in teaching in San José “reflected an alien lifestyle and pedagogy,” because the school adapted its schedule and calendar, it maintained a “flexibility which reflected the concerns of a teacher who was part of the community.”\footnote{64 Aikman, Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study, 44.} This meant the community did not feel threatened by the prospect of education and the program was able to thrive and be generally successful.\footnote{65 Aikman, Intercultural Education and Literacy: An ethnographic study, 44.}
The Establishment of FENAMAD

The Law of Native Communities and the National Constitution of Peru of 1979 called for the demarcation of community lands under “inalienable land rights.” When the clause guaranteeing this right was eliminated by President Fujimori’s 1993 Constitution, however, communities were directly endangered. Even more explicit threats were made against the Arakmbut, in the form of governmental approval for a cattle ranch within the traditional lands of four different Arakmbut communities. This particular violation caused the local Indigenous groups to organize to found the Federation of Natives of the River Madre de Dios and its Tributaries (FENAMAD, first congress held in 1982). The purpose of FENAMAD was to “represent the different indigenous peoples of the region and work towards titling of community lands and territorial defense, and other measures designed to improve the quality of the indigenous peoples’ lives.”

FENAMAD and other organizations collaborated to create the Education Policy Proposal for Madre de Dios, a document that detailed “qualitative improvements” needed for the region (CAAAP 1992). The criticism of education in Madre de Dios, as presented in the document, is that it was too “far removed from the lives of the students, both indigenous and non-indigenous”; it was “authoritarian and factual” in nature, reliant upon
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“an undiversified national curriculum which discriminates against rural schools.” As these schools already suffer from a lack of resources ranging from insufficient textbooks to insufficient and inadequately trained teachers (one or two educators per school, 75 percent of which lacked formal training, often from linguistic or cultural traditions distinct from their students’), it was clear to FENAMAD that changes were urgently needed. To this end, FENAMAD recommended that schooling:

1. adhere to the National Policy for Intercultural Bilingual Education as established by the Ministry of Education (1989, 1991);
2. adjust to and satisfy local learning needs as a way to stimulate socio-economic development
3. “promote peace and respect for human dignity.”

FENAMAD also helped further the idea of establishing an intercultural bilingual education program specifically catered to the needs of the ten Harakmbut-speaking communities, as they are the most well-represented linguistic family in Madre de Dios. At the VII Congress in 1991, the proposal for this program was technically accepted, however “the discussion did not enter into detail,” nor “did the community representatives voice an opinion.”

**Three types of schools and communities in the Lowlands of Peru**

The first kind of situation is one in which students and the community have little or no interest in bilingual education and a limited understanding of what intercultural education is and why it would be useful. A prime example of this sort of situation is that of San José,
where the school was run by lay-missionary teachers, the primary language of instruction was Harakmbut, and students had little or no knowledge of Spanish upon arriving at school, as was previously described.  

The second type of situation is one in which the community has greater contact with outsiders and perceives knowledge and understanding of Spanish as a useful skill. An example of this is found in the Arakmbut community of Barranco Chico, though not previously discussed at length. Barranco Chico’s educational system is run by a local educational authority, though classes are taught by a series of Mestizo teachers who were “poorly paid and posted to these remote indigenous schools without adequate preparation or any consultation with the community” regarding their placement. These teachers “evince a lack of commitment that results in poor relations with the community,” especially given the history of harassment of Indigenous women and children by the teachers and the sense of resentment they show regarding their placement in these schools. Retention rates in these schools are poor in the face of these challenges, rendering them, in this regard, unsuccessful.

The third type of system common to the Lowlands is one in which the mother tongue of the children is Spanish while the first language of the elders is Harakmbut. These Indigenous children are taught by Mestizo teachers in schools that are government organized and run, and often are outnumbered by “colonist children” of the non-Indigenous population living in the area. An example of this kind of community is the Araseri community of Villa Santiago, where a school was established in 1965 to fill a need voiced by
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colonist families and their children. These communities exhibit “strong support for indigenous-language-teaching, particularly among senior members who believe their language will die with them.”

Remarks on Peru

Peru demonstrates that the most basic requirements for a successful EIB program include stability, financial backing, and community support. Towns with more exposure to outsiders place greater value on attaining literacy and communication skills in Spanish and, as such, are typically more open to EIB programs.

As the schools examined in this chapter show, it is vital for an EIB program to be considerate of community needs and wants. In order to do this, the program organizers must consult with community members to determine the educational priorities for the school. This sensitivity and enabling of participation is of the most surefire ways to attain the community’s support, however the degree of specificity this entails poses challenges for policy-makers and policy-implementers in all levels of the educational system.

In the next two case studies, I will continue to explore and develop these themes in order to ascertain which are more widespread characteristics of EIB and are indicative of a broader narrative about Indigenous education.

---
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Chapter 5: Bolivia, a case study

Demographics

Bolivia’s population is comprised of various ethnic groups, the majority of which are Indigenous, making up 62% of the adult population in 2001. 1 30% of the population is Quechua, 30% mestizo (defined as “mixed white and Amerindian ancestry), 25% Aymara and 15% white. 2 At this writing, the country even has three official national languages: Spanish (spoken by 60.7% of the population), Quechua (21.2%), and Aymara (14.6%), in addition to foreign and other Indigenous languages (2.4 and 1.2%, respectively). 3 This is important to take into consideration, given that until 2001 the “proxy” and “principal diagnostic” for indigeneity in Bolivia had been the ability to speak an Indigenous language, both for the government and many scholars. 4

In 2006, Bolivia spent 6.3% of the GDP on education, ranking them no. 25 in the world in education spending. 5 This type of spending has meant that, with the understanding that literacy describes individuals age 15 and over who can read and write, 86.7% of the total population is considered literate, though there still remains some disparity between the sexes
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3 CIA World Factbook: Bolivia.
(93.1% male literacy rate, 80.7% female). The school life expectancy, spanning from primary to tertiary education is 14 years (among the total, male and female population in 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Indigenous</th>
<th>% Quechua</th>
<th>% Aymara</th>
<th>% Other Indigenous</th>
<th>% Monolingual Indigenous</th>
<th>% Monolingual Spanish</th>
<th>% criollo-mestizo</th>
<th>Literacy (% female/male)</th>
<th>Poverty (%) Nonindigenous/indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1,378,896</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>42 (c)</td>
<td>20 (a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,816,271</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>36 (b)</td>
<td>20 (b)</td>
<td>50.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,019,031</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>33 (d)</td>
<td>72/88</td>
<td>81/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4,613,486</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>81/93</td>
<td>81/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6,420,792</td>
<td>58 (d)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>81/93</td>
<td>81/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,274,325</td>
<td>62 (e)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>81/93</td>
<td>81/93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Indigeneity, multilingualism, literacy, and poverty in Bolivia, 1846-2001 (Table from Gustafson: New Languages of the State, 16). (a) "criollos" (b) Includes 30.81% "mestizo" and 11.83% "white." (c) "monolingual Spanish." (d) "self-reported knowledge of an indigenous language. (e) "self-identification of population fifteen years and older." (f) figures from 2002.

Conditions of living are relatively poor in Bolivia. According to recent studies by the United Nations Development Program, it was suggested that if Bolivia continues at its current growth rate, it would take 178 years to eradicate poverty in the country (UNDP 2005). Furthermore, several economists have conjectured that a Bolivian living in poverty requires a minimum of thirteen years of education “to break the cycle of individual poverty,” as compared to seven or eight years in countries like Brazil (Anderson and Wiebert 2003). Education alone, however is not “a miraculous road to salvation,” and increasing access to higher education and gainful employment “requires rethinking education—and development” in order to “address both the anticolonial struggle for deep democracy and
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the realities of globalization.”

This is one of the goals those eager to instate EIB in Bolivia hoped the system could accomplish.

**History of Indigenous education in Bolivia**

Indigenous culture is an omnipresent fact of life for most Bolivians, who live in a varied multicultural and multilingual state. Bolivia even has two national flags: the traditional state flag “La Tricolor,” and the co-official rainbow-colored *wiphala* banner of *Quila Suyu* representing Andean solidarity. When Evo Morales (familiarly known as “Evo”), who self-identifies as Aymara and Indigenous, was elected president in 2005, the question of indigeneity, advocation for “Indigenous” issues, and the interplay between Indigenous and national identities came to the forefront of Bolivian politics. This historic election of the world’s first Indigenous president was far from the beginning of Indigenous activism in Bolivia, though. For years, the Indigenous peoples of Bolivia had been working towards greater rights and representation, including in the sphere of education.

Bolivia had been involved with SIL since the 1940’s. The government was dependent on the missionary-linguists to take care of “basic education” in more distant and rural parts of Bolivia where the government itself was “unable, or unwilling, to undertake teacher training and textbook production” (López, 1994a). Partly because SIL had demonstrated support for the 1952 revolution, it was allowed to play “an important role in indigenous
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education” especially through its application of a “transitional model” designed to assimilate Bolivia’s distinct “linguistic and cultural” groups (López, 2002). Additional educational programs, without SIL’s missionary agenda, became interested and active in Bolivia. Among these are USAID’s PER-1 (1975-1980) and PEIA of the World Bank (1978-1980), though they followed SIL’s example in instating analogous “transitional” bilingual educational projects. As the objective of the Bolivian government, and SIL, at the time was to integrate Indigenous peoples into the national Bolivian identity and way of life, the state did not oppose the organization’s missionary ends. While the government advocated for a “monocultural policy that ignored ethnic and cultural diversity” in order to meet this goal, SIL, on the contrary, had chosen to pursue a “multicultural approach” in order to “effective assimilation.” The government was ultimately able to overlook this fundamental difference in approach because even though SIL’s method “promoted indigenous language use,” it did so in order to establish “effective Spanish language proficiency,” in accordance with the government’s 1955 education reform policies.

In addition to the Protestant group SIL, the Catholic Church was also largely significant in the education of Indigenous peoples in Bolivia through their Comisión Episcopal de Educación (CEE). CEE initiated the project P.TRB in 1981 based on the “different language ideology” that “mother tongue language maintenance and development through all five years of primary school” was essential to the success of Indigenous students. This reflects “an alternate view of the value of diversity within the nation” in accordance with the
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changed political ideology of the time and the return to democracy in 1982. The efforts of CEE and their different approach would come to be even more critical later on.

The Bolivian government eventually initiated its own literacy program through the *Servicio Nacional de Alfabetización y Educación Popular*, or the National Service of Literacy and Popular Education (SENALEP), a part of the 1983 national education plan of Hernán Siles Zuazo (president from 1982-1985). SENALEP echoed the ideology of CEE by valuing initial instruction in Indigenous languages and later incorporation of lessons in Spanish. This was the “first large scale Bolivian literacy initiative” in the country’s history, which ushered in a new era of policy-making that “no longer sought linguistic homogenization” but accounted for “both indigenous languages as mother tongues and the contributions to national culture by different ethnocultural communities” (de Vries, 1988; Plaza & Albó, 1989; López, 1994b).

While the CEE project may have taken on the “maintenance bilingualism efforts” of Bolivia, SENALEP “sensitized” the greater population to the advantages of employing indigenous languages in educational settings, affirming their value in the grand scheme of things (López, 1994a).

In 1988, projects such as CEE narrowed their scope to such goals as textbook production, when UNICEF and the Bolivian Ministry of Education initiated the development of *El Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*, or the Program of EIB, (PEIB, 1988-1995) to serve “as a pilot project” for both bilingual and intercultural education programs’ implementation at the national level. The Bolivian PEIB was modeled after PEEB-P, the bilingual and intercultural education project already established in Puno, Peru.
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(operational 1977-1990). As previously established, Peru’s program had five goals: (1) research; (2) developing curriculum and materials; (3) training teachers; (4) evaluating classrooms; (5) implementing EIB in Quechua- and Aymara-speaking communities. Bolivia was particularly interested in observing the methods and achievements of PEEB-P, as the Quechua and Aymara communities it affected actually straddle the border between Peru and Bolivia. Through an accord in 1990 with Peru’s Ministry of Education on cooperation in EIB planning, Bolivia was granted access to the textbooks and methodological guides developed by linguists and anthropologists who had been trained by Peru’s PEEB-P.

