



Journal of International Women's Studies

Volume 12
Issue 1 (January/February)

Article 4

Jan-2011

Women under Attack: Violence and Poverty in Guatemala

Corinne Ogrodnik

Silvia Borzutzky

Recommended Citation

Ogrodnik, Corinne and Borzutzky, Silvia (2011). Women under Attack: Violence and Poverty in Guatemala. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 12(1), 55-67.

Available at: <http://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol12/iss1/4>

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Women under Attack: Violence and Poverty in Guatemala

By Corinne Ogrodnik¹ and Silvia Borzutzky²

Abstract

In 2009 Guatemalan women experienced the highest level of violence in Latin America and one of the highest in the world, and death rates have continued to increase in 2010. At the core of the issue are two major problems: pervasive poverty and legal exclusion. In turn, these two issues are closely connected since legal/judicial exclusion is a consequence of poverty. This paper aims to analyze the question of violence against women in Guatemala, to discuss women's limited political, legal and economic rights, as well as the policies pursued since the end of Guatemala's civil war to deal with the violence. The fact that crimes against women have not declined, but in fact are on the rise points to the ineffective nature of the existing polices, and the need to make a larger investment in antipoverty and other socioeconomic policies geared to increase women's economic self-sufficiency.

Keywords: Violence against women (VAW), Guatemala, poverty, Conditional Cash Programs

Introduction

Gender equality and women's empowerment are critical both to the protection and expansion of human rights and to achieve socioeconomic development. Human progress is certainly affected when women, who represent over half of the global population, own only one percent of the world's wealth and hold only sixteen percent of the world's parliamentary positions. When women are both poor and suffering from violence not only are their rights compromised, but the development of the entire society is at stake.¹ This paper examines the dual questions of violence against women and its connection with poverty in Guatemala. This work not only offers a comprehensive synthesis of current research on the issue of violence against women in Guatemala, but also highlights the critical role that antipoverty measures have in mitigating its occurrence.

¹ Corinne Ogrodnik, MS Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University; doctoral candidate University of Pittsburgh, Sociology. Her current research focuses on women, poverty and development in the Latin American region. She is also the editor of *Integrating Food Stamps Benefits into Pittsburgh Farmer's Markets* (Publication of the Office of Data Analysis, Research, and Evaluation; Allegheny County Department of Human Services; Forthcoming 2010).

² Silvia Borzutzky is a Teaching Professor of Political Science and International Relations at Carnegie Mellon University. She has written extensively on Latin American politics, social policies and international relations. She is the author of *Vital Connections: Politics, Social Security and Inequality in Chile* (Notre Dame University Press, 2002) and co-editor of *After Pinochet: The Chilean Road to Capitalism and Democracy* (University Press of Florida, 2006), and *The Bachelet Government: Conflict and Consensus in Post-Pinochet Chile* (University of Florida Press, Forthcoming 2010). Her current research deals with the socioeconomic effects of globalization on social policies, poverty and women.

By 2009 Guatemalan women were experiencing the highest level of violence in the Latin American region and one of the highest in the world.² The fact that crimes against women in Guatemala have not declined, but in fact are on the rise points to the ineffective nature of the existing policies. We argue that to reverse this trend, a larger investment in antipoverty and other socioeconomic policies is needed. To the extent that violence against women is linked to poverty, violence will not be reduced unless poverty is reduced because largely the victims are poor women. If as Paul Collier argues there are clear connections between lack of development and societal violence, money spent on antipoverty programs will not only contribute to diminishing violence against women, but also will contribute to the country's development and to reductions of overall violence in Guatemala and in neighboring countries as well.³

The first section of this paper contains a brief socioeconomic picture of Guatemala, the second contains a summary of the country's violent political history, while the following section discusses the situation of women and the question of violence. The fourth section discusses policies enacted since the end of the civil war to deal with violence against women and their effectiveness, including the new Conditional Cash Program, *My Familia Progresas*. The paper concludes by arguing that the best antidote to violence is poverty reduction, which in turn, requires larger investments in antipoverty programs and ultimately policies geared to increase women's economic self-sufficiency.

