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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this film is to have four descendants of the Maya tell their stories and through them, explain four difficult concepts facing the 21st century contemporary Maya:

1. How do Mayan languages influence a worldview different than the westernized, globalized worldview?
2. How do the media, especially through movies, portray the Maya and other indigenous groups unfairly?
3. How have the descendants of the Maya coped with adapting to modernity while keeping their traditions intact?
4. How will the four protagonists ensure the protection of their language and their culture when they return home?

The answers to these questions can take up innumerable pages of essays, theses, and dissertations. As a matter of fact, three of the four protagonists were in the process of finishing their masters’ theses, in which they had to explore at least one of those concepts.

Before the interview process, I had researched the correlation between the indigenous genocides prevalent in 19th century Latin America and the formation of western nation-states, so having that as my background helped me predict some of the protagonists’ answers. However, their answers went beyond the scope of my research. They mixed not only their extraordinary scholarship and academic preparation, which exceeded any of mine, but included their own personal stories and experiences as true Maya. This last part is something I, as a mix-blooded mestizo Mexican, will never truly comprehend in this lifetime, regardless of any extensive preparation or research I might conduct for many years. This is why it was so important for me to let their stories shine through, without the interruption of a foreign narrator, including myself, or of “expert” interviewees, who don’t belong in the worldview of the storytellers. All four of the stars gave excellent interviews, and I could have let each person have his or her own capsule. However, reducing their four stories into a 30-minute-or-less narrative provided for one cohesive story bound by the thread of their common Maya experience.
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INTRODUCTION

The topic of indigenous peoples has been interesting to me since I was a child growing up in México. My father always had encyclopedias and books of all sorts, but I would tend to gravitate toward the topics dealing with indigenous cultures. In school, I was excited when, in social science classes, we arrived to the sections dealing with indigenous cultures. Also, one of my early encounters with the media involved TV cameras capturing the mass exodus of Guatemalans headed northward, be it toward México or all the way to the United States. As a small child, little did I know that those Guatemalans were descendants of the Mayas, whose unfair treatment by the established governments had led them to revolt, be it by arms or by moving northward.

Even at that young age, something did trouble me when we were studying the amazing Aztecs, the mythic Mayas and the colossal Olmecs: why do we always talk about them as something gone, something foreign, something in ruins, when it is so endemic to México? In other words, why have the Mexican social sciences relegated the role of the indigenous people into the realm of myth and lore, thus denying their obvious presence in the present? For some reason, talking about the indigenous peoples, or “indios,” in Mexican elementary school felt almost like talking about the Greek or Roman deities, something so foreign that it was no longer part of México's living heritage.

Entering my third decade of life, I like to critically look back at my childhood memories and recall the Purhépecha people of my native city of Uruapan, or the Nahuatl of Texcoco, the city where I had most of my elementary schooling. I keep wondering why these people were always the peasants trying to sell what little crops or artisan souvenirs they had in the street markets. Mostly, I remember the stench around these markets and the sellers: body odor mixed with freshly rained-on earth, a tepid sewage scent lingering about, and flies buzzing around as though the flesh of natives and mestizos coexisting in the market was their meal of last resort. Today, I like to break apart both the stench and the market images and I wonder whether it was the stench that Mexican society imposed on a defining “indio” image, or whether it was the “indio” imposing his image of society on a defining Mexican stench.

It is very troubling when people in México use the word “indio” as a denigrating term synonymous with ignorance, lack of culture, and, yes, the stench I mentioned above. Even some members of my family have used a similar word, “guare,” when referring to the peasant Purhépecha women in the
markets selling trinkets and vegetables, and the term goes hand-in-hand with that smell and the idea that they are somehow uncultured because of their street vendor status. It’s not like they don’t possess uncanny street smarts and quick math skills to ensure they make some sort of profit, however minimal, from their capitalist venture. Even in creating their souvenirs – masks, statuettes, toys, even musical instruments such as guitars, made out of the evergreen wood endemic to northern Michoacán – they exhibit great artisanship that takes years to perfect. And it’s not like some “guares” don’t go on to high cultural achievements, such as singing in the local choirs, performing difficult dances, and even going on to school to become teachers, lawyers and doctors.

When I was 23, I went to Uruapan to visit my maternal family that summer. As I had been involved in local choirs the previous year, one of my fellow basses asked me to fill in as interim director for one choir for about a month. I was happy to oblige, and the students responded well to me. One of the members was a Purhépecha tenor in his 40s who worked as a well-respected lawyer by day. He approached me after practice and handed me some hand-written sheet music with lyrics in Purhépecha. He asked me if I could help match the syllables to the notes, as the previous choir director, a Russian pianist and chanteuse married to a local Uruapense, did her best to transcribe the notes but couldn’t match the syllables to the corresponding melody. The lawyer suggested that maybe my Uruapense blood would help me match the lyrics to the tune. I tried my best, but it was difficult as I was a victim of not knowing my region’s autochthonous language.

I didn’t see the lawyer again before I returned to the States, but this whole ordeal has marked me in several ways. First of all, México and the rest of the world need to know that the term “indio” can and does apply to people like this tenor lawyer. A full-blooded Purhépecha is a productive member of society and situated himself at the higher echelons of city life, and neither his skin color nor his upbringing prevented his cultural and intellectual thirst from being satiated with ever-growing knowledge. Secondly, I realized how little I know about my region’s true culture and heritage. Even though I’m a westernized mestizo, I have realized that about one half of my being is this indigenous culture, and that it is my duty as a Michoacano to ensure that its endemic culture and language will continue to flourish, especially in my native Uruapan, whose name in Purhépecha happens to mean “city of eternal flowers.” The flowers of culture and knowledge are quickly dying in this region without somebody actively guarding them. I am
making learning Purhépecha one of my goals – though right now learning Russian is more critical as I’m raising a trilingual family, another catalyst for me to make a film about saving languages – and in learning this beautiful language I hope to understand more about who the people of Michoacán were, what kind of worldview they’ve had, and how that can reflect on me as a citizen of that area.

While making this film, I have learned that a language indeed defines a worldview. European languages have syntax and grammar that correlate in some ways, whereas indigenous languages are rooted in the heart – many feelings cannot be expressed without mentioning the heart’s yearnings – or imitate sounds of nature to express actions or concepts. Forget English onomatopoeia, these two indigenous language concepts alone go beyond the scope of anything you can learn in a textbook. As some of the protagonists told me off camera, learning indigenous languages is virtually impossible for a foreigner like me, implying not only that westernized language learning is a lot of churning through books and vocab, whereas indigenous language correlates with a total way of life that includes living as the speakers’ ancestors lived. This still doesn’t prevent me from trying to recapture one half of my heart that was lost in the Spanish conquest. I am still determined to learn something.

Though I admit I will never fully comprehend my indigenous language, I have to admit, also, that I do not thoroughly comprehend the philosophical parameters of the two European tongues I know fluently, Spanish and English. I will always be torn apart. Hence the curse and blessing of the Latin American mestizo: neither one nor the other, but in that lack of belonging, defining a new way of being. If I have to choose between being full-blooded anything or mixed-blooded mestizo in the next lifetime, I will choose mestizo immediately without thinking twice. It’s in this lack of belonging that I strive to find meaning in myself, in my life. And if life defines you from the get-go, where’s the fun of even starting a journey to find yourself? Making this film is part of the journey to understand a small portion of who I am culturally and where some of my people and I come from.
First off, the basic research. Who were the Maya? To say this is a mystifying question is a horrible understatement. “Neither tradition nor archaeology have thrown much light on Maya origins. Tribal memories are weak, and a combination of luxuriant vegetation and unfavorable geological conditions has made the search for really early remains difficult” (Coe 29). The Maya people, who have inhabited the region corresponding to present-day southern México, Guatemala and Belize for thousands of years, are still a modern enigma. “Five hundred years before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Mayas who built the great temples at Tikal, Palenque, and Yaxchilán abandoned their cities for reasons that continue to mystify scholars. They left behind the majestic shells of what was probably the most advanced civilization to have ever flourished on the American continent” (Perera 1). The discovery of ancient Maya cities in the 19th century “clarified problems relating to the origins of this civilization, the reason it was established here and the causes of its disappearance. Yet the cities themselves have remained almost mute on such essential points and questions still remain to be answered” (Ivanoff 65). Even with all this lingering mystery, the purpose of my research and corresponding film is not to focus on issues of the past or to decipher how the Maya came to be. In other words, my goal is not to literally translate the Maya creation story of the Popol Vuh from myth into reality. There are documentaries such as Cracking the Maya Code or The Dawn of the Maya that have plenty to say about that. My main concern is today’s contemporary Maya, the descendants of those mysterious people. Today, we have slightly more than 30 different Maya peoples with their corresponding languages and,

The six million or so Maya alive in the world today are survivors: they have endured repeated cycles of conquest that continue unabated even today. What have kept the Maya people culturally and even physically viable are their hold on the land (and that land on them), a devotion to their community, and an all-pervading and meaningful belief system. It is small wonder that their oppressors have concentrated on these three areas in incessant attempts to destroy them as a people, and to exploit them as a politically helpless labor force (Coe 202).

The contemporary Maya has had to deal with those above-mentioned genocidal issues from their nation-states, be it from México, Guatemala, or even the United States, and as such, have rebelled against their poor living conditions. Guatemala, for instance, has been in political turmoil, especially along racial lines, since the 1944 October revolution, bringing a democratically-elected president to the country only to have him overthrown a decade later with huge help from the U.S. government. The 1960s brought along less
democracy, yielding the 1970s that “saw an upsurge of political activity and optimism. In Guatemala City, students, teachers, and workers mobilized, displaying a political resolve and optimism that change was possible. Instead, the murders of peasant, labor, political, and student leaders accelerated in the 1970s … These selected killings had expanded into massacres in the countryside by the early 1980s” (Manz 18). Guatemala and its civil war, “which has lasted more than thirty years, have remained largely invisible, even to North Americans who defy the State Department’s negative travel advisories and fly to the Maya ruins of Tikal or visit the artisans’ markets of Atitlán and Chichicastenango” (Perera 11). This civil war was demarcated by social and racial lines, pitting the government-sanctioned military against guerilla groups consisting mostly of Maya peoples and their sympathizers. Some survivors “remember their involvement with the guerrillas as a conscious decision, fully voluntary, and are proud of their actions, even in the wake of the devastation that rained down on them. They blame the army for the massacres, terror, and destruction. Others admit to having provided support but in retrospect feel they were deceived. A few remain very resentful and fault the guerrillas for provoking the massacres and destruction” (Manz 232).

As far as the Mexican Mayas, a similar armed conflict blew up Jan. 1, 1994, which coincided with the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement:

In the dark hours of New Year’s Day morning, 1994, hundreds of masked Indians, carrying rifles across their chests, marched onto the cobblestone streets of San Cristóbal de las Casas. Tourists and coletos [locals], still merrymaking, some dazed by drink, stood aside and watched, as if the event were an unexpected parade. Other witnesses rubbed their eyes fiercely, like sleepers trying to clear their minds of an unnerving dream. Turning points in history, at their first moments, are experienced in various ways (McConahay 195).

Now for the issue at hand: The troubles of one indigenous group in North America are the same problems of another one in the Southern Cone. At least, that is the parameter I’m using in this research, as based on the brilliant Indios, ejército y frontera (Indians, Army and Border) by the Argentine writer David Viñas. The challenge of the 21st century Maya is the same challenge of the 16th century Mapuche of Chile. When the Spaniards came and attempted to expropriate the land of the Mapuches and exterminate their culture, the Mapuches fought back. Yes, they used weapons and physical and emotional harm, but the most powerful weapon was compromise. This is what the four protagonists of the film have adeptly accomplished: they have managed to embrace many of the ways of western culture, but they remain true to their Maya self, much like the Mapuche skillfully did shortly after the conquest. Even
though the research might seem out of place when taking into consideration that my film deals with contemporary Maya, not with Mapuches, bear with me. I will analyze the Mapuche experience to make a point about the current state of the Maya.

Redefining a Pan American “polis” through the Mapuche experience

Now let’s fast forward away from the original conquests of the American continent by 16th century Europeans. Much of today’s Pan American indigenous peoples’ troubles are a direct result of the 19th century’s wars of pacification all throughout the Americas. In Chile, for example, the process began through the Pacification of Araucania in 1861, a Chilean state-sanctioned militarized assault on the natives to usurp the mid-to-southern region’s land and use all its valuable resources, most notably silt. “Mapuche territory was first reduced through force of arms, after many unsuccessful attempts, and, after pacification, has been reallocated through the force of political action. Some of the important steps in this process are clearly revealed in documented history” (Mapuche Social 9). The current reservation system is often the bulwark of plaintive pathos of the Pan American indigenous problem, a direct legacy of those 19th century wars, which were a major initiative to create this model and to justify capital and political gains. The concept was very simple: persuade the citizens of the nascent nation-states that it was necessary to “pacify” the remaining unannexed regions by exterminating those with penchants for “savage” living – the indigenous people of Latin America not incorporated into the social mores of “civilization.” In the name of progress, be it 16th century colonialism, 19th century positivism, or 21st century neoliberalism, military force has received carte blanche in its attempt to subject peoples into a federation of nation-states that we see in today’s map of the world. But as history shows, the Mapuche have been different from their counterparts in the rest of the American continent from the initial conquest of the 16th century, for various psychological, cultural, philosophical, etc., reasons outside the intention of this thesis. Although much pathos happened to the Pan American Indian since the beginning of the Europeans’ settlement in the New World, something entirely different happened with the Mapuche:

La sociedad mapuche mostró una vez más su enorme capacidad de adaptación y su admirable fuerza de resistencia. Los mapuches se replegaron al interior de sus reservaciones, cambiaron sus tradiciones y costumbres, y se adaptaron a las nuevas condiciones que les impuso la sociedad chilena. [Mapuche society showed once again its enormous capacity for adaptation and its
admirable strength of resistance. The Mapuches retracted toward their reservations, they changed their traditions and customs, and they adapted to the new society imposed by Chilean society] (Bengoa 369).

