

# Of Friends and Foes

## The Caste War and Ethnicity in Yucatan

By

Wolfgang Gabbert

INSTITUT FÜR SOZIOLOGIE UND SOZIALPSYCHOLOGIE  
UNIVERSITÄT HANNOVER

---

---

### RESUMEN

---

---

Todas las situaciones coloniales y postcoloniales crean sistemas de dominación basadas en el antagonismo entre colonizadores y colonizados. En consecuencia se ha generalmente interpretado a las rebeliones rurales en las sociedades latinoamericanas durante la época colonial y en el siglo XIX como guerras étnicas o raciales en contra de la dominación de los conquistadores españoles y de sus descendientes. Esto ha sido también el caso con la Guerra de Castas de Yucatán (1847–1901) que fue la más importante de numerosas rebeliones que estremecieron las áreas rurales de México durante el siglo XIX. Sin embargo, un análisis cuidadoso de la evidencia pone en duda tal interpretación. Mientras las élites hispano-hablantes presentaron a este levantamiento como un conflicto racial los rebeldes lo consideraron como un asunto de las clases bajas visto que indígenas lucharon en ambos bandos. Ni los colonizadores ni los colonizados representaron comunidades homogéneas o solidarias. Por esto para entender mejor los conflictos sociales en sociedades coloniales y postcoloniales es de suma importancia no confundir categorías étnicas (o raciales) y comunidades étnicas. Además, partiendo del análisis del sistema de desigualdad social en el Yucatán del siglo XIX el artículo muestra que diferentes concepciones de diferenciación social pueden coexistir en una sociedad.

PALABRAS CLAVES: México, Yucatán, mayas, etnicidad, guerra de castas. KEYWORDS: Mexico, Yucatan, Mayas, ethnicity, Caste War.

---

---

ON A HOT SUNNY DAY in the summer of 1997, the small town of Tzucacab in the northern part of Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula resounded with gunfire.<sup>1</sup> A large number of men, most of them armed with rifles, others with bows and arrows, were lined up in the town's main plaza. They fired salutes and invoked the names of martyrs who died in the fight against the *ts'ulo'b* ("foreigners" in the Yucatec Maya lan-

*The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9(1):90–118, copyright © 2004, American Anthropological Association

guage).<sup>2</sup> These men, however, were not preparing for a new revolution as may have appeared at first glance, but rather celebrating one that is in the distant past. Tzucacab was commemorating July 30, 1847, the day considered to be the beginning of the so-called Caste War. This rural rebellion was the unexpected outcome of several civil wars which had upset the peninsula after Independence. *Ladino*<sup>3</sup> leaders had begun in 1839 to recruit Maya-speaking peasants and farm laborers systematically as soldiers. However, when rebel forces acted independently in 1847 and fought for such things as the abolition of head tax and free access to agricultural land, the confrontation began to change in character. What had started as a series of disputes between elite factions vying for power gradually became an insurrection of certain sections of the Maya-speaking lower classes against the Ladino-dominated government of Yucatan. After some initial successes in 1847–48, the rebels were forced to retreat to the isolated southeastern part of the peninsula where they established independent polities.<sup>4</sup> While one section of the rebels, the so-called *pacíficos del sur* (the peaceful of the south), made peace in 1853, the *sublevados bravos* (wild rebels) continued fighting for several decades. Their descendants remained de facto outside government control up to the beginning of the 20th century. Even as late as the 1930s, the influence of the Mexican state in the rebel area was minimal (see, for example, Gann 1924:30–31; Adrian 1924:235).<sup>5</sup>

In the 19th century, the Yucatecan elite considered this conflict an ethnic or racial war fomented by the “traditional hate of the descendants of the Maya against all in whose veins runs just one drop of white blood” (Ancona 1978, III:485–486).<sup>6</sup> It was seen as the stubborn resistance of Indian barbarians to progress and civilization (e.g., Sierra O’Reilly 1994, I:17; Baranda 1867).<sup>7</sup> The hegemonic discourse changed, however, after the Mexican Revolution (1910–17). President Cárdenas (1934–1940), for example, tried to mobilize support for his own political project by interpreting the Caste War as a precursor of agrarian reform and as the legitimate struggle of the “Maya race” for survival (e.g., Cárdenas 1972:154, 170–171; Bustillos Carrillo 1957:111, 175–179; see also Fallaw 1997:560, 563–565). Later, government schools all over Yucatan were called after famous rebel leaders. Today, politicians, intellectuals, and the press tend to see the rebellion as a symbol of Maya resistance to the suppression by the Spanish-speaking descendants of the conquerors, and as a forerunner of current struggles for Indian autonomy. Mexican anthropologist Miguel Bartolomé, for example, calls it the “ethnic liberation war” of “the Maya,” who are considered by him, and by many others, to be an ethnic community with a millenarian history (1988:16, 19–20, 179; see also Alonso Caamal 1993:37, 46–47, 56). This interpretation shows at least one similarity with views held by Yucatecan politicians and historians in the 19th century. In spite of diverging evaluations, the Caste War is interpreted as a conflict between two groups—Indians and whites (*Ladinos*) (e.g., Heller 1853:239, 267, 285; Méndez 1870:375–376; Villa Rojas 1945:20; Buisson

1978:8, 21–22; Montalvo Ortega 1988:301, 314).

However, there are other voices, too. Many Maya-speaking peasant families in the northern and western parts of Yucatan do not see the rebels as Indian freedom fighters. According to Xcupil residents interviewed in 1995, Indians (*indios*, or *indioso*<sup>b</sup> in Maya) are “those who burned down the villages, those who had no compassion.”

They were very bad, they caught and threw the smallest [prisoners], small in years, up in the air, to receive them with the blow of a maul. There they were bashed. There they were killed. . . . There they killed all of them. There they ate them (interview 1998).

This article argues that conflicting views on the Caste War are the result of two circumstances: the significant differences in contemporary Yucatan’s social categories system from that of the 19th century, and the contrasting experiences of different sections of Yucatan’s Maya-speaking population during the war and their transmission to succeeding generations through oral history.

In the following, I would like to substantiate three major hypotheses. Firstly, although the system of social categorization in 19th century Yucatan was dichotomously structured, regional society was not composed of two separate ethnic communities. Language, which is today the preferred criterion for ethnic (or, to be more precise, cultural) classification, was of no use in defining the Indian section of the population. Secondly, the fact that many Maya speakers (Indians as well as non-Indians) fought against the rebels or became victims of their attacks, questions the characterization of the Caste War as a “race war” or the ethnic struggle of “the Maya.” Thirdly, the Caste War, however, was of fundamental importance for the development of ethnic relations on the Yucatan Peninsula. But instead of promoting Indian unity it caused a deep rift between Maya speakers. This fostered, on one hand, the emergence of ethnic consciousness among the rebels and, on the other hand, the development of a socially and culturally homogeneous Maya-speaking lower class in the north and west of Yucatan with a localized sense of loyalty. Thus, the war hindered any tendencies towards the development of a Maya ethnic community encompassing all speakers of the language that might have existed on the peninsula (see also Restall in this issue).

Since there is no agreement among scholars, some remarks on the conceptualization of ethnicity seem necessary before developing these hypotheses further. Ethnicity is understood here as referring to a phenomenon of social differentiation in which actors use cultural or phenotypical markers or symbols to distinguish themselves from others. It is a method of classifying people into categories which include individuals of both sexes and all age groups, using (socially constructed) origin as

its primary reference (Gabbert 1992:31–34; Eriksen 1993:4; Levine 1999:168). These boundary processes can result in the development of a system of ethnic categories (i.e. classificatory units) or of ethnic communities (i.e. units of action). It is therefore of the utmost importance that *social categories* present in a specific society, the *groups* or organizations based on such categories, and the *individuals* using these categories in daily interaction be kept separate analytically. It would be erroneous to conclude from the existence of a category denoting a certain aggregate of individuals that social cohesion, solidarity, and group consciousness automatically prevail within that population. Therefore, the starting point for the analysis of ethnicity should not be ethnic collectivities but individuals using ethnic categories in social interaction. In doing this, it should be remembered that the use and meaning of categories may not only change historically but also in accordance with who is using them and to whom they refer. Thus, self-identification and ascription by others are not indissolubly linked to a person, as is suggested by the notion of “ethnic identity.” Frequently, they do not coincide (Gabbert 1992:8; 2001).

Ethnic communities are, pace Eriksen (1993:10), Jenkins (1997:46–47, 74, 77), and many others (e.g., van den Berghe 1994; Grosby 1994; Hutchinson and Smith 1996; Proschan 1997), not ubiquitous forms of social organization but the result of a specific technique for social distinction.<sup>8</sup> The concept refers to a special form of “imagined community,” that is, a community that is imagined as limited, sovereign, and of a “deep, horizontal comradeship” (Anderson 1991:6–7). It is an “imagined” community since it is larger than a face-to-face group and lacks the respective means of enforcing compliance to social norms among its members (Elwert 1989:32). Only groups above the local community level should be referred to as “ethnic” since they have to integrate individuals who cannot be united through direct social, economic or kin relationships. This requires special social integration mechanisms.

