

DEBATES

## Tumultuous Times: LASA in the 1960s

ESCOBAR continued...

(STS), sexuality studies, environmental studies, intellectual history, literary theory, hypermedia studies, etc.)

6. A complication of *sites of knowledge production and kinds of knowledge producers*. When LAS emerged in the 1940s, the site of knowledge production par excellence was the university and the chief, if not sole, knowledge producer was the well-trained scholar. Not any longer. Today, the State, NGOs, religious groups, social movements, and so forth are important sites of knowledge production. Non-academic critical or oppositional knowledges tend to flourish in spaces such as the World Social Forum process, and among many social movements. The idea that social movements need to be taken seriously as knowledge producers in their own right is becoming one of most dynamic insights in social movements research in anthropology, geography, and other fields. Notions of cognitive justice, epistemic decolonization, epistemologies of the South, and so forth seek to give shape to this emergent reality. LASA's recently launched initiative, *Otros Saberes* addresses this problem area.

How each institution responds to these challenges, which calls and trends it responds to, and how it pursues its transformative agendas within existing institutional constraints will in turn depend on processes involving faculty, graduate students, fund raisers, and administrators. This micro-political work is also of utmost importance, and perhaps as decisive as the larger trends outlined here. ■

### Some Personal Trivia about the Early Days

by RICHARD N. ADAMS  
Patzisotz History Company  
rbadams@guate.net.gt  
President 1968

I am not sure how many of us had felt the need for some kind of Latin American studies organization, but in my memory it was unquestionably Kalman Silvert who took the first and critical steps to put the idea into action. I had known Kal since he spent 1952-53 in Guatemala doing the research for his study of government in Guatemala. I arrived in Guatemala in late 1950, sent by the Smithsonian Institution's Institute of Social Anthropology, and at the request of Antonio Goubaud Carrera, Guatemala's then ambassador in Washington and principled anthropologist. Guatemala had been visited by a number of foreign anthropologists over the preceding decades, but Kal was the first North American political scientist to do an in depth field study. When he returned to play a leading role in establishing the Seminario de Integración Social we became re-acquainted and our friendship developed. In looking back, it seems to me that I always dealt with Kal when he was taking the lead in developing something. I was to learn much from Kal about leading and developing programs.

In the closing years of the 1950s our paths again crossed. Kal had been exploring Latin America as a member of the American University Field Staff. The Field Staff was an organization that employed academics full time to go into Latin America and send periodic reports on things of interest to academicians in the United States. These reports would be printed and distributed to the members' universities and the staff members would, after spending part of the year in the field, circulate to the member

universities, giving lectures on what was going on in the area. In the late 1950s Kal came to lecture at Michigan State where I was teaching.

I first knew Kal when he was at Tulane University, but he then moved to Dartmouth—perhaps after he left the Field Staff or perhaps sharing time between the two. His final move was to a position at New York University where he worked in conjunction with a permanent, but part-time, relationship as Latin American Advisor to the Ford Foundation. It was in his position at Ford that Kal was able to fuel the machinery that led to the invention of LASA. I unfortunately do not recall much about the composition of the group that he drew together to accomplish this, but I do remember that one of the early meetings was at Kal's home at Dartmouth College.

I frankly remember few details of the discussions at that meeting or most of the others. One thing that remains in my memory was that Kal had found someone to design a logo for the organization and he showed it to us for our approval. It would never have occurred to me that it was important to have a logo...indeed, I would never have missed it had it not been designed. But we got one then and we still have it. I recall thinking that a logo should reflect something about the things that it represented. It did not seem to me that this LASA logo was in any way suggestive of Latin America, or academics, or scholarship, or knowledge. But I was assured that these issues were not really important; and I guess they were right because it has served well without any of these apparently iconic virtues. I also remember particularly one of our number had been chosen by someone because he was very young. It was argued that we needed a young person as well as us older people to make the thing work. This sounded like somebody's logic, but not an

argument that I found convincing. Indeed, the person chosen proved to be a most entertaining companion, but he seemed to disappear from my horizons not many years after.

I am afraid that I probably learned less about Latin America from these meetings than about the ways meetings were run when well funded. One such lesson—I hope a minor one—that has remained with me occurred at a session held in Washington. Howard Cline, then head of the Hispanic Collection at the Library of Congress, hosted the meeting. We lunched at a restaurant where we were discussing some difficult aspects of the organization. They were so difficult that Howard felt that the only way to solve it was to order some wine. Good heavens! This was being paid for by the Ford Foundation and here we were spending their good money on wine! What an extraordinary thing. What germs of corruption were being spread! As I said, I learned a lot at these meetings.

When we came to the decisions about actually putting the LASA into operation we all agreed that Kal should be the first president. Because the first year was going to be dedicated to learning how to get things running, it was felt necessary to select the president for the second year as well. Somehow I was selected and to this day I really do not know why, except that Texas was famous for its Latin American Collection. I always felt a little odd about it—it was a painless way of becoming president.

A most useful product of those sessions—for some the most useful—has been the *Latin American Research Review*. Early in our discussions it became obvious that there would be a journal. It was assigned to me and to the Institute of Latin American Studies at Texas to get this underway. This in turn led to the selection of Dick Schaedel to be the

first editor. Although Schaedel and I had been graduate students at Yale at the same time, we had in fact not been in residence at the same time and so I did not know him well. We had similar academic careers, however, in that on finishing our degrees, neither of us had wanted to go directly into academics, and both had sought opportunities that would take us to Latin America. I came to know him in the late 1950s when we were both in Peru. He was working on a U.S. Government foreign aid project that focused on research in southern Peru and I was surveying North American academic programs in the Andes. I was much impressed with his work. He had been responsible for the preparation of a number of studies that were being issued in those years.

At the time we were looking for someone to undertake to design and produce the new journal, Schaedel was just finishing another period of foreign aid research in Haiti and was looking for something else to do. We were in the early days of that halcyon period when funding such things seemed almost effortless, and we were able to bring him to Texas to undertake the new editorial job. The Department of Anthropology willingly provided him with a part-time position while the Institute of Latin American Studies covered his salary for developing the journal, as I recall. One reason I favored him for the job was that he already had a broad experience in rather different fields. Although his own major interests lay in archaeology, specifically Andean prehistory, most of his professional work had been in applied social anthropology. In any event, the journal he started quickly took on its own character, and it continues today to be an important asset of the Association. Schaedel himself passed away in December.

The first national meeting of LASA was held at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City. This choice—I am quite sure—was Kal

Silvert's. He thought a first meeting should be in some particularly prominent place, where it could receive public attention as well as be introduced to the academic world. My only memory of it—aside from the comfortably splendid surroundings—was that one of the leading scholars who was in charge of a special session dedicated to setting up an organization of University Latin American Studies Centers left his session and came to me much disturbed. Some participants were raising noisy objections to something that we had done in the process of founding the Association. Naturally, I do not recall anything that we did wrong! But I do remember having to pick up the reins of a session that was noisy and unhappy. How I quieted it, or whether I did it in a way that was good or bad has, I suspect, fortunately been lost to history.