Guatemala: A Brief Socioeconomic Picture

Guatemala is a country of nearly 14 million people, with one of the largest indigenous populations in Latin America, representing 38 percent of the entire population. Spanish is the national language, but there are also twenty-four known indigenous languages spoken amongst its people creating a major challenge for societal integration and reform.⁴

A 2009 World Bank report found that almost half of the population is poor, that over the last ten years, rates of poverty have only marginally declined, and that the incidence of extreme poverty – about 15 percent of the population - has remained the same.⁵ The report also shows that the country's distribution of wealth is extremely unequal as the wealthiest 20 percent of the population controls 58 percent of the wealth, while the poorest 20 percent controls just over 3 percent of the wealth.⁶ This inequality is reflected in a very high Gini Coefficient of 55.1.⁷ Additionally, social indicators such as education, health and mortality rates show that the country ranks as one of the worst in the region, surpassed only by Haiti. Poverty also disproportionately effects the indigenous population, as over three quarters of indigenous Guatemalans are poor and indigenous mothers are three times more likely to die from pregnancy complications than non-indigenous women.

Expenditure on health and social services is low relative to international standards. As of 2006, Guatemala's social spending amounted to 5.6 percent of GDP, less than half of the average for Latin America.⁸ Data also shows that about 30 percent of Guatemalan women have nutritional deficiencies, that the country has the fourth highest rate of chronic malnutrition in the world and the highest in Latin America.⁹

Brief Political History

Guatemala gained independence from Spain in 1821 and experienced a myriad of dictatorships, coups, and military governments over the next 125 years. The mid twentieth century brought in a period of acute and continuous upheaval. In 1944, the Ubico regime was overthrown by a group of revolutionaries, in turn setting the stage for the popular election of José Arévalo and successor Jacobo Arbenz. Both administrations implemented social reforms that damaged U.S. corporate investments and sparked U.S. suspicion of communist sympathies, leading to a U.S. backed military coup led by Colonel Castillo Armas in 1954.¹⁰

Guatemalans experienced the consequences of the coup for the next forty years. The brutality of the ensuing dictatorships forced dissident groups into hiding and eventually the organization of a guerrilla movement. Conflict between the state and guerilla groups led to a civil war in the early 1960's that lasted for the next thirty-six years. One of the darkest periods of the civil war took place under the leadership of General Ríos Montt who formed a civilian defense patrol force that captured virtually all of the guerilla territory. It is estimated that over 200,000 Guatemalans – mostly indigenous peoples – were killed during this time.¹¹

General Mejía Victores replaced Ríos Montt in 1983 and facilitated the return to a formal democracy under the 1985 Constitution. Subsequently, the Serrano administration succeeded in reigning in civilian control over the army and engaging the army in discussions with the unified guerilla group, but in 1993, Serrano was accused of corruption and forced to resign.¹² The Human Rights Ombudsman, De León Carpio, completed Serrano's term. De León had widespread popular support and successfully called for the resignation of every member of Congress and the Supreme Court for "purification" purposes.¹³ A renewed Congress approved constitutional reforms, which were ratified in a popular referendum in 1994. Subsequently, De León paved the way for a renewed peace process, brokered by the United Nations (UN). Cornerstones of the 1996 Peace Agreements were human rights guarantees; creation of the Commission for Historical Clarification (Guatemala's truth commission); and constitutional reforms geared to transform the state and the society.¹⁴

Overall, there has been little progress towards securing the protection of human rights and upholding the rule of law since the signing of the 1996 Peace Agreements. Post war Guatemala is plagued by new forms of violence caused by former military and police members, paramilitary and guerrilla forces, and street gangs.¹⁵ While Guatemala has made some progress toward improving the functioning of democratic institutions and electoral reforms, these changes have largely been overshadowed by perpetual violence and a culture of impunity that interferes with the application of the laws and the provision of justice.

Alvaro Colom, the center-left candidate of the National Unity for Hope (UNE) party, won the 2007 presidential election. Colom claims to prioritize social development and the expansion of education, has adopted a 'zero tolerance' stance on corruption and organized crime, and has promised to provide basic services to the majority of the poor. Deep financial reform, however, is required to accomplish these promises, as the government claims a tax rate equivalent to only 10.2 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), one of the lowest in the Western hemisphere. Additionally, cases of the misuse of government funds and the death of prominent lawyer Rodrigo Rosenberg have

caused suspicion about Colom's integrity and possible connections to organized crime.¹⁶

