

Chapter 8

The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification: *Data Processing*

Rocio Mezquita

Collection of Data: The Case

The field collection of the human rights violation data for the Guatemalan Historical Clarification Commission (CEH) was done by the *case*. A case was defined by one or more violations against one or more persons, perpetrated by one or more perpetrators, in the same act or operation.

The case was worked in the field by the interviewers who collected the testimonies, identified the cases and summarized each one. If several deponents spoke of the same case, then the interviewers had to put these testimonies together, rewriting the summary, reconstructing the facts of the case and resolving contradictions. A printed summary was then sent to the CEH database, located at the Central Offices of the CEH, in Guatemala City.

Original testimonies were rarely recorded or written. The interviewers wrote a summary of what the people said at the interview. The printed summary was attached to a set of five *forms*. These were; the case summary form; the victim(s) form(s), the violations pattern form; the perpetrator(s) form(s); and the deponent form.¹ The information collected in the field by interviewers is described in detail in Appendix 1.

Different deponents gave testimony about the same case in different CEH field offices. Thus, if the case could not be reconciled and reconstructed into a single case summary in the field, this task was left to the database processing team.

When could a violation be considered a CEH case?

To be accepted by the interviewer as a case, one or more of the violations had to be a defined CEH violation (see the next section). The initial list of CEH violations was discussed, developed and accepted by the commissioners of the CEH, the Central Team, and the Database Coordinator. During the period of data processing the list was expanded to account for knowledge gained during the collection of the data.

To accept one of the CEH violations as valid for a case, the violation had to have a relation to Guatemala's war between the years of 1960 and 1996², no matter the perpetrator. A listing of the CEH violations, with their definitions, appears in Appendix 2.

How Violations Were Recorded

Violations were recorded in a *pattern form*. A *pattern of violations* is a sequence of violations that were inflicted on one or more victims in the same place and date by the same perpetrator(s). A case must have at least one pattern of violations, but may have an unlimited number of patterns. By using these pattern forms, repetition of each sequence of violations for victims was avoided. This was especially convenient in the case of a massacre, where there could be more than 200 identified victims.

The following is an example of a pattern in which information was given for the sequence of violations in a case.

- 1) Violation which occurred first**
Geographic location

¹ Editors' note. The reader of other papers in this volume will notice that this structuring is defined elsewhere. We retained these redundancies so that each paper is self-explanatory.

² The original mandate of the CEH, specified in the Final Peace Accords was that the period of interest was 1960 to 1996. After a subsequent historical analysis, the CEH Commissioners decided that the "internal conflict" started in 1962 and ended in 1996, with the signing of the Final Peace Accords.

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

Specific location (home, street, etc)
Date
Perpetrator's group name
Individual perpetrator's information if known
Victim(s) - (identified, anonymous or collective)³

2) Violation which occurred second

Geographic location
Specific location
Date
Perpetrator's group name
Individual perpetrator's information if known
Victim(s) – (identified, anonymous or collective)

... And so forth for 3...*n* times, as appropriate.

Certainty of the violation and the perpetrator

The data processing team identified the certainty that the violation had happened, the type of responsibility of the perpetrating forces (direct, intellectual, collaboration...) and the certainty that this was the perpetrator responsible for the violation.

Violation:

1. Deponent is a witness
2. Deponent is not a witness
3. Deponent is not sure about the occurrence of the violation

Perpetrator's responsibility:

1. Material author
2. Collaborator
3. Intellectual author
4. Informant
5. Does not apply This was used for specific violations such as “the person disappeared for unknown reasons”, in which there was no perpetrator, and therefore responsibility could not be assigned.

Perpetrator's identity.

1. Deponent is a witness
2. There are other witnesses
3. Deponent suspects
4. It is publicly known
5. Documented evidence exists
6. Does not apply This was used for specific violations such as “the person disappeared for unknown reasons”, in which there was no perpetrator, and therefore responsibility could not be assigned.