The Araucanian region underwent a radical change in its demographic, for if the Spaniards had not exterminated all the Mapuche and other indigenous peoples of the region, many Mapuche migrated to Argentina, while those who remained decided to become part of the new Chilean community. Hence, the Mapuche were no longer residents of an organic area, they went on to become national subjects of the nascent national territory of Chile and its government, something reinforced by brutal militarism.

The question remains, however, how and why does the individual subject imagine him or herself into this community? … What produces the aggregate wills? Why and how do individual wills sign on? The easiest answer, perhaps, involves the nostalgic notion of the organic nation that emerges from an unconscious, collective knowledge of unity. The “people” are inevitably invoked in this version of nation, and in order for it to work they must be taken to be homogeneous, identical subjects striking the same note. The countries of Latin America, however, are notoriously nonhomogeneous …. Under the military dictatorships of the Southern Cone of the 1970s, the state took as its task the absolute and complete assimilation of the nation to its definition of itself, emphasizing the subjection of the individual to the state in the term “national subject” (Kaminsky 25).

Kaminsky speaks of the “national subject” as something opposed to what Heidegger calls “polis.” Calling somebody a “national subject” signifies the existence of belonging, that a government has complete possession of a person. Elden goes further by explaining the “polis” as that which characterizes a people – its gods, its temples, its festivals, its poets, even its presbyterian and assambleic government. “All of these do not first belong to the πόλις, or are political through a relationship with a statesman, but through their being constitute the πόλις” (Mapping 70).

The Mapuche “polis” then can be marked in three stages: organic “polis,” crossbred “polis,” and pacified (i.e. exterminated) “polis.” First, there was the organic “polis,” which worked with its rules outside the European context, and although they had their systems of hierarchy (something underscored by Faron in his ethnographic works such as Hawks of the Sun: Mapuche Morality and Its Ritual Attributes), the Mapuche system belonged to no one, it simply was. The sharing of space would be minimal with other nearby natives, which took place all throughout the American continent, including México. “A collective spirit did actually exist in Maya, Nahuatl, and Mexica religious athletic communities, but just barely. It was limited to certain rituals, land tenure regimes, and military activities” (Castañeda 6).

The second stage would then transition toward the relationship with European settlers as the
Mapuche were the only indigenous people who managed to successfully prevent a total Spanish conquest, thus redefining their Mapuche “polis.” But there are two huge caveats – in truth, the Mapuches were neither a people militarily superior to the Spanish, nor did the first stage of colonialism mean a total loss of customs, languages, traditions (of the organic “polis”) for the 16th century Mapuche, unlike most of the rest of the Pan American indigenous peoples who were almost immediately subjected to slavery. The Mapuche journalist Cayuqueo apologizes for how the context of the Spanish conquest has been damaged in the Mapuche world:

Dejemos por tanto descansar en paz a Cristóbal Colón, Francisco Pizarro y el crédito local, Pedrito de Valdivia. Pocos saben -y básicamente porque a nadie se le enseña en la escuela- que los mapuches casi nada perdimos con España. Hasta podría decir que ganamos. Sí, ganamos el arte de la caballería, los textiles, la platería y una lengua castellana casi tan hermosa como la nuestra. Es cierto, se trató en los inicios de una guerra. De una cruenta y dolorosa guerra de anexión colonial. Pero la muerte de tres Gobernadores al sur del Biobío fueron más que suficientes. Sobrevino entonces la diplomacia de las armas y con ella florecieron en La Frontera el comercio, las artes, la ciencia y la Política. Así como lo lee, la Política, con mayúscula, que aquello eran precisamente los Parlamentos.

[Let us, therefore, put to rest Christopher Columbus, Francisco Pizarro and our local credit-taker, Little Pedro de Valdivia. Few know – and basically because no one taught it in school – that the Mapuches lost almost nothing with Spain. You could even say that we gained. Yes, we gained the art of chivalry, textiles, silverware and a Spanish language almost as beautiful as ours. True, it was at the beginning of a war. In a bloody and painful war of colonial annexation. But the deaths of three governors south of the Biobío were more than enough. Then came the diplomacy of arms and with it came the flourishing of border trade, of arts, of science and Politics. As you read, Politics, with capital letters, which is precisely what the Parliaments were] (Cayuqueo).

What Cayuqueo is suggesting here is that instead of installing a brutal capitalist nation in favor of the dispossession of Mapuche lands, the 16th century Spaniard rather led toward a sharing of the Araucanian space, creating a new culture, a novel “polis.” From this, a new race, the mestizo, was born and with it brought the concept of alterity (the Other), the notion that Europeans finally see people different from them: not only the Indians, but the aborigine-European mixed race was seen for the first time not only in the eyes of Europeans, but for the first time in the eyes of the history of civilization. The exploration of Europeans toward the sharing of Indian spaces led toward interracial, inter-American “intercourse,” caused by varied reasons such as religious proselytizing, expanded trade, and imperial glory; however, there was a huge result, that of “sexual desire for people understood to be racial and cultural Others. Although race mixture has starred in world conflicts and in world literature, it was formative in the history of the Americas primarily in terms of cultural constitution, political organization, national building...”
Here, the author shows us that indeed, the indigenous people had a plentiful role in the formation of a Latin American state, and that everything pointed toward creating a state that could never be a true reflection of the European model, precisely because the Otherness among the new inhabitants of the New World would prevent such nation-state to take place. The contribution of the indigenous people, however, was more of in the social and cultural context rather than the monetary and political.

The third stage is the painful loss of the bisemic Chilean Mapuche “polis,” giving way to a “polis” pacified not by the colonizer of the 16th century, but by the post-colonizing “criollo” – the direct descendants of the Spanish conquerors – who finished the uncompleted task their ancestors left more than three centuries before. In *Indians, Army and Border*, Viñas explains how “the 19th century Victorian conqueror is presaging his kinship with the classical Renaissance conqueror,” according to the foreword by Horacio González, adding that “Viñas wrote ‘presaged.’ In the verb, he fits all the justifications, literature and memoirs that were able to accompany and even shape the language of war that would unleash in the Desert Campaign of 1879 as ‘an upper stage of the Spanish conquest of America’” (Viñas 5). Here, González foretells us of the thesis we will read in Viñas’ literary monument: that the wars of “pacification” in the 19th century were a Pan American process to create nations, from Chile with the Mapuche all the way to the United States with a host of indigenous peoples.

The Pacification of Araucania has its parallels in other countries. Argentina, for example, had its corresponding pacification handled by General Julio Argentino Roca, who, having pacified the Patagonia region, managed several political, economic and social goals sought throughout the rest of the Americas:

Su positivismo se manifestaba, sobre todo, en su severa economía de tácticas: monopolio de las tierras expropiadas a los indios, capitalización de un prestigio pulcro obtenido sobre los desmanes de sus subalternos, centralización, conservadurismo modernista, feroz ‘homogeneización racial’, fuerte estetización, sintonización con los ritos del capitalismo mundial, nacionalización de las oligarquías provinciales y del ejército frente a las milicias locales, reaffirmación de fronteras, articulación de los ferrocarriles, los telégrafos y el puerto único.

[His positivism was especially manifested in his severe economy of tactics: monopolizing the expropriated land from the Indians, capitalizing on a clean prestige obtained over his subordinates’ excesses, centralization, modernist conservatism, fierce ‘racial homogeneity,’ strong aesthetization, tuning in to the rites of global capitalism, nationalization the provincial oligarchies and the military over local militias, reaffirmation of boundaries, joining of railways, of telegraphs and of their only port] (Viñas 25).

Within the context of 19th century positivism – a scientific way of arriving at a sublime truth – thinkers influenced by European thought found it necessary to make every possible effort to achieve statehood,
but as some theorists suggest, this 19th century positivism is really not much different from the philosophy of the original 16th century colonizers. "Nevertheless, enduring social hierarchies, political exclusion, and discrimination – and especially the language in which these practices are legitimized and pursued – reveal little substantive difference between the older racial and the newer ethnic epistemes" (Tilley 66).

This system of ideas certainly included the new worldview of the mestizo, a result of the complex, volatile sharing of territory between the European and the Indian and the interplay between the physical and philosophical concepts of both groups. "The history of ideas usually credits the discourse that it analyses with coherence. If it happens to notice an irregularity in the use of words, several incompatible propositions, a set of meanings that do not adjust to one another, concepts that cannot be systemized together, then it regards it as its duty to find, at a deeper level, a principle of cohesion that organizes the discourse and restores to it its hidden unity" (Foucault 149). Uniting these principles often took place in a violent way, eventually suggesting what to expect of the Latin American state, where a new lexicon would be necessary to divide this territory – indeed, even the very word “territory” had to be defined to be understood by the Mapuche and other indigenous people.

Si hubiera que sugerir una síntesis, en sus rasgos generales, del proceso sufrido por los indios de América Latina a lo largo del siglo XIX hasta llegar al momento positivista del 1880-1914, podría decirse que si bien muchas de sus características fueron previstas por Humboldt en los alrededores del 1800, ese "cataclismo demográfico" con sus rupturas de equilibrio, degradaciones sociales, feroces superexplotaciones, aniquilamientos masivos y ventajas, complicidades y silencios de los ejércitos y de las oligarquías fueron mucho más allá de todo lo previsto.

[If it is necessary to suggest a synthesis, with all its general features, of the process suffered by the Indians of Latin America throughout the 19th century until the positivist period of 1880-1914, it could be said that although many of its features were expected by Humboldt around 1800, this "demographic cataclysm" with its ruptures of equilibrium, social degradations, fierce hyperexplosions, mass annihilation and gains, complicities, and military and oligarchic silence reached beyond everything previously expected] (Viñas 49).

Barbara H. Stein is quoted by Viñas to say that the white Spanish-descended “criollos” declared illegal all those considered remnants of the colonial enclaves of privilege (whites). That is, they allowed the Indians to divide and use their land communally, without paying taxes or having special courts, being given full citizenship with their corresponding rights, all to give the appearance that there was no longer the schism between Indians (the Others) and non-Indians. Instead, the plan was to have nothing more than a division between rich and poor. But in truth, this never took place. Rather, a strong schism widened between
whites and indigenous, further emphasizing the social aftertaste that being white meant being rich and being Indian meant being poor. After this pacification of the Mapuche “polis,” two indigenous social issues were born, both dominating the 19th century, both still being discussed today in the fields of literature, sociology, and political science: “indianismo” and “indigenismo.”

First, “Indianismo, concerned with the portrayal of passive, uncivilized natives in an exotic, erotically charged natural setting, is often aligned with nineteenth-century romanticism and romanticized notions of the Other” (Rosenthal 19). Here we see the Indian treated with that rarity, that Otherness, and because of his being Indian, he is seen as someone outside the context of the construction of nation-states – they belong outside the civilized scheme because they’re rooted in the vast wilderness that Sarmiento describes of his 19th century Argentina in the first section of his monumental Facundo.

Secondly, “Indigenismo is inspired by different cultural contexts and different attitudes toward Otherness. Associated with twentieth-century realism, indigenismo can be characterized as a socially progressive movement that exposes white and mestizo exploitation of Indians and advocates their eventual liberation” (Rosenthal 19). Rosenthal emphasizes that the romanticizing of the Otherness of the Indian in the literary, social and political fields has to do with the lack of indigenous participation in building a nation-state that is viable and beneficial to all parties present, leaving the project in ruins and relegating the indigenous people into the reservation system that is now the ultimate practice of arbitration to pacify Pan American conflicts dealing with territoriality.

