

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

FORUM

SUMMER 2013 | VOLUME XLIV | ISSUE 3

IN THIS ISSUE

On the Profession

*The Impact of Fellowships on Individuals,
Their Institutions, and Their Communities*

Two to Tango: Franco-Latino and
Franco-Maghrebi Queer Transnationalism

by LUIS NAVARRO-AYALA

Transitando del yo al nosotros, y del nosotros
a los otros

por CECILIA BARJA CHAMAS

An Embarrassment of Riches: Reflections
on Visiting Fellowships

by RAPHAEL B. FOLSOM

Debates

Argentina, los juicios y los derechos humanos

por GRATZIA VILLARROEL y ROBERTO GARGARELLA

Judging Memory

by SAM FERGUSON

Courtrooms and Legacies of Violence

by RAM NATARAJAN

La Argentina: Un laboratorio extraordinario

por SÉVANE GARIBIAN

Addressing the Past, Avoiding the Present,
Ignoring the Future? Ongoing Human Rights
Trials in Argentina

by PAR ENGSTROM

Table of Contents

- 1 From the President: On to Chicago | *by* Merilee Grindle
- 2 From the Outgoing President | *by* Evelyne Huber

2013 SILVERT PANEL

- 3 On the Origins of Inspiration | *by* Peter H. Smith

2013 LASA/OXFAM AMERICA MARTIN DISKIN LECTURE

- 6 Introduction of Recipient, Stefano Varese | *by* Charles R. Hale
- 8 Eulogy of Utopian Praxis: From Dystopian Reality to the Research of Hope
by Stefano Varese

ON THE PROFESSION

- 14 Two to Tango: Franco-Latino and Franco-Maghrebi Queer Transnationalism | *by* Luis Navarro-Ayala
- 17 Transitando del yo al nosotros, y del nosotros a los otros
por Cecilia Barja Chamas
- 18 An Embarrassment of Riches: Reflections on Visiting Fellowships
by Raphael B. Folsom

DEBATES

- 20 Argentina, los juicios y los derechos humanos
por Grazia Villarroel y Roberto Gargarella
- 21 Judging Memory | *by* Sam Ferguson
- 24 Courtrooms and Legacies of Violence | *by* Ram Natarajan
- 26 La Argentina: Un laboratorio extra-ordinario | *por* Sévane Garibian
- 29 Addressing the Past, Avoiding the Present, Ignoring the Future? Ongoing Human Rights Trials in Argentina | *by* Par Engstrom

ON LASA2014

- 32 Chicago! Chicago! Looking Ahead to LASA2014
by Raúl Madrid and Florencia Garramuño
- 33 Call for Papers
- 35 Reservation Form for the LASA2014 Book Exhibit
- 36 Film Festival Form

CALLING ALL MEMBERS

- 37 Nominations Invited
- 40 Proposed Changes to the LASA Bylaws

LASA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

- 43 Silvert Reminiscences Project

ON LASA2013

- 53 Final Report on the 31st International Congress in Washington, DC
by Gwen Kirkpatrick *and* Kenneth M. Roberts
- 54 LASA Business Meeting
- 56 LASA2013 Awards and Recipients
- 62 LASA2013 Photos

LASA SECTIONS

- 64 Section News

President

Merilee Grindle
Harvard University
merilee_grindle@harvard.edu

Vice President

Debra Castillo
Cornell University

Past President

Evelyne Huber
University of North Carolina

Treasurer

Timothy J. Power
University of Oxford

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

For term ending May 2014:

Graciela Montaldo, Columbia University
María Clemencia Ramirez, Instituto Colombiano
de Antropología e Historia
Catalina Romero, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

For term ending May 2015:

Claudio A. Fuentes, Universidad Diego Portales
Katherine Hite, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie
Mary Louise Pratt, New York University

Ex Officio

Florencia Garramuño, Universidad de San Andrés
Raúl Madrid, University of Texas/Austin
Philip Oxhorn, McGill University
Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, University of Pittsburgh

FORUM EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Editor

Merilee Grindle, Harvard University

Managing Editor

Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, University of Pittsburgh

GUEST ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Roberto Gargarella, CONICET
Grazia Villarroel, St. Norbert College

LASA STAFF

Special Projects Coordinator

María Soledad Cabezas, University of Pittsburgh

Assistant Director for Institutional Advancement

Sandra Klinzing, University of Pittsburgh

Communications Specialist

Sara Lickey, University of Pittsburgh

Executive Director

Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, University of Pittsburgh

Membership Coordinator

Israel R. Perlov, University of Pittsburgh

Operations Manager – Congress Coordinator

Pilar Rodríguez Blanco, University of Pittsburgh

The *LASA Forum* is published four times a year. It is the official vehicle for conveying news about the Latin American Studies Association to its members. Articles appearing in the *On the Profession* and *Debates* sections of the *Forum* are commissioned by the Editorial Committee and deal with selected themes. The Committee welcomes responses to any material published in the *Forum*.

Opinions expressed herein are those of individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Latin American Studies Association or its officers.

ISSN 0890-7218

From the President

by MERILEE GRINDLE | Harvard University | merilee_grindle@harvard.edu

On to Chicago

As I looked around the busy hotel lobby and corridors of the LASA Congress in Washington, DC, I couldn't help but be reminded of the generations of scholars drawn to the study of the history, culture, economics, politics, and environment of Latin America, and the multiple journeys that bring us together at our (now) annual gathering. At the end of May, students, newly minted professors, rising generations, midcareer professionals, and my dear old friends collected, conferred, and caught up with each other for three busy days. Over a long career, I have seen how LASA meetings provide a space for reunions of friends and colleagues, a summit for debates about recent trends in scholarship, a treasure trove of panels and workshops for advancing important themes of research, and a springboard for students and young scholars to develop rewarding careers. LASA Congresses are, in the deepest sense, a gathering in of a fellowship of those committed to greater understanding of an important region of the world, and a place for expanding our relationships with those who share scholarly interests.

The Latin American Studies Association, founded in 1966, is the largest organization of scholars and professionals who wish to explore the past, present, and future of the region. In 2012, the Association had more than 7,600 individual members, 48 percent of whom resided outside the United States, and 381 institutional members. It is an organization deeply committed to being international and multidisciplinary. In my professional lifetime, I have seen LASA transformed. The language of choice became Spanish rather than English, and politics, history, anthropology, and sociology have been enriched and extended through widening interest in literature, art, film, journalism, environmental sciences, and other disciplines. I have seen the Association become a welcoming home for new generations of teachers, researchers, and explorers in diverse fields and professions.

Our next LASA Congress will meet in Chicago, that great windy city on a very large lake. Our program chairs, Raúl Madrid and Florencia Garramuño, are already thinking of ways to advance our tradition of diverse, intellectually stimulating, and professionally engaging events, and the LASA Secretariat is already busy making certain that the logistics are as flawless as possible. The historic Palmer House is once again anticipating our arrival and no doubt bracing for the clamor of our reunions and debates. We anticipate that the next LASA Congress will be a stimulating and important experience for our membership.

The theme for the Congress is “Democracy and Memory,” chosen to encourage reflection from diverse perspectives on legacies of collective experiences of repression, injustice, and resistance, and the construction of vibrant political, social, and cultural institutions in their wake. This theme has few disciplinary boundaries. Of course political scientists, historians, and sociologists focus on how collective memories of authoritarian experiences influence the present and future of Latin America, but the theme is also one that journalists as well as anthropologists and archeologists excavate; architects, city planners, and curators capture and interpret collective memories in public spaces and museums; humanists produce and study novels, poetry, essays, and theatrical productions about the theme; artists, dancers, and musicians interpret such experiences; religious studies guide us in thinking about trauma and healing; psychologists and brain scientists study how memory is conserved and understood; ecologists and geographers find threads in how our environments are shaped. The theme of memory and its influence on the construction of political, social, and cultural institutions will be particularly important in encouraging us to transcend our disciplinary boundaries and to engage in serious discussion of the influence of the past on our present and future.



There is much to reflect on as we anticipate and plan for the Chicago meeting. LASA provides a wealth of benefits to its members—intellectual encouragement, certainly, but also the important professional networks and collaborations that are critical in our careers and in our scholarship. Its secretariat is invariably responsive and well managed, and the extent of the assistance it offers to its members for attendance at its Congresses is central to its mission. How, then, can we help LASA maintain its important role in our scholarly lives? Let me suggest some opportunities for keeping LASA vibrant, international, and multidisciplinary:

- Renew your LASA membership regularly.
- Become a Life Member of LASA.
- Support LASA's travel funds and student fund.
- Encourage your university or organization to become an Institutional Member
- Contribute to the LASA Endowment.
- Establish a bequest for LASA.
- Serve on one of LASA's many member committees.
- Contribute your ideas and comments for improving our activities.

In addition to these means of keeping LASA dynamic, you can also begin planning panels and papers for our Chicago meeting, May 21–24, 2014. I look forward to seeing you there! ■

From the Outgoing President

by EVELYNE HUBER | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill | ehuber@unc.edu

LASA2013 in Washington is behind us, and as always we are thinking ahead to the next International Congress, to be held in a year's time in Chicago. The Washington Congress was a lively event, with some 3,500 participants and three packed days of interesting panels. The opening ceremony with the award presentations was hosted by Georgetown University in a beautiful space and was well attended. We were honored to have Secretary General Insulza of the Organization of American States offer opening remarks with his vision of a region with sovereign states and democratic governments working together to improve the lives of their people. His remarks provided an excellent lead-in to the many panels that considered in one way or another whether some kind of new social contract is emerging in the region.

This was the first Congress on the new annual schedule. One of the main goals of the change to this schedule was achieved: The number of proposals became more manageable within the given time and space constraints, and accordingly the rejection rate of proposals was negligible. All full panel proposals were accepted, and only some 3 percent of individual paper proposals were rejected. So, compared to a rejection rate of over 30 percent in San Francisco, we have achieved a situation conducive to highly inclusive participation. There are some drawbacks as well; some scholars who have attended just about every Congress were not able to come to this one for reasons of time or financial constraints. They were particularly missed in the Sections in which they have been active.

An enormous amount of work goes into planning and organizing a LASA Congress. The program co-chairs, Gwen Kirkpatrick and Ken Roberts, began to work with track chairs over a year ago. Together, we

planned several special panels and invited the participants. Gwen Kirkpatrick deserves particular credit for her successful efforts to engage Georgetown University to host and co-sponsor the opening ceremony and reception. I also want to thank Cynthia Arnson, Director of the Latin American Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, for co-organizing the panel on U.S.–Latin American Relations and inviting the former president of Uruguay, Tabaré Vázquez, to that panel. LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Sandy Klinzing, Pilar Rodríguez, and other LASA staff members worked tirelessly to ensure that the Congress would run smoothly in all respects, and so it did. They all deserve a big thank you!

One aspect of the Congress that was less than satisfactory was the situation with visas for Cuban scholars. Despite our proactive letter to Secretary of State John Kerry well before the Congress, in which we urged him to ensure that visas to invited participants from Cuba be granted in the interest of a free scholarly exchange, a dozen invited Cuban participants had their visas denied; some 70 visas were granted. Our letter was signed by all former LASA presidents who could be reached and was also sent to a few targeted members of the U.S. Congress. It was followed by supportive letters from other scholarly professional associations. This is clearly an issue that requires our continued attention and a repeat of proactive measures before the next Congress.

This Congress signaled the end of my year-long presidency. It was an honor and a pleasure to serve in this capacity. LASA is a strong organization with lots of dedicated members who serve in many roles, from track chairs to Section chairs and members of award and other committees.



Essentially, the Association is what committed members make of it. And they have made it strong through their dedicated service.

The Fund-Raising Committee made particular strides this year in ensuring a sound financial future for the Association. The former chair, Marysa Navarro, and the present co-chairs, Cynthia McClintock and Kevin Middlebrook, successfully pursued an initiative initially proposed by committee members Carmen Diana Deere and Lars Schoultz, to solicit bequests for the LASA endowment. The results surpassed expectations, with 22 pledges received. LASA members who pledged a bequest became the inaugural members of the Kalman Silvert Society and were honored at a reception. The Fund-Raising Committee has made the bequest campaign a priority in the run-up to LASA's 50th Anniversary in 2016. The LASA endowment is used for travel support and for special projects. Thus, these bequests will improve LASA's future capacity to respond positively to requests for travel subsidies to the Congresses and to support new collaborative scholarly initiatives.

The best aspect of being part of the LASA leadership is that you get to know and work with wonderful colleagues. This is true for members of the Executive Council and particularly for my predecessor and successor as president. Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida, past president, and Merilee Grindle, incoming president, combine the qualities of outstanding scholars with those of skilled leaders and committed team members. I want to thank them both for their support and their contributions to LASA.

On the Origins of Inspiration

by PETER H. SMITH | Kalman Silvert Awardee for 2013

Washington, DC, May 31, 2013

Good morning! My thanks to you, Maria Hermínia, to members of the selection committee . . . and to whatever they were smokin' at the time. Abrazos to the panelists for thoughtful and gracious presentations. And greetings to all of you. I very much appreciate your being here.

I am honored, humbled, and profoundly grateful. I feel like a little kid who's just snuck into a roomful of serious thinkers, brilliant minds, and inspiring teachers, among them Kalman Silvert himself. On my very first job, at Dartmouth College, still in my twenties, I became Kal's junior-junior-junior colleague. He was a formidable senior member of our profession, forceful and decisive. He was also generous to a fault. He read my doctoral dissertation word for word and offered sage advice. He permitted me to audit his college class and observe his lecture style. He urged me to gain command of quantitative methodology. At some conference or other it was my turn to speak while Kal was in the audience. An incredulous student came up to me later to say, "Did you see that? He was taking notes *on you!*" My stock soared throughout the Dartmouth community.

It wasn't always as easy as that. As a rite of passage, my dissertation adviser, Lewis Hanke, urged me to circulate my thesis proposal on the political economy of Argentina among leading scholars in the field. I did so with apprehension, politely asking a select group of luminaries if they thought my topic was "manageable and worthwhile." My first reply came by return mail, with one word scrawled in the right-hand margin alongside my query: No. This left me with a stark choice: either pitch myself off the nearest rooftop, or grit my teeth and muddle through. As you can gather from my presence here, I chose the latter course.

In subsequent work on Argentina, I proposed to examine roll-call voting patterns in the national Chamber of Deputies during the first half of the twentieth century. This would have the inestimable advantage of allowing me to display newly acquired statistical skills. I explained the plan to one learned colleague, who replied that he had already perused the legislative records of all those years and found that they contained no more than a dozen votes by name, known as *votaciones nominales*. Undeterred by this discouragement, I plunged ahead with my dubious enterprise and came up with more than 1,700 name-by-name votes. Being stubborn is a virtue in our profession.

Book reviews have been mostly merciful over the years. One glaring exception was a withering denunciation of my book *Talons of the Eagle* in the *Wall Street Journal*. In dismay I called my older brother, a journalist at the *Washington Post*, and described this unseemly development. "Congratulations," he replied, "you wouldn't have wanted a positive review from them, now would you?" You can define yourself by the enemies you make.

So there have been bumps along the road. I have also encountered innumerable and random acts of kindness and senseless generosity, especially as I was starting out on my career:

- José Molina, an up-and-coming agronomist at the University of Buenos Aires, went out of his way to critique key chapters of my dissertation-in-progress and invite me to join expeditions with his students to nearby estancias.
- At a later point I was seeking district-by-district results for the Argentina elections of 1973; a sympathetic bureaucrat said he



would see what he could do. Repeated visits to his office came up empty. On my last night in Buenos Aires, the front desk at the hotel called my room to announce the arrival of a package in my name. There, in a plain brown wrapping, were the official election results. No one would ever have to know.

- My research interests later turned to Mexico, where I had the great good fortune to meet with Mario Ojeda at El Colegio de México. After a while he referred me directly to don Víctor Urquidí (a Silvert awardee), who met me that same day and offered me an appointment as a visiting researcher. That opened up the world for me in that fascinating country.
- A central element of my research project on Mexico required biographical information on a large number of political officeholders. Eventually I went to the national congress and requested access to semiofficial profiles on then current legislators. The custodian politely explained that no such records existed. Days later I happened to have coffee with his superior, who not only said I could have the data but volunteered to accompany me over to the archives. Neither the custodian nor I blinked. Saving face can be an important part of the bargain.
- Soledad Loaeza, a prominent scholar and colleague, shared with me on many occasions her unique and firsthand knowledge of politics and personalities in Mexico. These insights greatly enriched

my understanding of the one-party regime. She not only supported my efforts; she also oversaw the translation of my resulting book into Spanish for publication by El Colegio de México.

So it has been. None of these people had to do the things they did for me. I have received invaluable help, guidance, and intellectual sustenance at every stage of my not-quite-finished career. I could never have succeeded without them, or, for that matter, without all of you.

Now I am going to take a bit of poetic license. I want to address my family: my sons, daughters, and daughters-in-law, all of whom are present. It is a special occasion to have them together in one place and listening to me. I intend to seize this opportunity. In so doing I will purport to speak on behalf of colleagues here assembled, in hopes that you will forgive my intentional slippages between singular and plural first-person pronouns.

Now then . . . children. You must wonder what I do. You see me working away at the computer, producing arcane documents, getting on airplanes, heading off to mysterious places, coming back home, and going back to the computer. You know I teach university students and I suspect you sometimes commiserate with them. Scribble, scribble, scribble, talk, talk, talk—what does the old man really do?

Let me explain. My colleagues and I are fascinated by the tenor and tones of life in Latin America. It is a land of paradox, and it stimulates our curiosity. Once we identify a puzzle, we become determined to solve it. Once we locate a trail of evidence, we are enthralled by the thrill of the chase. We are a band of hunters.

But there is more to it than that. As we learn about the region, we have been profoundly moved by things we have witnessed or observed. My personal experiences include riveting scenes:

- the resolute dignity of poverty-stricken indigenous women kneeling on the sidewalks of Mexico City, eyes downcast and hands outstretched, pleading for gestures of human charity;
- the passionate fury of a fashionably dressed young woman in Buenos Aires who, during a student protest against the 1965 U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic, climbed aboard a police jeep and used her handbag to club an armed policeman;
- the unrelenting courage of countless colleagues who confronted military and other authoritarian regimes by continuing to do their work, and risked life and limb in the process;
- the fate of a Jesuit priest from El Salvador who gave a stunning lecture to one of my university classes and was thereafter murdered in his homeland by a gang of military thugs;
- the callous destruction in 1989 of lives and property in Panama (aka “collateral damage”) by U.S. military forces in pursuit of just one individual, Manuel Antonio Noriega;
- the superhuman bravery of a grieving grandmother of the Plaza de Mayo, who expressed relief to learn that her adult daughter was dead and could no longer be subjected to torture.

These are matters of the heart, not the head. My colleagues and I cannot but empathize. In a world of unequal power,

we align ourselves with underdogs, with people who suffer within Latin America, and with Latin American nations that have sometimes suffered at the hands of the United States.

We ask ourselves what we can do. Our answer is: Seek truth. (We know, of course, that there is no such thing as absolute truth, that it is a relative notion, but we want to get as close as possible. This is a noble quest, even if results are fallible.)

Truth brings enlightenment. It provides perspective and enlarges our awareness. It takes away our blinders and it sets us free.

Truth enhances understanding. Many of us tell stories that have never been told. We try to explore the lives and struggles of the weak and disadvantaged, to emphasize their dignity and sense of purpose. This underlines realities of our common destiny.

Truth offers a path toward empowerment. In many times and places, the rich and powerful have invented stories explaining why they (and not others) should be rich and powerful. Occasionally these stories contain grains of partial truth; often they consist of gross exaggerations; and all too frequently they are based on blatant lies. On the whole, our work provides a corrective to these tales.

Truth unravels fabrication; it undermines mendacity. We thus unmask the instruments of domination and control. We speak truth to power, or at least we make it possible for others to speak truth to power.

We try not only to discover truth. We also want to spread the word. That is why we write, write some more, give papers, attend conferences, offer lectures, teach students, teach some more, and talk and talk and

talk. Some of us are pretty shy, but as a group we form a community of conversationalists.

For North Americans like me, it is especially imperative to have our studies published in Spanish or Portuguese translation, so they will be available to people who can put our findings to practical use.

Our work resembles that of journalists, especially print journalists, many of whom I greatly admire (like my older brother). But there are significant differences. First, we scholars are profoundly concerned with questions of theory and method, with the importance of explaining *how* we carry out our research and analysis. We hold ourselves, and each other, to very high standards. Second, we don't usually have fixed time deadlines. We work on projects until they are done. Articles take months and years. Books take years and decades. Scholarship requires discipline and patience, qualities aptly captured in the German term *sitzfleisch*—which, in literal translation, means “the ability to sit still for extended periods of time.”

We have yet another motivation. While we often deal with difficult and painful issues, the work itself is usually enjoyable. Much of it is just plain fun. I have been able to travel to many parts of the world, meet thousands of fascinating people, serve as president of LASA, see my name in print, and watch myself on television. My swelling ego has been gratified in unexpected ways.

One such instance occurred many years ago, right after the publication of my dissertation as a book. While visiting a major university I went to the library to see if my opus was there. I scanned the card catalogue eagerly. Yes! It was there! But

wait! It was listed as “missing from shelf.” I was crestfallen. Then I came upon a thoroughly satisfactory explanation: some enchanted reader had stolen my book! That's right. Stolen my book! My chest was bursting with pride as I skipped back out to the campus. And as fanciful as this reconstruction of events might seem in retrospect, it remains the preferred interpretation.