The data processing team had therefore to identify the following elements in a case:

who the victims were
what happened to them
who was responsible
where
when
violation's certainty
perpetrator's responsibility
certainty about the perpetrator's identity

³ The victim was directly related to the pattern, but victim information was recorded separately.

The perpetrators could be identified in a collective way by the group to which they belonged. The listing of such groups is given in Appendix 4. If the perpetrators' names were known, they could be related directly to the violation.

The victims

The victims were directly related to the pattern. Accordingly, there were three types of “countable” victims:

- identified
- anonymous
- collective

Identified victims

The identified victims were those victims of whom we knew at least two of the three fields used to identify the victim in the database, one for the name and two for the last names (father's and mother's).

Example #1:

NAME: *Francisco*
1st LAST NAME: *Pop*
2nd LAST NAME: *X (unknown)*

Example #2:

NAME: *Juana*
1st LAST NAME: *X (unknown)*
2nd LAST NAME: *Ramirez*

Example #3:

NAME: *X (unknown)*
1st LAST NAME: *Cu*
2nd LAST NAME: *Caal*

Anonymous victims

Anonymous victims were victims for whom there was no personal information. Until almost the end of the project, the program also counted the “xx” (individual victims whose names we did not know even though we knew their sex, age or ethnicity), as anonymous victims. Initially the program did not count this valuable information in its statistics, and it was lost. Finally, this was changed and the “xx” victim was automatically converted into a “collective” of one person. Thus, in the end, this information was counted in the statistics.

Collective victims

This term denoted two or more victims for whom we had some information, such as sex, group identity (e.g., catechists, or peasants from a specific village, or an ethnic group).⁴

Difficulties Encountered

The definition of a massacre

How to define a massacre was an issue of ongoing concern throughout most of the CEH project. As the term “massacre” was never a violation in itself, the identification was made through key words at the beginning and at the end, through the title.

Initially, a key word code was used when the when the case testimony mentioned a massacre. At that time it was the **testimony** that identified a massacre, and not the **case**, as there was a many-to-many relationship between cases and testimonies.⁵ A massacre was at that time defined as the

⁴ A discussion of the nature of the definitions of collective victims and the relationships inherent in these definitions appears in Chapter 9.

⁵ One testimony could relate information about many massacres; each massacre might be described in many testimonies.

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

killing of a “significant” number of people, but that number was not given in advance. Thus, whatever number the data processor thought to be significant determined whether the event was denoted a massacre. Unfortunately, a specific key word for massacre cases was not used. The case could be a massacre or its testimony could – among other things – relate a massacre, which was not the violation of the case itself. This was a confusing situation.

Later in the project, when almost all of the data processing of the cases had been completed, a final definition was agreed to. This final definition was: “A massacre shall be considered the execution of five or more people, in the same place, as part of the same operation and whose victims were in an indefensible state.”

A code was created to identify those cases, which fell under the new definition. All the cases that were already in the database and which had five or more victims of executions were revised and re-coded. A problem was that some cases which were massacres did not appear in the list of “five or more victims.” Thus, they could not be re-coded under the new definition. They were not in the list because the victim type was collective and when we did not know how many victims there were we counted the collective victim category as including only two victims.

When this problem was found, it was decided to automatically apply the first massacre definition to the second one. It was assumed that the first coding was more limited and that all the cases that had this code should also fall under the new more specific definition of massacre. Unfortunately, it was forgotten that the first massacre code has been used not only for massacre cases, but for all the cases in which the testimony mentioned a massacre whether it belonged to the case or not.

As a consequence, the new code for massacre lost its relation to the new massacre definition because it included testimonies which spoke of a massacre, or where the case itself was not a massacre, or from massacre cases under the old definition and massacre cases under the new definition.

There was no way to identify all the massacres in the database that fell under the new definition, as the code had been altered. To solve this newly created problem, it was decided to search for massacres by the “title” section, which appeared on the summary case form. This approach to a solution had its difficulties. Unfortunately, not all the massacres were identified correctly in the title because some interviewers used the wording “indiscriminate attack.” Another source of problems was a spelling error, which made it impossible for the program to correctly identify the code. Final resolution was achieved after a number of revisions of the entire database and all the massacres were identified and listed.

