

Horizontal inequality and ethnic discrimination in four Latin American countries

Alicia Puyana

Abstract

This article analyses ethnic discrimination in Mexico relative to Chile, Colombia and Peru from a perspective of horizontal inequality. It presents the numerous ways in which such discrimination is perpetuated and shows how far back in history segregation reaches, having taken root in the period of conquest by European nations before becoming entrenched in the colonial era and institutionalized in the constitutions that gave rise to the Latin American republics and in the formal and informal institutions shaped since then. Notwithstanding progress with recognition of political, social, cultural, collective and territorial rights and the creation of institutions to implement anti-discrimination policies, there is a large and enduring social debt. This article also identifies some divides and, by way of policy implications, suggests certain measures for closing them.

Keywords

Indigenous peoples, Afrodescendants, ethnic and racial groups, racial discrimination, social indicators, Mexico, Chile, Colombia, Peru

JEL classification

I320, J150, J710

Author

Alicia Puyana is a research professor with the doctoral programme of the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO), Mexico City. Email: apuyana@flacso.edu.mx.

I. Introduction

The starting point for this essay was a study of the same title (Puyana, 2015), which has been updated with information from the literature and from the 2015 Intercensal Survey in Mexico and the 2013 National Socioeconomic Survey (CASEN) in Chile. The study analyses the inequality that indigenous and Afrodescendent peoples in Mexico, Chile, Colombia and Peru have suffered and are still suffering and seeks to respond to the desire for a greater understanding of the divides that separate them from the other communities forming the nations of these countries. Horizontal inequality is a good framework for studying this issue since, unlike vertical inequality, which exists between individuals and households irrespective of their intrinsic characteristics, it refers to differences between groups with shared identifications, whether deriving from religion, membership of an ethnic group or other factors that create solidarity, such as regional origin, gender, sexual orientation or even occupation. These identities are constructed and are fluid, shifting in response to changes in the political, economic and social environment, and they are sustained for different purposes, in order to mobilize certain groups politically (Stewart and Langer, 2013).

By horizontal inequality is meant inequalities in economic, social or political dimensions and in cultural status between culturally defined groups (Stewart and Langer, 2013). These dimensions are complex and multifaceted. Neither their roots nor their manifestations can be reduced to a single aspect, such as income. Consequently, solutions cannot be limited to resource transfers or infrastructure endowment. It is therefore important to stress that membership of an ethnic group is not an individual decision and that the more fragmented a society is, the harder it will be to overcome this discrimination and its after-effects. This is something individuals might achieve in particular circumstances, but history suggests that group mobility is impossible.

There have been three stages on the way to recognition of indigenous peoples' rights: (i) civil and political citizenship (1948–1979), (ii) social citizenship (1966–1988) and (iii) ethnic citizenship (1989–2007). Foundational commitments were adopted at each of these stages.¹ A landmark in Latin America was the first Inter-American Indigenous Congress, held in the city of Pátzcuaro (Mexico) in 1940, and the Pátzcuaro Convention that came out of it, which was ratified by the four countries covered in this study between 1941 (Mexico) and 1967 (Chile). These are an indigenous policy milestone and, although imbued with paternalism and assimilationism, they gave rise to indigenous institutes and congresses and to indigenism, something that has been seriously criticized at times, but that is beyond the scope of this study. Another important event was the second Inter-American Indigenous Congress held in Cuzco (Peru) in June 1949, in which self-identification was suggested as a way of answering the questions of who and how many in number the indigenous peoples are and where and how they live.

In Latin America, examining ethnic inequality means considering the discrimination suffered by at least two major population groups, indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations,² whose origins go back to the conquest and colonization by European nations. The inequality suffered by indigenous peoples originated in the subjection of the aboriginal population and the confiscation of its lands, and that suffered by Afrodescendent populations in the slave trade carried on for reasons of labour efficiency and profit. This twofold discrimination and exploitation has been at the heart of the development of the Latin American countries' political, social and economic structures and is believed to be the reason for the region's relative economic underdevelopment today. Land confiscation and the slave trade reinforced the inequality of Africa and Latin America relative to Europe and laid down a pathway of unequal development, internally and externally.

Among the manifestations of ethnic discrimination is a refusal to admit that it exists, causing indigenous and Afrodescendent populations to become "invisible". One symptom of this invisibility is the decades-long dearth of basic statistical information by ethnicity, including census information, records of births and deaths and data on these populations' status, development and participation in the progress made by the region's countries over their republican history. As will be seen in later sections,

¹ See Puyana (2015) for details of this process.

² This is the term used in population censuses and official documents in the four countries studied and suggested by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

it is still recent and uncommon for census data to include information by ethnicity (the country that has had the largest number of censuses including questions on ethnic origin is Mexico, with three). Data are usually incomplete and skewed, often because language has been the preferred criterion for ethnic identification, which reduces the size of the population discriminated against and minimizes the multi-ethnic character of society and the ethnic discrimination that takes place on the basis of skin colour, thereby also minimizing divides and the resources needed to overcome them.

II. The moment of truth: what censuses reveal

Since the late twentieth century, the design of national statistical instruments in Latin American States has included questions intended to ascertain the ethnic composition of their populations. Obtaining this information is the first necessary step towards the adoption of the legal frameworks required by the commitments these States have signed up to and towards the design and implementation of policies aimed at eliminating ethnic discrimination. Identification criteria vary between countries and in some cases between censuses. The key identification criterion used in practically all of them is language, with approaches differing by country. Thus, the question is about a person's mother tongue in Peru but about the language they use in Colombia and Mexico. Some countries apply two methods, the language spoken and self-identification, while in Chile self-identification predominates. Colombia is a special case among the four countries included in this study, as its population census invites self-identification by the Afrodescendent and Roma populations.

Census and survey information reveals the multi-ethnic character of the Latin American population, provides a snapshot of the economic and political situation of indigenous and Afrodescendent peoples, exposes structural discrimination against them and reveals their position in society. In 2010, there were no less than 671 indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations in Latin America and the Caribbean. The indigenous population of Latin America is in excess of 44.8 million people, most of them living in rural areas in conditions of marginalization and inequality. This is a heterogeneous group characterized by great geographical, demographic and cultural diversity and thus great richness. There are peoples living in voluntary isolation, others in urban settlements and others still in transnational groups (ECLAC, 2013). Each group's situation depends on its demographic weight and political power. The common denominator is structural discrimination, manifested in exclusion and poverty.

