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As a candidate to become LASA Vice President and President-Elect, I articulated several goals that I hoped to achieve during my tenure. These included, most notably, increasing the opportunities for Latin American scholars and junior researchers to take part in LASA Congresses, and fostering dialogue between discipline-based scholarship and the field of Latin American Studies. In this context, I am pleased to report that the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has awarded the Association a grant of $300,000 in support of these and other objectives over the next five years. I believe that the resulting program of Mellon-LASA workshops will enable us to facilitate innovative scholarly work both at our Congresses and in other venues.

The Mellon-LASA workshops will promote trans-regional and comparative approaches to Latin Americanist research in the humanities and social sciences while strengthening ties between area studies and discipline-driven scholarship. Beginning at the upcoming meeting in Rio de Janeiro, the program will fund Congress participation of Latin American researchers, graduate students, and scholars whose primary empirical focus is on other parts of the world but whose work explores topics that are especially conducive to inter-regional comparisons. It will also make possible a series of research workshops that will be convened at roughly the midway point between Congresses. The latter will be selected for funding through a peer-reviewed competition open to all LASA members, and workshop results will be featured in panel presentations at the subsequent meeting of the Association.

This initiative supports three trends that are critical to the future advancement of Latin American Studies, which I shall try to summarize very briefly.

1) Regional reconfigurations

During the 20th century, scholarship in Latin American Studies, like other area studies fields, evolved largely within boundaries defined by geographic contiguity. Units of analysis typically were fixed in geo-cultural terms, and despite important exceptions, the tendency was for researchers to situate their work into spatial categories that reflected the institutional configurations of major universities, scholarly associations and journals. Latin Americanists did their work within their area studies circles, Africanists did similarly, and so on. The institutional terrain was tilted against efforts to rethink those very boundaries, to problematize regional spaces and to consider alternative aggregations. In North America, academic job markets reinforced this conservatism, as graduate students and junior faculty were recruited into positions defined according to traditional area studies geographies. This has begun to change over the past decade or so, to varying degrees but in a growing array of fields: Theoretical innovation is emerging from approaches to scholarly inquiry that do not deny the salience of regional units but treat them as historically contingent and porous. Historians of Latin America’s colonial period, for example, increasingly frame their work in the context of global empire. In turn, anthropologists and sociologists focused on issues of racial formations articulate their analyses in terms of the greater Atlantic. Political economists, for their part, often cluster cases not by location alone but also by their structural characteristics, which frequently but not always fit within geographical constraints suggested by conventional area studies.

Scholarship on contemporary processes as varied as international migration, environmental change and popular consumption patterns may take Latin American settings as their empirical referents, but they do so by conceiving of the sites of their research as forming parts of universes that transcend the region per se. Little by little, moreover, academic job markets are responding to these intellectual shifts and, in some universities, hires are being clustered along quite novel lines. LASA is well situated to push this trend further along and to highlight the importance of these new directions for area studies work in the 21st century.

2) Cross-regional comparisons

A second consideration involves the importance of fostering opportunities for cross-regional comparison. Here again, among Latin Americanists, almost certainly beyond what we see in any other area studies field, the clear trend is toward expanding the scope of comparative research to encompass cases beyond Latin America. This is by no means entirely new: For some decades now, comparative third world history and comparative historical sociology have been strongly influenced by scholarship involving Latin Americanists, with LASA members having played a key role in consolidating these cross-regional fields of inquiry. More can be done, however, both to encourage such research and to diffuse it to subfields of scholarship that have not yet taken advantage of the potential benefits of cross-regional comparison. The study of Latin American land reforms, for example, has paid relatively little attention to analogous processes outside the region, and the same could be said for research on religious pluralism, film production or the use of new technologies for disseminating...
scholarly resources. In these domains and quite a few others, LASA can play an important role in stimulating cross-regional encounters, and in establishing their legitimacy as part of the core set of activities associated with area studies scholarship. The Association can also expose scholars from outside the realm of Latin American Studies to the insights being developed through analysis of Latin American experience, thus enriching fields well beyond the core areas of concern to the Association. By opening Latin American Studies to other area studies communities, we may encourage the latter to broaden their horizons as well.

3) The necessary rapprochement between disciplines and area studies

In the U.S. academy the last couple of decades of the 20th century witnessed a troubling distancing of several key disciplines from the work of Latin American Studies and other regionally-defined fields. The case of economics is surely the most glaring example of this trend, and it is to the mutual detriment of economists and area studies researchers that the twain seldom meet. But the tension between area studies and disciplinary approaches was and to some extent remains apparent in domains ranging from comparative literature to political science and sociology. At one level this simply reflected a fundamental difference of view concerning the importance of empirical research for scholarly excellence, with some disciplinary purists retreating into theory or model building that putatively applied in all places and at all times. Over the past decade the climate has improved considerably, with at least a rhetorical consensus in favor of work that is rooted in disciplinary theory and engaged with the complexities of local settings. Yet the tensions remain, and there is good reason to attempt to address them productively. One can imagine a scenario in which important (particularly quantitative) currents of political science and sociology follow their economist colleagues in removing themselves from under the area studies umbrella. The adverse consequences for their work would likely be substantial: important currents of scholarship in behavioral economics, for example, have come to the conclusion that rationality differs dramatically across local and cultural settings. The implication should be that area studies has much to offer the discipline.

No less importantly, from the perspective of area studies as a discrete field in American universities, the defection of a significant fraction of the social scientific research community could prove devastating. Given that disciplines remain the most privileged units in universities throughout the Hemisphere, if area studies programs are seen by university administrators as relevant solely to inter- and trans-disciplinary fields they may be weakened irreparably. For LASA, and for our membership, no objective is more important than that of cultivating dialogue and mutual learning among those who define themselves as mainstream disciplinary researchers and those who identify with Latin American Studies in its many manifestations.

The good news is that that LASA is especially well situated to rekindle the interest of core social science disciplines. In part this reflects the degree to which some of the most influential work in Latin American Studies has also impacted the disciplines. This is the case in political science for work on such topics as the political economy of democratization; in sociology for research on the determinants and impacts of international migration; for anthropologists’ conceptualizations of the emergence of hybrid identities in the age of transnational cultural processes; and for comparative literature analyses of the “boom” in Latin American novel production from the late 1960s through the end of the 20th century. Beyond this established track record, we believe that by making the promotion of cross-regional research an explicit objective of the Mellon-LASA program we can go a considerable way toward incorporating into our activities networks of scholars whose inclinations are precisely toward such comparative work.

These efforts, I believe, will enhance LASA’s capability to take leadership in cutting edge academic work, reinforcing and perhaps accelerating encouraging trends that are underway in the scholarly community, while demonstrating the role that a dynamic area studies community can play in promoting intellectual innovation at universities in the United States and beyond. Taken together, we believe that the components of the proposed initiative will make an important contribution to Latin American Studies and to internationally-oriented scholarship more generally. They will enable LASA to build on some of its existing strengths, and to move in new directions that are important for our efforts to push the frontiers of research in the social sciences and humanities alike.
In the interest of providing LASA members with timely information concerning our Association’s finances, this report reviews LASA’s overall financial situation, the financial reporting practices now in place, and issues concerning the management of LASA’s permanent endowment.

**General Finances and Financial Reporting Arrangements**

Over the past several years, LASA has taken steps to ensure the professional management of its finances. The Association’s annual financial statements are audited independently by the Pittsburgh-based accounting firm Sisterson & Co. In its most recent report (for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007), Sisterson & Co. determined that the Association had total net assets of $5,517,562. The auditors found no “material weaknesses” (as defined by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants) in LASA’s financial statements or in its internal financial controls or operations, and they made no recommendations for changes in the Secretariat’s financial procedures.

The LASA Secretariat has also adopted several measures to comply with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. For example, since October 2006 LASA’s executive director has sent the LASA treasurer monthly summaries of all Association expenditures, as well as separate notification of all disbursements over $5,000. In addition, the Secretariat has improved procedures for records retention and adopted a “whistleblower” policy.

**Endowment**

Decisions concerning the management of LASA’s endowment are made on the basis of quarterly conference-call consultations with members of the Investment Committee. In addition to its ex officio members (LASA’s president, treasurer, and executive director), the committee’s current membership consists of Judith Albert, Marc P. Blum, Kimberley Conroy, and Thomas J. Trebat, all of whom have substantial experience in private-sector banking and investment firms. Since June 2005 LASA’s endowment has been managed professionally by Smith Barney, a major U.S. brokerage firm.

**Overall Performance**

As of September 1, 2008, LASA’s endowment totaled $3,751,274. This total was allocated among three major investment categories: equities (stocks), 70.1 percent; fixed-income assets (bonds), 25.9 percent; and cash, 4.0 percent.

The value of LASA’s endowment has fallen from its peak of $4,294,232 on October 31, 2007, as a consequence of the general decline in equities markets over the past year. Because of continuing uncertainty in global markets, the Investment Committee has opted to maintain a relatively conservative “risk profile” that gives additional weight to fixed-income investments and cash.

The distribution of equity investments among broad “market category” funds (“large capitalization” stocks, “small capitalization” stocks, “emerging market” funds, and so forth) reflects the Investment Committee’s judgment that the endowment is still too small to merit the higher fees generally associated with speciality portfolio management, in which an account manager would be actively involved in buying and selling shares in individual companies.

**“Socially Responsible” Investments**

Over the past fifteen years or so, many not-for-profit organizations have adopted a strategy of making “socially responsible” investments (SRI) in an effort to align their investment decisions more fully with their ethical concerns. So-called SRI funds typically forego investments in some categories (tobacco companies, defense contractors, gambling enterprises, and so forth) or concentrate investments in particular areas (environmental technology, for instance). However, because SRI funds are by definition narrower in composition than many other equity funds, sometimes carry higher management fees, and may not perform as well as the stock market in general, there may be a trade-off between responding to ethical concerns and the overall financial return on such investments.

LASA first made a small SRI investment ($200,000) in 2006. This initiative was reasonably successful, in the sense that the fund’s performance closely paralleled that of the broad-based Standard & Poor’s stock market index. However, a closer examination of the company composition of the chosen fund (the KLD Social Index Fund) revealed that it only excluded tobacco companies, while including leading defense contractors, firms with a highly questionable labor-rights record, and other companies whose business practices might be of significant concern to LASA members.

At its January 2007 meeting, the Executive Council expressed strong support for a transition toward more socially responsible investments in the management of the Association’s endowment. The Treasurer subsequently drafted a statement of investment principles highlighting the SRI issue. This statement was discussed, amended, and then formally adopted by the
Executive Council at its September 2007 meeting in Montréal:

“The principal purpose of LASA is to foster intellectual discussion, research, and teaching on Latin America, the Caribbean, and its peoples throughout the Americas, and to promote the interests of its diverse membership and encourage civic engagement.

LASA’s permanent endowment funds are invested to promote these primary goals. The endowment funds should be invested in such a way as to minimize short-term fluctuations, protect their real value from erosion due to inflation, and achieve long-term capital growth.

At the same time, LASA assumes responsibility for the moral implications and social consequences of its investment policies. It therefore seeks to avoid investments that are inconsistent with the pursuit of peace, the preservation of the natural environment, and the promotion of a democratic, humane social order. In its equity investments, LASA should give priority to companies that protect the environment, support workplace diversity and responsible worker-employer relations, and otherwise contribute to the social good. At a minimum, it should avoid investments in companies that manufacture armaments, munitions, and tobacco products.”

The Treasurer simultaneously sought additional information concerning socially responsible investing. He consulted informally with members of the Investment Committee regarding possible SRI funds, and he communicated with cognate professional associations (the African Studies Association, American Anthropological Association, American Political Science Association, and American Sociological Association) to learn more about how they have engaged the SRI issue.

On the basis of this additional information, in September 2007 LASA’s Ways and Means Committee and the Executive Council agreed (pending advice from the Investment Committee) to shift a significant proportion of the Association’s “large capitalization” investments (U.S. companies with a market capitalization of more than $1 billion) into the Domini 400 Social Index Fund, a major SRI fund that is available through Smith Barney. The fund employs a variety of social and ethical “filters” (community relations, corporate governance, workplace diversity, employee relations, the environment, human rights, and product quality and safety) to select 400 stocks from among the Standard & Poor’s 500 largest U.S. firms. The fund’s goal is to track closely the overall performance of the Standard & Poor’s 500 stock index.

Investment Committee members subsequently endorsed this decision, although they recommended that the transition to SRI take place gradually. As of September 2008, the Domini 400 fund represented 20.6 percent of LASA’s total endowment holdings and 29.4 percent of its equity investments. Between January and August 2008 the Domini 400 Social Index Fund slightly outperformed the broad Standard & Poor’s 500 market index. The Investment Committee has agreed to evaluate the fund’s performance through 2009 before considering further investments in it.

LASA has, then, taken very significant steps toward more socially responsible investing. It is important to note, however, that for now there may be practical limits to how far LASA can move in this direction while exercising sound fiduciary responsibility in the management of its permanent endowment. The principal constraint is that the endowment is still too small to justify active portfolio management, and most of the broad index funds (“emerging market” or “developed-country international” funds, for example) that provide an essential degree of diversity in the Association’s investment portfolio cannot be screened using SRI criteria.

LASA members with questions concerning any of the issues addressed in this report can contact Kevin Middlebrook at: kevinmiddlebrook@aol.com.
The On the Profession section of this issue of the Forum addresses a domain that, in my view, is of great importance to our membership, namely, trends in scholarly publishing in our field. Five prominent English-language publishers have provided pieces in response to our request to reflect on a series of issues specified below. The responses by publishers took various forms. Some, in keeping with the brief they were provided, offered item by item responses, and in my view these are quite informative. Others chose to approach the issues I presented in broader context, reflecting on the state of academic publishing and its evolution over time. Sandy Thatcher, of Penn State University Press, opens the section with an assessment of core issues facing the academic community, and does so building on an essay he presented in the Forum more than a decade ago (Winter 1993). Others, also insightfully, respond point by point to the queries posed by my invitation. I hope that their reflections, taken as a whole, will provide LASA members with a useful set of perspectives of issues that are pressing for our work. We are grateful to these publishers for taking the time to share their thoughts on questions that, given the importance of publication for scholarship and for performance evaluation and promotion, are of considerable interest to much of our membership.

- What is your view toward publishing edited collections, and how, if at all, has this evolved in recent years?

- How important is prospective course adoption for determining whether a manuscript is accepted for publication?

- Under what if any conditions might you agree to review a manuscript that is also being sent for consideration by other publishers?

- How do you make decisions about cloth or paperback release of your books?

- What is your approach to online availability?

- What are some of the key issues on the horizon that will affect the future directions of scholarly publication in our field?
Scholarly publishers have become used to thinking of our business as continually in crisis. Going back to at least the early 1970s, when a series of influential articles defining the nature of the crisis appeared in *Scholarly Publishing*, we are now well into our fourth decade of crisis management. I have made some contributions to this literature, notably for LASA an essay in the Winter 1993 issue of the *Forum* titled “Latin American Studies and the Crisis in Scholarly Communication.” What has changed and what has stayed the same since then?

The bad news is that many of the disturbing trends I highlighted in that article still continue today. These include (1) growth in the number, size, and cost of journals; (2) cancellation of subscriptions by university libraries, especially for journals in print form; (3) despite these cancellations, a steady decline in the proportion of library budgets available to purchase monographs compared with journals and electronic databases; (4) less administrative support for journal editorial offices; (5) no increase in subsidies for university presses; and (6) more demand than ever for publication of journal articles and monographs by faculty seeking tenure and promotion. For university presses publishing monographs, the future looked bleak. As I detailed in that article, the average sale of a typical monograph had dropped from around 1,500 in the early 1970s to fewer than 1,000 by the early 1980s all the way down to 500 by the early 1990s. Faced with such a steep decline in this stream of revenue, many presses had resorted to publishing more “mid-list” trade books (which big commercial publishers had been abandoning in favor of blockbuster titles), reference works, regional titles, paperbacks for course adoption, and even fiction and poetry, leaving fewer slots on their lists open to monographs. As possible solutions to this crisis, I had analyzed the pros and cons of (1) faculty in Latin American studies publishing more of their books abroad, (2) LASA itself assuming responsibility for publishing some monographs (as, say, the American Sociological Association does with its Rose Monograph Series), and (3) experimentation with electronic publishing (premised on its acceptability to tenure committees).

The good news is that not all has stayed the same, and some significant changes have occurred. But the impact of these changes has been mixed. Consider the advantages offered by the availability of dissertations in electronic form, both through the commercial databases of ProQuest and through the interuniversity cooperative effort known as the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD), which began in the mid-1990s and has grown substantially since then. While making scholarly literature of this type far more readily accessible than ever before, such databases have had the concomitant disadvantages of putting even more pressure on junior faculty trying to publish their first book in order to gain tenure. Libraries, quite rationally, figure that since their collections now include access to virtually all dissertations produced in the United States, they should not spend their scarce book budgets on monographs that have derived from dissertations. Presses, also quite rationally, know that libraries are purchasing fewer such monographs and thus can anticipate lower sales on these books than others; hence editors are wary of inviting submission of revised dissertations. Yet tenure committees continue to treat the monograph as the gold standard for publication in many fields of the humanities and social sciences. Overall, then, the system as a whole has become dysfunctional.

With monographs less reliable as a source of income, presses have invested more in other types of books, as noted above, only to have their missions questioned by their parent universities as they now seem to have drifted away from their core mandate to publish scholarly monographs. Consequently, those universities with presses seem little inclined to increase their subsidies, and those without have little motivation to launch new presses. With the squeeze on students’ finances from escalating tuition and other fees, teachers have taken advantage of the new technologies that provide them with course-management systems like Blackboard and Sakai and e-reserve systems through libraries to put many articles and book chapters online that were earlier included in print course packs. (Edited collections are particularly susceptible to being cherry-picked in this manner, as acquiring editors are well aware, making them more reluctant to take them on.) Unfortunately, either by intention or through ignorance, much of this online copying produces no revenue at all for presses, which experience a further erosion of sales of paperback editions for adoption at the same time as they are experiencing an erosion of sales of the cloth editions because more libraries than ever are now purchasing paperbacks whenever they are published simultaneously with hardbacks. This change in purchasing patterns has compelled many presses to return to the earlier scheme of publishing books first in hardback and then only later, after a delay of a year or so, issuing them in paperback—unless subsidies can be provided to make publication of a paperback possible right away by making up for the income lost from decreased hardback sales (which are often below 100 copies for a dual edition).

The rise of chain superstores like Barnes and Noble and of online retailers like Amazon.com in the past decade has been a mixed blessing. While providing vastly more shelf space to display titles, chain stores
stock only titles carrying trade discounts, and they follow inventory rules that oblige them to return copies that have not sold in ninety days; so, even if more scholarly titles of broad interest are making it into these stores, they often do not get reviewed early enough for people to know they are there to buy, resulting in large returns for those presses that engage in trade publishing. Amazon makes millions of titles available and is incomparable as a bibliographic resource, with such added features as “Search Inside the Book;” but at the same time it helps presses sell new books, it undercut those sales by offering used copies on the same page, and for a while it was even selling dissertations under an arrangement with ProQuest, thus exacerbating the publication of revised dissertations.

So, is there any unambiguously good news to report? Happily, there is, and it takes the form of what Cambridge sociologist (and Polity Press co-owner) John Thompson has dubbed the “hidden revolution” in scholarly publishing. This is, simply, the rise to prominence of the same technology that produced the Xerox machine, which as the Docutech became the prototype of a digital printing machine that has since taken the industry by storm. Its breakout event came with the founding of Lightning Print, now Lightning Source, in the late 1990s as a subsidiary of the Ingram Company, the largest wholesale book distributor in the country. By providing the ability to store books in a digital repository and print them out one copy at a time to fill order from the bookstores it services, Lightning Source offered as “print on demand” (POD) a solution to the industry’s #1 problem: excess inventory, which ties up capital for long periods of time and has to be written off and pulped at the end. Henceforth demand and supply could be kept in close equilibrium, freeing up capital for other uses, including experimentation with electronic publishing. A further evolution of business models built around this technology led to “short-run digital printing” (SRDP), which allowed for an intermediate stage of a book’s life cycle, starting with traditional offset printing of a modest number of hardbacks (400-500), then SRDP printings ranging from 100 to 300 copies for the paperback edition, and finally pure POD for the “long tail” of the book’s final stage (where the search capabilities of Google provide the opportunity to sell a book indefinitely into the future, even if just one copy at a time, ending the need ever to declare a book out of print). It cannot be emphasized enough that this single technological breakthrough has been the salvation of scholarly publishing and can help keep it afloat for many years to come—until, if ever, demand for print copies ceases and customers become satisfied with reading everything in electronic form in future iterations of Amazon’s Kindle, the Sony Reader, or any number of varieties of mobile phone devices.