Bolivia’s version of the program, PEIB, created its own textbooks in Aymara and Quechua for use in elementary schools (five grades) in the subjects of maternal language, mathematics, life science, Spanish-as-a-second language, and teacher guides. PEIB also produced textbooks for these same subjects in Guarani, though only through the first three years of elementary school. Because PEIB was originally designed with an eye towards students who were monolingual in an indigenous language or those who had but the most rudimentary bilingual abilities, the program had “little to no focus on the acquisition of Spanish as a second language,” though a partial “transition into a systematic alternation between the mother tongue and Spanish after the fifth year of elementary school” was to some degree enacted (López, 1995). This fact makes PEIB unique and valuable among EIB programs, as this was the “first time indigenous languages were the main languages of instruction during five consecutive years of schooling” (López, 1994b), underscoring the
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value and importance of language within a community.

PEIB was instated in 140 rural schools of Quechua, Aymara and Guaraní students, while the national PEIB project provided training for teachers, directors and supervisors at local, district and national levels as part of Bolivia’s shift from a “disjointed monocultural and multicultural ideology to a pluricultural ideology,” in the way those within and without the government considered the “role of language in education” as they developed plans (ETARE, 1993).25

**Educational reforms and decrees of the mid-1990’s**

In 1991, Bolivia underwent another major educational reform, which included the establishment of official EIB programs, under the *Equipo Técnico de Apoyo a la Reforma Educativa*, or the Team of Technical Support to Educational Reform (ETARE). This team, established by Jaime Paz Zamora’s (president 1989-1993) Ministry of Planning and Coordination, was charged with the task of developing educational reforms. ETARE was formed outside of the official Ministry of Education after the Ministry botched several attempts at reform during the 1980’s, giving cause for concern that the Ministry would not have “the vision and capacity to carry out a reform with the necessary scope for the complete restructuring of the educational sector.”26 With ETARE’s status as a body relatively independent from the government and primarily funded by international aid, it appeared to be much better poised to enact effective changes than any initiative from within the ministry.

While the ETARE was working on reforms for 1994 and the efforts of PEIB still
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remained largely experimental, the government made EIB official by signing in the Decreto Supremo 23036. Some critics claimed that there was a lack of an “EIB validated curriculum to implement,” and that there was a limited pedagogical or logistical basis on which to build a successful EIB program (Miranda, 1994). Others held that rushing to institutionalize EIB would undermine the “possibility of grassroots participation in policy formation” (Cárdenas, Miranda, 1994; Pimentel, 1993). Another pressure to hastily instate Decreto Supremo 23036 may have come “from the desire to impose the policy while simultaneously giving the impression of unanimity in order to facilitate international financing,” under “growing pressure to address the claims of indigenous peoples,” especially the Guaraníes, both from mobilized Indigenous communities and the obligations ensuing from signing ILO Convention 169 (Alavi, 1994).

In July of 1994, with Indigenous activism on the rise, the Bolivian congress approved Ley 1565, a Bolivian national Education Reform Law that “envisions far-reaching institutional and curricular change with the twin goals of making Bolivian education fully intercultural and participatory,” making education “more reflective of Bolivian society” both in terms of its “long-standing linguistic and cultural diversity” and “popular participation” (López 1995b: 63). In combination with Decreto no. 23950, Ley 1565 “declared the obligation of the educational system to offer intercultural bilingual education nationwide,
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and for a minimum of the eight years that comprise the primary school level.” Ley 1565 (also called “Reform 1565,” or the 1994 Reform) repealed the provisions of the Código (Education Code), established in 1955, which had previously “divided the education system into two parallel systems, one urban and one rural.” Ley 1565 “institutionalized the modality of EIB” and even “established interculturality as an eje transversal (transversal axis) or vertebrador (backbone) of the entire educational system,” a complete reform indeed (Moya, 1998; Anaya, 2002a). The Reform’s goals included: “to improve the quality and efficiency of education and to make it more relevant to community needs, to broaden its coverage, to promote the permanence of educators in the system, and to guarantee equality between the rights of men and women” (República de Bolivia, 1994b, Article 3:3).

To achieve these goals, Reform 1565 provides for including EIB; restructuring the educational system as a whole; improving teacher training and educational administrative systems; and emphasizing primary education (Contreras, 1999). The reform demands the concurrent transformation of the Bolivian system of education in two key aspects: (1) “the curricular-pedagogical approach” and (2) “the institutional-administrative approach.” Having this sort of an integrated focus distinguishes Reform 1565 from other education reforms in Latin America, which primarily treat specific aspects of the curriculum and pedagogy already in place. This reform instead tackles the much-needed “ideological as well as pedagogical change” required in order to move from “transition-oriented” and
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“assimilationist” systems to those based on “maintenance-oriented” and “pluralist” views (Anaya, 2002b). This Reform also coincides with the year Bolivia reformed its Constitution, in which Article 1 establishes Bolivia as “free, independent, sovereign, multietnic and pluricultural” state (Albó, 2000: 27). Directly related to these new views, not only did the 1994 Reform recognize the need for development of both personal and collective identity through education (Article 2:3), but it sought to address the concerns of multicultural, multiethnic, and multiregional state working towards decentralization and reversal of the “rural-urban divide,” both of which were embedded and propagated by Código. This law is yet another example of Bolivia’s attempts to balance “respect for sociocultural heterogeneity” with the eventual end of “forging a common sense of national consciousness,” a struggle relatively common among nations with a strong Indigenous presence.

The vision of this project was more broad-reaching than those in other countries, such as PEEB-P of Peru, as it sought to provide an “introduction of all of Bolivia’s indigenous languages (alongside Spanish) as subjects and media of instruction in all Bolivian schools.” While PEEB-P had been “designed and implemented” on a case by case “trial basis,” with changes made as the program continued to seek “pedagogical and linguistic answers” for how to address the specific educational needs of Indigenous students and improve the program to be more successful, from the very beginning Bolivia’s reform was
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seen to be a “political measure aiming at radical transformation not only of the educational system, but also of Bolivian society.”\textsuperscript{41} The Reform took on a “clear language-as-resource stance” from its inception in response to an “on-going process of self-discovery and recognition” begun around 1982 when the country returned to a democratic system of governance.\textsuperscript{42}

The law very clearly states that the educational system must be “intercultural and bilingual, because the socio-cultural heterogeneity of the country is assumed in an environment of respect between all Bolivians, men and women,”\textsuperscript{43} a stipulation that was highly controversial in some circles. The reform declared that:

“There are two modes of language use in the schools: (1) Monolingual: in Spanish with the secondary study of a national indigenous language [\textit{lengua nacional originaria}] (2) Bilingual: in a national indigenous language as the first language and Spanish as the second language.”

\textit{–Bolivian Education Reform Law #1565, Article 9.2. July 7, 1994.}

This explicit call for bilingual education as a means for children to attend school in and study their primary languages, was intended as “pedagogical common sense and a human right enshrined in global charters,” rather than a radical shift in education.\textsuperscript{44}

However, because traditional education in Bolivia was based on the “longer history of forced \textit{castellanización} [or the] Spanishization of indigenous peoples” typical of Bolivian public school systems in the wake of the 1952 revolution, so an official policy shift towards EIB was a novel and revolutionary concept.\textsuperscript{45}

EIB under the 1994 Reform was first introduced in Aymara and Quechua
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communities in Bolivia’s highlands, then to the Guaraní in Bolivia’s lowlands to the southeast, and finally to the communities in the Amazon in departments like Beni, Pando and Santa Cruz. While the original PEIB initiative only reached 114 schools, EIB implementation under the 1994 Reform “expanded to 1074 schools in 1997 and to 2899 by 2002,” making up “22% of the total primary sector” (Nucinkis, 2006b: 27). While EIB in most of these schools was only implemented for the first two curricular “cycles” of two to three years of “continuous learning” each, the goal of this program truly was to allow students to “fully develop” their abilities in both their indigenous and Spanish languages (Comboni Salinas and Juárez Núñez, 2000: 14).

One of the most important aspects of implementing the 1994 Reform was changing the approaches of existing teachers. A real “paradox” was presented in how Bolivia’s “traditional education system was seen as reproducing structures of colonial domination,” but the teachers “charged with changing the system” were results or “products of that system” themselves. In order to change the views of the “old guard” of teachers, who were frequently “socially and politically at odds with the Indigenous Educational Councils (Consejos Educativos de los Pueblos Originarios, or CEPOs),” the Ministry of Education worked to establish “teams of ‘Pedagogical Supervisors’” to conduct “in-service” trainings to introduce current teachers to the “new, pupil-centred, constructivist, pedagogical model” redirecting instructors to reevaluate and alter their teaching methods. This was not
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unanimously welcomed, however, as a great number of the teachers in question were from
“different cultural backgrounds” from “the communities to which they were posted,” relied
on “rote teaching methods which require relatively little preparation time,” and had become
accustomed to “clientelistic relations with the parents.” These, and other factors, meant
that teachers, especially the “established teachers of a mestizo class background,” were
resistant to changes that included adopting a “philosophy of interculturalism” that banished
the “habits and prejudices of years.” This is partly why preparing a “new generation of
teachers specifically geared to the [EIB] system” was so important to the Reform. Facilitated
by altering existing teacher training colleges (Escuelas Normales) into programs more catered
to EIB education (such as INS EIB, Instituto Normal Superior, which offers a concentration in
EIB) and investment in higher education training through such initiatives as PROEIB-
ANDES at the University of San Simón (centered in Cochabamba, est. 1994).

Subsequent laws, like Decreto Supremo No. 23949 of 1995, stipulate particular means by
which communities could participate in and shape “educational planning,” through such
mechanisms as a community board of education (Juntas Escolares) as the “most local form of
participation.” The idea of popular participation is well outlined in Bolivian laws, however
there is not a commonly accepted or legally defined concept of interculturality on which
educational reforms can actually depend, leading to complications and shifting ideologies. At
the time of the 1994 reforms, for example, “interculturality was understood as a relationship
of respect and appreciation for different Bolivian cultures that transcends regional and
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national borders” (Anaya, 2002a).55

Many “neoliberal reformers” of the time, were thrilled by the “recognition of cultural pluralism,” identifying it “as a way to talk about citizen difference while dismantling structures of politics that arose from the class-centered paradigms of centralized corporatist rule,” though non-neoliberal activists for collective rights were also in favor of EIB.56 In this way, EIB became a “paradoxical…convergence between free-market reformism and indigenous struggles for territory and equality” shaking up deep-seated opinions on “relations among schooling, power, and indigeneity in the country,” and pushing a “new politics of knowledge to the center of struggles over the state itself.”57 Even among the “Indigenous organizations, foreign donors, school-reform proponents, nonindigenous school teachers, and nonindigenous Bolivians” there was no consensus regarding EIB.58 Some detractors claim EIB to be based on “ethnic fundamentalism or foolish romanticism,” while some Indigenous and non-Indigenous critics thought programs like this might have been “a neoliberal plot to control indigenous people through new forms of exclusion.”59

In spite of the doubts of some, EIB has been a central pillar of “indigenous platforms to decolonize schooling and the state” over the past few decades “as an indigenous-led national-popular regime confronts new forms of racism and reaction among a conservative elite minority.”60 The fight to ensure students have the right to learn in and utilize their native languages through EIB has helped Bolivia’s Indigenous work to achieve greater goals of decolonization and reordering traditional power structures that exclude or
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silence Indigenous voices altogether.

**Educational reform and foreign aid**

Like other nations in the region, the Bolivian educational reforms of the 1990’s were largely motivated by “hybrid development prescriptions tied to foreign aid,” which both “promoted a limited state role in primary schooling in the name of poverty reduction and social inclusion” while simultaneously “pushing market policies that exacerbated inequality and exclusion,” a seemingly counterintuitive pairing. In the instance of Bolivia, however, we can observe many distinct features leading to ultimate education reforms. Chief among them was the alliance of “assertive indigenous political and intellectual movements across the Andes” with “transnational intellectual networks,” creating a “hybrid regional project” out of the effort to instate EIB systems.