For several Latin American countries, the unfortunate “eventual liberation” to the problems rooted in “indigenismo” was to try and whiten the continent, which, according to Tilley, was more viable in Argentina but not in countries with high indigenous and mestizo populations such as México. But she also emphasizes that the Argentine Pampas hosted more of a “cleansing” rather than a “whitening,” which sounds a lot like what happened during the “pacification” of the Mapuches in Chile. European nation-state models, then, could not be carried out in part because of the indigenous problem. “European scientific authority, therefore, seemed to confirm Latin America’s future, in international affairs as in its nations’ domestic growth potential, as permanently inferior and subordinate. Both policy solutions and European theory itself were, therefore, under hot debate” (Tilley 56). As the section explaining the concept of “transformative nation-building” on Page 17 indicates, an issue for México, in particular, is how the high
amount of mestizos was inverse to the distribution of wealth among the small population of whites when México was built as a nation-state in the 19th century. As a matter of fact, skin color and social status still have a very strong correlation that supersedes any mere coincidence in the 21st century:

Racial difference in Mexico is not conceived of as a matter of distinct communities, as it is in the United States and most of Europe, but as a colour continuum with cultural and class associations grafted on. The myth of unitary national identity developed under the PRI [Institutional Revolutionary Party] regime brushed over the differences with the claim that all Mexicans were variations of the basic mix of indigenous and European ancestry. It was nevertheless obvious then, and is arguably even more obvious today, that the vast majority of aspirational figures, outside of sport and the odd folkloric exception, are notably lighter than the vast majority of Mexicans. This is as true of the country’s news anchors and top entertainers as it is of the majority of intellectual opinion formers, business leaders and the models used in almost all advertising (Tuckman 274-275).

Beyond the distribution of wealth, another part of the legacy of the 19th century “transformative nation-building” that gives predilection to whites continues to scar present day México’s concept of beauty, which in turn gives way to status as Tuckman explains above. She further recalls talking to a dark-skinned, 14-year-old Mexican girl named Diana León, who, despite being intellectually bright, was denied the honor of holding the flag during a Monday morning ceremony because “her teacher has already made it clear that the criteria also include being güera, a term used interchangeably in Mexico to mean ‘light skinned’ and ‘pretty.’ ‘There is a lot of racism everywhere’, Diana told me in 2011. ‘I know that if, in the future, I apply for a job as a secretary, my chances of getting it will be very small if there is someone else applying with lighter skin’” (Tuckman 276).

The way 21st century Latin American nation-states are now demographically intermixed, and many times racially explosive, another common challenge directly correlated with and descended from the land usurpation of the 19th century has surged in all countries of the continent: language loss. As Muñoz Cruz denotes, the language loss problem is exacerbated not only by the extreme poverty the modern indigenous person faces after relegation from their native lands to reservations – a direct result of the 19th century, no less – but also by the migration used as a means of bettering the conditions around them, be it by moving around their assigned nation-state or by moving all the way to the United States. What the migration current causes is a “mestizaje,” or a mixing, of worldviews that, although it enhances the cultures of the migrants, it simultaneously reduces them thanks to the process of learning Spanish compulsorily, causing a loss of trust in the possibilities that their own culture and language could become
a mechanism of survival and social renown (Muñoz Cruz 159). The author expands on this contradictory function of “mestizaje” related to migration toward metropolitan living inside their own nation-state:

La urbanización en materia de lenguaje puede describirse como resultado de la operación simultánea de dos procesos antagónicos: uno se refiere a la transformación del tejido social que reduce la funcionalidad de los comportamientos lingüísticos tradicionales y extiende notablemente los espacios de la comunicación interétnica; el otro utiliza la lengua como un medio de identificación y de categorización dentro del mosaico de la masa cosmopolita de usuarios del hablar urbano, que permite delimitar barrios y comunidades en las ciudades.

[Urbanization in the matter of language can be described as a result of the simultaneous operation of two conflicting processes: one refers to the transformation of the social fabric that reduced the functionality of traditional linguistic behaviors and notably extends spaces of inter-ethnic communication; the other uses language as a medium of identification and categorization inside the mosaic of the cosmopolitan mass of users of urban speak, which allows to demarcate cities’ neighborhoods and communities] (Muñoz Cruz 162).

But the author’s research underlines a grand benefit in spite of this oft virulent mélange of cultures and compulsory mastering of European languages, mainly Spanish, in Latin America: that indigenous people can partake in this migration without necessarily having to renounce their ethnolinguistic identity — “sin renunciar necesariamente a la identidad etnolingüística” (162). I like that the writer uses the compound word “ethnolinguistic,” for it reinforces one of my convictions before beginning production of this film — that language and cultural ethnicity are intertwined, and it is equally important to preserve one to preserve the other. One of the premiere examples of a master of bilingualism and ethnolinguistic reinforcement is the Guatemalan K’iche’ poet Humberto Ak’abal. He is known for translating his own works from K’iche’ Mayan to Spanish, and vice-versa, a complex task that has made him restructure his texts as though he were himself two poets in one — “Ak’abal traduce su propia obra del k’iche’ al castellano, o viceversa, tarea compleja que lo ha hecho reestructurar sus textos como si fuera, él mismo, dos poetas en uno” (Lemus).

As Montemayor indicates of indigenous poets who translate their own works to Spanish, “the writers often use the Spanish language not as a neutral vehicle for the translation of a poem or a story but rather as a new space in which to continue creating or re-creating their works” (Montemayor 1).

In his collection, Aikem Tzij: Tejedor de Palabras (Weaver of Words), Ak’abal demarcates his attempt at revitalization of his K’iche’ Maya culture not only by publishing his works in his native tongue, but by translating to Spanish to ensure a broader understanding of his verses from an audience of a larger population. Another very minuscule but significant detail he adds to his book is numbering his pages not just with our Arabic numbers, but also with the Mayan numerals of his ancestors. Here is one of
his poems, translated to Spanish on Page:| |, in which he describes the several layers of meaning behind the act of writing:

**Ajetamanel**

Are chi’ xaq jampa’
kape ri jun rayinik che tz’ib’anik’
man xata rumal weta’m,
xa rumal chi kinb’ano kinturu kinmalama’
xa jewa wa’ kinwetamaj
kinchap jub’iq ucholaj wa jun chak ri’.

Ri le’anik,
ri juyub’,
ri siwan,
ri ojer taq tinimit
k’o ki je’lalaj keta’m ri man kakib’ij taj
rual ri’, kinrayij
kinwesaj uloq pa ri wa’katem,
pa taq ri usaq wuj.

Wa jun je’lik chak ri’,
kinchakuj puwi’ k’isb’al taq q’ij,
xa ta ne k’ex kinna’o
xa man jamal ta nuwech pa ri q’ij.
(Rajawaxik kinchakun che ri uch’akik ri nuwa).

Ri nutz’ib’e ch’aqalik rumal ri jab’
rumal ri rex ja’
xa rumal ri’, k’amon uloq pa taq ri juyub’.

**[Apprentice]**

In these sudden moments
I get the urge to write,
not because I might know, but
because doing it and undoing it
is how I learn this trade and in the end
something remains inside me.

The hills,
the mountains,
the ravines,
the old towns
hold enchanting secrets
and from there surges my desire to take them out to walk
on sheets of paper

This gorgeous trade I have to treat
as extracurricular though it pains me,
because I can’t afford as much time as I would like.
(I must work elsewhere to survive).

My verses have the dampness of rain,
or the tears of the night’s dew, and they cannot be
anything but, for they’ve been brought from the mountain] (Ak’abal 150-151).

In the act of writing, there is potential for the art of healing, as Ak’abal suggests in this poem. But the act of writing can also have the opposite effect: that of “undoing,” much as government-sanctioned historiography has done for indigenous peoples since the 19th century. And with undoing, destruction is most likely a method. When the time came to define spaces and write them down officially as nation-states with appropriate boundaries – also written, rewritten, and recorded – armed conflicts have been the unwritten necessity when there are disagreements between nations, those already-formed and those yet-to-be-annexed into one cohesively built nation.

Space Wars in the Contemporary Maya Context

For many 21st century descendants of the Maya, much like their Mapuche counterparts, the path toward “eventual liberation” involved regaining their land, to be achieved through any means necessary, including what global-minded American politics has dubbed as “terrorism.” The conflict par excellence that has defined the contemporary Maya is the 1994 guerrilla revolt in Chiapas, led by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN). Two of the film’s protagonists are from Chiapas, and they both directly recall the 1994 military confrontations as a series of events that marked their young lives (they were about 11 years old at the time). The movement, which began Jan. 1, 1994, can indeed be defined as “terrorist,” a word with parameters defined later in this essay, as the participants “bomb civilians, clear villages, and execute peasants death-squad style – tactics learned in dirty wars from Guatemala to Argentina,” as Kopkind describes. Still, he continues to depict the movement’s worthiness when framed within its total context:

And yet the revolt of the Chiapanecos is something stunningly new, the first shots of a rebellion consciously aimed at the new world order, the dire consequences of a history that did not die as predicted but intrudes in the most pernicious manner on the way of life of people always overlooked. It is a war against the globalization of the market, against the destruction of nature and the confiscation of resources, against the termination of indigenous peoples and their lands, against the growing maldistribution of wealth and the consequent decline in standards of living for all but the rich (Kopkind 19).

Mayas, like any other indigenous Pan American group, should now understand the concept of
territoriality in the European context under which the third phase of the Mapuche “polis” morphed, considering they have had at least 150 years to understand it. And if the EZLN is truly an indigenous organization, it does indeed understand the link between territory and terrorism, as Kopkind summarized. However, this is the 21st century, so extra conceptual dimensions have to be added and pastiched to define territory in our post-modern context. Elden underlines that it’s necessary to know that:

...the idea that territory, understood to be two-dimensional, destined to be conquered, and easily charted, is passé, and that the ‘war on terror’ is more complex, more multiple, and more diverse. Dimensions beyond those of latitude and longitude – presumably including verticality, and potentially including virtuality and temporality – need to be taken into account. Geographers can, on this reckoning, be relied upon to offer new insights into surveillance to detect unprotected potential targets for terror, or to provide new models by which to ‘measure,’ in a particular sense of calculative politics, what counts as “progress” (Terror xviii).

In its 19th century positivist sense, the idea of progress had much to do with making every effort to create a European economic model, which benefited greatly from usurping foreign soil and using the natives of those lands as cheap (or even free) labor, all the while building a flourishing nation that continues to benefit a small portion of landowners. The 21st century parallel includes neoliberal progress, where we also have a grand socio-economic minority benefitting, and where any “war on terror” justifies the huge capital gains. Again, current-day citizens of nation-states receive the notion that government-sanctioned killings are done in the name of democracy, especially when building new nations and new models of nation-states (see current Iraq and Afghanistan, for example). “Considering the interrelation of the spatial dimension of politics and political dimensions of space provides an important, arguably essential frame for understanding the ‘war on terror’” (Terror xix).

If the 19th century was the context in which pacification led to the formation of current states and borders throughout Latin America, the Pacification of Araucania is a microcosm of how civilization savagely eradicates indigenous peoples to inorganically create a nation and establish inorganic borders. There are four types of nation-building, according to Seymour. First is the maximalist “majority nation-building”: “the culture of the majority group should serve as the focus of cultural convergence” (Seymour 53). Under this theory of state formation, we see the importance for the colonizers to exterminate as many indigenous people as possible: the whites instantly become the majority of the territory, and thus, the territory can be manipulated into a state that serves that majority in a utilitarian manner, forsaking the
rights of the native minority. This is how the United States became a nation-state: as it expanded in territory, it ensured that whites remained the majority by exterminating as many natives as possible.

Secondly, we have the minimalist “constitutional nation-building,” in which the goal is to enshrine “the political values of a political community in a constitutional document that ought to become the focus of nation-building initiatives, which should consist only of the inculcation of these values” (Seymour 53). This method of building a nation virtually took place in the 16th century when the Spanish-Mapuche interrelation saw a mutually beneficial sharing of territory for both parties, and the values of both communities were expressed not by a written constitution, per se, but by an implicit constitution, a social agreement between both parties, which emerged from the art of “Politics, with capital letters” that Cayuqueo exalted in his defense of the Spanish colonizers.

The third nation-building strategy is a hybrid called “transformative nation-building,” in which “the cohesion of a political community depends on its members sharing a ‘thick’ set of cultural references. But they argue not that this culture ought to privilege the cultural symbols and practices of the majority group, but rather that it should build on aspects of the cultures of the society’s cultural sub-units” (Seymour 54). This happens more in countries with a higher percentage of mixed-blooded mestizos, as in México, where Tilley says it would be impossible to create a nation identical to that of Europe. This is because the vast majority of its inhabitants are already linked genetically to that Otherness, it’s the “sub-units” who are the majority of the nation. It becomes, therefore, incompatible to achieve a nation that favors the European ethnicity that formed the state according to its own self-beneficial ideas, as they are a demographic minority, something without precedent in European nation-states and present-day United States.

The fourth strategy is “organic nation-building,” in which “the institutions of a political community must be underpinned by some sense of belonging and common purpose, but they hold that a common culture of the kind required can emerge as an unintended consequences [sic] of the operation of shared political institutions” (Seymour 55). This concept is almost impossible to accomplish in the entire American continent, as the European notions of statehood have seized the entire Pan American geography to demarcate harsh boundaries and either divide or lump together native peoples in all countries. This is not to say movements of organic nation-building are not taking place in the 21st century. The United States has the case of the Lakota Nation petitioning to secede in December 2007. “The withdrawal, hand
delivered to Daniel Turner, Deputy Director of Public Liaison at the State Department, immediately and irrevocably ends all agreements between the Lakota Sioux Nation of Indians and the United States Government outlined in the 1851 and 1868 Treaties at Fort Laramie Wyoming” (“Freedom!”). Part of the Fort Laramie treaty included a general suggestion of boundaries of what the Lakota Nation would be, based on the naturally occurring topography simply needing general terminology such as “the mouth of Yellowstone River,” “the head-waters of the Muscle-shell River,” and “the main range of the Rocky Mountains.” Contrast this to the harshly demarcated boundaries of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Montana based on more modern systems of latitude and longitude. The ongoing struggle to secede from the United States also suggests that various indigenous peoples would form a federation working as one, thus the Lakota Nation would be an organic “polis” of the people who originally occupied this territory that belonged to no one, but simply was.