In Latin America, the indigenous population represents 8.3% of the total population and the Afrodescendent population 15.8%, so that the two ethnic groups between them form 24.1% of the regional population. This is a large body of people whose segregation entails serious problems for the socioeconomic and political development of the region and of each country (see table 1). The data also show the importance of these four countries when it comes to understanding ethnic horizontal inequality and its severity, considering that the segregated population numbers no less than 50 million people (the figure rises when the Afrodescendent population of Mexico, Peru and Chile is considered). The four countries account for 60.4% of the total indigenous population in Latin America and just 38.1% of the total population, an imbalance that marks them out as having a more indigenous character than the other countries. Following a review of identification concepts (with children aged under 3, not formerly counted, being added to the total of indigenous language speakers), it can be said that Mexico, with 17 million indigenous persons, accounts for 62.4% of the four countries' indigenous population and 37.7% of the region's. Peru ranks second among the four countries in terms of the absolute size of its indigenous population, but it has the largest indigenous population share when this is measured by the size of its indigenous population relative to the Latin American indigenous population and the size of its total population relative to the region's (this ratio is shown in the last column of table 1). Populations representing major civilizations (Maya, Aztec, Inca and Muisca) live in these countries, among other indigenous peoples. The earliest advances in recognizing these peoples' rights were made in Mexico and Peru. While Mexico abolished its special jurisdictions for indigenous peoples in the nineteenth century, Colombia retained them and is using them for its agrarian reform and to return land in the reservations to the indigenous peoples that originally owned it (DANE, 2006).

Table 1
Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Peru: population structure by ethnic origin, according to latest census data

	Population structure (millions of inhabitants)			Percentage of population that is indigenous		Indigenous population of total indigenous population of Latin America (1/1)	Total population of the country as a percentage of total population of Latin America (3/3)	Ratio A/B
	Indigenous population (1)	Non-indigenous population (2)	Total population (3)	Afrodescendent population (4)	Of the four countries' total indigenous population			
Mexico	16.9	95.4	112.3	...	62.4	37.7	20.9	1.8
Chile	1.6	15.6	17.2	...	5.8	3.5	3.2	1.1
Colombia	1.6	40.9	46.4	4.02	5.9	3.6	8.6	0.4
Peru	7.0	22.3	29.3	...	25.9	15.6	5.4	2.9
Total (four countries)	27.1	174.2	205.2	...	100.0	60.4	38.1	1.6
Latin America	44.8	408.5	538.2	84.85		8.3		

Source: Prepared by the author on the basis of A. Puyana, "Desigualdad horizontal y discriminación étnica en cuatro países latinoamericanos. Notas analíticas para una propuesta de política", *Studies and Perspectives series*, No. 161 (LC/L.3973; LC/MEX/L.1174), Mexico City, ECLAC subregional headquarters in Mexico, 2015. For Chile: Ministry of Social Development, *CASEN 2013. Pueblos indígenas: síntesis de resultados*, 2015 [online] http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/documentos/Casen2013_Pueblos_Indigenas_13mar15_publicacion.pdf; for Latin America: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), "Mujeres indígenas en América Latina: dinámicas demográficas y sociales en el marco de los derechos humanos", *Project Documents* (LC/W.558), Santiago, 2013.

III. Inequality, poverty, distributive justice and horizontal inequality

Inequality and its effects on society and the individual are a recurring theme of philosophers, politicians, economists and sociologists, who have defined the concept, first, on the basis of the idea of human dignity and the rights attendant on this and, second, on the basis of Rousseau's vision of the social contract as renewed by John Rawls and of John Locke's liberalism as revitalized by Robert Nozick (Stewart and Langer, 2013).

Adam Smith dealt with the inequality of individuals, which affects their ability to work and function in society. He regarded as legitimate a distribution that favoured capital and enabled everyone to dress decently and go to church without embarrassment. In his judgment, economic growth would ease poverty without altering the concentration of wealth, the social order or property rights, always provided it ensured equality of opportunities and freedom of choice, which are central to classical and contemporary economics.

According to the liberal conception, the State is the guarantor of distributive justice, whose rationale is the common humanity of all and individual merit, and no-one should be denied respect or be limited in their social performance because they are poor. Accordingly, no society can develop harmoniously if some of its members live in poverty or want, because then respect and trust disappear, whence the need to move from the egalitarian distribution of respect to the meritocratic distribution of resources, provided this does not perpetuate inequality. Because of the causal link between poverty (capability deprivation) and inequality (denial of opportunities), programmes that focus on poverty eradication while ignoring income concentration reflect a morally narrow conception of equity (Sen, 1993).

Nonetheless, concern about poverty and inequality in large sections of society is a relatively new issue in economics and practical politics, one that is taken up or dropped depending on the business cycle, political atmosphere and dominant paradigms. It arose with the independence of India, South Africa and a number of other African, Asian and Caribbean countries after the First and Second World Wars alongside development economics and was reinvigorated by social and economic human rights guaranteeing minimum access to health care, education and housing. Subsequently, following structural reforms and liberalization of the economy, concern shifted to relief of the acutest forms of extreme poverty, while social ethics treated increasingly insecure employment, real wages and diet and rising income concentration as normal. Social responsibility for the relief of these conditions ebbed, tax burdens and the distributive orientation of taxation and social spending diminished and poverty relief programmes with targeted transfers, criticized by Sen (1993), became widespread.

Inequality is analysed nowadays from the intrinsic and instrumental perspectives. The former builds on arguments about justice and distribution, while the latter focuses the analysis on the effects of inequality on socially accepted goals. From this second perspective, inequality is positive because it encourages emulation and speeds up economic growth, and because all individuals have the right to possess the wealth their labour produces. Negative perspectives stress the inequitable distribution of social capital or the impossibility of securing credit, expanding economic activity and acquiring scale advantages, besides the social and political instability deriving from income concentration. The concentration of income and ownership makes it hard to bring in reforms to catalyse growth and social welfare (Raghuram, 2010), discourages investment in education and cancels out the growth effects of human capital investments. Lastly, inequality drives distributive struggles, social conflicts and violence.

1. The dimensions making up horizontal inequality

For analytical purposes, it is possible to distinguish four areas of horizontal inequality that delineate the trend and size of divides: (i) political participation, (ii) economic aspects, (iii) social aspects and (iv) cultural status. Each field is composed of factors of differing importance. Thus, political participation (or the lack of it) is manifested alike in central, regional and local government, in the executive, legislature and judiciary, in police forces and in the army. The economic elements are ownership of all forms of assets (land, financial resources, education), access to jobs and wages. Social factors include access to services, educational attainments and health, for example, while cultural status means the degree of social recognition (or lack of it) for customs and practices (Stewart and Langer, 2013, p. 13). There is a causal relationship and continuous feedback between these areas: lack of access to education results in disadvantageous employment opportunities and limited political participation, which in turn means a lack of government attention and poor socioeconomic infrastructure endowments, leading to poor growth, lower incomes, increased poverty and a lack of cultural appreciation. Ethnic discrimination, sustained over long periods in Latin America, creates circles of poverty from which neither groups nor individuals can easily escape. This perpetuation of inequality, perceived as unjust by the groups that suffer from it, gives rise to social conflicts that have on occasion turned into the kinds of confrontations and even warfare with which the region's countries are only too familiar.

2. From vertical to horizontal inequality: new analytical criteria

This section discusses the differences between vertical and horizontal inequality and the reasons why it is necessary to move the analysis on from the former to the latter (Stewart and Langer, 2013; Stewart, Brown and Mancini, 2005). Some aspects of vertical inequality (between individuals) that are acceptable on the liberal principles of Rawls and Nozick, among others, are unacceptable when applied to population groups, just as it is unsustainable for horizontal inequality to be mitigated by applying policies designed to rectify vertical inequality.