An embarrassing personal footnote remains to be recounted. Although I have almost always been associated with academic enterprises, I have always had a hot-and-cold feeling about association with them. One aspect of this became evident in the early years of LASA. When my term as president came to a close, I felt that I simply had had enough of it; much of my time had been spent in trying to get LASA off under its own steam. I decided I wanted to be free of it, and rapidly shed myself of the remaining responsibilities to others who were then lining up to take over. Apparently my relief at being free was so dynamic that I failed to pay my dues. This was coincidentally the same year that LASA had chosen my own University of Texas to be the site of its annual meeting. So when the meetings came to pass, and I wanted for some reason to attend the business session, I was refused entry because of my failure to pay up! So much for founders and ex-presidents! I was not as embarrassed as I should have been.

## TUMULTUOUS TIMES: LASA IN THE 1960S continued...

**Words From the Eighth President of LASA***by* PAUL DOUGHTY

University of Florida  
 p\_doughty@bellsouth.net  
 President 1974

From the very beginning, LASA both struggled to develop its identity as a “legitimate” area studies association, and to create a role for itself, which conformed to the intellectual spirit of the region. LASA was the “Juanito-come-lately” among area studies associations in the United States. European, Asian, Middle Eastern, Russian and African scholarly associations had preceded us and there was a faint sense of “inferiority” among Latinamericanists in this regard. Was that because in the United States, Latin America was considered to be a “known” quantity and of lesser importance than other regions of the world? Many of us certainly felt that the reason for our tardy emergence owed something to that prevailing bias. The other condition, which seemed to limit us, was that United States and Latin American scholars could not be described as widely sharing common sets of interests or concerns, but rather were like the dozens of political parties that emerge as elections draw near.

Political events, societal and cultural changes that were beginning to challenge traditional domestic and international relations apparently served to bring us together. The “Sputnik era” was a time of immense growth in U.S. academia with new universities, programs and departments springing up everywhere. The Ford and Tinker Foundations among others were being particularly generous in supporting area studies and the government NDEA Center programs offered many opportunities as well. LASA emerged in this milieu.

LASA’s evolution began in the mid-1960s

when a group of scholars from various disciplines created an ultimately unsuccessful organization under the acronym of ALAS. Within that context was also born the idea of an interdisciplinary journal dedicated to Latin American issues. In 1965 ALAS was for me a ghost-like structure, occasionally mentioned but given little credence by those senior scholars I knew at the time, and ALAS never flew. From the ashes of the first idea came a second, with a much broader base of support.

In the spring of 1966 an organizational meeting was convened at the Hispanic Foundation in the Library of Congress under the paternal and watchful eye of historian Howard Cline, director of the Foundation. The 30 to 40 participants represented the universities with Latin American programs prepared to provide some initial funding to launch the organization. A small group of “significant others” was invited. Historian Robert Quirk and I represented Indiana University. As I recall, he, being very senior to me, was asked to sit up front with other luminaries such as Richard Morse, John Johnson, John Augelli, Kalman Silvert, Tom Davis and Richard Adams. I recall sitting in the back row with another of my ilk, Frank Cancian of Stanford. The meeting churned along with Cline presenting an organizational format that he and some others had worked out in advance. He proposed that the headquarters for LASA be located at the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress with a hand-picked executive secretary, Taylor Peck.

The idea of locating LASA in an office belonging to the U.S. government however struck me as inappropriate for many historic and certainly contemporary reasons, what with the CIA/Camelot follies in Chile beginning to unfold. How could we claim to be an independent academic and scholarly organization with such a tight affiliation with a

U.S. government agency—however scholarly—that would surely be interpreted negatively by our peers throughout Latin America?

When I stood to raise this issue, heads turned and an undercurrent of muttering could be heard: “who is that guy?” “what’s his problem?” and so forth. Cline, famous for having a “short fuse,” was red-faced and clearly peeved. Someone joked maliciously that it would be more convenient for some Latin Americans “to pick up their checks” in Washington if LASA was also there. The only persons I recall supporting my motion that LASA be seated in a university setting were Cancian and Tom Davis from Cornell and I think, John Thompson from Illinois. Thus the first locale occupied by LASA was in the Hispanic Foundation from which Cline, and Taylor Peck as the first executive secretary, presided over our day-to-day affairs for six years.

The *sede* of LASA was wrenched away from Cline’s clutches at the Library of Congress in 1972 amidst growing problems associated with the non-academic setting because it wasn’t attached to the Centers where LASA interests, membership and academic concerns lay, and, the position of executive secretary was in a word, “underpowered.” A series of rather arcane and complex negotiations took place between the LASA Executive Council (EC) and universities interested in landing the obligation, financial and otherwise, of handling the association’s affairs. William Carter at Florida eventually persuaded the Council that the Center for Latin American Studies at Florida could best assume that role with Felicity Trueblood as executive secretary. I did not play a significant role in this change despite being at Florida and on the CLASP board—and its president in 1972.

Trueblood was a very different Executive Secretary than her predecessors: fearless, tough-minded, competent and ready to wheel

and deal with anyone on behalf of the association. She just loved the LASA “action” which she managed with only modest, often part-time staff. True to form, it was Felicity who demanded that the Executive Council change her title to that of Executive Director, because she was tired of having people who called her office, always ask to speak to the “director” and not just the secretary! I remember her making the case to Council members with the words: “come on now fellas, let’s grow up here.” This early adventure in the equal rights era surely put LASA in the forefront of the movement. In 1973 first Meg Crahan and then Helen Safa were elected to the Executive Council and this was followed by a concerted effort to achieve gender equity in both leadership and membership. It would be a major change from past academic traditions in the field.

As the papers piled high on Felicity’s desk and the phone calls relentlessly had us all hopping, LASA experienced another jump in membership. We were now publishing a modest newsletter with Felipe Guamán Poma on the cover and *LARR*, produced at Texas under Richard Schaedel’s capable editorship, took off as an academic publication. Florida hosted LASA’s activities until 1978 when Illinois accepted that role under Carl Deal’s directorship.

### **LASA Issues and Academic Realism**

The first LASA meeting was held in New York City on November 7-9, 1968. Convened in the old Biltmore Hotel at Madison and 43rd Streets, the announcement went out to potential attendees on a single mimeographed typed page. No members were charged a registration fee but others had to pay \$2.00. In addition, subscription to a “vino de honor” reception at NYU and buffet dinner at the Columbia Faculty Club

cost members a total of \$4.00. The program consisted of but seven sessions with 35 male participants, including chairs and commentators; book advertisements occupied twelve pages. Twelve participants were from Latin America, four from Europe, and the rest from the United States. We thus clearly signaled our international intentions, having invited several major figures from outside the United States such as Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, Gino Germani, and Harold Blakemore.