I have loved this work. I am profoundly grateful for my abundant opportunities and for this glorious award. I owe special thanks to my children—for tolerating my absences (and absentmindedness), for embracing my ideals, for traveling with me to distant lands, and for being here on this occasion. All this makes me a very lucky guy. Quoting Maya Angelou once more, “Wouldn't take nothing for my journey now.” Thank you very much. ■

Introduction of Recipient, Stefano Varese

by CHARLES R. HALE | University of Texas | crhale@austin.utexas.edu

Washington, DC, June 1, 2013

On rare occasions the opportunity arises to introduce someone in a professional setting who is in equal parts inspirational colleague and dear friend. This makes the task a special honor, but also a formidable challenge. The prestigious Diskin Lectureship is certainly not about objectivity with a capital O but is meant to celebrate our fullest capacities of critical reflection. Some might argue that these capacities lose their edge under the influence of memories spanning some 25 years of companionship, entwined families, weekend adventures, and pauses for serious analysis followed by a burst of irreverence, another *copa*, and laughter—always lots of laughter. This introduction will advance the counterargument and leave it to you to decide.

It is especially fitting that Stefano Varese has received this award, because he is among a dwindling but hardy crew who knew Martin Diskin personally and worked closely with him. I have the strong sense that they were kindred spirits. Although the lectureship was founded to recognize extraordinary lifelong commitments to activist scholarship, Martin had an even more bedrock quality, of which Stefano is also a master connoisseur: the sage ability to maintain both an intense reverence for the weight of history and an abundant appreciation for the dance of life. Stefano's generosity, kindness, and mild-mannered ways are legendary—so much so that at times the other side of his character can take you by surprise. I have a vivid memory, from early in our time together at UC Davis, when a visiting Peruvian intellectual gave a presentation framed by racially tinged premises of criollo arrogance; Stefano took him on with eloquent vehemence, delivering a powerful précis on the weight of Peruvian history which, he suggested, his esteemed colleague would do well to learn.

His steely critique was a bit of a conversation stopper, and everyone did seem slightly taken aback; but I am sure the quiet also expressed deep admiration.

In the good tradition of Mariátegui, Stefano is a committed historical materialist. A rigorous political economy lens shapes his view of the world and frames his scholarly analysis. Here, that same balance comes into play in a slightly different way. It is no secret that indigenous and native peoples of the Americas have suffered considerably from various political projects of Marxist inspiration and generally harbor almost as much distrust for their Marxist “allies” as their adversaries on the right. For nearly a half century, Stefano has navigated this contradiction with a creative sensitivity that makes his approach to indigenous cultural politics unique, challenging, and always provocative. From early on, he advanced sharp criticism of the racism and developmentalism that Marxists so often have taken on as baggage, and he forged deep ties of commonality and shared vision with indigenous communities throughout the Americas. Throughout, he also maintained a sophisticated *longue durée* Marxist analysis of capitalism, and in so doing brought together ideas and people that in most settings would remain separate. Theoretical virtuosity? Certainly. But perhaps more fundamentally, this balance is best understood as a theoretical expression of how he has chosen to lead his life.

What an extraordinary record of scholarly *acompañamiento*, of “witness to sovereignty” (to borrow the title of Stefano's most recent book) these four decades have produced. It is a symphony in three movements, an *obra de teatro campesino* in three acts, with a special coda yet to come. The first movement took

place in his native Peru, where Stefano took his doctorate from the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú; taught at the renowned San Marcos University, where he served briefly as chair of the department of anthropology; and soon thereafter began work as director of the División de Comunidades Nativas de la Selva, in the government of Juan Velasco Alvarado, to conceive and implement a program of recognition of indigenous rights to territory in the *selva*. His principal credential for this job was his dissertation on the Ashaninka scholarship that yielded an early, prescient break with the dominant tradition of community studies—which depicted indigenous peoples as frozen in their own premodern space-time—and instead analyzed Ashaninka engagements with broader political economic forces. This work, later published as *La sal de los cerros*, became a classic, translated into English and reprinted numerous times.

The second movement took place in Oaxaca, Mexico, where Stefano and his wife Linda lived for a decade and where he headed the Ministry of Education entity for indigenous development, called Culturas Populares, under the national leadership of the visionary Mexican anthropologist Guillermo Bonfil Batalla. Here Stefano founded and advanced a wide range of projects, from bilingual-bicultural education, to artisan production, to novel forms of political organization, subverting the state-centered ideology of *indigenismo* and replacing it with an approach that came to be known as “ethno-development,” which emphasized cultural integrity and political autonomy. In Oaxaca he continued the established pattern of carrying forward an intensely productive research program on indigenous Oaxaca, which ran parallel to the ethno-development projects that he led.

In the mid-1980s the third movement began when the family moved to California. Stefano eventually joined the faculty at UC Davis and played a formative role in building the premier department of Native American studies in the country, which defends a truly hemispheric approach to the field. Here Stefano's research program expanded yet again, fully taking on the diasporic dimensions of indigenous cultural politics, accompanying the binational Zapotec organization Frente Indígena Oaxaqueño Binacional (FIOB) from its founding days with a documentary film as well as a prodigious record of scholarship on transnational indigenous identity, demography, and most recently, epistemology. The Native American Studies department at Davis also took full advantage of his well-honed skills as political organizer and diplomat: he served as chair for many years and invested heart and soul in the vision of a program of Native American/indigenous studies that would stay true to its revolutionary roots while transcending the deeply entrenched North-South boundaries.

All three movements were cumulative in topic and scholarly focus. Stefano stayed fully engaged in Oaxaca scholarship while living in California, and in recent years he has been drawn back to Peru to revisit work with his Ashaninka *compañeros* of some 40 years past. Three features of remarkable continuity mark these engagements over a half century. First, a striking number of these scholarly projects over the years have been collective (including the LASA-sponsored study he carried out with Martin on Miskitu-Sandinista relations in Nicaragua), and for anyone who knows Stefano it is simple to understand why: they are conceived with a social purpose that attracts others, and his charisma seals the attraction. I can hardly think of a conversation shared with Stefano

since I met him in the early 1980s that did not generate spontaneous energy and excitement for some project or another. Second, Stefano, though in many ways the consummate scholar, has always made practical political engagement an integral component of his scholarship. (This commitment is what first brought us together: in my rabble-rousing graduate student days at Stanford, Stefano had just moved from Mexico to the Bay Area, and we had read his work. "This was the kind of anthropology we wanted to learn! We want him here, *carajo!*") From 1971, when he formed part of the visionary group of intellectuals who signed the first Declaration of Barbados, to his later participation in the historic Fourth Russell Tribunal on the Human Rights of the Indians of the Americas, to the anthropology-inspired initiatives of *Culturas Populares*, to his association with transnational indigenous organizing in "Oaxacalifornia," to his bureaucratic trench warfare at Davis undertaken with skill and acuity that would have earned an approving nod from the Maestro Gramsci—in each space and phase, his work as a scholar has reached its fullest expression when immersed in, and mutually informed by, social and political action. That is the essence of the lectureship for which we are honoring him this afternoon. A final element is Stefano's deep generosity of spirit and contagious enthusiasm for the dance of life. This may well be the key to everything else: it provides a daily reminder of the utopian ideals of social change to which he has devoted his career; and it is most certainly collective, depending on the full participation of others, especially Linda, his lifelong dance partner, who always keeps him focused on what really matters most.

But this last part is just my speculation. Soon we'll have the full story from Stefano himself. Rumor has it that the coda, still in the works, is a memoir, in which Stefano will provide his own reflections on an extraordinary life and an inspiring life's work. Let this public announcement be a further inducement: we are waiting to read these reflections! And in the meantime, perhaps we'll hear an early installment, as we congratulate the 14th recipient of the LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship, and welcome Stefano Varese to the podium. ■

Eulogy of Utopian Praxis: From Dystopian Reality to the Research of Hope

by STEFANO VARESE | University of California, Davis | svarese@ucdavis.edu

I am grateful and extremely honored to have been named recipient of the LASA/Oxfam America 2013 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship. I am very pleased by this honor because of my long-standing and loyal membership and participation in LASA, one of the best professional associations of social studies and the humanities in the hemisphere. I thank the members of the Selection Committee: Chair Aldo Panfichi Huamán, of the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (my alma mater); Peter H. Smith, of the University of California, San Diego; Richard O. Snyder, of Brown University; and Gabrielle Watson, of Oxfam America. I also thank Milagros Pereyra, Executive Director of LASA, and the friends and audience gathered here. Special *abrazos cariñosos* to Vilunya, Leah, and Aaron Diskin, in celebration of those years spent in San Felipe del Agua, Oaxaca, playing and dreaming in Spanish and English.

In the fall of 1998 at the 21st LASA meeting held in Chicago I delivered a brief tribute to two friends and colleagues who had left an irreplaceable emptiness in the Latin American anthropology community, in the community of hope, and in the personal life of innumerable indigenous people, peasants, the poor, and—why not—scholars. Martin Diskin and Guillermo Bonfil Batalla knew each other well since the 1970s, when Oaxaca had become the home of Martin Diskin and his family—his wife Vilunya and children Leah and Aaron—and when Mexican anthropology was being swept by the innovative initiatives of Guillermo Bonfil, who, as director of the INAH, the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, was decentralizing the institution, sending teams of social scientists to the *México profundo* that lay hidden under the official mirage of modernization and the expansion of the corporate market economy.

Later, I published the short homage in Spanish as an article in *Desacatos*, the scholarly journal of CIESAS-Istmo of Oaxaca (the Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social).¹ What I intended to do in that homage, besides retracing the parallel anthropological paths of Diskin and Bonfil, was to ask why in the past one hundred years of anthropology in the Americas, especially in the United States, we have seen so few examples of sociopolitically committed activist anthropologists such as Martin Diskin and Guillermo Bonfil. Why was it so hard to find names and life histories of scholars and intellectuals that would resonate among the poor, the underprivileged, the commoners, the peasants, and the indigenous people as much as the lives of Diskin and Bonfil did? I realize that in our age of impersonal globalization, anonymous transit through existence as one more commodity or as a mercantile electronic persona living the illusion of world fame through a computer monitor, it is becoming increasingly difficult to extricate real people from the cyber net of the anonymous and famous impersonators. Books, articles, written documents, declarations, poems, and especially popular oral storytelling are still the sources through which we must reconstruct the life histories and intellectual journeys of stubborn thinkers and obstinate activists like Diskin and Bonfil. These names and their memories are living in the Miskito and Creole communities of Nicaragua and in the Zapotec, Mixtec, Maya, Purépecha and dozens of other indigenous and *mestizo* pueblos of Mexico, Central America, and the United States as proof of Antonio Gramsci's assertion that popular memory is true and therefore always revolutionary.

Having aged in synchrony with Diskin and Bonfil, at their premature deaths I started

to feel what one Spanish philosopher (Unamuno or Ortega y Gasset?) called “generational solitude”—that mystical sentiment that makes it difficult for me to remove from my address book names and addresses (even e-mail addresses) of friends and colleagues that have crossed the river and left us behind to wonder about the mysteries of cosmic justice. I find a profound sense of justice in the progressive loss of vital energy that establishes the natural chronology of biological decay of each one of us in the company of all our relatives: the animals, birds, fish, insects, amoebas, and all other entities tangible and intangible that constitute our precious cosmology. What I find more difficult to grasp and accept is the arbitrary and capricious early death—by car accident and by chronic disease—of two intellectual activists whose longer lives and political and social activities would have bettered the world for all of us.

Martin Diskin and Guillermo Bonfil Batalla belong to the same generation as Mexican and Latin American anthropologist-activists Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Salomón Nahmad, Nemesio Rodríguez Mitchell, and myself, and engaged North American social anthropologist Michael Kearney. We were all born between 1930 and 1940 in Latin America, Europe, or the United States. We grew up in the highly contested post-WWII Pax Americana, we were all subjected to anticommunist brainwashing and its miseducational process, and we all had to sort out in our early reading between the bourgeois interpretation of the world and the socialist (Marxist) rewriting of history. We had to build our cosmology in the contested, bipolar, and contradictory domains of the utopian hopefulness of socialism and the dystopian resignation of liberal capitalism. We were strongly influenced by the previous generation of thinkers born in the decade 1920–1930:

C. Wright Mills and Noam Chomsky in the United States, Darcy Ribeiro and Paulo Freire in Brazil, and Ivan Illich in Europe, Latin America, and Mexico. We recognized that these intellectuals were also and most importantly political activists who were willing to risk their academic stability and their professional lives to put into action what they had understood in theory.

I believe that the Marxist idea of *praxis* began to make sense to our generation precisely when we stepped into fieldwork (or should I say into the minefield of working with the rural and urban poor). This research was supposed to be objective, neutral, empirically disinfected, and focused on discrete socio-geographical spaces: the community, maybe the surrounding region, but never the country and its nation-state, and absolutely by no means the larger continental and world dimensions.

I speak in plural precisely because as a social scientist and a humanist I am obliged to acknowledge that ideas and practices are always social and collective and very seldom the personal possessions of the single individual. Praxis became for us literally free action, the activity and creativity exercised in freedom, without the restraining conceptual devices of our conformist and conventional discipline. Praxis, therefore, as free creative activity for our generation, aimed at changing and shaping ethical, social, political, and economic life in the direction of a more just, egalitarian, and humanistic world community. Some of us chose the party, others the labor movement, others social movements, others occasionally ended up working for revolutionary or at least reformist governments. And eventually, in Latin America since the 1960s, my generation of activist-anthropologists landed in jail or were deported or in

voluntary exile. The two decades of 1960 and 1980 were lost in Latin America for any open, progressive social movement. Military dictatorships ruling by torture, death, and disappearances took brutal control of two-thirds of the continent and millions of human beings, putting on a silver plate the resources and the subjugated labor forces of our countries to be used by corporate capital and the various Republican or Democrat administrations of the United States. The Pax Americana already stained by the war in Vietnam became unbearably bloody in Latin America.

In the early 1980s I accompanied Martin Diskin to the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua in a fact-finding mission of a LASA Task Force charged with analyzing the human rights situation of the indigenous and creole communities.² The military actions of the Contras, supported and financed by the Reagan administration, had wound down and the Sandinista government was reshaping the relations of the central revolutionary government of Nicaragua with the emerging indigenous forces seeking the regional autonomy of the Atlantic Coast. In my somewhat arrogant naiveté as an activist anthropologist who had worked for the revolutionary government of Juan Velasco Alvarado in Peru of the early 1970s, and with a younger brother who had fought as an “internationalist” with the Sandinista insurgents and reached a high-ranking military position in the Sandinista Army, I thought that there was very little that I could learn about activist anthropology from this “gringo” friend from MIT and Oaxaca. Now, after 30 years, I can easily confess my condescension—so Latin American, so stereotyped, so unfair, and especially so confused. Martin Diskin guided me through the roughest and most troubled ethnic/racial political waters of

postwar Nicaragua with a profound sense of humanity, justice, unprejudiced dialogic ability, and a down-to-earth and elegant sense of humor that I later identified as part of his Jewish heritage. What I saw in Diskin in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua was praxis at large in the true original Aristotelian sense: *praxeis* supported by *theoria* and *poiesis*. Knowledge in its three basic kinds: theoretical, practical, and poetic (the production of something, in this case the superb LASA Report on the human rights situation in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua).

I do not know for sure if the LASA Report was taken seriously into consideration by the Sandinista government. I know that sometime later I met briefly Comandante Tomás Borges and other Sandinista officials, and that the attitude of the Nicaraguans from the Pacific Coast regarding the indigenous and creole peoples of the Atlantic had gone through a radical change, admitting a series of misjudgments and ethnopolitical errors committed by the Sandinistas due to their ignorance of the anthropological reality of the Atlantic Coast. Here I must stop for a moment and make a special tribute to two younger activist anthropologists who played a fundamental role in promoting a democratic political process of ethnic plurality in Nicaragua (and other parts of Latin America): Charles Hale and Edmund Gordon (both at the University of Texas, Austin, and both activist members of LASA).

Nicaragua in the 1980s—like Peru and Chile in the 1970s, El Salvador in the 1980s and 1990s, and the four decades of genocidal war in Guatemala—became a testing ground for anthropologists and other social scientists to choose between social justice and cultural and political democracy or the professional rewards of

ethical indifference and the theoretical abstractions of mainstream academia. A limited number of anthropologists throughout the Americas would read and find in the tortured history of the peoples of Latin America the obligation to commit to popular causes and disregard the allure of academic fame, instead investing time, intellect, emotions, and imagination in the task of transforming the cool analytical discipline of observation into the burning and often muddy peoples' struggle for their own liberation. As in the case of the interdisciplinary programs of ethnic studies that had their origin in the social and civil rights movement of the 1960s, conceptual and ethical innovation and liberation of conscience emerged from the praxis of the people's struggle and not precisely from the monastic cloister of the conservative university, where professional merits are accumulated in proportion to the distance that scientists establish from the people's cause. I am a witness of this existential transformation, having migrated early in my academic life from anthropology in Peru, to 25 years of activism in Peru and Mexico, to return to nonmainstream academia in California as professor of Native American/indigenous studies at UC Davis.

I would argue that the small minority of anthropologists who have chosen activism are ideologically, politically, and conceptually connected to the various ethnic agencies that since the civil rights struggle of the 1960s have constituted themselves into interdisciplinary programs and departments and have infiltrated the rigid and outdated structure of the university. To use a United Nations metaphor, ethnic studies programs are increasingly becoming "refugee camps" of "indigenous" researchers/instructors who otherwise would have been marginalized and excluded by fundamentally

ethnocentric and Eurocentric institutions. In a sense we can say that activist anthropologists and indigenous intellectuals have met on a common ground of ideas and action coming from two different ways of counterhegemonic construction. The intercrossing boundaries of the different disciplines and humanities that are brought to life by ethnic studies and activist anthropology are radically reconfiguring the epistemology of the new decolonized social science, a science that puts at the center of research and social practice the multiple histories and aspirations of the people rather than the reiterated domination of a Euro-American mode of knowledge.

The long and tortuous process of decolonization in the Americas began almost immediately after the European invasion. More than four hundred years ago the Andean Indian intellectual and Quechua speaker Guamán Poma de Ayala wrote the famous letter to the Spanish King Philip III, a manuscript of more than a thousand folios and hundreds of drawings in which Guamán launches the first critique of European colonialism and proposes a "buen gobierno" that would restore Inca social justice and cosmological order. At the same time in Mexico the Nahua intellectual Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin was writing the history of Mexico in Spanish and Nahuatl, comparing his native society with that of the European invaders. Those critical indigenous narratives did not vanish throughout five centuries of European colonial occupation; they went underground or morphed into metaphors and symbolic rituals, or reconfigured as adapted cosmologies and new utopian aspirations. These are the narratives and cultural heritage that today constitute the core of Native American/indigenous studies in the Americas: an ancient and new

multidisciplinary field of critical knowledge and alternative epistemology where dozens of intellectuals like Vine Deloria Jr. and Robert Warrior, colleagues like Jack Forbes, David Risling, Inés Hernández-Avila, Victor Montejo, and Guillermo Delgado, and old friends from Amazonia, the Andes, and Mexico and Guatemala are testimony to the endurance and intellectual sovereignty of ancient and yet truly contemporary people.

I often have asked myself this question: Can we abandon dystopia? When did we start to neglect utopia and assume dystopia? When did we begin to take for granted that the world we live in is irremediably unchangeable, that it is a good world the way it is, with a few hundred thousand people living in imperial luxury and billions of human beings (and other beings) barely surviving or becoming extinct? When did we start to accept as normal that 1,300 international corporations with a concentrated and politically articulated nucleus of 147 companies—the "centralized elite of power," the 1 percent of the world population—can rule at will over the rest of us, the billions of humans and other beings that constitute our world?³ Can we, members of the local and global civil society, continue to be blind to the fact that this transnational corporate class protects its international capital, its indecently acquired wealth, with the concentrated power of the military empire increasingly denationalized and privatized?

In the last 50 years the rules of the game have changed radically. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, class and anticolonial struggles had clearly demarcated dividing lines between the oppressor and the oppressed, between capital and labor, between empire and colonial subjects, between political society

and civil society. Hegel's idea that the civil society was a valuable and inevitable aspect of modern social life, a counterbalance to the power of the state and the political society, was still functional. In the last few decades the idea and practice of civil society has become increasingly blurred and vague to the point that nowadays in Latin America we accept that nongovernmental and grassroots organizations can be financed by governments and political parties in power or foundations linked to transnational corporations of the global North. Our margins of independence and autonomy as local and global citizens are becoming increasingly narrow and uncertain, and so are our fundamental rights to choose and shape our political society. We are asked to participate in a cyclical electoral ceremony, a kind of imprecise and commoditized gambling game that is conducive inevitably to slight changes of the guard within the same monolithic and impenetrable club of the "rich, famous, and corrupted" elite.

Let me go back almost 20 decades in Euro-American history and present a central argument that I would like to consider as the premise to a larger discussion about social and political activism in anthropology. Almost 170 years ago three anonymous editions of a short pamphlet titled *Manifesto of the Communist Party* were published in London. Marx's and Engels's names appeared only 24 years later in the Leipzig edition of 1872, when the title was changed to *Communist Manifesto*. Starting with the *Manifesto* and the following construction of Marxism as a discipline for social theory and practice, the long-standing utopian tradition of the Mediterranean/European world, which had become lethargic since the Renaissance and almost died out with the Enlightenment, reappears with a central role in the European social imaginary. The

ideal of a better world, or an upside-down world of peasants and popular imaginations, a world that can be recomposed, reorganized to improve the living conditions of each member of humanity, becomes now not only the catalyzing idea of popular hope but also a consubstantial part of the social sciences and humanistic intellectual work. While liberal humanism and sciences insist on interpreting the world (and accepting it), post-Marxist humanism and social sciences aspire to know the world in order to change it and make it better.