Guatemalan Women: Political and Socioeconomic Rights

The lack of democratic stability, the prevalence of highly repressive and authoritarian regimes, and a situation of almost perpetual violence have impeded the participation of Guatemalan men and women in politics or in the exercise of their political rights. As a result, there is a significant gap between the constitutional and legal documents that have created the new political institutions, and the actual functioning of those institutions and the use of associated rights. Particularly, in the case of women the "legal gender gap" is even larger than for men, and as a result, women's legal rights are only minimally implemented.¹⁷

The history of women's political participation and provision of rights in Guatemala is fairly short. Women with the ability to read and write obtained the right to vote in 1945. This right was expanded to all women in 1966. Equal political participation is recognized in the constitution and Guatemala has signed and ratified international conventions and protocols geared to protect women's rights.¹⁸ However, as argued by Luz Méndez, "The electoral system as a whole has enormous obstacles for the full participation of citizens, particularly women, indigenous and the poor...[and] (t)he system of political parties is neither representative nor inclusive of women."¹⁹ Additionally, the proportion of elected women has decreased from 13.8 percent in the 1995 elections -held before the Peace Accords- to 11.5 percent in the 1999 elections, and to 8.9 percent in the 2003 elections. The number of women candidates remained almost the same in the three elections. Concerning indigenous women, only one was elected to the National Congress in the 2003 elections. Moreover, in 2003 no woman was nominated as a presidential candidate and only one woman ran for Vice-President.

Women's under-representation is also a reality in high level appointed positions. In the ten-member Constitutional Court there is only one woman and she occupies a deputy position, and in the Supreme Electoral Tribunal, there are two women. At the municipal level, the number of female mayors increased from 1.2 percent in 1995 to 2.4 percent in 2003.²⁰ Though this figure is still very low, it does mark an important increase in women's access to this level of elected position, possibly brought about by the initiatives launched after the Peace Accords geared to promote women's political participation. These initiatives include gender awareness raising and leadership skills training at the local level.

The exclusion of women can also be seen in the area of economic rights. In 2006 women represented 38.3 percent of the economically active population.²¹ Available data shows that 29.8 percent of women are poor while 24.6 percent of men are poor in Guatemala, and that women are poorer than men both when absolute and relative poverty measurements are used.²² Existing data also indicates that income transfers reduce the difference between poor men and women to 0.8 percent and that poverty among men and women is strongly associated with low levels of education. When analysts measured female headed versus male headed households there is also more poverty among female headed households even after income transfers have been included.²³ Additionally, the Gender Related Development Index ranks Guatemala 118 out of 177 countries and indicates that the estimated earned income for women is only PPS US \$2,267 compared to \$6,990 for men.²⁴

According to a recent study the gender wage gap in Guatemala has been reduced from 28 to 18 percent between 2000-2006, but Guatemala still exhibits the largest wage gaps in the region along both gender and ethnic lines.²⁵ It is important to note that the gap reduction is in part due to a decrease in male wages.²⁶ Additionally, when comparing monthly wages by educational attainment, the authors of the report observe significant differences. The ratio between average wages of those with college degrees and those with less than secondary education is five to one; but since 2000 this gap has been closing. These income disparities between the least educated and most educated are in line with other findings, which indicate that economic returns for education in Guatemala are high.²⁷ According to the same study, only 63.3 percent of women can read and write, further underscoring the lack of investment in education for females in the country.²⁸ Last, it is important to note that the disparities in education by ethnicity are more pronounced than gender disparities, as non-indigenous people have about three more years of education than indigenous people.²⁹

Femicide and other Forms of Violence against Women

According to the Guatemalan Human Rights Ombudsman (GHRO), during the first half of 2007, 287 women in Guatemala were killed, 10.5 percent more than in the same period of 2006. In 2008, there were 39,400 reports of domestic violence, and in 95 percent of the cases, the victim was a woman. This data is corroborated by the government's Office for Women's Issues (Secretaría de la Mujer), which argues that crimes against women increased between 2006 and 2008. In 2009, Guatemala's death rate resulting from violence against women was the highest in Latin America and one of the highest in the world.³⁰ For 2010, the GHRO estimated that the number of femicides had increased by 16 percent and the National Police revealed that by the end of June, 532 women had been violently murdered.³¹