Outgoing President Kalman Silvert’s address was scheduled in an auditorium at NYU but unfortunately he had become ill at the last minute and Richard Adams, as incoming president, delivered a spur of the moment speech. No dancing was scheduled. No one was listed as the program chair, but Charles Wagley apparently did most of that work out of his Columbia office.

The meeting was a rather loosely attended affair. People were largely bent on determining what was going on with the organization. Although sessions and papers carefully gave various disciplines their opportunity to expound, I can’t recall a single one. It all seemed rather bland academically speaking. And yet, LASA had already embarked on a distinctive path indicating that members were willing to take on the “powers that be” even before our first meeting. Virtually our first act as an organization in 1967 had been to issue a public statement about repression in Argentina (Silvert et al, 1967). This was followed by a rising crescendo of concern over events in Guatemala leading to LASA’s “Ad-Hoc Committee on Guatemala” report issued in 1973. For an academic organization it was a blistering account of repression in Guatemala and was sent to a broad spectrum of U.S. officialdom and 71 media outlets, as well as to reporters, agencies in Latin America, Europe and the

United States, invoking strong responses of approval and disapproval.

The second sesqui-annual Congress took place in Washington DC in 1970 and featured a raucous, standing room only, business meeting. In the face of member demands that LASA take stands on several policy and international issues, and calls for various parliamentary maneuvers, President John Johnson found himself and other Council members in a quandary as to how to conduct the meeting. Tom Skidmore came to the rescue, steering the meeting through its first turbulent business meeting. Seated with Richard Fagen towards the rear of the room, he and I found ourselves alternately dismayed or laughing: LASA had a lot to learn about both its membership and running coherent meetings.

Eighteen months later in Austin, we reconvened with President Henry Landsberger chairing the annual business meeting. By then we had new rules: paid up members were entitled to vote and would be seated separately from other attendees. Because our constitution did not specify what would guide the conduct of the meeting—our problem in 1970—Henry asked me, as a non-EC member to rise immediately after he convened the meeting, and move that we adopt “Roberts Rules of Order, Second Edition,” to structure our proceedings. I did this, and another “conspirator” instantly seconded it. A moment later, someone rose to question why it was that we wouldn’t utilize the first edition of Roberts’ Rules! The questioner appeared serious: everyone else was laughing. A voice vote carried the day for “order and progress.” The next business meeting held at the University of Wisconsin featured additional turmoil on the floor. By that time however, LASA had its organizational operations established, and we were utilizing the services of a professional parliamentarian to keep things from disintegrating.

DOUGHTY continued...

There were several hot button issues of course that began in the 1960s that continued to inflame passions through the 1970s: the disastrous U.S. war in Vietnam, the civil rights movement in the United States and the Equal Rights movement. In Latin America, the Argentine, Chilean and Peruvian turmoil, the Panama canal issue, and of course, U.S.-Cuba relations, the cold war, coupled with Nixon's scandals were all placed on our table, one way or another.

It was the shock of Augusto Pinochet's ruthless repression of his fellow citizens with U.S. tacit approval that paved the way to a wider public and academic recognition of human rights as a real issue. This was not new in hemispheric experience. Witness the infamous 1954 CIA-Guatemalan "revolution," Colombia's long period of *la violencia*, the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic to uphold dictatorship; Castro's vengeance taken at the *paredón*; Guatemala and Haiti's long running agonies among others. Although receiving attention from "specialists," only the Cuban revolution captured and held general public attention. Why was Chile different?

I think that it was because it was seen from abroad as a quasi "European" nation ("white"?) that had become the South American center for international social science: economists, political scientists, and sociologists were ubiquitous there; the Ford Foundation, SSRC, various UN agencies, and the interagency OAS Inter American Committee on Agricultural Development among many others made Chile their base of operations, viewing that nation as exemplary of democratic progress and constructive change. In Chile there also were legions of stunned witnesses who watched as their professional colleagues, friends and students were tortured, annihilated or "disappeared." The cream of hemispheric academe felt the brunt of the attack.

Barely six years old in 1973, LASA plunged into action in response to the demands of motions made from the floor of the International Congresses. As the incoming president of LASA in 1974, with LASA colleagues Henry Landsberger, Meg Crahan, Felicity Trueblood, Tom Skidmore, and Dick Fagen, I worked on a plan to influence the situation as best we might. Helping academics and intellectuals became our goal: we made and publicized official statements concerning human rights in Chile and assisted in the foreign placement of collegial refugees through a collaborative network called the *Bolsa de Trabajo* involving people in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Canada, the United States and Europe. As the 1974 LASA Congress neared, it was clear to me that we should not meet in the San Francisco Sheraton as scheduled, as a protest to International Telephone and Telegraph's (ITT's) alleged role in the Chilean coup d'état. (ITT owned the San Francisco Sheraton.) Backing out of the contract took some doing. We learned that a militant Chicano group was threatening to protest our meeting at the Sheraton over the Chilean issue. With that information I spoke with the Sheraton's manager and was able to convince him that it would be in his hotel's best interests to void the contract. I recall that he had a difficult time in understanding our stance based on ethical and human rights issues, but ultimately, relented.

Our position and LASA's prior stand on supporting academic interests and freedom in Cuba despite the U.S. embargoes had already helped to earn LASA an early reputation in U.S. government circles. A State Department official assigned to attend the LASA Congresses confided to me as we were lifted upwards in our alternate hotel's elevator in San Francisco, that LASA was known as being "radical" and "too far to the left." Despite our fears, the San Francisco Congress was amazingly orderly however impassioned

our business meeting and we had made our point with Sheraton for which we received some positive feedback from both members and erstwhile picketers. The 1974 meeting was also unique because it was the first time that on our invitation a two-person delegation representing Soviet Union Latinamericanists was in attendance. One was a Peruvianist, the other a Cuban specialist. The former desperately wished to speak Quechua with someone and I recruited my Cuzqueño friend, Gabriel Escobar, for the task.

One of my initiatives as President was to approach the African Studies Association to organize a joint meeting to discuss and compare common "Third World issues." It took place in 1977 in Houston and seemed to go well, although we really didn't find a way or time to explore the issues that we might share. On the other hand, our Houston Congress was the first time that a Cuban delegation actually managed to attend our meetings with State Department acquiescence. Having regularly invited a Cuban presence since our second meeting (Washington, DC), this was the first time that the State Department permitted visas to be granted.

As a result, LASA was invited to send a delegation to Cuba for a two-week visit. Wayne Cornelius, Vera Greene, and I were subsequently dispatched to Cuba to establish a LASA scholarly presence. It was a memorable trip in every way although we did not receive a "surprise" visit from Fidel as some of our hosts thought might happen. In retrospect it was probably the zenith of the Cuban state under Castro's leadership and a busy, instructive trip.