Will that future ever come? It is difficult to say. Predictions about electronic publishing are notoriously unreliable, as those large commercial companies that invested and lost millions at the beginning of the new millennium can attest. But ask a publisher about XML, and you will find that, for those who have not already done so, most of them have begun to think seriously about incorporating XML markup into the production process, so as to be ready for the time when both book and journal content can be “multi–purpose” for use on all these different types of electronic reading devices. In the scholarly arena, it is quite clear that journals have been making the transition from print to electronic quite successfully, with Project Muse proving to have been the Mellon Foundation’s greatest success so far in encouraging the move into the digital era in scholarship. And now, with “open access” already gaining great strength as an alternative to subscription-based publishing in journals, especially in the sciences, the future looks bright. But books present much greater challenges in making the transition. The Mellon Foundation’s latest annual report admits that neither the Gutenberg-e nor the ACLS History (now Humanities) E-Book projects lived up to early expectations and they seem unsustainable, at least as originally envisioned, over the long term. This has to do not only with issues of technical complexity and the need for expert staff support and extensive training of faculty involved, but also with legal barriers of permissions needed especially for works incorporating multimedia and difficulties for long-term archival preservation. Also, few advocates of “open access” have yet been willing to talk about how it can be applied to books, and as time goes on, there is a danger of creating another “digital divide” between book and journal content, the latter increasingly available online, the former not. Meanwhile, no one has yet mounted an effort as ambitious as the one I outlined in my 1993 Forum article, though there are several smaller-scale efforts under way, including a monograph series in Romance Studies being carried out at my own press as an “open access” experiment in our joint venture with the library that we call the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing. It is through such experiments that we will eventually find out what fate awaits the monograph in our brave new digital world.

Endnotes


4 I explain this dysfunctionality in more detail in “Dissertations into Books? The Lack of Logic in the System,” Against the Grain 19/2 (April 2007): 75-77. A recent effort to move away from placing so much emphasis on the monograph as the “gold standard” of publication is the Modern Language Association’s “Report on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure” (released December 7, 2006).

5 This mission drift was a major theme of the so-called Ithaka Report, “University Publishing in a Digital Age” (released July 23, 2007).

6 The Ithaka Report (p. 19) describes well the kind of Catch-22 in which university presses find themselves at present. “They feel they are held to a different standard than all the cost centers on campus, that they are essentially penalized for pursuing a cost recovery model, which then becomes the basis for evaluating their performance. When they perform well (in financial terms), they are ‘rewarded’ by having their subsidies cut. When they run too large a deficit, they are threatened with closure. Some have responded to these expectations by elevating cost-recovery in their selection criteria, publishing more trade books and shying away from the least marketable fields. This approach may improve their financial situation, while at the same time undermining the case for subsidies.”

7 The erosion of revenue from copying done through course-management and e-reserve systems has, in the extreme, driven some publishers to bring suit for copyright infringement. In April 2008 the presses of Cambridge and Oxford, joined by Sage Publications, filed suit against Georgia State University for illegal copying of books and journals they publish.


9 The theory of “the long tail” was first popularized by Chris Anderson in an article in Wired in October 2004 and elaborated by him later in The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business is Selling More of Less (New York: Hyperion, 2006).


12 For current projects of the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing at Penn State, including the Romance Studies series, see http://www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/odsp/current_projects.html.

13 In my 1993 Forum article, I quoted Nancy Eaton, then director of Iowa State’s library, as putting her finger on the heart of the problem in scholarly publishing: “I would submit that economic forces will shape the future library more than either user needs or evolving information technology. The driving force which will mandate change in libraries is the economic reality that higher education and society in general can no longer economically support scholarly communication and scholarly publishing in their present configurations. We all must balance our personal checkbooks each month or face the creditors. I submit that we can no longer balance our library checkbooks and that scholarly publishing will be forced to reconfigure itself, albeit over a significant period of time.” Nancy Eaton is now Dean of Libraries and Scholarly Communication at Penn State. It was her vision that led to the creation of the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing in the spring of 2005 and the administration merger of the press and the library later that year. The Ithaka Report devotes a paragraph to the Office’s projects as a model of one way that scholarly publishing can be reconfigured. This essay is dedicated to her.
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On Academic Publishing
Some Questions and Answers

by NIKO PFUND | Vice President and Publisher, Academic and Trade Books
Oxford University Press, New York

What is your view toward publishing edited collections, and how if at all has this evolved in recent years?

Our enthusiasm for publishing edited volumes, which had cooled considerably, has been somewhat rekindled by the migration—both real and anticipated—of scholarship to the web. Whereas edited volumes have generally been viewed by scholars and librarians alike as less valuable than single-authored book-length works and have long been overlooked by book review editors, online availability of the chapters in a well-edited, well-conceived, and well-executed edited volume today in many ways liberates a given essay from the fetters of print.

That said, we generally avoid grab-bag volumes consisting of unedited or loosely edited conference proceedings, preferring projects that were originally conceptualized as books, per se. We also are taking a very hard look at projects consisting even in part of previously published articles, unless the project is specifically—very specifically and deliberately—tailored to a particular course and is organized with adoption as a text in mind.

How important is prospective course adoption for determining whether a manuscript is accepted for publication?

The answer to this question depends entirely on the nature of the manuscript. If the manuscript is intended as an original and research-based work of scholarship that will contribute substantively to the scholarly literature, the question is moot since OUP continues to publish many works of specialized scholarship that are highly unlikely ever to be used in courses. So, we would not look unfavorably on a manuscript that takes a novel or revisionist position and thus has the potential to transform our understanding of its subject simply because we don’t believe it will adopt. Far from it, in fact. While we of course strive to publish books that have the potential both to change our understanding of a subject or period and to garner significant adoptions (our recently published Americanos by John Chasteen is an example of such), we don’t look to conflate our pedagogical publishing with our scholarly publishing (and in fact have a higher education publishing division entirely separate from our academic publishing arm). We are admittedly not displeased when the two dovetail, as they do with award-winning titles.

Under what if any conditions might you agree to review a manuscript that is also being sent for consideration by other publishers?

We regularly review manuscripts that are also being considered by other publishers and have no hard-and-fast policy in this respect. Individual editors may in certain instances request a period of exclusive review if they are particularly enthusiastic about a project and will then strive to accelerate our review process and bring it to an expeditious conclusion, but it is up to the author to decide whether or not to grant such exclusivity.

On the whole, we do not believe authors are well-served by limiting their options to a single press, unless they have a pre-existing relationship with that press, or with an editor at that press, or are especially eager to be published under the auspices of a given series, and/or have reason to believe the review process is likely to result in the offer of a contract. What no author wants, of course, is to spend months waiting for a review process to draw to a close, only to have the press’s decision ultimately be not to publish, in which case the author must start from square one.

That said, scholars are, I believe, well-advised not to take a “carpetbombing” approach when submitting proposals since most publishers request, as does Oxford, that we be given the opportunity to complete our review process once it has been initiated before the author makes a final publishing decision. If you send your work to too many editors, you may be hamstrung in this regard, held up by a particularly slow review process at one press.

How do you make decisions about cloth or paperback release of your books?

Very much on an ad hoc basis. We view each new book according to the likely size of the readership (a calculation based on the subject, author, writing style, competing titles, etc.) and whether that readership consists primarily of institutional libraries, specialists in a given discipline or subdiscipline, students, or general readers.

There are also differences in convention between the disciplines in this regard. Works in media studies, for instance, or linguistics tend to be published more frequently in simultaneous cloth and paperback editions than do books in, say, history or politics.

Book type matters as well. In the life sciences, for instance, field guides almost always appear simultaneously whereas research monographs are almost always published in hardcover. Edited volumes sometimes appear in simultaneous editions (especially if they are targeting a classroom audience), whereas festschriften publish in hardcover.

Most often we prefer to publish works of original research—whether specialized monographs or books geared toward a larger audience—first in hardcover and then selectively to publish paperback editions.
approximately 18-24 months subsequent to the original hardcover publication.

**What is your approach to online availability?**

“Online availability” can mean a great many things. To name just a few: publication of the final book as an ebook by the publisher; publication of the final book as an ebook by a commercial aggregator; publication of the final book in an online archive (whether Oxford’s own Oxford Scholarship Online or a multi-publisher aggregator such as Ebrary); the posting by an author of a PDF of the final book on her personal or departmental website; the posting by an author of a “gray matter” draft of the manuscript of the book before it has been edited by the press; inclusion in marketing programs such as Amazon’s Search Inside the Book which is intended to stimulate interest in the book and drive print sales; inclusion in Google’s Book Search program.

And we’ve taken a particularly proactive approach with our journals publishing, experimenting widely with various open access models.

**What are some of the key issues on the horizon that will affect the future directions of scholarly publication in our field?**

The humanities are clearly in the early stages of a migration to a mixed-model publishing environment wherein the printed book will usefully interact with online versions of the same work. What this means for individual scholarly communities varies from discipline to discipline but the first dividing line is arguably between the sciences and the humanities. The sciences have already made great strides in converting to a digital environment, steps which remain yet to be taken in the humanities world for a number of reasons (e.g., sources of funding, the pace of research and the need to publish results quickly, the sciences’ reliance on journal publishing over book publishing, and the baseline orientation of humanists toward the book).

Just as I’m hard-pressed to imagine a humanities academy without books, I can also not imagine that the book’s format hegemony will hold for all that much longer. A decade ago, I would have argued that a key step in this evolution will be the acceptance by tenure committees of digital forms of scholarship that never see publication in print. However, with the changing economics of digital publishing (i.e., the fact that publishers can now print single copies of a book on demand, much like we print documents from our desktops), I think this question of “print or digital” has become a red herring. Digital will not displace books in an environment where different formats exist side-by-side. Some new formats may squeeze out other new formats in the current Precambrian era we’re now in, but print will be with us for many decades yet to come. As long as authors have proud mothers and fathers who want to show off their progeny’s work, books will remain a staple.

In this environment, scholarly publishers will need continually to demonstrate the value they add to the scholarly communication ecosystem, and to make sure they are adjusting according to what the academic community requires of us.

* * *

In closing, I’m always pleased to chat with scholars and librarians about any of the above issues and welcome questions and comments. My email address is niko.pfund@oup.com.
To paraphrase Mark Twain’s famous quote, “Reports of the death of the book have been greatly exaggerated.” Publishing in the field of Latin American Studies continues to be a vibrant enterprise, but there is no question that the trends that have constricted academic publishing in general are influencing publishing on Latin American subjects as well.

One of the bigger blows to academic book publishing has been the consolidation of the journals business, which has allowed the major journals publishers to raise subscription prices well above the rate of inflation. This has left libraries with no choice but to devote larger proportions of their budgets to maintain their ongoing journal subscriptions. So, given that most library budgets are not keeping pace with inflation, the overall pie is smaller, and more of that smaller pie is going to pay for journals as well as a growing array of electronic materials. Thus, the traditional financial supporter of the monograph, the academic library, is no longer able to provide a reliable sales foundation for specialized books.

As libraries have become more selective in their book acquisitions, the first victim to be sacrificed has been the edited volume. Whether based on a conference proceeding or carefully developed from a commissioned set of essays, edited collections are viewed by librarians as an easy choice to drop from their approval plans. Quality and level of presentation is often uneven, and journals are more likely to review authored rather than edited volumes. As a result, Rowman & Littlefield is accepting very few edited collections unless they are specifically designed as readers for the classroom.

"Specifically designed is the key phrase here: many authors and editors genuinely believe that their book will have course adoptions, as well as appeal to a wide array of scholars, general readers, and policymakers. And although it’s true that many academic titles will find their way into a scattering of senior seminars and graduate courses, enrollments in those classes are small and the cost of marketing to those idiosyncratic and specialized courses are large. We much prefer to consider a book that has been written and presented realistically with an easily identifiable—and reachable—audience in mind.

We acquisitions editors also often are wary of edited volumes that are heralded for their multi-disciplinary breadth. It’s a noble and exciting concept in theory, but in practice such works tend to speak to no one rather than to everyone. It’s a phenomenon not dissimilar to the mass email requesting action. If a recipient sees that others are receiving the same request, he or she not unnaturally assumes that someone else will respond.

Specialized authored books too are endangered. True, librarians are more likely to buy monographs than edited volumes, but they do so now as part of a larger consortium, relying on inter-library loan to obtain a book for their patrons. With the growing acceptance by libraries of electronic books through OCLC’s NetLibrary, ebrary, and other vendors, e-publishing is an ever-more viable option for books whose primary purpose is to convey specialized information and analysis.

I have mixed feelings about the free electronic availability of works we hope to publish commercially. In the case of specialized books whose primary audience is looking for selected, specific information within its pages, I have found that free Internet access undermines book sales. For more general works that will be read cover to cover, electronic availability tends to make more potential readers aware of a book’s existence, enhancing “buzz” and sales.

Because of these trends, Rowman & Littlefield is focusing especially on the undergraduate textbook market. Challenges face us here as well, however. Students are less and less inclined to buy the books their professors require, let alone those on the recommended reading list. If they do, they will seek out a used copy from the increasingly aggressive used-book market over a new one or share with a friend. But the psychic (and sometimes practical) rewards are great of publishing a book that helps the next generation become informed citizens—whether by teaching critical thinking, helping students view an issue with informed eyes, or opening a window to a previously unknown world.

I will end with a modest plea to all the professors reading this essay. I hope you will think of the ongoing health of your favorite publisher or of your favorite colleague’s royalty check before you sell an exam or review copy through a used-book site or to your campus bookstore. Consider making the tests in your courses open book as long as the student has his or her own copy of the required text. This may sound like a self-interested scheme to sell books, but it’s intended more as an incentive for your students to read and refer to the works you discuss in class—an essential part of the learning process, as all of us who love books well know!
The Balancing Act of Publishing in Latin American Studies: Let’s Start at the Beginning

by AMY GORELICK | Senior Acquisitions Editor, University Press of Florida | ag@upf.com

On one hand, the needs of the press; on the other, the author’s desires. Editors and publishers have danced this delicate waltz for a long time. Today, academic publishing has its own version of the balancing act: to recoup publishing costs. Years ago, the need for balance was not quite so pronounced. University presses had the luxury of being able to publish important works for their own sake, and could trust that research libraries and individuals would buy scholarly books in large numbers. However, in this time of tightening budgets for both presses and buyers, presses want to publish quality books that will also sell a sufficient number of copies. Authors want to write books that make a scholarly impact but are typically less concerned about the financial pressures on today’s publishing enterprise. I contend that instead of thinking about this relationship as one of differing goals, we must collaborate on producing more books that succeed on both a financial and academic level. Herein, I offer some ideas on how scholars in Latin American studies can help publishers in the discipline balance these larger goals from the outset.

Since this essay is about the beginning, let us start with the conception of the book project. I think that some of the most worthwhile publications are ones where the very foundations of the work are open for discussion. While some books result from an editor pitching an idea to an author, many more books (especially those by younger scholars) originate from the author’s own proposal. Editors are supposed to help develop the strengths of a manuscript as part of their jobs, but they only do so when they feel strongly about eventually publishing the book. Therefore, a writer should take these directions from his or her editor seriously.

To give an example, I have been working with a senior scholar on the history of a Latin American city. The book as originally written had an identity crisis: the author wanted to write what amounted to a memoir about his family and its relation to the city; I wanted a more conventional history. After the author spent some additional time revising the manuscript, he finally struck the right narrative balance by using his family stories to illuminate the larger history of the city. The peer reviewers praised the author for his elegant writing and the style of the narrative. The author and I both navigated this balancing act successfully, since his book was improved without losing its personal flair, but it will also be accessible to a wider audience and thus sell more copies.

The potential format of the text is also related to the conception of the book. Authors commonly ask how they should present a topic; most often, they ask if it should be addressed in a single-authored book or an edited volume. I think many editors would agree with me that an edited volume is not the ideal book form. Authors who have published edited volumes will readily tell aspiring editors-to-be that there it takes far more effort to keep a dozen authors on schedule than to write the book themselves. Press editors know that edited works can be tricky to peer review and can be complicated to copyedit.

However, some topics are inspired choices for an edited volume. In Latin American studies, there seems to be a trend toward a broad regional or even hemispheric approach to certain topics, and thus a variety of specific country expertise or the diverse training of several scholars can shed light on key issues. For instance, our forthcoming book Rural Social Movements in Latin America gathers scholars and activists together to discuss a very hot topic. One author could not have written this book alone; thus, it is a good concept for an edited volume. It is always a good idea to sound out an editor on an edited volume before developing a full proposal, because once again, the editor can help balance the press’s needs and the author’s wishes.

The final starting point is the writing itself. This goes straight to the heart of the book’s potential in the marketplace. It is here that the most vital balancing act occurs: an author’s sometimes ambitious expectations for the work versus the reality of the market. Simply put, technical books about narrow topics are often of greater importance to other scholars but are not likely to reach a broader audience, including undergraduate course adoption, while easy-to-read books about big issues have better prospects (and thus more obvious paperback) potential. The rules for writing an accessible book are the same for Latin American studies as they are for any academic discipline: the manuscript should be an engaging narrative, not a series of discrete observations or articles; it should tell stories, not just relate information; and its prose should have more flourish than a typical academic book. If you wish to write the sort of book that will be assigned by your colleagues, an editor can give you the necessary advice, but it is incorrect to assume that all scholarly books have course potential.

This last point begs a further clarification about whether to publish the work in paperback, hard cover, e-book, or all of the above simultaneously. At our press, we initially print all scholarly books in hard cover, though this practice is not a universal one for presses that publish in Latin American studies. The largest market for monographs is research libraries, and they typically prefer archival quality publications and will pay the additional costs for hardbacks as long as they are not exorbitant. That is not to say if a paperback is available, that libraries will not buy the less expensive format and rebind it as a hardcover, which loses the press valuable sales revenue.
Electronic publications are not a major factor in the sales equation for most scholarly books at this time, because buyers do not yet purchase them in large enough numbers, so their sales numbers do not significantly contribute to the overall revenue stream for the book (this may well change in the next decade or so). Cost recovery has become a most critical metric in determining an academic list’s viability. In fact, some presses have moved out of publishing in Latin American studies entirely precisely because they felt they had to publish in paperback even when it was not fiscally responsible for them to do so. If an academic book is written in such a way that it has a paperback audience, it will be released in paperback eventually, and maybe even made available as an e-book if that is cost effective. The optimal choice for the initial printing remains hardback.

To conclude, scholarly publishing’s balancing act between its intellectual mission and its financial obligations seems unlikely to abate any time soon. Because of this, authors in Latin American studies should give greater consideration to the sorts of books they are writing, and develop relationships with editors to create books that are at once important to the field and also generate enough revenue to recoup the publisher’s costs in a timely fashion.

**What is your view toward publishing edited collections, and how if at all has this evolved in recent years?**

We have traditionally held to the view that, for most discipline areas, there is a limited market for edited volumes and therefore our resources were better reserved for more coherent works by an author or two. There have been some notable exceptions, however, and we have used one work in particular, *The Idea of Race in Latin America* edited by Richard Graham, as a model for how a multi-author work can succeed. In general, if the edited volume is for a very new or emerging field or if it is on a topic so broad that a single author would be unlikely to be able to cover it, we’d be more inclined to consider a collected work. Ironically, looking toward a future of increased re-purposing and re-packaging of content, we have considered that eventually edited volumes might actually become more attractive in the long run than monographic works, but that has not yet encouraged us to accept more collections.