Names of the categories

At the time of data processing, the database did not distinguish different violations for different perpetrators. For example, *extrajudicial execution* for state actors (as stated in international human rights law) and *assassination* or *killing* for the guerrilla forces. Extrajudicial execution was accepted and coded equally for any perpetrator. At the time of the final report, the category name was changed and the killing of a person was defined as “arbitrary execution.”

All such violations, which were denoted homicides in the sense that the reason for the killing was personal and not political, were considered extrajudicial execution whether committed by state agents or the guerrilla forces. The reasoning for this designation was that the perpetrators committed these violations under the impunity that the context of war offered.

The ambiguous category, *wounded or killed*, was created to keep a record of the combatants who were mentioned in the different cases and were either wounded or killed. This category was often used to identify those people who joined the guerrilla forces, and never came back. In such a case, it was assigned with a certainty of “it is suspected.” There was no certainty that they were killed or wounded. They may even have become refugees in another country. This information could have been useful if it were decided to look for those combatants who never returned, and whose families continue to search for them.

The identification of forced disappearances also had many problems. In some exceptional instances, there was no specific information on whether a witness observed the kidnapping or the testimony clearly stated that no one witnessed it. However, the context strongly suggests a forced disappearance. For example, the victim may have previously been threatened, or belonged to a group likely to suffer political violence in the Guatemalan context. In these special instances, the violation was classified as forced disappearance.

Other special cases arose when the body of the person was never found. In all of the following cases, the violation was denoted a forced disappearance:

- A person disappeared and people suspected s/he was dead.
- The victim's body was seen in a non-public place (such as military base) and it was clear that there was intent to disappear the victim.
- When one of the perpetrators confessed (usually under the influence of alcohol) that he had killed the person.
- When the person was taken away, but there is no more information in the testimony to determine whether the person reappeared, never appeared, or reappeared dead.

People with the same name/repeated victims

When entering the name of a victim whose name was already in the system, the program alerted the operator entering the information. At that time, whether the person was the same was not checked. This was done later, in the filtering of repeated names.

To verify if the two names belonged to the same person or not, it was necessary to check and compare the person's information as well as the context and the violation itself, and decide whether the person is or not the same person. If a person was discovered to be the same as another one in a different case, the cases were joined into one. This was a slow and time-consuming process.

Unifying a case

When by some circumstances (for example, two or more cases have the same victims or two or more cases contained the same violation) the data processing team had to unify the cases, cross the information of the violations, the victims, the place, date and perpetrators. If contradictions were found (which almost always occurred), the data processing personnel had to make a decision based on the information of both testimonies checking and taking into consideration which of the deponents was more reliable. Among the criteria for reliability was a closer relationship to the victim, or whether the deponent was a witness or not, etc.

Massacres were frequently described by many different deponents in the different field offices of the CEH so many cases of the same massacre arrived at the database without unification. To avoid going through the same cases again and again, as new cases for a same massacre were inputted, it was decided to accumulate all the cases which spoke of a specific place, and reconcile these cases out at the end of the reconciliation of testimonies. Massacre cases were unified in the same way as any other case. The major problem was that there often were many testimonies.

Deponent

Every case was constructed of one or more interviews. The relation of the person who gave the testimony was directly related to the case itself, never to the specific information that appeared in it. If more cases appeared which mentioned the same act of violation as another one, the additional deponent information was also added to the case.

Frequently the interviews were *collective interviews*. Sometimes entire communities would assemble and collectively give their testimony. This *collective deponent* was seldom identified by the interviewer, and therefore, was not recorded at the database.

For security reasons it is important to decide how and where the deponent's form is going to be filed. At the CEH, the deponents' forms (which contained their names and signatures) were filed separately from the case, for security reasons. Every testimony had to have at least one deponent sheet. This sheet either had a name, or if the person did not want to give their name, a note saying "deponent is afraid of giving the name" or stating whatever reason the name is suppressed. Only in this way, could we use the database to count all the people who gave testimony.