The market liberalization of the 1990’s was highly dependent on “infusions of welfare, both to those suffering the effects of reform and to the state itself.” In order to meet this need, foreign aid flooded into Bolivia “with projects to fill in the gaps in social services, stave off protest, and ensure the running of the government.” The prospect of assisting the country with one of the lowest GDPs in Latin America and benefiting the “picturesque population of colorfully dressed yet extremely poor indigenous people” proved wildly attractive for development projects and NGO’s that “embraced interculturalism” as an innovated means of discussing broader issues such as “poverty and exclusion.”
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However, due to the influx of such international assistance, Bolivia had become completely aid dependent by the early 1990’s, ignoring the glaring contradiction between aid dependence and the movement of market freedom as Bolivian sovereignty became more and more illusionary.\textsuperscript{66}

Educational reform in Bolivia, in the grand scheme of things, was “hammered out” between donors and elites, “packaged in a complex plan” underwritten with loans from the World Bank (over $200 million) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB, $80 million).\textsuperscript{67} Also involved were UNICEF and bilateral donors (such as Sweden, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands), which donated a combined 38.8 million USD to educational reform throughout the 1990’s, demonstrating the great involvement of foreign powers and Bolivia’s increased dependence on foreign aid to accomplish projects of national interest.\textsuperscript{68}

“The reformists” were primarily based in La Paz, where Bolivian and foreign politicians, experts and representatives of the World Bank, IADB, or European aid agencies worked alongside indigenous and nonindigenous leaders and academics, employees of NGO’s, and members of the state bureaucratic staff in charge of policy implementation.\textsuperscript{69} This “socially and ideologically heterogeneous group,” known as los de la reforma, was “financed by foreign banks and donors, structurally aligned against teachers’ unions, and in tactically shifting relations with indigenous movements, the public, and political parties.”\textsuperscript{70}

The development of bilingual education programs was a subproject of broader
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Bolivia, a case study

education reform “aimed at indigenous peoples.” While highly dependent on “targeted aid” from foreign nations and NGO’s, the bilingual education program was “touted by the government as their flagship project,” a fact that distinguished Bolivia’s from other education reforms as it promoted “interculturalism and participation” as the “discursive pillars of legitimacy central to the wider agenda of state change.” As such, the reformists did not, as a whole, accept the concept of EIB, which most notably drew criticism from the majority of the “elite pundit and political class” that otherwise supported education reform itself. To advocate for EIB, activists created a “heterogeneous transnational network” bridging divides between “state, donor, NGO and movement fields of practice,” with activists employing varied means to push their agenda, ranging from grass-roots projects, pedagogical movements concocted by curricular experts, or a “romantic or essentialist defense” of the value of cultural and linguistic preservation in Indigenous communities. EIB fell out of favor with officials by the end of the neoliberal era (1999-2003), but activists persisted and, with the election of Evo Morales in 2005, the movement for EIB was revitalized “from within and beyond the state.”

Current thought on and criticisms of EIB in Bolivia

There is a historical Bolivian saying, “indo letrado, indo alzado” or “a lettered Indian is a rebellious Indian.” This saying, and the philosophy undergirding it, has meant that Bolivia’s past experiences with Indigenous schooling had vacillated between either “hardening boundaries of exclusion and imposing violent processes of subordinate inclusion” or
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assimilation by the dominant *criollo* society. These views reflect the “broader Latin American understandings of citizenship and knowledge tied to the coloniality of power,” meaning that centuries of bias had to be undone in order to implement EIB systems at all. The concept of the *letrado* or “literate citizen subject” was long associated with the “white, male, urban” person, as opposed to the *indio*, who was “dark-skinned, feminized rural…a racially inferior object, neither lettered, propertied, nor possessed of citizenship,” a member of a backwards community located a “racial, spatial and political” world away from that of the “superior” *letrado.* This thinking, along with the “patriarchal and racist” concept that with “too little education…the animalistic savage might lash out” but with “too much education…the childlike Other might upset the social and racial order,” reflects the uglier side of interracial intercultural relations in Bolivia, and Latin America as a whole, but must be acknowledged as a formative aspect for the galvanization of the movement towards equality and education reform. Eventually, some systems were able to move beyond “this coloniality of power embedded in schooling,” though many of the same ideations were transferred into the language of “social rights, class struggle, nationalism and equality,” where schooling was seen as a means to nation-building and development projects aimed at “transforming structural inequalities and answering the collective aspirations of the *pueblo,* the people.”

Like most Latin American skeptics of EIB, critics in Bolivia “voiced ignorance about native languages being dialects unsuited for modern life” or made statements suggesting that
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“EIB would keep indigenous peoples from learning Spanish” and subsequently bar them from “progressing.” This assimilationist view that gives preferential treatment to Spanish and Spanish speakers relies upon false premises of EIB. EIB was not introduced as “a radical ethnicist plan, nor an exclusive turn to indigenous monolingualism,” but rather “a modest shift in a deeper history of Andean nation-building long defined by assimilationist language policies,” as well as an attempt to reverse some of the internal colonialism present in Bolivia (Manheim 1989).

Some Indigenous peoples, especially parents, had concerns founded on different grounds, primarily based on their substantiated fear that bilingual education would lead to the eventual eradication of their languages and cultures, probably within a generation or so. Given the statistical evidence that indigenous languages are fading, dying out with time “with or without EIB,” this anxiety is drawn from a valid body of evidence. Even Patzi, the “chief architect” of the 2006 draft Reform Bill, expressed concerns that “multiculturalism is merely a form of domination in disguise.” These fears primarily make sense within the context of an assimilationist model or with respect to situations in which the students eventually elect to discontinue using their mother tongues after gaining a certain level of comfort and utility in Spanish.

One of the perceived shortcomings of the 1994 Reform was that it was initially “exclusive to the indigenous sectors,” making it “unpopular with parents” who saw education as a way for their children to expand their horizons and move “beyond the

---

81 Gustafson, New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia, 17.
82 Gustafson, New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia, 17.
83 Gustafson, New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia, 17.
Quechua speaking limits of their rural communities,” both physically and socially, neither of which EIB initially seemed to provide or guarantee,\(^85\) as in cases of poorly executed systems. Some go so far as to demand a “new concept” of EIB that would be appropriate “for all,” rather than be limited to the “indigenous sector,” hoping for something more along the lines of two-way EIB, where Spanish-speaking students would gain exposure to Indigenous languages and cultures (López, 2005: 476).\(^86\) Additionally, the program was unpopular among the group of teachers who “were Spanish speaking and weakly identified with the language and culture of the communities whom they were assigned to serve.”\(^87\) Another failing was how the attempt to expand EIB too rapidly on a “massive scale,” instead of “introducing it gradually, beginning with areas where it would be more easily accepted.”\(^88\)

Among conservatives and Bolivian elites, there is often concern that EIB is a “metaphor of indigenous radicalism.”\(^89\) Seeing it as such, they frequently attack it in attempts to delegitimize indigenous movements themselves, based on their belief that using “native languages [was] a sign of the refusal of modernity, a marker of impenetrable differences that posed atavistic threats to universal knowledge, progress, and modernity.”\(^90\)

In addition to criticisms drawn from different sectors, changing circumstances have directly challenged EIB programs in Bolivia. Between the years 1999 and 2002, EIB stalled and essentially came shuddering to a halt thanks to “social conflict,” meaning programs left to survive dangling by a mere “thread of aid from Denmark and Germany.”\(^91\) Support from
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within the Bolivian administration continued to dwindle as the staff at the Education Ministry turned over one by one, only to be succeeded by another minister who was either explicitly or implicitly anti-EIB.

Expectations for EIB were high as Evo gained momentum as the leading presidential candidate, given that the MAS party of Evo Morales typically advocates for issues affecting Indigenous peoples, especially those of the highlands. However, part of Evo’s platform was a planned repeal of the 1994 Education Reform, “which had received extensive funding, was much heralded as a model of its kind in international educational development circles, and had provided ample evidence of pedagogical success.” For some, like Nicole Nucinkis, there were concerns that the President, “who is an Aymara man, who lived among Quechua, and who waves the flag for the indigenous struggle” was presenting a “flagrant contradiction!” and was, as of 2006, poised to retrace every step Bolivia’s Indigenous had taken towards what was perceived as greater access to rights.

Evo’s opposition to Law 1565, and EIB more generally, was primarily based on its “political context.” The 1994 Reform was one aspect of “a package of neoliberal reforms” carried out under “three successive administrations, despite their ideological differences,” as each government attempted “to reconcile two apparently irreconcilable sets of interests”: the neoliberal push towards modernization, and the pull of “international legal instruments on indigenous rights” to both “recognize and respond to the pluricultural nature of the national society.” The State was cautious in withdrawing its support of EIB, because it recognized that CEPOs and Indigenous parents had begun to appreciate and advocate for it more as
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they realized EIB’s potent value for the next generation.\textsuperscript{55}

Such developments as the 2004-2005 National Education Strategy show how the government slowly reduced its program until it was solely dedicated to the “oral development of the indigenous languages in the school system” rather than their written applications, without making “any reference to a future role for the CEPOs” (López, 2005: 473).\textsuperscript{96} “Education authorities” took up a new position that sought to provide preference to the “intercultural” rather than the “bilingual” aspects of education, or “to support the expression of cultural diversity in the classroom without emphasising the need for indigenous vehicular languages in the classroom.”\textsuperscript{97} This change was an “ideological rather than pedagogical” one because even though the Reform was not able to “achiev[e] the coverage” it had intended to, “there was plentiful evidence that it had been a pedagogical success.”\textsuperscript{98} Essentially, one of the most convincing arguments for why there EIB was on “hiatus” is attributed to “interrupted leadership and a change in political will in the climate of anti-neoliberalism.”\textsuperscript{99} The “Indigenous Block” and CEPOs, in an attempt to deepen and express “unanimous support not only for [EIB] but for the radicalization of indigenous education,” through convening an education congress (El Congreso Educativo Originario Indígena) in 2004 when the National Education Congress did not convene.\textsuperscript{100} The proposal this meeting yielded was entitled “For an originary indigenous education. Towards socio-cultural, territorial, political and ideological self-determination.”\textsuperscript{101} This document called for
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“principles of interculturalidad and bilingüismo to be applied across the whole educational system” and to “underpin social and State institutions beyond those of education,” among other demands.\(^{102}\)

One of the first things Evo Morales did upon assuming office was to focus on establishing an effective literacy campaign for Bolivia’s illiterate, the majority of which is “indigenous and lives in rural areas of the country.” Evo argued that “education is about the liberation of our peoples [nuestros pueblos],” a welcome point of view for Indigenous communities.\(^{103}\) With backing from “education officials,” Evo aimed “to use literacy as a tool for social transformation” and hoped to “eradicate illiteracy in Bolivia” by the year 2009.\(^{104}\) The campaign was an adaptation of “Yo, Sí Puedo,” originally developed in Cuba, later adapted for Venezuela and other nations. Under Evo, “the program has been tailored for the Bolivian context” by hosting classes “in the appropriate language of their participants.”\(^{105}\) This proved “challenging for the volunteer teachers” who were required to translate the donated materials, which were primarily written in Spanish (Claure, 2007; Torres, 2007).\(^{106}\)

The idea of “decolonization” exemplified in such programs as EIB can be described as a “vision of racial equality and opportunity,”\(^{107}\) an agenda popular among Andean intellectuals. Initiatives towards decolonization, such as the proposal to instate indigenous language as a part of curricula of every public and private school, were often met with strongly voiced opposition. Decolonization hopes to move beyond interculturalism towards
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intra
culturalism, calling for a “dialogue between and across cultural differences, largely
interpreted as an attempt to get the indigenous to open up to the outside and the supposedly
universal…based on a flawed sense that indigenous peoples and cultures were in fact largely
closed (cerrado) to non-Indians,” though the opposite is more likely.\textsuperscript{108} Bret Gustafson asserts
that intraculturalism, or “the strengthening of indigenous identities, histories, and languages
from within,” ought to “remedy the violences produced by colonialism” (referred to by the
Guarani as “dispersal”).\textsuperscript{109} To do so, intraculturalism’s vision includes “creating and
sustaining spaces—geographic, geopolitical, and institutional—for constructing alternative
knowledges” as a “key prerequisite for this process” of national healing.\textsuperscript{110} This is part of the
aim of such measures as the Education Reform Bill. Drafted in 2006 under Evo’s new
Minister of Education, Félix Patzi, entitled “Ante Proyecto: Nueva Ley de Educación
‘Avelino Siñani y Elizardo Pérez,’” this bill describes education as:

> “decolonizing, liberating, anti-imperialist, revolutionary and
transformative of economic, social, cultural, political and ideological
structures, oriented towards self-determination and the reaffirmation
of the originary indigenous and afrobolivian nations and of Bolivian
nationality.” (Ministerio, 2006: 5)\textsuperscript{111}

As the Ante Proyecto continues, we can see that it pushes for an educational model
that is “intracultural” in addition to “intercultural,” benefitting the “naciones indígenas
originarias” according to “their own terms.”\textsuperscript{112} This can be “a more inward-looking and
potentially segregationist idea than intraculturalism,” but it certainly advocates for the rights
of individual communities to have input in developing appropriate models.\textsuperscript{113}
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**Bolivia’s Guarani and EIB**

The Guarani community is relatively small in Bolivia, numbering 60,000 as compared to the 1.6 million Aymara or 3.2 million Quechua of the Bolivian Andes.\(^\text{114}\) The majority of Bolivia’s Guarani live as members of rural farming communities, where they primarily engage in small-scale agriculture and raise livestock. They have some land claims, which they mostly use for semisubsistence farming, though Guarani also work for *kairai*, or non-Guarani, farmers or migrate to Santa Cruz for seasonal employment.\(^\text{115}\) Many who do not have access to land eventually migrate to the “urban peripheries of large cities,” try to find jobs in provincial towns (generally in the informal sector), or work seasonally on road or gas projects.\(^\text{116}\) More recently, the Guarani have developed a teaching class that has been transformed into “a significant economic and political player in the region,” as well as a “handful” of Guarani who work in NGO’s, and many more Guarani who want to study at university.\(^\text{117}\)

While comparatively smaller than other Indigenous groups in Bolivia, the Guarani have become more politically active over the years. The Assembly of Guarani People (APG) was established in 1987, and is a member of CIDOB (the Indigenous Confederation of Eastern Bolivia) and COICA, the transnational confederation of various indigenous organizations of the Amazon Basin (Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica).\(^\text{118}\) Located in eastern Bolivia, the Guarani have been a focus of various attempts by the state to “co-opt eastern Bolivian indigenous movements and pit them..."
against Andean movements.” Additionally, the Guarani are a sticking point in a “geopolitical tug of war between nationalist and regionalist agendas” which are manifested in the contention over oil fields under land traditionally occupied by the Guarani.

**History of Education among the Guarani**

Mission schooling was in place throughout the Guarani frontier for centuries. This began with the age of Spanish colonialism (1600’s-1810’s), when Jesuit and Franciscan missions run by Spaniards spread throughout the southern and eastern Guarani territories. During the republican era (1840’s-1930’s), Italian Franciscans rebuilt the missions that had been destroyed during the wars of independence, “directly anticipated the ongoing role of the church in Guarani education and political organizing today.” Missions were a means of evangelization, representing “the least bad option for native peoples,” who often “turned to missions” when they could find no other alternatives for refuge from the “karai advance.”

Education in the missions, while originally partly intended as a means to stop the Guarani from emigrating to Argentina, “contributed to the transformation and in many cases the erasure of distinctive Guarani markers of difference and freedom (or ‘savagery,’ as it was termed),” such as cutting the long hair of the boys (known as *samba*, the Quechua word for “braid,”) banning the *tembeta* lip plug often worn by men, and enforcing a non-Indigenous dress code. The Franciscans even attempted to emphasize the importance of education by advocating literacy as a means to access God, by using the word *tïpa*, a being/object of supernatural power, for “God”, while terming “paper” *tupapire* or “the skin
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of God” (though *tupa* here originally signified reed parchment).\textsuperscript{124}

The secularization of the missions, brought about between 1915 and 1948 by the military state, was partly called for by the karai landlords. It transformed the territory of the Guaraní into a “landlord-dominated backwater” comparable to “rest of eastern Bolivia in the twentieth century,” causing a great exodus of Guaraníes from the region.\textsuperscript{125} This outflow, combined with that caused by the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay (1933-1935), helped form “national consciousness” among those soldiers who “fought in the war and later returned with a new sense of citizenship to question conditions of peonage in the Andes” (Klein, 1992). This, in turn, yielded a “rising Andean indigenous mobilization, the growth of Marxian-inspired labor movements, and the intensification of revolutionary nationalism against the mining barons,” all of which culminated in the 1952 Revolution, which demanded “land reform and the spread of mass public schooling” as the means of “transforming the Andean countryside.”\textsuperscript{126}

**The Kuruyukɨ massacre and its 100th anniversary**

In 1892, Guarani warriors organized and fought back against the colonizers, striking back against the karai outposts. Now known as the Kuruyukɨ Massacre, this event is considered the last of the *guerras de los indios* or the “Indian Wars.”\textsuperscript{127} At the time, the Guarani were seen as savages to be domesticated or made docile through the mission system, while the karai, Spanish-speaking whites and mestizos who had begun to identify themselves as *nacionales* or *cristianos*, were perceived as invaders by the Guarani. This polarized conflict proved to be the death rattle of “armed Guarani resistance to the expanding colonial
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According to reports from the time, eight hundred Guarani men and boys were killed, while only four Bolivian soldiers were lost, demonstrating the futility of violent rebellion by the Guarani, in spite of the heroism and strength of their fighters and notable leaders, including Apiaguaiki Tüpa and Ayemoti. The very fate of the tüpa himself, who was later tricked, captured, tortured, and executed as an example, further demonstrates the ineffectiveness of this approach.\textsuperscript{129}

This instance of ethnic cleansing and the devalorization of the Guarani temporarily halted challenges to colonial authority.\textsuperscript{130} Now, over one hundred years later, the memory and story of the Massacre of Kuruyukɨ has been transformed into a potent symbol of the Guarani struggle against continued subjugation.\textsuperscript{131} The Guarani tend to use anniversaries of the Massacre as pivotal moments to announce their latest strategic plans that will help forward community interests. On the Massacre’s centennial commemoration, in 1992, the APG marched to the battlefield as a powerful sign of challenge to the existing racial and political order and established system. The unarmed Guarani present were mostly bilingual, primarily clothed in a similar style to the “rural karai, replacing long, flowing hair with cowboy or baseball hats.” Some were even Christians, meaning to the observer there was little to distinguish the Guarani from the rural nonindigenous peasants from the area, apart from their “features, woven shoulder bags, and the proud use of their language.”\textsuperscript{132}
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This anniversary, attended by 6000 people including President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, marked the inauguration of a large-scale bilingual literacy campaign targeting the adult Guarani population. The campaign attracted funding from external global development sources such as UNICEF, UNESCO, and the World Bank because they were intrigued or moved by the low status of “poor and marginal communities blessed with the exotic allure of indigenous identity and a colorful narrative of heroic struggle.”

On that commemorative day, the Guarani leader Mateo Chumiray said, “We will fight no more with arrows and clubs…now we will fight with pencils and notebooks.” This campaign for literacy, seen as a means for development and political resurgence, was named Tataendí after the “embers fanned back to life in Guarani fire pits each morning,” chosen because the movement represented “an eternal flame” of Guarani culture, language, and history “being rekindled from beneath the ashes and violence of colonialism.”

Modern EIB among the Guarani

EIB in Bolivia has created the “conditions for a new dialogue on citizenship,” has begun to cautiously confront issues of “indigenous educational marginality,” and has “opened doors to those epistemes and languages historically relegated to the margins” (Mignolo 2005:120), which are now among the most powerful voices heard in the country.

While Western pedagogy continued to dominate the forms of educational institutions in
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Bolivia, EIB still allowed for progressive and “emergent intellectual projects that sought to reverse history.” In the case of the Guaraníes, this agenda “was not pursued through cultural conservatism or radical ethnic militancy, but through a dialogue of knowledges based on a logic of reciprocal exchange and mutual recognition (rather than mutual exclusion).”

While EIB might ideally be dedicated to such goals as cultural and linguistic preservation and promotion, or moving towards a time when the Guarani could “walk among the karai” and “speak without shame,” its actual status as a system in Bolivia appears, at least to some scholars, to be more of a way to enable the “slow dismantling of colonial ideologies institutionalized in the traditional school system.” Described as an “articulatory scaffold,” EIB was used by groups like the Guarani to further “an expansive social movement practice,” with great potential in “its possibilities for facilitating and mobilizing other kinds of change” by means of its role as a “networking and communicative vehicle, facilitating the movement of leaders, resources, symbols, and new practices like assemblies, marches, commemorations, and confrontations that emerged from multiple loci of talk, experience, and memory.” However, as leaders began to see the limited scope of its “political utility,” they shifted their focus from EIB to other means of activism.

While this is the case in certain communities, not all were roundly receptive to EIB systems of education. Gustafson suggests that this partly comes from the “weight of colonial history” as well as from “pragmatic understandings of schooling as a vehicle for accessing
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the Spanish-speaking power structure” and that the responses of individual communities is dependent on the ways the community understands EIB “in terms of potential empowerment.”

EIB certainly did find some support among the Guarani, though. While officials were slowly trying to quash EIB, in varying degrees, the Guaranies had begun to rally, “intensifying their strategies alongside national processes,” marching to defend various causes and organizing amongst themselves to create a greater impact for these causes. Through the Indigenous Education Councils (CEPOs), a structure of groups created by mandated education reforms, there were workshops and meetings between 2000 and 2005 held “to cultivate a position in defense of EIB,” quietly facilitated by “EIB-friendly international donors.” Eventually, they created the Indigenous and Originary Peoples’ Education Block, which was comprised of “many rural teachers, the APG, CIDOB and various Andean organizations,” developing a defensive position regarding EIB and introduced “a new discourse on schooling as ‘a decolonizing bilingual intercultural education with territorial control and self-determination’ ” (CONAMAQ et al. 2004). This Block wanted to change the conception of the EIB curriculum, and called for “inverting the picture to place indigeneity at the center of knowledge production (the roots of the tree) and thus at the center of educational, territorial, and political authority.”

The Guarani in Itavera

O’Connor Province of Bolivia is home to many Guarani, who primarily work as subsistence farmers and laborers, now primarily concentrated in the north, surrounded by
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karai *chapacos* and *kollas*, as well as Chaqueños.\(^{148}\) In many areas in this county, symbols of indigeneity, such as the long *simba* braid among men or the *mandu* dress among women, are seen as backwards by both the karai and Guarani parents, who insist their children dress like karai in order to attend school. In this way “the condition of being schooled supposes an irreversible transformation [while a] maintenance of these symbols accompanies a total resistance to schooling,”\(^ {149}\) establishing a sort of dialectic standstill. In communities that resist education and modernization, such as Tëtayapî, they have determined that it is “access to land and a strong communal organization, not literacy” that are the “crucial determinants of well-being.”\(^ {150}\) Communities that have clung to visual and linguistic markers of culture are often referred to as places of *Guarani katui*, or “true Guarani” (*–katu* combined with the emphatic *–i* means *par excellence*).\(^ {151}\) The term usually refers to the “language vitality” of these communities, or at least from the perspective of the “more urban and biliterate Guarani.”\(^ {152}\)

This group of Guarani sometimes conceive of the rural Guarani “backwards people that need guidance and control,” but EIB created a means of communication “between Guarani katui and the biliterate leadership that bridged different modes of knowledge and power,” both school- and experience-derived.\(^ {153}\) After pilot bilingual education programs were established in various communities through collaboration with NGO’s, the 1992 Literacy Campaign emerged, targeting specific communities within the Guarani territory, including Itavera. Gustafson, the anthropologist who eventually volunteered to help improve the local availability of materials, was well-received because the community had previously heard of
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EIB and already supported the existing adult bilingual literacy campaign.\textsuperscript{154}

At this time, Itavera had only had its own school for about two years, and had just welcomed its first bilingual schoolteacher, a young Guarani man named Ernesto “Tüi” (Parakeet) José. Tüi himself was one of the first students to graduate from the high school in his own community (Eitì), now in charge of introducing EIB to Itavera, which was in the “midst of a new process of political mobilization (the APG).”\textsuperscript{155} For Itavera, Tüi represented the “Guaranization” of Bolivian education in the region (López 1997).\textsuperscript{156}