In the following, I will first describe the system of social categories in 19th century Yucatan and its consequences for the development of ethnicity. This is followed by an analysis of the social composition of the enemy parties during the Caste War and of the victims of rebel attacks. Finally, the process of ethnogenesis among the rebels will be discussed briefly.

### **Social Categories in Yucatan**

After the Conquest Spanish colonialism established a social order in Latin America which can be characterised as an estate system. This means that fundamental social categories—Spaniards, Indians, and *castas* (people of presumed mixed ancestry such as mestizos or mulattoes) were legally defined and held specific rights and duties

(Hervik 1991:45–51; Gabbert 1997b:94; 2001:465–467). Even after Mexico gained political independence from Spain in 1821, the population of Yucatan remained legally divided. The *repúblicas de indios*, established during the colonial times as special administrative units for the indigenous, tribute-paying population, survived.<sup>9</sup> The colonial tripartition—Spaniards, castas, and Indians—was reduced to a system of administration which differentiated between people with total civil rights, the so-called *vecinos*, and Indians (indios or *indígenas*) (González Navarro 1970:299–301; Cline 1950, II:64).<sup>10</sup> The *repúblicas* remained in the state of Yucatan until 1868, whereas in Campeche, which had separated from Yucatan in 1858, they were abolished around 1869 (Suárez Molina 1977, II:292; Alvarez Suárez 1991:93–95). Nevertheless, the term *indígena* continued to be used in official documents and censuses (e.g., Padrón . . . Chenes, February 17, 1873, AGECE, G, CP, P, box 1, file 15; Padrón . . . Panaba, February 27, 1885, AGEY, PE, P, CP, RC). Everyday speech, in general, reflected the administrative dichotomy between Indian and *vecino*. Frequently, however, the Spanish-speaking elite considered it not merely a legal but an ethnic or “racial” differentiation. Thus, Ancona writes that in Yucatan anyone who did not belong to the “pure Indian race” was called *vecino* (1978, IV:37 n. 6). The terms *yucateco* and *blanco* (white) were also used to mean the opposite of *indio* or Maya.<sup>11</sup> Another set of categories contrasted those dressed in European fashion (suits, dresses, shoes), the so-called *gente de vestido*, with people who wore folk costume, which had evolved from the garments worn by Indians and mestizos during the colonial period.<sup>12</sup> Social categories were also dichotomously structured in the Maya language. Members of the in-group were generally referred to as *masewal* (originally “commoner”) or *otsil* (poor), those from the out-group were called *ts’ul* (originally “foreigner”) (see documents in Chi Poot 1982:237, 239, 278, 284–285, 287–288, 301–302; Tozzer 1982:19; Cline 1950, V:149; Gabbert 2004:32–33, 197 n. 29).<sup>13</sup>

Thus, the social categories employed in 19th century Yucatan constitute a complex system composed of a number of sets, each referring to one or more dimensions of difference, including legal status, “race” (phenotype and descent), and clothing. A particular set was selected according to the context (census, everyday communication), the topic in question, and the language used (Spanish or Maya). The analysis of this system is complicated by the fact that the social boundaries marked by the different traits did not coincide.<sup>14</sup> Data presented by Don Dumond (1997:41–43) for the first decades of the 19th century show that only the surname had a close relationship with legal status and administrative classification. This apparently remained constant in the ensuing decades. On a tax-payer list from the Santiago quarter in Mérida in 1851, for example, only 13 (2.01 percent) of 630 indios bore a Spanish patronymic, only nine (2.35 percent) of 383 *vecinos* had a Maya surname. All Indians listed in the Hunucmá birth register in 1873 had Maya surnames (DAME:155–156; AGEY, PE, P, CP, RC, box 185). There was therefore a strong ten-

dency to categorize anyone bearing a Maya patronymic as Indian.

Phenotype was a completely different matter. After more than three centuries of miscegenation any attempt to separate different population groups according to physical traits was a hopeless endeavor. These physical features, however, were by no means unimportant since statistically there was indeed a relationship between, for example, wealth and skin color. But physical traits were not important for the categorization of individuals as such but only in combination with other features, including wealth, dress, occupation, and descent. The owner of a hacienda, with a fine suit and a gold watch, and perfect Spanish was, of course, considered a wealthy *vecino* even if he had a dark skin and a round skull.<sup>15</sup>

In post-conquest Yucatan, Spanish was considered the language of civilization by the urban elite, which regarded Maya as the idiom of ignorance (e.g., Sierra O'Reilly 1994, I:202–203). Only a small part of the population in the few urban settlements and provincial towns understood and spoke Spanish. It was only in the southwest (western Campeche, Carmen, and Champotón) that Spanish was already dominant in the 19th century, and where, in contrast to the situation in Mérida, some of the peasants and farm laborers seem to have spoken it and domestic servants were forced to learn it (Aznar Barbachano and Carbó 1994:15; Velasco 1895:73, 85, 92, 102, 109; Cline 1950, V:307–308; Negrín Muñoz 1991, I:21). Outside these areas, however, Maya was universal (Stephens 1969, II:407; Norman 1843:68, 154; Heller 1853:217, 252; García y García 1865a:XXXVII; Tozzer 1977:14–15 and 1982:54). It remained the sole or preferred language of people considered Indian and was also the mother tongue of many *vecinos*, particularly in the rural areas. Thus, the German linguist Carl Hermann Berendt, who visited Yucatan several times, noted in the 1870s:

[Maya] is used not only by the Indians, but also by the greater part of the white and *mestizo* population; in the interior of Yucatan I have met with white families who do not understand one word of Spanish (Tozzer 1977:5 n. 5; see also LN, November 1, 1878:3–4; Stephens 1963, I:231; Aznar Barbachano and Carbó 1994:15; Anonymous 1997:15; Woeikof 1879:204; Brinton 1882:19.).

Contemporary descriptions show that dress was an important status symbol in 19th century Yucatan. Observers noted a division of society in two classes, those who wore pantaloons and those going around in cotton breeches or drawers. The pantaloons was “the uniform of civilization” as the U.S. traveller B.M. Norman (1843:139) put it (see also Stephens 1963, II:71; Cline 1950, V:143–144). However, wearing European clothes was more widespread in large settlements, especially in Mérida and Campeche, than in smaller towns and villages where, at best, a rich handful owned European style garments (Stephens 1963, II:71; Norman 1843:3, 22; Ober 1887:55;

Arnold and Frost 1909:63). Moreover, in many cases they were only worn on holidays. Thus, the *gente de vestido* comprised only a small portion of the population. Even the majority of the *vecinos* dressed, like the *indios*, in folk costume (e.g., Anonymous 1997:15). Thus, the culture and living conditions of poorer *indios* and *vecinos* in the villages, ranches, and haciendas of Yucatan were, in general, similar. Two contemporary observers noted with considerable contempt:

In the settlements of what we called the jurisdiction of Mérida [corresponding roughly to today's Yucatan state] the descendants of the conquerors, those who came from the interbreeding of races, and everybody living there rapidly acquired the usages, customs, language, and even the character of the Indians. They could be seen in the interior speaking the Maya language and ignoring Spanish, living in hammocks like Indians, using the same dress and food-stuffs and even acquiring their laziness and the suspicious nature of that miserable race . . . (Aznar Barbachano and Carbó 1994:14–15; see also Anonymous 1997:14–15; Charney 1992:26, 28, 59–60).

Don Dumond (1997:40–43) has shown that many *indios* and *vecinos* were not only culturally alike but also related by marriage or descent. In his sample of four communities in northern Yucatan between 1803 and 1840, more than 30 percent of the male *vecinos* were married to Indian women while 22 percent of women with Spanish names were married to men with Maya names. This meant, as Dumond puts it, that “a significant number of rural Yucatecan *vecinos* must have had a preponderance of Indian relatives and must have been Indian in outlook” (1997:43). However, it would be premature to assume a *general* insignificance of status categories in the 19th century. My analysis of entries in the registry office at Hopelchén, a town in the southern borderlands, confirms Dumond's conclusion in general, but beyond that it suggests that choice of spouse varied with class. In actual fact, status categories seem to have been of little importance in determining the behavior of poorer people (like farm laborers). No less than 37 (29.13 percent) of the 127 marriages registered in Hopelchén in selected years between 1875 and 1910 were exogamous, that is were marriages between spouses of different patronymics (Spanish or Maya). All the people involved in these marriages belonged to the lower class.<sup>16</sup> In contrast to the marriage pattern found among the lower class, the Ladino elite in Hopelchén was strictly endogamous. Of the 35 elite marriages registered none of the spouses bore a Maya patronymic.

The data on choice of spouse demonstrate that the social distance between lower class *indios* and *vecinos* must have been already minimal before the *repúblicas de indígenas* were completely abolished in the late 1860s. With the removal of the legal differentiation between both status categories, tendencies towards the development of a culturally and socially relatively homogeneous and Maya-speak-

ing lower class were strengthened.<sup>17</sup> The elite, on the contrary, remained an almost completely closed social group.