The term femicide refers to gender-motivated killings, carried out with extreme brutality. Although in the past year violence has increased in Guatemala regardless of gender, the murders of women are particularly alarming because of their misogynistic nature and because of the disproportionate rate at which they are increasing. While most of the murdered men in Guatemala were killed "with no intimate physical contact between the victim and the perpetrator," the majority of murders of women were marked by rape, torture, and mutilation. According to Angélica González of Guatemala's Network to Oppose Violence Against Women, "sexual aggression, the mutilation of body parts like breasts, torture, and the dumping of victims in empty lots are trademarks of the killings."³²

The widespread occurrence of violence against women in Guatemala is not only criminal behavior and a violation of women's rights, but also generates a deep sense of insecurity for women. During a 2004 visit, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Women observed that:

Worrying testimonies have been received in relation to the notable sense of insecurity that women in Guatemala feel today as a result of the violence and murders in particular. The resulting effect of intimidation carries with it a perverse message: that women should abandon the public space they won at much personal and social effort and shut themselves

back up in the private world, abandoning their essential role in national development.³³

The problem is exacerbated by the social stigma associated with domestic or sexual violence, which sentences women to silence and prevents reporting or talking about the crime. Moreover, women who experience sexual violence are often ostracized by their relatives and community, which in turn leads to even more isolation and negative consequences. As the UN General Secretary explains:

Women who experience violence suffer a range of health problems and their ability to earn a living and to participate in public life is diminished. Their children are significantly more at risk for health problems, poor school performance and behavioural disturbances... Women who are targeted for violence are less likely to be employed, tend to be employed in low status jobs and are unlikely to be promoted.³⁴

Violence against women ultimately paralyzes women, deprives the family of needed sources of income and emotional strength, and limits the country's development as a whole.

Where does the violence come from?

The factors that engender widespread violence against women are complex and multifaceted. While officials blame organized crime, gang violence, a culture of impunity, and embedded gender discrimination, other contributing factors are high rates of violence and unemployment in the country as a whole, a lack of educational opportunities and pervasive poverty.³⁵ Particularly, a 2007 report done by PUND, Guatemala's Program on Citizens Security and Prevention of Violence, argues that violence against women exists for two reasons: social exclusion and the lack of application of the existing laws. The report also argues that both of these issues are related because inequality and poverty only increases social exclusion.³⁶

Additionally, systematic weaknesses within the judicial system and the failure of authorities to investigate crimes and prosecute criminals create a culture of impunity and fearlessness in perpetrators. This "compounds the effects of such violence as a mechanism of control. When the state fails to hold the perpetrators accountable, impunity not only intensifies the subordination and powerlessness of the targets of violence, but also sends a message to society that male violence against women is both acceptable and inevitable. As a result, patterns of violent behaviour are normalized."³⁷ A report by the Coordinadora 25 de Noviembre, an umbrella group made up of nearly 30 local women's organizations, indicates that in the last seven years, only two percent of crimes against women have been solved. In 2006, judges handed down a total of 12 sentences, one for 60 years and the rest for 50 years. Of the few cases that are actually brought to justice, some took up to three years to make it to court.³⁸ In the words of Guatemalan Hilda Morales of the Network of Non-Violence Against Women, "Unfortunately, in Guatemala, killing a woman is like killing a fly; no importance is assigned to it...the perpetrators are encouraged to continue beating, abusing and killing because they know that nothing will happen, that they won't be punished."³⁹

Moreover, the legislation against femicide discussed in the next section appears to have made little impact as since the law came into force in May of 2008, only two offenders have been sentenced, even though 722 women died that year due to violent crimes committed against them. Morales argues that domestic violence and sexual harassment, the forerunners of the murders, are not even classified as crimes.⁴⁰ Amnesty International analysts further explain that there are continuous delays and insufficient efforts by police to respond to reports of missing women, which severely limits the ability to gather pertinent data to effectively investigate crimes.⁴¹ As argued by the authors of the Center for Gender and Refugee Studies report,

While the Guatemalan government has pledged its commitment to confronting the crisis, it has not devoted necessary resources to existing law enforcement and investigative institutions, nor has it been willing to take a closer look at its systematic failure to protect Guatemalan women.⁴²

A study which focuses on women and the judicial system in Costa Rica, El Salvador and Nicaragua argues that “women are significantly more likely to believe that [the] criminal justice system provides unequal treatment before the law than men...Evidence suggests that women connect unequal treatment to economic factors and follow a conflict model of criminal justice, which posits these attitudinal differences as a function of the group’s subordinate position in society.”⁴³ These conclusions can certainly be applied here since the level of socioeconomic exclusion suffered by Guatemalan women is larger than what is experienced by their counterparts in the region.⁴⁴

Policies, Domestic and International Actors

If as argued by PUND and throughout this paper the main reasons for violence are socioeconomic exclusion and lack of enforcement of the laws, one could argue that although current government measures constitute steps in the right direction, they will not solve the problem. This section will examine some of the legal measures taken by the government since 1996 and the extent of implementation.