Itavera, and other Indigenous communities like it, are often assumed to “naturally tend towards communalism” and to simply be “awaiting the right conditions to emerge through the cracks of uneven states” (García 2005:8).\textsuperscript{157} More often than not, however, the “critical factors” to developing Indigenous movements “are the cultural and social interconnecting of heterogeneous identities, histories, places, and divergent interests,” a process which “faces internal (localized identities and leadership patterns) and external (state or karai pressures, NGO tactics) obstacles.”\textsuperscript{158} It is because of these challenges that “new strategies of self-representation and institutional capture,” including EIB and APG as a project, are embraced as “potential articulators,” though they may not “automatically resonate with local lives.”\textsuperscript{159} The acceptance of EIB in Itavera, for example, was done “in relation to their own histories, ones different from the vision of unity and historical-territorial reversion imagined by the scribes, and quite different again from the textualizing
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urge of anthropological solidarity or simplistic theories of emancipation.”\textsuperscript{160}

In the author’s conversations with Airase, the captain and primary authority figure of the village outlines a “life trajectory from simba (autonomy) to empatronado (patronage).”\textsuperscript{161} All of his “memories of power and autonomy [were] linked to knowledge of the past,” an idea that conflicts with the way schools were understood at the time. Education was seen as a creation by the karai state, a system that was not designed as “a way to revive the knowledge and power of the simba,” but rather as a way “to further movement away from the past” through offering a “different kind of power—the possibility of gaining a semblance of voice in the karai world,” though learning to use that voice “required sacrificing other forms of knowing, speaking, or embodying personhood and sociality.”\textsuperscript{162} Because of these conflicting understandings of the role of traditional education, EIB can be imagined as a solution that presents the possibility of “empowerment without the violent shedding of other modes of being,”\textsuperscript{163} removing the dialectical conflict between culture and education.

Eventually, Itavera’s own one-room schoolhouse “completely reoriented daily life.”\textsuperscript{164} As a teacher serving 35 students between first- and fifth-grade, Tüi implemented routines, such as singing the national anthem in Guaraní, which may have “appeared colonialist to the core” or at least as a sort of “internalized subjugation.”\textsuperscript{165} However, Tüi was simply organizing a school in the way he had been educated. The fact that the indigenous language was used in the classroom and for such rituals as singing the anthem
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Bolivia, a case study

Teaching under these conditions and the close supervision of karai landlords and teachers proved a challenge that required much improvisation on the part of the teacher. He used the textbooks available and tried to appropriately adapt lessons for all students, including the three Spanish-speaking children of a local karai family. Attempting to educate multiple groups simultaneously in two distinct languages “seemed chaotic,” to say the least, but rituals like singing allowed both the teacher and the students to “participate in an activity that seemed to evidence learning and order.”

UNICEF ran comparative studies that led them to conclude that “EIB had positive effects in schools like that of Itavera,” a key conclusion for continued support of the system by donors (Muñoz 1997; D’Emilio n.d.; Albó and Anaya 2003). While traditional schools “historically offered [Indigenous students] literacy (of sorts) and citizenship (of a second-class variety), paid for with violent assimilation,” a great change was wrought with “the arrival of a Guarani-speaking teacher and the end of school violence.” In this kind of environment, “the school could potentially engage the social, linguistic, and moral terms of local Guarani life and of the emergent political organization,” something which the Guarani were, unsurprisingly, especially keen to further “on their own terms and in their own language, even if they were not yet thinking of substantive shifts in school practice.” This was also shown in the new roles the bilingual teachers played in Guarani communities,
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taking notes at community assemblies, helping smooth interactions with NGO’s and agents from the state, keeping records, among others.\textsuperscript{171}

This eagerness for bilingualism on the part of the Guarani did not translate to the karai, in places like Itavera, where karai parents threatened teachers like Tüi because they were “afraid that learning Guarani might contribute to their degeneration.”\textsuperscript{172} As the ten-year-old child of one of the karai pointed out, “Yo no soy ava para estar hablando guarani,” or “I’m no Injun to be speaking Guarani,” a fundamental different understanding of linguistic and ethnic roles and relations from that of his father.\textsuperscript{173} The success of EIB in Itavera was largely due to Tüi’s ability, as teacher, to “subtly maneuv[er]” rather than actively confront such opposition, in order to help develop EIB’s “mobilizing potential” by letting it “unfol[d] gradually” as part of the “successful movemen[t] to political-cultural transformation.”\textsuperscript{174}

While EIB helped empower the Guarani community to organize and develop a political discourse, there was “no straightforward synergy” between the new concepts and models of Guarani education and the “complicated messiness of resurgence.”\textsuperscript{175} The act of strengthening and defending Guarani knowledge practices through schooling was seen as “cultural, linguistic, and epistemic preservation” at best, viewing indigenous knowledge “as an ideational corpus that could be decontextualized (taken out of context), entextualized (written down), and recontextualized (recirculated in schools).”\textsuperscript{176} However, in actuality, EIB often “reproduced schooling forms more than it did indigenous knowledge,” sometimes
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even “bordered on sacrilege.”

In attempts to remedy this, teachers and “eventually indigenous students themselves sought to construct a more multidimensional vision of knowledge that reintegrated the past into future horizons, pursuing more control over pedagogical processes and standards of validation and authority, rather than debating essential authority.”

Gustafson maintains that it’s not necessarily that “EIB was misguided, but that a deeper process of reflection, only then slowly emerging, was needed to rearticulate Guarani knowledge practices, schooling, and mobilization.”

Years later, the community at Itavera appeared to be surviving, at a cursory glance, with the support of local NGO’s, which had helped to build new stucco homes and a brick school house in 2004 as part of the improvements to infrastructure required by educational reforms in place at the time. However, Airase, the captain of Itavera, continued to leave the community often to find work, as local corn crops proved insufficient. There had been a number of tragic deaths within the community, including the suicide of a youth, which lowered spirits. Conditions were poor enough that there were “speculations about witchcraft,” indicating “rising social tensions.” The teacher in the new schoolhouse was a young Spanish-speaking Guarani from a community further upriver, an interim teacher who had “neither a formal teacher’s certificate nor training in EIB,” which was “no longer practiced.” The community, and the NGO’s upon which it depends, had turned their concerns to fighting gas companies, including Petrobras of Brazil and YPF of Repsol,
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leaving EIB to fall to the wayside.

In spite of all of its initial successes, Itaverá’s EIB school faded into the background, meaning that we can examine it as a sort of “failure.” The fate of this EIB school demonstrates that, without addressing the more pressing concerns of a community, such as access to employment, a community can be hard-pressed to maintain education as a priority, even one as potentially ideal as EIB.

**Remarks**

Bolivia stands to reinforce conditions for EIB success previously established in this study. Bolivia is yet another clear indication of the way funding, in this case of foreign financial aid, contributes to a country’s ability to successfully initiate change and develop in ways that are sustainable and dignify all involved. Bolivia also demonstrates the importance of consistent governmental support in developing systems that can have a lasting impact, both within the communities in which they are instated and with respect to the national community as a whole. Here, too, Indigenous families and communities must ascertain whether or not tradition and education are fundamentally opposed or if the one can help foster the other.
Guatemala’s population is 59.4% Mestizo (called *Ladino* in the local Spanish) and European, 9.1% K’iche, 8.4% Kaqchikel, 7.9% Mam, 6.3% Q’eqchi, 8.6% other Mayan, .2% non-Mayan Indigenous groups, and .1% other (according to the 2001 census).\(^1\) Other sources, such as the World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples, claim that, not only are the majority of Indigenous peoples in Guatemala of Mayan descent, but that the Guatemalan Mayan population, comprised of 21 different groups, makes up an estimated 51% of the national population.\(^2\) This means that Guatemala’s Maya are “the only indigenous culture that constitutes a majority of the population in a Central American republic.”\(^3\) The exact figures differ from year to year and from source to source: in 1994, for example, a Maya demographer found that 68% of the population was Maya, while in 1996 the National Statistical Institute (Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE]) identified 42% of the population as Maya in a census on identity.\(^4\)

Guatemala’s official language is Spanish (spoken by 60% of the population), though
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Amerindian languages are well-represented (40%).\textsuperscript{5} Guatemala officially recognizes 23 Amerindian languages, including Quiche, Cakchiquel Kekchi, Mam, Garifuna, and Xinca, among others.\textsuperscript{6} At least two of these are not purely Indigenous languages, but are Creole languages used primarily along the Caribbean coast (including Garifuna/Afro-Caribbean and Creole English).\textsuperscript{7} The exact number of languages identified in Guatemala varies depending on the source, as there are discrepancies how to classify something as either a dialect or a distinct language, which has created the “existing tension between more descriptive and more normative approaches and the veiled desire of some linguists and institutions to exacerbate the dialectical differences within the same variety.”\textsuperscript{8}

Traditionally, in areas like Guatemala with high incidences of Indigenous populations speaking a variety of languages, bilingualism was “apparently natural and necessary for the social functioning of plurilingual communities,” though now bilingualism is often seen as more of a “transition phase, from a vernacular monolingualism, or a bilingualism of two Amerindian languages, to another monolingualism, this time of the dominant language.”\textsuperscript{9} However, with greater investment in Indigenous educational systems, “there is a relative renewal of confidence in the ancestral languages, and an equally relative confidence in their survival.”\textsuperscript{10}
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Image 1: Linguistic Map of Guatemala showing Maya, Xinca and Garífuna languages. Source: MINEDUC DIGEBIL from http://www.mineduc.gob.gt/DIGEBI/mapaLinguistico.html
Guatemala spends 3.2% of the GDP on education overall, ranking it no. 125 in the world (in 2008).\(^{11}\) In 2002, the literacy rate of the total population was reported at 69.1%, distributed unequally between male (75.4%) and female (63.3%) populations,\(^{12}\) however statistics from the Ministry of Education in 2009 claim that 80.5% of the population is literate.\(^{13}\) The school life expectancy from primary to tertiary education is a total of 11 years, accurately represented in the school life expectancy for the male population, though the female population is only expected to attend school for 10 years (in 2007).\(^{14}\) While that may be the expected length of attendance, there are only 6 years of compulsory education, and a national attendance rate of 41%.\(^{15}\) In 1994, for example, a student from one of these primarily indigenous regions would typically take 9 years and 5 months to complete the first four years of formal education (cf. Psacharopoulos 1994).\(^{16}\) Faced with facts like this, it makes sense that governments, and even nonprofits, would seek to improve the educational conditions that reinforce these norms.

At an estimated 14.7 million citizens in 2011, Guatemala is Central America’s most populous country. In spite of this, figures from the World Bank show Guatemala to have “one of the most unequal income distributions in the hemisphere,” as “the wealthiest 20% of the population consumes 51% of Guatemala's GDP.”\(^{17}\) This disparity can also be seen in the country’s “social development indicators,” including “infant mortality, chronic child
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malnutrition, and illiteracy, [which] are among the worst in the hemisphere.”

**History of Indigenous and Mayan peoples in Guatemala**

Maya can be found throughout Guatemala, though they are especially concentrated in the western highlands. Most notably, there are large Mayan populations in “rural departments” to the north and west of Guatemala City, especially Alta Verapaz, Sololá, Totonicapán and Quiché. Maya can also be found working on farms in Guatemala’s southern region of Boca Costa, and in various social strata in most cities. Specific groups within the Maya are generally distinguished by their distinctive languages, which some sources number around 26, the most common being Q’eqchi, Cakchiquel, Mam (Maya), Tzutujil, Achi and Pokoman.

The ancient Maya, evidently connected to the even older Olmec (Xhi) civilization, constructed an empire covering the modern-day states of Guatemala, Belize, western Honduras and El Salvador, as well as five Mexican states (Yucatán, Quintana Roo, Tabasco, Campeche and Chiapas). Along with the Huaxtecs, who separated early on, there were 28 ethnic groups (and corresponding languages) within the Mayan empire: Mam, Yucatec, Chortí Itza, Lacandon, Mopan, Chontal, Chol, Cholti, Tzotzil, Tzeltal, Coxoh, Tojolabal, Chuj, Jacaltec, Kanjobal, Mocho, Tuzantec, Aguacateca, Ixil, Quiche, Tzutuhil, Cakchiquel, Uspantec, Achi, Pocomchi, Kekchi and Pocomam.