**How important is prospective course adoption for determining whether a manuscript is accepted for publication? How do you make decisions about cloth or paperback release of your books?**

We almost always consider course adoption potential when we are doing a preliminary evaluation, but that is not a make-or-break issue for acceptance. Our basic business model for scholarly works has moved away from a list with many simultaneous cloth/paper editions toward initial publication in cloth only, followed by either a traditional offset paperback or a print-on-demand paperback within a year or less. This means that almost every book can be considered for classroom adoption, even if the classes are very small and/or aren’t taught every year. Occasionally, there are still cogent reasons for doing simultaneous cloth/paper runs or paperback only, but those are the exceptions these days.

**Under what if any conditions might you agree to review a manuscript that is also being sent for consideration by other publishers?**

We rarely do this because we simply don’t have either the staff or the resources to invest significantly in a manuscript that we may not get. Instead, in return for a modest period of exclusivity, we try to offer an expedited turn-around time, or we offer the author an advance contract.

**What is your approach to on-line availability?**

Experiments with simultaneous online and print publication at other university presses suggest that, in certain case, an online edition may actually stimulate sales of the print edition, but we have very little first-hand experience with online publishing.

**What are some of the key issues on the horizon that will affect the future directions of scholarly publication in our field?**

The open access movement is one of the most significant new developments everyone is watching for the moment, and, of course, emerging technology is a constant blip on all our radar screens. Another interesting dynamic is the repositioning of academic libraries as publishers or publishing partners.
ON THE PROFESSION

LACEA, The Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association

by MAURICIO CARDENAS | Latin America Initiative, The Brookings Institution | mcardenas@brookings.edu
and MARCELA ESLAVA | Universidad de los Andes | meslava@uniandes.edu.co

Editor's note: The Summer issue of the Forum included a section devoted to the activities of a number of professional associations that serve Latin Americanists around the world. For the most part these focus on sub-regions of the Americas, or draw on experts on the region from different parts of the world. Another sort of professional association is discipline-based, and we are pleased to present here two examples: the Latin American and Caribbean Economics Association (LACEA) and the Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers, both of which are described in this section in brief accounts by their officers.

The Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association was founded in July 1992 to encourage greater professional interaction and foster increased dialogue among researchers and practitioners whose work focuses on the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). Since its inception, LACEA has grown to an organization with an annual average of 800 active members. Besides organizing activities of interest for economists in general, LACEA sponsors four specialized research networks: the Network on Inequality and Poverty (NIP); the Political Economy Group (PEG); the Regional Integration Network (RIN); and the Workshop on International Economics and Finance. Information about LACEA's history, bylaws, and activities can be found at www.lacea.org.

Every year, LACEA and its associated networks organize meetings attended by economists and social scientists with an interest in LAC. Starting from 1996, the Association has held annual meetings in Mexico City (2), Bogotá (2), Buenos Aires, Santiago, Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, Madrid, Puebla, San José Costa Rica and Paris. These meetings have been joint with the Latin American Chapter of the Econometric Society since 2006. The 2007 Annual Meeting was held at the Universidad de Los Andes in Bogotá. That meeting gathered close to 800 participants; the program featured over 300 contributed papers and several invited sessions and lectures by recognized economists. Besides the Annual Meeting of LACEA, each of the associated networks organizes regular meetings focusing on the specific areas of interest. The programs of these meetings feature a few papers chosen, through competitive processes, from a pool of submitted documents. These meetings allow lengthy and detailed discussion of each of the papers presented, contributing to the quality of research by LACEA members.

Since 2000, LACEA has been publishing its own journal, Economia, that has recently released its fourteenth issue. Modeled after the Brookings Papers on Economic Activity and published by the Brookings Press, Economia is a policy journal, that is, one in which new theories or techniques are applied to policy questions. The journal seeks papers on issues that are both at the forefront of the policy agenda and of broad interest to countries throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Economia aims for the highest standards of theoretical and statistical rigor, but only publishes papers that are written in a style and language that make them accessible to policymakers.

LACEA also provides other services to its members. All LACEA members currently have access to JSTOR's Economic and Business Collection. They also receive LACEA's monthly Newsletter, featuring job postings, calls for papers, and other announcements of interest to our membership. In 2008 LACEA organized a short course on Applied Microeconometric and Panel Data techniques, as part of a broader reaching training program sponsored by the Global Development Network.

In sum, the Association is already playing a leading role in the Economics profession in the region. Its annual meetings are considered world class in terms of size and quality. Also, LACEA is considered one of the most active regional partners of the Global Development Network, an international organization based in Delhi, India.
In 1963, the Association of American Geographers (AAG) inaugurated a Committee on Latin American Geography to encourage interaction among these regional specialists. To further this effort, a group of geographers attending the IX General Assembly of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History met on June 5, 1969, at the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C. at the invitation of Preston E. James. After considerable discussion, the group concluded that the time was ripe for a national conference to share information and stimulate geographical research, teaching, and planning activities.

As it sought to organize a new professional organization, the group requested and received the support of three influential Latin Americanist geographers: Preston E. James (a member of the U.S. National Academy of Science’s Committee on Geography); Arch C. Gerlach (president of the United States National Section of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History); and John P. Augelli (president of the newly-established Latin American Studies Association). The group established working committees on public relations/publications, local arrangements, program, and finances, for a first meeting.

By 1970, therefore, the Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers (CLAG) was the first organization of specialists in the Association of American Geographers to establish its own independent structure and membership. This move prompted a succession of AAG specialty groups to form, including the Latin American Specialty Group (LASG) with which CLAG cooperates to the full.

CLAG is a non-profit organization governed by a Board of Directors elected by the general membership that has varied in number between 200 and 300. Each of the 13 members of the Board serves three years. A rotation policy brings new members to the Board each year and retires members who have completed their terms. Officers of the Board are a Chair, a Vice-Chair, and an Executive Director who may be assisted in their duties by appointed staff. Committees of the Board are appointed by the Chair to undertake organization business; they include an Executive Committee as well as Honors, Membership, and Publications. The Executive Committee is responsible for the integration and facilitation of the activities and plans of the organization.

Meetings of the Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers are scheduled at eighteen-month intervals. These meetings, which have been held in Latin America, Canada, and Spain, as well as the United States, consist of volunteered papers on a general conference theme with a keynote address by a noted Latin Americanist. The first such meeting, in 1970, was funded by the National Science Foundation and the Social Science Research Council-American Council of Learned Societies.

The CLAG annual business meeting, open to all members, is held in April of each year, normally during the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers. One meeting at the beginning of each decade is devoted to an inventory of geographical research in Latin America in the preceding ten years and a discussion of prospects for the future.

During the 1980s CLAG made great progress in becoming a truly international organization; indeed, only two of CLAG’s eight meetings since 1981 have been located in the United States. Latin American sites have included the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Colombia, Honduras, Peru, Costa Rica, Spain, and Guatemala.
A seção Debates deste LASA Forum é dedicada à discussão das mais antigas formas de desigualdades naturalizadas pelas sociedades humanas: aquelas derivadas do sexo. Convidamos cinco cientistas sociais para a tarefa.

Laís Abramo e María Elena Valenzuela abrem a seção apresentando o panorama atual das desigualdades de oportunidades e de situação de homens e mulheres nos mercados de trabalho latino-amERICANOS. O quadro que apresentam é animador em alguns aspectos e preocupante, em outros.

Por um lado, aumentou bastante a inserção e permanência das mulheres nos mercados de trabalho da região: aumentam as taxas de participação e as taxas de ocupação feminina, a escolaridade das mulheres aumenta em ritmo superior a dos homens. Ou seja, a brecha de participação e ocupação por sexo diminui nas últimas três décadas. Mas, por outro lado, as condições de inserção e permanência das mulheres continuam muito precárias. O trabalho informal e mal remunerado continua a incidir pesadamente sobre as mulheres e o emprego doméstico remunerado, ainda que comece a gozar crescentemente de proteção trabalhista, permanece sendo a forma principal de inclusão das mulheres indígenas e afrodescendentes. Ou seja, cristalizam-se formas de opressão por sexo e raça que, se não forem combatidas, tendem a perpetuar a naturalização da opressão feminina.

A agenda da Organização Internacional do Trabalho de promoção da igualdade de gênero através do “trabalho decente”, apresentado pelas autoras, deve servir de parâmetro para os programas sociais e as políticas públicas latino-americanas, de modo a constituir-se num patamar mínimo do estado democrático na região.

É justamente sobre as políticas públicas e a agenda política dos novos governos democráticos da América Latina que se volta a discussão de Cristina Ewig, partindo da constatação metodológica de que a reprodução das desigualdades de gênero estão imbricadas nas políticas sociais dos governos e que estão também intrincadas com as desigualdades raciais e de classe. Sua análise concentra-se especificamente sobre a política de saúde e suas consequências para a reprodução das desigualdades de gênero. A análise de Ewig deve ser lida com atenção pois desvenda a relativa desmobilização feminista no continente, tanto pelas reformas neo-liberais, quanto pelos novos governos de esquerda, com as raríssimas exceções — o governo Bachelet, principalmente. Quando os políticos e tecnocratas partem do suposto de que suas políticas são neutras em relação às desigualdades naturalizadas pelas relações sociais existentes, temos aí um bom começo para a sua invisibilidade e reprodução.

Obviamente, como discutimos aqui mesmo no LASA Fórum do Inverno 2008, é sempre possível argumentar que destacar tais marcadores diacríticos (sexo e cor, por exemplo) em políticas públicas é perpetuar a sua invisibilidade e eventualmente conseguir trazer tais desigualdades para patamares mínimos, o que nossos instrumentos técnicos e teóricos permitem. Ou seja, podemos fazer de uso de medidas quantitativas e avaliações qualitativas que influem diretamente seja na esfera ideológica, seja na base material de distribuição de recursos. Mas, não os destacando estamos ampliando a sua reprodução e ajudando-os a se consolidarem como a nossa própria natureza.

Patrícia Árias, no terceiro artigo desta seção, se dedica a discutir seis motivos pessoais que nutrem a agenda das mulheres no mundo rural mexicano, numa situação em que seus homens se ausentam regularmente em busca de emprego nos Estados Unidos. Estariam estas mulheres em melhores condições para exercerem sua liberdade individual, desconstruindo papéis de gênero e representações milenares do sexo, que as mantém em posições de subalternidade social? Como a crise e a desagregação do mundo rural mexicano são vividas por suas agentes em termos das relações sociais de sexo? A análise de Árias, ainda que limitada a um território geográfico nacional e à esfera da vida rural, é o contraponto necessário para avaliarmos como as políticas públicas, que discutimos acima, são importantes na remodelação e reconfiguração dos constrangimentos estruturais que definem e redefinem as relações sociais. Isso em duplo sentido: tanto aquelas que destoam relações tradicionais, quanto aquelas que estabelecem os parâmetros da modernidade.

Este número de Debates se fecha de modo ainda mais desafiador ao se interrogar, como o faz Amy Lind, sobre a estranheza da sexualidade humana (queerness), em teoria e em prática política, num país que passa por reformas democratizantes que se querem radicalmente populares e libertárias. Lind se interroga sobre a agenda queer, tal como se encontra na arena política equatoriana hoje, em meio a campanha para mudança constitucional. Como convidarão constrangimentos à liberdade sexual individual e ao exercício da igualdade de direitos nas novas revoluções sociais pacíficas, como se quer o Equador de Rafael Correa? Mas, o suposto é que ao poucos a agenda das ciências sociais latino-americanas estão sendo fertilizadas pela teoria queer, como antes o fora pelo feminismo e pelos “novos movimentos sociais”, pois nos obriga a lançar um olhar novo sobre algo que supunhamos natural. Como pode algo tão naturalizadamente irreductível como o sexo...
se dividir em diferentes formas de sexualidade socialmente aceitas?

***

Gostaria de finalizar esta introdução refletindo sobre a construção social de tal irredutibilidade. Ou melhor, sobre uma instância muito particular de tal irredutibilidade, a partir do único conhecimento empírico sistemático que tenho. Posso colocar a questão assim: porque os negros brasileiros são negros?

Diferentemente de outros povos formados em diáspora ou oriundos de imigração, os milhões de africanos trazidos escravizados para as Américas e seus descendentes não se constituíram enquanto etnias em seus novos habitats, mas sim enquanto raça. O mesmo pode ser dito para aqueles que, séculos depois, imigraram livremente das jovens nações africanas em busca de trabalho no Ocidente. Os africanos de ontem e de hoje foram e são geralmente definidos negativamente (por outros) ou positivamente (por si próprios) por características fisionômicas e fenotípicas e não pela cultura ou nacionalidade de origem. Nas Américas, mesmo no Brasil, onde traços das culturas que trouxeram da África marcaram profundamente a cultura popular e fundiram-se à cultura nacional e regional, apenas a mobilização pela raça lhes permitiu avançar reivindicações de direitos civis. Para os negros, como muito bem salientou DuBois, a dupla consciência de raça e de nacionalidade foi e continua sendo condição para integração social e política.

Este único fato marca a grande diferença entre os negros e outros povos formados em diáspora, como os judeus, por exemplo, que se cristalizaram, ao contrário, enquanto minoria étnica ou religiosa, ao lado de outras minorias nos estados-nações europeus, surgidos na idade moderna. Os judeus resistiram com sucesso, ainda que de forma muitas vezes trágica, ao processo de racialização que lhes quiseram impor — a religião, e a cultura desenvolvida à sua margem, lhes serviram de cimento identitário. Não há duplicidade de consciência, no caso dos judeus, pois a pluralidade de suas identidades sociais assemelha-se àquela das variações admitidas pelo estado-nação republicano e democrático: são portadores de especificidade religiosas e culturais, tal como outros coletivos são portadores de subculturas regionais, étnicas ou religiosas. No Brasil, continua sendo um brasileiro comum tal como o protestante, o evangélico ou o espírita, ao lado do católico.

Como os negros, também os descendentes dos japoneses que imigraram para as Américas continuam, de certo modo, a se diferenciar fenotipicamente dos demais americanos e brasileiros a depender de seu grau de miscigenação. No entanto, eles também resistiram com relativo sucesso à racialização, atendendo-se à referência nacional de sua origem, muito mais forte que a designação de raça amarela que lhes quis imponer. A mesma força dos estereótipos raciais que os japoneses resistiram com sucesso, ainda que de forma muitas vezes trágica, ao processo de racialização que lhes quiseram imponer — a religião, e a cultura desenvolvida à sua margem, lhes serviram de cimento identitário. Não há duplicidade de consciência, no caso dos judeus, pois a pluralidade de suas identidades sociais assemelha-se àquela das variações admitidas pelo estado-nação republicano e democrático: são portadores de especificidade religiosas e culturais, tal como outros coletivos são portadores de subculturas regionais, étnicas ou religiosas. No Brasil, continua sendo um brasileiro comum tal como o protestante, o evangélico ou o espírita, ao lado do católico.

Como os negros, também os descendentes dos japoneses que imigraram para as Américas continuam, de certo modo, a se diferenciar fenotipicamente dos demais americanos e brasileiros a depender de seu grau de miscigenação. No entanto, eles também resistiram com relativo sucesso à racialização, atendendo-se à referência nacional de sua origem, muito mais forte que a designação de raça amarela que lhes quis impor. A mesma força dos estereótipos raciais que os japoneses resistiram com sucesso, ainda que de forma muitas vezes trágica, ao processo de racialização que lhes quiseram imponer — a religião, e a cultura desenvolvida à sua margem, lhes serviram de cimento identitário. Não há duplicidade de consciência, no caso dos judeus, pois a pluralidade de suas identidades sociais assemelha-se àquela das variações admitidas pelo estado-nação republicano e democrático: são portadores de especificidade religiosas e culturais, tal como outros coletivos são portadores de subculturas regionais, étnicas ou religiosas. No Brasil, continua sendo um brasileiro comum tal como o protestante, o evangélico ou o espírita, ao lado do católico.

Houve tentativas no sentido de que a nacionalidade e não a raça marcasse prioriariamente a identidade negra nas Américas. Identidades nacionais consolidadas entre os anos 1920 a 1950, no Caribe e na América do Sul, são provas cabais destas tentativas. As nações caribenhas e latino-americanas, em sua maioria, forjaram para si uma nova identidade supra-racial, desvencilhando-se do estigma da mestiçagem e, mais que isto, transformando tal estigma em carisma, ou seja, em marcador diacrítico positivo. Quando isso aconteceu, os negros foram instados a afastar-se cultural e sentimentalmente do continente de origem para tornarem-se cem por cento nacionais ou “japa”, no Brasil, e nipo-americanos, nos Estados Unidos.

É bem verdade que a cultura e a religião, no caso dos negros, serviram de núcleo a partir do qual a identidade racial pode desenvolver-se e solidificar-se. Costumes alimentares e de lazer, como o samba e a feijoada crioulizada por cozinhinhas negras, ou religiosos, como a devoção a santos santos, o candomblé, xangô ou batuque, serviram de esteio para agrupar mais duradouramente pessoas muito socialmente diversas, mas que tinham na “cor”, isto é, na raça atribuída, uma especificidade negativamente valorizada pela formação nacional. Não se trata, portanto, de negar o papel da especificidade cultural na formação racial dos negros. Trata-se, isso sim, de salientar o fato de que a principal referência identitária de outros povos diaspóricos gravitou sempre em torno de símbolos culturais, oferecidos pela nação ou religião de origem, enquanto que, no caso os negros, tal referência nunca foi tão forte quanto a raça, o principal marcador diacrítico da identidade coletiva.
O processo de mestiçagem foi, até certo ponto, bem sucedido, se tomarmos como parâmetro o fato de que boa parte dos mestiços se desvinculou de referências culturais africanas ou indígenas, chegando mesmo os mestiços claros a assumir-se completamente ao mundo cultural e sentimental latino-americano de expressão européia. Digo “de expressão européia” porque esses mundos mestiços latino-americanos conservaram os valores europeus como referentes últimos pelos quais se medir. O que restou de “cultura africana” ou indígena foi gradualmente absorvido pelas culturas nacionais. Mas tal sucesso teve seus limites, exatamente, no sentimento de inferioridade mestiço, no preconceito de cor negativamente, a partir da generalização de raça-definida-pelos-outros, biológicas ou sociais, para raça-definida-por-si, generalizando carismas com marcadores culturais e históricos.

A meta de negação de qualquer especificidade racial e cultural, definindo-se como cem por cento brasileiros, mostrou-se idealista e impossível de ser cumprida, até mesmo por que os brasileiros, em sua maioria, não querem ser negros. Somos brasileiros, mas não deixamos de ser baianos, paulistas, homens e mulheres, ricos e pobres, negros e brancos, católicos, evangélicos etc. (identidades regionais, sexuais, de classe, raciais e religiosas). Se assim é, como mobilizar-se politicamente contra a discriminação racial sem mobilizar-se em raça? De fato, alternativas existem para outros povos discriminados: podem-se mobilizar como judeus, como japoneses, como sírio-libaneses, formando clubes, associações, etc.; o mesmo se aplica às mulheres, aos homossexuais, aos deficientes físicos, aos indígenas e a outros.

Alguns intelectuais dos anos 1940 e 1950 abraçaram o socialismo para manter-se coerentes com o universalismo e o hipernacionalismo que se pediam aos negros. Na verdade, se por formação nacional, os brasileiros eram negros e mestiços e, quando brancos, sabiam-se mestiços claros, no que toca às consequências da discriminação provocada pela cor, os negros eram pobres, explorados e livres —raciocinavam os socialistas negros —tal como todos os trabalhadores sob o capitalismo imperialista. Essa formação pela via da luta de classes e pela arregimentação socialista prevaleceu por bastante tempo no século XX nos meios negros brasileiros e contou com a simpatia e a solidariedade internacionais, não apenas dos comunistas europeus, mas dos comunistas negros norte-americanos e latinos.