As has been shown, the social categories used in 19th century Yucatan were dichotomously structured. However, there were several categories denoting overlapping aggregates of people so that no such thing as bounded, separate ethnic communities resulted. The category *indio* (*indígena*) was, for example, part of more than one set. It could refer to people of a certain legal status, to individuals of a certain descent/phenotype, or to individuals wearing a particular dress. Apart from surnames, legal or administrative distinctions (*indio/vecino*) did not coincide with either cultural differences or endogamous units. Maya, for example, was not only the language of legal Indians but was the mother tongue of the vast majority of the population. The most important cleavage separated the mainly urban Spanish-speaking elite from the Maya-speaking lower classes that dressed in folk costume. The elite considered the vast majority of peasants, farm laborers and their families to be Indian, whereas *vecinos* in the interior, who frequently spoke nothing but Maya, referred to people legally so defined, or people easily identifiable by a Maya patronymic, as Indians when trying to claim a higher social status.<sup>18</sup> This relativity of ascription helps to understand why a community consciousness encompassing everyone categorized as Indian or *masewal* did not develop.

### **The Social Composition of the Rebels**

It has already been said that the contemporary Yucatecan elite considered the Caste War to have been a conflict between two “races” and that many later scholars also cling to the dichotomic view that portrays the uprising as a struggle between Indians and whites. Following the lead of Howard Cline (1950), several authors have questioned the “racial” or ethnic foundations of the war and stressed its agrarian roots, especially the expansion of commercial sugar production in the interior of the peninsula which led to the increasing privatization of communal or public land (Orlove 1979; Bricker 1981:92–99; Patch 1983, 1990).<sup>19</sup> Although these scholars stress the class aspect of the conflict and characterize it as a peasant rebellion, they generally equate peasant and Indian and therefore largely retain a dichotomous interpretation of the conflict. However, in actual fact the lines of cleavage were far from clearcut.

In his recent analysis of the decades preceding the outbreak of the Caste War, Terry Rugeley (1996) has shown that there was intensive interaction between *vecinos* and Indians at the municipal level and that members of both categories participated jointly in numerous political and sometimes military affairs. The frequent civil wars between elite factions which had plagued Yucatan since the late 1830s are



a case in point. As will become clear in a moment, this heterogeneous composition of opposing parties continued even after the outbreak of the Caste War.

Indeed, the rank and file of the rebel movement were mainly members of the Maya-speaking lower classes (especially the free peasants of the borderlands in the interior of the peninsula) and apparently the greater part were also legal Indians, as can be deduced from their Maya surnames. This preponderance of Indians is, however, at least in part the result of Yucatan's demographic structure since the vast majority of the rebels came from regions where Indians outnumbered *vecinos* by at least three to one (Cline 1950, V:154–157; Gabbert 2004:50). The important role non-Indians (*vecinos*) played among the rebels has been neglected in most treatments (e.g., Buisson 1978; Bracamonte y Sosa 1994:115–146). Although Nelson Reed has dedicated a separate article to the non-Indian rebel leaders, he maintains an ethnic interpretation of the conflict. Since he believes that “their numbers were never great,” he sees no reason to doubt the “basic Maya aspect of the revolt” (1997:63, 86). This conclusion can, however, be questioned at least for two reasons, one being the terms the rebels employed for themselves and their adversaries, the other being the numerical significance of *vecinos* among the rebels, which has been highlighted among others by Betancourt Pérez and Sierra Villarreal (1989:129–133), Dumond (1997:123–125), and Gabbert (1997c). As Dumond puts it:

With the borderlines muddled between “Indian” and “Spaniard” in a social sense if not a legal one; with half or more of all *vecinos* able to count a mother, a grandmother, or both, who had been legally Indian before marriage; with affective relations thus made ambiguous; and with Maya the real native language of all campesinos, inclusion of *vecinos* among the rebels was inevitable (1997:408–409).

Although there is a lack of precise data, the number of *vecinos* among the rebels must have been considerable. This is suggested, for example, by a decree from June 1848 establishing the death penalty for all non-Indians found among them (APP III:210–211; for the presence of non-Indians among the rebels see also Baqueiro 1990, II:17, 156, 163, 167, 283; III:28, 65, 371–372; IV:31; RY, 1849, II:70–71; Anonymous 1997:63; Ancona 1978, IV:181, 185, 263; Berzunza Pinto 1965:116–117; Chi Poot 1982:264). Had *vecino* presence been negligible a special decree would probably not have been made. Beyond this, many of the leading rebels were not Indian. A list of the major leaders disclosed that 18 (23 percent) of the 78 individuals named did not have a Maya surname (in Reina 1980:415–416; for the presence of non-Indians among the rebel leaders see EN, August 27, 1862:2; EP, September 12, 1862:4; NE, April 25, 1864:3; RP, August 26, 1872:1, May 27, 1873:2, December 16, 1874:2, April 16, 1879:2; Aldherre 1869:74; Ancona 1978, IV:291, 296). Even José María Barrera, who founded the cult of the Speaking Cross which had been the essential ideological

support of the rebels since 1850, was considered by contemporaries to be white or mestizo but not Indian (RY, 1849, II:70–71; Reed 1964:287; Bricker 1981:108). As late as 1853, non-Indian presence among the rebels was of such importance that the peace treaty between the Yucatecan government and a section of the rebels dedicated a special paragraph to this group, granting them the same guarantees conceded to the Indians (see the text in Bracamonte y Sosa 1994:232 and Anonymous 1997:98–99; see also the documents in Chi Poot 1982:274–276; APP III:315; Ancona 1978, IV, app. XXIX). Moreover, due to the risks and hardships of military service many Indian and non-Indian government soldiers deserted to the rebels (Cuaderno copiadador . . . Don Isidro González, February 28, 1851, CAIHDY, M, XLIV, 021 and several documents in EC, September 11, 1861:4; Baqueiro 1990, II:286, 288, 290–291, 304; García y García 1865b:137; Reina 1980:405). This is confirmed by Bishop Carrillo y Ancona who wrote in 1865 that “deserters of government troops, runaway debt peons, evildoers and all kinds of bad and debauched people of different races, such as Indians, whites, negroes, and mulattoes” had joined the rebels (1950:67).

The written expressions of the rebels are similar evidence against the racial war thesis. In the surviving correspondence of the leaders written in Maya, the rebels frequently employed the ethnically neutral term *enemigo’b* to designate their adversaries. Even the occasional use of *ts’ulo’b* does not necessarily support an ethnic interpretation (see the documents in Chi Poot 1982:230, 240, 243 and Quintal Martín 1992:59; Florentino Chan, July 19, 1850, CAIHDY, M, XLII, 011). This term had a multitude of meanings and cannot simply be translated as white or Spanish, as is frequently the case in the relevant literature (e.g., Bricker 1981:187–218; Quintal Martín 1992). It alludes to differences in lifestyle and status and particularly expresses the social distance to the speaker. In most cases the rebels called themselves *cristiano’b* (Christians), *otsilo’b* (poor), or *masewalo’b* (see, e.g., the documents in Bricker 1981:188–207; Chi Poot 1982:277–294; Quintal Martín 1992:68). *Kruso’b* (crosses) in comparison, which hints at the Cult of the Speaking Cross, appears only rarely (Chi Poot 1982:285; Dumond 1997:359). These terms referred to religious ties or a certain social position, *masewal* was a designation for the common people and, at least for the time being, not an ethnic category (Dumond 1997:123–124; Gabbert 2004:31–33).

Considering the evidence presented so far it seems highly unlikely that the rebels were guilty of widespread racist attitudes.<sup>20</sup> An interpretation of the conflict in racial or ethnic terms, on the other hand, is typical for contemporary elite intellectuals and politicians. Many of them were influenced by early currents of anthropology dominated by the ideas of Herbert Spencer. A racial interpretation allowed them to divert attention from the social origins and objectives of the rebels who, at least during the first years of the war, merely aimed at political and economic reforms.<sup>21</sup>

## The Adversaries of the Rebels

As we saw in the preceding section, the rebel forces were not socially homogeneous but consisted of both Indians and *vecinos*. The same conclusion can be drawn for their adversaries. Although the Ladino government depicted the conflict as a “race war,” it was unable to control the rebellion without the active support of a major part of the Indian population. As mentioned earlier, the Maya-speaking lower class (Indians and *vecinos*) in the north and west of the peninsula did not generally support the uprising in 1847, many even joined government forces and fought against the rebels (e.g., Julian Pisté, Homun, June 23, 1848, box 8, file 588 and *Notificaciones . . . Seybaplaya*, March 31, 1850, box 12, file 937, both in AGECE, G, PY; *Nómina, . . . Tekanto*, May 27, 1848, AGEY, PE, J, JP, box 69; RM, January 22, 1873:3.). In 1848, for example, no less than 10,000 of the 25,000 men fighting the rebels were Indians (Carrillo y Ancona 1988:68). The following table indicates the composition of several National Guard units from different towns between 1869 and 1884.<sup>22</sup>