Colonial rule by the Spaniards rapidly weakened the already declining Mayan civilization, through the “dispossession of lands and the use of Mayans for forced labor on
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cocoa and indigo plantations.” Mayan leaders consider this the first holocaust. The second holocaust is the land dispossession during the liberal reforms and revolution in the 19th century. The third holocaust is, regrettably, relatively fresh in Mayan memory: the 1980’s massacres. These massacres were the result of the formation of social movements in Guatemala during the 1960’s calling for land and just wages, both in the Mayan highlands and the southern coast’s large farms. On January 31, 1980, the Spanish Embassy was burned once 39 Mayan leaders had sought refuge inside, creating a more “fertile ground for recruitment to the armed insurgency under the umbrella of the Guatemala National Revolutionary Unit (URNG).” The state officially attempted to quash these movements, responding with the “counter-insurgency campaigns of General Ríos Montt and the subsequent militarization of the area,” a move that caused around 200,000 deaths and roughly the same number of Guatemalan refugees fleeing to Mexico. Additionally, the state’s response created about a million internally displaced persons. Later, the United Nations sponsored a truth commission that defined the combination of these actions as “genocidal.”

As the state returned to a civilian rule, there was “less formal discrimination,” though “discriminatory legislation against women still existed and de facto discrimination continued to exclude the Mayan communities from the legal, political, economic and social systems of Guatemala.” For many primarily Mayan areas, the army remained the “only visible institution of the state apart from the Catholic Church.”

Fortunately, the state has continued to make progress towards reconciliation since
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then. The 1985 Constitution contains several provisions advocating for the rights of Indigenous persons. These include Article 66, which recognizes that “Guatemala is formed of diverse ethnic groups among which figure Indigenous groups of Mayan heritage” and pledges that the state “recognizes, respects, and promotes their forms of life, customs, traditions, forms of social organization, the use of indigenous clothing among men and women,” as well as the rights to use their own “languages and dialects,” and Article 70, which “called for establishing law to regulate everything relating to indigenous questions.”25 While the new constitution looked to create change, even ten years after the new constitution went into effect the law called for by Article 70 had yet to be enacted leaving the Maya to remain bound by the existing electoral law which prohibited them from organizing politically.26 Indigenous peoples remained hopeful that Congress would ratify ILO Convention 169 in 1992, but after much stalling and a coup in 1993, there was little hope for its ratification, while “Mayan culture continued to be denigrated by the national political elite, which was implicated in their massacre.”27 Most attempts by the government to make concessions to the Maya, including the installation of an EIB program of limited scope, were more assimilationist in nature, attempting to bring Maya into alignment with the “mainstream national culture, in this case by integrating Mayan children into the existing Spanish education system.”28

In the face of this adversity, discrimination, the lasting negative consequences of the “internal armed conflict” from 1985-1995, “a new movement of Mayan organizations
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blossomed,” including groups dedicated to locally-based development. The major topics of
discussion and goals of these development initiatives included “issues such as the rights to
land, civil and cultural rights, bilingual education and the recognition of Mayan local
authorities,” and new projects to gather and document Mayan history and civilization were
initiated by Mayan academic institutions and research institutes.

In addition to the efforts of these organizations, when Rigoberta Menchú won the
Nobel Peace Prize in 1992 it was certainly a crucial moment for the Indigenous popular
movement in Guatemala. As a Mayan exile gaining attention on the international stage, she
became a “key symbol” representing the movement, and even gained “some local protection
from military repression” for the Maya.

The confluence of these new developments and international attention “forced all
parties in the conflict to radically alter their perceptions regarding the Maya.” One of the
greatest steps forward came in March 1995 when the government and the guerrillas signed
an accord on indigenous rights, a move that was “cautiously welcomed” by the Coordination
of Guatemalan Mayan Organizations (COPMAGUA, the “umbrella organization of Mayan
organizations”). Afterwards, COPMAGUA assembled and presented proposals for the
Peace Accords to the Assembly of Civil Sectors. These accords sought to officially define
Guatemala as a “multi-ethnic, pluricultural and multilingual” nation, a definition which they
hoped to incorporate into the national constitution. Additionally, the accords “promised the
introduction of anti-discriminatory legislation and the congressional approval of ILO
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Convention 169,” while establishing “a number of measures to increase Mayan participation in society.” These measures included “the promotion of bilingual education at all levels of the state education system; the official use of indigenous languages within the legal system sanctioned through indigenous legal aid organizations; the training of bilingual judges and interpreters and the provision of special legal defense services for indigenous women.” The proposed accords also sought “commitment to the principle of municipal autonomy” through “an agreement to reform the municipal code and to strengthen Mayan authorities.”

While the process was not as expedited as Indigenous activists may have hoped for, these aspirations were gradually realized. In 1996, Guatemala ratified ILO Convention 169, while in 1999 “a national referendum was held on indigenous rights” proposing to change four constitutional points. This included a proposal for cultural and linguistic plurality which was ultimately defeated, as it only received 43% of the vote, though there has been much criticism regarding “voter intimidation and overtly racist campaigns,” which may have factored into the abysmal voter turnout of a mere 19% of the total electorate.

Memories of past conflicts and discrimination are never far from the minds of Guatemala’s Indigenous, as Indigenous rights leaders were receiving death threats, being abducted and reportedly murdered as recently as 2002-3. Much of this can be attributed to these activists’ involvement in “working to bring government officials and military officers to trial over civil war-related atrocities” and the subsequent “reactivation of groups connected to the 2003 election campaign of presidential candidate General Efraín Ríos
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Montt, the founder of the Guatemalan Republican Front (FRG) party who was Guatemala’s dictator during the 1982-3 period.”  

Reassuringly for Indigenous and human rights activists, General Montt was soundly defeated in 2003, offering a “less than ideal, but nonetheless better, chance of stabilization and democracy,” though “historical social practices and apathy in the government [continue the] political exclusion of indigenous people, including limited access to the civil service and high public office.”

For example, Indigenous peoples are often excluded from voting in spite of the universal suffrage permitted by the Constitution, as there are “tedious voter registration requirements, elections scheduled during harvest season and inadequate transportation,” which “limit the numbers who actually vote,” though they may not reflect an official exclusionary policy on the part of the State. While this may be true, there still exist measures to exclude Indigenous peoples from election in the “wider political arena,” as “national political parties restrict the election of their indigenous members to decision-making leadership posts in the internal party structure.”

Change, with respect to political involvement of Indigenous peoples, is very gradual. As of 2003, 105 of the 331 municipalities had indigenous mayors, including one female Indigenous mayor in Sololá, a municipality. When we consider the National Assembly, only 15 of the 158 elected deputies are indigenous, of which only one is a woman. The influential figure Rigoberta Menchú attempted to change the role of Indigenous peoples in politics with her run for the presidency in 2007. While she successfully allied her Winaq movement and the political party Encuentro por Guatemala and promised to “foster a plural
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and inclusive government, where Maya, Xinca, Garífuna and Spanish-speaking indigenous people all have the same rights” if elected, her bid was ultimately unsuccessful, demonstrating a sort of stagnation in the progress of Indigenous advancement. 43

The truth is that, in this country left devastated by a 36-year civil war, there are “few remedial policies of recent years” and a slowly emerging and only “slightly more tolerant climate” for Indigenous people. 44 While the accords of 1996 are designed to “promote indigenous cultural and social rights,” in actuality “the free expression of Mayan religion, language and other factors continues to be hampered by a shortage of resources and a lack of political will to enforce laws and implement the 1996 peace accords.” 45

**History of Indigenous Education in Guatemala**

As in many countries in the region, SIL became involved in Guatemala where they worked on establishing a transitional and integration-oriented bilingual education program after their arrival in 1952. 46 In the Andean countries, the State and linguistic missionaries like SIL both prioritized working with territories within the tropical Amazon rather than Highlands people, for various reasons. The State, for example, was more interested in “consolidating boundaries and national territory, subjugating and incorporating a people with whom it had very little contact,” while the missionaries viewed the development of bilingual education as “an opportunity to preach, convert and ‘save’ a people who, in contrast to highland Amerindians, had often had no contact with the Catholic missionaries

---

44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
of previous centuries." The Instituto Indigenista Nacional (IIN) contracted SIL to provide schoolbooks and training for teachers in areas with primarily Indigenous populations, with the ultimate goal of "incorporating Maya children into the national education system, thereby laying the foundation for cultural integration so important to the Guatemalan state." As in other countries in the region, SIL also had the ulterior motive of promoting their Protestant religion while "erod[ing] the strong position of Maya religion and Catholicism," through such means as new translations of the Bible in indigenous languages. SIL wasn't always widely welcomed, in part because the ways they achieved their goals, such as opposing the use of the Mayan unified alphabet proposed by the Academia de las Lenguas Mayas de Guatemala (ALMG) and excluding Maya from positions where they could influence decision-making processes. In spite of these criticisms, SIL schools helped deepen an interest in Mayan languages among young Maya, to the extent that "a number of contemporary cultural activists trace their involvement in linguistic issues to SIL programs." Additionally, SIL was able to help found the first Guatemalan organization solely “dedicated to the promotion of indigenous literature,” called the Asociación de Escritores Mayences de Guatemala (AEMG) (García Hernández 1986).

Catholic groups also increased their interest in a "mobilization of the Indian population around economic and political issues," such as the Catholic Action movement (Acción Católica), established in 1948 in Guatemala. Their primary goal was not initially the education of Indigenous children, however after the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965),
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Catholic Action refocused their programs from theological to social issues. A great number of the more “progressive” priests felt that “the church must concern itself with improving the material conditions of its followers, raising the consciousness of the poor, and enabling them to become the authors of their own destiny” (Berryman 1984: 27-29). This group became “heavily involved” with developing “cooperatives, schools, and health services” in Guatemala (Calder 1970; Berryman 1984). Their involvement helped to train and encourage the development of a new generation of Indigenous leaders and activists with a new awareness of the problems facing Guatemala's Indigenous.

**Policies, the Project of Bilingual Education and PRONEBI**

The governmental policy of “idiomicida,” designed to reduce the multilingual character of Guatemala and establish one national language, was instated in 1824. This sort of integrationist philosophy was in place for years, reinforced by the Constitution of 1945, in which Article 4 declared the official national language of Guatemala to be Spanish, reaffirmed by the following constitutions of 1956 and 1965. A great change came in the Constitución Política of 1985, in which Article 143 declares the Mayan languages as “parte del patrimonio cultural,” or part of the cultural heritage of Guatemala (though this document still asserts that the status of “official language of Guatemala” is still reserved for Spanish). The 1985 Constitution and its 1993 reforms both maintained that “habitants have the right and the obligation to receive initial, preprimary, primary, and basic education” that is free and state-provided (Article 74), both recognized the “social obligation” to fill the urgent need for
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literacy on a national scale (Article 74), and both recommended that “in schools established in areas with a predominantly Indigenous population, teaching should preferably be done in a bilingual form” organized in a “decentralized and regionalized” system (Article 76), many communities still found their educational needs were not being met by government initiatives.\(^\text{58}\)

Guatemala has developed “twin government-indigenous commissions” in order to examine the design and implementation of governmental projects, including educational reforms.\(^\text{59}\) With respect to education, these reforms yielded the *Proyecto de Educación Bilingüe* (Project of Bilingual Education), designed to last between 1979-1984.\(^\text{60}\) This pilot project was a collaboration between the Guatemalan government and USAID. The objectives of this project included extending the use of Spanish through the second grade and preparing materials in four Mayan languages (namely k’iche’, kachikel, mam and q’eqchi’) in order to facilitate learning of the official language.\(^\text{61}\) This program was originally instated in 40 pilot schools though, after an evaluation of the program in 1985, the government took responsibility for the project, converting it to the *Programa Nacional de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* (PRONEBI, or the National Program of Bilingual Education).\(^\text{62}\)