Difícil explicar, diante da história das ideias que germinaram nos meios negros brasileiros, porque essa vocação universalista cedeu lugar à mobilização mais nitidamente racial e mesmo étnico-racial dos últimos anos. Mas há que se lembrar que fenômeno análogo trespassou todo o mundo ocidental a partir dos anos 1970, dando espaço à formação do que os sociólogos vieram a batizar como “novos movimentos sociais”. O movimento feminista, o movimento gay, o movimento de bairros, até mesmo o novo sindicalismo brasileiro, ainda que inspirados pela herança universalista marxista, constaram de pouco a pouco, desenvolvendo identidades e ideais mais delimitados em torno do gênero, da preferência sexual, dos problemas locais e propriamente sindicais.

No caso dos negros, vale lembrar também que, como já salientamos, a raça (através da cor) foi sempre um marcador primordial para o destino pessoal de qualquer negro no Brasil. Assim, a ascensão social, o aburguesamento, o sucesso pessoal, a celebridade, o cultivo pessoal da alta cultura europeia como forma de expressão, nada evitou —nunca—que um negro fosse um negro.
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Después de más de tres décadas de crecimiento sostenido de la participación laboral femenina y de sus niveles de escolaridad en América Latina, aun persisten serios obstáculos a una inserción y permanencia de las mujeres en el mercado de trabajo en igualdad de condiciones con respecto a los hombres. En el contexto de la globalización económica y de la transformación en los paradigmas tecnológicos y productivos—en los cuales algunas de las tradicionales barreras de entrada de las mujeres al mercado de trabajo o a ciertas funciones y ocupaciones desaparecen o se desvanece—algunos de estos obstáculos han disminuido, pero otros se han reproducido e incluso incrementado.

Ese contexto también está marcado por una crisis del modelo tradicional en torno al cual se organizó el trabajo productivo y reproductivo, caracterizado por la definición dicotómica y jerarquizada de roles del hombre como proveedor y de la mujer como cuidadora, o, como máximo, como una “fuerza de trabajo secundaria”. El aumento de la participación laboral de las mujeres (más acentuado justamente entre aquellas que están en edad reproductiva) y del número de hogares en que ambos padres trabajan o que están a cargo de mujeres (estos últimos corresponden a aproximadamente al 30% en las zonas urbanas de América Latina) ha producido un aumento significativo de las tensiones entre el trabajo y la familia, que afecta en forma desproporcionada a las mujeres. Con una jornada promedio de trabajo remunerado de 40 horas semanales, las mujeres siguen desempeñando la mayor parte de las tareas domésticas. Además, una proporción creciente de ellas se inserta al mercado de trabajo a través de contratos y formas de trabajo “atípicos”, en los cuales las jornadas son con frecuencia extensas, intensas e irregulares, y que están en gran mayoría excluidas de cualquier tipo de protección social, incluyendo la protección a la maternidad y otras medidas de conciliación entre el trabajo y familia, como por ejemplo la provisión de salas cunas y guarderías infantiles.

Es un contexto también en que las economías de la región, a pesar del crecimiento que se ha registrado en los últimos años, siguen caracterizándose en general por una baja capacidad de generación de empleo, en especial de empleo de calidad, o de trabajo decente. Este es definido, por la Organización Internacional del Trabajo (OIT), como un trabajo productivo, adecuadamente remunerado, ejercido en condiciones de libertad, seguridad y equidad y capaz de garantizar una vida digna a todas las personas que buscan un trabajo. En 2006 la OIT calculó que el déficit de trabajo decente en América Latina afectaba a 126 millones de personas, o sea, a 53% de su Población Económicamente Activa (PEA).

Principales tendencias de evolución del empleo femenino en América Latina

Las mujeres representan, en la actualidad, más del 40% de la PEA urbana de la región. Sus tasas de participación se han incrementado notablemente en la última década y media: han aumentado de 34% en 1990 a 53% en 2006. Ese es un indicador muy importante, asociado a la voluntad y disposición de incorporación de las mujeres al mercado de trabajo, de la cual depende, cada vez más, cualquier posibilidad de autonomía económica, aun en un contexto marcado, como lo fue la década de 90, por un aumento de las tasas de desempleo más acentuado entre las mujeres. Aunque persisten fuertes diferencias entre los niveles de participación laboral de las mujeres según los estratos de ingreso de los hogares de que provienen, siendo un hecho conocido que estos son bastante inferiores entre las más pobres y con menos escolaridad, es en ese estrato que las tasas de participación laboral se han incrementado más acentuadamente. Como resultado, se ha reducido tanto la brecha de participación de las mujeres con respecto a los hombres, como la brecha de participación de las más pobres con respecto a los niveles promedio de participación femenina. Sin embargo, una gran proporción de mujeres de 15 años y más no dispone de ingresos propios: 45% en las zonas urbanas (para los hombres esa proporción es de 22%) y 59% en las zonas rurales. También han aumentado las oportunidades de empleo de las latinoamericanas, en una proporción mayor que las de los hombres: su tasa de ocupación entre 1990 y 2000 creció a un 4,4% al año, mientras la de los hombres creció 2,9%, lo que significó una disminución de la brecha de ocupación entre hombres y mujeres. Esa tendencia persiste en los años 2000. En Brasil, por ejemplo, la brecha entre las tasa de ocupación de hombres y mujeres, aunque siga siendo elevada, se redujo de 33 puntos de por ciento en 1992 a 24 puntos de por ciento en 2006.

Sin embargo, el aumento de la tasa de ocupación no fue suficiente para absorber la mayor oferta de trabajo de las mujeres, o sea, su mayor posibilidad y necesidad de trabajar. La tasa de desempleo abierto de las mujeres en América Latina en 2006 era de 13,3%, significativamente superior a la de los hombres (9,3%). Al contrario de lo ocurrido...
con relación a los indicadores anteriormente analizados, la brecha de desempleo por sexo aumentó en los últimos años, caracterizados por la recuperación económica.

También persisten importantes problemas en la calidad de la inserción laboral de las mujeres: la incidencia de las ocupaciones informales en el total del empleo femenino es superior a la registrada para los hombres y el servicio doméstico sigue absorbiendo un porcentaje bastante grande de la ocupación femenina en la región: 17% en 2006. El servicio doméstico es el segmento del empleo que cuenta con los niveles más bajos de remuneración y protección social, y aunque en los últimos años se han introducido en la mayoría de los países de la región una serie de reformas legales para equiparar sus derechos, todavía se rigen por un régimen jurídico especial, que reconoce a las/os trabajadoras/os domésticas/os menos derechos que al conjunto de los/as asalariados/as. Un alto porcentaje de las mujeres ocupadas en el servicio doméstico en América Latina son indígenas o afrodescendientes, y en algunos países, también migrantes. Muchas de ellas enfrentan situaciones de doble o triple discriminación. También sigue siendo alta la incidencia del trabajo infantil doméstico.

La escolaridad de las mujeres se ha incrementado en un ritmo superior a la de los hombres (las ocupadas tienen en promedio un año más de escolaridad que los hombres) y ha crecido significativamente el número de mujeres en las ocupaciones profesionales y técnicas, alcanzando una proporción de más de 50% en algunos países de la región. Este es sin duda un factor importante para mejorar las posibilidades y las condiciones de incorporación de las mujeres al mercado de trabajo. En la medida en que aumentan sus niveles educativos, se incrementan significativamente sus tasas de participación, sus ingresos promedio y sus posibilidades de acceder a un empleo formal (en el cual son mayores sus probabilidades de contar con protección social). Sin embargo, al analizar la relación entre los niveles de escolaridad de hombres y mujeres y sus respectivas posibilidades y condiciones de inserción laboral, se evidencian fuertes desigualdades. Los mayores niveles de instrucción no les garantizan más y mejores oportunidades de empleo en relación con los hombres. Ellas necesitan de credenciales educativas significativamente superiores para acceder a las mismas oportunidades de empleo que ellos: en promedio cuatro años más para obtener la misma remuneración; y dos años adicionales para tener las mismas oportunidades de acceder a un empleo formal.

Por otro lado, los mecanismos de segmentación ocupacional que confinan a la gran mayoría de las mujeres a los segmentos menos valorizados del mercado de trabajo siguen existiendo y reproduciéndose. Mientras el 45% de los hombres está ocupado en el sector servicios, para las mujeres esa proporción llega a 75%.

Las brechas de ingresos, a su vez, expresan la desigual valoración económica y social de las tareas de hombres y mujeres y siguen siendo uno de los indicadores más importantes de las desigualdades de género. En América Latina, aunque se observa una disminución de esa desigualdad, ella sigue situándose en un nivel muy elevado: la proporción de los ingresos femeninos con relación a los masculinos se eleva de un 61% en 1990 a un 70% en 2006. Sin embargo, la brecha es más acentuada en los tramos superiores de escolaridad. En Brasil, por ejemplo, mientras en promedio las mujeres recibían, en 2006, el 71% de los ingresos masculinos, esa cifra disminuía a aproximadamente el 50% entre los/as que tenían 15 años y más de estudio. En México se observa una situación similar.

La promoción de la igualdad de género en la Agenda del Trabajo Decente

América Latina es el continente que se caracteriza por ser el más desigual del mundo. Las desigualdades de género, junto a las desigualdades en la distribución de la riqueza y las discriminaciones que sufren los afrodescendientes y los pueblos originarios, son ejes estructurantes de la matriz de la exclusión social en la región y se potencian entre sí. La promoción de la igualdad de género, a su vez, es un elemento central de la Agenda de Trabajo Decente de la OIT. No será posible superar el significativo déficit de trabajo decente que caracteriza a la región, sin avanzar, al mismo tiempo, en la superación de la desigualdad de género y de los déficits de trabajo decente para las mujeres, tanto con relación a las dimensiones cuantitativa y cualitativa del empleo, como con relación a las dimensiones de los derechos en el trabajo, de la protección social y del diálogo social.

La Agenda Hemisférica del Trabajo Decente, documento presentado por el Director General de la OIT a la XVI Reunión Regional Americana de la Organización, realizada en Brasilia en mayo de 2006, y que fue apoyada por los representantes tripartitos (gobiernos, empleadores y trabajadores) de 23 países de la región, que se comprometieron en la ocasión con una década de promoción del trabajo decente, establece algunas metas a ser alcanzadas hasta 2015, plazo también definido para los Objetivos del Desarrollo del Milenio (ODMs). Con relación a la promoción de la igualdad de género, esas metas son: elevar en un 10% las tasas de participación y ocupación de las mujeres y disminuir, en un 50%, las brechas de informalidad y de ingresos. Para alcanzar esos objetivos, la Agenda Hemisférica de Trabajo Decente propone algunas estrategias y líneas de acción.
Propone, en primer lugar, avanzar en la aplicación efectiva del principio de la no discriminación a través del fortalecimiento de los marcos legales y del desarrollo de planes nacionales (incluyendo políticas de acción afirmativa) para enfrentar el problema de la desigualdad y discriminación de la mujer en el empleo. Eso incluye la promoción de la ratificación y de la efectiva implementación de los convenios de la OIT relativos a la igualdad de género y a la protección de los derechos de las mujeres trabajadoras, entre los cuales se destacan los siguientes: los convenios n. 100, 1951, Igualdad de remuneración para trabajo de igual valor y n. 111, 1958, No discriminación (empleo y ocupación), definidos como fundamentales por la Declaración de los Derechos y Principios Fundamentales en el Trabajo, adoptada por la OIT en 1998; los convenios n. 103, 1952, y 183, 2000, de protección a la maternidad y el convenio n. 156, 1981, relativo a los trabajadores con responsabilidades familiares.

En segundo lugar, promover el aumento de las tasas de participación y ocupación de las mujeres, garantizando su acceso a las políticas activas de mercado de trabajo (formación, intermediación, planes especiales de empleo) en proporción no inferior a su peso en la fuerza de trabajo, estableciendo mecanismos que aseguren que las mujeres no sean discriminadas en los procesos de selección y contratación, promoviendo los derechos de las trabajadoras a través de la negociación colectiva e incluyendo medidas específicas dirigidas a las mujeres en los programas de empleo juvenil.

En tercer lugar, promover la mejora de la calidad de los puestos de trabajo de las mujeres en la economía informal. Esa estrategia se desdobla en las siguientes líneas de acción: diseño e implementación de políticas de formación dirigidas a las mujeres con baja escolaridad para aumentar su acceso a nuevos nichos del mercado de trabajo y a ocupaciones no tradicionales; programas para ampliar el acceso de las mujeres a los recursos productivos (información, tecnología, crédito) y promover el desarrollo empresarial de las mujeres; mejora de las condiciones de trabajo y eliminación de la discriminación contra las trabajadoras domésticas (revisión de la legislación a fin de lograr el pleno ejercicio de sus derechos laborales, aumento de la cobertura de la protección social, incentivo a su organización, etc.).

En cuarto lugar, reducir las desigualdades de remuneración a través del monitoreo de su evolución, la implementación de programas que actúen sobre la segregación ocupacional, la aplicación de métodos de evaluación de los puestos de trabajo sin sesgos sexistas (en base a las calificaciones, el esfuerzo, las responsabilidades y las condiciones de trabajo) y la elaboración de metodologías para implementar políticas de igual remuneración para trabajo de igual valor, y la inclusión de cláusulas en la negociación colectiva para hacer más transparente la contratación y la promoción de las mujeres.

En quinto lugar, promover el equilibrio entre hombres y mujeres en las organizaciones sociales e instancias de diálogo a través del desarrollo de programas para promover la representación equilibrada de mujeres trabajadoras y empleadoras (incluyendo formación de líderes y negociadoras y establecimiento de cuotas), la incorporación de demandas de género en las agendas de las organizaciones de trabajadores y empleadores y en los convenios y negociaciones colectivas.

En sexto lugar, avanzar hacia la compatibilidad de la vida laboral con la vida familiar y personal a través de nuevos marcos legales y políticas de conciliación y co-responsabilidad que consideren la dimensión reproductiva como una responsabilidad social e integren a hombres y mujeres, garantizando el cumplimiento de la protección a la maternidad y extendiendo este derecho a trabajadoras informales, garantizando y ampliando las licencias de paternidad y parentales, ampliando la cobertura de salas cunas y guarderías infantiles para hijos e hijas de mujeres y hombres trabajadores (tanto formales como informales), promoviendo el desarrollo de programas voluntarios en las empresas y la inclusión de cláusulas en la negociación colectiva que faciliten la compatibilización de horarios y responsabilidades laborales y familiares y en general, políticas para lograr mejor calidad de vida familiar y personal y lugares de trabajo mas igualitarios y productivos.

En séptimo lugar, promover la incorporación de mujeres en los sectores más dinámicos y con mayor potencial de crecimiento en la economía global, en las áreas vinculadas al desarrollo de tecnologías de punta y a los nuevos sistemas de información y comunicación, a través de políticas educacionales que rompan con los estereotipos tradicionales y promuevan el acceso de las mujeres a la ciencia y la tecnología.

En síntesis, la región no solo está experimentando un cambio de los paradigmas productivos, sino también sociodemográficos que han modificado las fronteras entre el trabajo productivo y reproductivo e involucran necesidades a las que sólo el Estado puede responder. La promoción del trabajo decente y la igualdad de género como eje transversal de esa estrategia constituyen importantes pilares frente al gran desafío de la región para avanzar hacia una mayor justicia e inclusión social.
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With the recent “Left turn” in Latin America, inequality has re-emerged on many national agendas with an urgency not seen since prior to the regional economic crisis of the 1980s. Most nations have prioritized economic inequality, which is understandable given that Latin America is the most unequal region of the world in terms of income. In several countries, notably Bolivia and Brazil, racial inequality is also an area of active discussion (on Brazil, see the Winter 2008 issue of LASA Forum). Gender inequality has not been a top agenda item, however, and some Left governments have even worked against gender equality. The abolition of therapeutic abortion by the current Sandinista government in Nicaragua indicates the regressive stance of this government on gender issues, for example. Despite other positive aspects of this program, the Venezuelan government’s reliance on the unpaid labor of poor women for the success of its neighborhood “Misiones” that deliver state social benefits smacks of the instrumental use of women’s voluntary labor. The government of Michele Bachelet stands apart for its pro-active stand on gender equity, evidenced in Chile’s recent pension reforms that sought to correct important inequities in women’s compared to men’s pension distributions.

As these examples illustrate, gender inequality remains a pressing issue in Latin America, despite advances such as gender quotas for political office, the establishment of ministries of women meant to actively redress gender inequalities, and agreements to abide by international conventions on women’s rights. These examples also indicate that many of today’s gender inequalities are embedded in social policies, be it reproductive rights legislation, poverty alleviation strategies or pension policies. More attention is needed to determine how the social policies that constitute Latin America’s welfare regimes alleviate or aggravate gender inequalities, and what can be done to improve these policies so that they promote greater gender equity.

Research on gender equity and social policy in Latin America needs both long-term and short-term perspectives, and sector-specific and overarching “regime type” analyses. This research needs to look beyond (though not lose sight of!) the reproductive health arena which at times becomes the focus of gender and social policy. Most of all, such research needs to take an “intersectional” approach—an approach that is attentive to how the inequalities of gender, race and class interact, resulting in distinct effects of the same social policy on different groups of people.

My own approach is sector-specific; I analyze one sector of Latin American welfare regimes, health care policy, with special attention to the gendered political dynamics and effects of the neoliberal retrenchment of the 1990s. Health policy (as Briggs and Martini Briggs pointed out in the Spring 2008 LASA Forum) offers a useful window onto “big questions of the state, citizenship, and struggles centered on neoliberal policies and their effects” (p. 17). It also offers a particularly useful analysis for gender inequity and its intersections with race and class within the broader framework of the Latin American welfare regime.

Because the health sector in Latin America is often composed of distinct systems (public health, social security health and private health systems) which serve different populations, health policy captures how one social policy sector impacts the entire national population (whereas pensions, for example, serve only formal sector workers—a small slice of the population). Segmentation within the health sector reveals how welfare regimes, as the renowned European welfare scholar, Gosta Esping-Anderson (1990) first observed, can also stratify—along gender and race, as well as class divides. Latin America’s public health systems serve the poor and in those countries where women or women heads of household are concentrated among the poor, these systems also serve a majority female constituency. It is also in these public systems where indigenous and Afro-descent populations are concentrated. By contrast, social security and private health systems in Latin America largely serve middle and upper-class, mestizo and “whiter” constituencies. Comparing these systems, their resources, and their quality (in which public health systems consistently fall to the bottom), allows one to see how the segmentation of health systems in Latin America is grounded in gender and race as well as in class inequality, and serves to reinforce these inequalities.

An historical view of the emergence of these separate systems offers even greater depth of understanding how gender, race and class interact to determine access to health care. Nancy Leys Stepan has documented how public health systems were created in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in a context in which the medical profession was heavily influenced by Lamarckian eugenics (1991). Latin America’s particular form of eugenics influenced by Lamarckian eugenics (1991). Latin America’s particular form of eugenics viewed public health systems, and within these systems the molding of mothers, as central to nation-building and betterment. Due in part to this history, public health systems in the region traditionally have prioritized mother-child health, and women and children have been the primary public.
health system clients. By contrast, social security health care, created through a process of conflict and cooptation between largely male unions and authoritarian and semi-authoritarian governments, was a masculine affair. The Colombian social security system restricted health care coverage for female dependents of male workers to obstetric coverage until 1993. In Peru, women workers in the social security system could not carry their spouses as dependents until 1992. These facts belie the gendered assumptions behind these systems: social security health systems were an essentially male privilege and the public health systems were feminized.

Gender inequalities are also evidenced in political debates over distinct health policies during the period of neoliberal retrenchment. For example, discussions of family planning, maternal mortality or infant health care regularly invoked policy discourses that underlined women's contribution as mothers to the family and the nation. Policy makers have tended to view women's wombs and mothering skills as essential for economic and national progress. Feminist activists have resisted this discourse, strategically invoking global conventions on women's rights (like the CEDAW) to demand women's autonomy as individuals and greater reproductive rights. In these debates, women and gender are central.