Since the 1996 Peace Accords, the government has adopted a number of policies such as the National Policy for the Promotion and Development of Guatemalan Women aimed at promoting women’s rights; and the Plan for Achieving Equity of Opportunities aimed to improve women’s access to healthcare and education, and protection from violence. Similarly, the National Plan for the Prevention and Eradication of Violence in the Family and Violence Against Women Act was followed by the creation of several bodies within the government such as the Presidential Secretariat for Women who advises on the coordination and implementation of policies dealing with the protection of women.⁴⁵

Simultaneously, the government has attempted to decentralize policies and responses to violence by placing more responsibility in the hands of localities through The Municipal Pacts Agreements for the Integral Security of Women.⁴⁶ The Agreement was initiated in 20 Municipalities and is to be extended to the remaining 333 municipalities across the country. Program personnel argue that the program has achieved some of its goals, including the development of cooperative connections between national

and local governments; the opening of Women's Municipal Offices to promote a gender perspective in local public policy; increased cooperation amongst local authorities, officials, community leaders, and women's associations; and the raising of awareness about violations of women's rights.⁴⁷ Civic and governmental participants have acknowledged, however, that to achieve greater success, political will and accompanying resources to fulfill commitments are required.

Non-governmental organizations have also emerged across the country, including the two renowned organizations Fundación Sobrevivientes (Survivor's Foundation) and CONAPREVI. Fundación Sobrevivientes assists women in navigating the legal system to prosecute crimes of violence and advocates for change in Guatemala's justice system to end impunity of perpetrators. In 2009, the organization's founder, Norma Cruz, was named Person of the Year by Guatemalan newspaper *Prensa Libre* and honored by the US State Department with the International Women of Courage Award. Additionally, CONAPREVI works at the policy level to promote legislation that protects women and prevents intrafamilial violence. This organization also serves as a watchdog and compiles data on the incidence of femicide, rape and domestic violence, and on legislative measures created to address the violence.

Internationally, Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) opened its only Latin American operation in Guatemala specifically to respond to the crisis of sexual violence against women.⁴⁸ Additionally, UN General Secretary Ban Ki-moon launched in 2008 the *UNiTE to End Violence Against Women Campaign* to encourage action across the UN system to prevent and punish violence against women, highlighting Guatemala as a target country.⁴⁹ The UN Population Fund (UNFPA) has been supporting projects that address the issue of violence against women.

In a recent publication, the UNFPA stresses that economic issues were critical to the success of a project in Mexico:

Increasing women's economic self-sufficiency is key to breaking the cycle of violence. In addition to recognizing violence against women as a human rights violation, a comprehensive strategy must also be developed to strengthen women's financial autonomy. Without some means of earning an income, the options for women victims of violence seeking to improve their situation are limited. Women's empowerment and the development of their capabilities are closely related to their economic self-sufficiency and the real possibility of emerging from the cycle of violence.⁵⁰

In this same light, we argue that, in Guatemala, current government measures enacted to deal with the violence are not sufficient to solve the problem. Instead, the foundation of legislative efforts aimed to address violence against women should be policies geared to lift women out of poverty and to create opportunities for women's economic autonomy.

Solving Poverty through Conditional Cash Transfers

The previous section highlighted the legal and societal measures taken by the government, NGO's and international organizations to address violence against women. Because we argue that violence is rooted in poverty, this section examines the main

antipoverty policy implemented by the Colom government with the support of the World Bank and other International Financial Institutions (IFIs).