The socialist project proposes a theory of knowledge and a science that operates on the implicit assumption that the world must be changed and that the intellectual (natural or organic) has an active role in this enterprise, a role that goes beyond observation and "objective" theorization of the phenomenon. The Cartesian "cogito, ergo sum" is being complemented and finally eroded by a new dictum, "I act, thus I exist"—act as expression of praxis, as creative action and production. Or as in the "existentialist" words of André Malraux referring to the anticolonial struggle in Algeria: "I resist, thus we are."

The establishment in Latin America of praxis as the methodological fulcrum of activist anthropological research created a watershed between two scientific humanistic and value systems: on one side the positivist, unlinked, objective mode of knowledge that is basically unconcerned with the social and political consequences of research, focusing more on the advancement of social theory; on the other side research programs that put at the center of their activity the goal of intentionally transforming social reality through praxis. I could argue that Latin America social science was better positioned than the social sciences from

Euro-America and other Third World/peripheral regions to accept a nonconformist, less conventional, and more progressive use of anthropology. From the end of the nineteenth century and through the first half of the twentieth century, anarchism and socialism played important roles in the construction of a utopian, revolutionary social consciousness. I can mention only a few names: anarchist Manuel González Prada and socialists José Carlos Mariátegui, Víctor Haya de la Torre, Luis E. Valcárcel, and Hildebrando Castro Pozo in Peru; indigenous Quechua-Aymara intellectual Fausto Reinaga in Bolivia; postrevolutionary Mexican intellectuals Vicente Lombardo Toledano and young Manuel Gamio; indigenous political leader Quintín Lame in Colombia; and Peru's Quechua poet and anthropologist José María Arguedas. All these and other intellectuals, most of them of indigenous ancestry, created an environment in which we young Latin American anthropologists in the 1960s understood clearly that the theory and practice of anthropology were founded on the ethical premise and the epistemological imperative that this was the science of the people, at the service of people and their causes and for the architecture of the new social utopia.

By the time that modernization theory, under the leadership of Harvard University sociologist Talcott Parsons and Kennedy political appointee Walt Rostow, arrived in Latin America with all the prestige of "the northern wind of innovation," Latin American anthropologists had developed strong antibodies by reading Marxism and decolonization texts. We had absorbed the writings of Amílcar Cabral and understood his position on the fundamental role of culture in the national liberation movement; we had read Franz Fanon's and Albert Memmi's critiques of colonial ethnic discrimination and racism; we had enjoyed

Aimé Césaire's poetry of liberation and understood Jean-Paul Sartre's analyses of French colonialism. We were becoming familiar with all those young European ethnologists trained in critical theory and post-Marxism such as Maurice Godelier, Claude Meillassoux, Pierre-Philippe Rey, and Georges Balandier. But we were also following the debates taking place in U.S. academia about the role of anthropologists in the Vietnam War and the imperial use of anthropologists in Latin America and South East Asia. Gerald Berreman, Kathleen Gough, and Noam Chomsky became part of our vocabulary. Armed with these ideas and ideals we were ready to analyze and discuss the validity of modernization theory, which stated that the rural poor and the indigenous people were poor because they were obsolete; they were not modern; they lived at the margins of the market economy and thus were unable to take advantage of modernity.

You may remember that during the JFK administration the ideas of modernization of Talcott Parsons and Walt Rostow were put into practice by creating the Peace Corps as a kind of mission of modernity. We in Latin America, at the receiving end of these ideas and practices, were astonished at their naiveté. Where was the class analysis? Where were the attempts to understand economic exploitation, political oppression, and racial and ethnic discrimination? The indigenous peasants are not poor because of their culture, they are not powerless because they organize their social life according to their cultural heritage and therefore they must abandon their way of life and turn themselves in an impoverished carbon copy of the urban lower middle class or proletariat. The irony of this period of our common history—for those of us from the global South and the young U.S. Peace Corps members from the global North—is that

most of those from the North became like us from the South. On a personal note I can say that some of my best friends and colleagues, progressive and socially conscientious social scientists and activists, were trained not by the Peace Corps program but rather by the appalling Latin America social reality. This confirms that it is praxis that does the trick. It is praxis as an exercise that verifies knowledge and becomes proof of truthfulness.

In June 1971 a dozen Latin American anthropologists accompanied by a U.S. ethnologist expatriate to Mexico and an Austrian social scientist met on the island of Barbados under the sponsorship of the World Council of Churches to discuss the situation of the indigenous people of Latin America. The Barbados I meeting, as it became known, produced an impressive volume of denunciations of human and ethnic rights abuses by governments, missionaries, the private sector, and even social scientists, together with a short declaration that soon became a banner for some of the emerging indigenous organizations of Mexico and Central and South America. The Spanish edition of the book, published in Montevideo, never reached the shelves of bookstores: it was burned by the Uruguayan military dictatorship. This was a curious act of racist zeal and political conservatism, since Uruguay is one of the few countries of Latin America that does not have a substantial indigenous population. No indigenous people were present at the meeting of Barbados I. It would take another six years for the Barbados group to convene a larger second meeting of 35 participants, 18 of whom this time were active militants of the indigenous Latin American movement. Some of the indigenous members of Barbados II traveled to the island clandestinely. The Guatemalan Maya and the Colombian

Nasa/Paéz participants were actually risking their lives by being at the conference. Finally in 1993 the Barbados group (III) met in Río de Janeiro, 23 years after the first meeting, to mourn the death of one of its most enlightened members, Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, and to address again old indigenous issues of neocolonialism, wars, land eviction, genocide, human rights abuses, and cultural destruction, now implemented by the transnational community of capital and presented as the inevitable price to be paid by the weak to allow for the globalization of the economy and the establishment of a "new world order."

The three Barbados meetings can be read as a synopsis of 25 years of intellectual activity and praxis of a minority of Latin American anthropologists accompanying the indigenous peoples' movement of liberation. The declaration of Barbados I, "For the Liberation of the Indigenous People" (1971) was a strong denunciation and demand to the state, the church, the private sector, and social scientists to satisfy the basic human and ethnic rights of the indigenous people. Barbados II (1977) reflected both the Indians' and anthropologists' activism and direct involvement in the social movement of liberation, assuming all the risks of such a decision. Some of the indigenous participants and some of the anthropologists were already living either clandestinely in their own countries or in exile. The declaration of Barbados III, "The Articulation of Diversity" (1993), evaluates the last 25 years of Latin American anthropology and its contributions to the Indian struggle of decolonization. There is little optimism in this assessment, which recognizes the ethical distortions of contemporary theoretical meandering and the self-gratifying solipsism that disguises the lack of commitment of academic

anthropology to indigenous peoples' liberation struggles, and for that matter to the struggles of the oppressed. Finally Barbados III recognizes that, at the end of the century, the Indian movement of the Americas is a fundamental factor on the international scene that will have to be taken into consideration in any major decision regarding world peace and development.

Just a few weeks after the meeting of Barbados III, on January 1, 1994, Tzeltal, Tzotzil, Chol, Tojolabal, and Zoque Maya Indians of Chiapas organized into the Zapatista National Liberation Army (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional, or EZLN) and declared war on the Mexican government, quickly establishing the military occupation of four major municipalities in Chiapas, Mexico. An indigenous army of eight hundred combatants occupied the city of San Cristóbal de las Casas, seized the municipal palace, proclaimed their opposition to the "undeclared genocidal war against our people by the dictators," and described their "struggle for work, land, shelter, food, health, education, independence, freedom, democracy, justice, and peace." The Maya Zapatista movement, which has survived and grown for almost 20 years, has had a tremendous influence on the rest of indigenous peoples throughout the Americas and the world. I also believe that the Maya people from Mexico and Guatemala and all the other indigenous peoples of the Americas mobilized against oppression and exploitation have forced anthropologists and social scientists to reconfigure their assumptions about indigenous peoples/Native Americans and their own commitments to their struggle for ethnic liberation and political sovereignty.

At the end of this talk I would like to argue that activist anthropology does not emerge necessarily from the proverbial ivory tower of universities; rather it takes shape and is constantly reformulated through social, cultural, political, and ethical praxis. As in the case of Martin Diskin, activist anthropology is formed by walking together—anthropologist and the people (indigenous or not)—the long, winding, and always contradictory collective journey through the dystopian reality toward our common utopian world.

Endnotes

- ¹ Stefano Varese, "Crítica de la razón distópica: Homenaje a la imaginación utópica de Martin Diskin y Guillermo Bonfil Batalla," *Desacatos, Revista de Antropología Social*, no. 10 (2002): 189–194.
- ² Martin Diskin, Thomas Bossert, Salomón Nahmad S., and Stefano Varese, *Peace and Autonomy on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua: A Report of the LASA Task Force on Human Rights and Academic Freedom* (Pittsburgh, PA: Latin American Studies Association, 1986).
- ³ Nemesio J. Rodríguez, "Pueblos indígenas amazónicos: Apuntes para una utopía discreta," in *Selva vida: De la destrucción de la Amazonía al paradigma de la regeneración*, edited by Stefano Varese, Frédérique Apffel-Marglin, and Róger Rumrill (forthcoming), chap. 10. ■

The Impact of Fellowships on Individuals, Their Institutions, and Their Communities

Two to Tango: Franco-Latino and Franco-Maghrebi Queer Transnationalism

by LUIS NAVARRO-AYALA | St. Norbert College | luis.navarro-ayala@snc.edu

Even before starting grammar school in my small hometown in the Mexican state of Michoacán, I learned like all of the children around me that Cinco de Mayo is a patriotic day to celebrate the defeat in 1862 of the Napoleonic army by Mexican troops. Years later, as an undergraduate, I studied abroad at l'Université Lumière Lyon II in France to take advantage of its comprehensive program in Latin American studies, which allowed me to study this holiday—as well as events throughout history—from a French perspective. While a doctoral candidate in French and Francophone Studies at UCLA, I again spent an academic year in France. During that stay, I taught for the University of California Study Center in Paris, while benefitting from a research fellowship that gave me the privileged status of a visiting student scholar (*pensionnaire étranger*) at the prestigious École Normale Supérieure. Situated on rue d'Ulm, at the heart of the Latin Quarter and only a few short steps from the Pantheon, this elite school dedicated to preparing future university professors offered me an ideal context to explore the significance of the cultural and literary exchanges between France and Latin America. Above and beyond the advantages of taking up residence at this institution dedicated to interdisciplinary research, my stay in Paris was transformative because it placed me at the center of a network of cultural and intellectual exchanges that extend well beyond the borders of metropolitan France, throughout the French- and Spanish-speaking worlds.

The Latin American presence in France is evident in music and dance, food and restaurants, cinema and theater, the fine

arts, and literature. Latin American music has long been present in Paris, with concerts held in venues ranging from small cafés to world-renowned concert halls like the Olympia. As for dancing, La Peña, not far from the École Normale, is entirely dedicated to salsa; however, the longest tradition uniting Latin music and dance in Paris is the Argentinean tango. First played in the City of Light's most sophisticated salons at the turn of the twentieth century, it has now gained widespread popularity. For instance, the Paris-Banlieue-Tango Festival (Paris-Suburb-Tango) is held throughout the French capital and its suburbs every fall. Those who work up an appetite can then enjoy Latin American cuisine, which is booming throughout the city: El Sol y La Luna, La Pachanga, O'Mexico, and Poco Loco are just a few of its many Latin restaurants. All of Latin America's aromas mix together at their tables, where specialties range from Cuban, Peruvian, Colombian, and Argentinean dishes to Mexican tequilas, Dominican and Puerto Rican rums, or Chilean piscos and wines. Not to be overlooked, Latin American film and theater are visible at festivals in Cannes, Paris, Toulouse, and Avignon, while fine arts from the region occupy the walls of all of its major museums, which have shown exhibits by Frida Kahlo, Diego Rivera, Julio Silva, Pablo Reinoso, Juan Carlos Langlois, and Fernando Botero.

However, the most documented Latin American presence in Paris remains literature. As noted by Sylvia Molloy in *La diffusion de la littérature hispanoaméricaine en France au XXe siècle* (1972) and Jason Weiss in *The Lights of Home: A Century of Latin American*

Writers in Paris (2003), Latin American intellectuals were key figures of the Parisian literary scene throughout the twentieth century. Rubén Darío (Nicaragua, 1867–1916), Vicente Huidobro (Chile, 1893–1948), Pablo Neruda (Chile, 1904–1973), Alejo Carpentier (Cuba, 1904–1980), Jorge Luis Borges (Argentina, 1899–1986), Julio Cortázar (Argentina, 1914–1984), Severo Sarduy (Cuba, 1937–1993), Octavio Paz (Mexico, 1914–1998), Carlos Fuentes (Mexico, 1928–2012), Gabriel García Márquez (Colombia, b. 1927), and Mario Vargas Llosa (Peru, b. 1936) are among the numerous Latin American writers who established relationships with their French counterparts. In many cases, these authors are associated with the classical portrait of the Latin American male who expresses himself through machismo. Indeed, it is worth noting that these men of letters are far better known in France than their female peers, making Latin American literary production abroad a male-dominated pursuit.

Although other Latin American influences in France prove more open to women, gender plays a crucial role in the perceived identity of the region. Since Latin Americans are just as fascinated by the French as the French are fascinated by Latin Americans, my research proposes a new perspective on Frenchness as it has been historically conceived through colonial stereotypes. By crossing transcultural spaces, the Transcultural Queer discovers new modes of social engagement and finds ways to create transverse dialogues inclusive of racial, cultural, and sexual specificities. Corresponding to the “semiotic zones of contact” that Yuri Lotman identifies in

Universe of the Mind (1990), these transnational spaces are uniquely qualified to reconceptualize Frenchness and French influence as defined in local cultures around the globe. Thanks to discussions with my peers at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, I recognized viable parallels not only between the Maghreb and Latin America as places of origin for migratory movements, but also between France and the United States as host nations for first- and second-generation immigrant youth. As a queer who migrated from Mexico to the United States, I occupy a native informant role akin to those in Francophone narratives by Moroccan writers like Rachid O. and Abdellah Taïa. Their frequent references to their birthplaces—combined with my experiences learning firsthand about immigrant youth in Paris—led to the epiphany that I should bring together North Africa and Latin America in my research.

Comparing these two regions in the global South enabled me to develop comparisons between “marginal” spaces that hold vastly different cultural ties to France. In this regard, my research responds to Françoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih, who argue in *Minor Transnationalism* (2005, 7) for the need to examine “creative interventions that networks of minoritized cultures produce within and across national boundaries.” My dissertation, “Queering Transcultural Encounters in Latin American and Francophone Contexts: Space, Identity, and Frenchness,” ultimately deployed postcolonial theories of identity in relation to Moroccan as well as French and Argentinean subjects. As places of work or pleasure, French spaces in the works that I studied become the locus of meetings between locals and foreigners whereby they negotiate new transcultural relationships. Of course, such interactions occur against the backdrop of a long

history of colonial fantasies and inequalities that haunt the colonizer as well as the colonized. Famously outlined by Edward Said in *Orientalism* (1978), the complexities of the Self-Other relationship between Europeans and Arabs were notably illustrated in queer fiction by André Gide’s novel *L’immoraliste* (1902), set in Algeria. For better or for worse, I argue, Latin American and North African cultures have both come to reverse the gaze of the colonizer and to view Frenchness itself as queer. In this process, many characters in Spanish- and French-language narratives overcome the dominant paradigm of the formerly colonized subject who acts as a transnational object in the European culture.

While it has long been acknowledged that France customarily thought of North Africa as a queer space permitting promiscuity, it has less often been noted that Latin America looks to France for the same purpose, or that Frenchness has likewise come to represent an imagined queer space enabling sexual explorations in North Africa today. This comparison across linguistic borders thus moves beyond the traditional colonizer-colonized relationship to ask a broader question: to what extent do transnational encounters facilitate or challenge sexual agency in postcolonial societies where Frenchness alternately represents a corrupting influence or a liberating ideal?

In the Latin American context, the French-inspired *garçonnière* serves as a private space for homosexual permissiveness. In works such as José González Castillo’s *Los invertidos* (1914) or Alfonso Hernández-Catá’s *El ángel de Sodoma* (1928), the Transnational Queer is defined in contrast to the “type” of individuals accepted, or not accepted, by the nationalist agenda. While González Castillo turns the French

cultural space of the *garçonnière* in Buenos Aires into a “homosexual brothel,” Hernández-Catá uses the French capital itself as the center for sexual “degeneracy.” The nationalist impetus of these narratives uses the exclusion of the Other to prohibit marginalized sexualities, making the main characters Lotmanian boundary figures who experience inclusion and exclusion simultaneously. Given this status, they are pushed from the periphery of national culture, expelled out of the Ibero-American matrix, and obliged to take refuge in the French space. In fact, both narratives conceal the main characters’ homosexual desires until they find themselves in such a French refuge. As Emilio Bejel suggests in *Gay Cuban Nation* (2001, 4), the homosexual body participates by “exclusion” in “defining the nation to which it does not belong.” In these narratives, the homosexual subject is not only excluded from national culture but also specifically rejected into French culture.

In contrast, the Maghreb characterizes the *terrace de café* as the public sphere, where the cross-cultural encounter with the French Other in commercial interactions (tourism, prostitution, global media) leads to masculine transformation. Initially, Frenchness tends to reinforce the traditional dynamics of unequal exchange. In *Queer Nations: Marginal Sexualities in the Maghreb* (2000), Jarrod Hayes argues that this power structure reflects how European male tourists may conform to normativity at home while engaging in “homosex in the Orient,” where they may escape from jeopardizing “their heterosexual privilege” (30). Yet, young North Africans in narratives like Mohamed Choukri’s *Le pain nu* (1980) and Rachid O’s *L’enfant ébloui* (1995), *Chocolat chaud* (1998), and *Ce qui reste* (2003) manage to maneuver around Frenchness in order to

develop queer agency, positively transforming the largely homophobic spaces that they must navigate as sexual subjects.

In essence, my research proposes a type of parallelism: Orientalism for the French corresponds to Frenchness for the Latin American imaginary, and each demands that the Transnational Queer create unique forms of agency. My ongoing projects continue to analyze how exile from the sexual repression of a home culture pushes the Transnational Queer to search for sexual fulfillment abroad. Unfortunately, due to the lingering effects of colonial paradigms, such experiences tend to fall prey to exploitation and racial bias still today. However, my approach seeks to highlight the ways in which local youth may move beyond the colonizer's homoerotic gaze to pursue self-realizing subject formation, whether their transcultural homoerotic encounters occur at home or abroad. Through literary and intercultural creativity, these figures surmount the social conditions involved in sexual tourism to forge new sites of resistance to global economic power structures. Although Frenchness may still act here as a fantasized construct to defeat (or love only from a distance), intellectuals, writers, artists, and innumerable Latin Americans continue to dream of visiting Paris . . . since, after all, it takes two to tango.

References

Bejel, Emilio

2001. *Gay Cuban Nation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Choukri, Mohamed

1980. *Le pain nu*. Paris: Librairie François Maspero.

Gide, André

1902. *L'immoraliste*. Paris: Mercure de France.

González Castillo, José

1914. *Los invertidos*. Buenos Aires: Editores Puntosur.

Hayes, Jarrod

2000. *Queer Nations: Marginal Sexualities in the Maghreb*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hernández-Catá, Alfonso

1928. *El ángel de Sodoma*. Madrid: Mundo Latino.

Lionnet, Françoise, and Shu-mei Shih, eds.

2005. *Minor Transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Lotman, Yuri M.

1990. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Molloy, Sylvia

1972. *La diffusion de la littérature hispano-américaine en France au XXe siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

O., Rachid

1995. *L'enfant ébloui*. Paris : Éditions Gallimard

1998. *Chocolat chaud*. Paris : Éditions Gallimard.

2003. *Ce qui reste*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.

Said, Edward W.

1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Weiss, Jason

2003. *The Lights of Home: A Century of Latin American Writers in Paris*. New York: Routledge. ■

Transitando del yo al nosotros, y del nosotros a los otros: Vivencias y reflexiones sobre fellowships en los Estados Unidos

por CECILIA BARJA CHAMAS | Praxis Pública | Cecilia.Barja@avina.net

Sentado a pocos metros de mí, Jeffrey Sachs me miraba intermitentemente mientras me respondía. En la mesa ovalada, 20 Yale World Fellows de distintas partes del mundo y miembros del equipo escuchaban en un intenso silencio. Mi voz estaba áspera y entrecortada por las emociones encontradas de tener a uno de los economistas más reconocidos del mundo, pero quien llamaba al recientemente depuesto presidente boliviano Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada un genio político. Nos dimos la mano cuando se despidió del grupo, fue una mañana fría en Washington, DC, de finales del 2004.

Catorce meses antes estaba sentada en una colchoneta en la parroquia de la emblemática Iglesia de San Francisco en La Paz, con otros ocho jóvenes en nuestro tercer día de huelga de hambre pidiendo la renuncia del entonces presidente Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada. La mayor crisis en la democracia boliviana, tenía aquel 17 de octubre de 2003 a decenas de muertos, cientos de heridos y miles de personas movilizadas y en huelga de hambre a lo largo y ancho del país. Era difícil pensar que el hombre que salía en un helicóptero con rumbo desconocido, era el mismo con quien almorzamos en palacio de gobierno solo unos meses antes, con todos los concejales y Alcalde de La Paz para compartir criterios sobre como salir de la crisis severa de gobernabilidad que el país afrontaba y que afectaba brutalmente a la sede de gobierno.

Y la tuerca da una vuelta más. Primavera de 2008, auditorio lleno del Harvard Kennedy School. Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, notoriamente envejecido pero con la misma agilidad mental, sentado con otras tres personas en el podio. Un grupo de activistas de la Escuela de Derecho protestaban afuera, mientras que en el

auditorio otros estudiantes y comunidad en general lo escuchaban sin más prejuicio.