By contrast, in the “mainstream” health reform debates over privatization, decentralization and targeting of the 1990s and early 2000s, policy makers told me in interviews that gender was inconsequential. This response may have stemmed from a narrow understanding of gender as sex: what in the world would privatization for example have to do with sex, or issues related to biological reproduction? To these policy makers, such reforms were about reducing the role of the state, introducing the market, and promoting health care “choice” and efficiency. It was not about gender, or women. With the exception of recent reforms in Ecuador and Chile, feminists also largely stayed out of these “mainstream” health debates (Ecuador was most successful, in that “gender equity” was incorporated into the nation's general health legislation; on feminists’ role in reforms in Chile, see Ewig 2008). In most countries, feminists focused on more obviously women-related policies such as abortion or access to contraception. The comparison of these contrasting policies and the dynamics of gender in each reveals a lot about the politics of the health sector, and in turn, welfare regimes. In certain arenas related to biological reproduction or mothering, gender is an accepted category of analysis, while in other more “technical” domains gender analysis is considered frivolous or a distraction. This division reinforces the misconception that “gender = women” and “women = mothers” rather than viewing gender as a set of power relations in society based on the perceived differences between the sexes—power relations that play into all policy arenas.

“Mainstream” neoliberal social policy reforms such as privatization, decentralization, and targeting that were implemented across health, pension and education sectors in the region in the 1990s and early 2000s do have significant implications for gender inequality. In health care, privatization of health insurance in Chile led to discriminatory fee structures in which women were charged more than men due to the “risk” of pregnancy. Such practices shift social responsibility for reproduction onto individual women. This is doubly discriminatory because women, due to gender discrimination and segmentation in labor markets, earn less and thus are less likely to be able to afford the more expensive, but also higher quality, private health insurance (Pollack 2002, Ewig 2008). Similarly, private pension firms, using strict actuarial logic, provide women with lower monthly benefits because women tend to take time out of the work force or work part time due to childrearing, earn less due to labor market discrimination, and live longer than men and thus accumulate fewer funds that must be stretched over longer time periods (Arenas de Mesa and Montecinos 1999, Bertranou 2001, Dion 2006). As a result, private pension schemes leave older women more vulnerable to poverty. By contrast, the previous state-run systems did not differentiate benefits based on sex.

Likewise, the ostensibly gender-neutral move toward decentralization has often shifted state responsibilities to women, as in Chavez’s Misiones, or in Peru’s Comités Locales de Administración en Salud (CLAS) program. While my research on the CLAS in Peru reveals many positive aspects of community-based decentralization, it also demonstrates how gendered assumptions played into the execution of community-based decentralization policies. In urban areas, primarily women were recruited to serve on the CLAS committees in which they were asked to invest time and energy into overseeing the budget and daily administration of local health care centers and enlist neighbors in vaccination campaigns. To policy makers, such work fits into traditional notions of women's care work responsibilities and is seen as an “efficient” way to reduce local health care costs. Many policy makers assume these women do this work out of a “natural” concern for family and community well-being, rooted in their identities as women, when in fact many of the women I interviewed were hoping the work would be a stepping stone to paid opportunities—a hope that rarely materialized. By erroneously assuming that women’s work is
“free” and their time unlimited, policy makers fail to recognize the value of this work and the degree to which the informal labor of women sustains Latin American welfare regimes. Moreover, such policies reify unequal gender relations by asking women (not men) to contribute to community well-being under conditions in which the value of that work is not recognized.

Of course, my research is far from the first to recognize the ways in which welfare states in Latin America rely on women’s unpaid work. Amy Lind (2005) shows how the use of women’s unpaid labor became part of Ecuador’s “logic of development.” A main contention of feminist scholars of structural adjustment was that economic adjustment relied implicitly on women’s voluntary labor for human survival in the “lost decade” of the 1980s. In other words, the use of women’s unpaid labor is a recurring theme in Latin American social policy and is one that further embeds gender inequalities by simultaneously depending on and devaluing women’s contributions to social reproduction.

“Targeting” was also a key strategy of neoliberal reforms. It refers to the practice of offering a carefully selected benefit or set of benefits (usually chosen on the basis of cost-benefit analysis) to a specified population—usually those most in need—as a way of ensuring that state moneys are used in the most efficient manner and reach the most needy. On the surface, it makes sense to prioritize certain services, such as vaccinations, which have broad preventative effects at low cost. But the narrow range of services offered often misses critical elements essential to gender equity; the health package offered to the poor in Colombia, for example, did not offer full diagnosis for cervical cancer until 2006 (and in practice often still denies it) despite the fact that this is the leading cause of death for women in that country. In such cases, a concern for efficiency creates gender inequities by not offering life-saving health care to some women (poor women), and it also raises serious questions of medical ethics.

Moreover, targeting strategies may also reinforce gendered divisions of responsibilities in a similar manner to the decentralization described above. Mexico’s Oportunidades program offers cash assistance to mothers that keep their children enrolled in school, who regularly bring their children to the local health center and who attend monthly meetings at the health center on child and nutrition and health. In many ways Oportunidades is working to ameliorate gender inequalities. For example, the program gives women, rather than men, control over this new cash resource thus providing women with greater authority in the household. It also provides extra incentives for girls to attend school, in order to reverse trends of girls’ early dropout rates. But the program also relies on traditional gendered assumptions that it is mothers’ responsibility to ensure children succeed, by putting the onus on mothers (not fathers) to attend lectures and ensure children’s health and education in order to receive their monthly check (Molyneux 2006).

Key to a full understanding of how social policies may either ameliorate or reproduce inequalities is to take an intersectional approach which recognizes how gender, race and class work together to create inequality (McCall 2005, Hancock 2007). For example, in Peru, health reforms had profoundly different effects on rural, indigenous women than they did on urban, mestiza women. Race interacts with gender in the rural sierra of Peru, as women are considered “more indigenous” and more likely to remain monolingual Quechua speakers (de la Cadena 1996). As a result, these women are unable to participate in the CLAS reform described above, which requires fluid communication with health care professionals who rarely speak Quechua and often view indigenous people with disdain. Similarly, when the package of benefits offered to the poor is smaller than that offered to the middle class (as in the case of Colombia) or when private health care is of higher quality than the public system (as in most of Latin America) class mediates gender by affording middle class women improved benefits compared to their poor counterparts.

While I use one sector as a window onto the changing dynamics of gender (in relationship to race and class) in Latin American welfare regimes, others have looked at multiple policy sectors to paint broader pictures of the gendered nature of national welfare regimes. The works of Karin Rosemblatt (2000) and Christine Ehrick (2005) provide important insights into the gendered politics of, including women’s roles in, the founding of early social security systems and poverty policies in Chile and Uruguay. These historical works provide clues as to the origins of the gendered discourses and political arrangements that still shape welfare policies today. Jennifer Pribble (2006) compares the contemporary Uruguayan and Chilean welfare regimes and provides a much-needed comparative assessment of what constitutes a “gender-friendly” welfare regime in Latin America. Finally, Juliana Martínez (2008) is perhaps most ambitious; she develops a typology of Latin American welfare regimes that consistently incorporates a gender analysis through a focus on the family.

Whether sector-specific, regime-oriented, contemporary or historical, research on gender and welfare in Latin America points to persistent gender inequalities that are reproduced by social policies. But this
research also demonstrates that these inequalities are constructed, they are surmountable, and they deserve a higher priority on the agendas of governments across the region today.

This essay draws on my forthcoming book Second Wave Neoliberalism: Gender, Race and Health Sector Reforms in Peru (Pennsylvania State University Press) and on on-going research on gender and health reform in Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Ecuador. I thank Jane Collins, Eric Hersberg and William Jones for their comments on this essay.
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Women in Rural Mexico Agendas and Transitions

by PATRICIA ARIAS


In recent years, three trends have emerged that are having a transformational impact on women from rural Mexico. First, rural Mexican women are participating in wage labor markets on a large scale; second, they are taking on new social and economic tasks as a result of indefinitely prolonged male migration; and, third, female migration is intensifying (D’Aubeterre, 1995; Durand and Massey, 2003; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003; Marroni, 1993; Moctezuma Yano, 2003). The explanation of reuniting families as the impetus for this migration has lost ground as the female exodus proceeds: the women currently leaving their communities may be married, unmarried, abandoned, widowed, or single mothers.

In light of this evidence, some studies claim that women have achieved greater “empowerment” in their places of origin (Deere and León, 2000). With the men away, women have taken on new jobs—as agricultural laborers on small plots for example—and are participating more in community activities (D’Aubeterre, 1995; Deere, 2005; Garza Bueno and Zapata Martelo, 2007; Menjivar and Agadjanian, 2007; Peña Piña, 2004; Rosas, 2004).

Although accepting new responsibilities has meant more work than rights for women, the absence of the male appears to have had positive effects on their self-esteem, autonomy and independence (Rosas, 2005). However, male absence can have negative effects as well. Remittances perpetuate economic dependency and male control of women: in many cases wives do not receive their allowances directly and cannot decide...
how to spend them (Peña Piña, 2004; Rosas, 2004). Many women stay in their in-laws’ homes and are thus subject to the control of the families of their spouses (Estrada, 2007; Marroni, 2002; Menjívar and Agadjanian, 2007; Peña Piña, 2004; Rosas, 2005). In this context, the new tasks and roles women have taken on can lead to stress (Menjívar and Agadjanian, 2007; Rosas, 2005).

Although there are few studies of destination communities, they indicate that women’s wage labor has brought about greater equality in marital relationships. In Dominican migrant households in New York with both husband and wife working outside the home, domestic chores and childcare were more equally shared (Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991). Grasmuck and Pessar also found that in order to preserve and prolong the benefits of migration, Dominican women postponed returning to their country. For example, they would purchase expensive goods on credit, thus obligating their families to stay longer in the United States. When they marry, they would purchase expensive goods on credit, thus obligating their families to stay longer in the United States. Patrilocal residence had been the most widespread model in Mexican rural societies (Robichaux, 1997), women go to places of origin? To fully explore this question, we can note first that Hontagneu-Soteló (2003) finds that gender relations—understood as power relations between the sexes—are not limited to the domestic realm and everyday life; rather, they are present in all social and political fields and institutions. Thus, to understand rural Mexican women’s demands and struggles, the scope of analysis should be expanded to include family, social and cultural contexts, since men and women are likely, and often obligated, to conduct gender relations as dictated by their families or the community. Social relations and institutions exert pressures that impose particular gender relations on couples through constraints, gossip, accusations, instigations, interpretations, and even violence, which has a serious impact on the lives of these women (González Montes, 2002). Thus, it is not surprising that women are interested in making changes: they are the more affected by the gender dimensions of models of social reproduction that determine patterns of residence, obligations, control, mobility and resources.

In the Mesoamerican model of social reproduction, the traditional subordination of the woman at home is deeply rooted, unrestricted and hazardous. As long as they were unmarried, women were under the control of their mothers, fathers, or brothers. In many cases they had no choice of whom or when to marry; until quite recently, this was a decision made by the family or it was the chance selection of a man “stealing the bride” (González Montes and Salles, 1995; Oehmichen, 2002). As for “single” women, rural societies have long concealed their existence, and especially their living conditions. Singles included unmarried women, mothers without spouses, widows, or those who had been abandoned by their husbands and either stayed with or returned to their domestic groups with their children. Women who are “single” in the sense that they do not have a recognized spouse have been the most vulnerable, and the most likely to suffer the worst living and working conditions in their domestic groups and in their communities.

Motivating Goals

1. Having the right to work for wages. Until the nineteen eighties, it was common for women who worked outside their homes to have to ask for permission from parents and husbands. Changes in traditional marital relationships were not to be discussed, nor were modifications in house rules: the women were to continue, as always, to be in charge of domestic chores and childcare, and their movements were to be confined to the journey from house to work and back. This placed them in a disadvantageous and subordinate position.

As women in agricultural families began to break the mold and work outside the home, their wage labor became highly valued and they sought assistance with agricultural work. Second, women began to make personal and independent use of their income and negotiate the financial contribution they make to their households. Third, wage labor ceased to be a sporadic, temporary event associated with the pre-marriage stage of life: it became sought after and constantly defended.

2. Breaking with patrilocality. In the Mesoamerican model of social reproduction, the most widespread model in Mexican rural societies (Robichaux, 1997), women go to live with their husband’s domestic group when they marry. Patrilocal residence had
many advantages for society as a whole, but tended to be the worst stage in life for a woman: she was subject to abuse by her husband and in-laws, subordinated and obligated to help or to take over tasks from the mother-in-law and sisters-in-law; and was vulnerable to physical aggression and social isolation (Córdova Plaza, 2002; Estrada, 2007; Mindek, 2007; Moctezuma Yano, 2002; Sierra, 2004). Once “joined in marriage, the woman could be beaten, sometimes brutally, without her own original family taking her back in” (Oehmichen, 2002).

Recent ethnography has shown that one of women’s objectives, sometimes on their own and sometimes with their spouses, is to break with patrilocality as a form of post-marital residence in favor of neolocal residence—establishing their own households. Women insist on using the money received as remittances to build a house separate from their parents-in-law as soon as possible, and thus shorten, or better yet, eliminate, the patrilocal residence phase (Córdova Plaza, 2002; D’Aubeterre, 1995; Marroni de Velásquez, 1995; Pauli, 2007). They even “make attempts to delay their husbands’ return” until they achieve their basic aim of having a home of their own, away from their mothers-in-law and sisters-in-law (Sánchez Plata, 2004:198).

3. Escaping the moral control of communities of origin. Wage labor and migration have helped women to deal with or to escape from the brutal moral control exercised in their communities of origin. The only option for women abandoned by their spouses had been to return to their original households. In exchange for a place to live and some assistance, they had to cooperate in the projects and economic activities of their own parents and brothers. At the same time, they were subject to accusations and sexual harassment from relatives and neighbors and to suspicion that could lead to an extremely tight watch on their activities, movements and relationships (Casados González, 2004). Female behavior is rigorously “watched and occasionally punished violently, when the husband or the father or the brother have doubts about her honor and sexual behavior” (Oehmichen, 2002). The fear of reprisals and loss of support forced women to repress their sexuality and to exalt their submission. The slightest doubt about a woman’s sexual behavior could become an excuse for male family members to repress and punish her. To encourage other men to judge, avoid or harass the women, male family members often cut off communication and invented or repeated slander against them. Just having a spouse, any spouse, gave women legitimacy and protection from other men, from all men, in fact, which compelled them to accept spouses who were sometimes quite dreadful (Mindek, 2007).

But today things have changed. Single women who are unable to depend on their children’s fathers or grandfathers are deciding to work outside their communities to improve their children’s and their own standard of living. This option allows them to remain single or to form a relationship with another man.

4. Having the right to live alone with their husbands. Until recently, women accepted without question the decision made by spouses and the family group with respect to where they should live. But young women, both married and single, have started to make new arguments to justify the right to build their lives as a couple not only away from the in-laws’ house but also far from their villages. They assert that “they want to live with their husbands” wherever their husbands are, and the only way to be with their husbands now, they may say, is to emigrate. For example, young women from Miguel Acuexcomac, Puebla, try to get to Los Angeles because they want to live with their spouses (Fagetti, 1995). In seeking to restore the marriage bond that has been weakened by distance, or else moved by a new ideal of married life, young women abandon their villages, leaving their parents and in-laws behind (D’Aubeterre, 2002).

The indefinitely prolonged emigration of husbands and fiancés has made it easier for women to assert their right to go with them. The scenarios of U.S. migration they have heard about, imagined or experienced, also influence them. In destination communities women have been able to confront the machismo, gossip, abuse and mistreatment that was common in their communities of origin and enjoy greater equality with their spouses. Domestic violence is also less pervasive than in their villages back home (Oehmichen Bazán, 2005; Ruiz Robles, 2004). By comparing the female condition in their communities with conditions in other communities, young women have been able to question traditional norms and obligations—especially in the mother-in-law/daughter-in-law relationship. Migration can mitigate the tensions and complexities of the often conflictive relationships among women of different generations living under the same roof.

Migration can also open the door to changes that do not seem possible in the villages: a woman can decide, with her husband, about key questions, such as how many children to have and their education, as well as work, investments and projects. Not that the husbands are always agreeable, but outside the local context they may be more flexible. Departure may be a way to create husband-wife relationships that are more egalitarian than in communities of origin, where both are pressured into fulfilling the stereotypes and gender norms imposed by parents and siblings, as well as a long list of in-laws and
extended family. For women away from the watchful eye of their relatives it becomes possible to negotiate and to make agreements with their spouses alone rather than the whole domestic group.

5. Having the right to break marital bonds. For decades male migration disguised the dissolution of marital unions and the abandonment of children. Ceasing to send remittances amounted in practice to cutting off marital relations even if it was not overtly stated. Mothers had to totally assume the economic responsibilities of supporting their children. This dynamic is beginning to change. Single women who do not have the support of the fathers or grandparents of their children are choosing to work away from their communities in order to maintain or improve their standard of living. At the same time, married women have begun to react to domestic violence that they are no longer willing to put up with. Oehmichen Bazán (2005) has shown that Mazahua women migrate for a variety of reasons that nearly always include escaping some form of conjugal violence. Women are increasingly walking or running away from violent marital or family relations. They also are increasingly unwilling to accept vulnerable positions within their domestic groups, opting to leave their communities.

Female-initiated marital breakups create a lot of tension within households. Parents and siblings, many of them also violent men, often do not accept this change and repeat the old arguments for why the woman has no right to separate, such as, “it’s what she chose,” “marriage is like that,” “all men are like that,” “what’s she done to make him act like that,” “she’s brought shame on all of us,” or “it would be just the same with someone else.” Women who leave marriages face reprisals from their own families. Resources, services and assistance suddenly become scarce. But the women don’t stop leaving.

6. Challenging the stereotype of the male provider. In order to secure these changes, women have had to struggle against gender stereotypes and ideologies. They have had to break with the idea that marriage required putting up with anything, including physical abuse, because they were being supported by their husbands. Significantly, most families did not support women who sought separation from abusive husbands. As long as a husband was supporting his wife financially, she was expected to put up with whatever he did. Women themselves valued that support, since working outside the home was not, generally acceptable (Rosas, 2005).

As the notion of egalitarian marriages has met with more approval, rural Mexican women are working outside the home in greater numbers and are valuing their own work. The “good man” increasingly is one who is dependable, doesn’t abuse his wife and is not an alcoholic; he doesn’t necessarily need to be the best provider anymore.

Conclusion

Rural Mexican women have fought to modify the status traditionally assigned them in their roles as sisters or daughters, as well as in their marital relationships as wives, daughters-in-law and sisters-in-law. Rural women use migration, work and money, often without expressing the fact openly, to break away from the values, beliefs, mechanisms, practices, identities and ideologies that have traditionally marked, bounded and affected their lives as females in a set of family relationships. Their struggle has not been necessarily against their husbands per se, but against the weft of family and social relations and meanings in which both husband and wife have been embedded. Departure from their communities of origin has facilitated the transition and a break with the Mesoamerican model of social reproduction, based on assumptions that create strong and painful gender imbalances for women.