**Lest We Forget: Women's Contribution to Making LASA an Organization for all Its Members by One of the First Women to Serve on the LASA Executive Council (1973-1975)**

by MARGARET E. CRAHAN

City University of New York, Hunter College  
notmeg@rcn.com

In 1967, a new Ph.D. in hand, I joined the Latin American Studies Association. The next year I took myself off to New York's Biltmore Hotel for the very first LASA conference. As I approached the registration desk, the all-female graduate students who were checking people in, said: "What are you doing here?" I said I was a member of LASA and I'd come to attend the conference. They replied, "but there are no women here." Indeed, I was one of only three women attending the conference that year.

By the early 1970s LASA had a substantial number of women members, but when the program for the 1972 meeting in Madison, Wisconsin, came out, together with the nominees for the Executive Council and the presidency, there was only one woman on the program and none among the nominees for the various elective positions. This resulted in the organizing of the Women's Caucus of Latin Americanists, better known as WOCLA, spearheaded by Elsa Chaney, June Nash, Helen Safa and myself. We organized to pressure for greater female participation in conference programs, as well as mounted the first write-in campaign for the Executive Council and the presidency. Jane Jacquette was WOCLA's candidate for the presidency representing the West Coast and I was the candidate for the Executive Council representing the East Coast. I was elected and some years later Jane was elected president as the official candidate.

At Madison WOCLA introduced a series of resolutions to ensure that in the future there would be women on the program and on all committees, as well as nominees for the Executive Council and for the presidency. While I was presenting these resolutions at the Business Meeting, a well-known male Latin Americanist came up to me and whispered in my ear that the women didn't need to pass resolutions, as that would be disruptive. Rather, he and the other men on the Executive Council would take care of women's interests. It was clear that some members of LASA felt that it was unseemly for women to insist on equality of representation and participation. Also at the Madison meeting a well-known female Latin Americanist pulled me aside and said, "you and I have to make sure these other women don't get into the inner circle, because it will cut down on our opportunities." I responded that I was working not just for myself, but for all women Latin Americanists, whether they were outstanding or mediocre just like male Latin Americanists.

Before attending my first Executive Council meeting in 1973, I contacted Felicity Trueblood, then the Executive Secretary, later Executive Director, of LASA, who sent me copies of all the files relating to the issues to be discussed, knowing that I would have to be extraordinarily well-prepared if women were to be taken seriously on the EC. I spent four days reading and cross-referencing every single document in those files. At the actual EC meeting, as the then president Henry Landsberger moved through the agenda he repeatedly asked the other members if they could remember the background on each issue. I would, then, gently pipe up with a summary. Finally, Landsberger said "Meg, why don't you just brief us on each item of the agenda as we get to it", which I did.

That meeting was also notable for the fact that one member of the Executive Council during a discussion referred to women with a particularly scabrous term. Lewis Hanke, who, like me, had been elected as a write-in candidate, asked me to leave the room. I had never heard Hanke, who had been my major professor at Columbia, raise his voice, but I did that day as I stood outside the room, while he lectured loudly on basic courtesy, decency and professionalism.

After that, by-and-large, the members of the Executive Council accepted me, as well as Karen Spalding and the other women who were elected in the 1970s. In fact, in a few years women would come to be well-represented on the Executive Council, as well as in the presidency. Among those on the Executive Council in the early 1970s who were strongly supportive of women's participation, in addition to Lewis Hanke, were Paul Doughty, Richard Fagen, Ivan Schulman and John Saunders. All of them went out of their way to make it easier for us and to open up LASA to the participation of all of its members. They should always be remembered by LASA for that.

At my last meeting of the Executive Council in 1975, I was asked to co-chair the 1977 joint LASA and African Studies meeting in Houston. As co-chair of that meeting, I organized the first U.S.-Cuban exchange with the assistance of Franklin Knight of Johns Hopkins University and Al Stepan of Yale, funded by the Ford Foundation. As a result, I had to deal with the Houston Police departments VIP section extensively. At our last meeting before the LASA-ASA conference, the police detail asked me if I could wait a few minutes in order for them to change into the outfits they would wear to the meetings so they would blend in. After they changed out they came, eight men and one woman, in tweed jackets with elbow patches, chinos and Hush Puppies—

CRAHAN continued...

such was their stereotype of us!! During the course of the meeting, the one female police officer complained to me that she was being hit on by some of the male members of LASA and asked what I recommended she do. I suggested that maybe if they knew she was armed they would leave her alone, so the next time she walked across the lobby of the Houston Hilton, her gun “accidentally” fell out of her purse and skidded across the floor. After that, she had no more trouble.

In the late 1970s indications that women were still not being given full recognition in LASA was confirmed by the fact that my name was left off the program of the 1977 conference as co-chair. From the 1980s up to the present, however, the level of participation in LASA by women, on the program, on committees, on the Executive Council and in the presidency, confirms that there have been major changes. My hope today is that every member of LASA, regardless of gender, or any other factor, will not only enjoy equality of opportunity within the organization, but will carry on the tradition of those of us who fought for equality within LASA and without not only in the 1970s but up to the present.

TUMULTUOUS TIMES: LASA IN THE 1960S continued...

### Memoirs from LASA's 14th President

by PETER H. SMITH

University of California, San Diego

phsmith@dss.ucsd.edu

President 1981

The 1960s was not just any other decade. It tends to be remembered as a time of youthful hijinks, psychedelic experimentation, and libidinous liberation. We all know the refrain: Sex, drugs, and rock n' roll. It sounds like a lot of fun.

But the 1960s was more than that. It was a time of enormous social transformation in the United States. It was a time of political violence. It was a time of conflict, protest, and Vietnam.

The Cold War was reaching its zenith. The Cuban Revolution was sending shock waves throughout the hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress appeared and disappeared. Military coups installed bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes in Brazil and Argentina. A U.S. invasion overwhelmed the Dominican Republic and, in its aftermath, destroyed the credibility of the OAS.

It was also a time, given the Cold War, when U.S. officials expected the academic community to promote U.S. policy goals. The National Defense Education Act (note that name!) offered generous scholarships for the study of Latin America—on the mistaken assumption, of course, that newly trained area experts would figure out ways to prevent or defeat revolutionary movements. Many members of my generation thus went through graduate school with thanks to Fidel Castro. More broadly, it was a time when “area studies” was in fashion. The Ford Foundation and university administrations across the country were building up interdisciplinary area programs as respectable fields of

inquiry. Resources were coming our way, and it was time to take advantage of these opportunities.

It was in this setting that LASA began. As a child of the 1950s, alas, I myself held retrograde views on matters of gender. But I had the good fortune to attend graduate school at Columbia, where Meg Crahan held forth in our seminars and Marysa Navarro told me how to write a dissertation about Argentina. I was utterly daunted by the incredible brain power and social grace of these women and their colleagues, and promptly began to shed the macho outlooks of my adolescence. Yet I was still a brash kid in graduate school.