Estos momentos ejemplifican bien lo que representa para mí haber tenido la oportunidad de ser jugadora en la cancha, pero también haber tenido la posibilidad de ser público, directora técnica o jugadora sentada en el banquillo de suplentes. Y esta no es una distinción de roles, sino de perspectivas del desafío, construcción de equipo, medición de las fuerzas adversas, y de posibilidad de anotar el gol.

El privilegio de ser parte de la comunidad de Yale World Fellows, de los Mason Fellows de Harvard Kennedy School gracias a la beca del Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation, del Global Competitiveness Leadership Program de Georgetown University, me ayudó a abrir nuevas dimensiones mentales, espirituales, sentimentales y de discernimiento. Amplió mi visión de procesos locales-nacionales, a tendencias globales. Extendió mis ciclos de conocimiento de historia de años o décadas, a siglos y milenios. Desarrollo habilidades de reflexión y manejo de lo complejo, confuso y volátil, para evitar reacciones basadas en el instinto, el prejuicio, y la ignorancia.

La posibilidad de hacer historia solo cobra sentido, si tienes la oportunidad de reflexionar y estudiar sobre ella desde la distancia. Estudiar solo tiene sentido, si su objetivo es construir en el terreno mejores procesos sociales y bienes públicos para las grandes mayorías, y no solo engolosinarte de conocimiento estéril. El ambiente desafiante, pero seguro, de las universidades tiene como complemento la acción en el campo que muchas veces es mediocre, pero que se juega el pellejo.

Mi paso por universidades tan prestigiosas, hace que hoy mi desafío de vida sea distinto. Soy parte de la Fundación Avina (www.avina.net) desde el 2010, y mi vocación está menos centrada en mi visión de la realidad, y más en cómo se construye el cambio de forma colaborativa con otros actores: actores distintos, opuestos, desconocidos. Arriesgarse en agendas complejas de construcción de lo público, implica tener la capacidad de generar las condiciones para que el cambio se dé, más que presumir que nosotros personificamos el cambio. ■

An Embarrassment of Riches: Reflections on Visiting Fellowships

by RAPHAEL B. FOLSOM | University of Oklahoma | raphael.folsom@ou.edu

The phrase “embarrassment of riches” is one that comes readily to mind when thinking about the years I spent as a visiting fellow at Southern Methodist University’s Clements Center for Southwest Studies and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies (DRCLAS) at Harvard. The scholarly, cultural, bibliographical, and aesthetic resources available to fellows often seem, like the universe, to be incalculably vast and constantly expanding. There are other reasons the phrase seems apt. In some measure this is because of the embarrassment one feels at wanting to devote all of one’s time to the talks, films, debates, exhibitions, libraries, interesting people, conferences, hors d’oeuvres, and wine on offer, and to neglect the work one got the fellowship to do. There is a further touch of awkwardness in the sensation one often has, while walking in the groves of academic paradise, that all scholars should be so fortunate. Many, if not most, deserving professors do not get such opportunities for focused research. I suspect that many visiting fellows are a little uneasy with what they fear is their undeserved privilege. I certainly was. Here, nevertheless, are a few reflections on the topic of visiting fellowships.

The best thing about them is, indisputably, the time and space they allow you to do research. Over the course of my two fellowships, I completed work on a manuscript dealing with the Yaqui people under Spanish colonial rule that is now under contract with Yale University Press. Perhaps the key moment in that book’s life came at the Clements Center’s manuscript seminar. This seminar, which almost all Clements Fellows pass through, brings together all the visiting fellows, most of the Center’s affiliated faculty, and three outside readers who fly in from all over the country. All seminar participants read the

fellow’s book manuscript and then proceed, over the course of a three- to four-hour seminar, to tear it to shreds. For most fellows, I suspect the experience is as difficult to weather as it is salutary for the future book. I recently had lunch with a retired army general whose comments on the military brought the Clements seminar to mind. He told me that most raw recruits realize, after a their first few months in the army, that the harsh treatment they receive from their drill sergeants is in fact the expression of the highest kind of love there is. Severity in the training process translates into survival in combat. The critiques I received at the Clements Center seminar burned away much that was weak or worthless in my manuscript and made it a vastly better book. This exposure to peer review was also a key preparation for the rigors of the tenure process. I remain enormously grateful to the colleagues who organized and participated in that seminar, and I am happy to take this opportunity to thank them once again for putting the book on its present trajectory.

My book on the Yaquis, now entitled *Imperial Ironies*, was also enriched by a second visiting fellowship at DRCLAS. Harvard’s unparalleled libraries, and the conversations I had with Latin Americanists working in a broad variety of disciplines, further sharpened my thinking about Yaqui history. Those same resources made it possible for me to complete the research on a second book project on the Chichimeca War, a pivotal series of conflicts in sixteenth-century north Mexico. DRCLAS is among the largest Latin American studies centers in the world; while there I was able to interact with art historians, anthropologists, and ethnohistorians working on topics close to mine. Those conversations brought about a deep shift in the way I think about the Chichimeca War. I learned that some of the

most exciting scholarship now being done on New Spain deals with the visual culture of the colony. My own research has revealed that the Chichimeca War had a powerful impact on the ways race was represented in the paintings and pictorial codices of colonial Mexico. Analysis of the visual and cultural aftermath of the war now forms the manuscript’s analytical core. The development of this project at DRCLAS reminded me vividly of the changes one undergoes in the course of traveling abroad. Each university is a foreign country, with its own tastes, culture, practices, and taboos. As with travel abroad, the process of adapting to and adopting elements of that foreign culture helps one become a better thinker and better person. I know the book that comes out of my research at DRCLAS will be far better for having traveled and lived among the Harvardians.

Visiting fellowships are not without their pitfalls. There were two quotations I taped over my desk at DRCLAS that helped me avoid them. One is from a letter quoted in Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*, in which Johnson tries to remedy his biographer’s tendency to procrastinate: “The dissipation of thought, of which you complain, is nothing more than the vacillation of a mind suspended between different motives, and changing its direction as any motive gains or loses strength. If you can but kindle in your mind any strong desire, if you can but keep predominant any wish for some particular excellence or attainment, the gusts of imagination will break away.” The mind of the visiting fellow often finds itself in Boswell’s circumstance of being suspended between different motives. The conflicting desires to gorge on archives, to write, and to dabble in talks, films, and cocktail parties are ever present. The key to a fellow’s success is that Johnsonian faculty of kindling one’s desire for some

particular excellence. The ubiquity of excellence of all kinds to be found at Southern Methodist University and Harvard helps one keep that desire predominant in one's mind. The second quotation I kept handy came from the late Norman Cantor, a scholar who resembled Johnson in learning, wit, and impetuous crustiness: "The American academic world," he wrote, "is a strange place. There 95 percent of humanists cannot do first rate work because they do not have the time, leisure, facilities, or income. The other 5 percent get all the plum jam and often don't do their best work because they are not pressed hard enough." Pressing oneself hard, in the absence of a boss or department chair, is the daily challenge of the research fellow.

It is critical to remember that these fellowships cannot be successful without the support of one's home institution. I know of a colleague (not associated with any of the institutions mentioned in this essay) who, on informing her employer that she had received an prestigious yearlong fellowship, was told that she would only be allowed to leave for a single quarter. It was only after a great deal of pleading that she was allowed to leave for two quarters. This was a welcome extension, but the university's policy nonetheless truncated her research fellowship by almost three months and rendered it impossible for her to remain at the granting institution's excellent libraries for the summer. Another colleague (also not from any university mentioned here) told me that she returned from her sojourn as a research fellow to find that colleagues at her home institution no longer wanted anything to do with her. Some combination of jealousy and resentment made it impossible for them to respond generously to her good fortune. They were also unable to appreciate the contribution to the local intellectual

community that her fellowship helped her to make. Only institutions such as the University of Oklahoma, where I teach, that have a very strong commitment to research and an intellectually magnanimous faculty and administration can give their full support to scholars who win visiting fellowships. OU has been completely supportive of my research agenda, and I have received only the kindest treatment from my colleagues. In this, also, I am aware of being exceptionally fortunate.

In thinking about the impact of visiting fellowships on my career, home institution, and community, I've been struck by the importance of sharing the wealth. In the end, the visiting fellow's embarrassment of riches is really not for the fellow to enjoy alone. What is the best way of sharing it? Publication is one key way. The grant maker and the fellow's home institution have communicated in the most forceful terms that they value the fellow's intellectual passions, curiosity, and work. Publishing one's research is a fitting expression of thanks. One can also share the wealth with one's students in the classroom. Knowledge of how excellent scholarship is done and what is going on at the frontiers of one's field is something both undergraduates and graduate students are eager to hear about. A further effort I've made to share my experiences with my home institution has been to run a grant-writing workshop for graduate students in my department. Fellowships like those I've had at the Clements Center and DRCLAS have been an extraordinary boon to my career, and it has been a pleasure to guide OU graduate students through the arduous process of applying for research grants like these. Another way of sharing the intellectual riches is to maintain one's ties to the granting communities and to support them in whatever way one can. Perhaps the best

way to think of visiting fellowships is as the beginning of a long cycle of reciprocal support and exchange. Over time, fellows may be able to help others as they have been helped, and it is incumbent upon them to pass on the generosity they have received. ■

Argentina, los juicios y los derechos humanos

por GRATZIA VILLARROEL, *Associate Editor* | St. Norbert College | gratzia.villarroel@snc.edu
y ROBERTO GARGARELLA, *Associate Editor* | CONICET | roberto.gargarella@gmail.com

Hemos decidido dedicar una parte significativa de este nuevo número al análisis de la reapertura de los juicios por violaciones de derechos humanos en la Argentina. Ello, por varias razones: En primer lugar, se trata de un tema de importancia para todos los que están interesados en cuestiones de teoría democrática, y preocupados —en particular— por los modos en que una democracia debe lidiar con el pasado autoritario. ¿De qué forma una sociedad decente y responsable debe asumir y tratar las responsabilidades existentes en relación con las graves faltas que se han cometido durante el período de autoritarismo que procedió a la llegada de la democracia? La cuestión resulta relevante, también, para aquellos interesados en teoría del castigo, y preocupados por reflexionar sobre los modos en que una comunidad debe reprochar los graves crímenes cometidos por una parte de ella contra la otra. Más específicamente, entendemos que la reapertura de los juicios en la Argentina resulta muy iluminadora sobre la importancia vital de la movilización popular en la discusión de los asuntos públicos. En la Argentina, en efecto, dicha movilización, masiva e insistente, por parte de la sociedad civil, movimientos sociales y ONGs, confluó para obligar a un cambio radical en las políticas oficiales. Gracias a esta presión social, se pudo revertir una serie de decisiones tomadas por el poder público —tanto por las ramas políticas del gobierno, como por la rama judicial— que incluyeron, entre otras medidas, normas de perdón dictadas tanto por la propia dictadura (en forma de una ley de autoamnistía), como otras puestas en

marcha por las propias administraciones democráticas (las llamadas leyes de “punto final” y “obediencia debida”, durante el gobierno de Raúl Alfonsín; y el indulto dictado por el presidente Carlos Menem). Para examinar la cuestión a través de miradas y aproximaciones diversas, convocamos a especialistas de primera línea, dedicados al estudio de la justicia transicional, y enfocados en el caso de la Argentina: Par Engstrom, Sam Ferguson, Sévane Garibian y Ram Natarajan.

Judging Memory

by SAM FERGUSON | Yale University | samferguson3@gmail.com

For two decades, “memory, truth, and justice” was emblazoned on banners, spray-painted on miles of blank walls, shouted loudly at protest marches, and penned in countless editorials as the rallying cry to repeal two laws passed in the wake of Argentina’s democratic transition that had effectively provided amnesty for the perpetrators of the country’s so-called Dirty War. When the laws were finally repealed in 2003, 20 years after the return of democracy and 16 years after their passage, the rallying cry transformed from a political slogan into a theoretical justification for prosecution. Judgment, it was argued, was necessary not only to mete out punishment to those responsible for the forced disappearance of over nine thousand citizens during Argentina’s last military regime between 1976 and 1983, but to discover and disseminate the truth of what happened so as to instill a social memory of Argentina’s horrific past. “Can we achieve a real, integral, and effective regime of human rights in our country if we throw a cloak of forgetting over one of the worst violations that’s ever occurred in our country?” asked deputy Araceli Estela Méndez de Ferreyra during the congressional debate over repealing the amnesty laws, echoing a common sentiment.

The desire for memory and truth was not cast as an ancillary hope, in the sense that trials might uncover truth and instill memory while pursuing justice. Rather, the proponents of repealing Argentina’s amnesty conceived of memory and truth as equal objectives alongside justice. When Argentina’s Supreme Court upheld the congressional repeal of the amnesty laws in 2005 in the *Simón* decision, it held that the amnesty laws were “constitutionally intolerable” because they were “oriented toward ‘forgetting’ grave violations of human rights.”¹ So described, the antidote

to amnesty (to forgetting) is memory through trials.

This is a laudable ambition. Argentina—and the world—must remember the last dictatorship to prevent a return of the hell of state terrorism. Memory is also a valuable end because the dictatorship’s victims were anonymously discarded into the river or burned in mass graves; memory becomes a substitute for the ordinary rituals of mourning that have been denied to the family members of the military’s victims, a way of bringing the past into public life.

Nevertheless, memory is not ordinarily the object of a criminal trial, a fact that has caused significant tension in Argentina’s recent wave of prosecutions. An ordinary trial considers only the evidence that may prove or disprove the charges at issue. When memory is introduced as an object of the trial, the foundation of legal relevance is disturbed, as what is significant for memory may not be relevant to the charges at issue. In other words, if a normal trial asks what the defendant did, a memory trial asks the larger and harder question of why he did it and how it came to pass. Likewise, using trials to foster social memory changes the relationship between the court and the viewing public. Ordinarily, the public acts as a check on the judiciary. Public access to the courts is guaranteed by right to ensure that proceedings are conducted fairly. But when memory is the object of the trial, the public becomes an audience. The end of the trial is not just a verdict but a lesson (or, in case of disagreement about memory, a debate). A memory trial demands an audience so that someone may learn the lessons of the hearing.

For the past five years, I have closely followed Argentina’s human rights trials for an upcoming book. During 2009 and 2010, I attended most of the hearings of a criminal case against 18 officers from Argentina’s Naval Mechanics School (Escuela Superior de Mecánica de la Armada, ESMA), sometimes called the Auschwitz of the South. Every day, I saw this tension play out in the courtroom.

One notable example illustrates the point. In November 2010, Jorge Mario Bergoglio, now Pope Francis, was called to testify about two Jesuit priests who were disappeared in May 1976 when he was head of the Jesuit order in Argentina. The priests, Orlando Yorio and Francisco Jalics, were detained during a raid on the Bajo Flores slum and secretly taken to the ESMA. Both were hooded, shackled, and starved. Neither was allowed to properly relieve himself for some time, and each was forced to wear his soiled clothing for over a month. Yorio, the more political of the two, was drugged, interrogated, and threatened with electrocution. After five days, the two priests were transferred to a secret country home on the outskirts of Buenos Aires, and after five months, they were drugged and abandoned to their fate in an open field.

Activists were interested in Bergoglio’s testimony for two reasons. First, he had long been accused of failing to protect the two priests, and the activists saw his testimony as a chance to cross-examine him about the incident. Second, as the highest-ranking member of the Argentine Catholic Church at the time of his testimony, he served as a proxy for the church at large. Nevertheless, his testimony on the issues in dispute was completely irrelevant. In 1985, during the trial of the junta (one of two cases prosecuted in the 1980s before the amnesty laws were passed) the Federal

Criminal Appeals Court had already established that both Yorio and Jalics had been illegally detained in the ESMA, and the court had convicted Admiral Emilio Massera for their kidnapping. When Bergoglio was called to testify about their ordeal in 2010, only one defendant was charged in the incident, retired Admiral Oscar Montes. Montes, the former chief of naval operations on the Navy General Staff, was charged under a theory of command responsibility. To prove the case against Montes, the prosecution had to prove that Montes was in the chain of command and supervised the officers that kidnapped Yorio and Jalics. Montes argued that Admiral Massera, his superior, had circumvented the chain of command and that as a matter of fact he had no power over decisions at the ESMA. The fact that Yorio and Jalics were kidnapped and that they were held in the ESMA was not in dispute.

If Bergoglio had anything to say about Montes's command responsibility (the only legally relevant question regarding Yorio's and Jalics's detention) nobody asked. Instead, activists grilled Bergoglio for hours over his alleged involvement in the incident and the relationship between the military junta and the church hierarchy. "Did any member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy reach an agreement with the military junta that before a priest was detained the military would inform their ranking bishop?" human rights lawyer Luis Zamora asked, among other, similar questions. The judges gave Zamora and other lawyers ample room to pursue the line of questioning, clearly tolerating the more ambitious memory purposes of the hearing. Indeed, one of the judges found the topic worth engaging. "What was the church's and the Vatican's posture in front of the dictatorship?" Judge Germán Castelli asked

Bergoglio, as if the trial could and should answer such a question.

For the human rights lawyers, Bergoglio's answers served as a representation of the church at large. He admitted that he did not speak out and did not file judicial charges when he learned of Yorio's and Jalics's disappearances. But he insisted that he worked behind the scenes to save Yorio and Jalics by securing audiences with dictator Jorge Videla and Admiral Massera. At the end of the trial, Zamora said that it was not enough. "This trial has shown the accomplice role of the Catholic Church," Zamora argued during his summation. Judge Castelli disagreed. "It's completely false to say that Jorge Bergoglio ratted out [his] priests. . . . We analyzed it, we heard this version, we looked at the evidence, and we understand that his behavior has no legal ramification. . . . If not, we would have denounced him," Judge Castelli told *La Nacion* after Bergoglio was named Pope.

If Zamora's pronouncement was premature—how could he comment on an entire institution, when only a shred of evidence about the church had surfaced?—Castelli's answer reflected the depths to which memory has been superimposed upon justice and how the two were conflated. Bergoglio was not a defendant in the case; prosecutors and the instructional judge had never subpoenaed evidence to investigate Bergoglio's role in the incident, archives from the Jesuits and the Archdiocese of Buenos Aires had never been examined, and witnesses related to Bergoglio's role in the disappearances had not been interviewed.

The investigation of the church was just one example of memory and truth that filtered into the courtroom. The object of the trial was to show the ESMA in all its

destructive dimensions as much as it was to prove the individual charges in the case. Survivor testimony was sometimes repetitive, irrelevant, or redundant, but the stories of kidnapping, torture, sensory deprivation, isolation, terror, and humiliation served to illustrate the scope of the atrocity, and were a mechanism that reminded the public at large what had happened in Argentina not so long ago. Particularly shocking was the testimony of several dozen victims who were put through the ESMA's "process of recuperation," an inquisition-like experiment where prisoners could win their freedom if they renounced their political commitments and adopted more "normal" lives. Some women who had been guerrillas were encouraged to put on makeup and embrace their feminine side; military officers took some of the male prisoners out to soccer games and for drinks on the town, all in an effort to help them "recuperate" from being political subversives. Some human rights activists also saw the trial as an opportunity to defend the activism of the victims, sometimes turning the courtroom into a seat of political debate rather than legal inquiry. The trial was also in conversation with the perceived failures of the democratic transition. "We have to end the discourse of the repressor," human rights lawyer Rodolfo Yanzón said in his summation at the ESMA trial, arguing that public discourse during the transition had justified the military repression by framing the violence of the dictatorship as a war. Even the defense partook in the memory exercise. Defendant Ricardo Cavallo, for instance, wrote a 50,000-word treatise on the history of the guerrilla movements in Argentina for his final defense. It was odd from a legal perspective, as Cavallo had flatly denied the charges against him. But he saw a moral obligation to defend the conduct of the navy.

The bigger question is whether using the courts to promote memory is appropriate. Political philosopher Hannah Arendt famously argued in her critique of the trial of Nazi Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem that historical questions have no place in the courtroom, for the impulse to provoke memory and truth tends to suffocate those interested in the tedious business of sorting through the evidence against individual defendants. In other words, when the courtroom is used for historical projection to create a true record of the past, there is a strong impulse to instrumentalize the trial; an official history presumes only one conclusion, namely a guilty verdict for the defendants. To this I would add other concerns: What should be remembered? Whose memory? From which perspective? Are there false memories and perspectives? Should courts render judgment on the past? There are also practical concerns: when memory is placed at the center of trials, the judicial process becomes long and tedious.

Others, such as the legal scholar Mark Osiel, have defended using trials as a mechanism to provoke social memory. In his book *Mass Atrocity, Collective Memory, and the Law*, Osiel argues that so long as the proceedings respect procedural norms, trials as public spectacles can be useful in solidifying the rule of law by inculcating society with liberal-legal values. During periods of democratic transition, Osiel believes that “the need for public reckoning with the question of how such horrific events could have happened is more important to democratization than the criminal law’s more traditional objectives.”²

The debate between these two positions may never end, but we should be aware of the tension.

Endnotes

- ¹ Causa S.C. 1767; L. XXXVIII, “Recurso de hecho deducido por la defensa de Simón, Julio Héctor y otros s/ privación de la libertad, etc. — causa N. 17.768,” June 14, 2005, p. 120.
- ² Mark Osiel, *Mass Atrocity, Collective Memory, and the Law*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000), 3. ■

Courtrooms and Legacies of Violence

by RAM NATARAJAN | New York University | vn327@nyu.edu

In 2010 in the city of La Plata, Argentina, a trial of 14 members of Argentina's 1976–1983 military regime culminated in violence. Victims and activists from all over Argentina attended the verdict, and as was customary in this trial, proceedings took place in a large theater, with judges, attorneys, and defendants sitting on the stage; victims and their supporters sitting level with the stage in the orchestra seating; and defendants' family members and friends sitting separately and directly above everyone, in the second-floor balcony.