It is important to take into consideration that in 1985, when the Bilingual Education Project came under the control of the Ministry of Education, the country was undergoing an intense civil war which absolutely made it “dangerous to support any initiative related to the
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Mayan people.\(^{63}\) This can help account for the fact that while 42% of the Guatamala populace self-identified as Mayan at the time, and there was even a demonstrated Mayan majority in rural areas, only an estimated 40% of the scholarly-aged population attended school. What’s more, 50% of these students abandoned their studies after the first year.\(^{64}\)

While PRONEBI had begun to take into account the cultural differences of students from various Indigenous backgrounds, the goal of the program was still largely to use the Indigenous languages as means to teach the official language of Spanish. The use of Indigenous languages in schools was “transitory,” serving as a “bridge” from one language to the other, rather than a more complete validation of the various languages of Guatemala.\(^{65}\) This kind of bilingual education is often called subtractive rather than additive, as the goal is not to add knowledge of a new language to existing knowledge of the maternal language, but to replace the maternal with the national over time.\(^{66}\) Additionally, this program was limited in its growth because of lack of funding on the part of the State.\(^{67}\)

During the 1980’s and 1990’s, PRONEBI expanded to include 800 schools—400 “complete schools,” in which “the program worked with preschool and the first four primary grades” (under Government Decree No. 1093-84, under Government Agreement No. 726-95), as well as 400 “incomplete schools,” where “PRONEBI only worked with preprimary classes.”\(^{68}\) At this point, PRONEBI was receiving support from USAID through the Rural Primary Education Improvement Project (1984-1989) and the Basic Education Strengthening (BEST) Project (1990-1997), all with the goal “to provide a relevant bilingual
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education to rural Indigenous boys and girls and create a permanent capacity in the Ministry of Education to deliver this education.⁶⁹

Under the Ministry of Education’s Directorate of Rural Education (Dirección Socio-Educativo Rural), responsible for all rural primary education in Guatemala, PRONEBI consisted of five components: (1) administration and supervision of bilingual education in all of Guatemala; (2) curriculum development of texts and instructional materials; (3) infrastructure, which “carried out the printing of bilingual texts and guides as well as the purchasing of desks and furniture for rural schools”; (4) training of bilingual educators, including continued in-service training for teachers and university-level training for supervisors/PRONEBI personnel; and (5) evaluation of the academic success of students and the model.⁷⁰ In this incarnation of PRONEBI, the model “supported the development of the mother tongue of the students and Spanish was taught as a second language from preschool to fourth grade.”⁷¹

⁷¹ Ibid.
More changes for Indigenous education in Guatemala came when the _Acuerdo sobre Identidad y Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas_ (AIDPI, “Accord on the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples”), one of the Peace Accords, was signed in 1995 after nine months of negotiation. This document promises to recognize, respect and promote the group of languages spoken in the country and to modify the status of these languages. The government proposed to do so in seven ways, namely: (1) promoting a constitutional reform listing the existing languages that Guatemala would be constitutionally obligated to recognize, respect and promote; (2) encouraging the use of all of these languages in the educational system in order that students could learn to read and write in their mother tongues, especially promoting programs of bilingual or intercultural education (like the _Escuelas Mayas_); (3) promoting the use of these languages in social services provided by the state to communities; (4) informing Indigenous citizens of their rights, obligations and opportunities as citizens in their own languages, providing written translations when necessary; (5) promoting programs of certification for bilingual judges and interpreters; (6) bringing about the positive valorization of Indigenous languages, opening new spaces in social means of communication and transmission of culture, fortifying organizations such as the _Academia de Lenguas Mayas_; (7) promoting the officialization of Indigenous languages through a commission involving representatives of Guatemala’s various linguistic communities and the _Academia de Lenguas Mayas de Guatemala_, and bringing about a reform of Article 143 of the Constitution regarding the official language of Guatemala.\(^\text{72}\) By March 1998, the commission that had been created to work on making indigenous languages
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official was able to present a “proposal for official recognition of indigenous languages.” Other language-related cultural rights, such as the demand for the “promotion of the use of indigenous languages in public administration” were not implemented. Overall, the Indigenous Rights Accord has, of all of the Accords, “been implemented to the least degree.”

**DIGEBI: La Dirección General de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural**

Relatively simultaneously, the government instituted educational reforms with various goals, under Governmental Decree No. 726-95. In addition to transforming PRONEBI into the General Directorate of Bilingual Intercultural Education (DIGEBI), the decree established specific goals that included: (1) to be a decentralized and regionalized system in order to adapt to the specific linguistic/cultural needs of different areas; (2) to grant communities and families a main role in defining the curriculum and school calendar, as well as a say in hiring and firing of educators, according to the community’s educational and cultural interests; (3) to integrate educational concepts from Maya and other Indigenous cultures, especially their philosophical, scientific, artistic, pedagogical, historical, linguistic, and political-social components as key aspects of educational reform; (4) to broaden and promote (“impulsar”) bilingual educational education and appreciate (“valorizar”) the study and knowledge of Indigenous languages at all educational levels; (5) to promote better socio-economic conditions of life of the communities, by means of developing the values, content, and methods of the culture of the community, technological innovation, and the ethical
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principle of conserving the environment; (6) to hire and to train bilingual teachers and Indigenous technical/administrative employees to develop education within their communities and institutionalize mechanisms of conference/participation of representatives from the community/Indigenous organizations in the educative process.\textsuperscript{77}

In its current form, and in accordance with the aforementioned goals, DIGEBI provides services in “more than 1400 schools and 14 linguistic groups in 11 departments and 135 municipalities,” as of 1997.\textsuperscript{78}

\textbf{Iq’ and the current reality of DIGEBI}

DIGEBI, identifies EIB with the glyph “Iq’.” Iq’ is literally defined as “the wind, the air, the atmosphere.” More poetically, it “symbolizes the breath of life, the movement of the air, the currents of air, the clean purity of the crystal.” The Maya identify the “day the wind was born” as “how life originated,” bespeaking the importance of Iq’. This glyph was chosen as a symbol of EIB by DIGEBI because “Iq’ is the air by means of which we emit the voice” and “the voice is united to the word, communication, and language.”\textsuperscript{79} This concept of interconnection is foundational to the continued expansion of EIB programs, as well as a validation of

\begin{image}[htb]
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\caption{El glifo Iq’: “Es el viento, el aire, la atmósfera, por eso simboliza el soplo de la vida, el movimiento del aire, las corrientes de aire, la limpieza y la pureza del cristal. Este día nació el viento y así se originó la vida.”}
\end{image}

\textbf{Source:} MINEDUC DIGEBI from http://www.mineduc.gob.gt/DIGEBI/index.html
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\textsuperscript{79} Gobierno de Guatemala, Ministerio de Educación, Dirección General de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural (MINEDUC DIGEBI) http://www.mineduc.gob.gt/DIGEBI/index.html. Original text: “La Educación Bilingüe Intercultural -EBI- se identifica con el glifo Iq’, pues el Iq’ es el aire por medio del cual se da la Emisión de voz y la voz va unida a la palabra, a la comunicación y el idioma, consecuentemente se da la interrelación, la filosofía de la información por hacer uso del idioma materno se desarrolla la adquisición de un segundo idioma y el aprendizaje de un tercer idioma tal como lo establece el Currículo Nacional Base actualmente en vigencia.”
the concept of utilizing the maternal language in the classroom and learning a second or third language as an important part of the education and development of a student. The inseparable association Iq' establishes between the breath, life, and language also demonstrates, in a lyrical way, the fundamental necessity of language to the survival of peoples, and the especially powerful significance language has for Indigenous peoples of Guatemala.

Guatemala today is proud of the progress it has made since the original bilingual program geared towards “Castellanización.” The EIB program in place now is designed to “promote the coexistence of people from different cultures,” especially between the four pueblos or peoples of Guatemala, broadly classified as Maya, Garífuna, Xinka and Ladino. EIB is “the axis on which identity is constructed” provides the necessary “tools by which the four Guatemalan peoples who cohabit the territory can broaden their opportunities for local, regional and national growth,” and actualize the “full development of their potential in the sphere of social life for a true intercultural coexistence.”
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A study on actual success of EIB graduates in Guatemala

In 2003, the Guatemala Ministry of Education and the General Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education released a study on “Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala” with the goal of improving educational quality. The study was conducted using a sample of the original 40 pilot schools in the Mam, Q’eqchi’, Kaqchikel and K’iche’ linguistic areas as well as a sample of similar schools from the same areas that had never been involved in or offered bilingual education, choosing four schools for each “linguistic area.”

This study aimed to “determine the influence of participation in a bilingual multicultural education program on the adult life of graduates, in terms of personal well-being, participation in civil society, and the maintenance of Mayan culture.”

This study focuses on three key periods of EIB implementation: “the project phase (1979-1984); the program phase (1985-1994); and the directorate phase (1995-2002),” using the same schools for the different periods.

The indicators used to determine the success of the graduates were divided into two sets: the first, focusing on the students’ experiences during primary school itself; the second, focused on the results of the primary experience on later life,” according to personal well-being, civic participation and ethnic identity.

Data was collected from interviews with students (typically two boys/two girls from each school), interviews with teachers (one long-employed and one “relatively new” teacher per school), as well as observations on economic status in four schools for each linguistic area in question. When there were more than four
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graduates, fieldworkers randomly chose two boys and two girls from each class, though in cases where there were not enough graduates from a particular year, the sample was completed with graduates from the subsequent year.86

**Primary School Experience**

There are two main differences that stand out when DIGEBI and non-bilingual school are compared, the first is the students’ ability to access and go to preprimary classes before enrolling in first grade.87 The study demonstrates slightly higher attendance of students below the age of 7 at bilingual schools (176 students, 92.6% of students) than traditional schools (138 students, 68% of students).88 This can partly be attributed to the fact that “one of the objectives of the [EIB] program was to offer students a preschool” in order to help them “adjust to the formal school environment and learn preliteracy skills,” though the fact that so many students from the comparison group also attended preprimary classes is somewhat surprising.89

The second great difference between the two types of programs is found in the usage of the mother tongue in the classroom. As seen in the following table, the students in EIB programs report more use of Mayan languages by teachers in the first year of education, though there is also a markedly higher usage of both languages of instruction in PRONEBI/DIGEBI teachers, as can be expected from a bilingual program.90
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Table 3: Languages Used by Teacher in the First Year of Study by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X²=26.6 sig=.000

Graduates were also asked whether, as students, they used Spanish or Mayan more frequently. 49% of EIB students used more Mayan, as compared to 40% of the comparison group students, while 50% of the comparison group students used more Spanish, as compared to 42% of the EIB program students. In another question, EIB students reported a particular emphasis on Mayan language in especially in the curriculum for reading and writing. In spite of this, students from both groups similarly identified the importance of Spanish language (75% of students), and the subordinate role of Mayan cultural content, such as “the Mayan numbers or calendar, the agricultural calendar, and Mayan customs” (mentioned by no more than 15% of each group). This finding, out of context, might lead scholars to conclude that the inclusion of cultural material was therefore less effective than hoped by program designers, as in its implementation it was not featured as prominently as the acquisition of Spanish. Thankfully, there is more data with which to frame this image of EIB.

With respect to the most commonly used classroom materials among primary students, notebooks were the most common materials. In spite of PRONEBI/DIGEBI’s dedication to developing of texts in Indigenous languages, Mayan texts were not usually identified by graduates as significant and/or available materials (5 students, or 2.6% of EIB).
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Students from both groups were also asked about the kinds of texts used in classrooms, over two thirds of which were either from the Ministry of Education or private vendors (66.3% in EIB schools, 76.8% in comparison schools). Interestingly enough, the study reports that PRONEBI/Mayan texts were used in 8.5% of EIB schools and in 7.4% of comparison schools. Unsurprisingly, given the funding challenges of EIB programs, 6.3% of EIB schools were reported to operate with no texts, while only 3.4% of the comparison schools were in the same situation.

Another factor to consider is the rate and effect or impact of parent participation in the respective school programs. In both groups, more than 70% of parents were reported to be involved in the school, though both groups reported different kinds and degrees of involvement. For the comparison group, parents most typically attended meetings. With the EIB students, “parents were most likely to ask about their children’s performance or progress in school,” partly due to the bilingualism of the instructors which would allow for greater communication and on both sides.