Given the negative effect that neoliberal policies have had on the poor and particularly on poor women throughout the world, the World Bank and other IFIs have advised countries to adopt Conditional Cash Transfers (CCT) programs. The goal of CCT programs is to break the poverty cycle by changing the behavior of the poor by conditioning the benefits to positive behaviors of the poor. Typically, benefits are given to the female head of household. The World Bank posits that these programs “reduce current consumption poverty via the cash transfer to the poor, and break the inter-generational transmission of poverty through accumulation of human capital, through health and education co-responsibilities. ...Most CCT programs link the cash transfer to an education and a health/nutrition condition.”⁵¹

To what extent these programs have been successful in reducing either overall poverty, and in particular, female poverty is controversial. By and large, analysts argue that while the programs might contribute to small improvements in child and maternal health and school attendance, their contribution to reducing poverty is so far unclear.⁵² In a study of Mexico’s CCT program, *Progres/Oportunidades*, the evidence indicates that women appear to feel empowered as a result of the stipend received from the government, yet identified the need for additional education and training to break the cycle of poverty. A preliminary study of Chile’s CCT *Solidario* program leads to similar conclusions that women are grateful for the small cash allowances received through the program, but that there are no positive effects on overall poverty reduction.⁵³ The case of Brazil, the *Bolsa de Familia* program, on the other hand, is considered to be successful, as it has produced reductions in malnutrition, increased school attendance and according to one analysis “was responsible for a 12 percent reduction in poverty.”⁵⁴

Additionally, while the data remain insufficient, partial studies done in Mexico indicate an increase in the likelihood of violence against women as a result of the application of the program. This may be due to the fact that CCT programs do not reliably create opportunities for women to gain economic self-sufficiency and keep them trapped in the cycle of dependency on their male counterpart. As argued by analyst Maxine Molineaux “(m)ore research is needed to establish if [the programs] produce a redistribution of power and status within the household, and, if so, to explain what effects this status re-ordering has on household livelihood and well being.”⁵⁵ The challenge remains then to identify policies that truly lift women out of poverty and create opportunities for economic independence.

In April of 2008 President Colom began implementing the *Mi Familia Progres* (MIFAPRO) CCT program, according to which the Guatemalan state transfers Q.300 per poor family with children of up to 13 years of age, or to expecting mothers. The first stage of the program is targeted to families in the poorest municipalities and the beneficiaries have the obligation of seeking medical care in the case of pregnant women, taking children to medical check ups, and sending the children to school. Checks are disbursed every two months after the families certify fulfillment of their obligations.⁵⁶

Given the recent implementation of the program and the lack of available data it is impossible to provide an assessment of this program at this time. It is clear, however that transferring about US\$74 every two months to a family will not take the family - or women - out of poverty. The World Bank has set the poverty line at US\$1.25 per day, per

person, and in the case of Guatemala each member of a four person family receives approximately 25 cents per day.⁵⁷ Moreover, unless the program is followed by large investments in education and health, the goals of the program will not be accomplished.

In brief, while we recognize that a measured assessment of the program is possible in the near future, it appears at this time that given the small sums of money distributed to the poor and the low investments in health and education within the country, the program will not succeed in reducing poverty amongst women.

Conclusions

Paul Collier's analysis of the connections between violence, conflict and lack of development leads him to argue that the poorer the country is the more likely it is to be submerged in perpetual violence. Ultimately the best way out of violence is through economic development. While we don't necessarily see a linear progression between the lack of violence and development and vice versa, we argue that in the case of violence against women in Guatemala the solution lies in the ability of the political leaders to find new sources of gender inclusive development for the country that enable women to become independent and empowered economic actors. We have also argued that although the Guatemalan government has taken measures and created relevant legislation to fight violence against women, that the implementation of these laws is lacking, and more critically, that laws targeted to lift women out of poverty are lacking, and as a result violence against women continues to increase.

In 2006 the UN's General Secretary stated that "(e)liminating violence against women remains one of the most challenging issues of our time."⁵⁸ Indeed, the advancement of global development necessitates the engagement and empowerment of women at all levels of society. Yet while local and international actors can contribute to creating an environment that demands adequate policies, it is up to those who hold power to implement effective policies that address the root cause of the violence and the long term success of efforts; and in the case of Guatemala, that lies in creating opportunities for the economic self-sufficiency and legal inclusion of women. Given the historically limited effects of CCT programs in other countries of the region, we conclude that poverty reduction will most likely be accomplished by policies that allow women greater access to the labor force and to a decently paid job. But, that in turn, will depend on a set of state actions including the greater provision of education and health benefits to women, and the creation of opportunities that ultimately increase women's economic self-sufficiency.

¹ United Nations Development Programme. *Women's Empowerment*. <http://www.undp.org/women/>

² *Guatemala: No Protection, No Justice: Killings of Women in Guatemala*. Amnesty International. London, 2006. For a copy, please see <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR340192006>

³ Paul Collier. *Breaking the Conflict Trap*. Report for the World Bank, 2003.