This use of space, designed to accommodate big crowds and give importance to the proceedings, contributed to the chaos that ensued after the judges' announcement of the verdict, in which the tribunal convicted all 14 defendants and labeled their actions as genocide. Following this pronouncement, one of the convicted operatives immediately sprang out of his seat and defied the conviction by flamboyantly waving his hands in the sign of victory. Straightaway, as the guards subdued and forced the operative offstage, the victims and activists seated in the orchestra turned on the balcony of defendants' supporters. Pumping their fists and shouting, the victims and activists likened the defendants' families and friends to Nazis and told them that they'd be found wherever they went. Many in the balcony screamed back, "Go look for the disappeareds' bones in the potter's field." A few men in the balcony began to punch members of the press who shared their space. Others threw objects into the orchestra. The judges and other attorneys and guards sat silently on stage through this, letting the hostilities rage on.

Across Argentina, trial proceedings prosecuting the repression carried out by the dismantled junta are as highly charged as this verdict in La Plata. Tensions

between the junta's collaborators and those the junta once persecuted flare into new hostilities within courtrooms. In this essay, based on three years of ongoing ethnographic research on Argentina's human rights violation cases, I draw attention to how the contentious, acrimonious situations that victims, court officials, and former operatives confront within courtrooms are part of Argentina's legal adjudication of crimes against humanity. It is the human context of the trials, the gritty interpersonal dimension of what transpires within trial chambers, that most concerns me here. I ask that we pause and consider how life within courtrooms in Argentina shows how subtly violent juridical efforts to overcome past violence can be.

Many former detainees, kin of the disappeared, and human rights activists took great interest in regularly attending trials. Some likened their attendance to an addiction; others described it as a political and social commitment. Within courtrooms, victims and other activists frequently confronted accused defendants with pictures of the disappeared, cursed the defendants, or jeered when the accused officers and civilians blew kisses to their loved ones. For many victims and kin of the disappeared, the hurt at being persecuted and battered for no real, tangible reason and the open wounds of not knowing what happened to the disappeared are ongoing and unresolvable, despite criminal prosecutions of the perpetrators.

Many of the accused former soldiers and civilians, meanwhile, seethed in the presence of those who leveled accusations against them. They continued to regard the people the junta once persecuted as the enemy. An officer charged with infiltrating groups and kidnapping mothers of

disappeared children accused the surviving mothers who came to court of profiting from their suffering. He did this when judges were engrossed in work, by pointing at the white handkerchiefs the mothers wore, and then laughing and rubbing his hands in the sign for dirty money. A different indicted officer caught sight of the woman who had accused him of rape and called her a fat bitch, before pointing her out to the other accused defendants, who fixedly stared at her and smirked.

Exchanges between those once persecuted and those accused of violations also occurred more passively, but no less adversely. Seeing abusers in court and hearing attorneys narrate what had happened to other victims was enough to unsettle those who had already suffered. Observing court officials handcuff the man who had abducted her, a woman, Carmen, who had been detained along with her daughter and had survived while her daughter did not, suddenly felt villainous. "I am the bad one now," she said. "In a movie the military officers would be the good guys. I would be the villain." Moments later, when a prosecutor began describing cases of rape, Carmen became anguished. "My daughter was pretty," Carmen said. "God only knows what they did to her."

Within courtrooms, many human rights activists and individuals once persecuted by the junta also became aggressors toward attorneys representing indicted soldiers and civilians. An estimated 70 percent of the 407 soldiers and civilians who have stood trial have received legal representation from state public defenders, attorneys in their thirties or forties who may or may not share their clients' beliefs but either accepted the assignments because they work for tribunals assigned human rights violation cases, or else volunteered and

were promised promotions and modest salary raises due to the unpalatable nature of the cases. Many victims and activists accepted the public defenders' work as indispensable—since achieving justice requires genuine defenses—and were consistently polite to these public defenders, at least until these state lawyers' defenses took the side of the accused. A public defender who used her closing argument to depict her army clients as victims, as people waging a justified war, was deliberately bumped up against in courtroom hallways by plaintiffs' attorneys, ostracized and rebuffed within the courthouse by victims and activists, and denounced in print and television interviews as a sympathizer to repression. The state public defenders' ministry ultimately fired this publicly vilified defense attorney from all future human rights violation cases, as both a reprimand and a way to protect her. The fact that many victims had been persecuted for their own beliefs and that many activists were sympathetic to those who have suffered intolerance didn't mean that victims and activists accepted and tolerated those who disagreed with them.

In all trials, hostilities coexisted with efforts to diminish tensions, whereby judges checked in on the well-being of audience members, defendants, and attorneys; judicial authorities created separate entrance and exit routes for defendants' supporters; and children of the disappeared staged celebrations outside courthouses on the days of verdicts. In these kindnesses and convivialities, the grind of proceedings gave way to reprieves—not only from the interpersonal tensions, but also from the toil of trials: sessions that began as early as 8 a.m. and ended as late as 11 p.m.; depositions from victims that left even judges and defense attorneys in tears; and the closing arguments, fuguelike and lasting

months, in which state prosecutors and distinct teams of private attorneys took turns one after the other and reiterated descriptions of each incident of human rights violations anew, often illustrating their presentations with pictures of the cracked walls of torture centers or pictures of the disappeared, so that judges and defendants could know and feel, as approximately as they could, what it is to be a victim.

Trials of human rights violations have thus far produced hundreds of convictions and a handful of acquittals. They have generated an archive, the case report of each tribunal, accessible online. They have also created an industry of new occupations: prosecutors specializing in human rights violations, psychologists who counsel victims who testify and accompany them to the stand, camera operators who videotape daily sessions. Day after day, the weight of trial sessions accumulates in the bodies of the judges, attorneys, audience members, and defendants, making the courtroom itself an arena of a conflict that has yet to be extinguished. For me, attending criminal proceedings all over Argentina and sitting in on sessions in the public galleries has been an experience of seeing how much anguish and anger the junta has left in its wake. Many courtroom cases, in attempting to overcome past violence, have been deeply and profoundly violent, often excruciating to those who attend and participate in them. Attending trials thus produced in me a new commitment to the idea of *nunca más*, no more repressive regimes. To spare human beings the distress of living through trials of human rights violations as highly charged as Argentina's is a reason to work to prevent future repression.

I gratefully acknowledge Bob, Maud, and Ruth Cox and Tex and Jeanie Harris,

Yasmin Moll, Amy Lasater-Wille, Adrienne Klein, Annie Claus, Jessica Hardin, and Sally Merry and Bambi Schieffelin for wise counsel on various drafts, and the Wenner Gren Foundation, Andrew Mellon Foundation/Social Sciences Research Council, and National Science Foundation for funding my research. ■

La Argentina: Un laboratorio extra-ordinario

por SÉVANE GARIBIAN | Universidades de Ginebra y de Neuchâtel | Sevane.Garibian@unige.ch

La Argentina, antigua tierra de acogida de numerosos criminales de guerra nazis, deshecho por su propio pasado dictatorial que ocasionó al menos 30.000 desaparecidos, tiene la singularidad de experimentar, inmediatamente después de la dictadura militar, la casi totalidad de los mecanismos jurídicos conocidos en el tratamiento de violaciones masivas de los derechos humanos. En este sentido, la Argentina es un extra-ordinario laboratorio en materia de lucha contra la impunidad y de restauración de la verdad, que da para pensar tanto el papel de la justicia penal retributiva (proceso penal clásico) y de la justicia penal restaurativa (“juicios por la verdad”) en un contexto post-dictatorial, como su(s) relaciones(s).

La reapertura de los procesos penales

Apenas accedido a la presidencia tras elecciones libres luego de siete años de dictadura (1976–1983), Raúl Alfonsín, iniciador de la transición democrática, instituye la CONADEP (o “Comisión Sábato”) encargada de investigar sobre las desapariciones forzadas perpetradas por el régimen militar. El mismo año, el Congreso anula la ley de auto-amnistía previamente promulgada bajo el gobierno del general Bignone en nombre de la pacificación del país y de la reconciliación social² (anulación cuya validez constitucional la Corte Suprema confirmará ulteriormente);³ y el presidente Alfonsín autoriza los procesos penales contra los generales de las tres primeras juntas militares.⁴ En 1985, la CONADEP publica su célebre informe Nunca Más, ofreciendo un primer panorama de los crímenes de la dictadura.⁵ El 22 de abril de 1985 comienza en Buenos Aires el juicio histórico a las juntas, a fin de juzgar a los principales actores de la dictadura (pronunciación del veredicto el 9 de diciembre de 1985). En 1986 y 1987,

frente a las presiones de los militares y los sublevamientos de las fuerzas armadas, Alfonsín promulga dos leyes de amnistía,⁶ siendo la constitucionalidad de la segunda rápidamente confirmada en un fallo muy controvertido de la Corte Suprema.⁷ A partir de diciembre de 1990, el nuevo presidente Menem firma los primeros decretos de gracia y otorga el indulto a todos los condenados de 1985.

Hoy, la Argentina asiste a la reapertura de los procesos penales tras la revolución jurídica que constituyen la anulación de las leyes de amnistía de 1986–1987 por el Congreso, en 2003,⁸ y la declaración de su inconstitucionalidad por la Corte Suprema en el célebre caso Simón de 2005:⁹ según la Corte, las leyes de Punto Final (1986) y de Obediencia Debida (1987) chocan frontalmente con el derecho internacional, pues como toda amnistía se orientan “al olvido” de graves violaciones a los derechos humanos. La Corte confirma a la vez su incompatibilidad con el orden jurídico internacional, y la validez de la ley 25.779 de 2003 por la cual el Congreso de la Nación declaró insanablemente nulas las leyes en cuestión.

En realidad, es en gran parte sobre la base de la sentencia Barrios Altos de la Corte de San José que se funda, en 2005, la decisión de la Corte Suprema de la Argentina en el caso Simón.¹⁰ Los votos de la mayoría de los jueces supremos argentinos, conforme a la jurisprudencia de la Corte Interamericana, traducen la aceptación de un lazo indisoluble entre búsqueda de la verdad y sanción penal de los criminales, en el centro de las obligaciones estatales en materia de violaciones graves de los derechos humanos. La idea principal es, por un lado, el carácter complementario —y necesario— de las dos misiones del Estado (investigar/sancionar) como componentes del derecho a la justicia y, por

el otro, el carácter inconciliable de esta doble misión con la existencia de leyes de amnistía. Es una gran novedad: olvido ficticio del Estado por vía de amnistía y misión de justicia son declarados fundamentalmente incompatibles.

La herencia de los “juicios por la verdad”

Es importante recordar que, entre la adopción de las leyes de amnistía de 1986–1987 y su reciente anulación, se vio en la Argentina la aparición de una acción judicial alternativa y única en el mundo: el juicio por la verdad, verdadera práctica sui generis construida en reacción al bloqueo de los procesos penales hasta 2003 y a la política de olvido de los años 90. En respuesta de la confesión pública del ex capitán Adolfo Scilingo de sus crímenes cometidos durante la dictadura y su participación en los “vuelos de la muerte”,¹¹ se inician en 1995 los dos primeros casos que dan origen a los juicios por la verdad, ante la Cámara en lo Criminal y Correccional Federal de Buenos Aires (casos Mónica Mignone y Alejandra Lapacó). El objetivo principal es el de esquivar el bloqueo judicial operado por las leyes de amnistía; más exactamente, proponer una conciliación entre dos exigencias a priori inconciliables: por un lado, el respeto de las amnistías previstas por leyes adoptadas por un Estado democrático en el marco de sus prerrogativas soberanas, y cuya validez fue en esta época confirmada por la Corte Suprema; por el otro, el respeto del derecho al juez, garante de la misión de justicia.

La estrategia de conciliación adoptada consiste en fundar la demanda sobre un nuevo derecho subjetivo, el derecho a la verdad —apenas emergente de la jurisprudencia de la Corte de San José,¹² indefinido y ausente del derecho argentino.

A este fin los demandantes remiten al derecho internacional de los derechos humanos, cuyos principales instrumentos forman parte del bloque de constitucionalidad desde la reforma de 1994 (artículo 75.22 de la Constitución). La justificación de esta tarea consiste en decir que el derecho a la verdad permitiría conciliar amnistía y acceso al juez penal, dado que el mismo se sitúa en el centro de un proceso judicial cuyo objeto es diferente al del juicio penal clásico. La función del juez penal, en el marco de los denominados juicios por la verdad, no sería la de juzgar a los responsables de los crímenes, sino averiguar la verdad, no como antecedente necesario de la pena, sino como un objeto en sí: aunque no le competa establecer la verdad histórica, el juez podría sin embargo participar de su “esclarecimiento”, que toma una dimensión particular en estos juicios exclusivamente destinados a la aclaración, a la autenticación y a la designación de lo que tuvo lugar más allá de la dialéctica binaria culpable/no culpable.

Después de múltiples pasos hacia delante y hacia atrás —incluso una sentencia desfavorable de la Corte Suprema¹³ y una denuncia ante la Comisión Interamericana— se logra un acuerdo de solución amistosa (firmado el 15 de noviembre de 1999), a partir del cual el Gobierno argentino “acepta y garantiza el derecho a la verdad que consiste en el agotamiento de todos los medios para alcanzar el esclarecimiento acerca de lo sucedido con las personas desaparecidas”. El acuerdo precisa que “es una obligación de medios, no de resultados, que se mantiene en tanto no se alcancen los resultados, en forma imprescriptible”.¹⁴ Este acontecimiento permitirá la sistematización de los juicios por la verdad en Argentina, en particular ante la Cámara Federal de La Plata, donde, desde entonces,

más de 2.000 desapariciones son objeto de audiencias públicas todos los miércoles.¹⁵

Poco después del acuerdo concluido en 1999, y paralelamente al desarrollo de la jurisprudencia argentina en la materia, la Corte de San José, a su turno, reconoce por primera vez expresamente el derecho a la verdad en el caso *Bámaca Velásquez* (2000),¹⁶ pero sin admitir su carácter autónomo: según los jueces interamericanos, se trata de un derecho “subsumido” del derecho a la justicia (o sea de las garantías judiciales y de la protección judicial en el sentido de los artículos 8 y 25 de la Convención Interamericana). La Corte de San José confirmara su posición en la sentencia *Barrios Altos* citada (2001): el derecho a la verdad es definido como el pre-requisito indispensable que condiciona el acceso efectivo a la justicia para las víctimas y/o sus familiares —indispensable, pero no suficiente en tanto tal por la realización de las garantías judiciales de las que no es más que un componente.

En la nueva configuración argentina desde el caso *Simón* de 2005, la garantía del derecho a la verdad se vuelve una especie de antecámara de la acción penal clásica, posible de ahora en más. De hecho, la anulación de las leyes de 1986–1987 y la reapertura oficial de las causas penales no clausuran, sin embargo, los juicios por la verdad. Esta práctica judicial híbrida —entre Comisión de verdad (reparación simbólica) y juicio penal (retribución)— no sólo prosigue en La Plata paralelamente a los procesos penales nacionales, sino que además ofrece material de investigación e importantes testimonios, o sea un trabajo de reconstrucción de los hechos utilizado para la preparación de los juicios penales.

Se plantean entonces dos cuestiones. Primero, sobre el plano nacional, ¿cuáles son los contornos y los límites exactos de la

colaboración y del “diálogo entre jueces” que parecen nacer, en estos últimos años, de la coexistencia, única en su género, entre juicios por la verdad y juicios penales —en particular desde el punto de vista del respeto de los derechos de los acusados? Luego, sobre el plano internacional, uno puede preguntarse si el lazo establecido por la Corte de San José entre el derecho a la verdad y el derecho a la justicia es inmutable, considerando la consagración convencional del derecho a la verdad como derecho subjetivo autónomo en la Convención Internacional para la protección de todas las personas contra las desapariciones forzadas del 20 de diciembre de 2006.

Notas

- ¹ Creada por decreto 187 del 15 de diciembre de 1983.
- ² Ley de facto 22.924 del 23 de marzo de 1983. La ley que anula esta auto-amnistía, es la ley 23.040 del 22 de diciembre de 1983.
- ³ Fallos 309:1689 del 30 de diciembre de 1986, “Causa originariamente instruida por el Consejo Supremo de las Fuerzas Armadas en cumplimiento del decreto 158/1983 del Poder Ejecutivo Nacional”.
- ⁴ Por decreto 158/83 del 13 de diciembre de 1983.
- ⁵ CONADEP, *Informe de la Comisión Nacional sobre la Desaparición de Personas (Nunca Más)* (1985; Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 8e ed. 2006).
- ⁶ Respectivamente: ley 23.492 de Punto Final y ley 23.521 de Obediencia Debida.
- ⁷ Fallos 310:1162 del 22 de junio de 1987, “Camps, Ramón Juan Alberto y otros”.
- ⁸ Por ley 25.779 promulgada el 2 de septiembre de 2003.
- ⁹ Fallos 328:2056 del 14 de junio de 2005, “Simón, Julio Héctor y otros”.

- ¹⁰ Caso Barrios Altos vs. Perú. Fondo. Sentencia del 14 de marzo de 2001. Serie C No. 75.
- ¹¹ Horacio Verbitsky, *El vuelo* (Buenos Aires: Planeta, 1995).
- ¹² Caso Velásquez Rodríguez vs. Honduras. Fondo. Sentencia del 29 de julio de 1988. Serie C No. 4.
- ¹³ Fallos 321:2031 del 13 de agosto de 1998, “Suárez Mason, Carlos Guillermo”.
- ¹⁴ Informe no. 21/00 de la Comisión Interamericana caso 12.059, 29 de febrero de 2000.
- ¹⁵ Véase el sitio internet de l’Asamblea Permanente por los Derechos Humanos de La Plata: <http://apdhlaplata.org.ar/v1/category/juicio-por-la-verdad>.
- ¹⁶ Caso Bámaca Velásquez vs. Guatemala. Fondo. Sentencia del 25 de noviembre de 2000. Serie C No. 70.

Referencias

Abregú, Martín

- 1996 “La tutela judicial del derecho a la verdad en la Argentina”. *Revista IIDH* 24: 11–47.
- 1998 “Derecho a la verdad vs impunidad”. *Revista IIDH* 27: 117–119.

Bakker, Christine A. E.

- 2005 “A Full Stop to Amnesty in Argentina: The Simón Case”. *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 3 (5): 1106–1120.

Elias, J. S.

- 2006 “‘Simón’ O de cómo las buenas intenciones pueden socavar el Estado de Derecho”. *Jurisprudencia de la Corte Suprema de Justicia de la Nación*, Suplemento 2006–III, Fascículo n° 13, Sección Jurisprudencia Anotada, pp. 37–72.

Garibian, Sévane

- 2012 “Derecho a la verdad. El caso argentino”. En *Justicia de transición: El caso de España*, compilado por Santiago Ripol Carulla y C. Villán Durán, 51–63. *Resultats de Recerca* 02/2012 (Barcelona: Institut Català Internacional per la Pau) (accesible online: www.gencat.cat/icip).
- 2012 “El recurso al derecho internacional para la represión de los crímenes del pasado. Una mirada cruzada sobre los casos Touvier (Francia) y Simón (Argentina)”. *Revista Jurídica de la Universidad de Palermo* 13 (1): 53–74.

Méndez, Juan E.

- 2006 “The Human Right to Truth: Lessons Learned from Latin America Experiences with Truth Telling”. En *Telling the Truth: Truth Telling and Peace Building in Post-conflict Societies*, editado por Tristan Anne Borer, 115–151 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press). ■

Addressing the Past, Avoiding the Present, Ignoring the Future? Ongoing Human Rights Trials in Argentina

by PAR ENGSTROM | UCL Institute of the Americas | p.engstrom@ucl.ac.uk

The recent death of the former *de facto* president of Argentina, General Jorge Videla, highlights the long journey traveled since the country's period of state repression. The 87-year-old army general died in a common prison, convicted of multiple crimes against humanity. The former military strongman will be buried—discredited and repudiated—according to legislation passed in 2009 that prohibits funeral honors for members of the armed forces who have been involved in human rights violations. Fittingly, perhaps, the legislation was passed under the leadership of the civilian minister of defense at the time, Nilda Garré, herself a former target of the military regime that Videla once led.

Yet, the inglorious passing of the former leader of the Argentine military junta also demonstrates that his compatriots' efforts at truth and justice have been far from linear. Videla was initially convicted together with the other members of the military junta in 1985 for multiple heinous crimes but was pardoned five years later by then president Carlos Menem. In 1998, however, Videla was again convicted and returned to prison for his role in the military regime's systematic abduction of children of the disappeared, only to be moved to house arrest shortly thereafter. It was not until 2006 that then president Néstor Kirchner ordered the old general transferred to a military base; this was followed by a series of convictions in separate trials that eventually led Videla to serve out his life sentences in the civilian prison where he died.

As Gabriel Pereira and I have argued elsewhere, Argentina has gone through an ebb and flow process in which the initial opening to judicial accountability following the transition to democracy was gradually restricted and eventually foreclosed. However, due to gradual shifts in the

balance of power and the motivations of ruling governments, the military, and human rights organizations, together with broader shifts in the global accountability regime, unrestricted prosecution reopened nearly 20 years after the beginning of the transition to democracy.

Since the reopening of the trials for violations committed during the military regime, significant prosecutorial momentum has developed. Although figures vary, around one thousand individuals are currently indicted (*procesados*), and over four hundred have been convicted (though given the Argentine legal system, the number of individuals with confirmed sentences is considerably lower). The sheer scale and scope of the ongoing trials testify to the drama of Argentina's protracted political and legal struggles over transitional justice. And yet, even the passing of such a discredited figure as Videla does not dispel the very significant shadows inherent in Argentina's most recent approach to its past and the implications for contemporary concerns over both human rights and political accountability. Three sets of issues need highlighting.