Of course, communities and domestic groups have tried to perpetuate traditional relationships by keeping women in their communities. But the deepening agrarian crisis and the end of land redistribution have diluted the bonds connecting the migrants to their original communities and helped push the transition. There is an emerging trend for young people, both male and female, to give up agricultural activity and emigrate. Like men, women who have left their communities for economic reasons are the beneficiaries of a significant modification in the gender relations that prevailed in their households of origin.
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Introduction

To speak of queer studies and politics in Latin America, one must necessarily interrogate the ways in which notions of queerness have circulated and been resignified by various groups of scholars and activists. Like other terrains of struggle, “queer” brings with it a set of pressing questions about the place of Anglophone expressions in Spanish, Portuguese and other linguistic contexts; the sexual, racial and nationalist taxonomies that accompany its interpretation; and the ability (or lack thereof) to organize successfully and establish a shared cultural meaning around such a term. As lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer scholars have long pointed out, both in the North and South, “queer” can be used in several ways: as an identity marker or category, as a methodology, as an epistemological framework, and/or as a starting point to produce new or distinct forms of knowledge and political strategies that challenge heteronormativities and gender normativities.1 In Latin America, “queer” is often associated with northern or “western” cultural imperialism and seen as a notion that reinforces a whitening and/or homogenization of the interests and identities of people who do not fit within the culturally prescribed sexual or gender roles of their societies (e.g., Viteri 2008). Yet some of the basic forms of thought emanating from queer studies, embodied in the work of, for example, Michel Foucault (1978) and Judith Butler (1990), continue to take on new place-based meanings which have held both epistemic and political salience in the contemporary struggle for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) rights in Latin America. That is to say, whether one opts to embrace the term “queer” or not, even negative encounters with “queerness” have produced important and interesting forms of inquiry and activism in the region, which in my view would not have occurred in such a way without an encounter with queer studies in the first place.2

Encountering “Queerness” in the Field:
Gays, Lesbians, Transfeminists and Neoliberals

Recently I returned from a research trip to Venezuela and Ecuador where I interviewed LGBTI activists about this issue, particularly as notions of “gayness” and “queerness” are understood by activists in their quest for a post-neoliberal order, in the era of “21st century socialism” in these two countries. I was motivated to learn not only how activists are constructing political strategies which challenge the premise of liberalism as a cultural (and imperialist) project, but also how their own encounters with Latin America’s new Lefts (plural) have given them pause to rethink the centrality of heteronormativity in both capitalist and socialist development projects and in the constructions of nationhood that are created through and sustain these narratives of progress and revolution. As I was asking questions aimed at these broad issues, I found myself returning to the question of identity markers as central to broader struggles for interpretive power within each country—struggles which also play out among LGBTI activists as they debate what constitutes an appropriate political agenda. Below I provide some examples from my interviews in Quito, Ecuador, to highlight some of the tensions that exist in current...
Ecuadorian scholarly and political debates on queerness, and to draw out the strategic potential of a “queer” political agenda in a context in which “queerness” is more often than not rejected as a mobilizing category.

Quito’s LGBTI movement, which is comprised of approximately 15 organizations, a handful of coalitions, and several additional individual activists working in a diversity of spaces, has effectively mobilized its various ideological sectors to participate, either formally or informally, in the redrafting of and negotiations surrounding President Rafael Correa’s (2007-present) newly-proposed constitution, voted on in a national referendum on September 28, 2008. Ecuador’s new constitution, which passed by a wide margin, provides several new articles aimed at protecting the rights of people on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Unlike the 1998 constitution, which included sexual orientation in its anti-discrimination clause, the new constitution includes additional judicial guarantees and mechanisms that, for the first time, allows people to demand, either individually or collectively, freedom from discrimination on the basis of gender identity or sexual orientation in the workplace, educational system, health care system, housing sector, and in cultural life (Asamblea Constituyente 2008). It also acknowledges and aims to protect “alternative families”—families that are not based on blood or property relations but rather on “other types of solidarity,” including migrant families, single parent households, and “sexually diverse” families including same-sex couples who live together. The alternative-families clause could also apply to, for example, transsexual and transvestis communities, and to any other type of household that does not rely upon a traditional logic of blood relations.

The process by which sectors of LGBTI activists struggled to include these articles in the constitutional assembly’s final proposal was long and arduous. And needless to say, there was great opposition to these articles. The religious Right and conservative Left coincided in some views on homosexuality and abortion—the two hot button topics—yet it was the religious Right that successfully pushed for an anti-same-sex marriage clause and a clause stating that same-sex couples cannot adopt, both of which appear in the new constitution. The opposition to same-sex marriage was particularly interesting given that virtually no LGBTI sector asked for it; rather, the fear of same-sex marriage was created by the Right as an intimidation strategy and ultimately, as an attempt to create opposition to President Correa’s general push for economic sovereignty and individual and collective rights through his “citizen revolution,” a process viewed by Right-wing economic and political elites as inherently anti-capitalist, anti-market, and as threatening to the traditional nucleus of the Ecuadorian nation, “the family.”

Despite these tensions within the assembly meetings, the presence of key activists in the pre-assembly meetings and during the six-month constitutional assembly itself, coupled with Correa’s majority political bloc approval of the articles, solidified the approval of the progressive articles in the final document. Interestingly, while certainly “queer” was not a term used in assembly negotiations, some activists have remarked that notions from queer theory were used to develop their own movement proposals to the assembly, a point I develop below.

LGBTI Movement Currents: Neo/Liberal and Transfeminist

To begin, two currents of the LGBTI movement stand out. First, the more liberal, mainstream current represented primarily by gay (male) rights and HIV/AIDS NGOs, along with at least one lesbian organization. This movement current presented its own proposal to the assembly which included same-sex unions, access to property rights, and anti-discrimination legislation, among others. The general thrust behind the proposal was to seek full citizen rights for gays and lesbians (and to a much more limited extent, transgendered people) in Ecuador’s otherwise benevolent democratic system. This framework works well with the existing legal system, although the emphasis on same-sex unions meant that access to citizenship would be based on a traditional notion of an intimate relationship (either through a unión de hecho or domestic partnership, for example) and as such, this liberal approach did not challenge the traditional legal notion of “the family” as rooted in blood or property relations, nor did it question the neoliberal logic behind supporting a citizenship model based on the assumption that all citizens have equal access to the marketplace and consumer culture. In many ways, this current is comparable to liberal LGBT political currents in northern countries which aim to solidify access to citizenship through a marriage or domestic partnership model—a model often critiqued by queer activists as reinforcing rather than challenging a heteronormative logic of the family, marriage and market as hegemonic institutions (e.g., Seidman 2001).

The second current of the movement, which also submitted its own proposal to the constitutional assembly,* was often defined by its members as “transfeminista” in my interviews (Vásquez 2008; Medranda 2008; Valverde 2008; Rojas 2008). This current is
“transfeminism breaks with a (neo)liberal logic, at least in the Ecuadorean context. We are not interested in the theme of goods and patrimonies; rather, we are seeking a broader proposal that goes beyond the neoliberal.” With this in mind, activists in this current have attempted to create alliances with other sectors, both within the LGBTI movement and outside it, particularly with sectors that “…have not been heard and that have organized around an alternative aesthetic [i.e., form of expression] and notion of family…one based more on a logic of solidarity rather than on one of individualism. These are identities that are not recognized by the formal system nor within traditional cultural practices. We say ‘no’ to norms, to the dominant aesthetic, to the neoliberal system…there are other ways of seeing the world.” (Rojas 2008).

For the transfeminist current, “trans” implies a break not only with the traditional gender/sex system but also with other forms of normativities based on race, ethnicity, class and geopolitical location. As some activists pointed out, unlike “queer,” “trans” and “transfeminista” hold organizing potential in the Quito context and relate to local understandings of non-normative identities, forms of expression, and living arrangements. For example, the transfeminist current, which advocated for the notion of “alternative families” in its proposal to the constitutional assembly, draws directly from Ecuador’s history of collective rights, rooted in indigenous thought and cultures, rather than relying on a notion of individual rights so common in liberal discourse. At the same time, transfeminist activists have also challenged both indigenous and mestizo accounts of “the family” which exclude sexual and gender dissidents. In addition, “transfeminista” implies an explicit political agenda, rooted both in transgender rights and feminism, which seeks to address the violence of the normalizing effects of state policies and laws, institutional discrimination and cultural discourses concerning homosexuality, gender identity and the family. In contrast, according to one activist, advocating for a “queer” agenda does not necessarily imply a political agenda per se, since “queer” can also signify a methodology or academic field and historically the embracing of the identity marker “queer” has not always been linked to political activism (Rojas 2008), a critique that has been made both in the North and South.

Transfeminism and Queer Studies

There is no doubt that the mobilizing success of transfeminism has its roots in queer studies. Indeed, transfeminism as a political project exists in part due to alliances among academic institutions, NGOs, movement alliances, and even the state-based National Women’s Council (Consejo Nacional de la Mujer, or CONAMU), which now includes LGBT rights in its agenda, at least on paper. A recent academic event in Quito serves as a case in point. In a presentation at the tenth anniversary conference of the Gender Studies Program at the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO-Ecuador) in June 2008, a Quito-based lesbian activist and intellectual argued that the term “queer” is not relevant in Ecuador and that, in her view, “transfeminism” is a more appropriate term to describe a new form of politics taking place within Ecuador’s increasingly heterogeneous lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) movement. For her, “transfeminism” referred to a particular kind of political vision that some lesbian and trans activists share with regard to social change. As in the case of the transfeminist current of Ecuador’s LGBTI movement, for the speaker “transfeminism” captures at least two central political notions: the idea that the personal is still very much political; and the idea that activism itself must be transgressive, that is, that it must not buy into a heteronormative, eurocentric liberal logic of identity. The speaker drew from Judith Halberstam’s (1998) research on female masculinities to define her own notion of transfeminism, yet she also drew from transnational feminist and postcolonial studies to define “trans” more generally as capturing “the sites where taxonomies don’t quite fit” (Quiroga, 2000: 195-196 as cited in Viteri 2008: 180). Interestingly, while she drew from “northern” scholarship, her own appropriation and definition of the term took on a meaning of its own, one very unique and relevant to LGBTI movement debates in Ecuador and one quite distinct to Halberstam’s original usage of the terms “trans” and “feminism.” What is interesting about this term, from my perspective, is that while the speaker rejected the term “queer,” she developed a similar challenge to the logic of liberalism so central to queer theory’s critique of LGBT identity politics. Her theoretical perspective, like that of transfeminist activists, is grounded in lived political, cultural and economic experiences and not just in academic theory. Certainly there is a correlation between the two, yet as many scholars have pointed out, notions from queer studies circulate and are resignified in local contexts in such a way that they take on new meanings altogether, some of which challenge dominant understandings of “queerness” even as they are incorporated into LGBTI political strategies.

In Quito, the late Patricio Brabomalo was perhaps one of the first activists to identify explicitly with a form of “queer” politics and to publish his views on queerness.
Brabomalo, one of the founders of the LGBT rights NGO, Fundación CAUSANA, espoused a “queer” form of doing politics that involved a critique of various forms of identity expression among self-defined gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and transsexuals. As Brabomalo states,

No existen un ‘solo’ de gays y lesbianas, existen además, maricones, plumas, locas, fuertes. No existen solamente lesbianas, existen también marimachas, tortilleras, areperas. (Brabomalo 2002: 31).

He continues,

En el Ecuador el rostro que se le ha dado a la homosexualidad dentro de la misma población, muestra a un hombre comprendido entre 25 y 45 años, mestizo, de clase media, con escolaridad de nivel universitario. Estas características...se han diseminado en la misma población tomando como referentes de un grupo de personas más heterogéneo de lo que se imagina. Este rostro...oculta la realidad y existencia de toda una gama de tonalidades, de rostros invisibilizados, escondidos y...sancionados en su “propio” terreno....(Brabomalo 2002: 31).

Brabomalo draws from the work of theorists such as Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Jeffrey Weeks, among others, to develop his understanding of the “face of homosexuality” in Ecuador, a “face” which he views as biased toward a Eurocentric, White, middle class aesthetic even within the realm of LGBTI activism. He draws from queer theory to elaborate on his political agenda, which entails a rethinking of identity as fluid and constantly changing rather than static and fixed. For Brabomalo, this approach speaks to his lived concrete experience more so than liberal theory.

**Transfeministas and Cooperativos: Pending Questions, Preliminary Conclusions**

The “face of homosexuality” that Brabomalo speaks of continues to serve as a visible terrain of dispute in Quito’s current LGBTI movement to such an extent that the transfeminist current considers the liberal current a group of “cooperativos,” or the corporate gay current of the movement. According to one self-defined transfeminista interviewee, the cooperativos emphasize individual rights, gay consumerism, and a corporate NGO model of advocacy, whereas transfeminists emphasize a logic of solidarity and aim to challenge, rather than merely reform, normative legal and political structures (Vasquez 2008).

The ongoing tensions among the liberal and transfeminist currents of Quito’s LGBTI movement raises a series of questions about the usefulness of “queering” LGBTI politics in a country like Ecuador, and about the place of queer studies in Ecuadorian academic life. To be sure, FLACSO-Ecuador has provided a crucial space for critical reflection on these issues, initially established in part through an alliance with Fundación CAUSANA and FLACSO’s Gender Studies Program. In 2002, the Sexual Identities Study Group was created by Fundación CAUSANA and FLACSO, with the goal of bringing together scholars and activists interested in intellectually interrogating the meaning of sexuality and gender identity. FLACSO has offered several courses in the areas of queer theory, sexuality studies and masculinity and femininity studies and has hosted several public events and conference panels on these issues. Activists from organizations such as Proyecto Transgénero, Casa Trans (housed together) and Fundación CAUSANA have been trained either at FLACSO or at other Ecuadorian universities where they have studied queer theory as part of their broader degree programs. In this sense, it is impossible to separate the academic enterprise of queer studies from political activism in Quito. Yet how these individuals reinscribe notions of queerness in their professional, academic, and activist work, be it through embracing historically perjorative terms such as marimacha, loca or maricón and reclaiming them as forms of pride; or through creating new, locally understood terms such as llapingacha; or by critiquing the limitations of globalized discourses of “gay rights,” these debates will continue to shape the increasingly heterogeneous nature of Ecuador’s academic scholarship in gender and sexuality studies as well as its activist networks.

**References**


Endnotes

1 By “heteronormativities,” I am referring to the ways in which heterosexuality is privileged above all other expressions of sexuality and viewed as natural and normal versus non-heterosexual identities or experiences which are marked as unnatural, abnormal, or as “outside” dominant societal understandings of sexuality, sex and gender. By “gender normativities,” I am referring to the ways in which gender identities, forms of expressions, and roles are likewise naturalized and normalized such that anyone who does not fit within a culturally prescribed gender role is deemed “abnormal” in their society. Both of these types of normativities have symbolic and material effects, often violent ones, for sexual and gender dissidents.

2 By “transgender” I am referring to various groups of people that transgress, challenge, or alter the gender categories assigned to them at birth: transsexuals, travestis or cross-dressers, drag kings and queens, lesbianas masculinas, transgenders.

3 Not unlike earlier historical encounters with feminism, Marxism and liberalism.

4 Multiple proposals were submitted to the constitutional assembly by LGBTI sectors but in my interviews these two proposals were repeatedly mentioned whereas other proposals were not.
As we anticipated after seeing the record number of proposals—43 percent more than for the Montréal Congress—we have had to schedule the Rio meeting over three and a half days, from Thursday morning through Sunday morning. This is true even though we shall have a record number of rooms available. Except for Sunday, when the sessions will end at noon, the meetings will run from 9:00 am until 6:45 pm at the Catholic University and will be followed by receptions, probably mainly at the hotels (negotiations about venues for receptions continue).

We can also now report that the number of submissions from Brazilian scholars has been unprecedented—1663 individual submissions. Because of this huge response from LASA members, and despite extending the meeting calendar to Sunday, we found it necessary to reject nearly 20 percent of the panels and papers proposed. On the other hand, some 7,200 of those who submitted proposals will be receiving news of acceptance from the Secretariat in late October. Please be mindful of the fact that it was only possible to accommodate such a large number of proposals because we have so many rooms available and therefore can run a large number of concurrent sessions.

This necessitates running concurrent sessions from the same track, so attendees inevitably will not be able to visit all the sessions of interest to them.

We are enormously grateful to the chairs of the 35 tracks who reviewed the thousands of proposal submissions for the Rio Congress, including those who signed on as second or third co-chairs once the volume of submissions became clear: Mirta Antonelli (Culture, Power and Political Subjectivities), Rodrigo Cánovas (Literary Studies: Contemporary), Jorge Papadopoulos (Politics and Public Policy), Maria Aparecida Andrade Salgueiro (Literature and Culture: Interdisciplinary Approaches), Nestor Rodriguez (Crossborder Studies and Migration), Gonzalo Rojas-Ortuste (Literary Studies: Contemporary), Ben Schneider (Economics and Development), and Elliott Young (Transnationalism.) However, literally hundreds of panel proposals and individual paper proposal submissions were sent to the wrong tracks—something to note for future Congresses. (Errors were particularly common for the Culture, Power and Political Subjectivities track, which received over a hundred proposals that should have gone to political and other social science tracks.)

We also scheduled an exciting series of presidential panels, including sessions on inequality as it relates to the social sciences, history, and economics; ecological issues; welfare states; the politics of racial/ethnic categorization; literature and recent political turns to the left and right; and new Brazilian and Mexican Cinema. There will also be a LARR-sponsored series of workshops on scholarly publishing and keynote lectures by several distinguished Brazilian scholars.

We could not have accomplished our task of scheduling all the sessions in Pittsburgh last week without the invaluable preparatory work and collaboration of Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Executive Director of LASA; Monica Davis, the LASA Staff Coordinator for the Rio Congress; Sandra Klinzing, Assistant Director for Institutional Advancement, and Israel R. Perlov, Administrative Coordinator. As always, Eric Hershberg’s overall vision and leadership has been essential to the Congress planning.

All in all, this promises to be the most ambitious and international LASA Congress ever! ■

### Target Dates for LASA2009

- **December 15, 2008**  
  Deadline to submit changes/corrections for Program Book (lasacong@pitt.edu)

- **January 19, 2009**  
  Notification of travel grant requests (date subject to change based upon availability of funds)

- **February 15, 2009**  
  Pre-registration deadline

- **February 15, 2009**  
  Deadline for canceling pre-registration without penalty

- **March 9, 2009**  
  Deadline to submit electronic paper for Congress proceedings (lasacong@pitt.edu)
Elections 2008
Nominating Committee Slate

The LASA Nominating Committee presents the following slate of candidates for vice president and members of the Executive Council (EC). The winning candidate for vice president will serve in that capacity from May 1, 2009 to October 31, 2010 and as president from November 1, 2010 until April 30, 2012. The three winning candidates for EC membership will serve a three-year term from May 1, 2009 to April 30, 2012.

Nominees for Vice President:
Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida
University of São Paulo
Rosemary Thorp
Oxford University

Nominees for Executive Council:
Roberto Blancarte
El Colegio de México
Paul Gootenberg
Stony Brook University
Robert Hoffmann
German Institute of Global and Area Studies
Gwen Kirkpatrick
Georgetown University
Nicolas Shumway
University of Texas
Kimberly Theidon
Harvard University

The Candidates

Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida is Professor at the University of São Paulo where she teaches in the Undergraduate Program of International Relations and in the Graduate Program of Political Science. She presently is deputy director of the Institute of International Relations at the University of São Paulo. She has a Bachelor degree in Social Sciences (1969) and a Ph.D. in Political Science (1979) from the University of São Paulo and engaged in post-doctoral studies at the University of California, Berkeley (1984). Her research interests focus on public policies and Brazilian political institutions, especially federal structures and intergovernmental relations. She published the book *Economic Crisis and Organized Interests* (São Paulo: Edusp) and some 100 articles in academic journals and books, among which are “Brazil - Privatization: reform through negotiation” and “Federalism and social policies in Brazil.” She has been Visiting Researcher at the Institute of Latin American Studies, University of California, Berkeley (1992); Tinker Visiting Professor, Stanford University (1996); Visiting Professor, Latin America Program, Ortega y Gasset Institute (1999, 2000 and 2002); Visiting Professor, Political Science Department, Université de Montréal (2006). She served on LASA’s Executive Committee (2001-2004) and has been President of the Brazilian Political Science Association (2006-2008). Presently, she is a member of the Brazilian Institute Advisory Council, Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, and of the International Political Science Association’s Executive Committee. She holds the Brazil National Order of Scientific Merit (2006).