Training the Team

Data processing consisted of two main steps: 1) reading the testimony, identifying the information (violations and other qualitative information), entering it on forms in code or text, and 2) entering the codes and text into the database.

The interviewers and data processors did the first step. Then, the data entry personnel who *captured* the codes and text on the forms did the second step. No one person did both of these tasks. This specialization was good because at best it allowed team members to develop a high level of skill at their task with a greater level of accuracy and higher speed. On the other hand, there were some disadvantages to specialization.

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

The disadvantages included the difficulty of reading other people's handwriting, which was a continuing problem. Team personnel would have to contact the persons who carried out prior tasks to get clarification. This caused some lost time and may have resulted in undetected errors by persons who did not realize they should seek help. Also, most of the interviewers, data processors, and data entry personnel were not Guatemalan and were not always sure of the spelling of names. In a few cases, the data processor might fail to enter some information that was required. Errors due to these causes were avoided, but time and effort was expended correcting the errors.

However, specialization had its advantages. Data entry personnel were able to increase the speed of entry as they became more experienced (further along the learning curve). Data processors could concentrate on reading the testimonies and dealing with the specific problems that appeared when determining and interpreting the acts comprising a violation or a statement.

The database coordinator and her assistant trained the data processors. The topics covered in the training were the following:

- Information to be obtained from testimonies (violation, date, perpetrator's group name, perpetrator's individual name, etc.)
- CEH violations
- Key words
- How to properly fill in the forms
- Use of codes and textual entries
- Coding categories, for example, how to determine an identified, collective or anonymous victim or perpetrator
- Explanation of how to properly complete the forms, specifying which information should be coded and which should be text

Lessons Learned

Problem	Lesson learned	Issues
Codes and definitions were not unique throughout the project.	A unique code should be kept for each definition. If a new definition is to be coded, do not code it under an existing code. Give that definition its own unique code.	Enable the system to keep track of all the information in a separate way. Then, the system will be robust with respect to changes introduced by heads of the investigation, interviewers or analysts.
In some cases, original information was coded but the details not retained.	Record testimonies if authorized by the deponent. Always keep the original testimony.	
Inefficiencies resulting from the lack of knowledge of Guatemalan languages, history and geography.	Assure that the database team personnel have a good knowledge of the language, history and geography of the country. This can be achieved through training and education.	It would be good to have country nationals "seeded" throughout the teams if the proportion of foreign personnel is high.
The same problems were not always resolved in the same way.	Make consistent rules for resolution of problems and distribute to team personnel.	
Different rules for determining duplicate names were used by different team members at different times.	Make consistent rules for resolution of duplicates and distribute to team personnel.	This is the most important special case of the prior lesson learned.

Problem of apparently anonymous victim who bears a known relationship to an identified victim.	Consider on an individual project basis.	For example, Juan Perez is an identified victim and it is known that another victim is his son, but cannot be fully identified by name.
Not all violations had a controlled vocabulary at all times.	Do not allow violation coding without a controlled vocabulary.	
Duplication of names because deponent testifies in several cases.	Make clear on the forms that this deponent is duplicated, and on which forms the name is repeated.	
Lack of information about number of deponents participating in a collective interview.	In future, have a space on deponent forms to indicate number of participants in a collective interview.	
Filtering for duplicate names was inefficient and consumed too much time at end of project (two months!).	Filter suspected duplicate names early in the process of data entry. Provide an entry on forms for indicating that an interviewer, data processor or other person believes that a form contains a duplicated name. Store this notation with the record in the database.	When duplicate names are not cleansed early in the process, each duplicate entry is processed. Thus, many data processing operations are duplicated unnecessarily.
Inefficient re-coding because it is done by a different person.	Identify who does coding so that person can re-code if needed.	
Balancing too little information with too much.	Education of data processing team on objectives of project, especially if they are changed.	It is not always clear in advance what information will be useful. Too much is better than too little, except that resources, especially time, limit what can be done.
Continuous communication between interviewers and database team to facilitate correct reconstruction of cases.	Encourage and assure continuing communication between interviewers and database team.	
Inefficiencies at the start of the project because of incomplete organization, confused ideas about information to be collected, and lack of understanding of principles of case/violation structure.	Establish principles and rules at start of project; inform data processing team members, making sure that they are aware of changes as they occur.	Unfortunately, there was still disagreement over some of these principles going on after data collection had started.