First, there are the inherent challenges of the trials themselves. In its recently published annual report, the Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS), one of the key Argentine human rights organizations driving the trials forward, laments the many administrative and procedural delays and shortcomings of the ongoing trial proceedings. Progress has been slow, adding to the frustrations of some that justice delayed is justice denied. Significant judicial and administrative resources have been devoted, but the refusal of many of the indicted (including Videla) to accept the legitimacy of the trials and cooperate by providing information on

the fates of the disappeared has hampered the proceedings.

Moreover, there is the challenge inherent in the overwhelming emphasis on judicial processes in transitional justice and the legitimacy of legal approaches more generally. For many in Argentina, particularly in the period immediately following the transition to democracy, there was a strong consequentialist rationale for criminal prosecution of past atrocities as a way to reassert the legitimacy of the state, to strengthen the rule of law, and to promote political democratization. Yet as the followers of Carlos Nino have pointed out, the legitimacy of judicial procedures and the law more generally is based on their degree of inclusiveness and the quality of public deliberation. While there have been robust safeguards in place to protect defendants' due process rights, the criminal prosecutions have not led to any discernible increase in the quality of public debate concerning Argentina's past, and the effects of the trials on human rights accountability more generally are far from clear.

There are also concerns related to the retributive rationale that underpins the trials. Here, Argentina is not an isolated island. The principle of individual criminal accountability has become deeply embedded in global transitional justice policy and practice. This is in contrast to the more collective notions of accountability—political or regime accountability—that shaped debates on transitional justice in the early transitional period. The enmeshment between international criminal law and justice has, in other words, both criminalized and individualized accountability debates in transitional justice. The significant limitations of retributivist approaches to criminal justice, especially in response to large-scale organized political violence, are

rarely acknowledged in Argentina. Simply given the vast number of cases in such contexts, attempts to establish individual criminal responsibility tend ultimately to be unsatisfactory. To focus on a handful of cases may invite accusations of selectivity and further contribute to the politicization of the judicial system. To pursue maximalist prosecutorial strategies may cause an already slow and inefficient judiciary to grind to a halt, undermining the rule of law.

True, the trials in Argentina indicate gradual yet significant changes in judicial thinking with regard to international human rights law and the jurisprudence of the inter-American human rights system in particular. Like judiciaries elsewhere, the Argentine judiciary is attuned to and generally accommodates political shifts. The law, however, and the interests and normative preferences of its practitioners, cannot be simply reduced to politics. Yet, influences external to the judiciary—including the Kirchner governments and human rights organizations—are clearly important when accounting for these judicial changes. And while successive Argentine governments have acknowledged special international obligations that limit the scope of political discretion and the autonomy of domestic laws in human rights matters, the Cristina Fernández de Kirchner government appeared to signal a reversal recently by failing to support the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights against retrograde attempts to restructure the regional human rights body.

Second, the trials raise questions concerning the depth of political democratization in Argentina. As is widely documented, the pursuit of accountability for past human rights violations in Argentina continues to coexist with very persistent impunity for other types of

human rights violations. In light of problems ranging from rampant police violence to enduring discrimination against indigenous communities, the morally compelling question should be: how can the continuing pursuit of accountability for crimes committed 30 years ago shape and contribute to the transformation of the very structures that gave rise to the violations in the first place? To be fair, little is understood about the transformative potential of transitional justice. For researchers, there are inherent difficulties in measuring accountability developments because of the variety of measures used, and difficulties in assessing what the actual impacts are on broader measures of democracy and human rights. But even on the conceptual level, there is still a significant gap between the terms of accountability debates in the transitional justice literature, on the one hand, and in the democratization literature on various forms of political accountability, on the other.

Activists' contributions to broader human rights issues, beyond the sometimes narrow confines of truth and justice concerning past atrocities under the military regime, have been, with some notable exceptions, limited. Fairly few Argentine human rights organizations have been able to make the transition to human rights advocacy in a deeply unequal and problematic but still democratic society. The intimate association in the minds of significant sectors of the population between human rights and abuses by military regimes has limited the advocacy agenda to abuses of the past, although for many sectors of society the widespread abuses of the present constitute a more pressing concern. The association of the vocabulary of human rights with military abuses of the past has made it difficult to mobilize the

human rights discourse around pressing contemporary challenges.

This matters, because the politics of human rights accountability in Argentina has tended to revolve around more narrow concerns about accountability for historically defined past abuses, rather than around broader accountability in Argentina's inevitably—and not uniquely—flawed democracy. This matters as well because the pursuit of accountability does not necessarily lead to improvements in democracy and human rights. Clearly, the trials matter for the many victims of abuses. But what is their broader impact, and how can broader public support be generated, when they have become viewed, in some quarters, as a set of special interests, or, perhaps even worse, with indifference? There are also considerable accountability deficits in Argentina that are quite unrelated to the extent to which accountability for past human rights crimes are achieved. Yes, accountability for its past is vital for any society, but so is present accountability.

This leads me to the final and concluding cluster of concerns that, in some ways, underpin much of this discussion: contemporary Argentine politics, which has become centered on heated debates around the character of *Kirchnerismo*. Since the election of Néstor Kirchner in 2003, the question of accountability for past human rights abuses has been given a prominent position on the government agenda. Together with the significant weakening of the military as a political actor, the support of successive Kirchner governments has been crucial in precipitating the most recent shift in Argentina's path to accountability. True, without the persistence and creativity of Argentina's highly mobilized human rights organizations, these developments would have been unlikely. At the same

time, although civil society initiatives are clearly important, they cannot replace state action. In the aftermath of mass atrocity, public institutions have a responsibility to ensure reparations, compensation, and restitution to victims. These are responsibilities and functions—both material and symbolic—that state institutions are uniquely placed to fulfil in order to foster a continuing state policy with broad support across political divides.

However, arguably there is now a real risk that the politicization of human rights discourse and practice in Argentina is reaching a tipping point. For some time it has been pointed out that the Kirchner government's focus on the crimes of the past has allowed it to avoid dealing with current human rights problems. Moreover, the strong political association between the Madres de Plaza de Mayo and Kirchnerismo may have been mutually beneficial, in addition to its instrumental role in advancing the trials. But with the moral leadership of the Madres in doubt as a consequence of the controversies surrounding the Schoklender corruption case, and the Cristina Fernández government facing increasingly vocal accusations of corruption, their respective political opponents have gained leverage in their attempts to portray the trials as a partisan attempt at "victors' justice." Indeed, supporters of the military regime have sought to appropriate the language of accountability, with the government as their target, to oppose the trials, and perpetrators have sought to portray themselves as victims of government persecution.

This political manipulation of the trials may have been inevitable. Thirty years have passed since Argentina returned to democratic rule, but a basic consensus on transitional justice remains elusive. A

contentious coexistence, to borrow Leigh Payne's phrase, of opposing and competing views about the past may indeed be what can be reasonably wished for. Moreover, delayed justice offers no magic solution to deep-seated problems of impunity. However, there is a pressing and quite urgent need in Argentina—and elsewhere—to connect the past with the present as a way of imagining the future. This, I hope, is not merely a rather nice turn of phrase but a way to prevent a focus on past crimes from pushing concerns regarding the present and future consequences of the pursuit of accountability to the margins of debates. It is not about an either/or approach, as indeed, the past and present are inexorably linked. But addressing the past at the expense of the present and the future tends to be politically expedient for an incumbent government. Invariably, this comes at a heavy price for society as a whole. ■

Chicago! Chicago! Looking Ahead to LASA2014

by RAÚL MADRID | University of Texas at Austin | rmadrid@austin.utexas.edu
and FLORENCIA GARRAMUÑO | Universidad de San Andrés | florg@udesa.edu.ar

LASA in 2014 will return to the city that Carl Sandburg described a century earlier in a famous poem as “Stormy, husky, brawling.” “City of the big shoulders,” the name that Sandburg gave to this blue-collar, industrial, and agricultural hub, came to seem appropriate given the reputation the city acquired for tough gangsters (Al Capone) and even tougher sport teams (Da Bears). Chicago’s toughness was exemplified by Sean Connery’s line in the gangster film *The Untouchables*: “If they put one of ours in the hospital, we put ten of theirs in the morgue—that’s how it’s done in Chicago” (or as a Chilean might put it: “*a chanchada: chanchada y media*”). Over time, however, Chicago acquired other reputations and nicknames as city leaders worked to clean up the city’s image. Some dubbed it the Jewel of the Midwest or Paris on the Prairie for its classical architecture, wide boulevards, and beautiful parks. Others called it the Windy City, the Big Onion, or “that toddlin’ town.” Former mayor Richard J. Daley dubbed Chicago “the City that Works” to celebrate its legendary efficiency, which was, not coincidentally, overseen by his political machine.

Latin America has witnessed similar struggles over how to characterize the region and interpret its past. These struggles will be the subject of inquiry at LASA2014, the theme of which is “Democracy and Memory.” More than 30 years after the return to democracy, it is time to examine Latin America as a site of cultural, political, and social debate over memories of dictatorship and democracy.

Since the return to democracy in the region, Latin American countries have struggled to deal with the legacies of authoritarian rule. The authoritarian regimes that ruled the region until the 1980s committed widespread human rights violations and repressed civil and political liberties. They also created a variety of laws and political

institutions designed to prevent future governments from holding them accountable.

Some individuals and countries have pushed to bury this past or have tried to defend it, while others have sought to learn from it and to make amends. Some have sought to preserve the inherited laws and institutions, while others have sought to reform or dismantle them. Central to these disputes are conflicting memories of the past. The different sides have disagreed fundamentally about who did what to whom as well as why they did it. Democracies in Latin America thus have been concerned not just with looking forward, but also with looking back.

LASA2014 will explore these issues in depth. We will ask how memories have been shaped and interpreted and how these memories have molded the institutions and policies that countries have adopted since the return to democracy. We will examine how experiences with violence and contemporary conflicts are dealt with. We will probe how these experiences and memories have shaped public opinion and political commitments, and how these opinions and commitments have been reflected in public policies. We will explore how collective memories have endured and been passed onto younger generations that have no personal experience of authoritarian rule. We will analyze how individuals and institutions, from writers and artists to museums and schools, have sought to represent and commemorate the past. Finally, we will discuss how current and future generations can learn from the past and encourage open and sustained discussion about it.

LASA2014 will hold a variety of panels, events, and workshops dealing with these themes and, as program co-chairs, we welcome all suggestions about this or other aspects of the conference program. Of

course, LASA2014 will also examine a fantastic variety of other topics. Indeed, it is the broad diversity of the panels, events, and workshops offered at LASA that make it the truly great conference that it is.

Track chairs have already been chosen for LASA2014; we thank all you who agreed to serve in this position. The track chairs will have the difficult task of sorting through and ranking hundreds of papers and panel proposals. We selected our track chairs with an eye toward achieving a diversity of views, approaches, and backgrounds, and together we will work to ensure that this diversity is reflected in the papers and panels.

As in past years, we encourage LASA members to submit panel proposals, rather than individual paper proposals, whenever possible. Panel proposals will have a better chance of being accepted, and the panels that are organized by our members tend to have greater coherence than the panels we assemble from individual paper proposals.

Proposals for LASA2014 are due September 3, 2013. Proposal forms and instructions can be found on the LASA website. See the “Call for Papers” in this issue of the *LASA Forum* for further information and a list of the program tracks and track chairs.

LASA2014 will be held from May 21 to 24, 2014, in the historic Palmer House Hilton in Chicago. The Palmer House, also the site of LASA1998, was built in 1873 and is located blocks from Chicago’s Magnificent Mile shopping district, the theater district, and Millennium Park. Chicago is well known for its terrific museums, parks, restaurants, and nightclubs, many of which are also in walking distance of the conference hotel. Please join us in May 2014 in the City of the Big Shoulders! ■

Call for Papers

Democracy & Memory

September 11, 2013, marks the fortieth anniversary of the violent coup that toppled a long-existing democratic regime in Chile. This country was not alone in experiencing repressive military rule. Indeed, during the 1960s and 1970s, democracies in Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil were replaced by military governments. Moreover, during the same period, and extending to the 1990s, authoritarian regimes held power in numerous other countries—Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Panama, Peru, and Paraguay among them.

Many of these authoritarian regimes made systematic use of violence, repression, disappearances, and fear to suppress resistance, protest, and human rights. They targeted enemies of the state broadly and used exile, torture, and executions as instruments of state power. Resistance to state repression was also widespread.

Beginning in the 1980s, democratic processes of government were reestablished throughout Latin America and new constitutions were written and introduced against a backdrop of public memories of past political experiences of repression and injustice, many of them constructed under years of authoritarian rule. Sufficient time has now passed for scholars to assess the longer term consequences of collective memory and institutional development and to reflect on a number of major questions:

- Does this past, shaped by collective memories that are themselves constructed of narratives, shared experiences, and interpretations of everyday life, as well as of violence, repression, and resistance, affect how new institutions are discussed, devised, and developed?
- Does the collective experience of violence and oppression contribute significantly to collective commitment to “new rules of the game” that are expected to result in widespread political participation, peaceful conflict resolution, and the generation of consensus about broad lines of public policy?
- What are the enduring tensions and conflicts that result from collective memories of political pasts?
- How have conflicting views of the past shaped public recognition of historical events through art, museums, public spaces, and school curricula?
- How do collective memories survive and how are they transmitted across generations?
- What is the obligation of current and future generations to honor past struggles and to engage in conflicts and discussions about differing interpretations of the past?

Merilee Grindle
Harvard University
LASA PRESIDENT

Raúl Madrid
University of Texas/Austin
PROGRAM CO-CHAIR

Florencia Garramuño
Universidad de San Andrés
PROGRAM CO-CHAIR

You are invited to submit a paper or panel proposal addressing either the Congress theme or any topics related to the program tracks. LASA also invites requests for travel grants from proposers residing in Latin America or the Caribbean as well as from students. Visit the LASA website for eligibility criteria. All proposals for papers, panels, and travel grants must be submitted electronically to the LASA Secretariat via the online proposal system by **September 3, 2013**.

The deadline to submit proposals is September 3, 2013.

Proposal forms and instructions will be available on the LASA website: <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu>.

No submissions by regular mail will be accepted. The Secretariat will send confirmation of the receipt of the proposal via e-mail.

All participants will be required to pre-register for the Congress.

PROGRAM TRACKS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Select the most appropriate track for your proposal from the following list and enter it in the designated place on the form. Names of Program Committee members are provided for information only. Direct your correspondence to the LASA Secretariat ONLY.

Afro-Latin/Indigenous Peoples

Tony Lucero, U Washington (Jackson School)
Maria Elena Garcia, U Washington

Agrarian and Rural Life

Kristen Andersson, U Colorado, Boulder
Anthony Bebbington, Clark University

Biodiversity, Nat. Res., Environment

Denise Humphries, Clark University

Children, Youth, and Cultures

Donna DeCesare, UT-Austin

Cities, Planning, and Social Services

Sergio Montero, UC Berkeley

Citizenship, Rights, and Justice

Rodrigo Nunes, St. Edwards U

Civil Society and Social Movements

Amy Risley, Rhodes College
Sybil Rhodes, Universidad del CEMA

Culture, Power, and Political Subjectivities

Fermin Rodríguez, CONICET
Gabriel Giorgi, NYU

Defense, Violence, and (In)security

Guillermo Trejo, Notre Dame
Harold Trinkunas, Naval Postgraduate School

Democratization

Katsuo Nishikawa, Trinity U
Eduardo Dargent, UCP (Lima)

Economics and Development

Juan Camilo Cárdenas, Uniandes, Colombia
Juan Carlos Moreno Brid, ECLAC, Mexico

Education, Pedagogy, Educational Policy

Jason Beech, Universidad de San Andrés
Marcelo Caruso, Humboldt U

Film Studies

Gonzalo Aguilar, UBA
Ivana Bentes, UFRJ

Gender Studies

Christina Ewig, U Wisconsin
Mercedes Prieto, FLACSO-Ecuador

Health, Medicine, and Body Politics

Kate Centellas, U Mississippi

History and Historiographies/Historical Processes

Brian Owensby, U Virginia

Human Rights and Memories

Marcos Novaro, UBA

International Relations

Gregory Weeks, U North Carolina-Charlotte

Labor Relations and Class Relations

Viviana Patroni, York U

Latino(as) in the United States and Canada

Alejandra Vazquez, Princeton
Lázaro Lima, U Richmond

Law, Jurisprudence and Society

Jeffrey Staton, Emory U

Literary Studies: Colonial and 19th Century

Agnes Lugo Ortiz, U Chicago
Pablo Ansolabehere, Universidad de San Andrés

Literary Studies: Contemporary

Hector Hoyos, Stanford
Karl Posso, Manchester

Literature and Culture: Interdisciplinary Approaches

Juan Carlos Quintero Herencia, U Maryland
Italo Moriconi, UFRJ

Mass Media and Popular Culture

Sallie Hughes, U Miami

Migration and Latin American Diasporas

Clarisa Pérez Armendáriz, Bates College
Katrína Burgess, Tufts (Fletcher School)

Performance, Art and Architecture: Critical and Historical Perspectives

Alessandra Russo, Columbia

Political Institutions and Processes

Rossana Castiglioni, Universidad Diego Portales
Carlos Gervasoni, Universidad Torcuato Di Tella

Politics and Public Policy

Brian Wampler, Boise State U
Candelaria Garay, Harvard (Kennedy School)

Religion and Spirituality

Virginia Burnett, UT-Austin

Sexualities and LGBT Studies

José Quiroga, Emory U

States, Markets, and Political Economy

Natasha Sugiyama, U Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Transnationalism and Globalization

Elizabeth Aranda, U South Florida



FILM FESTIVAL LASA2014

XXXII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION
Democracy & Memory

May 21 - 24, 2014 – Chicago, IL, USA

Claudia Ferman, Director

You may submit a film or video (not integrated into a panel, workshop, or other regular Congress session) for selection to participate in the LASA Film Festival. Selection criteria are: artistic, technical, and cinematographic excellence; uniqueness of contribution to the visual presentation of materials on Latin America; and relevance to disciplinary, geographic, and thematic interests of LASA members, as evidenced by topics proposed for panels, workshops, and special sessions at recent Congresses.

These films and videos will be screened free of charge in the LASA2014 Film Festival, and compete for the juried designation of LASA2014 Award of Merit in Film, which is given for "excellence in the visual presentation of educational and artistic materials on Latin America."

Films and videos released after January 2013 and those that premiere at the LASA Congress will be given special consideration, if they also meet the above criteria. LASA membership is not required to compete.

Films must be received **no earlier than November 1, 2013, and no later than February 1, 2014**. Selection will be announced by April 15, 2014. Entries constitute acceptance of the rules and regulations of the LASA Film Festival. Film screeners will not be returned and will be deposited in the festival archives.

LASA2014 FILM FESTIVAL SUBMISSION FORM

Submissions for the Film Festival will be received **only from November 1, 2013** through **February 1, 2014**.

Film title (original title, and published translations) _____

Director _____

Producer _____

Year of Release _____

Country _____

Running Time _____

Language/s _____

Subtitles _____

Original Format _____

Brief description of subject matter, including countries or areas treated (or attach descriptive brochure)

Distributor _____

Email _____

Phone / Fax _____

Address _____

Your Name _____

Email _____

Address _____

Affiliation _____

Phone / Fax _____

To enter the competition for the LASA2014 Film Festival:

Mail the completed submission form, along with a DVD copy of your film to the Festival director. Submissions are encouraged to be mailed through express services (i.e., UPS, DHL, FedEx). Please, keep your tracking number to guarantee delivery. **Films without a submission form will not be considered.**

Claudia Ferman / Director, LASA2014 Film Festival
University of Richmond – 28 Westhampton Way – LAIS – CWIC 334 -- Richmond VA 23173 – USA
Email: cferman@richmond.edu

CALLING ALL MEMBERS

Nominations Invited

Nominations Invited for 2013 Slate

Deadline: September 3, 2013

LASA members are invited to suggest nominees for vice president and three members of the Executive Council, for terms beginning June 1, 2014. Criteria for nomination include professional credentials and previous service to LASA. Each candidate must have been a member of the Association in good standing for at least one year prior to nomination. Biographic data and the rationale for nomination must be sent by **September 3, 2013**, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas <milagros@pitt.edu>.

The winning candidate for vice president will serve in that capacity from June 1, 2014, until May 31, 2015; as president from June 1, 2015, to May 31, 2016; and as past president for an additional year. Executive Council members will serve a two-year term from June 1, 2014, to May 31, 2016.

Members of the Nominations Committee are Todd Eisenstadt (chair), America University; Brodwyn Fischer, Northwestern University; Graciela Montaldo (liaison), Columbia University; Juan Pablo Luna, Catholic University of Chile; Gareth Williams, University of Michigan; and Elisa Reis, *Federal University of Rio de Janeiro*, who will serve as the liaison with the LASA Executive Council.

Kalman Silvert Award *Call for Nominations*

Deadline: September 7, 2013

The Kalman Silvert Award Committee invites nominations of candidates for the year 2014 award. The Silvert Award recognizes senior members of the profession who have made distinguished lifetime contributions to the study of Latin America. The award is given at each LASA International Congress. Past recipients of the award were: John J. Johnson (1983); Federico Gil (1985); Albert O. Hirschman (1986); Charles Wagley (1988); Lewis Hanke (1989); Victor L. Urquidi (1991); George Kubler (1992); Osvaldo Sunkel (1994); Richard Fagen (1995); Alain Touraine (1997); Richard Adams (1998); Jean Franco (2000); Thomas Skidmore (2001); Guillermo O'Donnell (2003); June Nash (2004); Miguel León-Portilla (2006); Helen Safa (2007); Alfred Stepan (2009); Edelberto Torres-Rivas (2010); Julio Cotler (2012); and Peter Smith (2013).