Over time, the amount of teachers using Mayan in the classroom increased, as EIB became more widely supported, most notably by the Peace Accords. In the comparison schools, however, the use of Mayan decreased continually, with a corresponding increase in the use of Spanish in teacher-student communication. Interestingly enough, both groups of students initially showed a similar disposition to use Mayan with their classmates (71.2% among EIB graduates, 71.6% among comparison schools during the EIB pilot period),
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though the use of Mayan among graduates of comparison schools dropped to 57.8% in 2001.\footnote{Chesterfield, “Study of Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala,” 13.}

Later Life of Graduates

The vast majority of students from both groups found the education they received to be useful later in life, a finding that we hope to be true in a more universal context. An overwhelming majority from both (more than ¼) specifically identified that the most useful learning done in the classroom was connected to Spanish-language reading, writing and speaking, though a good number (20%) of students also identified mathematics as an important skill learned in school.

Table 4: Principle Areas of Learning Useful in the Lives of the Graduates, by Program\footnote{“Table 11” from Chesterfield, “Study of Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala,” 15.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading, writing, speaking Spanish</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, writing, speaking Mayan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the students studied showed that they found their education to be valuable, they were left with some degree of dissatisfaction, or at least were able to identify areas where they would like further education. The largest percentage of the comparison group (35.4%) wished for more learning in Mayan languages, while the largest percentage of EIB graduates (38.5%) identified secondary studies, or higher-level education, as the additional learning they felt was missing from their educational experience.\footnote{Chesterfield, “Study of Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala,” 15.}
Graduates were also asked their opinions regarding the importance of different educational systems, as well as improvements that could be made to said systems in order to promote greater learning. The results of these questions are represented in the table on the following page.

**Table 5: Opinions about Bilingual Intercultural Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Mayan Bilingual Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Mayan Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students study more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government help schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything is good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 16.6; \text{sig} = .05\]

As we can see, 79% of the sample agreed that Mayan-Spanish bilingual education was important for students and many also valued the role of teaching Mayan culture in the schools. Both groups, however, experienced difficulty expressing an opinion on the role of intercultural education in schools, primarily because around two-thirds of each group (65.8%)
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and 66.5% among EIB and comparison school graduates, respectively) did not know what intercultural education was, even though half of the sample graduates had been enrolled in EIB systems during their primary years.\footnote{Chesterfield, “Study of Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala,” 16.}

The reason for this failed understanding of the concept of intercultural education is difficult to explain, but could perhaps be attributed in part to the fact that many of the individuals from the regions and linguistic groups in question live in a multicultural society and have an understanding of education that may incorporate multiculturalism without specifically defining it as “intercultural” education.

Before delving into more specific detail on the economic statuses of the graduates, the study took stock of their opinions on the socio-economic situation of Guatemala. Unsurprisingly both groups had similar opinions as to the greatest issues facing Guatemalans, both listing violence and crime as the greatest problem in the country (37.1% and 36% of EIB and comparison school graduates, respectively). Along these lines, more than a quarter of respondents also identified economic problems as a pressing challenge for the country.\footnote{Chesterfield, “Study of Bilingual Education Graduates in Guatemala,” 17-18.} In both groups, the majority felt that there was no available work for them, though more EIB graduates (61%) thought this than graduates from comparison schools (56%).\footnote{Ibid.} The greatest percentage of graduates from both systems worked in agriculture (30.9% of EIB graduates, 20.7% of comparison school graduates), reflecting Guatemala’s dependence on agriculture as a leading industry and source of employment. These figures speak to a greater economic situation regarding access to employment and decent living, which is often identified as a key factor in, as well as result of, education. While I will not
explore these issues too deeply, they can be helpful in establishing a context for understanding the life of Indigenous people in Guatemala.

The graduates of comparison schools reported higher rates of graduates who needed to use reading skills (76% as opposed to 67%) and writing skills (69% as opposed to 60%) in the workplace, showing the different kind of jobs available to, or at least acquired by, graduates from these primarily Spanish-systems. In spite of this, the greatest percentage of graduates from the comparison schools (38%) claimed their workplace required bilingualism, while 43% of EIB graduates reported needing only Mayan in their place of work.\textsuperscript{105}

While graduates may have been employed in different sectors, graduates of both programs did not display great differences in their personal wealth, though the comparison group had “significantly more refrigerators” and slightly greater wealth than EIB graduates.\textsuperscript{106} One factor that is key to take into consideration when assessing the personal wealth of an individual is the quality of the homes in which the study’s participants live. The study shows that “the most recent graduates of the bilingual program have houses that are inferior to previous generations of graduates,” probably due to the fact that “the houses were generally those of the parents among the most recent graduates,” demonstrating that the population served by DIGEBI schools is comparatively poorer than those served by other schools in the same area.\textsuperscript{107} In general, the differences between the two groups’ material possessions can be seen as negligible.

Another key factor to consider is the amount of graduates who went on to secondary or higher education. The comparison schools’ graduates were more likely to continue
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beyond primary school, as well as attend high school and college (though there were very few graduates educated to this level in either group). While the comparison schools may boast a 13.4% completion rate of high school to EIB schools’ 12.7%, the EIB schools in this study demonstrate a 72.2% completion of sixth grade to the comparison schools’ 66.8%.

The languages used during the interviews varied based on the preference of the participants in the study. The graduates from EIB schools preferred to conduct the interview in Mayan (37.2% to 35.7% of comparison school graduates), and were more able to go through with and finish the interview in Mayan. The disparity between the comparison school graduates’ desire to conduct the interview in Mayan and their ability to do so “suggests that their perceived ability may be less than their actual facility with the language,” an indicator of deterioration of knowledge of and facility in their mother tongue.\(^{108}\) While there may have been variance in this aspect of the study, it is valuable to distinguish that both groups primarily defined themselves as Mayan (88.6% of EIB graduates, 90.1% of comparison group) rather than Guatemalans, typically defining Mayans “as people who spoke their language and who they worked with and relaxed with in their communities.”\(^{109}\) While both groups shared this sense of Mayan self-identification, graduates from DIGEBI schools demonstrated greater usage of traditional clothing among graduates and their children. DIGEBI graduates were also more likely to send their children to an EIB school than graduates from the comparison schools who also had children.\(^{110}\)

The study concludes that DIGEBI, over the years, “has met its principle objective of providing a means for Mayans to preserve their identity and language during a period in

Guatemalan history when both were threatened,” primarily by means of “encouraging the use of Mayan language or Mayan and Spanish in the classroom.” The study also reflects upon the “lack of civic participation” among graduates, understanding that “the danger of public visibility through may of the initial years of [EIB] program implementation” was a leading factor, and remains optimistic that, in keeping with the Peace Accords, which “mandate for equal opportunities and self representation for Mayans,” future EIB curricula would perhaps include a greater focus on civic participation. Additionally, the study points out that the “lack of continued formal education may be the result of limited opportunities,” and recommends further investigation into how “to provide post-primary education” given that a higher level of schooling is typically tied to greater material well-being and a higher standard of living. Finally, the study suggests that DIGEBI further explore the role of preschool and early enrollment, as this is “generally associated with persistence in school.”

**Remarks**

Guatemala underlines the importance of peace as an enabling condition for EIB to function without failing. Along with this, Guatemala also shows the significance of enforcement of the stipulations of laws, constitutions, accords and conventions, which remain hollow words if they are not substantiated by implementation. The case study examined in this chapter imparts some worthwhile wisdom in the way the students recognized the value of their education even if they were not necessarily able to recognize or define the concept of interculturality when asked. Finally, this case study also shows that, while both groups of students identified as Maya, the EIB graduates were more closely in
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alignment with their cultural heritage, if judging by indicators of indigenous language ability or dress. This can be taken as an indication that EIB schools in the regions studied were successful in delivering education in such a way as to foster indigeneity.
Indigenous peoples of Latin America often express concern that their ways of life are being corrupted and corroded by involvement with and intervention of the modern state. Traditionally, educational systems initiated by governments and established by organizations only reinforced the dire premonitions of these vulnerable communities as, one by one, policies and schools continued in their trajectory of oppressive and transitional tactics bent on the ultimate assimilation of Indigenous peoples as part of the foundation of an unthreatened national identity. Because of these pervasive propensities in histories, a nontraditional educational system like EIB is important and unique in its ability to address the particular needs of Indigenous peoples with linguistic, cultural, and ethnic communities distinct from those of a nationally dominant group.

I began with the broader themes of Indigeneity, common problems faced by Indigenous peoples, collective and minority rights, and the importance of education in order to establish the appropriate context for the discussion of the discussion of three countries I had chosen as case studies. Through this examination on international, national and local levels, I was able to distinguish five salient features that contribute to an EIB school’s ability to flourish or fail in a given country: (1) national and regional stability; (2) governmental
support in both legal and fiscal terms; (3) funding and resources; (4) community support and participation; and (5) system design, program adaptation, and flexibility.

As elaborated previously, a country and region must be stable in order for there to be any sort of development of or commitment to EIB programs. It is an unreasonable expectation to hope that communities will be receptive to educational initiatives if members of these communities fear they will be directly endangered by any involvement with them.

In addition to the stability experienced by a state not engaged in violent conflict, whether internal or external, it is also important that there be some degree of political or ideological stability or continuity. When leadership changes and each new leader, whether president or head of the Ministry of Education, has a different view on the value of EIB or Indigenous rights themselves, any progress made within communities is stagnated, if not undone entirely.

What’s more, a government must demonstrate its full support of EIB initiatives by establishing and enforcing policies, constitutional and educational reforms, and other legal measures to uphold these types of programs. These measures must be further supported by allocation of funds to ensure that these programs have the potential to succeed and serve the needs of the country’s Indigenous communities.

While the fiscal costs of funding, organizing, and staffing EIB schools may cause some to complain, especially when there may be traditional schools available, once the system has been designed and implemented, it should not require that much more assistance than any other type of school system. For Indigenous rights activists, the fiscal costs are nothing compared to what Indigenous communities have endured for generations, in terms of loss of language, culture, ways of life, and even life itself. Ensuring that Indigenous
Conclusion

Communities have the ability to choose to continue in their linguistic and cultural traditions while simultaneously preparing for life in a country and region where the majority speaks Spanish, and a person typically needs Spanish-language abilities to escape poverty and access a higher quality of life, is a but small price for governments and NGO’s to pay.

A community’s support and participation is vital to EIB’s ability to reach its full measure of success. Because of the long-lasting understanding of education as an irreversible process that opposes and overwrites Indigenous cultures, it is imperative that those responsible for implementing these programs emphasize the altered approach of modern EIB. They must encourage the interpretation that contemporary methods can actually help to maintain and foster linguistic and cultural practices of a community, in order to dispel myths and garner support from communities, without which there would be no students in the classrooms. Key to furthering community support is allowing for community participation in decision-making regarding the school, the program’s design, the calendar, hiring, and many other aspects of planning and management. Using community participation as a source of input also helps to ensure that the system is designed and adapted to be most appropriate to the community in which it is implemented.

Perhaps most importantly, the ideologies behind, designers of, and teachers of EIB must not have assimilationist goals. Rather, the system should be designed to uphold linguistic and cultural traditions of communities in a maintenance system, allow Indigenous children to access the same curriculum as their Spanish-speaking peers, and eventually provide some instruction in Spanish communication skills so Indigenous children will be better prepared to achieve whatever degree of social and geographic mobility they may choose to pursue. This must be done with great tact and flexibility on the part of the
educators themselves, who have direct influence on and great power in the school’s future as a successful or failed initiative within the community.

Part of the problem with this study was the great variety in available data from one country or region to the next. It proved challenging to find statistics for a specific region of a state or broader ethnic community, meaning that employing a comparative method of study wasn’t as straightforward or effective as I had hoped. In order to address this, I propose greater regional specificity in educational studies, or increased dissemination of existing materials.

In spite of these challenges, I have determined that EIB is the sort of system that, if implemented properly, can meet the needs of all the students and communities that it serves. EIB is one of the simplest and most effective ways to alleviate the disparity between Indigenous and nonindigenous peoples by ensuring that all have access to an appropriate education. By doing this, policy makers and implementers ensure not only that Indigenous rights are being upheld, but also that every child is offered the educational opportunities that will provide them with the skills and abilities necessary to lead rich and fulfilling lives.
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