Tavares de Almeida Statement
As a longtime LASA member, and having served on the Executive Committee for three years, I took my nomination to the vice presidency as a challenge and an exciting academic endeavor. I consider LASA an invaluable tool for furthering our common knowledge about Latin America through exchange between academic fields and academic communities in the Americas and, secondarily, elsewhere. LASA is a successful organization and therefore needs little change. In this sense, as vice president and then president I would basically build upon what previous presidents and ECs have achieved. But since LASA’s success can be interpreted in different ways, I would like to note the achievements that have impressed me and that I would further develop. I think LASA is an academic professional organization of enormous importance in the development of shared standards of scholarship and should continue to be so. LASA’s main achievement, in my opinion, is its capacity to be a multidisciplinary organization where fruitful interdisciplinary dialogue is possible. Multidisciplinary organizations face the challenges of their diversity. Social Sciences and Humanities disciplines have evolved in quite different—and, sometimes, divergent— theoretical, epistemological and methodological directions, besides having their own internal differences of styles, approaches and methods. LASA has succeeded in including new areas, themes and analytical approaches in the academy. The Association’s present challenge is to draw from its ingrained pluralist tradition to accommodate diversity in ways comfortable to all its members—and especially to create opportunities and venues for a productive intellectual exchange about our shared views on specific topics as well as about divergent views on where Latin American studies are and should head. Although something has already been done through the LASA
Forum, more can be achieved in LARR and during our Congresses. LASA decided to go South, and that was an important decision. The 2008 Congress, in Rio de Janeiro, will be a landmark in this process of approaching academic communities dedicated to the study of Latin American issues in different countries across the Continent. This will happen in an opportune moment, since in the democratic systems now prevailing in almost all Latin American countries, Social Sciences and Humanities communities are developing in the old institutions in which they resisted the authoritarian sieges, as well as in new ones, at universities or research centers. Professional academic associations, either disciplinary or getting together different fields, have been established. Many of these can cooperate with LASA and help increase its membership. In countries where academic institutions are still weak, participation in LASA can be of great help in connecting scattered intellectual communities to the international flow of information and knowledge. For scholars living in Latin America, LASA has been a forum in which their work can reach a public well beyond national borders. The Association has also allowed for their participation in international scholarly networks as partners in building a better understanding of Latin America within a broad comparative perspective. After decades of authoritarianism and economic distress, Latin America may be about to enter a new and promising era. The combination of growth and democracy creates favorable conditions for countries to begin facing secular problems of poverty, inequalities, waste of resources by privileged elites—and also new problems regarding environmental issues, promising paths to sustainable development, ways of enforcing citizens’ rights and recognizing the legitimacy of new social identities. Scholars devoted to the study of Latin America, across the Americas, cannot replace political and social actors facing the challenge of taking advantage of favorable conditions to build a better future. But scholars certainly can produce knowledge that may help clarify the issues at stake. As an academic, professional and multidisciplinary organization, able as no other in the region to bring together an immense array of qualified scholars from different countries, fields of knowledge and specialization, LASA enjoys a privileged position as it contributes to an educated debate about Latin America’s present dilemmas and perspectives.

Rosemary Thorp has been Lecturer and then Reader in the Economics of Latin America at the University of Oxford since 1970. She has been a fellow of St Antony’s College, Oxford, since 1978. In 1995 she elected to move from the Economics department to Queen Elizabeth House, the university’s Department of International Development, to support Frances Stewart as the new Director, in a move to give new life to interdisciplinary development studies in the university. She has held the rotating post of Director of the Latin American Centre for three periods. She has also been acting director, then interim director of Queen Elizabeth House. In her period on the Social Science Divisional Board she was heavily involved in creating and embedding an institutional mechanism to protect area and development studies in the course of a major university reform which aimed to decentralise and strengthen disciplines. She has taught and supervised masters and doctoral students throughout her time and been responsible for the development of new courses. She has had extensive voluntary sector and international experience. For seventeen years she was a trustee of Oxfam GB, a non-governmental organisation with an annual income of £300 million. As chair for the last five years, she led the board of trustees in having overall responsibility for all of Oxfam GB’s work and strategic thinking. It was an important part of the role to spend as much time as possible gaining experience of Oxfam’s work on the ground and at the policy level. She was ex officio a member of the Oxfam International Board. Other international experience has included three years teaching at Berkeley, and extensive involvement in a range of Latin American countries, but especially Peru, where she has taught and lectured widely, and in 2002 was the first holder of the Carlos Rodriguez Pastor Visiting Chair at the Catholic University, Lima. The university has recently awarded her an honorary degree. She graduated from Oxford in 1962 in Philosophy, Politics and Economics. Her first major book was an economic history of Peru, with Geoff Bertram: Peru 1890-1977: Growth and Policy in an Open Economy, 1978 (also in Spanish). In the 1980s she ran a series of comparative economic history workshops resulting in published volumes, working closely with Carlos Díaz Alejandro until his death. In 1995 she was invited by Enrique Iglesias, president of the IDB, to write an economic history of Latin America in the twentieth century. She organised this as a collaborative project, building on the earlier workshops, and eventually included some eighty colleagues from throughout the Latin Americanist community. The result was: Progress, Poverty and Exclusion: an Economic History of Latin America in the Twentieth Century (also published in Spanish, French and Portuguese). Other books include: Economic Doctrines in Latin America: their origin, evolution and embedding (edited with Valpy Fitzgerald, 2006); Group Behaviour and Development (edited with Judith Heyer and Frances Stewart) 2005; Decentralising Development: the
Political Economy of Institutional Change in Chile and Colombia. Alan Angell, Pam Lowden and Rosemary Thorp, 2001; The Export Age: the Latin American Economies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (edited with Enrique Cárdenas and José Antonio Ocampo, 2000, also in Spanish); Industrialization and the State in Latin America: the Black Legend and the Post-War Years (edited with Enrique Cárdenas and José Antonio Ocampo, 2000, also in Spanish); Economic Management and Economic Development in Peru and Colombia, 1991 (also in Spanish); with L. Whitehead (eds.), Latin American Debt and the Adjustment Crisis, 1987 (also in Spanish); Latin America in the 1930’s: The Role of the Periphery in World Crisis (ed), 1984 (also in Spanish); with L. Whitehead (eds.), Inflation and Stabilization in Latin America, 1979. Her recent research has returned to Peru and become more interdisciplinary in nature. She is working on the persistence of inequality, and especially the role of inequality between groups, above all ethnic groups. Recent articles from this work are: “Collective Action, Gender and Ethnicity in Peru: a case study of the comedores populares,” not yet published, available from the author; “Group Inequalities and the Nature and Power of Collective Action: Case studies from Peru,” with Ismael Muñoz and Maritza Paredes, World Development Nov. 2007; “Inequality, Ethnicity, Political Mobilisation and Political Violence in Latin America: the cases of Bolivia, Guatemala and Peru,” with Corinne Caumartin and George Gray-Molina, Bulletin of Latin American Research, 2006; “Acción Colectiva, Violencia Política y Etnicidad en el Perú,” with Ismael Muñoz and Maritza Paredes, Lima 2006; Cuadernos de Investigación Política N° 1, Department of Politics, Catholic University, Lima; “When and How Far is Group Formation a Route out of Chronic Poverty?” World Development July 2005 (with Frances Stewart and Amrik Heyer). On retirement from her university appointment, she will remain as research associate in Queen Elizabeth House, and as Emeritus Fellow, St Antony’s College.

Thorpe Statement
I have been an enthusiastic supporter of LASA throughout my career, for the same reason as I have chosen to dedicate my career in Oxford to building interdisciplinary studies, and in particular Latin American Studies. As an economist I learnt in working on Peru that rooting my interpretation of the economy in the history, society, politics, geography and culture of the region gave me insights and understanding that I relished. And as many of us have found, Latin America is also a continent that engages and doesn’t let go: the bonds of friendship and affection I have developed have sustained my commitment to Latin American Studies and therefore to LASA. The latter allows people like me to mix and cooperate, and defends the ‘space’ of interdisciplinarity in a world where increasingly complex disciplinary training can appear to threaten it. The growing complexity of disciplinary work is only one among many challenges which LASA faces and where I would seek to help. The organisation faces new challenges as Asia and Africa appear to absorb the attention of policy makers and funders alike. It faces new challenges as it grows—sheer numbers threaten to overwhelm efforts at dialogue and communication. It has always faced special in-built tensions. As a professional organisation originating outside Latin America, LASA has a delicate responsibility to support and enrich academic life within Latin America, not stifle it in some dependency nightmare. This is an in-built tension as we all want our own institutions to grow stronger. And as a multi-disciplinary organisation, it has to hold in balance the interests of a shifting disciplinary composition of its membership: again an inherent tension requiring management. Perhaps here my experience in Oxfam would help me, should I be elected: Oxfam is an organisation abounding in such tensions—between the claims of advocacy, humanitarian need and long-run on-the-ground development work, or again in Oxfam International, as a confederation of 14 Oxfams. Oxfam and running my College’s governing body have also shaped my view of governance. My career has taught me that consensus needs to be built and valued but in non-manipulative ways. The leadership needs to be strong in values: I hope LASA will always continue to be characterised by respect for human rights. I have always admired it as a professional organisation for strength and clarity on issues of human rights. The decision not to meet in the United States while this would prevent the attendance of Cuban colleagues is a good example. And finally, the leadership needs to be creative and self-critical in being genuinely inclusive. In short, I see LASA as more needed than ever, while it faces huge challenges to maintain quality and defend the field. If I were elected, it would give me enormous satisfaction to try to help it on its way.

Roberto J. Blancarte (born in Mazatlán, Mexico in 1957) is Professor and Director of the Center of Sociological Studies at El Colegio de México in Mexico City. He obtained his Ph.D. at the Écoles des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris, France (1988). Founder and main counselor of the Interdisciplinary Program for the Study of Religions (PIER) of El Colegio Mexiquense in Zinacantepec, Mexico.
Associate researcher of the Groupe Sociétés, Religions, Laïcités in France. Member of the National Committee of Bioethics (2006-2007) and the National Commission to Prevent Discrimination of Mexico (2005-2008). He has been counselor at the Mexican Embassy to the Holy See and Chief of Staff of the Vice-ministry of Religious Affairs. His research work has dealt with sociology of religion, particularly Church-State relations, secularisation, “laicity” and lately around the connection between secular State and sexual and reproductive rights. He has been Visiting Professor at Dartmouth College (NH, USA) and the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études (France). Author and editor of several books, including Historia de la Iglesia católica en México (1992); Religión, Iglesias y democracia (1995); Laicidad y valores en un estado democrático (2000); Afganistán, la revolución islámica frente al mundo occidental (2001); El sucesor de Juan Pablo II: Escenarios y candidatos del próximo conclave (2002); Entre la fe y el poder: Política y religión en México (2004); Sexo, religión y democracia (2008); Los retos de la laicidad y la secularización en el mundo contemporáneo (2008); Para entender el Estado laico (2008) and numerous articles in scientific reviews. He writes weekly a column on politics and religion for a national newspaper (Milenio) and participates actively in local politics, particularly around the subject of civil freedoms.

**Blancarte Statement**

A few years ago, I was asked by James Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, to contribute a chapter to the Handbook on Sociology of Religion (Sage, 2007). What I finally said in that contribution was that one of the good reasons for analyzing Mexico’s religion and society is the fact that the country, and in fact the entire region of Latin America, is simultaneously host to both a Western and a non-Western society. I tried to explain that Mexico, like many other Latin American or Caribbean countries, experiences modernity or post-modernity with all the ambivalence and paradoxes of any country that was colonized and partially Westernized. Precisely because of that, Latin America could and should be a perfect reminder that theories devised to explain particular situations are not always automatically applicable in general. Furthermore—I stated—in order to achieve global reach, concepts and theories should incorporate particular experiences. “Theory construction can then become a two-way process, not only in the sense of a dialogue between theory and empirical data—between analysis and facts—but also between the different experiences of Western, semi-Western and non-Western societies.” I insisted that I perceived this as a permanent dialogue between different perspectives in an attempt to create universal tools for a broader understanding of society: we could call this a “system of cultural mirrors in social sciences” that would seek to elaborate new universal paradigms, theories and concepts. This is how I see the role of the Latin American Studies Association. If elected to the Executive Council, I would like to promote in that direction this important and inevitable exchange, in order to increase the understanding of our societies and of our disciplines.

**Paul Gootenberg**

I trained as an historian in the early 1980s at St. Antony’s College, Oxford and the University of Chicago, specializing in the Andes and Mexico. Those two institutions left me with an indelible appreciation for vibrant interdisciplinary communities. I have taught at Stony Brook University since 1991, contributing to the growth of its international Ph.D. program in Latin American history. My early work, in books like Between Silver and Guano: Commercial Policy and the State in Postindependence Peru (Princeton, 1989), looked at the political economy of early Latin American state formation from the angle of historical sociology. In recent years I have published widely in the emerging field of drug history: my new book, Andean Cocaine: The Making of a Global Drug (UNC Press, 2009), uses a global commodity lens on cocaine’s long-term history. As the director of Latin American and Caribbean Studies at Stony Brook (2000-05), I developed a Rockefeller Foundation funded program on “Durable Inequalities in Latin America” which tried to shed new historical and cultural light on this central dilemma of Latin American societies and social sciences. Over the past decade, I have been active in a number of projects at the Social Science Research Council, which keeps me close to my interdisciplinary roots. I live in Brooklyn and have two young kids.

**Gootenberg Statement**

As LASA continues to vigorously grow and diversify in the 21st century, we need to continually expand its global reach and inclusiveness. LASA must continue to foster the participation and leadership of Latin American and Caribbean scholars, as well as reach out concertedly to younger scholars, such as graduate students. LASA can act as a wide bridge between the area studies tradition, with its keen sense of place, history, and culture, and the diversity of disciplinary and theoretical traditions from which we come. As the United States enters this more hopeful stage of its political life in 2009, socially-informed scholarship may indeed make a difference. LASA can help shape the renewed public debates that will
undoubtedly ensue about an informed, multilateral, multicultural, and constructive engagement with the world, including of course Latin America.

Bert Hoffmann is vice-director of the Institute of Latin American Studies at the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA) in Hamburg, Germany. He studied at the Free University of Berlin, where he received his doctorate in political science with a thesis on the politics of the Internet in Third World development. After working as a journalist he joined the Institute of Iberoamerican Studies in Hamburg as a researcher in 1993. In 1998 he became assistant professor at the Latin American Institute of the Free University of Berlin, and since 2003 he has been a senior researcher at the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies. A LASA member since 1998, he currently serves as secretary of LASA's Europe-Latin America Section. Over the course of his career, Hoffman has worked on a diverse range of issues in a variety of settings, both in academia and beyond. In 1998 he was awarded a research grant from the Instituto Rio Branco in Brasilia. He was invited to be a visiting scholar at Nuffield College, Oxford University from February to April 2007. And in 2007/08 he was a visiting professor at the Free University of Berlin’s “Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood” research center. Alongside his academic research, he has also worked for or advised NGOs in the fields of solidarity and human rights, and has served as a consultant on development cooperation. In his role as academic coordinator of GIGA's publications, Bert Hoffmann led the GIGA to embrace open-access publishing; this has culminated in the current transformation of the institute's five area-focused journals from print and subscription periodicals into full open-access publications. As part of this initiative, the Journal of Politics in Latin America (JPLA) will be launched at the beginning of 2009 as a new and ambitious open-access journal with an international editorial team and board (see www.jpla.org). Hoffmann’s publications include, among others, Debating Cuban Exceptionalism (coedited with Laurence Whitehead), New York/London: Palgrave 2007; Cuba. Apertura y reforma económica. Perfil de un debate. Caracas: Nueva Sociedad 1995; and numerous journal articles and book chapters such as “Why Reform Fails: The ‘Politics of Policies’ in Costa Rican Telecommunications Liberalization,” in European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies No. 84, April 2008; “Los retos del desarrollo social en la era digital,” in Muller, Ulrich / Bodemer, Klaus (eds.): Nuevos paradigmas de desarrollo para América Latina; Hamburg 2004; “Transformation and Continuity in Cuba,” in Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 33, No. 1, Elsevier 2001; “¿Subvirtiendo los ‘intereses nacionales’? Los latinos y la política exterior de EE UU,” in Ingrid Wehr (Hg.): Un continente en movimiento: Migraciones en América Latina, Frankfurt/M., Madrid: Vervuert 2006; “How Do you Download Democracy? Potential and Limitations of the Internet for Advancing Citizens’ rights in the Third World: Lessons from Latin America,” in Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft - International Politics and Society, 3/2005; “Cuba: Civil Society Within Socialism—and its Limits,” in Henke, Holger / Reno, Fred (ed.): Modern Political Culture in the Caribbean; Barbados et al.: University of the West Indies Press 2003. From 1993 to 2005 he was coeditor of the German-language Latin America yearbook Lateinamerika Analysen und Berichte.

Hoffmann Statement
It is a great honor to have been nominated to serve on LASA’s Executive Council. Over the Association’s history we have witnessed its impressive growth and transformation from a U.S. organization into a truly international forum for all scholars working on Latin America, wherever they reside. The choice of Rio de Janeiro as the site for the upcoming Congress perfectly symbolizes how strong and successful the participation of scholars from Latin America has become. In this context, LASA’s longstanding commitment to scholarly exchanges with Cuba obliges the association to take a strong public stance against U.S. restrictions on travel to and from the island. If elected, I would strive to contribute to LASA’s development with three priority concerns:

1) Reaching out beyond the Americas: In addition to the continuing outreach to the academic communities in Latin America, LASA’s drive to become a fully global association should aim to include an enhanced presence of scholarship on Latin America from Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania.

2) Coping with size: As proud as LASA should be of its growth, the ever-increasing number of members and Congress participants also poses new challenges. The creation of LASA Sections has been a vital step in the past, and an expanded role for the Sections within LASA’s activities and Congresses could help cope with growth-related challenges. At the same time, LASA should strengthen its core identity as a professional association in which scholars from all relevant disciplines and from the most diverse approaches find an intellectual home. This should also lead to renewed efforts to build bridges with scholars from the discipline of economics. While we seem to have become accustomed
to the rather marginal presence of this discipline within LASA over the years, this remains an unsatisfactory situation given the truly interdisciplinary approach we need in area studies and for which LASA stands.

3) Open access: LASA is committed to the democratization of scholarly communication and to overcoming barriers that restrict access to the results of research. It is precisely these goals that are at the core of the open-access movement, which has been spreading dynamically in Latin America and other parts of the world in recent years. Accordingly, I would like LASA to engage in a more active debate about the promotion of open-access publishing—a matter that pertains directly to the professional interests of the Association’s members.

Gwen Kirkpatrick (U Alabama, BA 1971; Princeton U, PhD 1979) is Professor of Spanish at Georgetown University since 2004. Her publications include: Dissonant Legacy of Modernismo, the co-authored Women, Culture and Politics in Latin America, and editions and co-editions on Sarmiento, Lugones, and Guiraldes. Her most recent publications are studies on the contemporary poetry of Carmen Berenguer, Francisco Leal and Lorenzo Helguero; the novels of Diemela Eltit; and nineteenth century literature and culture. In 2008 she was elected president of the Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana. She has served on editorial boards of Revista Iberoamericana, LARR, Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana, and other journals, and is a contributor to the Handbook of Latin American Studies. At Georgetown and at UC Berkeley, where she taught 1982-2003, she has been an active collaborator in Latin American Studies, as CLAS graduate director and center director, department chair, and most recently teaching in the LAS graduate program at Georgetown. She has received NEH, Fulbright, and UC Humanities Center fellowships and has been a reviewer for fellowship programs of the Ford Foundation, NEH, Fulbright, ACLS, and SSRC. From 1999 to 2001 she resided in Santiago, Chile, as director of the University of California Education Abroad Program. This fall she is also teaching a graduate seminar at the University of Maryland in addition to her teaching duties at Georgetown University.