The transition from such pre-Columbian organic nations toward modern countries is forgotten in the official, state-sanctioned historiography and archeology that present the Indian as a residue of history, not as a full-fledged participant in building a nation’s history. The memory of the Indian becomes fossilized, thus denying that there was an invaluable contribution in sacrificing an organic, autochthonous “polis” to make way for the pacified “polis,” and today giving us a Mexican nation-state with its subsets and its corresponding racial inequalities. The various contemporary Maya peoples are, then, relegated to becoming merely a subset of México’s innumerable types of national subjects. They, like other indigenous sub-groups, tend to receive credit only for their cultural and social contributions on history as written by the government, but they do not receive credit for the political and economic impact they had upon history and the formation of the nation-state. This helps present-day governments to continue giving contemporary indigenous sub-groups the political and economic cold shoulder and to justify that their current state in squalid spaces, such as reservations, are deeply rooted in history. Foucault gives us an audacious critique of such state-sanctioned archaeological descriptions of change:

*Archaeology seems to treat history only to freeze it. On the one hand, by describing discursive formations, it ignores the temporal relations that may be manifested in them; it seeks general rules that will be uniformly valid, in the same way, and at every point in time: does it not, therefore impose constricting figure of a synchrony on a development that may be slow and imperceptible? (Foucault 166).*

In this ossification of the descendants of the Maya as an almost forgotten part of Mexican and
Guatemalan history, state-sanctioned history denies that the indigenous people had their own space, and by denying the existence of their own space, the state also denies that it had destroyed this space to form a nation, be it modern day Belize, República de Guatemala, or the states of Chiapas, Quintana Roo, Tabasco, and Yucatán to be incorporated into the current Estados Unidos Mexicanos.

Elden analyzes this sort of land-grab using Heidegger’s philosophical theories to explain the geographical divisions that exist today, akin to the deforestation of an organic state/space to make way for a modern state/space. “For an answer to the question of the propriety [Eigens] of space, Heidegger returns to language … In ‘space’ [Raum], the word ‘making space’ [Räumen] is spoken. ‘This means: clearing out [roden], to make free from wilderness. Making space brings forth the free, the openness for the settling and dwelling of humans’” (Mapping 90). It’s noteworthy that Heidegger is moving away from definitions of space in Cartesian terms, something Foucault would continue later but with larger amplitude.

For Descartes, according to Elden, “space” was defined in medieval terms as juxtaposed places (lieux): protected sites adjacent to open spaces, sacred places next to profane places; this definition was eventually dissolved by Galileo, who saw in terms of the infinite – spaces were infinitely open – thus, he viewed a thing’s place as only one point in its transition; and finally, its own most recent definition where “Foucault suggests that the understanding of space on the basis of extension has been replaced by the notion of site [emplacement]. ‘The site is defined by relations of proximity [voisonage] between points or elements’ … This entailed space being understood not in terms of extension or mathematical co-ordinates, but in terms of lived experience, nearness and farness, locale and situation” (Mapping 116-117). A shared living experience is what the Mapuche people managed skillfully when living among Spaniards and other Mapuche peoples during their second-stage “polis.”

But by the epoch of pacification in the mid 19th century, the sharing of lived experience and space between Spanish-blooded “criollos” and the Pan American indigenous peoples, including even the pliant and ever-adaptable Mapuches, reached a breaking point. For the descendants of the colonizers, the Galilean definition of space was no longer sufficient for their egoistic purposes, opting instead to define space in Cartesian terms, space in the realm of the physical and the temporal. Their goal was to grab hold of this Cartesian space by military means with the explicit motive of protecting against the “terror” of the “savages,” but with the implicit motive of gaining capital-producing land and its resources. This is a
tradition that today’s neoliberal and highly militarized nation-states continue to follow. “Geographers and others have offered many spatial insights in their analysis of the ‘war on terror.’ This has included looking at the geographical spread of U.S. bases and mapping their interventions in recent years. The ideas of imperialism and colonialism have been given a specifically geographical focus, and the impact on cities has been explored in pioneering ways” (Terror xvii). The destruction of the Pan American Indian’s space and the construction of inter-state borders were, of course, to be achieved by strategic military means, although to justify these military actions, the nation-state needs to redefine the word “destruction” through Heideggerian terminology. “To translate Destruktion as ‘destruction’ emphasizes the violence rather than the de-structuring. Violence may well be a part, but it is a violence of excavation, unbuilding rather than obliteration … As Heidegger himself clarifies: ‘Destruction does not mean destroying [Zerstören] but unbuilding [Abbauen], liquidating [Abtragen], putting to one side the merely historical assertions about the history of philosophy”’ (Mapping 87). Here, we return to the idea that if we destroy/unbuild the organic history of the Pan American Indian, we make way for the official historiography of the American continent’s nation-states, thus allowing the destruction/unbuilding of Pan American Galilean spaces to make way for the construction of inter-American Cartesian spaces consisting of boundaries between emerging nation-states.

Facing the threat of pacification’s destruction (in the Heideggerian Abbauen and Abtragen sense of the word) of the second-stage “polis” achieved by the Mapuche – which would give way to the reservation system and inter-state borders of the third-stage “polis” – the natives of the Araucanian region did not remain with their arms crossed after the military assault of 1861. They preferred death to passively accepting their shackles. “The Mapuche responded, as they had in the past, by staging a major rebellion, from 1869-1870, in which they were defeated and their population further dispersed and socially disrupted” (Mapuche Indians 12). If we were to place those late 19th century Mapuches in our current context, their grand rebellion against the Chilean state would be dubbed “terrorist.” The 1994 uprising in Chiapas was also deemed terrorist by the Mexican state, as the movement’s spokesman Subcommander Marcos recalls of a Feb. 9, 1995 incident involving the state accusing a journalist, who covered the EZLN movement since 1994, of terrorism. “The government began an offensive against the indigenous communities of the Lacandon Jungle and arrested dozens of Mexicans in several parts of the country. It
accused them of ‘terrorism’ and exhibited as proof a ‘threatening’ arsenal: paper bombs and some old weapons” (Marcos 96). It is important to note the double standard used in defining the violence of terror, and how the use of violence is defined and justified differently by the parties involved, even though in the end, violence is violence. As Elden writes, “terror’ is understood in a broad sense – from the practices of the nonstate actors traditionally labeled as terrorist organizations to the actions of states in their international relations; and from the bombs, missiles, and bullets of death and destruction to the imagined geographies of threat and response. States clearly operate in ways that terrify. The terrorism of nonstate actors is a very small proportion of terrorism taken as a whole, with states having killed far more than those who oppose them. This is true in the ‘war on terror’ as in countless other conflicts” (Terror xxi).

The double standard exercised in the destruction caused both by terror and the war on terror is better summarized by the following political cartoon than by any essay about terror:

A cartoon by Andy Singer.

“Terror,” as defined by the American government, cannot be defined or understood without strongly linking the ideas of territory, violence, and subsets of national subjects. Here is part of the official definition from U.S. Code Title 22, Chapter 38, § 2656f:

(2) the term “terrorism” means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents; (3) the term “terrorist group” means any group practicing, or which has significant subgroups which practice, international terrorism;
(4) the terms “territory” and “territory of the country” mean the land, waters, and airspace of the country…

What the official definition does not identify, however, is precisely the dichotomy of destruction caused by both parties involved. Marcos further emphasizes this dichotomy/hypocrisy in his April 6, 1996 essay on history repeating itself:

While through the press the government congratulated itself for having recovered its ‘national sovereignty,’ in the Lacandon Jungle, Swiss planes bombarded the communities’ surroundings, North American helicopters machine-gunned the mountain, French tanks occupied the homes of the indigenous who were fleeing into the jungle, Spanish policemen interrogated suspects, and North American military advisers checked very carefully an artifact that might contain some dangerous military device. This artifact traveled all the way to the Pentagon and was checked by the military’s most advanced technological devices … The report said that all evidence on the artifact in question, snatched from transgressors of the law, indicated that the object might be…a little toy car, made of metal and plastic (Marcos 96-97).

We see that the struggle of terrorist agents is precisely for territory, but we also need to realize that state-sanctioned military (anti-terror agents) struggle for Cartesian space – land, water, air – that is, what is converted into capital for the nation-state. The terrorism that was exercised by Pan American militaries against the Pan Indigenous people of the 19th century to create the nation-state is forgotten by the ossification of indigenous memory, thus giving more of the polysemic sense of the word “terrorist” to the rebel Mayan Indian and furthering the military from being accused of terrorism. Although, many questions still remain unresolved by a nation-state’s official historiography and the dichotomy/hypocrisy of terrorism:

¿No hubo vencidos? ¿No hubo violadas? ¿O no hubo indias ni indios? ¿O los indios fueron conquistados por las exhortaciones piadosas de la civilización liberal-burguesa que los convenció para que se sometieran e integraran en paz? ¿Y qué significa “integrarse”? … Todos esos interrogantes, especialmente ahora, necesito aclararlos. Lo intentaré, trataré de hacerlo. Dado que, francamente, no me convence la versión que me ofrece el circuito liberal de 1879 hacia acá.

[Were there no vanquished men? Were there no raped women? Or were there no Indian women or Indian men? Or were the Indians conquered by the pious admonitions of a bourgeois-liberal civilization that persuaded them to subject themselves and integrate in peace? … All these interrogatives, especially today, I need to clear up. I will try, I’ll try to do it. Given that, frankly, I am not convinced by the version that the liberal circuit has offered me from 1879 until today] (Viñas 18).

It’s all too plausible that these questions will not be totally resolved, but by trying to answer them, Viñas, Foucault and Elden give us plenty to ponder. Mainly, they make us aware of the government-sanctioned historiography of oblivion, which Viñas critiques as “the version that the liberal circuit has offered me,”
justifies that not only will national subjects today be relegated into sub-units of their nation-state, but they will also be labeled as “terrorists” if they try to reclaim their Galilean and Foucauldian space through the same violence and brute force used by state-sanctioned militaries to keep their conquered Cartesian space in place.

Conclusion

The contemporary Maya has gone through the first and third stages that the Mapuche “polis” underwent since the Spanish conquest, and we could say that their ongoing struggle through the EZLN could lead them to the second-stage “polis” they did not enjoy because they were immediately subjugated into slavery and eventually into the reservation system. Since the eruption of the Zapatista conflict, Mexicans have been bombarded with propaganda from all political spectra and all political interests to make up their mind about the movement’s worthiness or lack thereof. But perhaps those villagers who “remain very resentful and fault the guerrillas for provoking the massacres and destruction,” as Manz describes a handful of survivors of the Guatemalan civil war whom she interviewed, are the ones entitled to the most moderate and neutral viewpoint of the indigenous conflicts in the Maya region. They best summarize the dichotomy of bloody indigenous struggles: movements once rooted in a grand orderly cause of restoring equality that ended up in a grand violent mess of lingering inequality. Rebels might have started as noble fighters, but it seems like they let go of their ideals and ended up as ineffective, romanticized rock stars, with the personification of the southern Mexican conflict’s leadership, Marcos, being no exception. As Castañeda observes:

He appeared on every TV show, flattered and infatuated every foreign correspondent and fellow traveler, and captured the imagination of thousands of Mexicans and tens of thousands of Europeans. He came to personify, more than ever before, a social fighter in a Mexico that, through the wide-spread identification of the struggle with its leader, remained perhaps more anachronistically individualist than ever before. Whether Marcos and his comrades sincerely tried to de-individualize the Chiapas rebellion and simply failed, or whether he was unable to resist the temptation to become an international celebrity is irrelevant from this perspective. The combination of worldwide stage lights, Mexico’s persistent, congenital, individualist “chip,” and his own predilection for glamour resulted in another typically Mexican complete identification of a movement with its jefe [chief]. Marcos was not “postmodern,” revolutionary, or different, despite his talent for the coup de théâtre or the brilliant quip or stylish pose (always smoking a pipe through his disguise). He became, and probably was always destined to be, another failed and fallen Mexican idol, who wasted away his considerable political capital and talent, as he waded
into the endless, esoteric, antiglobalization, “Another World Is Possible” discussions in the intellectual and student neighborhoods of southern Mexico City (Castañeda 31).

It is clear from this sharp critique that Marcos and the indigenous movements possess the charisma, skill, and leadership necessary to become quite capable of politics that would promote changes in the living conditions of the 21st century contemporary Maya. But this change will not happen with mere theatrical, rhetorical politics. It will only happen if indigenous leaders are able to adeptly use the “Politics, with capital letters” that are so important to champions of compromise and action like Cayuqueo.