My overall sense is that LASA began as a way of claiming a rightful place for the study of Latin America. Other groups were forming—African studies, Asian studies, Middle Eastern studies, and so on—and, as Paul Doughty has intimated, it was time to establish an association and assert our place in the firmament. The idea was to build leverage for dealing not only with foundations and the U.S. government, but also with university administrations. There was not a little opportunism here.

From my perspective, LASA was a generational project. It was the creation of a cadre of distinguished senior scholars—Johnny Johnson, Kalman Silvert, John Augelli, and others. Beneath them was a bunch of wide-eyed graduate students still in their twenties. In terms of age or stature, there were very few folks in between. LASA began with curious demography: full professors and doctoral candidates.

One time Jack Harrison came up to me when I was doing my dissertation research in Argentina and told me that LASA was launching a scholarly journal. “Oh, a new journal!” I thought to myself. “You know,” he continued, “if you produce an

article about this new group of Argentinean historians, maybe you can get it published.” “Oh man!” I responded. So I first heard of LASA as a potential publication outlet (probably in mimeograph form, to be sure, but an outlet nonetheless). By the way I never wrote that article, but that’s another story.

Although LASA eventually developed into a truly international organization, it was pretty U.S.-focused at its initiation. It was also pretty modest. Even though I was a student at Columbia, I didn’t even hear about the first meeting at the Biltmore Hotel in New York. Then LASA migrated to university campuses—Texas, Wisconsin, and Indiana. These were pleasant but modest locations. If you compare them with the Caribe Hilton here in San Juan, you can see how far we’ve come.

Throughout the 1960s and into the 70s, LASA confronted some serious issues. The first was its relationship to the U.S. government. As Paul Doughty has suggested and Ron Chilcote has indicated, there was a good deal of suspicion and uncertainty around this point. Tensions came to a head with the revelation of Project Camelot, an effort to disguise a military contract as social-science research. Reflecting on this episode, Kalman Silvert wrote an article that shed pristine light on questions of scholarly ethics—what we should and must do, what we should and must avoid. His eloquent statement drew a clear line in the sand for all of us. Scholarship must never become a clandestine arm of U.S. policy. LASA has respected that tradition ever since.

The second issue was, Is LASA a professional and academic organization? An advocacy group? Or both? The answer has become, A little bit of both. The balance has never been easy to strike. In

the face of horrendous developments in Washington or Latin America, many inquired, Why shouldn’t we simply tell it as we see it? One subterranean issue was whether we wanted to make such declarations to relieve our collective conscience, or to assist the beleaguered peoples of Latin America. These debates opened generational divides within LASA: younger members were more inclined toward activism and advocacy, senior members were more inclined to protect the organization’s academic integrity. These were all legitimate concerns. Over the years, LASA has confronted them with clarity and candor.

A third issue concerned the scholarly enterprise itself. Should there be a preferred framework or not? Should LASA espouse any specific focus for research? As we all know, *dependencia* became a predominant paradigm in the late 60s through the 1970s into the 1980s. I remember an unbelievable exchange at the Texas meeting, when one scholar proclaimed that “There is only one thing to study these days, and it is *dependencia*. That is what we should be studying. If you do not study it, then you are not fulfilling your obligation.” This drew a prompt reply from Riordan Roett, who stood up in his three-piece suit and took exception to the statement. Riordan happened to be sitting next to a historian who was writing a biography of Jorge Ubico. “If my good friend [whom he barely knew!] wants to consult archives without the benefit of *dependencia*, he should be allowed to do it!” Applause rippled through the room. Somewhat startled, the historian turned to Riordan and asked, “Who are you and what the hell are you doing?”

In any event, this episode distilled a legitimate question: whether it was the role of LASA to promote a predominant

paradigm for knowledge, or whether to let a thousand flowers bloom. To our credit, we finally adopted the latter approach. In this we were assisted by Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s ironic article on the “strange career” of *dependencia* in the U.S. academic community.

Finally, LASA had to confront some serious governance questions. I attended my first meeting in 1970 in Washington. My colleague Tom Skidmore was very active in the association and, as an attentive acolyte, I stayed about three feet behind him at all times. Tom was trying to help LASA leaders deal with the rambunctious behavior of outspoken and rebellious younger members. To my astonishment, deliberations of the LASA inner circle took place not in a conference room, not in a restaurant, not even in a bar—but in Johnny Johnson’s hotel suite! Such were the workings of power.

Disorder nonetheless marked that year’s business meeting. A discontented audience kept muttering and speaking out. John Johnson finally yielded the podium to John Augelli, who looked around the room and plaintively asked, “Anybody here know Robert’s Rules of Order?” Arturo Valenzuela was the only volunteer. A semblance of order was established, and the gathering went on.

One would have to say that LASA’s quest for institutionalization of internal rules of governance was off a rocky start. But this early history might have helped to make a major difference. Since that time LASA has assumed a leadership role on many key issues—on internal organization, on representation and participation, and on collaboration with colleagues and students from Latin America. LASA now has an enviable record in these areas.



SMITH continued...

Let me close with a personal comment. Why is it so great to come to LASA meetings? It is great because you see colleagues, you exchange ideas and thoughts, you learn a lot of things. The range of panels is extraordinary. I wish we had about a month to attend all the discussions. Over the years, the LASA leadership has chosen to make participation as expansive as possible. It has declined to turn its Congresses into job markets. And it has made unusual efforts to bring colleagues and participants from Latin America. As a result, the meetings provide enormous intellectual stimulation.

LASA is fun. It is amusing, it is enjoyable, and it can be hilarious. LASA has a tumultuous, picturesque, and challenging institutional history. We can agree or disagree on how well LASA has managed to resolve all the specific issues it has faced. Yet there can be no doubt about the LASA spirit. We can all take pride in that.

TUMULTUOUS TIMES: LASA IN THE 1960S continued...

### The Legacy of the Sixties and its Impact on Academics

by RONALD H. CHILCOTE

University of California, Riverside  
chilcoter@aol.com

Cuba and its revolution provided a context for my involvement in LASA and early experience in Latin America. As a graduate student I traveled throughout Latin America for four months and spent a week in Cuba in September 1958, and while at Stanford until 1963 I was involved in activities in support of the Cuban Revolution. Along with Russell Bartley, Don and Marjorie Bray, Frances Chilcote, Jim Cockcroft, Peter Eisenberg, Fred Goff, Michael Hall, Tim Harding, Bill Hutchinson, Dale Johnson, Saul Landau, Jim O'Conner, Scott Palmer, Lars Schoultz, Alan Young, and many others, we worked on the monthly *Hispanic American Report* which in late 1960 became renowned for its factual reporting on the training of Cuban exiles in Guatemala. The *New York Times* even sent its Central American correspondent to Stanford to find out more about the Cuban counterrevolutionaries in Guatemala, and *The Nation* published a piece by Ronald Hilton that gave some of the early news. This did not deter the recently inaugurated Kennedy administration from proceeding with the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Also at that time Sandra Levinson and Richard Fagen were graduate students at Stanford; both became deeply involved in Cuba. Sandra later founded the Center for Cuban Studies, and Richard visited Cuba and wrote about the revolution. Fred Goff got *NACLA Report* off the ground. I returned to Cuba in 1968 for six weeks and managed a visit throughout the island.