Evelyne Huber (chair), LASA immediate past president; Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida and John Coatsworth, past presidents, Philip Oxhorn, editor of the *Latin American Research Review*, and Peter Smith, 2013 Kalman Silvert awardee. Nominations should be sent to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas <milagros@pitt.edu> by **September 7, 2013**. Please include biographic information and a rationale for each nomination.

Bryce Wood Book Award *Call for Nominations*

Deadline: September 7, 2013

At each International Congress, the Latin American Studies Association presents the Bryce Wood Book Award to the outstanding book on Latin America in the social sciences and humanities published in English. Eligible books for the 2014 LASA International Congress will be those published between July 1, 2012, and June 30, 2013. Although no book may compete more than once, translations may be considered. Anthologies of selections by several authors or re-editions of works published previously normally are not in contention for the award. Books will be judged on the quality of the research, analysis, and writing, and the significance of their contribution to Latin American studies. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers. The person who nominates a book is responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to each member of the Award Committee, at the expense of the authors or publishers.

All books nominated must reach each member of the Award Committee by **September 7, 2013**. By March 1, 2014, the committee will select a winning book. It may also name an honorable mention. The award will be announced at the LASA2014 Welcoming Reception, and the awardee will be publicly honored. LASA membership is not a requirement to receive the award.

Members of the 2014 committee are:

Kurt Weyland (chair)
4126 Batts H
1 University Station A1800
Austin, TX 78712
USA

César A Braga-Pinto
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Northwestern University
Crowe 2-163
1860 Campus Dr.
Evanston, IL 60208
USA

Natalia Brizuela
Department of Spanish & Portuguese
5319 Dwinelle Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-2590
USA

Ana Lucia Araujo
Department of History
Frederick Douglass Memorial Hall
2441 6th Street N.W., Room 316B
Washington, DC 20059
USA

Rachel Sarah O'Toole
Department of History
University of California, Irvine
200 Krieger Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-3275
USA

Bryan McCann
Georgetown University
History Department
ICC 601
3700 O St, NW
Washington DC 20057

or USPS:

Bryan McCann
Georgetown University
History Dept
Box 571035
Washington DC, 20057
USA

Eva-Lynn Jagoe
Comparative Literature
93 Charles St., 3rd floor
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON M5S 1K9
CANADA

Mark Overmyer-Velázquez
El Instituto: Institute of Latina/o,
Caribbean and Latin American Studies
University of Connecticut
Ryan Building, 2nd floor
2006 Hillside Road, Unit 1161
Storrs, CT 06269-1161
USA

Latin American Studies Association
Attn: Bryce Wood Book Award
Nominations
University of Pittsburgh
315 South Bellefield Avenue
416 Bellefield Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
USA

*Premio Iberoamericano Book Award
Call for Nominations*

Deadline: September 7, 2013

The *Premio Iberoamericano* is presented at each of LASA's International Congresses for the outstanding book on Latin America in the social sciences and humanities published in Spanish or Portuguese in any country. Eligible books for the 2014 award must have been published between July 1, 2012, and June 30, 2013. No book may compete more than once. Normally not in contention for the award are anthologies of selections by several authors or reprints or re-editions of works published previously. Books will be judged on the quality of the research, analysis, and writing, and the significance of their contribution to Latin American studies. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers. Individuals who nominate books are responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to *each member* of the award committee, at the expense of those submitting the books.

All books must reach each member of the committee by **September 7, 2013**. LASA membership is not a requirement for receiving the award. The award will be announced at the 2014 Welcoming Reception, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

Members of the 2014 committee are:

Gerardo Luis Munck (chair)
Univ. of Southern California
School of International Relations
3518 Trousdale Parkway VKC 330
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0043
USA

Sol Serrano
Las Hualtatas 4717, Vitacura
Código postal 7630000
Santiago
CHILE

Soledad Loaeza Tovar
El Colegio de México
Camino al Ajusco 20
Pedregal de Santa Teresa
México, DF 10740
MEXICO

Latin American Studies Association
Attn: Premio Iberoamericano Book Award
Nominations
University of Pittsburgh
315 South Bellefield Avenue
416 Bellefield Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
USA

LASA Media Award
Call for Nominations

Deadline: September 7, 2013

The Latin American Studies Association is pleased to announce its competition for the year 2014 LASA Media Awards for outstanding media coverage of Latin America. These awards are made at every LASA Congress to recognize long-term journalistic contributions to analysis and public debate about Latin America in the United States and in Latin America, as well as breakthrough journalism. Nominations are invited from LASA members and from journalists. Journalists from both the print and electronic media are eligible. The committee will carefully review each nominee's work and select an award recipient. The award will be announced at the LASA2014 Welcoming Reception, and the awardee will be publicly honored. LASA may invite the awardee to submit materials for possible publication in the *LASA Forum*. Recent recipients of the awards include: Marcela Turati, *Periodistas de a Pie* (2013), José Vales, *El Universal de Mexico* (2012); Carlos Dada, *El Faro* (2010); Mario Osava, *América Latina Inter Press Service* (2009); Hollman Morris, Colombia (2007); Maria Ester Gilio (2006); Julio Scherer, journalist, Mexico (2004); Eduardo Anguita, freelance journalist, Buenos Aires (2003); Guillermo González Uribe, *Número*, Bogotá (2001); Patricia Verdugo Aguirre, Conama, Chile, and *Diario 16*, Spain (2000); Gustavo Gorriti, *Caretas*, Lima, Peru (1998).

To make a nomination, please send one copy of the journalist's portfolio of recent relevant work to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas <milagros@pitt.edu> by **September 7, 2013**.

Members of the Media Award committee are Cecilia Alvear (chair), independent multimedia journalist; June Carolyn Erlick, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University; Elio Gaspari, journalist and writer; Alfredo Corchado, *Dallas Morning News*; Maria Teresa Ronderos, *Semana.com*; and Carolyn Curiel, Purdue University.

**LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship
Call for Nominations**

Deadline: September 7, 2013

The Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship is offered at each LASA International Congress to an outstanding individual who combines commitments to activism and scholarship. This distinguished lectureship is made possible largely by a generous contribution from Oxfam America, an organization committed to grassroots work, and one with which Martin Diskin was closely associated.

Past Lecturers were Ricardo Falla, S.J., 1998; Gonzalo Sánchez Gómez, Instituto de Estudios Políticos y Relaciones Internacionales, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2000; Elizabeth Lira Kornfeld, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Santiago, Chile, 2001; Rodolfo Stavenhagen, El Colegio de México, and Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo, CIESAS, Mexico City, 2003 (shared lectureship); Jonathan Fox, University of California, Santa Cruz, 2004;

William LeoGrande, American University, 2006; Orlando Fals Borda, 2007; Terry Karl, Stanford University, 2009; Carlos Ivan Degregori, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 2010; Claudia Paz y Paz, Instituto de Estudios Comparados y Ciencias Penales, 2012; and Stefano Varese, University of California, Davis, 2013.

Nominations, including self-nominations, are welcome. A nomination should include a statement justifying the nomination, the complete mailing address of the nominee, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address. To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than **September 7, 2013**, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas <milagros@pitt.edu>.

Members of the 2014 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Committee are Shannon Speed (chair), University of Texas at Austin; Jonathan Fox, University of California, Santa Cruz; and Cynthia Sanborn, University of the Pacific, Peru.

LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Dissertation Award

Application deadline: September 7, 2013

The Martin Diskin Dissertation Award is made possible through the generosity of Oxfam America, LASA, and LASA members. This award is offered at each LASA International Congress to an outstanding advanced junior scholar who embodies Professor Diskin's commitment to the creative combination of activism and scholarship. The award will be presented to an advanced doctoral student or recent PhD. Advanced PhD candidates pursuing this award must demonstrate that they will complete their dissertation prior to the LASA International Congress. LASA limits recent PhD recipients to those individuals who received their degrees after the LASA Congress prior to the one at which the award is to be received. LASA welcomes dissertations written in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The Award Committee will employ three criteria in its evaluations: (1) overall scholarly credentials, based upon the candidate's curriculum vitae; (2)

**Proposed Changes to the LASA Bylaws
Article 7 (second paragraph, lines 5–8)**

On August 2, 2013, the Executive Council approved the following proposed change in the Bylaws of the Association:

Amendments to resolutions may be presented at the LASA Business Meeting, and if accepted as a friendly amendment by a duly empowered person present at the meeting, the resolution as amended will be sent out for a vote to the membership. If not accepted, the resolution will be sent out for a vote in the form presented to the Business Meeting.

Amendments proposed by the Executive Council go into effect 90 days after the LASA membership is notified provided that no more than 100 persons object in writing to the Executive Director within the interim period. Objections can be directed to LASA Executive Director, LASA, 416 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, PITTSBURGH PA 15260. E-mail<lasa@pitt.edu>. The cutoff date for receipt of objections to the above proposed change is *November 12, 2013*.

the quality of the dissertation writing, research, and analysis as determined by the dissertation outline and sample chapter submitted; (3) the primary advisor's letter of recommendation. The definition of activist scholarship shall remain broad and pluralist, to be discussed and interpreted by each selection committee.

Applicants should submit a current curriculum vitae; a dissertation abstract of 250 words; the dissertation outline or table of contents; one sample chapter, which exemplifies the author's approach to activist scholarship; and a letter of recommendation from the candidate's primary advisor that focuses explicitly on the candidate's qualifications for the Martin Diskin Dissertation Award.

All application materials must be submitted electronically to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas <milagros@pitt.edu> and received by **September 7, 2013**. The Martin Diskin Dissertation Award recipient will receive a \$1,000 stipend. Individuals are encouraged to distribute this call for nominations as widely as possible with particular attention to passing it on to colleagues and students.

The 2014 selection committee consists of Shannon Speed (chair), University of Texas, Austin; Jonathan Fox, University of California, Santa Cruz; Cynthia Sanborn, University of the Pacific, Peru.

Charles A. Hale Fellowship for Mexican History *Call for Nominations*

Deadline: September 7, 2013

This fellowship will reward excellence in historical research on Mexico at the dissertation level. It will be awarded at each LASA International Congress to a Mexican graduate student in the final phase of his or her doctoral research in Mexican history, broadly defined. Selection will be based on the scholarly merit and on the candidate's potential contribution to the advancement of humanist understanding between Mexico and its global neighbors.

Members of the 2014 selection committee are Javier Garciadiego (chair), El Colegio de México; Halbert Jones, Oxford University; Sergio Silva Castañeda, Instituto Tecnológico de México; Aurora Gómez Galvarriato, Archivo General de la Nación.

A qualified applicant must hold Mexican citizenship and be in the final phase of her/his doctoral program, that is, finished with coursework and exams but not yet granted the PhD. Applications must be accompanied by (1) verification by the dissertation committee chair of the student's good standing in the doctoral program; (2) a one-page (single-spaced) statement that summarizes the dissertation project, in either English or Spanish; (3) a brief (two pages maximum) curriculum vitae.

To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than **September 7, 2013**, to Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, LASA Executive Director <milagros@pitt.edu>.

Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Book Award *Call for Nominations*

Deadline: September 7, 2013

The Latin American Studies Association presents the Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Book Award to the author(s) of an outstanding book on Latin American foreign policies and international relations published in English, Spanish, or Portuguese in any country. Books eligible for the 2014 award must have been published between July 1, 2012, and June 30, 2013. Anthologies of selections by several authors are not eligible. Books will be judged on the originality of the research, the quality of the analysis and writing, and the significance of their contribution to the study of Latin America and the Caribbean. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers. A nomination should include a statement justifying the nomination, four copies of the nominated book (one for each member of the award committee), complete mailing address of the nominee as well as telephone and fax numbers and e-mail address. The person nominating a book is responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to each member of the Award Committee, at the expense of the authors or publishers.

All books nominated must reach each member of the Award Committee by **September 7, 2013**. By March 1, 2014, the committee will select a winning book. It may also name an honorable mention. The award will be announced at the LASA2014 Welcoming Reception, and the awardee will be publicly honored. LASA membership is not a requirement to receive the award.

Kalman Silvert and LASA's 50th Anniversary

by MARTIN WEINSTEIN | Professor Emeritus, William Paterson University | weinsteinm@wpunj.edu

Members of the 2014 committee are:

Monica Herz
R. Marquês de São Vicente,
225 - Gávea,
Rio de Janeiro - RJ, 22451-900,
BRAZIL

Rut Diamint
Universidad Torcuato di Tella
Miñones 2177
C1428ATG
Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA

Francisco Monaldi
IESA
Avenida IESA
San Bernardino
Caracas 1010
VENEZUELA

Latin American Studies Association
Attn: Luciano Tomassini Book Award
University of Pittsburgh
315 South Bellefield Avenue
416 Bellefield Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
USA ■

The 50th anniversary of LASA is an appropriate time to recall Kalman Silvert's extraordinary life and contributions to Latin American studies. Silvert served as LASA's first president; was the program advisor for the social sciences in Latin America at the Ford Foundation from 1967 until his untimely death in 1976; and was teacher, mentor, and institution builder at universities in the United States and Latin America. During the darkest days in Latin America in the late 1960s and early 1970s, accompanied by the tumult and constitutional crisis in the United States, he turned his energy, intellect, and his institutional position to saving lives and institutions in Latin America, and defending democracy and strengthening democratic theory and practice throughout the Americas.

Abe Lowenthal and I have been coordinating a project on Kal's many roles and contributions. We invite you to read the following interviews conducted by Peter Cleaves with his fellow Dartmouth alumni concerning Kal Silvert and the influence he had on them personally and professionally. If the spirit moves you, send some thoughts or reminiscences of your own to the email above. All of the material will be published on the LASA website in the 50th year. ■

Silvert Reminiscences Project: Students at Dartmouth College

From 1962 to 1966, Kalman Silvert taught Latin American politics and methodology at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. He had an enormous influence on a large number of undergraduate students. Some of them have written separate reminiscences of their times with him. This article includes interviews with six Dartmouth students, all of whom describe how he changed their lives.

One of Kalman Silvert's courses was on Latin American governments and politics. The course catalog described it as "an analysis of the contemporary distribution of political power and the major government forms in Latin America. Special attention will be paid to the political aspects of economic and social development, the influence of ideology on public policy, and the role of relevant interest groups." He also taught seminars on political modernization and methodology.

These interviews were conducted by Peter Cleaves in August and September 2012. The interview date appears below each former student's name. Short bios of the participants are included at the end of the article.

James C. Cason Interview *September 22, 2012*

PC: What do you remember most from Kal's teachings?

JC: Kal helped cement my interest in international affairs and Latin America. At the time there were very few academics writing on Latin America. I always thought his approach was the best, compared to other academics like historian Tannenbaum's "Ten Keys to Latin America." Other professors on

international affairs were not as intellectually rigorous as Silvert. He created my interest in Latin America, beginning with Uruguay. My recollection is that Silvert pointed out that development was more complicated than people might think. He asked, "What are the cultural conditions for modernization?" This is a question that is still being asked today.

When I again read "Discussion at Bellagio," I find he was asking all the right questions about development. The things he wrote about are still very relevant today. He talked about freedom and development, and nationalism as a social value. His definition of the "state as the impersonal arbiter of human affairs" has stuck in my mind. The state helps create an integrated country, freeing people from the bonds that constrain human development. All through my career, I have seen this element missing in national leaders. In the years since we were in college, it became increasingly common for analysts to point out that economic growth requires rule of law. As an academic, Silvert was pointing this out well before others, stressing the relationship between human freedom and democracy for development.

Back in the 1960s, modernization theorists thought they were like social engineers—how to guide countries to democracy. Silvert was grappling with what values ruling elites were willing to give up to achieve this goal. He considered that elites either lead—or do not lead—a country toward development, and described what happened in England and India. Neither of these country's elites was willing to extend opportunities to the masses. The people had to fight for it.

The key to development is to allow the human potential to blossom. One of his sayings was "Freedom equals opportunities

for choice." Also, "Development is asymmetrical." Other scholars said a country was either wholly developed or undeveloped. Silvert's approach was multidisciplinary. He said a society could be developed in some aspects and underdeveloped in others. Humans are any country's principal resource for development and economic resources. Unleashing their potential was the key to development.

I thought Silvert was a God at the time. At all the other universities I attended, when professors and students spoke of other scholars, I always quoted Kalman Silvert.

PC: What might you recall from his ethics, values, or philosophy?

JC: In my 40-year career, dealing with democratic and authoritarian governments, I found that Silvert's precepts were correct. If the former elites chose not to give choices to the masses, like in Venezuela, you get a dictator like Hugo Chávez. Silvert was a humanist who believed that human freedom and a state that provides unity beyond class and family gives a society its best prospects to develop.

In identifying nationalism with the state as the ultimate arbiter of human affairs, I believe Silvert was referring to countries like Guatemala. These societies are divided by ethnic, religious, and language cleavages and dominated by powerful classes. The state as the impersonal arbiter could bridge these differences. The concept of the state was that we all are part of a common collectivity. If the country does not have an open system allowing everyone to develop his talents and share in the fruits of development, it will not progress. East or West, it was the same process. Elites have to be forced to give up political power. In the 1960s this was true in Latin America

and during the civil rights movement in the United States, and we see the same today.

PC: How would you describe him, in one or two phrases?

JC: Ahead of his time. Profound humanist. Firm believer that freedom is a precondition for modernization.

PC: Can you describe any times when you thought of him in guiding your career?

JC: Silvert got me interested in Latin America. My diplomatic career spanned nearly 40 years, mainly in Latin America. Uruguay fascinated me. Batlle y Ordóñez was a president who increased choices for the people and integrated them under nationalism. My thesis research in Uruguay was on why people became communists. Why was it that you had a Communist Party in a middle-class country like Uruguay? I was grateful that he sent me in that direction.

He believed that people everywhere were basically the same. If they had freedom of choice and rule of law, they could become modern. I always thought it important that society's fortunate people should share their wealth. He got me interested in human rights, and I defended them wherever I worked—whether in countries run by rightwing dictators like Uruguay or by the left in Cuba.

In my diplomatic career, I always picked difficult countries to go to. I focused on helping those individuals trying to create a better country—in favor of rule of law and civil society. I worked for a level playing field and to help those not in power to compete. My most fulfilling activities were helping small groups working for freedom.

I worked in Uruguay, Venezuela, Portugal, Honduras, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Panama. I asked the question, "Who owns this country?" If it was run by family firms who controlled the executive, the legislature, the judiciary, and the economy, it was not nationalistic. They were using their power to promote their own interests. All this was a subset of what Kalman Silvert was saying. These were not all fair and impartial countries.

In the embassies' political sections, I was always frustrated with the typical impressionistic reporting. In contrast, I started with the data. For example, in most countries where I worked I researched who owned the top 500–10,000 companies, building databases and family trees of the owners to ascertain just who "owned" the country. In Uruguay, I tried to figure out why people voted socialist or communist. I read every issue of the Communist Party newspaper over 30 years. I researched electricity consumption by neighborhood and how each city block voted in past elections. It turned out that the communists were the only one defending the meatpackers. Decades later, the document I wrote with biographies, family trees, and networks in Panama is still being used. I think Kal would have approved my approach to go from empirical data to conclusions substantiated with evidence.

PC: Were there any times you remember thinking of him when making important decisions or ethical judgments?

JC: We went to Dartmouth College as empty glasses that the college filled with concepts, values, and theories. I am thankful to Dartmouth. I received a better understanding of freedom, human rights, and was willing to take risks in their pursuit. Sometimes I was tossed out of the country. Other times I got a medal.

I remember Grenadians throwing their arms around me saying the U.S. saved them from communism. I worked against thugs like Noriega. I was always interested in going the extra mile and taking risks. The Uruguayan military threw me out of the country when I tried to arrange a prisoner swap between Russian dissidents and Tupamaros. As a young person I was inculcated with a sense of duty and responsibility. I joined these values with many of Silvert's teachings to guide decisions made during my whole career.

PC: If you were to think of the ten persons who inspired you as a young professional, would Professor Silvert be on the list?

JC: Kalman Silvert would certainly be on the list. Winston Churchill would be at the top. While a pupil in French Morocco, I read Churchill's collective works. Afterwards I never doubted that I would become a diplomat. Others on the list would be Truman and Roosevelt. Silvert would be number four or five. I can't think of any other professor who had such an influence on me. Silvert steered me in a direction that became my life's work.

Peter S. Cleaves
August 21, 2012

I remember Kal's rendition of the Parson Pattern Variables to distinguish between modern and traditional behavior. It went something like this: Modern values were change oriented, relativistic, rational, and universal. Contrasting traditional values were static, rigid/dogmatic, ritualistic, and parochial. Individuals and societies could be measured from tradition to modernity to the degree they espouse these value sets. Interestingly, this formalization was never published in his written works that I saw. He just made allusions to these concepts.

He also taught a strategy of change. A modernizing political leader can most easily change the political system, followed by the economic system, then educational, then the religious, and finally the family and personal. I used this construct in my undergraduate thesis on Turkey's modernization by Kemal Atatürk, who did not face strong opposition till he banned the fez. I recall my thesis advisor (a Middle East historian) saying at the time, "Now I understand what Kal's theories are." Granted, however, that Kal never published this sequence (to my knowledge) except in a mimeographed handout.

Perhaps his most controversial theoretical statement was his definition of nationalism as "the acceptance of the state as the impersonal and ultimate arbiter of human affairs." This shorthand definition did not sit well with scholars who integrated language, religion, culture, territory, ethnicity, and history into their definition of nationalism. He added many qualifiers to the definition, but in its short form it seemed fully at odds with Kal's own belief in freedom and abhorrence of state compulsion. I never understood why he chose that definition.