These data are not derived from a statistically representative sample. However, they demonstrate that people bearing a Maya surname made up an important part of many of the National Guard units that fought against the rebels. Their participation in the fighting was neither reduced to single regions nor to a specific point in time. Contrary to views held by a number of authors (e.g., Molina Solís 1927, II:118), the duties of Indians were not confined to auxiliary services (such as the construction of entrenchments) but frequently included combat participation (Decree by Miguel Barbachano, Mérida April 11, 1848, AGEY, PE, C, D, box 68, file *Maxcanú/Mérida*; GS, July 2, 1858:1; EC, March 12, 1860:1; Juan Pino Muñoz, Ten-

PLACE	YEAR	TOTAL	MAYA SURNAMES
Tenabo	1869	174	116 (66.67%)
Iturbide	1869	49	15 (30.61%)
Acanceh	1872	177	130 (73.45%)
Bolonchén	1873	301	168 (55.81%)
Mérida	1879	92	40 (43.48%)
Cozumel	1883	54	9 (16.67%)
Hunucmá	1884	41	33 (80.49%)
Total		888	511 (57.55%)

abo, February 1, 1869, AGECE, AH, G, AM, box 2; García y García 1865b:30–31, 36; Bojorquez Urzaiz 1977:19–20; Dumond 1997:212, 233, 315).<sup>24</sup> Apart from that, people with Maya surnames not only served as enlisted men but some of them were sergeants or officers (RP, February 22, 1871:3, July 20, 1871:2.).

Several authors have suggested that the participation of Indians from the north and west of Yucatan in the struggle against the rebels was due to an “ambiguous and alienated identity” resulting from the long exposition to hacienda rule in these regions which led this group to “turn their aggression towards their own ethníe” (Lapointe 1983:40; see also Barabas 1979:118; Bartolomé 1988:117).<sup>25</sup> This argument is then sound when the pre-existence of an ethnic unity of all Maya-speakers from which some were “alienated” is obviously assumed. However, the evidence presented so far makes such an assumption unlikely.<sup>26</sup> I would argue instead that Indians in northern and western Yucatan had good reasons for not supporting the rebellion.

To account for the regional pattern of revolutionary activity, some authors have suggested that the old colonial centers in the west were much less affected by the agrarian changes of post-independent Yucatan than the rebellion centers in the borderlands where sugar cultivation had recently been introduced (Cline 1947:49, 52–53, 58; 1950, II:75; Bricker 1981:94–95; Lapointe 1983:40, 68–69). As Robert Patch (1990:62–63, 69, 71–74) has shown, nearly 45 percent of all the lands converted into private property in the 1840s were indeed located in the areas where the Caste War was most intensive (Peto, Hopelchén, Sotuta, Tekax and Valladolid). However, roughly 25 percent of the affected lands were located in the northwestern part of Yucatan (the areas around Maxcanú, Mérida, Hecelchakán, Ticul, Motul, Izamal, and Tecoh). Since these regions were more densely populated than the borderlands, the consequences of agrarian change must have been especially distressing for the peasants here. It did not, however, result in armed revolt. Thus, instead of concentrating on grievances it might be more fruitful to look at the factors which made participation in the rebellion unlikely and, on the other hand, at the incentives that motivated members of the Maya-speaking lower classes to fight against the rebels.<sup>27</sup>

First, due to more stretches of road and a stronger presence of government institutions and military units, state possibilities of controlling the population were much greater in the north and west than in the rest of Yucatan. Although peasants in the northwestern part of Yucatan had protested against taxes and land alienation in the 1840s, open rebellion was not a viable option. Secondly, when the war began many Indians were attracted by substantial social and economic incentives. They were rewarded with the honorific title of *hidalgo* which referred to the status hierarchy in the colonial period where this term was employed for a certain class of Indian nobles. The government gave no pay for service but allowed them to keep the booty they obtained during their campaigns against the rebels. In addition, it

promised to pay for those held in debt bondage. *Hidalgos* were to receive the same pensions as other soldiers in the case of disablement or death. Moreover, “loyal” Indians who had fought up to the end of the campaign and the re-establishment of peace on the peninsula were to enjoy a lifelong exemption from the head tax (*contribución personal*) (APP III:173, 181–182, 203–204, 206–209). Furthermore, some Indians were rewarded for their services with land grants of considerable size. Juan Chi, *cacique* of Hecelchakán, for example, received a square league, or 1,755.61 hectares (Se notifica, . . . Hecelchakán, June 6, 1848, AGECE, PY, G, box 7, file 551).<sup>28</sup> A decree from spring 1848 promised, apart from customary pensions, a quarter of a square league (438.90 hectares) of public lands to anyone who would fight against the rebels. In addition, Indians who fought the rebels on their own were promised a little less than 17 pesos for every prisoner they captured and presented to the authorities (APP III:177–178, 186–187). Third, as the following section will show, there are good reasons to suggest that, in addition to material gains and the rise in social status, a further motivation to fight the rebels became more and more important as the war continued: revenge.

### The Victims

The Caste War was a traumatic event in Yucatan’s history. The battles of the initial years and the bloody frontier war that raged for several decades after the rebels had retreated to the isolated southeastern part of the peninsula in 1849–50 claimed thousands of victims. Both parties were guilty of acts of extreme violence. The rebels raided towns, villages, hamlets, and haciendas in the area controlled by the government. Money, valuables, and goods were taken, the inhabitants sometimes killed or abducted (e.g., EC, September 11, 1861:3–4; EN, September 1, 1862:1). With little other sources of income, these assaults provided the major source of wealth required by the rebels to buy weapons, ammunition and whatever else they needed from traders in the neighboring British colony of Belize. For their part, government troops repeatedly attacked and burned rebel group settlements to the ground. Captured rebels were sometimes killed on the spot (e.g., RP, August 28, 1872:1; EN, October 1, 1862:1). In 1848, for example, several rebels were caught in the second story of a building in Tekax. Swinging them by their arms and feet, Yucatec officers threw them onto bayonets held by soldiers in the plaza below (Baqueiro 1990, III:22–23; Dumond 1997:451–452 n. 5).

The fact that the rebels harmed both the *Ladinos* and many of the Indians, who were identified by their Maya surnames, is of central importance to the argument developed here. The rebels took as prisoners, who were frequently forced to work on the sugar ranches of rebel leaders, both *Ladinos* as well as Indians (RP, January

TABLE 2  
*Victims of Rebel Raids, 1858–1879*<sup>29</sup>

PLACE	NUMBER OF VICTIMS		SEX
	TOTAL	INDIAN	
rancho Xnojuktun (Valladolid)	31	6	m,f
Peto	60	10	m,f
Xocen	2	2	m
Tzucacab	27	12	m,f
Sacalaca	44	8	m,f
rancho Kopché	3	3	m
rancho Santa Lucia	3	3	m
rancho San Pedro	17	1	m,f
Kanxoc	3	3	m
Chichimila	8	8	m,f
rancho Kakalná et al.	74	30	m,f
rancho Balché et al.	9	8	m,f
rancho Katbe	5	3	m
Total	286	97	

29, 1873:2–3; Sullivan 1997, I:5–7). They also injured or killed during their raids on Yucatec villages numerous individuals of both categories (GS, March 31, 1858:1; EN, August 27, 1862:2; see also Sullivan 1997, II:6–7). The attack on a ranch called San Pedro in the district of Peto in May 1853 is a case in point. An Indian servant reported later that the rebels had taken a number of prisoners. Some of them were killed during the retreat: “They also killed an Indian women because she was pregnant and could not walk” (Elogio Rosado, Peto, May 17, 1853, AGEY, PE, G, M, box 94). More than 40 percent (30 out of 74) of the people killed or injured in 1864 during rebel attacks on several settlements in the district of Peto bore Maya surnames. Almost 15 percent (11) of the victims were female (see NE, December 3, 1864:3) which shows that the killing of the pregnant woman mentioned above was by no means an isolated act. Frequently victims of rebel attacks, including people bearing Maya surnames, also received relief payments from the government. After Tekax had been sacked in September 1857 almost 900 of the town’s inhabitants received financial aid, about 25 percent of which bore a Maya surname (own calculations

based on several lists in GS, January 22, January 25, February 1, and February 2, 1858). Table 2 shows that almost 34 percent of the victims of rebel attacks on several settlements in Yucatan between 1858 and 1879 were identified by their surnames as Indian.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the data presented. The rebels attacked and killed not only vecinos but also legal Indians. This took place not only during assaults on targets considered Ladino-owned or Ladino-dominated, such as haciendas or large towns, but also when entirely Indian hamlets (*ranchos*) were raided. That women were frequently not spared attests to the cruelty with which the war was waged. The more victims the Caste War claimed on both sides, the more important revenge became as a motive to fight. Since Indians and Maya-speaking vecinos killed and died on both sides, the possibility of developing an encompassing ethnic consciousness was precluded.