This decade of experience was filled with impressive moments: Events that followed

the Bay of Pigs debacle in 1961 were the Alliance for Progress; U.S. maneuvering against Cuba through the OAS in 1961 and 1962; the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962; a series of U.S.-supported coups, beginning in Guatemala in 1962 and extending throughout the region in ensuing years under Kennedy, Johnson, and their successors. I recall Secretary of State Dean Rusk defending the U.S. involvement in the Bay of Pigs in a document that outlined more than three hundred instances of U.S. intervention in Latin America. This pattern of intervention was continued throughout the sixties and, often with less overt involvement, into the seventies in Chile, the eighties with the contras in Nicaragua, and the return of U.S. Marines to Panama.

During the spring 1962 a group of progressive Brazilian students visited Stanford and desired to meet Paul Baran, a founder of the independent socialist *Monthly Review* and a Marxist economics professor. They were inspired by his best-selling book in Latin America, *Political Economy of Growth*. I did not know Baran, but I took the students to his home for an exchange of views. He had been to Cuba and just written about the revolution. His early writing was a foundation for the ensuing debates on underdevelopment and dependency in Latin America. This example is but another lesson how we learned about Latin America because later I enrolled in his courses and his ideas inspired me to work in the development and political economy fields. The Brazilian students returned home to participate in open and exciting political events, but after the 1964 coup and by the late 1960s, two of the most revolutionary of them returned for doctoral work and today are involved in conservative causes. Their trajectory reminds me of a conversation in the late 1960s with the Chilean sociologist, Eduardo Hamuy, who after a visiting

professorship at UC Berkeley declared he would not dare to send his students to North American universities.

The activist response to many of these events involved academics. In 1968 I recall the first meeting of LASA in New York when a group of young academics raised questions in the business meeting and introduced a series of resolutions about how LASA should deal with issues in Latin America. Therein began the process of resolutions, a reflection of the deep concerns about U.S. policy and about repression, especially of intellectuals, throughout Latin America. This tradition continues to the present and represents an important part of the history of LASA.

My research during the last half of the sixties generally occurred in Brazil under military rule, and I spent several years in the field under authoritarian conditions. Project Camelot was exposed in the Chilean Congress as a subversive U.S. project under the guise of academic research and Pentagon funding. This undermined prospects for field work in the area.

I became active in the Los Angeles Group for Latin American Solidarity (LAGLAS) which was a response to U.S. policy beyond Vietnam and Asia and to the depressing political, economic, and social conditions in Latin America. LAGLAS met monthly and its success was due to its assimilation of many political currents and its avoidance of sectarian tendencies. Some of us had learned this lesson during our Stanford experience. Rather than debate ideology, we focused on problems, published an occasional newsletter, and petitioned repressive governments everywhere and exposed U.S. policy aimed against Latin America. Within LASA, some of us, including one of my students, Joel Edelman, began to publish the Union for

Radical Latin Americanists (URLA) newsletter in an effort to facilitate Latin Americanists within LASA to debate issues. URLA was supported by several hundred academics.

URLA presented a resolution calling for LASA to publish a journal of Latin American issues. It received an overwhelming vote in favor, leading the EC to invite me to work up a proposal for a new journal. This eventually was not accepted for lack of funds and the hope that the *LASA Forum* might fill the gap, a wish that only now, after 40 years, is being fulfilled in recent numbers organized by Arturo Arias. However, I had involved a dozen academics in southern California in this proposal, and we decided to carry the proposal to the LASA meeting in Madison, Wisconsin, where more than one hundred academics endorsed the launching of *Latin American Perspectives* in 1974. The new journal aimed to focus on issues and debates, to include Latin Americans as at least half of its editorial board, to decentralize decision making and workload, to translate and publish important essays from Spanish, Portuguese, and French, and to implement a whole host of procedures intended to open up the journal to widespread participation inside and outside Latin America.

We drew many lessons from the sixties:

1. The HAR experience taught us the importance of paying attention to daily events and the need to spend time in Latin America. Many of the senior Stanford Latin Americanist professors had built reputations around their dissertation field work but had not returned to the region and had lost familiarity with much of what was going on. Subsequently, I resolved to return frequently and visited Latin America nearly every year, residing in Brazil

probably six or seven years and in Chile the better part of another year. We lived in Portugal at least four or five more years.

2. The experience at Stanford impressed on me the need to explore the Iberian Peninsula and thus during 1960 and 1961 learned my Portuguese and Spanish at the University of Madrid and at the University of Lisbon. The Salazar regime offered me funds and books to conform to their outlook. This was unacceptable plus some early writings on the Portuguese opposition resulted in my expulsion from Portugal and my imprisonment in Angola over a book I was writing. Today in North America I often think of my early experience in Portugal when it was necessary to report every week to the secret police, difficult to talk politics for fear of arrest, and to face hourly propaganda on the "terrorist" threat to the colonies in Africa. Today in America as we are harangued constantly by fear over terrorism, I am reminded of my experience under fascist Portugal.

I learned a lot about dictatorship, authoritarianism, and fascism, which was useful as Latin America turned counterrevolutionary with a series of military coups throughout the region. John J. Johnson, one of my teachers, had written a book on the military in Latin America, sponsored by the Rand Corporation, and the ensuing coups in the region made me skeptical of his thesis that a professional military would guide Latin America to constitutional democracies. Coincidentally, the Pentagon sent six of its young bright officers to Stanford to obtain master's degrees in Latin American studies, with the intent that they would serve on a Pentagon desk dealing with Latin American insurgency. Two of them worked with Lincoln Gordon to plan the 1964 coup against João Goulart in Brazil. One of them led U.S. Marines into the Dominican

CHILCOTE continued...

Republic in 1965. Another accompanied U.S. helicopters into the Marquetalia communist strongholds in Colombia.

3. The Cuban revolution inspired revolutionary movements everywhere in Latin America and motivated many of us to study the left. Don Bray at Pomona College, Tim Harding at UCLA, and I at Stanford organized seminars of students to study the left and met in 1963 at Idylwild in Southern California for a three-day conference with papers on left movements in Latin America. Our enthusiasm for such study, however, was dampened by the revelation a couple of years later that the National Student Association financial support for the conference may have been tainted by CIA funds, and thereafter we abandoned this inquiry on the left, fearing that our work was aiding the U.S.-led counter insurgency in Latin America.