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

Appendix 1

Information Collected in the Field by the Interviewers

Victim:

1st last name	
2nd last name	
Name	
Other names	nicknames, war names, pseudonyms
Sex of the victim	M/F
Identity document.	number and date of issue; one of the following was accepted: Identity Card, Birth Certificate, Refugee Card, Demobilization Card, Passport. This information was almost never completed
Date of birth or age at the moment of the violation. Certainty of this information	there were several levels of certainty options: 1) total 2) 1-2 years 3) 3-5 years 4) 6-10 years 5) none
Nationality	text, not coded
Place of birth	department, municipality, town, village, with a code number from a coded geographical dictionary of Guatemala
Mother's language	A coded list of languages spoken in Guatemala, as well as other languages, was used to answer this question
Type of victim	multiple and non exclusive options were allowed here
Where did the victim live at the moment of the violation?	text, not coded
Was the victim forced to leave the place where she/he lived because of war?	Y/N
Name of the father	
Name of the mother	
Marital status	at the moment of the violation, options were: 1) single, 2) married 3) widowed 4) divorced
Name of the wife/husband	
Number of daughters and sons	dead or alive
Name and age of the daughters and sons.	for the age, the deponent had the option to tell the age at the moment of the violation, or the age when the testimony was given
Additional comments on the victim	text, not coded

Perpetrator (individual):

1st last name	
2nd last name	
Name	
Other names	nicknames, war names, etc.
Sex	M/F
Identity document	number and date of issue. One of the following was accepted: Identity card, Birth Certificate, Refugee card, Demobilization card, Passport
Date of birth or age at the moment of the violation. Certainty on this information	there were several levels of certainty options: 1) total 2) 1-2 years 3) 3-5 years 4) 6-10 years 5) none
Place of birth	department, municipality, village. With a code number from a coded geographical dictionary of Guatemala
Mother tongue	a coded list of languages spoken in Guatemala, as well as other languages, was used to answer this question.
Groups)/organizations) to which the perpetrator belonged	multiple and non-exclusive options were allowed here. A coded list of groups of perpetrators was used.
Post of responsibility in this organization	a coded list of posts of responsibilities was used.
Violations for which the perpetrator is responsible	The violation had to be related to the pattern and to the order in the sequence of violations. This section included the kind of responsibility: perpetrator, intellectual responsibility or informant, and the type of evidence - deponent is witness, other people saw him, deponent suspects, "everybody knows," there are documented proofs.
Other violations in which the perpetrator participated	Text, not coded
Where is the perpetrator living now and what is he doing?	Text, not coded
Other comments on this person	Text, not coded

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

Deponent

1st last name	
2nd last name	
Name	
Where does he/she live now?	Text, not coded
Sex	M/F
Identity document	number and date of issue. One of the following was accepted: Identity card, Birth Certificate, Refugee card, Demobilization card, Passport. This information was almost never completed.
Date of birth or present age.	
Mother tongue	a coded list of languages spoken in Guatemala, as well as other languages, was used to answer this question.
Is the deponent also perpetrator?	Y/N
Other characteristics of the deponent	one of following options should be selected if it corresponds: a) refugee b) displaced c) reinserted ex-combatant d) returned refugee, e) survivor of a massacre f) victim of non typified violations g) witness or survivor of the political violence h) other text
Relation of the deponent with the victims	as the deponent could be the same in several cases, this section specified the victim, the victim's number, and the case in which that victim appears. Then, the relation was specified. There was a coded list of the most common relationships.
Other people who the deponent knows were also witnesses of violations	Text: name of the witness, how to find her/him, and any security problems there may be for this witness if s/he is looked for by a CEH interviewer
Expectations that the deponent has from the CEH	Text, not coded
Date of the interview	
Place of the interview	Text, not coded.
Language in which the interview was taken	a coded list of languages spoken in Guatemala, as well as other languages, was used to answer this question.
If necessary, can the CEH contact the deponent again?	Y/N How? Text.
Signature of the interviewer	
Signature or fingerprint of the translator	
Signature or fingerprint of the deponent	