### War and Ethnogenesis

Richard Jenkins recently called violence “the ultimate form of categorization” (1997:65). Similarly, but several decades earlier, Lewis Coser (1956) in his discussion on Georg Simmel’s sociology had already stressed the importance of conflict for the setting of boundaries between groups and the maintenance of social cohesion within groups once they have been established. These ideas can be successfully applied to the understanding of ethnicity in Yucatan. Thus, in the case of the rebels, the repression of the Yucatecan troops who attacked their settlements and destroyed their fields was a significant factor in forming a *kruso’b* ethnic community out of a heterogeneous group of vecinos and Indians. Their struggle against the government provided a common point of ideological identification for the inhabitants of different villages and the followers of different leaders. The development of the religious Cult of the Speaking Cross was another key element that fostered cohesion among the rebels. It came into being in 1850 when the rebels were desperate. The cult provided the rebels with an interpretation of their destiny but also allowed for the development of military and social structures to integrate different local groups, and made possible the assimilation of descendants of Chinese contract laborers who had fled from Belize, as well as black lumbermen and Ladino prisoners (Miller 1889:28; Gann 1926:246–247; Villa Rojas 1945:48, 95). A fraternity emerged in the form of companies, for example, to which the inhabitants of the *kruso’b* settlements belong to this day (Villa Rojas 1945:91–94; Reed 1964:132–145, 199–228; Bartolomé and Barabas 1977:33–38, 59–60; Bricker 1981:102–118; Sullivan 1984:76–90). In addition, the cult became the most important cultural symbol for separating the *kruso’b* from the Ladinos and the Maya-speaking population in the north and west of

the peninsula (Villa Rojas 1945:95; Bartolomé and Barabas 1977:117–118; Sullivan 1984:90–92; 1989:45, 47, 219–220; Moßbrucker 1993:44–50; Kubitzki 1997:32, 35, 41).

The *pacíficos del sur*, in contrast, left the Cult of the Speaking Cross and returned to the care of Catholic priests after they had made peace with the government in 1853. Although preserving autonomy *de facto* until the end of the 19th century, they did not consolidate to an independent ethnic community. Integration into the state of Campeche steadily increased due to intensified commercial and administrative relations as well as to the construction of roads. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the *pacíficos* were assimilated into the neighboring population that included numerous immigrants from other parts of the peninsula who had come to the region to work at collecting chicle. They thus disappeared as a distinguishable group (Sapper 1895; Dumond 1977; 1997:262–287, 333–350, 382–386, 401–404; Ramayo Lanz n.d.; 1997; Schüren n.d.; Maler 1997:243–267; Castro 2001).

In the west and north of the peninsula, the Caste War did not induce the changes in social structures that would have brought about the emergence of an ethnic community among the Maya-speaking lower class. The war made “barbarous” rebels the common enemy of the entire population in the region, Maya speakers and Ladinos, Indians and *vecinos* alike. Thus, it was not suitable to foster a specific Maya identity. What is more, no social or ideological structures emerged such as the Cult of the Speaking Cross or the companies of the *kruso’b*, which could have united Maya speakers to an ethnic community, with the result that primary loyalty remained bound to the village or *hacienda*.<sup>30</sup>

## Conclusion

Twenty years ago, Eric Wolf reminded us that “by turning names into things we create false models of reality” (1982:6). This fits nicely into one of this article’s arguments, namely that the relationship between social categories and people in the flesh is nothing if not problematic, and that the complexity of this relationship has important consequences for the development of ethnicity. While language is at present the most important criterion for ascription to a Maya Indian identity in Yucatan, many Maya speakers in the 19th century were not Indians but *vecinos*. While the Ladino elite styled the Caste War as a racial or ethnic rebellion to close the ranks, it is very likely that the rebels considered their uprising mainly as a lower-class affair. This brings me to a second point. Instead of assuming that only one widely shared conception of inequality can exist in society, it seems more realistic to allow for the coexistence of different ideas of differentiation (for examples of this see Nutini 1997:230–231; Weismantel and Eisenman 1998:133–137; Restall in this issue). Several authors have convincingly argued that since the late 18th and early 19th cen-



turies, modern racism has become the leading ideology of elites in Latin America and elsewhere because it provided a new legitimation for class rule and the political exclusion of the masses after earlier sources of legitimacy such as the king's rule by divine right crashed under the attack of the Enlightenment (Abercrombie 1996; Weismantel and Eisenman 1998). 19th century Yucatan was no exception. The regional elite considered social differentiation essentially based on "races" to be largely a product of biology. The lower classes, in contrast, saw people mainly divided by a "way of life". Thus, the *kruso'b* had little difficulty in assimilating *vecinos*, but also blacks and Chinese from Belize. Colonialism did indeed create societies structured around the dichotomy of colonizer and colonized but, as the history and anthropology of colonialism has shown (Stoler 1992), it would be highly misleading to regard these categories as homogeneous solidary communities.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>This article is based on archival research and anthropological field work carried out in Yucatan over a period of twenty-one months between 1993 and 1998. The Yucatan Peninsula comprises three federal states (Campeche, Yucatan, and Quintana Roo). Unless otherwise indicated, Yucatan is used here to refer to the peninsula in general. Campeche and Quintana Roo, however, are used for the states.

<sup>2</sup>The indigenous language of Yucatan is *maya' t'an*. In the 19th century, linguists introduced the term Maya to refer to a group of 31 related Mesoamerican languages. Languages belonging to this group and their speakers are generally referred to by a compound (e.g., Tzotzil-Maya) or by their specific names (Tzotzil, Mam, Kekchi, etc.). In this essay, the term "Maya" refers only to the speakers of Yucatec Maya unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>3</sup>The term Ladino, which originally meant Spanish-speaking, is used in other parts of Middle America but not in Yucatan. Nevertheless, it seems more apt to describe the culturally and linguistically hispanicized section of the population than other terms (e.g., white) since it has less phenotypical or genetical connotations inappropriate to Yucatan.

<sup>4</sup>For the celebrations in Tzucacab see "No más sometimiento al pueblo maya!" *Por Esto!*, July 31, 1997. For general studies on the Caste War and its antecedents see, for example, Reed (1964), Jones (1974), Bricker (1981:87–118, 185–218), Rugeley (1996; 2001:49–98), Dumond (1997), and Sullivan (1997).

<sup>5</sup>For the history of the independent polities of the *sublevados bravos* see Reed (1964:159–269), Jones (1974), Dumond (1977, 1985, 1997), and the classic ethnography of Villa Rojas (1945). For developments in this region after the Mexican state had extended its influence, see Bartolomé and Barabas (1977), Villa Rojas (1962, 1977), Sullivan (1984, 1989), Hostettler (1996), and Moßbrucker (1998).

<sup>6</sup>This, and all translations, are mine.

<sup>7</sup>For an extended discussion of the elite discourse in 19th century Yucatan see Gabbert (2004 and 2000).

<sup>8</sup>This point is argued convincingly and at length by Fardon (1987); see also Nash (1989) and Astuti (1995). Other forms of social organization are, for example, the dynastic realm, and residence or kinship groups (Anderson 1991:4, 19–22; Gellner 1983:48–49, 55; Elwert 1989:25–31).

<sup>9</sup>The liberal constitution of 1841 formally abolished the *repúblicas de indios* but in actual fact they

continued to operate. In 1847 they were re-established (*Ley restableciendo y reglamentando las antiguas leyes para el régimen de los indios*, August 27, 1847, APP III:146–151). For a discussion of the repúblicas de indios after Independence see Rugeley (1996).

<sup>10</sup>Indio and indígena were terms ascribed by others and used as synonyms in official documents, newspapers, novels etc. (e.g., Baranda 1867; Hernández 1846a).

<sup>11</sup>“In Yucatan whites are generally not only those in whose veins pure European blood runs but even those who mixed it with a quantity of Indian blood. Thus . . . our population is divided into two broad sections: the Indians and the whites. The first are the descendants of the Mayas who did not mix their blood with any other, and the second are the individuals of all other races . . .” (Ancona 1978, IV:13 n. 3; see also Stephens 1963, I:154–155; Regil and Peón 1853:295; Martínez Alomía 1941:40, 46; Arnold and Frost 1909:58, 325; Cline 1950, V:90–91, 153). For the term yucateco see Hernández 1846b:291; APP II:245; Cline 1950, V:146–147.

<sup>12</sup>This consisted, in the case of women, of a long skirt (*fustan* or *pik*) worn with a long wide blouse with embroidery (*ipil*) on the square neckline and the hem below the waist. Men dressed in cotton shirts, trousers or drawers, and frequently sandals (Hernández Fajardo 1946; Cline 1950, V:143–144). The folk costume was also known as *traje de mestizo/a* (mestizo costume). This has confused many authors who suggested that the people known as “mestizos” in 19th century Yucatan were a different social group to the Indians and whites (e.g., Cline 1950, V:145–146). This was, however, not the case. The *traje de mestizo* was *not* a garment specific to a social group but merely a term employed for the more elaborate variants of the folk costume. Differences in the quality of cloth and ornamentation reflected the economic situation of the wearer or were due to the contrast between clothes worn on ordinary days and those worn on holidays (Gabbert 2004: 77). People wearing the folk costume were *not always* called “mestizos” as Redfield (1938:521), Hansen (1980:123), or Pintado Cervera (1982:81, 90–91) suggest but frequently referred to as Indians (e.g., Norman 1843:145; Castillo 1845:295; Arnold and Frost 1909:63, 65; Ober 1887:118). While *mestizo* in other parts of Mexico and Latin America generally refers to the offspring of unions between Spaniards or whites and Indians, or designates the culturally hispanicized section of the population in contrast to the Indian one, in Yucatan *mestizo* is used to refer to wearers of the folk costume and has become a symbol of Maya Indian identity.