4. All these events and the continuing military coups in Latin America culminated in the U.S. invasion in the Dominican Republic. This was a decisive moment for U.S. Latin Americanists when hundreds of colleagues signed a petition, published in *The New York Times*, condemning the U.S. intervention. The signatories included many who had long served or counseled the U.S. State Department and the CIA. It was a decisive turning point.

5. Since many of us were spending much time in the field in Latin America, we came away sensitized to issues there. Our experiences not only exposed the failure of U.S. policy, they committed us to do more than simply research and write about the region. Many of us became activists, some through the Peace Corps, some through missionary groups associated with the National and World Councils of Churches, and most through our personal experiences in the field. In 1965 I invited Padre Camilo

Torres, a young sociologist deeply concerned about urban problems, to come to UC Riverside as a visiting professor. He promised to come the following year but instead joined the Colombian insurgency and died a martyr.

6. My field research under authoritarian conditions and urban guerrilla warfare in Brazil from 1968 to 1971 and the specter of Project Camelot led to several requirements: first, field research must be sponsored by local authorities; second, one must be open and willing to share in its findings; third, if possible, published studies should appear in the language of the host country (my field work has been published there). In 1971 Brazilian military authorities attempted to intervene in my research into two communities in the backlands of the Northeast, but I was saved in several ways: one of my grants through the OAS had been signed by a Brazilian general; my research had been formally supported by the leaders of the two towns; it had inadvertently been presented to the communities through two troubadours whose singing on the local radio station told about me and my family, my purpose for being there, and so on; and my research data and questionnaires were secured safely without my awareness under the bed of the local bishop.

7. There also was pressure at home over my work in Latin America. Soon after joining UCR, I was strongly encouraged by a university administrator to work with the CIA after my return from field trips in Latin America, but I did not cooperate with the agents who visited me throughout the sixties, appearing unexpectedly at my office. The recent experience of my colleague at Pomona College, Miguel Tinker-Salas, who was surprised and intimidated by Los Angeles Sheriff deputies in collaboration with the FBI and whose

students were also questioned, demonstrates that we must continue to be vigilant and resist the repression that pervades our lives today.

I think of the sixties as an era of innovation, openness to old and new ideas, debate and dialogue, and alternative possibilities and outcomes. The increasing openness of North America was countered by the increasing repression of Latin America. Even the traditions of openness in places like Chile were soon crushed, yet Cuba emerged as an alternative, inspiring most of us to think about the region's problems and issues. What we learned many of us brought back to North America and explored all sorts of alternatives in our teaching, our research, and our involvement in our communities.

## TUMULTUOUS TIMES: LASA IN THE 1960S continued...

### Comments on the Presentations about LASA in the 1960s

by TERRY KARL  
Stanford University  
tkarl@stanford.edu

First, I have realized that I probably would not have been a professor and a Latin Americanist if I had not met Richard Fagen on a beach in Cuba. He was there on LASA business, and I was trying desperately to defend a copyright, a silly thing to do. I had written a children's book. The Cubans had published it. I went there to defend my copyright, and got very excited by what I saw. I met Richard by accident, and he said, "why don't you go to graduate school?" I said, "don't be silly, I'm not interested in academics, it's much more complicated than trying to write something for kids." That was that, but he told me about LASA. It was the first time in my life I heard about it.

The next time I heard about it, was in San Francisco. I heard that LASA was going to have a conference at an ITT-owned Sheraton, and I said, "let's demonstrate against it." But then we heard that LASA had in fact cancelled its contract with the Sheraton. I cannot tell you what an impact that had on us. Nobody was canceling anything because of Pinochet, nobody. Indeed, very few were protesting Pinochet at that point. And then we heard that this major academic association had cancelled, and I thought, "maybe I should become a Latin Americanist after all." Then I went to my first LASA meeting, in 1980 or else at the end of the 70s. The first thing I saw were women. I am a political scientist, and I had never had a female instructor in my life. I went eventually to two departments that were not noted for their good treatment of women, Harvard and Stanford. And then I go to LASA, and

there were all these women. It was just visually amazing for me to see this.

I remember meeting Meg Crahan, I remember meeting Carmen Diana Deere, I did not meet Marysa Navarro then, but I thought they all were the most incredible human beings. If they could do it, I could do it too. What I learned was that LASA helped me become a professor, and also helped me save one. Many people know that I was one of the first people at Harvard to do an open sexual harassment case against somebody that was an official at LASA. In that process, I was told that if I did it, I would lose my career, I would never be a professor, and that all that fieldwork I did in Caracas would just go down the drain. I was told that by every single academic I talked to. "Don't file a complaint, don't do it openly," and I remember Albert Hirschman, a wonderful human being, said to me: "Terry, we'll help you get another job if you do this, but it may be that the best way to do this is to not be public." Then I thought, I have all those female graduate students, what happens if I leave? I was an assistant professor at the time, but I filed for sexual harassment anyway. As many of you know, the only organization in the United States that organized itself to support me was LASA. Carmen, Marysa, Helen Safa, Meg, Peter Smith, many others did it. If that had not happened, there would not have been an organized statement by about fourteen leading Latin American studies centers in the United States condemning the sexual harassment going on in that department, and threatening to boycott Harvard University and not send graduate students there unless something was done about it. They signed an open letter. This was when nobody talked about sexual harassment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission picked up my case, and it became the EEOC vs. Harvard University,

until we settled. The two case officers were Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill.

LASA has meant so much to so many of us because of its diversity. It has done much more as an organization than people know. Not just because of its male/female diversity, but because these things were supported by many as the decent and right thing to do. LASA ended up being diverse because of its ability to deal with Latin America. This extraordinary organization we have is in fact bi-continental. For five years or so, I have been working in Africa and Eastern Europe. I have been attending other meetings, and I have learned two things. One, they are not fun. And, two, they do not have the kind of diversity and contact that we do, not only because of the extraordinary efforts of the people who organize LASA and others who make this happen, but also because we are fortunate to actually be close to one another. You realize how much you want to come back to LASA and to Latin America when you see that we really have something special here as a result of our geographic proximity, but also because of the incredible diversity of this organization in every possible way.

I want to pick up two other themes: Repression, authoritarian rule, and our deep relationship with what happened in Latin America and how it shaped us, how our scholarship in turn helped to open up in many ways the politics of Latin America. That interaction was extraordinarily important because most of us went through the authoritarian period in Latin America. Most of us helped provide places for Latin Americans to work when they had no place to work. Most of us protested oppression.

The very first LASA resolutions, I was told by Fernando Henrique Cardoso, were in fact to protect Brazilians. He himself was

KARL continued...

one of the victims. In our efforts, whether we were scholars of repression or just felt strongly about human rights, LASA put people together in an academic, scholarly and activist network to deal with it. Let me just give you a brief example that goes beyond our scholarship. With several of you, I have been working on trials of Latin American generals living in the United States. We are trying them in civil courts for human rights abuses. In order to try Salvadorian generals, or the head of the Caravan of Death in Chile, or Hondurans involved in death squad activities, we have had to marshal every single bit of knowledge that any academic ever knew about repression in these countries.