Putting aside all my realist cynicism, my hope is that all Pan American peoples will achieve the same mutually beneficial inter-relationship that Mapuches and Chilean Spaniards enjoyed in their second-stage “polis.” I also hope all Pan Indigenous military struggles are not for naught, but that both nation-state and national sub-units can put aside their guns and work toward a better, more utilitarian Latin America for all its peoples, Others and whites alike. Though it might help, the modern Maya need not look all the way to Chile for a model of successful inter-relations with the outside, globalized western world. They have such figure in one of their own: La Malinche, also known as Marina, “the truly first Mexican,” as Castañeda dubs her, for being able to successfully coexist with Hernán Cortés and the pioneers of the Spanish conquest in México, be it as translator, confidante (and, yes, lover), or best yet, Politican, with capital letters. “La Malinche simply used her considerable talents and charm to make a virtue out of necessity, and extricate herself splendidly from quite a mess. Other Mexicans followed her path over the coming centuries, though seldom with her success or cynicism” (Castañeda 7).

From my experiences, the four protagonists in this film are equally adept Politicians who are successfully navigating through this 21st century globalized world while remaining true to their peoples and themselves. As I learned during production of the film, one of the tenants of Maya thought is the importance of a person’s discovery of a guardian animal, a totem if you will, which guides this person throughout life once they know who they are. One of the protagonists has the owl as her totem, and I made sure to include plenty of owl imagery, even a Mayan piece of music titled “Owl.” If history has been a blanket of darkness for indigenous peoples, it is important to cope with such obfuscation, be it by overcoming it or leaving it behind, much as the bat and owl cope with the nighttime. I end this section with
a poem by Ak’abal titled “Darkness“ and dedicate it to all the descendants of the Maya who have found themselves:

**Oscuridad**

Los murciélagos esconden la oscuridad debajo de sus alas;  
los tecolotes, detrás de sus ojos

**Q’equmal**

Ri e sotz’ kikik’u’ ri q’equmal chi kixe’ ri kixik’;  
Ri e tukur chirij ri kib’oq’och.

**[Darkness]**

Bats hide darkness under their wings;  
owls, behind their eyes] (Ak’abal 300-301).
PRODUCTION NOTES

A major key to success in graduate school, like most of life, is flexibility. But flexibility must have a solid backbone of structure for it to work. In my role as a graduate teaching assistant, I began each semester writing a syllabus with a strict set of guidelines, expectations, even an obsessively detailed scheduling of each day's lesson plan, all working toward the goals of the course, also detailed and outlined for all to see as the semester’s roadmap. With that said, once I established the goals and expectations of the class, I learned I could be flexible and every once in a while give my students a chance to explore the theoretical and practical issues of their chosen field on their own, without the need to be physically present in a classroom setting. Though this might seem like taking too many liberties from compulsory, traditional public schooling, I always referred back to the goals and expectations and never ever left off one lesson plan or one goal unaccomplished, or one bit of information unlearned before semester’s end.

I make a documentary film the way I’ve taught my classes. I am very detailed and organized when preparing for the film, especially during the pre-production phase when my research allows me to define the goals of the film. I refuse to take a camera with me without having thoroughly thought about what kind of film I’m willing to make, so as to not waste my time, my subject’s time, or even precious gigabytes of space on my memory card. Even if my outline is no more than undeveloped ideas, the main thing before heading out and start filming is to remember the goals of your film. Always keep your eyes on the prize. But at the same time, all the prep work is for naught if, once you start filming, you realize that some ideas have to morph, or some bits of information will not fit with others, some interviews don’t fit at all... So the best solution to the frustration that happens when your film is not going according to your original plan is to be – you guessed it – flexible.

In the case of Taak in Sutik, the same basic set of goals remained unscathed from the beginning:

1. This film will be about indigenous Latin Americans keeping their languages and their cultures alive in the 21st century.

2. This film will have at the very least four protagonists so the audience can have different voices expressing one same experience.
3. This film will showcase literature in some form or multiple forms, as Spanish literature is my secondary area of study.

4. This film will have protagonists oscillating between the narrative and the philosophical/intellectual for 30 minutes or less.

5. This film will not be a plaintive assault on globalization or the Spanish conquest, but will show how western and indigenous can coexist.

The idea of making this film came to me serendipitously in early 2011, I think in February. I was hard at work on Mountain Man, my first documentary, and I still hadn’t settled on what my thesis film would be. I had been writing an absurdist play called Aberdeen Mother and remembered that when I took a graduate-level Hispanic-American theater course my senior year, one of my classmates wrote a play about her mother. The classmate, Veronikha Salazar, is a Quechua woman from Perú whose first language is her indigenous tongue, but unlike most Latin Americans, her second language was not Spanish, but rather English. I thought, surely, if I try to stage part of her play and film it, the story would immediately become captivating and I would fill my Spanish language literature requirement. This was not my first film idea, though. When I first applied to grad school in 2009, I told Professor Carpenter that I had been thinking of eventually making a film about Adriana, my Cuban friend and former co-worker at The Orlando Sentinel. She left Cuba around when the Soviet Bloc collapsed, therefore squashing the island’s economy. It all sounded well and good, Carpenter told me, but the amount of traveling required for this project might go beyond my monetary and logistical abilities. So the whole time during my graduate studies, I’d been mulling over what could be a more viable backup plan, and when the idea of doing a film on Veronikha came to me, I ran with it. Although, once I suggested the idea to Veronikha herself, she was hesitant about it – she’s always carrying her photo camera with her, but she is shy about actually being on camera. She did want to be in the film in the end, but she suggested talking to a Maya woman who has a business called World Treasures on Block Avenue in downtown Fayetteville, as she is not camera shy at all and loves to promote her culture. That’s when I knew this project would be viable, that I would have Vero in it, but I would feature the woman, Lucía, more prominently.
Also, in March 2011, when I asked Professor Restrepo to be in my thesis committee as he is an expert on indigenous literature, he suggested to interview this Maya poet who’s visiting Fayetteville for about two months to learn English. He was part of the Spring International intensive language-learning program. I contacted the guy so he would merely read some of his poetry. He ended up giving me a very long and valuable interview along with one of his poems titled “Taak in Sutik.” The poet, Hilario, seemed destined to have an essential role in the film from the beginning – even if the footage of him was just the interview and the poem without much B-roll to go with his interview (he was heading to Bolivia the next day to finish his master’s coursework and eventually returning to Quintana Roo, México). As Hilario was cleaning out his apartment, I saw an old friend and former co-worker from *The Arkansas Traveler*, Jimmy Bowie. He was shocked to see me, a former newspaper guy, with a camera hooking Hilario up with a microphone. Jimmy asked me what this was all about, and I explained my project. He smiled and said, “Dude, we have plenty of indigenous folks coming every nine weeks. Come back and I can help you contact them.” Without Jimmy’s help and serendipitous appearance on the scene, I would have struggled mightily to find protagonists for the film, but once he reassured me, he helped breathe life into my now-official thesis film project.

My first outline had the above-mentioned five goals in mind, but the actual content therein is completely, totally, utterly different from the final outline (see Appendix A). The first outline was a three-act story in which the first act would have been a discussion of the role of the Latin American indigenous peoples in the 21st century. The second act would be the meat of the film, devoting a significant chunk of time to each protagonist from each of the four countries I would eventually have at hand: México (Tzotzil Maya or Purhépecha), Guatemala (Kaqchikel Maya), Perú (Quechua), and Chile (Mapuche). The third act would be the take-away message: a mélange of all the voices reaffirming that all indigenous peoples indeed have a place in 21st century globalized society and are full-fledged contributors to it. This film still included Veronikha in my plans, but because she left for another job in Georgia before I got a chance to interview her, I knew I would have to find another Quechua person to replace her spot and keep my original outline in place.

The first indications that the original outline was going to change, however, happened during the fourth interview, which was María’s. At that time, March 2012, I realized I had two Maya women and one
Maya man talking and sharing insights that, if they weren’t altogether similar, they complemented each other fantastically. Something that helped me enormously to realize this – and I’m very glad I started to realize it at that stage – is my uncanny memory for remembering piquant sound bites from previous interviews, even months after they happened and without having had transcribed them. I started remembering insights from Hilario from almost a year before I had the inkling that María would be in Arkansas. And I also remembered stories Lucía told me a few months before, which resonated with what María said. So it was that day, March 10, 2012, when I started toying with the idea of including only Maya people in the film, even though a few weeks before I had interviewed Valentín Ccasa, a Quechua man from Perú, who was going to flawlessly replace Veronikha’s spot in the outline.

Still, I wanted to continue with the plan of having at least one protagonist from each country – I even started turning away other indigenous people from México because I thought I would overload the film with too many Mexicans and not enough from the rest of Latin America. The main thread to my story, so I thought, would be for each protagonist to answer the following question: “What role do your peoples have in 21st century globalized society in regard to territory and the building of nation-states?” This was my attempt to keep in line with the research I’d conducted in my 19th century Latin American literature class. Even though the question was complex and difficult, each participant had an astoundingly answer to this question, showing how vast the quantity and quality of their scholarship was. Their answers were long and well thought out, without a hint of vacillation from solid critical thinking. The sound bites were long and wonderful as they were, and I was thrilled at first. The problem once I turned off the camera, though, became this: I have only 30 minutes to tell this story, and it is already bloating beyond the ability of the most talented editor to cut down to small, palatable sound bites. In other words, the long answers were perfect the way they were, and I didn’t want to fix something that wasn’t broken.

By the end of shooting, concluding May 2012, I had decided to interview any and all indigenous subjects who were studying in Spring International. So I even interviewed members of peoples not listed in the original outline, plus one last Maya man, Julio, just to see if I could do something with it. Once I put away the cameras for good and took the footage to catalogue in the editing room, I confirmed what I had suspected back in March: the original outline was going to be either 86’d or transformed into something more workable. It took a prolonged look at Julio’s footage to realize what a gem I had captured on film.
My co-photographer and de facto associate producer, Bernard Oliver, had shot it outdoors right at magic time and captured a spectacular image: the splendor of the sun scintillating over the camera lens and reflecting around Julio’s aura. It wasn’t so much the image alone, but the sound corresponding to the image. Julio was talking about how indigenous languages directly affect a “cosmovision” (worldview) completely different from western understanding.

The synchronicity of the moment was almost enough for me to decide that Julio had to be in the final film. But the decision hinged mainly on listening to his interview in its entirety. His words fit perfectly with the words of the other three Maya people I had previously interviewed. Even though these four people had probably not met in person (except for Julio and María), it was as though I could have had them in the same room, and they would all nod and agree as they spoke, or they would probably complete one another’s sentences. The next stage would be to rewrite the outline into its current form (see Page 37).

Now that I had decided on focusing exclusively on the four Mayas, the outline had to be rewritten not by giving each person a chunk of space independent of one another, but by having all four complement each other’s sentences and ideas. Rather than transcribing each and every word the protagonists spoke, I created a timeline on Adobe Premiere and divided it into four sequences, one titled “Lucía,” another one titled “Hilario,” one titled “María,” and another one for “Julio.” I placed their entire interviews on each sequence, and started cutting away into only the best sound bites. Once I broke up each interview, I started looking for patterns, the instances when one person’s insight complemented another. Thus I arrived at another set of sequences, one titled “Lenguaje y Cosmovisión” (“Language and Worldvew”), another one called “2012,” another one called “Beauty,” another one called “Ser Indigena/Regresar” (“Being Indigenous/Returning”). I started pasting the four protagonists’ sound bites regarding each theme next to each other, and I started transcribing only when I saw that these sound bites did indeed work with each other. Once I had the main themes of the film, I could write my outline to guide me during the script writing and final editing process. So the film became divided into six parts, with a prolonged open and three acts. As my secondary area of study was Spanish literature, I wanted to ensure my outline reflected this. To keep the philosophical divisions of the film in place, I used the structure of *The Popol Vuh*, the Maya creation myth, to divide the narrative of the story into six fluid
sequences. I also used the three main divisions of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* to demarcate three acts of the film, as I wanted to make sure to exalt the idea of a post-modern odyssey. By mixing these two structures, I also planned to theoretically emphasize one of the five original goals of the film, which is to show that indigenous and western can peacefully coexist and complement one another, be it in literature, in film, or in quotidian life.