From an economicist instrumental perspective, a degree of vertical inequality may be acceptable, assuming the social contract ensures equality of opportunities, in which case the optimum distribution would be the one that maximized efficiency and output. Under these conditions, some vertical inequality may encourage emulation and raise productivity and individual incomes. In these instrumental terms, inequality may raise saving and investment and thereby an economy's potential. The question must be what degree of inequality would induce these efficiency effects, measured by outcomes, and what degree would suppress them. Extreme inequality, like that in Latin America, is negative for production efficiency and effectiveness, limits the domestic market and, far from being a catalyst for emulation, stifles competition and diminishes the human capital of society as a whole, since the poorest are probably malnourished and undereducated, with limited access to health services (Birdsall, 2006). A given distribution of income is desirable and just only if the poorest are better off as a result, and this only happens when the poor capture a larger income than the non-poor and than they would receive under a distribution driven by outcomes.

In terms of horizontal equity, distributive justice cannot be based on distribution driven by outcomes, as this means accepting that groups differentiated by ethnicity, gender, language, religion or other factors have fewer comparative advantages, value effort less or place less value on income. Thus, if for centuries large population groups have not had access to land or a good education, their poorer efficiency outcomes cannot be attributed to their membership of their ethnic group or some cultural characteristic, since they are the result of factors they had no control over. Likewise, if as a result

of poor economic outcomes (poverty, poor health, lack of education) over centuries these groups are discriminated against on the basis of criteria beyond their control, such as ethnic factors or the fact of living in a particular region, merit-based distribution loses any instrumental justification. Thus, groups face unequal opportunities.

This approach entails a need to review the considerations justifying inequality, such as the fairness or legitimacy of sources of ownership or property rights, respect for which is the basis of the social contract. Property inheritance, a primary source of inequalities, is among these legitimate rights. When differentiated social groups have suffered from asset poverty for generations, however, inheritance affects distribution and reproduces inequality, even if legitimate. This is more serious when whole groups have lost their possessions (land, for instance) through violent usurpation or confiscation by means of legal ruses; then the principle of restitution needs to be applied, since the fact that some people have stolen from, defrauded or enslaved others means that their property was not legitimately acquired, including inherited goods if they were originally obtained illegally; rectification and application of redistributive criteria is required (Stewart and Langer, 2013, p. 4). Redistribution will depend on what society does and does not consider legitimate. With regard to the inequality of indigenous and Afrodescendent populations, the question must be for how long illegitimately acquired possessions should be treated as wrongfully held and inherited, how the impact of the devaluation of cultural heritage should be measured, and how the damage should be remedied.

The fact that ethnically diverse societies tend to register lower economic growth is attributed to ethnic inequality of opportunities over long periods (Stewart, Brown and Mancini, 2005, pp. 5-7). Nonetheless, for the instrumental reasons set out earlier, it is not feasible to reduce individual inequality without remedying group inequality (Easterly and Levine, 2000; Montalvo and Reynal-Querol, 2005). It is hard if not impossible to reduce the Gini coefficient of overall income concentration without first tackling horizontal inequality.

IV. Horizontal inequality and the indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations of Latin America

Understanding horizontal inequality in Latin America means considering the systematic discrimination suffered by at least two major population groups: indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations (in the case of Columbia, the Roma population, descended from the Gypsy people, has been included). Although the origins and nature of the horizontal inequality now affecting these peoples are different, the indicators seem to suggest that the inequality affecting Afrodescendants may be severer insofar as, unlike indigenous peoples, they cannot differentiate themselves and self-identify by language to demand certain rights. The inequality of these groups relative to the white or European-descended population goes back to the Conquista and colonial era: in the case of the indigenous population, to the subjection of the original inhabitants and confiscation of their lands, and in the case of the Afrodescendent population, to the slave trade, also of colonial origin, for reasons of labour efficiency and profitability. Dispossession of lands and the slave trade deepened inequality in Africa and Latin America relative to Europe and marked out a pathway of unequal development, internally and externally. Thus, it might be suggested that ethnic discrimination had its starting point in the period of the Conquista, was consolidated in the colonial era and was perpetuated in the republican one by virtue of the inherited power structure and because of policies that recreated horizontal inequality and social practices based on ideologies of a racist character.

Ethnic inequality forms part of the fragmentation that has made Latin America the most inequitable region in the world, as manifested in the divides between genders, between town and country and between capital and labour, those affecting people with different capacities or different sexual orientations, and those between regions. Ethnic inequality is among the most serious because it was rendered invisible by the misleading premise that all citizens are equal before the law under the constitution and because formal equality in situations of great real inequality can be a vehicle for the reproduction of divides between those who own everything and those who lack everything. Not long after their creation and well before they had consolidated as nations, almost all the new republics abolished the special jurisdictions for indigenous people that the Spanish crown had created both to protect them and to reduce the growing power of colonial officials or safeguard tax revenues and agricultural production. Under the conditions of great inequity prevailing in the colonial era (Humboldt, 1811), a social covenant based on justice and citizenship for all members of society without distinction was not conceivable. Freedom for slaves was decreed in several countries during the wars of independence so that they could be recruited into the republican armies (Gros, 2001). In the ideology of the local Spanish-descended elites, popular sovereignty and citizenship were indispensable for the exercise of political power, but “constitutions defined, as well as assuming, the ideal citizen, whom they endowed with political rights and thus turned into a member of the nation’s political community” (Zarza, 2010, p. 2640). Thus, in the nineteenth century citizenship embraced the enlightened and financially solvent male elite, which meant that equal citizens were created in a situation of highly unequal rights (Zarza, 2010, p. 2650). Ayala (1995) brilliantly reviews indigenous rights in the constitutions of the new republics and the way they evolved after the International Labour Organization (ILO) initiatives enshrined in the Convention concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and Other Tribal and Semi-Tribal Populations in Independent Countries (No. 107 of 1957), superseded by the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (No. 169 of 1989).

V. The overwhelming scale of ethnic inequality

This section uses census data and other specialized sources to examine the divides separating indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations from the rest of the population. The analysis begins with Mexico, which means, first, that these divides can be observed in geographical areas with predominantly indigenous populations as a proxy for one type of poverty trap, the fact of living in depressed areas; and, second, that ethnic discrimination can be estimated using data from three censuses, those of 1990, 2000 and 2010. References to the divides in Chile, Colombia and Peru are presented.