⁴ *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America*. Report for the World Bank; *World Bank Meets with Mayan Elders*. World Bank. <http://go.worldbank.org/Z5UQ2XOUV0>

⁵ World Bank, Central America Department, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit, Latin American and Caribbean Region, "Guatemala Poverty Assessment: Good Performance at Low Levels", Report 43920, March 18, 2009.

http://www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=64187283&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000333038_20090709000311&searchMenuPK=64187283&theSitePK=523679

⁶ World Development Indicators: Guatemala, 2006.

⁷ Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Factbook , <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2172.html>. The Gini Coefficient is an aggregate numerical measure of income inequality. The higher the value of the coefficient, the higher the inequality of income distribution.

⁸ World Bank, op. cit.

⁹ World Health Organization. Country Cooperation Strategy: Guatemala, add website CNN, Guatemala declares calamity as food crisis grows, September 9, 2009, <http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/americas/09/09/guatemala.calamity/index.html>.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of State: Guatemala. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2045.htm>. Company and the US policies see, Steven Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1999.

¹¹ Piero Scaruffi, Wars and Genocides of the 20th Century. <http://www.scaruffi.com/politics/massacre.html>

¹² Guatemala: The Secret Files. "Timeline: Guatemala's History of Violence" <http://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/guatemala704/history/timeline.html>.

¹³ U.S. Department of State, Op. Cit.

¹⁴ Jonas, Susanne. *Of Centaurs and Doves: Guatemala's Peace Process*. Westview Press, 2000. 182.

¹⁵ Roland Paris., *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. Cambridge University Press, 2004, 239.

¹⁶ Guatemala President Alvaro Colom Cleared Over Murder. BBC News. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8455537.stm>.

¹⁷ Elisabeth Malkin, "Political Struggle Strains Guatemala's Justice System" New York Times, July 4, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/04/world/americas/04guatemala.html?sq=guatemala%20july%204%202010&st=cse&scp=1&pagewanted=print>

¹⁸ Luz Méndez, Guatemala Case Study, United Nations, Office of Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, Expert Group Meeting on Enhancing Women's Participation in Electoral Process in Post-Conflict Countries" January 19-22, 2004, p. 4 <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/meetings/2004/EGMelectoral/EP7-Mendez.PDF>

¹⁹ Luz Méndez, Ibid, p. 4

²⁰ Luz Méndez, ibid, pp. 5 and 6

²¹ Secretaría Presidencial de la Mujer, Asesora y Coordinadora de Políticas Públicas, "Respuesta al cuestionario sobre la aplicación de la declaración y la plataforma de acción de Beijing y el documento final del 23avo periodo extraordinario de sesiones de las asamblea general (2000) para la preparación de las evaluaciones y exámenes regionales que tendrán lugar en 2010 para la conmemoración de Beijing 15+,"

Guatemala, marzo, 2009 <http://www.eclac.cl/mujer/noticias/paginas/8/36338/Guatemala.pdf>, no page numbers

²² Janet C. Gornick and Markus Jantti, “Women Poverty and Social Policy Regimes: A Cross National Analysis”, Luxembourg Income Study, Working Papers Series, No 534, April 2010, Tables 1 and 3 <http://www.lisproject.org/publications/liswps/534.pdf>

²³ Gornick and Jantti, Op. Cit. Table 2

²⁴ Hugo Ñopo and Alberto Gonzales, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID), Research Department, Departamento de Investigación, Working Paper #641, Gender and Ethnic Wage Gaps in Guatemala, from a Matching Comparisons Perspective, Inter-American Development Bank, July 2008, Washington D.C., p 4

²⁵ Ñopo and Gonzales, Op. Cit. p 4

²⁶ Ñopo and Gonzales, Op. Cit. p. 7

²⁷ Ñopo and Gonzales, Op. Cit. p. 9

²⁸ Gender Related Development Index, Table 28, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_GDI.pdf

²⁹ Ñopo and Gonzales, p. 25

³⁰ Amnesty International, Op. Cit.