<sup>13</sup>Indio and Maya were not used as self-identifications (Tozzer 1982:19).

<sup>14</sup>I made this point for the first time in a paper presented at a meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde in 1995 (Gabbert 1995; see also 1997b). Don Dumond (1997:38–40) came independently to the same conclusion in his opus magnum on the Caste War.

<sup>15</sup>In the peninsula a round skull is considered a sign of Maya ancestry (e.g., Velasco 1895:111–112). However, outside Yucatan this trait is seen as typical for *all* Yucatecans, who are sometimes depicted as block-headed and referred to “cabezones”. An anonymous reviewer suggested that this was a consequence of cradling babies in hammocks which has a tendency to round out their heads while the infant’s cranium is still malleable.

<sup>16</sup>The entries analysed are from RCHO 1875 (the beginnings of registration), 1880, 1885, 1890, 1895, 1900, 1905, and 1910. A relatively high proportion of exogamous marriages would not be sufficient to suggest the minor importance of the status categories indio and vecino for social interaction within the lower class. It could be explained by hypergamy (women of a subordinated social category marrying men from a higher category) which has been ascertained for the colonial period. The exogamous marriages in Hopelchén, however, do not show a significant gender-specific variation. Spouses with Spanish patronymics were male in 20 cases and female in 17 cases. For a detailed discussion of the data presented here see Gabbert (2004:72–73).

<sup>17</sup>Similar tendencies towards the development of a common lower-class culture among people of different legal status have been reported, for example, for colonial Mexico City (Cope 1994) and 18th cen-

tury Potosí, Bolivia (Abercrombie 1996).

<sup>18</sup>This can be inferred from material presented by Redfield (1941:66–73, 375–377) and data collected during my field work (e.g., field notes, Hopelchén, January 11, 1995).

<sup>19</sup>Joseph (1986:25–36) provides a fuller discussion of this approach.

<sup>20</sup>Nevertheless, the racist motives of some individuals cannot be completely ruled out. One example could be the rebel leader Venancio Puc, blamed for killing numerous prisoners (Reed 1964:170–171; 1997:74–75).

<sup>21</sup>Elsewhere I have shown how Ladino politicians consciously “ethnicised” the political and economic conflict from which the Caste War emerged (Gabbert 1997c; 2004:48–53).

<sup>22</sup>For certain periods Indians were exempted from compulsory military service (Ley, . . . August 27, 1847 and Nueva organización de la milicia local, . . . November 8, 1849, both in APP I:54; III:151, 284). It is, however, not quite clear for how long these exemptions were effective. At all events, there are numerous documents to prove that Indians had to perform military service in the 1850s and 1860s (e.g., Decreto, . . . Mérida, February 26, 1851; Orden, . . . Mérida, November 2, 1852 and Bando, . . . Mérida, March 27, 1855, all in García y García 1865b:30–31, 36, 270–272, 398; GS, February 2, 1858:1–2; EN, September 5, 1862:2; EP, October 3, 1862:1). Since 1868 there were no special regulations for Indians in the laws on the National Guard (EP, March 20, 1868:1).

<sup>23</sup>Sources: Juan Pino Muñoz, Tenabo, February 1, 1869 and Lista, . . . March 14, 1869 both in AGECE, AH, G, AM, box 2; Lista, . . . Bolonchén, May 31, 1873, AGECE, AH, G, AM, box 6; RP, March 6, 1872:1–2, March 5, 1879:2–3; Lista nominal, . . . Cozumel, July 1, 1883 and Relación, . . . Hunucmá, June 27, 1884, both in AGEY, PE, M, Correspondencia Jefatura Política, Policía Militar.

<sup>24</sup>After they had made peace with the government in the 1850s several groups of pacified rebels also fought actively against their former allies (RP, August 28, 1872:1; RM, January 22, 1873:3; Anonymous 1997:99; Dumond 1997:216–217).

<sup>25</sup>For a detailed critique of this interpretation see Gabbert (1997a).

<sup>26</sup>See Restall (1995 and his contribution to this issue) and Gabbert (2001b) for evidence on the colonial period.

<sup>27</sup>In his study on the antecedents of the Caste War Terry Rugeley (1996) detailed the local circumstances that decisively influenced the outbreak of the rebellion in the east of Yucatan. A comparable work on post-war history in the north and west of the peninsula is still waiting to be written. Therefore, in the following only some general factors which influenced the attitude of Maya-speakers towards the rebellion in this region can be suggested.

<sup>28</sup>Three hundred *mecates* (about twelve hectares) was deemed the normal minimum to meet the needs of a nuclear family (Farriss 1984:127).

<sup>29</sup>Sources: GS, April 5, 1858:2, August 25, 1858:2; EC, July 25, 1860:1, August 8, 1860:1, July 8, 1861:2; NE, February 15, 1864:1, October 21, 1864:2, December 3, 1864:4; RM, January 26, 1873:1–2; RP, July 31, 1874:1, February 14, 1879:2–3; Elogio Rosado, Peto, May 17, 1853, AGEY, PE, G, M, box 94.

<sup>30</sup>This is indicated by frequent conflicts between communities (Rugeley 1996:34, 161; for the period after the Mexican revolution see Redfield and Villa Rojas 1934:26–27, 221–224; Brown 1998; Moßbrucker 1998:20–21, 269).

## References Cited

### *Archives*

- AGEC Archivo General del Estado de Campeche, Campeche  
AH Archivo Histórico  
AM Asuntos Militares  
CP Censos y Padrones  
G Gobernación  
P Padrones  
PY Período Yucateco, 1820–1857  
AGEY Archivo General del Estado de Yucatán, Mérida  
CP Censos y Padrones  
G Gobernación  
J Justicia  
JP Juzgados de Paz  
M Milicia  
P Población  
PE Poder Ejecutivo  
RC Registro Civil  
AGN Archivo General de la Nación, México, D.F.  
SI Segundo Imperio  
CAIHDY Centro de Apoyo a la Investigación Histórica de Yucatán, Mérida  
M Manuscritos  
RCHO Registro Civil de Hopelchén, Hopelchén

### *Printed Sources*

- APP Colección de leyes, decretos y órdenes o acuerdos de tendencia general del poder legislativo del estado libre y soberano de Yucatán [cited numbers follow pages in Aznar Pérez & Pedrera 1849–51].  
DAME Documentos del Archivo de la Mitra Emeritense [cited numbers follow pages in Dumond and Dumond 1982].

### *Newspapers*

- EC *El Constitucional*, Mérida  
EN *El Espíritu Nacional*, Mérida  
EP *El Espíritu Público*, Campeche  
GS *Las Garantías Sociales*, Mérida  
LN *La Nueva Era*, Campeche  
NE *La Nueva Epoca*, Mérida  
RM *Revista de Mérida*, Mérida  
RP *La Razón del Pueblo*, Mérida

*Books and Articles:*

Abercrombie, Thomas A.

- 1996 Q'aqchas and *la plebe* in 'rebellion': Carnival vs. lent in 18th century Potosí. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 2 (1):62–111.

Adrian, H.

- 1924 Einiges über die Maya-Indianer von Quintana Roo. *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin* No. 5–7:235–247.

Aldherre, Fed.

- 1869 Los indios de Yucatán. *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* (IIa época) 1:73–81.

Alonso Caamal, Bartolomé

- 1993 Los mayas en la conciencia nacional. *In* Movimientos indígenas contemporáneos en México. Arturo Warman and Arturo Argueta, eds. Pp. 35–61. México: Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Humanidades UNAM.

Alvarez Suárez, Francisco

- 1991[1913] *Anales históricos de Campeche*. 2 vols. Campeche: H. Ayuntamiento de Campeche.

Ancona, Eligio

- 1978[1879/80] *Historia de Yucatán desde la época más remota hasta nuestros días*, vols. III and IV. Mérida: Universidad de Yucatán.

Anderson, Benedict

- 1991 *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London and New York: Verso.

Anonymous

- 1997[1866] *Guerra de castas en Yucatán. Su origen, sus consecuencias y su estado actual*. Edited by Campos García, Melchor. Mérida: Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán.

Arnold, Channing and Frederick J. Tabor Frost

- 1909 *The American Egypt. A Record of Travel in Yucatan*. London: Hutchinson.

Astuti, Rita

- 1995 'The Vezo are not a Kind of People': Identity, Difference, and 'Ethnicity' among a Fishing People of Western Madagascar. *American Ethnologist* 22 (3):464–482.

Aznar Barbachano, Tomás and Juan Carbó

- 1994[1861] *Memoria sobre la conveniencia, utilidad y necesidad de erigir constitucionalmente en estado de la confederación mexicana el antiguo distrito de Campeche*. Campeche: Gobierno de Campeche

Aznar Pérez, Alonzo and Rafael Pedrera (eds.)