To estimate the divides affecting the indigenous population in territories considered predominantly indigenous, the starting point taken is the classification of municipalities by the indigenous share of the total population. Much of the indigenous population lives in rural communities, engaging in rural activities in depressed areas. The study of social inequality is enhanced when it includes consideration of spatial inequalities, since the place or region of residence affects opportunities for individual and group mobility (Stewart and Langer, 2013; Stewart, 2008; Dutta and Nagarajan, 2005). To better understand the severity of discrimination against indigenous peoples, Mexico’s National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CDI) aims to identify what could be called “indigenous regions”, a task whose quantitative complexity “is manifested in the fact that 60% of the indigenous population, or some 6.02 million people, live in indigenous municipalities (those in which the indigenous population is over 40% of the municipal total), while the rest, some 4.2 million, live in municipalities where they are a minority” (CDI/UNDP, 2006, p. 7). There are 24,090 indigenous settlements in these municipalities, and these are often small and dispersed, with high levels of marginality and deprivation. Both types are in

predominantly indigenous states and form regions with high levels of poverty and inequality in all or some of the dimensions of inequality mentioned, constituting territorial areas in which it is difficult to escape from deprivation (Bird, Higgins and Harris, 2010). For these reasons among others, it is interesting to take a spatial approach to the estimation of horizontal inequality, at least at the municipal level, and this is a perspective that is not sufficiently considered in laws, programmes or plans of development and assistance for indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations.

When the issue of horizontal inequality and the divides separating indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations from those not so classified is addressed from a regional perspective, it is possible to examine how far and in what way differences in production specialization and the orientation of some economic and social spending policies affect ethnic inequality. It has been detected, first, that rural and agricultural income has been declining as a share of the total and that poverty is greater and poverty gaps are wider in rural areas than in urban ones and nationally, creating an incentive for migration; at the same time, it has been observed that some macroeconomic policies and per capita social spending, oriented by efficiency criteria, tend to be more lavish in regions and states that are more developed, have better economic, social and institutional infrastructure and are less rural (Puyana, 2015).

Going by the classification of the National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CDI/UNDP, 2006), the 2,454 municipalities in Mexico were divided for the purposes of this study into the following five groups by the indigenous share of their populations, using data from the 2015 Intercensal Survey:³

- A: municipalities where the indigenous population is over 70% of the total;
- B: municipalities where the indigenous population is between 40% and 69% of the total;
- C: municipalities where the indigenous population is less than 40% of the total but exceeds 5,000 people;
- D: municipalities where the indigenous population is less than 40% of the total and is fewer than 5,000 people, including three municipalities in Michoacán and Morelos where inhabitants speak varieties of the Nahuatl language (Puyana and Murillo, 2012);
- E: municipalities with a scattered indigenous population or none.⁴

The social deprivation index of the National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL) was used to measure deprivation in these five types of municipality. The municipalities were grouped into homogeneous categories designed for there to be the largest differences between them. The variable resulting from this stratification is the degree of social deprivation, and five social deprivation categories were established, from very high to very low.

To ascertain the relationship between indigenous status and social deprivation, municipalities were weighted by the presence of indigenous people in the different degrees of social deprivation. The findings for 2015 are presented in tables 2 and 3, which show that this relationship does obtain and is direct and powerful, and likewise that there is an “overfrequency” or overrepresentation of municipalities of types A and B in the three highest degrees of social deprivation and a deficit or lower frequency in the lower degrees of deprivation. This “overfrequency” in the higher and middle degrees of deprivation is found to diminish significantly in B municipalities, turning into a deficit from the C municipalities onward, where the middle and low degrees of deprivation are overrepresented, while there is a large deficit in the very high and high degrees of deprivation. The shaded cells in table 3 indicate where municipalities are overrepresented in a given degree of deprivation.

³ This is a change from Puyana (2015), which applied data from the 2010 Population and Housing Census.

⁴ There are 22 such municipalities with a total of 17,000 inhabitants.

Table 2
Mexico: types of municipality by concentration of indigenous population, 2015

Type of municipality	Number of municipalities	Number of inhabitants		Percentages		
		Indigenous population	Total population	Distribution of indigenous population by municipality type	Distribution of total population by municipality type	Indigenous population as percentage of total
A. Over 70% indigenous population	777	7 717 348	8 588 248	28.61	7.77	89.86
B. Between 40% and 69% indigenous population	364	5 715 206	10 920 561	21.18	9.87	52.33
C. Less than 40% indigenous population	455	12 179 995	78 715 329	45.15	71.18	15.47
D. Scattered indigenous population ^a	850	1 365 997	12 364 936	5.06	11.18	11.05
Not determined (inadequate sample size)	11	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	2 457	26 978 546	110 589 074	100.0	100.0	24.40

Source: National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>.

Note: The indigenous population is defined as persons speaking or understanding an indigenous language or self-classifying as indigenous.

^a This category includes municipalities of category E (municipalities with a scattered indigenous population or none).

Table 3
Mexico: degree of social deprivation by types of municipality categorized by proportions of indigenous population, 2015

Type of municipality	Degree of social deprivation					Total
	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	
Type of municipality	A. Over 70% indigenous population					
Observed number of municipalities	101.0	367.0	175.0	102.0	32.0	777
Expected number of municipalities	35.3	156.9	154.7	182.0	248.1	
Adjusted residual	13.7	22.7	2.2	-8.2	-20.1	
Type of municipality	B. Between 40% and 69% indigenous population					
Observed number of municipalities	7.0	59.0	128.0	101.0	69.0	364
Expected number of municipalities	16.5	73.5	72.5	85.3	116.2	
Adjusted residual	-2.6	-2.1	7.9	2.1	-5.8	
Type of municipality	C. Less than 40% indigenous population					
Observed number of municipalities	0.0	11.0	40.0	104.0	300.0	455
Expected number of municipalities	20.6	91.9	90.6	106.6	145.3	
Adjusted residual	-5.2	-10.5	-6.6	-0.3	17.2	
Type of municipality	D. Scattered indigenous population or none					
Observed number of municipalities	3.0	57.0	144.0	266.0	380.0	850
Expected number of municipalities	38.6	171.7	169.2	199.1	271.4	
Adjusted residual	-7.3	-12.1	-2.7	6.7	9.9	
Observed total	111	494	487	573	781	2 446

Source: National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL), "Medición de la pobreza. Pobreza a nivel municipio 2010" [online] <http://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Medicion-de-la-pobreza-municipal-2010.aspx>.

Note: Indigenous population defined by self-classification.

The larger the indigenous share of the total municipal population, the more heavily municipalities are overrepresented in the higher degrees of deprivation, while the smaller the indigenous population share is, the more municipalities are underrepresented in the lower degrees of deprivation. The adjusted residual, or difference between observed and expected frequencies in each column, and the resulting residual are expressed in units of standard deviation above or below the mean. According to Agresti and Finlay (1997), an adjusted residual value greater than -3.0 or 3.0 is strong evidence of association.

The shaded cells in table 3 contain the most extreme values of the residuals. The frequency values obtained for this study are greater than those yielded by 2010 census data, which means that the overrepresentation of municipalities with larger indigenous population shares in the higher degrees of social deprivation increased between 2010 and 2015, as did the underrepresentation of municipalities with smaller indigenous population shares in the lower degrees of deprivation (Ribotta, 2010).

Table 4 likewise uses 2015 data to illustrate the size and evolution of different types of poverty gaps in order to show how these correlate with municipalities' indigenous population shares. The persistence of inequalities and ratios is confirmation that there are geographical poverty traps.