Appendix 2

CEH Violations

The CEH used definitions for most violations that were derived from international humanitarian law, except for some violations that had CEH definitions. The following were the CEH accepted violation categories with the approved definitions.

a) Human rights violations and cases of violence resulting in death	This is a general category. However, the database processing team used this category to classify all conflict-related deaths that did not correspond to any of the approved specific violations under this general category. For example, people who died as a consequence of torture -- not immediately, but several months or years later – were included in this category, as well as related suicides.
Extrajudicial execution	Legal definition, including incidents where a guerrilla was the perpetrator. Also, when a person died immediately after or as a clear consequence of torture.
Death by forced displacement	People who died as a consequence of the displacement that persecution, fear, and massacres produced. Includes deaths due to hunger, sickness, depression, lack of medical attention due to displacement (pregnant women who died in labor, etc.).
Civilian death during hostilities	According to the international humanitarian law definition for “hostilities.”
Civilian death by indiscriminate attack	According to the international humanitarian law definition for “indiscriminate attack.”
Civilian death by the use of mines	Death as a consequence of touching or walking over an anti-personnel mine.
Death resulting from use as a human shield	Deaths in events in which civilians or paramilitary state-approved forces (e.g., PACs) were used by military forces on patrol to protect themselves from guerrilla forces. Not easy to identify, as not all deponents would have known that these people were being used as human shields at the moment they were killed.
b) Human rights violations and cases of violence resulting in grave injuries	This is a general category. However, the database processing team used this category to classify all conflict-related wounds and injuries, which did not correspond to any of the approved specific violations under this general category.
Wounded during an attempt on one's life	Victims who survived an attempt at extrajudicial execution, but were wounded in the attempt.
Wounded during forced displacement	People who were wounded as a consequence of the displacement that persecution, fear, and massacres produced. Includes wounds due to hunger, sickness, depression, lack of medical attention due to displacement (pregnant women injured in labor, etc.).
Civilian wounded during hostilities	According to the international humanitarian law definition for “hostilities.”
Civilian wounded by indiscriminate attack	According to the international humanitarian law definition for “indiscriminate attack.”
Civilian wounded by the use of mines	Injury as a consequence of touching or walking over an anti-personnel mine.

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

Wounded while being used as a human shield	Injuries or wounds in events in which civilians or paramilitary state approved forces (e.g., PACs) were used by military forces on patrol to protect themselves from guerrilla forces. Not easy to identify, as not all deponents would have known that these people were being used as human shields at the moment they were injured or wounded.
c) Torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment	As defined in international humanitarian law, but applied to state agents, guerrillas or any other group. This category includes ill treatment.
d) Sexual violations	Sexual abuse by any perpetrator. If a person was raped by more than one perpetrator at the same place and date, the database team counted only one act of sexual violation.
e) Disappearances	This general category was never assigned.
Forced disappearance	Used in general only when the victim was seen being disappeared by a perpetrator. In cases where the context (e.g., prior threats, membership in a targeted group) strongly suggested a forced disappearance, this category was also assigned.
Disappearance by unknown cause	This category was used in the absence of information about the circumstances of the disappearance (e.g., a person left his/her house or was last seen somewhere, and after that, never seen again.). If there was a suspicion that a specific perpetrator disappeared the person, then the violation should be "suspected forced disappearance".
f) Kidnapping	This category was used only where the kidnapping was from guerrilla actions, when extortion was involved. If the person died as a result of the kidnapping, the violation should be classified as kidnapping and arbitrary execution.
g) Others	This category is for violations not included in the original list, but are violations or other events that the team considered valuable for future analysis or investigation.
Threats, intimidation	Originally to be used only when there was no other CEH violation which made it possible for the violation to be recorded as a case. Later, also used when this violation was important to a case.
Burning crops	Rarely used. Defined to allow recording of this act as part of a context.
Deprivation of one's liberty	Any action which aims to deprive the victim of physical liberty. This category was mainly used to classify those violations in which a victim was kept as a captive for a specific period of time, and then freed, tortured, killed or disappeared. This violation could happen several times to a same person, if she or he was transported from one place to another. For example, often a victim would be kept in a specific military building, and then moved to another one where s/he could have been tortured, and then to another location, and so on until s/he was freed, killed, or never appeared again.
Forced recruitment	Not easy to distinguish from other deprivations of liberty. Only when the testimony gave specific information that the victim had been forced into military service was this violation assigned.
Homicide	<i>Not a CEH violation.</i> This violation was used when the testimony gave clear elements to conclude that the death of a person was not the result of political violence.
Dead or injured combatants	<i>Not a CEH violation.</i> For historical record only.