In the trial against one of the killers of Archbishop Romero in Fresno, the death squad link, and one of the people involved in the murder, was an Argentine death squad leader who came to El Salvador and helped teach them how to organize death squads. Nicolás Carronso, who was just tried in Memphis, was one of the founders of the death squads in El Salvador as well and we learned through his own testimony that he had been CIA asset since the 1960s. I was sure that he had been since the late 70s, but I never had any idea that it went back that far. He set up the connection between the security forces, the military and U.S. intelligence, and those were the roots of what later became the death squads. The kind of research that goes into those trials is a cooperative type of research. It is not the type that any one of us does. It comes from calling everybody and saying, "do you know anybody who did work in Argentina in the 1960s?" What other organization but LASA has that kind of historic memory? It is already being incredibly important for these kinds of activities, and for recovering the memory and achieving justice in Latin America.

Let me just pick up on a couple of things related to change, and to the tension that it represents. There was in some of the disciplines, particularly in my own, political science, a huge attack against area studies, in an effort to try to move away from it. But what is happening in the United States now, in the military, in the State Department, etc., is that they are discovering that they do not know anything. This is particularly compelling if anyone watched Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice receiving a present from President Evo Morales of Bolivia at the inauguration of Michelle Bachelet, the new Chilean president. She received a *charango* that had real coca leaves embedded in it. Because there was no one to advise her, she was caught explaining how lovely they were, going on and on. It turns out to be one of the most hilarious transcripts ever. There are many mistakes being made because people do not have information any more. Thus, one of the things that you are seeing in the State Department is that they are going through a reorganization, in which they are insisting that every single State Department person has to become an area specialist, that they have to learn a language, and that they have to stay at the region where they work. They are recreating inside the U.S. government a certain type of area studies that was lost.

The second thing is the issue of where to draw the line between scholarship and activism. This organization has grappled with this issue all the time. I am probably on the activist side, but also very much in favor of keeping a certain line, and of being able to differentiate between the two. We need to keep the kinds of ethics that we learned from Kal Silvert. That means that our scholarship must be public, that it must be for everyone, and that if it is not public and if the funding sources are not public, then it cannot be considered scholarship,

period. I think we have to keep that line as strong as we can.

The second line that we need to hold is that of the universal declaration of human rights. Whether you are on the right, or on the left, or wherever you might fall, torture is a crime. Putting people in prison for indeterminate amounts of time is a crime. It is a violation of the law. It is violation of the Bill of Rights. It is a violation of the basic rights that we have insisted on in Latin America. So, whether you like Chávez, or not, is not a crime. It is a debate. And those debates, we must have. We must debate about the Cuban Revolution, we must debate about Evo Morales, we must debate about Chávez. We must always have those debates. But we cannot reopen crimes that we have condemned, we cannot reopen a discussion on whether things that are crimes against humanity can be okay under certain circumstances. That is something that we cannot do.

Finally, let me make one last point. When I went to graduate school, one of my advisors used to say that I should go down to Latin America with all the important lessons from the United States, with our way of seeing things, and teach those frameworks. Now, we are in an interesting period where the lessons are actually coming from Latin America back to us.

I was very struck on examining public opinion polls in Latin America, on the enormous decline of support for the United States, and for the U.S. government in particular. If you look at these public opinion polls, when approval really dropped was not during the invasion of Iraq, but when the news of Abu Ghraib came out. Latin Americans had heard us in Central and South America lecturing on the way you don't treat people and on the



## The Never-Ending Cold War: The United States, Cuba, and LASA's Battle for Academic Freedom

things you do not do. You do not have death squads and you do not torture. Suddenly, there was the shock of the United States not practicing what it preached. These were polls about what elites think about the United States, they were not polls of mass public opinion. And the big change was there. Then, it struck me that we are in fact entering a period when we are dealing with our exchanges between Latin America and the United States on a much more equal basis than we ever had before. I think part of that is due to the work of LASA's pioneers. ■

### U.S.-Cuban Relations and U.S.-LASA Relations

by JORGE I. DOMÍNGUEZ  
Harvard University  
jorge\_dominguez@harvard.edu  
*President from January 1982 – June 1983*

Imagine that an extraterrestrial creature hovers over planet earth in order to observe U.S. relations with neighboring countries. The extraterrestrial beams back the following information to its space ship: On the border between the United States and Mexico, the armies of Mexico and the United States face each other every day, engage in routine contact, and have developed a professional, cooperative relationship that seeks to anticipate problems or, if necessary, to resolve them. Moreover, the security forces of the United States and Mexico on land, sea, and air cooperate to prevent the emigration from Mexico to the United States of those Mexican citizens who lack the proper documents to enter the United States lawfully. Mexico works hard and effectively on its own to prevent such emigration. The United States interdicts most Mexicans who seek to cross the border illegally and returns them to Mexico, which accepts them without fail. We all know, of course, that not even Star Trek ever presented such a fantasy.

And yet, those behaviors are part of the routine relations between the armed forces of Cuba and the United States, respectively, around and inside the U.S. base at Guantánamo. This relationship evolved in the early 1990s seeking to avoid an accidental military conflict and subsequently to prevent cross-border migration. In the current decade, the procedures first developed a decade earlier became one means to seal the U.S.-Cuba land border. The United States did not

want its prisoners to get out from the base, and Cuba did not want to receive such prisoners in any event. Similarly, the U.S. Coast Guard and Cuba's *guardafronteras* have developed a professional relationship surrounding the Cuban archipelago but especially in the Straits of Florida. They engage in search and rescue missions, interdict illegal migration between the two countries and, when appropriate, the Coast Guard returns the interdicted Cubans back to Cuba. Elements of this bilateral migration relationship date to 1984, when President Ronald Reagan authorized such U.S. government cooperation with President Fidel Castro's government. The current Bush administration has enforced the policy even at domestic political cost in important segments of the Cuban-American community, including the contrary views of Cuban-American Republican members of Congress from Florida.

Such security relations are but one example of various instances of good relations between the Bush and Castro governments. Every six months, on schedule and without fail, President Bush has waived Title III of the Helms-Burton Act, which had been potentially an explosive generator of property compensation disputes between U.S. citizens and firms and international investors and traders engaged with Cuba, and arguably the most punitive feature of this U.S. statute. Consistent with an agreement reached between the United States and the European Union in 1998, moreover, the Bush administration has enforced Title IV of Helms-Burton lightly and only by exception; under this provision, the United States was to deny visas to executives of international firms that "traffic" with Cuba. In late 2001, in addition, the United States began to export agricultural products to Cuba and has become Cuba's principal international supplier of such products, for which Cuba