Table 4
Mexico: poverty gaps by types of municipality defined
by indigenous population shares, 1990–2015
(Percentages and ratios)

Municipality type	Food poverty ^a				Capability poverty ^b				Asset poverty ^c			
	1990	2000	2010	2015	1990	2000	2010	2015	1990	2000	2010	2015
A. Over 70% indigenous population	53.6	69.7	52.7	47.6	62.4	76.0	63.0	57.9	80.8	87.8	84.0	80.2
B. Between 40% and 69% indigenous population	47.9	58.2	42.6	32.4	56.7	65.3	52.6	41.9	76.5	80.5	75.6	66.2
C. Less than 40% indigenous population	28.5	31.8	24.0	20.3	36.6	39.2	32.4	28.4	58.7	58.9	56.3	53.1
D. Scattered indigenous population	32.6	36.8	26.1	23.6	41.0	44.0	34.9	32.0	63.0	62.2	59.5	56.5
Ratios	1990	2000	2010	2015	1990	2000	2010	2015	1990	2000	2010	2015
A/A	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
B/A	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8
C/A	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
D/A	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7

Source: Prepared by the author on the basis of National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), Population and Housing Censuses of 1990, 2000 and 2010; and "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>.

Note: The indigenous population is defined as persons speaking or understanding an indigenous language or self-classifying as indigenous.

^a Food poverty: inability to afford a basic food basket even if the whole of the household's available income were spent on this.

^b Income does not cover the cost of basic food, health care and education.

^c Income does not cover the cost of basic food, health care, education, housing and transport.

What stands out in this measurement of divides is that group A municipalities have higher indicators of poverty, especially asset and capability poverty, and while the food poverty situation has improved, that of capability and asset poverty has not. The gap between these municipalities and those with smaller indigenous population shares has widened on all measures, with little change between 2000 and 2015.

To complete this review of horizontal inequality and ethnic divides, summary information based on population censuses will be presented. The emphasis is on Mexico, which has no records of Afrodescendent populations or special institutions dedicated to this ethnic group, like the CDI.

As regards Mexico's demographic structure and dynamics, all institutions present figures suggesting a lower intercensal rate of growth in the indigenous population, so that the proportion of people stating they spoke some indigenous language dropped from 10.57% in the 1990 census to 7.13% and 6.60% of the total population surveyed in 2000 and 2010. A general decline in the indigenous proportion of the total population can be inferred from this falling trend in the proportion yielded by the linguistic self-identification criterion, although this is only demonstrated in the case of Mexico, which has had three censuses including this information. Data will now be presented on

social and service access issues in Mexico, with references to the other countries. The aim is to show that divides have remained broadly unchanged notwithstanding the many conferences held and agreements reached, laws passed, complex institutions created and programmes instituted in all the countries, with differences in structure and scope that can be deduced from the legal and institutional frameworks operating there (Puyana, 2015). The 2015 Intercensal Survey, which included questions on self-classified ethnic origin, yielded surprising results that bear out those from the 2010 census and suggest that gaps have widened.

1. Demographic divides in Mexico

The age structure of the four countries confirms the need for investigations and programmes that are differentiated by country and by the ethnic origin of populations. In Mexico, the proportion of people aged over 60 is greater in the indigenous population than in the non-indigenous population (14% and 12%, respectively) and increased between 2000 and 2010, so that the ratio between the two declined. In the same period, conversely, the proportion of people aged between 3 and 29 declined in the indigenous population and was smaller than in the non-indigenous population. This is important considering that the indigenous proportion of the total population dropped in the intercensal period, suggesting that self-identification is not something the youngest people care about, or is not an appropriate way of capturing the ethnic origin of the population. In Chile, a larger proportion of the indigenous population is aged over 60 (16%), while in Colombia and Peru it is about 9%. The demographic structure of indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations is younger in Colombia and Peru than in Mexico or Chile. The reasons for these divergences are unclear, and it is not plausible to attribute them to greater compliance with national or international agreements, which might prompt higher fertility and lower infant mortality rates, as there is no indication of this in figures for access to health services. What is clear is that fertility is higher in the indigenous than in the non-indigenous population, especially in Colombia and Peru, where the fertility gap between the non-indigenous and indigenous populations is 0.65 and 0.80, respectively, being somewhat greater in rural areas (ECLAC, 2013, p. 58, table 9).

Mexico's indigenous population has a greater propensity to form households, whether through marriage or cohabitation, and a lesser tendency to divorce or separate (INEGI, n/d), which means that a smaller proportion of indigenous people are single. These differences and their impact on the other horizontal inequality variables cannot be explained. There is a higher proportion of early and continuous pregnancies in the indigenous population, with potentially serious effects on women's health and life expectancy.

2. Social divides in Mexico, with reference to those in Colombia, Peru and Chile

(a) Education

The large proportion of Mexico's indigenous population found in the 2010 census to lack a basic education (about 22%) is alarming, as is the fact that this is almost three times the figure for the non-indigenous population, although the difference between the two narrowed between 2000 and 2010. The improvement was probably due to conditional transfer programmes requiring children to be kept in school. Between 2000 and 2010, the proportion of the indigenous population with no more than a basic education dropped from 96.6% to 90.6%, although this is still an alarming level, given the limitation on young indigenous people's secondary and higher education options that it reflects. Reducing the educational divide between the two major population groups in Mexico

requires a major effort: first, to bring down the proportion of the indigenous population without an education until it is similar to that in the non-indigenous population; second, to eliminate the deficit in basic and upper secondary education. These basic and secondary education levels are essential if a larger proportion of the population is to be able to opt to study at university, the level of education that has been the focus of public policies for the last three or four decades. The situation looks even more serious when the quality of the education provided to the indigenous population is considered, as it does not match either the needs or the world view of that population, besides which educational establishments are deficient and textbooks are in Spanish or are translations of those used in the mainstream system (INEE, 2014). Social scientists and politicians stress the importance of investing in education as part of the effort to expand human capital, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index treats education as the way to increase individuals' power to decide their own destiny, prepare them for the exercise of citizen rights and expand their employment options (UNDP, 2014). Consequently, failure to make eliminating the education divide that affects the indigenous and Afrodescendent population in Latin America and the Caribbean an explicit, high-priority goal is unacceptable.

Educational deprivation, meaning the proportion of the population without schooling, is similar for indigenous populations in Colombia and Mexico. In Peru, 91.5% of the total indigenous population only has basic education, as against 25.6% of the rest of the population, with the remainder having been through upper secondary or higher education. Chile has historically had higher levels of education and until 1973 was the most egalitarian country in Latin America, being comparable to developed countries (Bulmer-Thomas, 1996). There is educational inequality nonetheless, since 8.5% of the indigenous population has no schooling whatsoever, as against 6.4% of the non-indigenous population (see tables 4 and 5).