Prisoners of war	<i>Not a CEH violation.</i> Recorded combatants who were taken prisoner by the military. If other CEH violations (i.e., torture) occurred during the detention, these were recorded.
------------------	--

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

Appendix 3

Key Words

Key words are categories that make it possible to classify information according to qualitative criteria. These key words were classified into the following 12 major groups. A summary of the key words follows:

Human rights violations and cases of violence	violations that were not registered as types; i.e., forcing a person to commit acts of violence against one's family or community; forcing a person to witness acts of violence; publicly displaying cadavers; committing extremely cruel actions; destroying housing; violating other rights, such as civil or political rights; persecuting populations; etc.
Violations to cultural integrity	violations committed in relation to the ethnic background of the victims (indigenous people)
Strategies of parties to the peace accords Specific military strategies Specific guerrilla strategies	strategies and actions employed by armed actors against the population: among others, forced recruitment; massive oppression; sociological actions; prisoners of war; infiltration; scorched earth policies; use of paramilitary groups; use of informants; accusing a person of being a guerrilla or collaborator with the military, etc.
Modus operandi	themes related to the way in which parties to the peace accords acted: the use of disguises; acting like other parties to the peace accords; wearing hoods; use of arms; use of specific vehicles, etc.
General context	information on local conflicts; local power structures (social, economic, political, religious, and the state); impunity, etc.
Community reaction mechanisms	alternatives sought by the civilian population to protect themselves from violence: forming popular organizations; forming communities of people in resistance; fleeing; displacement; hiding in the mountains, etc.
Consequences of armed conflict	the effects of war: poverty; displacement; dispossession of land; physical and psychological illnesses; marginalization; returnees, etc.
Women victims of violence Child victims of violence	specific violence against women and children respectively: sexual assault; exploitation and forced work against women; persecution; abandonment; trade and exploitation of children, among others
Cemeteries	hidden graves, communal graves and exhumations, and characteristics of violence in Guatemala

Appendix 4

Perpetrator groups

The perpetrators could be identified in a collective way by the group to which they belonged. The following is the listing of the perpetrator groups that were used in the project.

Military	41 identified military sections
National police	17 identified National Police sections
National Guard (<i>guardia de hacienda</i>)	
Security forces	
Military Commissioners	
Self-defense Civil Patrols (PACs, <i>Patrullas de Autodefensa Civil</i>)	
Paramilitary groups ("Death Squads")	at least 10 different death squads were identified
Guatemalan Revolutionary National Unity (URNG, the guerilla umbrella organization)	<i>Ejercito Guerrillero de los Pobres</i> <i>Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias</i> <i>Organizacion del Pueblo en Armas</i> <i>Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo</i>
Armed groups	
Unidentified	
Civilians	plantation owners, businesspersons, etc.
Public employees	
Mexican military	
Mexican police	
Ex-military	
Ex-guerrilla	

Chapter Eight: The Guatemalan Commission for Historical Clarification