The script writing process went smoothly, mainly because I saved plenty of time by remembering those piquant sound bites and by not wasting time transcribing the words that would end up in the digital cutting room floor anyway. For inspiration toward this project, I watched many documentaries starting in January 2012 and paid attention to their structure and how the script writing reflects that structure. The most important documentaries I watched were part of the *America’s Game* series from the NFL Network. Each of the Super Bowl-winning teams received a documentary film treatment to detail their story of struggle and sacrifice from the beginning of the season (or even as far back as the hiring of the film’s protagonists) until their eventual crowning as champions. The first film I watched was merely out of personal curiosity, I wasn’t even thinking of using it as research for my thesis film. As the New York Giants were set to play the New England Patriots in the Super Bowl, a rematch of the 2008 grand prize, I started wondering how it all played out. The Giants were a bottom-seeded, wild-card team that began the season poorly but exploded at season’s end and went undefeated, even on the road, against the mightiest regular-season teams during the playoffs – in both 2008 and 2012! I had to find out how the Giants did it, and looked for the YouTube highlights of Super Bowl XLII to see an indication of how Super Bowl XLVI would play out. Not only did I find a 10-minute clip of the heart-thumping final minutes of the fourth quarter, I also found a 44-minute documentary about the Giants’ quest for glory. *America’s Game: The 2007 New York Giants* was fascinating as it took three protagonists – Coach Tom Coughlin, Quarterback Eli Manning, and Defensive End Michael Strahan – to describe their mutual quest to earn a Super Bowl ring. I enjoyed how the three men’s interviews complemented each other fabulously, and even though they were interviewed independently of one another, it seemed like they were interviewed side by side because of how well the interviews flowed against one another. I took note of how the script writers banked on these common themes.
From there, I continued searching for more *America’s Game* documentaries, this time taking notes about the films’ structures, the producers’ choices for scenes, how the scenes flowed naturally, and again, how the interviewees complemented each other without being physically together in the green room, but bound together in their experience of earning a ring. I immediately sought the story of the 1972 Miami Dolphins, my favorite team, and took note of how Coach Don Shula, Running Back Larry Csonka and Defensive Tackle Manny Fernandez once again complemented each other’s stories fabulously. The films about the 2002 Tampa Bay Buccaneers, the 2006 Indianapolis Colts, the 1994 San Francisco 49ers, and the 1998 Minnesota Vikings (in the *Missing Rings* spin-off) were subjected to my meticulous research, as I sat down and broke the films apart into its structural parts to see how they fit together (see Appendix B).

Though the subjects of American football and indigenous people are two completely different subjects (barring athletes like Jim Thorpe), I was convinced that *America’s Game* provided the best structure and look I wanted to achieve in my thesis film. Barring the use of a narrator in the films (James Gandolfini, Alec Baldwin, for example), the *America’s Game* series had the same set of rules I wanted: a handful of protagonists explaining one similar, shared-experience, with archival footage and photographs to go in between the interviews, and dramatic music to engage the viewer into feeling what the protagonists feel. I shared my idea with Professor Foley, and he agreed that this was a good series to follow and to look at how the producers used the same, almost formulaic pattern in all the films. This is how they get you hooked into the film, he added. I went back to my notes and saw the common theme—each sequence started with low conflict that intensified at the end, with the release point being the final, game-winning drive or the feeling of elation when the team captain holds up the trophy toward the end of the film. I went back to watch the films about the 2008 Pittsburgh Steelers, the 2009 New Orleans Saints, and the 2010 Green Bay Packers, just to see if I could predict the structure of the films without writing anything down. I could.

Something I thoroughly enjoyed about watching the *America’s Game* series was the cinematography. The series began in 2006, already at a time when high-definition camera equipment was becoming the norm. The interviews, even though they are no more than medium close-ups of the protagonists’ faces, are fascinating to look at in gorgeous high definition. Then when they are smelted into
archival footage with lower definition (as in the case of the 1972 ‘Phins or the 1994 Niners), the result is even more pleasing. We get to see not only an obvious, clashing change in technology that parallels the passing of the decades, but the viewer also sees how combining seemingly incompatible film quality enhances the film’s storytelling prowess. In other words, seeing Larry Csonka in 2006 vividly reminisce about himself in 1972 and see the grainy footage to match his detailed storytelling creates a visual and aural experience that, to me, was heavenly because of how contradictory it feels. The grainy footage immediately takes the viewer to a distant era, but the vivid present-day storytelling in high definition really brings it home. The cognitive disassociation between the analog and the digital makes it feel as though there really was no technological shift over the decades. Through this experience, my mind tricked me into seeing the archival footage not as old, but as vivid as if high definition was alive and well in the 1970s. In my film, I wanted the same look: my protagonists’ interviews filmed in digital high definition, but through their vivid storytelling intertwined with lower-definition footage, make the viewers have the same Csonkaesque experience I had.

As the UA documentary film program is more production-oriented than technically so (look for an MFA program to master the camera, sound, and editing elements), my main goal was always to have a cohesive, flowing story well told, and not worry so much about the shooting. With that said, I did want to have the best possible look, which is why I enlisted Bernard to help me shoot some of the interviews, especially those needing artificial light. Me, I can shoot without a problem when there is plenty of sunlight, but it takes plenty of skill to shoot adeptly in lower-light settings. For example, shooting inside Lucia’s business, World Treasures, was not ideal without lighting equipment, so I made up for it by increasing the camera’s shutter speed. Another reason to have Bernard as my assistant was to ensure that sound levels were in check. I have struggled in the past maintaining good sound quality, and having Professor Carpenter remind us that you can get away with mediocre shooting but not with mediocre sound, I definitely wanted someone like Bernard to ensure the sound levels were good. I also had help from production assistant Andrey Dumchev in understanding how user-friendly Adobe Premiere is when fixing and adjusting sound levels, and through his guidance, I was able to stabilize interview volumes before I started cutting sound bites apart. We still did end up with some fizzy sounds here and there, and at one point during Julio’s interview, the microphone makes a crispy sound. But all in all, I remember that those
sound problems are minimal compared to my previous efforts (*Mountain Man*, for example), and that minor sound problems in *Taak in Sutik* can be forgiven as long as I have a captivating story.

The editing phase went as smoothly as the script writing, again because I already had a clear idea of how I wanted the film to look. It was definitely a blessing being both script writer and editor, as I was always thinking as an editor while writing, and as a writer while editing. While I was looking for sound and laid down my sequences on the timeline with the interviews, I was already looking for the archival footage or still images that would complement the interviews or serve as transition points between interviews. For archival images, again to achieve that Csonkaesque effect, I looked for public-domain footage and photographs, as frankly I did not have the money to pay exorbitant amounts for moving images. Plus, I had the unpleasantness on *Mountain Man* of requesting to use footage from the University of Pennsylvania in a non-profit, educational-purposes fashion, and still get rejected and handed a bill for each 30 seconds of film I intended to use. I learned my lesson and decided to scrap the UPenn footage in favor of U.S. Government film, which as long as it is paid with our taxes, the public can use freely. I cannot stress how invaluable Archive.org has been in all my films. For this one, I found footage of the Zapatista movement in both 2001 and 2010, plenty of Mayan music with free-to-use licenses, footage of what is now called the Mayan Riviera (let’s be honest, I had neither the money nor time to travel to southern México to film those places just to have B-roll), and even some photographs. Also, the Public Resource channel on YouTube provides countless archival government films free for us to use. There, I found 30 minutes of 1950s CIA footage on the remnants of the Maya empire, which provided valuable B-roll in my film.

Organization was key. I reaffirmed that I needed to be very organized with my editing bins, separating archival images and high-definition footage, to make the editing process more manageable. Also, learning how to use Adobe Premiere was a very valuable skill, as this program proved to be much more manageable when mixing archival images with high-def footage because there is no need to render every time old footage is inserted into the timeline. This helped me organize my time much more efficiently. Even though I had originally thought about learning to use After Effects, once I started writing I didn’t see the need to use special effects at all, opting for simple, traditional cuts and dissolves. The closest I came to making “fancy” edits was at the beginning of the film, in which I introduce the three
students learning English. I cropped three pieces of footage of each student and made the three fit on the screen. I figured out that to get this effect, I only had to use the “Crop” tool in Adobe Premiere, and a 3-D wipe that moves the image from left to right, aligning everything evenly. Again, no need to use After Effects for this imagery.

What I learned from this experience is incalculable. First of all, I learned the value of working by myself, as I could simultaneously think as producer, photographer, editor and writer and was always thinking about how to be as efficient as possible to help those four roles complement one another. I also learned the value of working in a team setting, especially when it was becoming clear I couldn’t possibly do this all by myself. I started missing my experience making Mountain Man with two other teammates, especially the camaraderie and the cooperation that took place to achieve the same common goal. This is when I see Bernard’s contribution to the film as huge, not just as a gifted photographer, but also as a confidante and a friend when, sometimes, that’s the main fuel that keeps the filmmaking experience going smoothly. In regard to friendship, filmmaking (both documentary and narrative) can go a lot more smoothly if the filmmakers and protagonists have the bond of trust and understanding. With Hilario, I clicked instantly and we still keep in touch electronically on a regular basis. With María, we clicked in that we were both interested in the same topic of filmmaking, though there was always the tension that she knows more than me (academically, life experience wise, and definitely in filmmaking) and it is always weird when making a film about a filmmaker. With Julio, I learned my lesson from before and immediately started hanging out with him and introducing him to the Dickson scene, and we almost right away clicked with our interest in guitar. Even though, just like with María, I sensed that Julio knew he was much smarter than me, and let’s face it, they both are! And I’m proud to admit it. With Lucía, I shot all her stuff in one day, as she was leaving to Guatemala the following day (not unlike Hilario), and because she’s been away for so long, it’s been hard to stay in constant contact with her. I am still going to try to pry into her world, though, but I’m conscientious that she is infinitely busy with her business and her family.

I also learned, or rather, reaffirmed the importance of flexibility through structure. If I had stuck to my original idea of a film about Latin American indigenous folks, I would probably not meet my thesis defense deadline. I’m glad the project transformed and morphed, and most importantly, I’m glad the original goals of the film remained intact. The film can still improve through cutting away some sound bites.
here and there, as little as two minutes and as much as five minutes, but for this, I will need a few outside perspectives to guide me. All in all, though, I am pleased with the film, as I’ve captured a mix of esoteric and academic, powerful images and powerful stories, and a shared four-way perspective that should enlighten some viewers who have never seen life through indigenous people’s worldviews – me included.

There isn’t anything I’d do over, but if anything, there is something left unfinished: a short film about the other folks I interviewed, and the film I’ve been hoping to create since 2009 about my Cuban friend. I am very proud of all I’ve accomplished through this program, culminating with my film, and as I go into the “real world” of post-graduate life, I will continue to remember how the mix of structure and flexibility was the tool of success for my two years in this master’s program.
OUTLINE

TAAK IN SUTIK (I WANT TO RETURN)

I. Open (Preamble)
   A. Statistics on how dire language loss is in the world. Introduce the film’s four protagonists, who are special because they are saving their languages and, therefore, their cultures. They are descendants of the Mayas.
   B. Open with the poem, “Taak in Sutik,” as an ode to what I call the “Maya mother.”

THE TELEMACHIAD

II. Protagonists (Part 1 – Account of creation of living beings)
   A. Introduce Lucía López’s basic story as a businesswoman.
   B. Introduce Julio Aguilar’s basic story as a student and agronomist.
   C. Introduce María Dolores Arias’ basic story as student and filmmaker.
   D. Introduce Hilario Chi as a poet and guardian of Mayan language.

THE ODYSSEY

III. Language and Cosmovision (Part 2 – Lineage of principal figures)
   A. Include all protagonists explaining how their language, passed down from their ancestors, ties in with their unique worldview.

IV. Media v. Maya (Part 3 – Creation of humans, first dawn)
   A. The characters talk about the beauty of their features, their culture and how the media deny a creation of a true Maya cultural self by divulging stereotypes. The 2012 myth is overblown by the media as well.

V. Modernity (Part 4 – Migration and division)
   A. Discuss how modern Mayas are coping with keeping their traditions, yet embracing this globalized society.

THE NOSTOS

VI. Ithaca
   A. All four protagonists explain why they are eager to return home, and how their knowledge of globalized American culture will benefit them when they return.
SCRIPT

TAAK IN SUTIK (I WANT TO RETURN)

Note: Narration/interviews are in bold, up-nats-full are in regular font.

I. Open (Preamble)

The lunar eclipse on the winter solstice of 2010 is the background to the following text. The various phases of the eclipse dissolve into one another, the moon waning to mimic the loss of indigenous languages in the world.

Music: “Sut U Suutuk” by Tumben K’ay.

Title: “Of the estimated 7,000 languages spoken in the world today, linguists say, nearly half are in danger of extinction and likely to disappear in this century. In fact, one falls out of use about every two weeks.”
- The New York Times
  Sept. 17, 2007

Title: This is the story of four people who are protecting their languages and their cultures in a globalized world.

Dissolve

Title: This is the story of four people who descended from the Maya.

Taak in Sutik

(I Want to Return)

A film by José López Bribiesca

Keep the eclipsed red moon up as the poet Hilario declaims his poem. Dissolve into CU of his mouth and heart to symbolize the giving of a voice to the modern Maya, whose language is rooted in the heart (as explained in the film).

Hilario:
(39:15:22)
Taak in sutik a xìmbal yéetel u múuk’ in t’óon.
Taak in sutik a múuk’ yéetel u múuk’ in puksi’ik’al.

Taak in sutik a che’ej yéetel u ki’imakil in wóol.
Taak in sutik u tojil a wóol yéetel u tojil in wóol,
a kuxtal yéetel in kuxtal.
(39:31:18)
(I want to return your steps
with the strength of my legs.
I want to return your strength
with the force of my heart.