- 1849–51 *Colección de leyes, decretos y órdenes o acuerdos de tendencia general del poder legislativo del estado libre y soberano de Yucatán*. 3 vols. Mérida: Imprenta del Editor.

Baqueiro, Serapio

- 1990[1878–87] Ensayo Histórico sobre las revoluciones de Yucatán desde el año de 1840 hasta 1864. 5 vols. Mérida: Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán.
- Barabas, Alicia
- 1979 Colonialismo y racismo en Yucatán: Una aproximación histórica y contemporánea. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales* 25 (97):105–140.
- Baranda, Joaquín
- 1867 Los indios. *El Espíritu Público*, August 16:1.
- Bartolomé, Miguel Alberto and Alicia Mabel Barabas
- 1977 La resistencia maya. Relaciones interétnicas en el oriente de la península de Yucatán. México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Bartolomé, Miguel Alberto
- 1988 La dinámica social de los mayas de Yucatán. Pasado y presente de la situación colonial. México: Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- Berghe, Pierre L. van den
- 1994 Does Race Matter? *Nations and Nationalism* 1 (3):359–368.
- Berzunza Pinto, Ramón
- 1965 Guerra social en Yucatán. México: Costa Amie.
- Betancourt Pérez, Antonio and José L. Sierra Villarreal
- 1989 Yucatán: Una historia compartida. México: Secretaria de Educación Pública/Instituto Mora/Gobierno del Estado de Yucatán.
- Bojorquez Urzaiz, Carlos
- 1977 El Yucatán de 1847 hasta 1851; breves apuntes sobre el trabajo y la subsistencia. *Boletín de la Escuela de Ciencias Antropológicas de la Universidad de Yucatán* 5 (27):18–25.
- Bracamonte y Sosa, Pedro
- 1994 La memoria enclaustrada. Historia indígena de Yucatán, 1750–1915. México: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- Bricker, Victoria R.
- 1981 *The Indian Christ, the Indian King: The Historical Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Brinton, Daniel G.
- 1882 *The Maya Chronicles*. Philadelphia: no publisher.
- Brown, Denise
- 1998 Macehual, dzul e indio en Chemax, Yucatán. Paper presented at the 4th International Congress of Mayistas, Antigua, Guatemala, August 2–8.
- Buisson, Inge
- 1978 Gewalt und Gegengewalt im ‘Guerra de Castas’ in Yukatan, 1847–1853. *Jahrbuch für Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 15:7–27.
- Bustillos Carrillo, Antonio
- 1957 Los mayas ante la cultura y la revolución de México. México: no publisher.
- Cárdenas, Lázaro
- 1972 Ideario político. México: Era.

- Carrillo y Ancona, Crescencio  
 1950[1865] *Los mayas de Yucatán*. Mérida.  
 1988[1871] *Guerra de castas*. In *Yucatán: Textos de su historia*, vol. 2. Antonio Pérez Betancourt and Rodolfo Ruz Menéndez, eds. Pp. 61–72.
- Castillo, Gerónimo  
 1845 *El indio yucateco. Caracter, costumbres y condición de los indios, en el departamento de Yucatán*. Registro Yucateco I:291–297.
- Castro, Inés de  
 2001 *Die Geschichte der sogenannten Pacíficos del Sur während des Kastenkrieges von Yucatán: 1851–1895*. Ph.D. dissertation. Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn.
- Charney, Désiré  
 1992[1885] *Viaje al país de los mayas*. Mérida: Dante.
- Chi Poot, María Bonifacia  
 1982 *Medio siglo de resistencia armada maya: Fuentes documentales*. Etnolingüística 27. México: Secretaria de Educación Pública/Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- Cline, Howard F.  
 1950 *Related Studies in Early Nineteenth Century Yucatecan Social History, in the Microfilm Collection of Manuscripts on Middle American Cultural Anthropology, No. XXXII*. University of Chicago Library. Part II: *The War of the Castes and its Consequences* and V: *Regionalism and Society in Yucatan, 1825–1847*.
- Cope, Robert D.  
 1994 *The Limits of Racial Domination. Plebeian Society in Colonial Mexico City, 1660–1720*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Coser, Lewis A.  
 1956 *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Dumond, Don E.  
 1977 *Independent Maya of the Late Nineteenth Century: Chiefdoms and Power Politics*. In *Anthropology and History in Yucatan*. Grant Jones, ed. Pp. 103–138. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 1985 *The Talking Crosses of Yucatan: A New Look at their History*. *Ethnohistory* 32 (4):291–308.  
 1997 *The Machete and the Cross. Campesino Rebellion in Yucatan*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dumond, Carol Streichen and Don E. Dumond, eds.  
 1982 *Demography and Parish Affairs in Yucatan, 1797–1897*. Documents from the *Archivo de la Mitra Emeritense* Selected by Joaquín de Arrigunaga Peón. University of Oregon Anthropological Papers No. 27. Eugene.
- Elwert, Georg  
 1989 *Nationalismus, Ethnizität und Nativismus—über Wir-Gruppenprozesse*. In *Ethnizität im Wandel*. Peter Waldmann and Georg Elwert, eds. Pp. 21–60. Saarbrücken and Fort Lauderdale: Breitenbach.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland

- 1993 *Ethnicity and Nationalism. Anthropological Perspectives.* London and Boulder: Pluto Press.
- Fallow, Ben W.  
 1997 Cárdenas and the Caste War that wasn't: State Power and Indigenismo in Post-Revolutionary Yucatán. *The Americas* 53 (4):551–577.
- Fardon, Richard  
 1987 'African Ethnogenesis': Limits to the Comparability of Ethnic Phenomena. *In Comparative Anthropology.* Ladislav Holy, ed. Pp. 168–188. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Farriss, Nancy M.  
 1984 *Maya Society under Colonial Rule.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gabbert, Wolfgang  
 1992 *Creoles–Afroamerikaner im karibischen Tiefland von Nicaragua. Kontroversen 1.* Münster: Lit.  
 1995 Die Entwicklung ethnischer Kategorien in Yucatán. Paper presented at the Gemeinsame Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde, der Österreichischen Ethnologischen Gesellschaft und der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft, Vienna, September 25–29.  
 1997a Ethnicity and Forms of Resistance: The Caste War of Yucatán in Regional Perspective. *In Resistencia y Adaptación Nativas en las Tierras Bajas Latinoamericanas.* Maria Susana Cipolletti, ed. Pp. 205–232. Quito: Abya-Yala.  
 1997b El desarrollo de las categorías sociales y el problema de la etnicidad en Yucatán. *Revista de la Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán* 12 (202):91–101.  
 1997c La etnización de un conflicto político y económico: La 'Guerra de Castas' de Yucatán, 1847–1855. Paper presented at the Congreso internacional conmemorativo de los 150 años del inicio de la Guerra de Castas de Yucatán: "Una guerra sin fin: Los crucoob ante el umbral del milenio", Mérida, Yuc., México, July 28 to August 1.  
 2000 Race Mixture, Civilization, and Exclusion: Elite Discourse and the Indian in Nineteenth-Century Yucatán. Paper prepared for delivery at the conference "A Country unlike any other? New Perspectives on History and Anthropology in Yucatán, Yale University, November 4–5.  
 2001 Social Categories, Ethnicity and the State in Yucatán, México. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 33 (3):459–484.  
 2004 *Becoming Maya. Ethnicity and Social Inequality in Yucatán Since 1500.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Gann, Thomas  
 1924 *In an Unknown Land.* London: Duckworth.  
 1926 *Ancient Cities and Modern Tribes: Explorations and Adventures in Maya Lands.* London: Duckworth.
- García y García, Apolinar  
 1865a Historia de la guerra de castas de Yucatán, sirviéndole el prólogo una reseña de los usos, costumbres e inclinaciones peculiares de los indígenas. Mérida.: Tipografía Manuel Aldana Rivas.