Table 5
Mexico, Chile, Colombia and Peru: educational attainments of indigenous language speakers and Spanish speakers, various years
(Percentages of the total population)

Level of education	Mexico						Peru								
	2000			2010			2007			2015					
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population
No schooling	26.30	7.50	8.80	21.90	7.60	8.50	18.97	6.51	7.32	34.70	6.51	7.32	34.30	6.51	7.32
Basic education	67.30	70.10	69.80	68.70	63.60	63.80	69.10	60.73	61.28	92.58	60.73	61.28	87.89	60.73	61.28
Upper secondary education	3.40	13.10	12.30	3.00	15.10	14.40	8.36	19.00	18.30	503.33	19.00	18.30	227.29	19.00	18.30
Higher education	2.00	8.60	8.10	3.00	13.10	12.40	3.57	13.77	13.10	436.67	13.77	13.10	385.44	13.77	13.10
Total (number of people)	6 044 547	78 381 411	84 794 454	6 913 362	97 250 211	124 400 000	7 352 022	105 146 107	112 498 129	1 406 670	105 146 107	112 498 129	1 430 170	105 146 107	112 498 129
Level of education	Chile			Colombia			Peru								
	2011			2005			2007								
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Rest of population ^a (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population
No schooling	8.50	6.40	6.60	28.70	12.00	9.20	32.06	32.06	60.49	60.49	32.06	60.49	32.06	32.06	60.49
Basic education	45.70	35.20	36.10	56.50	62.20	60.40	106.90	106.90	16.88	16.88	106.90	16.88	106.90	106.90	16.88
Upper secondary education	35.40	39.20	38.90	7.70	2.40	17.40	225.97	225.97	11.86	11.86	225.97	11.86	225.97	225.97	11.86
Higher education	10.40	19.20	18.50	2.60	8.00	12.70	488.46	488.46	10.12	10.12	488.46	10.12	488.46	488.46	10.12
Total (number of people)	1 369 563	15 592 952	16 962 515	1 269 965	4 016 922	32 923 297	2 592 460	2 592 460	38 210 184	38 210 184	2 592 460	38 210 184	2 592 460	2 592 460	38 210 184

Source: For Mexico: National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>; for Chile: Ministry of Social Development, CASEN 2013. *Pueblos indígenas: síntesis de resultados*, 2015 [online] http://observatorio.ministeriodesocial.gob.cl/documentos/Casen2013_Pueblos_Indigenas_13mar15_publicacion.pdf; for Colombia: National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE), "Censo general 2005" [online] <http://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/poblacion-y-demografia/sistema-de-consulta>; for Peru: National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), "Censos nacionales 2007" [online] <http://censos.inei.gob.pe/Censos2007/Pobreza/>.

^a Population that is neither indigenous, Roma, Afrodescendant, Raizal nor Palenquero.

(b) Access to health services

In Mexico, entitlement to health services in public or private health-care establishments is through work, military service or the purchase of voluntary insurance, or by being a designated family member of someone benefiting from health care in one of these ways (INEGI, n/d). Between 2000 and 2015, this was the area that saw the greatest narrowing of the divide between the indigenous and non-indigenous populations, suggesting that in a context of improvement across the board, coverage expanded more quickly for the indigenous population. In 2015, however, just 88 of every 100 people in the indigenous population were thus entitled to the use of health-care establishments, as against 91 of every 100 in the non-indigenous population (see table 6). However, there is a public insurance scheme, Seguro Popular, which provides access to public health-care services for the uninsured.

Peru has the largest proportion (63%) of indigenous people without social security coverage, this being 20 percentage points more than Mexico in the closest year (2010), while in Colombia 33% of the indigenous population and 22% of the Afrodescendent population lack this entitlement. In Chile, according to the 2013 CASEN survey, 87.3% of the indigenous population and 77.4% of the non-indigenous population belong to the public health-care system, but the figures are only for eligibility and do not necessarily imply effective access or a high-quality service (see table 6).

Table 6
Mexico, Chile, Colombia and Peru: indigenous language speakers' and Spanish speakers' eligibility
for treatment at health-care establishments, various years
(Percentages of the whole population)

Eligibility	Mexico						Peru									
	2000			2010			2007			2015						
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	
Eligible	16.1	43.3	41.3	268.60	57.1	65.8	65.2	115.30	87.7	90.6	87.9	103.20	87.7	90.6	87.9	
Ineligible	82.9	55.7	57.6	67.20	42.5	33.9	34.5	79.86	12.3	9.4	12.1	77.00	12.3	9.4	12.1	
Total (number of people)	6 044 547	78 381 411	84 794 454	12.97	6 913 362	97 250 211	104 781 265	14.07	7 381 987	105 427 704	112 809 691	14.28	7 381 987	105 427 704	112 809 691	
Eligibility	Chile			Colombia			Peru									
	2011			2005			2007									
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous or Roma (A)	Afrodescendent, Raizal or Palenquero (B)	Rest of population ^a (C)	Whole population	Rest of indigenous population ^a (C/A)	Rest of Afrodescendent population ^a (C/B)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	
Eligible	87.3	77.4	88.5	0.89	62.9	74.8	83.1	79.9	132.09	110.97	37	41.7	37	41.7	41	
Ineligible	12.7	22.6	11.5	1.80	33.1	22.0	14.4	15.6	43.65	65.60	63	58.3	63	58.3	59	
Total (number of people)	427 752	5 550 063	5 977 815	12.97	1 392 802	4 223 468	34 648 185	41 174 853	24.88	8.20	4 045 713	21 764 618	25 810 331	5.38	5.38	5.38

Source: For Mexico: National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/especiales/intercensal/>; for Chile: Ministry of Social Development, CASEN 2013, *Pueblos Indígenas: síntesis de resultados*, 2015 [online] http://observatorio.ministeriodesocial.gob.cl/documentos/Casen2013_Pueblos_Indigenas_13mar15_publicacion.pdf; for Colombia: National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE), "Censo general 2005" [online] <http://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/poblacion-y-demografia/sistema-de-consulta>; for Peru: National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), "Censos nacionales 2007" [online] <http://censos.inei.gob.pe/Censos2007/Pobrezal/>.

^a Population that is neither indigenous, Roma, Afrodescendent, Raizal nor Palenquero.

(c) The labour market

At first sight, there are no significant divides between the proportions of the indigenous and non-indigenous populations that are economically active and inactive in Mexico. Nonetheless, the trend between the two population censuses reveals a growing gap, with the active proportion of the indigenous population declining while the active proportion of the non-indigenous population rose. At the same time, the non-active proportion of the indigenous population rose (see table 7). Symmetry in labour relations, employment type or income levels is not taken for granted. The lower activity of 2015 may be connected to educational underperformance and the larger proportion of the population aged over 60. Confirming this requires employment to be analysed by age and education groups. The proportion of the employed population earning less than twice the minimum wage or with incomes below the food poverty line is greater in type A municipalities, whose populations are over 70% indigenous, than in those with smaller proportions of indigenous people. One explanation is that these municipalities are predominantly rural and agricultural, and incomes in municipalities of this type have slipped relative to the national average (see tables 2 and 3).

The same is true of Chile and Peru, where the proportions of people who are economically active and inactive are practically the same in the indigenous and non-indigenous populations. As with Mexico, this does not mean there is no horizontal inequality in these countries' labour markets, for inequality arises with other factors such as income and employment type. In Peru, for example, 51% of the indigenous population are manual labourers, as against just 37% of the rest of the population. While 15% of the country's employed indigenous population receive no income whatsoever, the figure is just 5.7% for the non-indigenous population.