³¹ Guatemala Human Rights Commission, USA, News,

³² Center for Gender and Refugee Studies, University of California, Hastings College of Law, “Guatemala’s Femicide and the Ongoing Struggle for Women’s Human Rights” Update of the CGRS 2005 Report “Getting Away with Murder” September 2006, p. 9 http://cgrs.uchastings.edu/documents/cgrs/cgrs_guatemala_femicides2.pdf

³³ *Guatemala: No Protection, No Justice: Killings of Women in Guatemala*. Amnesty International. London, 2006. For a copy, please see <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGAMR340192006>

³⁴ United Nations General Assembly. “In-depth Study on all Forms of Violence Against Women”, July 6, 2006. For a copy, please see <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/SGstudyvaw.htm>

³⁵ *Programming to Address Violence Against Women: 8 Case Studies*. Volume 2, UNFP Report. New York, 2008. For a copy, please see <http://www.unfpa.org/public/publications/pid/1913> and Jasper, Miranda Louise and Colleen W. Cook. *Guatemala: 2007 Elections and Issues for Congress*. CRS Report for Congress. 1/9/2008.

³⁶ Secretaria Presidencial de la Mujer, Op. Cit., No page numbers

³⁷ United Nations General Assembly, Op. Cit., 2006

³⁸ IPS, Op. Cit.

³⁹ IPS, Inés Benítez, “Impunity Fuels Violence Against Women” <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=40203>

⁴⁰ IPS, Op. Cit.

-
- ⁴¹ Amnesty International, op. cit. 2006.
- ⁴² Center for Gender and Refugee Studies, Op. Cit., p. 7
- ⁴³ Lee Demetrius Walker, “Gender and Attitude toward Justice System Bias in Central America” *Latin American Research Review*, Vol 43 (2), 2008, p. 80
- ⁴⁴ Guatemala ranks below these countries in the Gender Development Index
- ⁴⁵ UNFP, Op. Cit
- ⁴⁶ UNFP, Op. Cit
- ⁴⁷ UNFP, Op. Cit
- ⁴⁸ Norma Cruz Fights to End the Killing of Guatemalan Women. <http://www.america.gov/st/hr-english/2009/March/20090306154900ajesrom0.1163599.html>. Accessed 1/26/10.
- ⁴⁹ United Nations, UNiTE.. Op. Cit. <http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/index.shtml>.
- ⁵⁰ “Programming to End Violence Against Women: 10 Case Studies.” United Nations Population Fund. New York, 2006.
- ⁵¹ World Bank, Op. Cit., p. 64, Sarah Bradshaw with Ana Quirós Viquez, “Women Beneficiaries or Women Bearing the Cost? A Gendered Analysis of the *Red the Protección Social* in Nicaragua”, *Development and Change*, No39 (5), 2008, p. 823 and 824
- ⁵² For an assessment of programs see, Fabio Vera Soares, et. al. “Evaluating the Impact of Brazil’s Bolsa Familia: Cash Transfers Programs in Comparative Perspective, *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 45, N2, 2010, pp. 173-190, Silvia Borzutzky, “Anti-Poverty Policies in Chile: A Preliminary Analysis of the Chile Solidario Program” *Poverty and Public Policy: A Global Journal of Social Security, Income Aid and Welfare*, Vol.1, No1, 2009
- ⁵³ Silvia Borzutzky, “Anti-Poverty Politics in Chile: A Preliminary Assessment of the Chile Solidario Program” *Poverty and Public Policy: A Global Journal of Social Security, Income, Aid and Welfare*, Vol 1, Issue 1, article 2
- ⁵⁴ Rafael Veras Soares, Rafael Perez Ribas, Rafael Guerrero Osório, “Evaluating the Impact of Brazil’s Bolsa de Família: Cash Transfer Programs in Comparative Perspective”, *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 45, No 2, 2010, p. 179
- ⁵⁵ Maxine Molineaux, “Mothers at the Service of the New Poverty Agenda: Progresas/Oportunidades, Mexico’s Conditional Transfer Programme” *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol. 40 (4), August 2006, p. 437
- ⁵⁶ Government of Guatemala, Consejo de Cohesión Social, “Que es mi Familia Progresas?” <http://mifamiliaprogresas.gob.gt/joomla/mi-familia-progresas.html>
- ⁵⁷ World Bank, Poverty reduction and Equity, “Overview: Understanding , Measuring and Overcoming Poverty” <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTPA/0,,contentMDK:20153855~menuPK:435040~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:430367,00.html>
- ⁵⁸ United Nations General Assembly, Op. Cit., July 6, 2006.