Kirkpatrick Statement
LASA has long attracted members from several disciplines. This juxtaposition and interaction among the disciplines have produced LASA’s astounding growth and vitality in recent years. I see three primary challenges for LASA. One of LASA’s challenges is to confront the asymmetry of an organization focused on Latin America, but whose membership resides largely in the United States. Another is to recognize the membership shift among the disciplines, with a much larger percentage now in the humanities. A third is to continue to address the need to include Brazil and the Portuguese language as a central part of LASA’s range. LASA’s leadership has vigorously addressed the first issue, the asymmetry with Latin America itself, and has attempted to incorporate participants from Latin America in meaningful ways, through collaborative projects, publications, and conference attendance. This is an ongoing challenge. Attention to the dynamics of publishing in both the United States and Latin America is an area that could potentially engage members and potential participants in meaningful dialogue. Additionally, the wave of creation of new doctoral programs in Latin America can be a way to evaluate graduate education throughout the hemisphere. The shift among disciplines within LASA reflects changes within the disciplines themselves, where some fields no longer encourage area specializations. To maintain the vitality of true multidisciplinarity, however, LASA must encourage the widest range of disciplinary participation. LASA has been fairly successful at incorporating recently formed or emergent disciplines, such as U.S. Latino studies or sexuality studies, but less successful in retaining the interest of scholars in, say, agricultural economics or political science. How do we structure an organizational discourse that is inclusive of disciplines that do not share a culturalist language? The third issue is a critical one, for LASA will be much impoverished without the inclusion of scholars focusing primarily or partly on Brazil. LASA should work toward promoting competence in Portuguese as well as Spanish for specialists of Latin America. Such a posture might go a long way in reincorporating Brazilianist scholars within LASA.

Nicolas Shumway has enjoyed a long and varied career as a scholar, teacher, administrator, and musician. As an undergraduate at BYU, he majored in Spanish and Music, after which he completed an MA and a PhD at UCLA in Hispanic Languages and Literatures. While his doctoral major was in literature, he accrued sufficient course credits for a second doctoral major in Hispanic linguistics. He has continued active in all these fields. His language textbook, Español en Español, which went through four successful editions, grew out of his interest in applied linguistics. Similarly, he continues active in music performance and for several years sang professionally with the Roger Wagner Chorale and the Los Angeles Master Chorale. He has also held
positions of choir director and organist in several churches. In 1976, he began his first tenure-track teaching position at Indiana University Northwest. Two years later, he accepted a position at Yale University where he taught literature and applied linguistics while also directing the Yale Spanish language program. He was promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure at Yale in 1987 and to Full Professor in 1992. In 1993 he accepted his current appointment at the University of Texas at Austin as the Tomás Rivera Regents Professor of Spanish Literature and Language. In 1995, he was appointed Director of the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies (LLILAS) at UT-Austin, a position he held for eleven years, during which he submitted four applications for NRC and FLAS funding under the NEA Title VI programs, all of them successful. As director, he expanded LLILAS programs and was instrumental in securing endowment and grant funding that has helped maintain UT’s international prominence in Latin American Studies. He also enjoyed frequent interaction with other NRC directors and developed a broad understanding of all that Latin American Studies entails. In fall of 2006, he stepped down as Director of LLILAS to become Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, a position he continues to hold, although he is on research leave for the current academic year. Fluent in Spanish and Portuguese, he has held visiting appointments in Brazil at the Universidade de São Paulo and in Argentina at the Universidad Torcuato di Tella and the Universidad de San Andrés. He thus would bring to the LASA EC an unusually broad range of experience that includes directing a language program, heading a major center in Latin American Studies, and chairing a large and highly regarded academic department. As a scholar, Prof. Shumway has written widely on Hispanic literature, Hispanic cultural history, and language teaching. Still in print, his book The Invention of Argentina received honorable mention for the LASA Bryce Wood Prize. It was also selected by The New York Times as a “Notable Book of the Year.” The book was later translated into Spanish and published in Argentina under the slightly amended title, La invención de la Argentina: historia de una idea. A revised and expanded edition of the Spanish edition was published in Argentina in 2005, a Portuguese translation of which just appeared in Brazil. He has also published on a variety of Hispanic authors, including Pedro Calderón de la Barca, José Joaquín de Lizardi, Ricardo Palma, Teresa de la Parra, Raúl Scalabrini Ortiz, Tomás Eloy Martínez and—an enduring favorite— Jorge Luis Borges. As a citizen in the profession, Professor Shumway has long been active in LASA and the Modern Language Association. He has served on several key MLA committees, including the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, the Radio Program Committee, and most recently the MLA Executive Council.

**Shumway Statement**

I begin with dos grandes obviedades: Latin America is a very big place, and Latin American Studies is a very big subject consisting of myriad sub-subjects, many waiting to be thought of. However obvious these statements might be, they suggest a direction for LASA that I will promote, that direction being one that can include as many topics, institutions, and people as academic responsibility will allow. With this in mind, I list below areas I would support as a member of the EC.

- **LASA must continue to provide space for traditional disciplines to discuss explore, challenge and enhance their particular approaches to Latin American subjects.**
  - While challenging traditional disciplinary methods and boundaries is both healthy and necessary, let’s not forget that academic rigor is often linked to the standards of traditional disciplines. No one should feel that LASA has moved beyond them, or that there is not a place in LASA for any academically responsible debate, including debates on politics.
  - LASA must also welcome new ways of approaching Latin America, ways that make room for discussions on gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, and new theoretical approaches. Similarly, we must continue developing strategies for including the traditionally excluded. LASA must continue its efforts to become a genuinely global organization. We need particularly to cultivate institutional contacts with universities throughout the world and particularly in Latin America. LASA should develop aggressive fundraising strategies to underwrite the needs of a global organization in which not all partners have the same economic wherewithal. While LASA has a good record for supporting research, we should pay more attention to teaching. For example, the most likely place for students to first encounter Latin American topics is in language classrooms. Language-teaching professionals have been talking about “language across the curriculum” for some time. LASA needs to cultivate a corresponding interest in how specialists in anthropology, history or gender studies might enrich language instruction. Similarly, LASA should continue exploring ways for bringing technological innovations into the classroom to enhance collaborative learning and research, and give both students and scholars greater control of digital research materials and methods. But most of all, LASA must continue being an organization where defenders of all approaches to Latin American Studies can meet, discuss,
disagree and learn in an environment of mutual concern and respect. For indeed, Latin America is a very big place, and Latin American Studies is a very big subject.

Kimberly Theidon is a medical anthropologist focusing on Latin America. Her research interests include political violence, forms and theories of subjectivity, transitional justice, and human rights. From 2001-2003 she directed a research project on community mental health, reparations and the micropolitics of reconciliation with the Ayacuchan office of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission. A book based upon this research, Entre Prójimos: el conflicto armado interno y la política de la reconciliación en el Perú, was published in 2004 by the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. Her second book, Intimate Enemies: Violence and Reconciliation in Peru, is forthcoming from Stanford University Press. Dr. Theidon is currently conducting research in Colombia and Ecuador on two interrelated themes: the causes and consequences of populations in displacement, refuge and return, with a particular interest in the role of humanitarian organizations in zones of armed conflict; and the paramilitary demobilization process in Colombia. She is the director of Praxis Institute for Social Justice, and is an Associate professor of Anthropology at Harvard University.

Theidon Statement
Sería un privilegio servir como miembro del Comité Executivo de LASA, y trabajar para hacer la organización más relevante por nuestros colegas quienes viven en Latinoamérica. Mi enfoque sería en elaborar más oportunidades y formas de apoyo para jóvenes investigadores, especialmente aquellos que viven afuera de las grandes capitales de sus países y por lo tanto tienen menos acceso a las redes transnacionales de becas, estudios posgrado y mentoring. Los intercambios académicos han tendido a favorecer a los y las alumnos norteamericanos, pero los intercambios unidireccionales empobrecen nuestros diálogos intelectuales y oscurecen los importantes aportes teóricos producidos afuera de los centros de poder académico y económico. En colaboración con colegas quienes comparten mi compromiso, intentaré establecer un programa que sea sostenible y contribuya a multiplicar las oportunidades disponibles a jóvenes investigadores y, en turno, diversificar lo que se considera “conocimiento”. ■
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Section News

LASA2009: Call for Travel Grant Applications

The Environment Section of the Latin American Studies Association is pleased to announce that it will award two US$ 800.00 grants to help defray the costs of travel to LASA2009 in Rio de Janeiro (June 11–13). Awardees will be selected by a three-person committee composed of current members of the Environment Section’s executive board.

Eligibility

Applicants must have been accepted as paper presenters at the LASA Rio Congress and be permanent residents of a country in Latin America or the Caribbean. Commentators or panel chairs will not be funded. Priority will be given to junior researchers (pre-tenure academics or their equivalent for non-academic professionals). Membership in LASA and the Environment Section is required. Visit http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/eng/membership/ for membership information.

How to Apply

Eligible candidates must apply no later than Monday, January 5, 2009, submitting via email a brief (350-word maximum) statement. This should include information about the applicant’s participation in LASA2009; the date and institution of the highest degree obtained; current professional position; and country of permanent residence.

The following supporting materials are required as attachments: 1) an abstract of the paper accepted for delivery at the LASA2009 meeting; 2) a one-page curriculum vita; and 3) a budget detailing expected costs and other potential sources of funding. All application materials (in English, Portuguese, or Spanish) must be sent via email to

Environment Section co-chairs Sherrie Baver (SBaver@GC.CUNY.edu) and Kate McCaffrey (McCaffreyk@mail.Montclair.edu). Attachments may be sent in Microsoft Word, Adobe PDF or plain text format.

Increase in Section Membership Fees

For the first time since LASA Sections were established in 1998, the fee for Section membership will increase from $8 to $10 commencing with the 2009 membership year. For each $10 individual payment, $6 will be placed in the account of the Section, and $4 will be kept with the Secretariat to help defray the cost of service to the Sections. The dues increase approved by the LASA EC at its June 2008 meeting is meant to assist Sections in raising funds for travel grants to the LASA Congress. Sections are encouraged to use some portion of their funds for this purpose whenever possible.
Charles Adams Hale, the preeminent historian of Mexican liberalism and father of LASA’s immediate past president, died on September 29 in Seattle at the age of 78.

Charles was born in Minneapolis on June 5, 1930. A history major and Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Amherst College in 1951, he returned to Minneapolis to earn an MA in History in 1952 at the University of Minnesota. He married Lenore Rice, Lenny to her legion of friends, the next fall. After a Fulbright year in Strasbourg, the Hales moved to New York City where Charles entered the doctoral program at Columbia University and studied with Frank Tannenbaum whose papers formed the basis for a penetrating 1995 article in the Hispanic American Historical Review. After receiving his Ph.D. in 1957 and journeying to brief teaching posts at the University of North Carolina, Lehigh, and Amherst, Charles settled in Iowa City where he became the Latin American historian in the University of Iowa’s History Department until his retirement in 1998.

Intellectual history punishes beginners because it demands both erudition and subtlety, qualities that come only with much hard work and more time than most can give. Charles’s dissertation on “The Problem of Independence in Mexican Thought, 1821-1853” would have made an important book without any further work, but the book he actually published in 1968, Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853, became an illuminating classic that defined an entire field. By the time the book appeared, liberalism—however defined—was rapidly disappearing from intellectual and political landscapes in Europe and the United States and throughout Latin America. Charles persisted almost stubbornly not because his eyes were closed, but because he could see farther than most of us. His method was comparative, seeking the intellectual forebears of Mexico’s leading thinkers not to expose them as pale reflections of European influence, but to understand their originality by showing how and even why they accepted some ideas, modified others, and rejected the rest.

Charles’s second book, The Transformation of Liberalism in Late Nineteenth-Century Mexico, appeared in 1989 as the intellectual terrain was moving through another epochal earthquake. The Spanish edition of his first book had won him a slowly liberalizing Mexico’s prestigious Fray Bernardino de Sahagún Prize; his second took the Bolton Prize, awarded by the Conference on Latin American History (CLAH) for the best book in English that year on any aspect Latin American history. Transformation brought Mexican liberalism into the twentieth century in a wide ranging and incisive analysis of the interactions between modernization, dictatorship, and the world of ideas both foreign and domestic. By the time it was published, Charles had already received the Order of the Aztec Eagle, the highest award Mexico can bestow on a foreign citizen, and had been elected to the Mexican Academy of History.

Charles’s last book, Emilio Rabasa and the Survival of Porfian Liberalism: The Man, His Career, and His Ideas, 1856-1930, arrived at my office just days before Charles died. It follows the “transformed” liberalism of the Porfian elite into the Revolution of 1910 and through the 1920s by focusing on a single resilient individual. Rabasa, as Charles shows, never lost his belief in a “scientific politics” ordered by constitutional norms and managed by an oligarchy of the competent, but he had an unusual capacity to adapt to new circumstances, including the new “revolutionary” regime. He never lost his belief that Mexico’s indigenous people were ill-suited to modernization, but he worried about social issues and eventually espoused an independent Supreme Court as a protection against dictatorship. Charles manages to account for Rabasa’s enduring influence without suppressing any of the contractions and ambiguities. In doing so, he connects the focus of his life’s work to Mexico’s equally contradictory and ambiguous contemporary dilemmas.

Charles’s scholarship was matched by a genuine warmth and kindness to colleagues as well as students that became legendary at Iowa and known everywhere. He served, quite without realizing it, as an example to many of us. He believed in the power of ideas. His integrity never faltered. He kept his mind open without sacrificing his standards. Honors and distinctions left him more modest than before.

Charles was immensely proud of his four children. The preface to Emilio Rabasa concludes by thanking Lenny, his wife of 56 years, for “constructive criticism, good judgment, and unbounded love.” A Memorial Service will be held in Seattle on October 18. The family has suggested that in lieu of flowers, colleagues and friends can make donations in his name either to the Seattle Parks Foundation “for a memorial bench” (860 Terry Avenue North, Suite 231, Seattle, WA 98109) or to LASA for a memorial scholarship for advanced study of Mexican history (LASA, 416 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260).
Politics of Latin America
The Power Game
Third Edition
HARRY E. VANDEN and GARY PREVOST
The third edition of this highly acclaimed text includes a new chapter on Bolivia and a stronger focus on anti-neoliberal economics, U.S.-Latin American relations, women’s issues, and social movements.
2008 656 pp. paper $46.95

The Course of Mexican History
Eighth Edition
MICHAEL C. MEYER, WILLIAM L. SHERMAN, and SUSAN M. DEEDS
The eighth edition of the leading text in the field offers updated and streamlined coverage, an updated section on Vicente Fox’s presidency, and a sixteen-page color insert.
2006 718 pp.; 200 illus., 13 maps, and 16-pg. color insert paper $64.95

Talons of the Eagle
Latin America, the United States, and the World
Third Edition
PETER H. SMITH
“Peter Smith has given us, once again, a must-read volume that merits a prominent place in our libraries and our syllabi.”—David Scott Palmer, Boston University
2007 448 pp.; 14 illus. & 4 maps paper $34.95

Colonial Latin America
Sixth Edition
MARK A. BURKHOLDER and LYMAN L. JOHNSON
Revised and updated to reflect the latest scholarship, the sixth edition of Colonial Latin America also features a new section on pre-Colonial Africa and new maps and illustrations.
2007 448 pp.; 48 illus. & 8 maps paper $49.95

Brazil
Five Centuries of Change
Second Edition
THOMAS E. SKIDMORE
Vividly tracing the development of Brazil over the last 500 years, the second edition of this text has been revised and updated to provide an unparalleled look at Brazil in the twentieth century.
May 2009 320 pp.; 25 illus. paper $34.95

Writing History
A Guide for Students
Third Edition
WILLIAM KELLEHER STOREY
“A first-rate guide for students who are new to the field of history and to the processes of historical research and writing.”—Oberlin College
2008 144 pp. paper $16.95

Prices subject to change.

Not for Profit. All for Education.
Oxford University Press believes that high-quality educational support can and should be delivered at a reasonable price.

To request an examination copy, please visit www.oup.com/us/he.
For more information, please call 1-800-280-0280. In Canada, call 1-800-387-8020.
Participate in **intensive, educational experiences** with fellow faculty members from higher education institutions.

Choose from 4 seminars in Latin America:

» Economic Reform, Regional Integration, and Democratization in Chile and Argentina
» Contemporary Mexico through Art, Literature, and Cinema
» Revolution and Neoliberal Reform in Nicaragua
» A Fusion of Identities: Examining Peru's Complex Past, Present, and Future

**Principio y Fin del Mito Fidelista**
Por José Alvarez, Ph.D.
Catedrático Emérito de la Universidad de la Florida

Una nueva versión del proceso insurreccional que llevó a Fidel Castro al poder absoluto en Cuba. Producto de muchos años de investigación, este libro revela hechos inéditos como la magnitud de las finanzas del Movimiento 26 de Julio, el antagonismo entre la Sierra y el Llano, y las circunstancias misteriosas de las muertes de sus dos jefes principales: Frank País y René Ramos Latour. Material de estudio necesario y oportuno en el momento en que comienza la disputa historiográfica por el saldo de la revolución.

TRAFFORD PUBLISHING. BC, CANADA
1-888-232-4444 • www.trafford.com/07-2402
MODERN LATIN AMERICA. The History Department at Stony Brook University invites applications for an advanced Assistant Professor or an Associate Professor, beginning in September 2009. The Latin American History program at Stony Brook is dedicated to an international community of graduate students. We seek candidates of any area specialization, including Brazilianists, with firm publication records and strong commitments to graduate teaching and program building. The candidate’s research and teaching concerns should intersect with the Department’s larger thematic clusters, which include the Nation, State, and Civil Society; Empire, Modernity, and Globalization; Women, Gender, and Sexuality; and Environment, Science, and Health studies. Teaching responsibilities are two courses per semester. Please send letter of application, c.v., and three letters of recommendation before December 5, 2008 to Professor Paul Gootenberg, Chair of Search Committee, Department of History, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4348. The University is an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action employer. Applications from women, people of color, disabled persons, and/or special disabled or Vietnam era veterans are especially welcome.

Harrington Professorship Job Announcement

The Institute for the Study of the Americas at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (<http://isa.unc.edu/>) invites nominations and applications for the Anthony Harrington Distinguished Professorship in Latin American Studies, to start as early as July 1, 2009. The appointment will be for an eminent senior scholar with a distinguished record of scholarship and teaching within the social sciences or humanities, with preference for a scholar with specialization in Brazil. The appointment will be made to the most appropriate academic department.

Candidates should submit a letter of interest, curriculum vitae, and the names, mailing addresses (including email addresses), and telephone numbers of four references to: Harrington Search Committee, UNC – Department of Political Science, CB3265 Hamilton Hall, Chapel Hill NC 27599-3265. Candidates will also need to complete a brief application form on-line. To do so follow this link: http://hr.unc.edu/jobseekers/search.htm and click on “open positions” under the EPA Faculty Positions heading. Under the department drop down menu, select Inst for Study of the Americas and the position title Distinguished Professor. Click the “apply now” button, create a new applicant profile and complete the form.

Review of nominations and applications will begin on October 1, 2008 and continue until the position is filled. Applications from women and minorities are particularly welcome. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an affirmative action / equal opportunity employer and educator. The staff contact person for this position is Ms. Shannon Eubanks (seubanks@email.unc.edu).

Chair, Department of History, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte invites applications for the chair of the Department of History effective July 1, 2009. The twelve-month, tenured position is open to applicants at the senior level. Salary is competitive. Candidates must possess 1) a doctoral degree in history or an appropriate related field; 2) a distinguished record of scholarship; 3) credentials and experience appropriate for a senior associate or full professor at UNC Charlotte; 4) demonstrated ability to provide academic leadership for a highly visible, research-oriented, and productive department.

Previous administrative experience is highly desirable. The selected candidate should have the ability to work with interdisciplinary programs and centers, to develop existing graduate programs, to seek external funding, and to perpetuate the University’s outreach mission. Candidates apply online at https://jobs.uncc.edu/ with a letter of interest, curriculum vita, and the names of three referees. Screening of applications will begin October 1, and will continue until the position is filled. For more information, please contact the chair of the search committee, Professor John David Smith, at jdsmith4@unc.edu.

UNC Charlotte strives to create an academic climate in which the dignity of all individuals is respected and maintained. Therefore, we celebrate diversity that includes, but is not limited to ability/disability, age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, race, religion, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. AA/EOE.
The Latin American Studies Association (LASA) is the largest professional association in the world for individuals and institutions engaged in the study of Latin America. With over 5,500 members, thirty-five percent of whom reside outside the United States, LASA is the one association that brings together experts on Latin America from all disciplines and diverse occupational endeavors, across the globe.

LASA’s mission is to foster intellectual discussion, research, and teaching on Latin America, the Caribbean, and its people throughout the Americas, promote the interests of its diverse membership, and encourage civic engagement through network building and public debate.