- 1865b Recopilación de leyes, decretos y órdenes, expedidas en Yucatán, desde el año de 1851 en adelante. Mérida: Imprenta Manuel Aldana Rivas.
- Gellner, Ernest  
1983 Nations and Nationalism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- González Navarro, Moisés  
1970 Raza y tierra. La guerra de castas y el henequén. México: El Colegio de México.
- Grosby, Steven  
1994 The Verdict of History: The Inexpungeable Tie of Primordiality—A Response to Eller and Coughlan. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17 (2):164–171.
- Hansen, Asael T.  
1980 Change in the Class System of Merida, Yucatan 1875–1935. *In Yucatán. A World apart*. Edward H. Moseley and Edward D. Terry, eds. Pp. 122–141. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Heller, Carl Bartholomaeus  
1853 Reisen in Mexiko in den Jahren 1845–1848. Leipzig: Verlag Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Hernández, Juan José  
1846a El indio yucateco. *Registro Yucateco* III:425–430.  
1846b Costumbres de las indias de Yucatán. *Registro Yucateco* III:290–298.
- Hernández Fajardo, José  
1946 Historia de las artes menores. La indumentaria. *In Enciclopedia Yucateca* IV:823–833.
- Hervik, Peter  
1991 The Position of Language and Cultures in the Yucatecan Landscape. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Copenhagen, Institute of Anthropology.
- Hostettler, Ueli  
1996 Milpa Agriculture and Economic Diversification: Socioeconomic Change in a Maya Peasant Society of Central Quintana Roo, 1900–1990s. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Bern.
- Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith  
1996 Introduction. *In Ethnicity*. John Hutchinson and A.D. Smith, eds. Pp. 3–14. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, Richard  
1997 Rethinking Ethnicity. Arguments and Explorations. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Jones, Grant D.  
1974 Revolution and Continuity in Santa Cruz Maya Society. *American Ethnologist* 1 (4):659–683.
- Joseph, Gilbert  
1986 Rediscovering the Past at Mexico's Periphery. Essays on the History of Modern Yucatán. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- Kubitzki, Katharina  
1997 Kleidung und ethnische Identität am Beispiel eines Dorfes der Zona Maya, Mexiko. MA thesis, University of Hamburg.

- Lapointe, Marie  
 1983 Los mayas rebeldes de Yucatán. Zamora: Colegio de Michoacán.
- Levine, Hal B.  
 1999 Reconstructing Ethnicity. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5 (2):165–180.
- Maler, Teobert  
 1997[1886–94] *Península Yucatán* (edited by Hanns J. Prem). Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Martínez Alomía, Gustavo  
 1941 *Viaje arqueológico a los Chenes, 1894*. Campeche: Gobierno del Estado de Campeche.
- Miller, William  
 1889 A Journey from British Honduras to Santa Cruz, Yucatan. *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society N.S.* 2:23–28.
- Molina Solís, Juan Francisco  
 1927 *Historia de Yucatán desde la independencia hasta la época actual*. 2 vols. Mérida: Cia Tipografía Yucateca.
- Montalvo Ortega, Enrique  
 1988 Revolts and Peasant Mobilizations in Yucatán: Indians, Peons, and Peasants from the Caste War to the Revolution. *In* *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution. Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*. Friedrich Katz, ed. Pp. 295–317. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moßbrucker, Gudrun  
 1993 Wie ethnische Gruppen ‘gemacht’ werden: Die ‘Rebellion’ in Quisteil und der Kastenkrieg (Yucatán, Mexico). *Wiener Ethnohistorische Blätter* No. 38:31–60.  
 1998 *Kantunil Kin—Zu kulturellem Wandel und Identität der Maya in Quintana Roo*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Nash, Manning  
 1989 *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Negrín Muñoz, Alejandro  
 1991 *Campeche—Textos de su historia*, 2 vols. México: Gobierno del Estado de Campeche/Instituto Mora.
- Norman, B.M.  
 1843 *Rambles in Yucatan including a Visit to the Remarkable Ruins of Chi-Chen, Kabah, Zayi, Uxmal &c..* 2nd ed. New York: J and H.G. Langley.
- Nutini, Hugo G.  
 1997 Class and Ethnicity in Mexico: Somatic and Racial Considerations. *Ethnology* 36 (3):227–238.
- Ober, Frederick A.  
 1887 *Travels in Mexico and Life among the Mexicans*. Revised ed. Boston: Estes and Lauriat.
- Orlove, Benjamin S.

- 1979 Systems of Production and Indian Peasant Insurrections: A General Discussion and Three Specific Cases. Actes du XVIIe Congrès International des Américanistes. Pp. 127–144. Paris.
- Patch, Robert W.
- 1983 El fin del régimen colonial en Yucatán y los orígenes de la guerra de castas: El problema de la tierra, 1812–1846. Boletín de la Escuela de Ciencias Antropológicas de la Universidad de Yucatán 10 (60):17–26.
- 1990 Decolonización, el problema agrario y los orígenes de la guerra de castas, 1812–1847. In *Sociedad, estructura agraria y estado en Yucatán*. Othón Baños Ramírez, ed. Pp. 45–95. Mérida: Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán.
- Pérez Betancourt, Antonio and Rodolfo Ruz Menéndez, eds.
- 1988 Yucatán: Textos de su historia, 2 vols. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública/Instituto Mora/Gobierno del Estado de Yucatán.
- Pintado Cervera, Oscar
- 1982 Estructura productiva y pérdida de indianidad en Yucatán en el proceso henequenero. Cuadernos de la Casa Chata 71. México: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social.
- Proschan, Frank
- 1997 'We are all Kmhmu, just the same': Ethnonyms, Ethnic Identities, and Ethnic Groups. *American Ethnologist* 24 (1):91–113.
- Quintal Martín, Fidelio
- 1992 Correspondencia de la Guerra de Castas. Mérida: Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán.
- Ramayo Lanz, Teresa
- N.d. Los mayas pacíficos de Campeche. Unpublished MS, Universidad Autónoma de Campeche, Facultad de Humanidades.
- 1997 Repartir lo indivisible: Los Mayas de la montaña, Campeche y la tierra. In *Guerra de castas: Actores postergados*. Genny Negroe Sierra, ed. Pp. 127–148. Mérida: Unicornio.
- Redfield, Robert
- 1938 Race and Class in Yucatan. Cooperation in Research. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication No. 501, pp. 511–532.
- 1941 The Folk Culture of Yucatán. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Redfield, Robert and Alfonso Villa Rojas
- 1934 Chan Kom. A Maya Village. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution.
- Reed, Nelson
- 1964 The Caste War of Yucatán. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1997 White and Mestizo Leadership of the Cruzoob. Saastun. *Revista de Cultura Maya*. 0 (1):63–88.
- Regil, José M. and Alonso Manuel Péon
- 1853 Estadística de Yucatán. Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística (época 1) 3:237–340.
- Reina, Leticia

- 1980 *Las rebeliones campesinas en México, 1819–1906*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Restall, Matthew
- 1995 *Yucatec Maya Responses to ‘Modernization’: The Colonial Period*. In *The Fragmented Present. Mesoamerican Societies Facing Modernization*. Ruth Gubler and Ueli Hostettler, eds. Pp. 53–62. Acta Mesoamericana 9. Möckmühl: Saurwein.
- 1997 *The Maya World. Yucatec Culture and Society, 1550–1850*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rugeley, Terry
- 1996 *Yucatán’s Maya Peasantry & the Origins of the Caste War*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Rugeley, Terry, ed.
- 2001 *Maya Wars. Ethnographic Accounts from Nineteenth-Century Yucatán*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sapper, Karl
- 1895 *Die unabhängigen Indianerstaaten von Yucatan*. Globus 67:197–201.
- Schüren, Ute
- N.d. *Los mayas pacíficos de los Chenes ayer y hoy*. Paper presented at the Congreso internacional conmemorativo de los 150 años del inicio de la Guerra de Castas de Yucatán: “Una guerra sin fin: Los cruzoob ante el umbral del milenio”, Mérida, Yuc., México, July 28 to August 1.
- Sierra O’Reilly, Justo
- 1994[1848–51] *Los indios de Yucatán*, 2 vols. Mérida: Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán.
- Stephens, John L.
- 1963[1843] *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan*, 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.
- 1969[1841] *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*, 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.
- Stoler, Ann
- 1992 *Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule*. In *Colonialism and Culture*. Nicholas B. Dirks, ed. Pp. 319–352. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Suárez Molina, Victor M.
- 1977 *La evolución económica de Yucatán a través del siglo XIX*, 2 vols. México: Ediciones de la Universidad de Yucatán.
- Sullivan, Paul
- 1984 *Contemporary Yucatec Maya Apocalyptic Prophecy: The Ethnographic and Historical Context*. Ph.D. dissertation, John Hopkins University.
- 1989 *Unfinished Conversations. Mayas and Foreigners Between Two Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1997 *Para qué lucharon los mayas rebeldes? Unicornio, Cultural Supplement in Por Esto!*, August 3:3–9 (part I) and August 10:3–9 (part II).
- Tozzer, Alfred M.
- 1921[1977] *A Maya Grammar*. New York: Dover.

- 1982[1907] Mayas y lacandones. Un estudio comparativo, transl. México: INI.
- Velasco, Alfonso Luis
- 1895 Geografía y estadística de la república mexicana. Tomo XVI. Geografía y estadística del estado de Campeche. México.
- Villa Rojas, Alfonso
- 1945 The Maya of East Central Quintana Roo. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution.
- 1962 Notas sobre la distribución y estado actual de la población indígena de la península de Yucatán, México. *América Indígena* 22 (3):209–240.
- 1977 El proceso de integración nacional entre los mayas de Quintana Roo. *América Indígena* 37 (4):883–906.
- Weismantel, Mary and Stephen Eisenman
- 1998 Race in the Andes: Global Movements and Popular Ontologies. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17 (2):121–142.
- Woeikof, A.
- 1879 Reise durch Yucatan und die südöstlichen Provinzen von Mexiko 1874. *Petermanns Mitteilungen* 25:201–212.
- Wolf, Eric R.
- 1982 *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.