I want to return your smile
with my happiness.
I want to return your health
with my health,
your life with my life.)

Title:
Starring

Lucía López Pérez
Businesswoman
Kaqchikel Maya
Hometown: San Antonio Palopó, Guatemala

Julio Aguilar Ruiz
Agronomist
Tzeltal Maya
Hometown: Ocosingo, Chiapas, México

María Dolores Arias Martínez
Filmmaker
Tzotzil Maya
Hometown: Chenalhó, Chiapas, México

Hilario Chi Canul
Poet
Yucatec Maya
Hometown: Naranjal Poniente, Q, Roo, México
II. Protagonists

Various images of moving vehicles as the day begins for Fayettevillians.

Title:
Fayetteville Arkansas, USA

Move into World Treasures store, where a customer walks in to greet Lucía, who’s already hard at work. It’s Christmas time, btw.

(04:32:05)
Customer 1: Ho ho ho!

Lucía: Ho ho ho, how are you? (Gives and counts change to another customer. The phone rings, and she answers. She has a conversation in Kaqchikel Mayan with her nephew.) (04:48:02)

Lucía:
(23:21:18) I’m from Guatemala. I come from the Lake of Atitlán. It’s such a lovely place. And now I’m here in the United States. (23:30:15)

(24:38:03) My parents named me Lucía López. But in Kaqchikel it’s “xtaluz” (?). (24:44:07)

(24:58:23) “Xtaluz” means “light.” So some people say, “You are a light.” And I say, “I don’t know about that.” (25:11:27)

(23:32:14) And I have five children total and a granddaughter. My husband is Jerry Gene Hall, and this business is ours. (23:42:00)

(47;34;10)
Customer 2: How’s the family doing?

Lucía: Just fine. Everybody’s fine, just been busy. Jerry Gene’s busy, the kids is busy, everything. But it’s good. (47;46:23)

Music: “Caverna” by Balam.

Now switch to an art class, where Julio is hard at work painting a two-faced mask, which represents his outer self (persona) and his inner self (anima).

Title:
Julio, María and Hilario earned the prestigious Ford Foundation Fellowship.

Title:
They are studying English intensively for nine weeks as part of their scholarship.

Julio continues to explain the meaning behind his mask.

(52:02:10)
Julio: OK, this is my face. Umm… I… I have two… two face. Umm, two colors. Uh… it’s represented, represented two, two, uh… cultural, no, two language indigenous. The first, Tzeltal. And second, Tojolabal. Both, both, both language are only, only one: Maya. Maya, it’s, mainly, and Tzeltal. Tzeltal y
Tojolabal. But, umm, I, I speak better Tzeltal. (52:00:12)

Go to the interview of Julio.

Julio:
(02:57:14)
My name is Julio Aguilar. I'm from an "ejido" called Champa San Agustín. (03:04:13)
(01:09:24) I come from an "ejido," my community where we only speak Tzeltal as our mother tongue. (01:17:19)
(00:31:08) I was 14 when I learned to speak Spanish in a more fluent manner. (00:36:17)
(00:14:03) Now I am studying English. I'm trying to learn and expand my knowledge. (00:09:03)

Back to the persona/anima mask exercise.

(53:04:22)
Buri: What is on the inside of your mask?
Julio: OK. Inside, uh… My color is, uh, white, black and red. Umm… for me, the color, uh, white and, it, it, it means, um, the, the, you know, paz? I don’t know exactly how to say, paz. Peace.
Buri: Peace.
Julio: Peace, the, the white, uh… no, black, black color. It’s the peace. And the red, uh, because in my, umm… When I, I was, umm, 10 or 15 years old in my country, mainly in, in Chiapas, it’s a mov— a movement, indigenous movement and a war, the war, the EZLN, I think. Umm, many people, umm, many people died. (54:19:15)

Fade into images of the Chiapas conflict and progress into María’s narrative of how the war shaped her decision to become a journalist. Nats of EZLN sympathizers shouting, turned low as María introduces herself.

María:
(11:29:15) I’m Maria Dolores Arias Martínez. (11:32:00)
(12:49:02) I’m earning my master’s in documentary filmmaking at the University of Chile. (12:55:00)
(13:02:10) Everything began after 1994, when the Zapatista movement blew up in Chiapas. It was a movement that demanded equality and that indigenous peoples be taken into account. It was a movement that helped the world turn toward Chiapas, to that small corner in México that previously no one paid attention to or knew existed. It was after the Zapatista movement that I became interested in mass communications. I watched TV and at that moment I decided I wanted to study the media and to give other people the opportunity to find out what took place at that time. My town was full of reporters, even people from other countries who came to cover the stuff from ’94. But all the news were in Spanish, English or other languages. And my people didn’t know what was happening. At that moment I asked myself, Why do the media not give space to indigenous people? Why should our language be lesser than any other language? (14:22:02)

More images of a more current Zapatista silent march in San Cristóbal, near María’s hometown. This to show that the struggle continues into the 2010s.

Hilario:
(47;28;06) Sometimes silence is worth more. (47;29;25)
(47;23;19) When it's worth it, I speak. When it's not, I simply… (47;26;22)
(47;19;08) Generally, I quiet down a bit. I like to listen. (47;23;08)

Music: “Jokenchechen” by Tumben K’aay.
Archival footage of the Maya kingdom circa 1950.
Hilario:
(06;06;06) I like to identify myself with the Maya profile, with the Maya hair and all that. But to say “Maya,” you have to ask, Who were the Mayas? I’m not even .5% of what the Mayas were. I’m not. (Who are you then?) I’m Hilario. Being a proud part of a culture called “Maya,” I can’t say I’m “Maya,” because to me, that weighs a lot. I’m proud to be just part. I’m a contemporary Maya who knows a little about his culture and tries to promote his culture. (06;42;21)

(00;51;29) If you don’t differentiate between the non-Maya and the Maya, then you know neither one. So I limit myself to saying I’m Hilario Chi Canul, with Maya last names meaning “Guardian of Language,” and I work on that. It’s my destiny.
III. Language and ‘Cosmovision’

Music: “Bach-Bach” by Balam.

A study lesson María has set up with her friend Pilar. Up-nats-full on their reciting of simple English vocabulary.

María: (12;28;26) I have never liked the English language. I don’t like it but I’m also conscientious that I need to learn it for professional reasons, and because my fieldwork requires it at the level I’m studying. (12;46;11)

The girls have a language question, so like any normal person, they consult Google Translate. They are attempting to say “Who is coming to the party?” but cannot figure out its Spanish equivalent.

(52;56;25) María: Quién está viniendo a la fiesta, o algo así. Porque, como el presente...
Pilar: Mmm-hmm.

They type in “who is to the party coming.” Pilar reads out the outcome, which translates to:

Pilar: “What is the party of presentation.” “What is the par--”? María: No! That’s not right!
Pilar: Yeah, that’s wrong!

Julio: (03;57;24) I think Indigenous language springs from a worldview. Therefore, many of our expressions are related to the sky, to the earth, and even with our heart. (04;11;02)

María: (41;27;20) This means that we can learn English, but now that I’ve been in this course and supposedly learning English, with its structure and all that... it’s much more different. Our language goes beyond written and spoken. Our language is rooted in our heart. That’s where it starts. The heart is the origin of all our words. All we say, all we feel, what we’re doing, it all has to do with our heart. (42;09;00)

Julio: (04;11;13) Many words in Tzeltal end with “kotan,” for example: “I want.” And “kotan” means “my heart.” Or “tik” – “us.” Everything is related to the heart. It’s a little bit difficult and we couldn’t compare as we can from Spanish to English, as they have certain similarities. But in Tzeltal, the fact that it springs from a worldview, another way of relating ideas, it’s a little bit more different. Of course, Tzeltal also has a grammatical structure as in all languages, but there are things endemic to it, which for us in our community, we don’t know how to call a “helicopter” or an “airplane” because in our environment, we never had those things. So we end up borrowing words from Spanish. (05;14;09)

Lucía: (24;32;12) The Spaniards changed many things when they arrived. (24;35;01)

Hilario: (08;48;10) We teach how to say “bus depot,” “depot,” “store” when for the Mayas, those things don’t exist. So we teach something outside of our context: a language without culture. When a language is made by society, and a language is made though culture, it’s a social creation. It cannot be independent from society. So we can’t disregard the social context and the cultural
context of language use. (09;14;25)

(09;24;05) If we want to do something for the Mayan language, we now have a social-linguistic movement: Many families, for various reasons, many times justified even by me, are neglecting teaching Mayan at home. They stop teaching Mayan because a child is being taught Castilian Spanish form an early age. If I come as an outside investigator to analyze a family, I’m going to say the people hate their language. They are killing their language. But when I go inside, take away my professional and academic hat, and enter as a Maya to see what’s happening, by living and feeling what they feel, I can understand that no one, nobody can dispense of something so intimate if there weren’t outside factors causing it. Current Mexican education is one of those factors. (10:32;20)

Music: “Tojka’ (Owl)” by Tumbo Kaay.

We are now at World Treasures, where we hear about Lucía’s efforts to keep her Mayan language alive.

(55;23;28) José: What do you think of Lucía’s efforts to keep her, uhh, her indigenous tongue alive through her daughters?

Customer 3: I think it’s really cool. You know, I used to work next door at the, uh, Little Bread Company. And they’d always come, you know, and get food and stuff from us. And Jerry Gene and everything. So, it was, you know, I think it’s really cool when they go down, I think, to Guatemala every once in a while and get stuff from there and bring it back up here to sell and everything. And they have, like, the donation jars to take down there. And I think they’ve built a school or something like that down there for them. So, I think that’s really cool.

José: Do they ever speak in their indigenous language, like, when you’re, when you’re around, like, around you? Have you heard from them?

Customer 3: I have, yes. I have. They’d be out playing in the sidewalk, (chalk) talking and stuff, and so, I thought that was really, really cool that, you know, you’re— ‘Cause that’s your heritage, you know. So you definitely wanna, wanna keep it alive.

(56;19;03)

Now to Lucía, who’s talking to another customer.

(38;23;29) Lucía: Sometimes, too, I can, when the weather is really nice outside, sometimes I sit with people outside, I teach.

Customer 4: Do ya?

Lucía: Oh yeah. Yes.

Customer 4: I would love to learn Spanish. In this area, it’s becoming so much more necessary.

Lucía: Spanish... I’m not really good at Spanish, and English, too. It’s the same. But the, uh, Mayan, yes. And people, they like it too.

Customer 4: I bet that’s an interesting language.

Lucía: I can teach usually one or two, and, and, it’s free. Free, one hour, and we sit outside.

Customer 4: During the summer?
Lucia: Mmm-hmm.

Customer 4: Oh, wow!

Lucia: Yup. Yup.
(38;59;16)

Footage of Lucia teaching her Mayan lessons outside of her store.
IV. Media vs. Maya

Music: “Jokenchechen” by Tumben K’aay.

As Hilario continues his poem, cover video of a Maya mother statuette and a time-lapse of fog and clouds over the Maya jungle.

Hilario:
(39:42:00)
Taak in sutik a na’tsílil
yéetel u na’tsílil in paalalo’ob.
Taá in sutik tech in yuum
yéetel u yuum in paalalo’ob.

Taak in sutik u sáasiílil a wich
yéetel u sáasiílil u yich in paakat.
Taak in sutik u táaxbaye’enil a wich
yéetel jujunp’éeel u yach’ayach’il in wich.
(40:08:15)

(I want to return your maternal being
with the mother of my children.
I want to return my father to you
with the father of my children.

I want to return the gleam in your eyes
with the lucidity of the eyes with which I see.
I want to erase your wrinkles
with each wrinkle I might have.)

Show some old CIA film about the Maya people of the 1950s. The film shows both reverence and slight culturalist hubris, something counter to María’s filmmaking style.

María:
(24:59;25) I have worked for years making video ethnographies in indigenous languages. I’ve made two documentaries in Chiapas. I’ve worked seven years in TV giving news on-camera, at the switchboard, editing. These are all well-known spaces for me. Radio, I’ve worked many years on radio. Touring those places here isn’t interesting to me. Some might think that because you’re indigenous, you’re surprised by a TV station, a radio station, or that we’re very foreign to technology. But you and I can work the same technological equipment. In fact, I can work these tools better than you. I can shoot and edit, so the fact that I’m indigenous and you’re not doesn’t stop me from learning or using those tools. We have the same knowledge. But that we haven’t had the same opportunities – that is true. That we’ve always been relegated and we’ve always been regarded as, “Oh, poor Indians, they don’t know how to talk, they’re dirty, they’re violent, they can’t work a camera.” People are always surprised that you’re indigenous and you’re using a camera. (30:11;29)
(30:37;22) That’s precisely why it’s necessary that we portray ourselves as we wish. (30:43:10)

Stand-up of comedian Charlie Hill’s assault on Hollywood movies reinforcing indigenous stereotypes, such as having white guys playing Indian leaders. “It’s like having ‘Martin Luther King’ starring Robert Redford. Hey, that’s Hollywood!” (Pending approval from producer Joel Samuel to use this clip.)