In Colombia, a much smaller proportion of the indigenous population than of the rest of the population is economically active (27.3% versus 40.7%), and 47.1% of the former earn less than US\$ 230 a month, while only 39.3% of the non-indigenous population do.

Table 7
Mexico, Chile, Colombia and Peru: indigenous language speakers and Spanish speakers aged 12 and over,
by economic activity status, various years
(Percentages of the whole population)

Activity status	Mexico						Peru					
	2000			2010			2015			2007		
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)
Economically active	49.30	49.40	49.30	100.10	48.80	53.00	52.60	108.70	44.06	50.91	50.45	115.50
Economically inactive	50.40	50.30	50.30	99.80	50.50	46.50	46.70	92	55.94	49.09	49.55	87.80
Total (number of people)	5 041 137	64 019 691	69 235 053	12.70	5 784 439	78 737 666	84 927 468	13.61	6 303 029	86 940 681	93 243 710	13.79
Activity status	Chile						Colombia					
	2011			2005			2005			2007		
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)	Indigenous (A)	Rest of population ^a (C)	Whole population	Rest of population ^a /indigenous ratio (C/A)	Indigenous (A)	Rest of population ^a /Afrodescendent ratio (C/B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)
Economically active	55.90	55.90	55.90	100.06	37.22	40.72	39.92	149.033	45.50	109.405	44.20	97.20
Economically inactive	44.08	44.05	44.05	99.93	47.43	47.31	47.23	106.451	54.50	99.760	55.60	102.40
Total (number of people)	1 000 100	12 393 016	13 393 116	12.39	3 827 966	31 589 792	36 611 367	26.460	3 856 358	20 307 535	24 163 893	5.27

Source: For Mexico: National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>; for Chile: Ministry of Social Development, *CASEN 2013. Población indígena: síntesis de resultados*, 2015 [online] http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/documentos/Casen2013_Poblacion_Indigena_13mar15_publicacion.pdf; for Colombia: National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE), "Censo general 2005" [online] <http://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/poblacion-y-demografia/sistema-de-consulta>; for Peru: National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), "Censos nacionales 2007" [online] <http://censos.inei.gob.pe/Censos2007/Pobreza/>.

^a Population that is neither indigenous, Roma, Afrodescendent, Raizal nor Palenquero.

(d) Water provision

Once again, the indigenous population in Mexico is at a considerable disadvantage when it comes to the proportion with access to piped drinking water that has undergone some degree of decontamination by disinfection or boiling. Table 8 presents this divide and the resulting ratio, which has been falling but is among the largest of any of the aspects analysed. In 2015, 17.1% of the indigenous population in Mexico lacked piped water, as against just 4.5% of the non-indigenous population. The ratio between these proportions dropped from 34.9% in 2000 to 26.1% in 2015 as the provision of piped water to the indigenous population increased more quickly.

In Colombia and Peru, there is also great horizontal inequality in access to this service. In Colombia, almost 80% of the indigenous population lacks piped water, while the proportion for the rest of the population (non-indigenous and non-Afrodescendent) is much lower at 25%. In Peru, 52% of the indigenous population does not have direct access to water, while just over 25% of the non-indigenous population does not have this service. This is an alarming disparity, in that the lack of this infrastructure and service is a cause of severe diseases that affect the whole life course of indigenous people, a disadvantage originating within their own homes that tends to increase with the passage of time.

Table 8
Mexico, Colombia and Peru: indigenous language speakers and Spanish speakers aged 5 and over
by access to piped water in the home, various years
(Percentages of the whole population)

Access to piped water	Mexico											
	2000			2010			2015					
	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)
Have piped water	59.50	85.60	83.70	144.00	74.90	92.30	91.10	123.20	82.92	95.54	94.71	115.20
Do not have piped water	38.50	13.40	15.20	34.90	24.60	7.30	8.40	29.60	17.08	4.46	5.29	26.10
Total (number of people)	6 011 721	78 065 443	84 433 162	12.99	6 673 117	92 868 076	100 036 275	13.92	7 374 622	105 293 413	112 668 035	14.28
	Colombia											
	2005											
	Indigenous or Roma (A)	Afrodescendent, Raizal or Palenquero (B)	Rest of population ^a (C)	Whole population	Rest of population ^a /indigenous ratio (C/A)	Rest of population ^a /Afrodescendent ratio (C/B)	Indigenous (A)	Non-indigenous (B)	Whole population	Non-indigenous/indigenous ratio (B/A)		
Have piped water	20.31	56.38	75.31	71.20	370.86	133.58	46.70	73.80	69.60	158.0		
Do not have piped water	79.69	43.60	24.69	28.79	30.98	56.61	51.90	25.20	29.40	48.6		
Total (number of people)	1 397 480	4 311 757	34 898 171	41 468 384	24.97	8.09	4 002 198	21 460 227	25 462 425	5.36		
	Peru											
	2007											

Source: For Mexico: National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/especiales/intercensal/>; for Chile: Ministry of Social Development, *CASEN 2013. Pueblos Indígenas: síntesis de resultados*, 2015 [online] http://observatorio.ministeriodesocial.gob.cl/documentos/Casen2013_Pueblos_Indigenas_13mar15_publicacion.pdf; for Colombia: National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE), "Censo general 2005" [online] <http://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/poblacion-y-demografia/sistema-de-consulta>; for Peru: National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), "Censos nacionales 2007" [online] <http://censos.inei.gob.pe/Censos2007/Pobrezal/>.

^a Population that is neither indigenous, Roma, Afrodescendent, Raizal nor Palenquero.

3. Political divides

Of all the divides between the commitments accepted and actual progress in reducing the horizontal inequality affecting the indigenous population and Afrodescendants, perhaps the widest is in the area of political discrimination. Statistics on the subject are hard to come by, and few surveys have dealt with it. This is true of all the countries, but particularly of some that have held out against extending genuine citizen rights to ethnic minorities, such as the right of prior consultation on policies and projects that affect their culture, their habitat and even their lives.

The Latinobarómetro survey is one of the few to have included questions on ethnic origin very recently. According to the 2011 Latinobarómetro survey, an average of 22% of people in the four countries perceive themselves as part of a group that is discriminated against. Those belonging to some indigenous people (identified by language) perceive themselves as being more discriminated against in their country than those who speak Spanish. Again, this perception differs by country: some 50% of people belonging to indigenous peoples perceive themselves as being discriminated against in Chile and Peru, while the proportion is lower in Mexico, at 33%, and lowest of the four in Colombia, at 29%. The reasons are unclear and deserve scrutiny (Latinobarómetro, 2011).