Hilario:
If I’ve let my hair grow out, it’s because it makes me look more handsome. Really. It gives me a more original Maya touch. Whoever sees me will say, “This mofo is Maya.”

Your face is important. You can be on the big screen. In fact, I remember when they said, “Do you want to be a Hollywood star? Come do a casting for ‘Apocalypto.’ Then you can be a Hollywood star with your Maya face and language.” So, many people went. But many of them already don’t speak their tongue. Many of them don’t know their culture because no one taught it to them.

I remember arriving in Cancún and the f-–, the line went beyond the convention center. I saw people with long hair when I didn’t have long hair at the time. My hair was short and I wore a cap. I came thinking I was going to win this acting contest.

When I came here, one of the people Mel Gibson hired surprised me. He came from England speaking Mayan. He talked and interviewed you in Mayan. (A white guy?) A white guy, speaking Mayan. He spoke the basics and he interviewed you to find out whether you spoke Mayan. There you will see all those people, with their faces, and if they ever cursed their “ugly” indigenous faces, they forgot about it at that moment. But they rued because, in the back, I heard, “How I rue that I don’t know how to speak Mayan. I have everything to maybe win this contest, but I don’t know it.”

Switch to part of the trailer of “An Inconvenient Truth” and posters of big disaster movies to talk about how the media have overblown the whole 2012 thing.

Julio:

You know that in Maya culture, we have this prediction that the world will end in 2012. And our communities and families have internalized it. We await changes, big changes regarding climate behavior, which we’re already seeing.

Sometimes when you talk about climate change, we relate it to the Universe. As it is, our ancestors talked about this happening. Al Gore didn’t say it, So-and-so didn’t make these predictions. This is what really gets us. We already knew this as Mayas, that there were going to be periods of drought or intensive rains. But just now we get Al Gore and other academicians saying it.

Lucia:

And before, my grandparents told me: In 2012, some things are going to happen. But I don’t know. We’ll see if anything happens. But I think it will because weather change has already started. Like last year when we had two mudslides. Many people died and many homes were destroyed. So my dad told me he’s never seen this problem as dire as it was last year.

Julio:

When someone said it because he has political power, then that’s what seems to count. Though if a farmer said it, or if a brother said it, people say, “What does he know?” But now we’re seeing it and we say, “By the way, a brother told me this would happen, and because Al Gore says it, too, I now believe it.” So I do think it has to do with political power.
V. Modernity and Tradition

Music: “Mayan Fire Flute” by Xavier Quijas Yxayotl.
Direct CU of Hilario’s mouth as he evokes movements corresponding to these verses.

Hilario:
(40;09;04)
Taak in sutik u sakil a pool
yéetel a ka’ansaj.
Taak in sutik u booxil a pool
yéetel jujunkúul u sakil in pool.

Ki’ichpan máama, nojch máama Trinidad
te buka’aj k’iino’oba’
jach ts’oka’an in tuklik,
taak in sutik tech tu laakal a yaabitaj...
Chen ba’ale’, yáan junp’éeel ba’a
ma’ taak in sutik techi’..., u ja’il a wich.
(40;46;19)

(I want to give back to your white hairs
with all of your teachings.
I want to return your hair’s raven color
with each gray hair I might grow.)

Blessed Mother, oh, Santísima Trinidad,
during these times,
I have truly thought about it:
I want to return all your love.
But there is something I don’t want to return to you:
your tears.)

Lucía:
(26;49;25) In Guatemala, in my town, we didn’t have a stove or a refrigerator. We didn’t even have a table. Every day we had to go cook the corn in the nixtamal. We had to get up each morning to go to the mill. We returned home to make tortillas by hand. But here in the U.S., I have almost everything I’d never have in Guatemala, for 22, 23 years now. (27;34;08)

Hilario:
(30;45;38) I remember when we were hunters, my parents always took us hunting. After hunting 13 animals, we had to stop for a while. We had to conduct a ritual so Nature could recuperate for a while and so it could give us more. Also, we had to ensure this recuperation happened. After that, we ask for permission to keep feeding ourselves and procreating inside Nature. We are part of Nature, after all. It’s not like we’re an element outside of Nature. This should go down as one of the Bible’s commandments. (31;23;00)

Maria:
(31;32;20) There are many things being kept inside of our elders’ words, so you can’t expect for others to know these things, too. Many people neither know nor understand. They ask, “Why do you believe that a mountain has life, when science says that’s unexplainable?” Stuff like that.
(31;56;13)

Julio
(07;19;54) So when I arrived in college, I had internal conflicts about how the Green Revolution
came to replace traditional agriculture. That’s what economists call “sustainable agriculture,” because it only generates itself. So now I can interrelate many things, such as the ability to look inward and then go outside and learn topics such as climate change, and linking it back to the community. How do you help the community understand change? Of course, they don’t define concepts such as “adaptation” or “vulnerability,” but the small towns have already started applying those concepts. So my job is to be an intermediary who explains how their local practices are connected to foreign concepts. Those concepts shouldn’t be divorced from each other. That’s what is polemic: having the academicians on one side and the people at a local level.

(08;28;28) (08;43;54) And when I’m in my community, I feel it when people tell me their situation. I understand it because I’m part of this process. Sometimes it is difficult for me to make that interrelation.

(08;57;24)
VI. Nostos (Epilogue)

Hilario:
(10:32;20) In México, we talk about multiculturalism. OK, here you go: words, speeches. We also talk about México’s interculturalism. It’s still the same old story. We have an “intercultural” university, but I don’t think we’ve tried to focus inward. We still remain outside. It’s like the governments who stay seated at the top making plans for the bottom, but they don’t descend to see what truly happens down here to know what we need to do up there. (11:02;29)
(19:07;30) It would be very nice to keep working in universities and schools to strengthen our identity. To know why we go outside our community. To define what you’re doing, who you are to begin with. (19;19;08)

María:
(38;11;07) I hold the title of “indigenous” because I was born in an indigenous town. Because I am indigenous myself. And perhaps some of my peers never had the opportunity to study, but I did. Therefore, I have the duty to return to my hometown and work there. It’s pointless for me to stay here or go elsewhere with my “master’s” title and use it to work elsewhere. But, me forgetting my hometown? No. (38;44;12)

Julio:
(06;21;12) Since I finished college, I’ve been working with indigenous communities in the Lacandon Jungle on various conservation and development projects. Later, I went for two years to study in Costa Rica to hone those skills. Once again, I have that duty to return the little knowledge I learned by sharing it and continuing learning with the communities. (06;49;38)

Lucía
(28;01;32) I think we will move back home in a few years. (Do you miss home?) Oh yeah, because of the climate being so beautiful – neither hot nor cold. And I also want to spend more time with my mother, who is over 80 years old. For now, I will go back to Guatemala this month (December) and spend a few months there. (28;31;34)
(28;36;08) I love it there. I also want to spend more time with my girlfriends. Plus, we’re building a house there, which we’re trying to finish up next year. We’re thinking of moving back in 2012, but we’ll see. (28;56;16)

María waves at the camera and gives a thumbs up.

María
(42;17;22) May your heart receive my heart’s Grand Greeting. (Repeats it in Tzotzil) (42;24;09)

“X- múuts’i, múuts’i,” a traditional piece of Mayan music, plays as credits roll.
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APPENDIX

A. Original Outline

Taak in Sutik
(Outline)

Act I – Introduction
The issue at hand: Indigenous people’s role in 21st century globalized society. Can their languages and cultures survive, especially when living the global village?

Act II – The Story
Introduce the characters and their reasons for living in the epitome of the 21st century global village: The United States.

Mexico
Maya, Purhépecha

Guatemala
Kaqchikel

Perú
Quechua

Chile
Mapuche

Act III – Takeaway Message
The characters return to their homelands, but are forever changed after experiencing American culture. They reaffirm that indigenous people have had their place in the formation of nation-states in the 19th century, and are very solidly a part of this new 21st century global village.
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C. “Taak in Sutik” Poem (with notes)

Taak in sutik...

Taak in sutik a ximbali
yëtel u múk’ in t’ón.
Taak in sutik a músk’
yëtel u múk’ in puki’ik’al.

Taak in sutik a che’ej
yëtel u ki’imakil wóól.
Taak in sutik u tejil a wóól
yëtel u tojil in wóól,
a kuxtal yëtel in kuxtal.

Taak in sutik a n’atsili
yëtel u n’atsili in paalalo’ob.
Taak in sutik tech in yuum
yëtel u yuum in paalalo’ob.

Taak in sutik u saásili a wich
yëtel u saásili u yich in paakat.
Taak in sutik u táaxbayenil a wich
yëtel jujump’el u yach’ayach’il in wich.

Taak in sutik u sakil a pool
yëtel u ka’ansaj.
Taak in sutik u boxil a pool
yëtel jujunkul ul sakil in pool.

K’ichpan máama, nojoch máama Trinidad
be bu’k’aj k’íno’oba.
jach ts’ok’an in tükít,
taak in sutik tech tu laakal yaa-bitaj...
Chen ba’ale’, yáan jęp’el ba’a ma taak in sutik tech’... u ja’il a wich.

Le beetik’e ko’oten wey’ máam,
ko’oten ka in kanantech...
Tich’ teene sak’ nook’ o
ka in tep’ech je’ex a tep’ken ka’achile’.

¡Ko’oten! ¡ko’oten!
¡Ko’oten! ka in na’aksech tin tseel
te x-uuchbén k’aan tu’ux ta chijisel a,
cha’a in peets’machik a kabo’ob yook’ol a
tu yos’al ma’ u ja’ak’al a wóól.
Máam uyawu’uy u k’áay tin k’áay:

Quiero devolver...

Quiero devolver tus pasos
con la fuerza de mis piernas.
Quiero devolver tu fuerza
con la fuerza de mi corazón.

Quiero devolver tu sonrisa
con mi alegría.
Quiero devolver tu salud
con mi salud.
Quiero devolver mi Padre
con el Padre de mis hijos.

Quiero devolver la claridad de tus ojos
con la claridad de los ojos con que miro.
Quiero borrar tus arrugas
con cada arruga que Yo tenga.

Quiero regresar lo blanco de tu pelo
con tu enseñanza.
Quiero regresar lo negro de tu cabello
con cada cana que Yo tenga.

Hermosa madre, Santísima Trinidad,
en todo estos tiempos
lo he pensado de verdad,
quiero devolverte todo tu amor...
Pero hay algo que no quiero devolverte...
tus lágrimas.

Por eso ven aquí Mamá,
ven para que yo te cuide...
Pásame el pañal
para envolverte como me envolvías antes.

¡Ven! ¡ven!
¡Ven! para subirte a mi lado
en esta vieja hamaca donde me creciste,
déjame agarrar tus manos encima de tu pecho
para que no te asustes...
Mamá escucha tu canto en mi canto:

x- múuts’ij, múuts’ij,
x- múuts’ij, múuts’ij,
k’o’oten a weensej chan paala’.
ko’oten, ko’oten a weensej x- mónts’il, x- mónts’il, móuts’ij, móuts’ij, móuts’ij
ko’oten a jayabaj tu yök’ol, Ko’oten a jayabaj tu yök’oj x- mónts’il
Lalalalajjì, lalalalajjì, Lalalalajjì, lalalalajjì, x- móutsij, móuts’ij, móuts’ij, móuts’ij, ko’oten a weensej chan paala’.
ko’oten, ko’oten a weensej x- mónts’il, x- móutsij, móuts’ij, móuts’ij, móuts’ij
ko’oten a jayabaj tu yök’ol, Ko’oten a jayabaj tu yök’oj x- mónts’il

Máam, Mamich, j- Hiilen, ts’ok in suut, suunajen in kanantech
tumen bejla’ake’ leech in yáax paal, in chan x- yáax chúupaal.

Suuunajen in wuk’ u ja’il a wich kun niikil tin wicho’,
tumen bejla’ake’ teen kin wóok’ol
ra wo’osal nojch máamaj Trinidad.

Mamá, Mamich, soy Hilario, he vuelto,
he vuelto para cuidarte
porque hoy tu eres mi primer bebé,
mi primera hijita.

He vuelto para beber tus lágrimas
que caerán en mis ojos,
porque hoy Yo lloraré
por ti Santisima Trinidad.

Amigas y amigos quiero que sepan el motivo de esta inspiración, quiero afirmarles que la inspiración de escribir un poema es fácil si existe el motivo, y éste en cada instante se halla... si no existe es porque no existimos...
Yo existo porque mi familia existe, porque la mujer que es mi madre existe. Por lo tanto, la mujer; mi madre, la madre de mis hijos, la madre de todos es un gran motivo para inspirarme, para escribir paginas y páginas de poema de amor sin sentir que el tiempo pasa...

Trinidad Canul Canche es mi madre, ella y la futura madre de mis hijos son las dos grandes e invencibles mujeres que me hacen ser un gran devorador de Dios, porque ellas cada día; en cada segundo y en cada milimetro, comienzan para romper las barreras del tiempo y la distancia que nos separan y a la vez nos unen; más allá y más acá...
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