As regards citizen participation, an important factor in strengthening democracy, some 33% of respondents in the four countries as a group mentioned this as a shortcoming in their country's democracy. Those belonging to indigenous peoples were less likely to bring it up than the rest of the population, which does not mean that it is an unimportant aspect, but there is no way of interpreting this result at present. It may be that political participation is not a latent problem, or that the failure to mention it indicates a lack of legitimacy in the system or is a result of the same discrimination. This is another issue worth analysing and studying. It cannot be concluded from this Latinobarómetro result that indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations do not consider it urgent or necessary to strengthen democracy as a way of securing social justice and recognition of their rights.

Indigenous peoples in Chile and Colombia are more likely to emphasize the lack of citizen participation in their countries, and indeed the participation deficit is brought up more often by citizens from indigenous peoples than by the Spanish-speaking population in these two countries. In Peru and Mexico, conversely, a smaller proportion of indigenous than of Spanish-speaking respondents bring up the need for citizen participation.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

The purpose of this study is to examine the main types of inequality affecting indigenous peoples in Mexico, with references to the situation in Chile, Colombia and Peru. The analysis has centred on manifestations of discrimination that can be measured from the perspective of horizontal inequality, particularly in certain categories: economic, social and political inequalities and inequalities in cultural status.

Commitments to eliminating ethnic discrimination entail an obligation, first, to gather relevant and significant information and, second, to refine the usual analysis of social, economic and cultural divides, which is generally carried out by distinguishing between social classes, regions, income deciles, households by the income and educational level of the head, and so on. What is required is, first, the measurement of gaps between specific populations as a whole and the rest of the population when it comes to variables relating to the guarantee of citizen rights and, second, the application of new concepts, alternative forms of measurement and different solutions, such as positive discrimination, usually applied for the benefit of women in policies to mitigate gender discrimination. This does not mean

a whole new start in the analysis of discrimination, since the roots of inequality need to be established, not just to measure the accumulated social debt, but also to perceive the multitude of interrelated difficulties involved in overcoming segregation in all its dimensions.

The analysis of divides in the ethnic dimensions of horizontal inequality in this study set out from a detailed review of the Mexican situation, which made it possible to establish the close, direct link between being an indigenous person resident in a municipality with a particularly large indigenous population share and suffering from greater poverty and more acute deprivation.

Macroeconomic and sectoral policies have differentiated effects on different regions, sectors and producers. In areas with larger proportions of indigenous or Afrodescendent inhabitants, the main activity is usually agriculture and the production of basic foodstuffs, these being sectors that have lost out from trade liberalization and currency appreciation, among other things. In both the cities and the countryside, indigenous peoples and Afrodescendent populations are primarily small own-account producers who have not benefited from changing macroeconomic policies. At the same time, major horizontal inequalities of a demographic, social and political nature have been identified.

Bibliography

- Agresti, A. and B. Finlay (1997), *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
- Ayala, C. (1995), "El Estado constitucional y autonomía de los pueblos indígenas" [online] <http://biblio.juridicas.unam.mx/libros/4/1836/29.pdf>.
- Bird, K., K. Higgins and D. Harris (2010), "Spatial poverty traps: an overview", *CPRC Working Paper*, No. 161, London, Chronic Poverty Research Centre.
- Birdsall, N. (2006), *The World is Not Flat: Inequality and Injustice in Our Global Economy*, Helsinki, World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER).
- Bulmer-Thomas, V. (comp.) (1996), "El nuevo modelo económico en América Latina: su efecto en la distribución del ingreso y en la pobreza", *Lecturas de El Trimestre Económico*, No. 84, Mexico City, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- CDI/UNDP (National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples/United Nations Development Programme) (2006), "Definición de las regiones indígenas de México. Apuntes metodológicos" [online] <http://www.cdi.gob.mx/regiones/regs.html>.
- DANE (National Administrative Department of Statistics) (2006), "La visibilización estadística de los grupos étnicos colombianos" [online] http://www.dane.gov.co/files/censo2005/etnia/sys/visibilidad_estadistica_etnicos.pdf.
- Dutta, P. V. and H. Nagarajan (2005), "Spatial inequality in rural India: do initial conditions matter?", *CPRC Working Paper*, No. 29, Chronic Poverty Research Centre.
- Easterly, W. and R. Levine (2000), "Africa's growth tragedy: policies and ethnic divisions", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 112, No. 4, Oxford University Press.
- ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean) (2013), "Mujeres indígenas en América Latina: dinámicas demográficas y sociales en el marco de los derechos humanos", *Project Documents* (LC/W.558), Santiago.
- Gros, C. (2001), *Políticas de la etnicidad: identidad, estado y modernidad*, Bogota, Colombian Institute of Anthropology and History (ICANH).
- Humboldt, A. (1811), *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, London.
- INEE (National Institute for the Evaluation of Education) (2014), *El derecho a una educación de calidad. Informe 2014*, Mexico City [online] <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P1/D/239/P1D239.pdf>.
- INEGI (National Institute of Statistics and Geography) (n/d), "Encuesta intercensal 2015" [online] <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>.
- Latinobarómetro (2011), [online] <http://www.latinobarometro.org/latNewsShow.jsp>.
- Montalvo, J. G. and M. Reynal-Querol (2005), "Ethnic diversity and economic development", *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 76, No. 2, Amsterdam, Elsevier.

- Puyana, A. (2015), "Desigualdad horizontal y discriminación étnica en cuatro países latinoamericanos. Notas analíticas para una propuesta de política", *Studies and Perspectives series*, No. 161 (LC/L.3973; LC/MEX/L.1174), Mexico City, ECLAC subregional headquarters in Mexico.
- _____(2013), "Formulación de una propuesta de política pública integral de Estado para los pueblos indígenas de la Amazonía Colombiana: propuesta documento CONPES", Bogota, unpublished.
- Puyana, A. and S. Murillo (2012), "Trade policies and ethnic inequalities in Mexico", *European Journal of Development Research*, vol. 24, No. 5, Springer.
- Raghuram, R. (2010), "Inequality is untenable", *Finance & Development*, vol. 47, No. 3 [online] <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2010/09/pdf/ramchara.pdf>.
- Ribotta, B. (2010), "Diagnóstico sociodemográfico de los pueblos indígenas de Perú", *Project Documents*, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)/Ford Foundation.
- Sen, A. (1993), "Capability and well-being", *The Quality of Life*, M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds.), Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Stewart and Langer, F. (2013), "Justice, horizontal inequality and policy in multiethnic societies", Mexico City, 17 September.
- _____(ed.) (2008), *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict. Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stewart, F., G. Brown and L. Mancini (2005), "Why horizontal inequality matters: some implications for measurement", *CRISE Working Paper*, No. 19, Oxford, University of Oxford.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2014), *Summary. Human Development Report 2014. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*, New York [online] <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-summary-en.pdf>.
- Zarza, G. (2010), "El largo camino hacia la ciudadanía: la población indígena en la Constitución de 1812", *Actas. XIV Encuentro de Latinoamericanistas Españoles Congreso Internacional 1810-2010: 200 años de Iberoamérica*, E. Rey Tristán and P. Calvo González (eds.), Santiago de Compostela, University of Santiago de Compostela/Spanish Council of Ibero-American Studies [online] <https://minerva.usc.es/xmlui/handle/10347/13419>.