Mostly, Kal spoke authoritatively and affectionately of his times in Latin America. He referred frequently to checking his theoretical interpretations with Latin American scholars in long and far-reaching debates in "Buenos Aires coffee houses." That sounded pretty good to undergraduate students with a romantic image of intellectual life in Paris in the 1950s—but taking place in an exciting new land waiting to be explored.

Kal was passionate about values. A question he raised in the classroom was telling. "How is it that Germany—with its philosophical, musical, literary, scientific,

and architectural accomplishments—being among the most advanced countries in the world, perpetrated the Holocaust?" I believe he found the answer in his interpretation of German society's value system within the parameters of modern versus traditional. While on the surface the country was modern; in its soul it was traditional in a way that permitted horrendous crimes. He saw some of the same dangers under Latin American military governments.

Kal also made a distinction between technicians and artists. Technicians simply applied rules or procedures created by others, whereas artists were creators and intellectuals leading society to a higher purpose. Clearly Kal considered himself in the artistic class and probably felt many of his students would at best be technicians. We could suffer this implied label due to our youth and inexperience. Kal ran into trouble, however, with bureaucracy and with some of his senior peers who sensed he thought of them as mere technicians.

One more aspect of Kal's personality is worth mentioning. He did not take care of himself. He smoked heavily, was overweight, and did not exercise. He admitted in class that he drove automobiles too fast (which could be said to be the way he drove his life). This behavior turned out to be harmful to him and, when he passed away, to all who admired him.

After leaving Dartmouth, Kal joined the Ford Foundation as head of the Social Science Program in New York. The Foundation was recruiting for the assistant social science advisor position in the Lima office. While finishing up my PhD dissertation, I had submitted my resume to Ford (not to Kal) through Ford's Chile office. After a first candidate chose instead to go to Harvard (Jorge Domínguez), I

received a letter in Santiago from Kal to the effect, "I was rummaging through the CV's on file for the Lima position. Why don't you fly up to Lima and interview with Dick Dye and Abe Lowenthal?" (Dick was Ford representative and Abe held the social science position.) I did so, was offered the post, staying with Ford for ten years.

Kal died in 1976, so we overlapped at the Ford Foundation only four years. He visited Lima on a few occasions where he would meet grantees and speak to office staff. These were magisterial seminars in which he would impress with his broad knowledge of world events, and not pull punches on what he approved and did not approve in the United States, in Latin America, and in the Ford Foundation itself. He saw great evil in the military governments of Chile and Argentina, had more nuanced views of Brazil, and was suspicious but withheld judgment on the Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces in Peru under General Velasco. Ford had a research grant with the Planning Institute. At a meeting in the Institute, I recall his forceful rejection of their intention to keep the research findings confidential. If they would not publish the results, Ford would withdraw the grant.

All social science grants went to him for review, and he would write two- or three-page opinion recommendations. These were highly valued for their erudite historical and theoretical content. To be sure, they were received anxiously in the field office and analyzed and discussed thoroughly by the local program officers. Hints of praise in the memos made the program officer's day. Admonitions or circumspect disapproval caused heartburn. Sometimes one had to be satisfied when the verdict was that the grant, or the grant justification, was "unobjectionable."

I began my Latin American career in his class in 1966, and the career continues to this day. It included senior positions in three foundations, several years in Latin American banking and investment, several books, university teaching. He was the key figure in my recruitment to the Ford Foundation. His value categories helped me understand the mind-sets and political views of elites and revolutionaries I met and observed throughout my career.

After graduating from Dartmouth, I went to Chile on a fellowship and conducted interviews with municipal councilmen from the five political parties, from the rightist National to the leftist Socialist and Communist Parties. The politicians received me cordially as a young academic. After finishing my interviews, I was invited by the political officer in the U.S. Embassy for a meeting. He asked whether I would turn over my interview data for them to understand the councilmen's views. I thought of Kal's deep anger over the Camelot Project, where U.S. researchers were to conduct surveys of Chileans ostensibly for academic purposes, but were really secretly employed by the U.S. military. I declined the political officer's request, replying that my study of Chilean municipal councilmen was based on a promise of confidentiality. My findings hopefully would be published (they were) and available to all interested readers. I think that would have been Kal's answer.

Kalman Silvert was an intensely serious intellectual who lived passionately in pursuit of fundamentally important causes of democracy, freedom of thought, human rights, and scholarly accountability. He believed that education was a public policy intervention that could reinforce traditional values negatively or imbue individual citizens with modern, empathetic, and positivist values. He was very influential in

my life, and would clearly be among the top four persons who inspired me.

John F. Keane Interview
August 22, 2012

PC: What do you remember most from Kal's teachings?

JK: I took a Silvert course on Latin American government, very focused on empirical evidence of long-term trends largely related to weak democratic institutions, oligopolies, inequality, and impatience for change which engendered social unrest and repression. He used a very empirical approach to develop theories on why events happened as they did and what may happen in the future.

He was a mind-numbing empiricist. Some would consider he relied too much on empirical data to develop his theory of political dynamism and social change, and the reaction of elites to change (through repression).

At Dartmouth I also took two courses from Frank Safford (still teaching at Northwestern University), who wrote on the country of Colombia. As a historian Safford spoke of culture, thought processes, and trends to explain political change, in contrast to Silvert's empiricism.

PC: What might you recall from his ethics, values, or philosophy?

JK: Today we would call him a progressive. He profoundly believed that social reform was a moral imperative. He was very strategic in his approach. For him social inequality was personally repugnant—as he observed the extreme inequality in Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s. He was concerned about the

exclusion of indigenous populations in Guatemala and Peru.

I remember his strong objection to the U.S. role in the 1954 Guatemala coup. And he was very enthusiastic about the Christian Democratic Party coming into power in Chile. It had a solid base and was committed to changing the system of injustice.

I was in Peru during the ham-fisted efforts of the Peruvian military government to achieve social reform. I thought of Kal's emphasis on inclusion of all social sectors. I worked a lot with APRA, which had national inclusiveness as an objective in their image of "Indo America." Much of the Velasco military regime program was to give indigenous peasants in the sierra and workers in the sugar refineries a role in decision making through cooperatives. I remember thinking how this corresponded to Kal's thinking of the peasants and workers being participants and not subjects.

PC: Did you continue with Latin American interests?

JK: As a Latin Americanist, Silvert was a strong influence on my life. On entering the Peace Corps, I insisted on being sent to Latin America and preferably Colombia. In fact, that's where I went. I became enamored with Colombia, and I spent 37 years of my career as a U.S. diplomat in Latin America.

PC: If you were to think of the ten persons who inspired you as a young professional, would Professor Silvert be on the list?

JK: I would place Kal certainly in the top ten, perhaps six or seven. Those above would be other persons who also inspired

me, like some of the ambassadors with whom I worked.

PC: How would you describe him, in one or two sentences?

JK: Kalman Silvert felt that social change was a moral imperative in Latin America, and he constructed strategies drawing on his values, knowledge, and research to address inequality and repression.

Peter T. Knight Interview
August 25, 2012

PC: What do you remember most from Kal's teachings?

PK: I audited Kal's course at Dartmouth. I recall the content was based on his time with the American University Field Services in Latin America. He taught that Latin America is a fascinating place dealing with significant issues. That is what stuck with me from his class. Although I just audited his class, his teachings piqued my interest, even though time passed before I dedicated my career to Latin America.

PC: Did you have other interaction with Professor Silvert?

PK: I joined the Ford Foundation in 1971 when Kal was social science advisor in New York. But Kal had nothing to do with my appointment, as far as I know. I was at Brookings and wanted to go to Latin America. Abe Lowenthal had already left Brookings and joined the Foundation's Lima office. He encouraged me to apply for a position in the Ford Foundation. I figured that Ford had indirectly financed much of what I had done to date—my position at Brookings and my fellowship from the ACLS [American Council of Learned Societies]—so the idea made sense.

There were three positions open—Chile, Peru, and Brazil (at the Viçosa Agricultural University in Minas Gerais). I visited all three locations. The Brazil option was not attractive; Chile during the Allende regime was exciting, as was Peru to a lesser degree but more likely to remain stable than Chile. I chose Peru, where I worked from October 1971 to the end of 1974. Afterwards I took a leave of absence at Cornell University and continued my Latin American career at the World Bank.

PC: What might you recall from his ethics, values, or philosophy?

PK: Kal was a liberal who stood up against the forces of reaction on the left and right. His attitude at Ford was, "We've come here to help you do what you think needs to be done. If you have the will, we will back you."

Kal was instrumental in getting Ford to support the Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) in Brazil and the Corporación de Estudios para Latinoamérica (CIEPLAN) in Chile. Kal's thesis was that, during these countries' military governments, if social scientists were not under immediate physical threat and wanted to stay in the country, Ford would support the establishment of new research institutes where they could work productively while they sought additional financing. He had to fight to get these ideas accepted by Ford, but he prevailed. He broke the ground in Brazil, and the strategy extended also to CIEPLAN in Chile. This support—which would not have occurred without Kal's convictions—was one of the most important things the Ford Foundation did in Latin America at the time (still felt today) and perhaps globally as well.

I admired the goals he set for the Ford Foundation in Latin America. After he passed away, Ford changed to a more technocratic and direct action mode. It abandoned the idea of using social science to enable Latin American scholars to understand their own situation and put forth policy recommendations. Ford started supporting "direct action," becoming more like the Inter-American Foundation while the IAF was mutating to become more like the old Ford Foundation. In my view, this change at Ford was regrettable. Staff became less incorporated into local society and spent more of their time flying between countries they covered. Consequently they were less integrated into the social science communities in the countries where they lived. There were fewer field offices and less staff.

PC: Can you describe any times when you thought of him in guiding your career?

PK: Even though I just audited one of his courses, exposure to Kal was a key influence on my career. He was the reason I launched my lifetime engagement with Latin America.

But the path was roundabout. At Dartmouth I took a course on Middle East politics. I was one of the first two undergraduates to receive an overseas internship to study Middle East politics, with the country choices being Turkey or Egypt. I chose Egypt to study the formation of the Arab League, and spent five months based there, but also traveling to the Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. On my return to Dartmouth for the winter term 1962 I wrote my undergraduate thesis on this topic, and also a term paper on Zionism as a pressure group in U.S. politics. I got a Fulbright Fellowship to Oxford (Worcester College and the Middle East Centre, the latter

headed by Professor Albert Hourani). At the Middle East Centre I participated in seminars with Hourani, the author whose books I most admired when researching my thesis. My experience there, in the Middle East, and at Dartmouth led me to appreciate how powerful a hold Zionism and oil companies had on U.S. foreign policy. There was very little space for a student to operate without being wedded to one of them.

Speaking with older mature fellows at St. Anthony's College, the full implications of becoming an Arab region specialist came home to me. I'd need to spend a full year just to learn Arabic and then to work in a region plagued with the Zionist and oil issues mentioned earlier. In the Arab region, you were either a friend or an enemy; there was no grey area.

I thought back to Kal's description of Latin America, and all the adventures he had. I just decided that for all these reasons—and despite the huge intellectual investment I had made to the Middle East region—that I should switch to Latin America. The region offered a more legitimate political space for Americans given the diverse U.S. players active there, the languages would be easier to learn, and Latin America had all the fascinations Kal described. Kal had planted a seed in my mind that was ready to blossom.

PC: Were there any times you remember thinking of him when making important decisions or ethical judgments?

PK: By extension, Kal was responsible for my doing my PhD dissertation in economics at Stanford University on Brazil. My principal dissertation advisor urged me to study hedging in the Brazilian agricultural market as a way for producers to protect against price fluctuations. After

checking this out during my first months in Brazil, I concluded that producer hedging would not be viable in Brazil for many years. While doing my research, I was also teaching macroeconomics at a Brazilian government training center, and across the street there was a group of economists advising the Planning Ministry led by Professor Albert Fishlow, then of UC Berkley. He became a kind of mentor and suggested I change my topic to import substitution and export expansion in Brazilian agriculture. I convinced my Stanford dissertation advisors to accept this change. I am sure that Kal would have considered this subject more relevant.

PC: If you were to think of the ten persons who inspired you as a young professional, would Professor Silvert be on the list?

PK: Of course Kal would be on the list of ten, along with Albert Hirschman, Albert Hourani, and Joseph Grunwald at Brookings. During my postdoc at Cornell University, Jaroslav Vanek, Peter Miovic, and Branko Horvat were influential for my studies on worker management. I can't say that I had any mentors during my 21 years at the World Bank. If I had had more interaction with Kal, I'm sure he would have been an excellent mentor.

PC: How would you describe him, in one or two sentences?

PK: Kal Silvert was a consummately tough-minded liberal.

Walton N. Smith Interview

August 24, 2012

PC: What do you remember most from his teachings?

WS: I took two courses from Professor Silvert. One was on methodology that included Max Weber. That was the one Dartmouth class notebook I kept for many years. Just recently while cleaning, I looked at it and asked myself, "Why am I keeping this?" Well, unfortunately I don't have it anymore.

His teaching on methodology has had a lasting effect on the way I interpret things—like an S curve on population. He introduced us to analytical tools we could use later in many ways. He influenced how I read a book. For the methodology course, the class read a little short book by Weber. It was heavy Germanic going. When we got to class, Professor Silvert asked us, "To whom is the book dedicated?" Well, that was the last question we were prepared to answer. No one knew. He then directed us to the two names in the dedication, and explained the following. By choosing these names, Max Weber was taking a position in an ongoing intellectual debate, as did the introduction which we had all skipped as well. Simply by selecting these names, Weber was stating his position. Kal advised us, "Don't ever ignore the dedications." Since then, I have read every word an author puts in his printed work and find that I would have missed a lot of good stuff had I not done so. The way Kal conveyed this message was very embarrassing for us. We had all the notes on the Weber book – but nobody had noticed the dedication. This was characteristic of Kal's academic theatrics.

Let me tell a story on his teaching style. A bunch of us were invited to his house one

evening. For some reason he was prompted to play the violin. I had never been that close to a violin, being more interested at the time in opera. He said that we would not understand music unless we understood the violin, especially Pablo Sarasate. He showed if you don't play the violin correctly, all you get is a hissing sound. He demonstrated that if you miss just a bit with your fingers or the bow, the sound was awful. But his real message was that you have always to pay attention to the little things, to the details. If you do that, you will *get it* (whatever "it" is). As with the violin on his shoulder, the notes from the instrument vibrate and reach your brain, and you will see that you are getting it right—by paying attention to the little things. The lesson to pay attention to the details—explained in this way—stayed with me for the rest of my career.

One other thing about his teaching actually bothered me. It was modernization, which I thought was a soft concept. It did not seem to be backed by data. I was more in line with the social science side, and felt there was not enough hard definition of the concept. He was striving to give a hard definition to modernization but had not gotten there.

PC: What might you recall from his ethics, values, or philosophy?

WS: I remember there was an event that related to his time with the American Field Services. Project Camelot was a research project by American scholars secretly funded by the U.S. military to find information on Latin America that would be reported back to the U.S. government. Kal was extremely annoyed. He was not so bothered that the military would want this information, but that the academics went along with this plan. The academics never had considered how their actions would

affect their profession and harm other legitimate researchers. Latin America officials and interviewees would never know whether an American researcher were not really a U.S. spy. These academics did not consider the real-world implications of their behavior. Kal felt that they entered academia without professional accountability and ended up violating its principles.

Kal was important in forming my personal worldview in ways that I would never have imagined in 1960 going to Hanover, New Hampshire, from Macon, Georgia. If you look at where I came from and the influences making me see what was wrong and out of place, you begin to understand the changes I experienced. I was not getting these new ideas from Macon's Lanier High School.

In the winter of 1960 Jere Smith and I went on a tour of civil rights activities in Atlanta. We wrote it up. At the time John Lewis was leading a sit-in at Loeb's restaurant. I put the civil rights movement in a development context.

Drawing on Silvert's classes, my analysis was political and economic. The South was disadvantaged in economic growth because the division between poor whites and blacks was perpetuated by Bourbon Democrats who wanted to maintain control. That major portions of the population were not integrated into society was similar to Latin America. This integration was not going to be handed out. The disenfranchised had to make the play themselves to move up—and they did. The process could have been more violent, and fortunately wiser heads prevailed. But the lesson was that you could not hand out freedom but had to take it on your own.

By extension, development forced from the outside is less likely to prevail compared to when it comes from the people themselves. I remember reading a book on Turkey that pointed out that village leaders did not like specific Atatürk policies but found a different way to make them their own. Change in Turkey was more successful because it came from the people.

In sum, I found many applications of Kal Silvert's teaching through my experiences in the American South and Vietnam.

PC: Did you have other interaction with Professor Silvert?

WS: At Dartmouth, I became a public administration major (rather than government or something else) because I knew I wasn't going to be a political scientist, but I took his courses because I enjoyed the subject and I enjoyed him. The Max Weber course was the only methodology course I took since the PA major required taking only one of them. I chose that Max Weber course because I enjoyed being in Professor Silvert's class. I already knew I wanted to be a lawyer and was able to benefit from the course without considering that it required a full professional engagement.

I mentioned to him that I wanted to be a lawyer. He let me know that he had walked up the steps of the University of Pennsylvania law school—"before turning around to do something more useful" with his life. While I did not take his advice, I definitely remember it. I have told people that Dartmouth took this boy from Macon, Georgia, and introduced him to the great world. Silvert did a lot of that introducing.

After Dartmouth and three years of law school, I ended up in the military in Saigon, Vietnam. It was 1967. One day a

Dartmouth classmate from a U.S. naval outpost—also a Silvert student—visited me in Saigon. We got roaringly drunk while talking about our Vietnam experience. We decided that we needed to tell Professor Silvert what we thought, so we got a four-track tape and dictated our findings. We talked about what we had seen up country and in Saigon. Lots of what we saw related to what Kal had taught about Latin America—social change in a traditional society, nationalism, the struggle against entrenched forces, and a developing country in revolution. It is illustrative of our feelings for Kal Silvert that we thought sending him this tape was the appropriate thing to do. (It would be great to find that tape today.)

PC: How would you describe him, in one or two sentences?

WS: Kal had a great personality. A very hard worker, he grappled with the challenge of raising the technical part of his intellectual craft to a high level. He was able to convey his values and work ethic to students, whom he treated as adults.

I cannot let this pass without some mention of Frieda Silvert, who seemed to me to not only be Kal's wife, but also frequently his partner in his work. She seemed a great support to him. There was some half-remembered story he told about their living in a village in perhaps Central America where the air was blue at night from the high bean content of the diet, and her working along with him in whatever the study was. She also put up most graciously with students descending on their home in Woodstock, Vermont, and—at least in my case—into a rather large and fancy party they were having at their double apartment at NYU after they had moved to New York City. Frieda was part of the sharp, solid,

and yet friendly and welcoming environment that I felt surrounded Kal.

PC: Any other thoughts or anecdotes to share?

WS: In March 1964, a major civil rights incident erupted in St. Augustine, Florida. The situation was getting out of hand. It was during spring break, and a lot of students from the Northeast traveled to St. Augustine. The head of the Tucker Foundation (Fred Berthold?) led a group of Dartmouth students to join the movement. Well, they got arrested and needed bail money to get out of jail. WDCR, the college radio station, hooked up a live telephone line to St. Augustine to follow events.

The radio station needed people in Hanover to fill in dead air. Among those who talked were Professor Silvert and me. Kal used his airtime to speak of the larger social and political context of the civil rights movement and the events in St. Augustine. But when he was off air, he had ironic statements about the whole enterprise. He said that the students and university official who had gone down were basically ivory tower academics who were ill prepared for the mission. How could they not foresee how they would be received and what would happen? And they had not even taken the precaution of arranging beforehand for bail money!

As a final word, I remember him saying, "Chile has the most beautiful women in the world."

PC: If you were to think of the ten persons who inspired you as a young professional, would Professor Silvert be on the list?

WS: I thought the world of him. Silvert would certainly be in the top ten. Kal was

not influential as "Herr Professor," but in the way he affected my life in a general way. He was the number one influence at Dartmouth and would be in the second five overall.

When I told my wife about this reminiscence project and how I would reflect on his influence, she commented, "I'm not surprised with what you say since you have been thinking this way for 40 years."

Eric Paul Veblen Interview
August 23, 2012

PC: What do you remember most from Kal's teachings?

EPV: Kal had been in the places he was writing and teaching about. He had been there and observed events firsthand. You did not find that much on the part of many academics.

I took two courses with Kal—Latin America politics and methodology. The methodology seemed more like sociology and focused on Max Weber.

The goal of his Latin America course was not to learn facts. Rather he stressed the context and ways to think about the topic. In Latin America, he used typologies of political systems. The method revealed the great differences between countries' levels of development, and relative development of regions within a country. He taught the heterogeneity of development and modernization. In his work, modernization was his main theme, extending from overall concepts to the makeup of a modern man or woman. He did a good job of conveying the vastly different levels of modernization, from those segments of the population not oriented toward national politics to those

who shared values associated with education.

The modern parts of the country attained a greater ability to identify with the nation in approaching politics. This was Kal's way of getting you to think about politics in developing countries rather than just facts about the country. He was successful in doing this.

Kal gave a lot of emphasis to typologies to conduct social science analysis. He gave us an unusual midterm exam question—to write out the table of contents of Weber's book. Partially it was his way to find out who was doing their homework. More importantly, he was helping structure our minds to understand Weber's approach.

Kal's theories were most important for the development field. A book that has stuck with me for a long time was "Man's Power." This outstanding work was a terrific demonstration of the scope of his mind. We once talked about [the renowned political scientist] Robert Dahl, whom Kal referred to as a "small theory man." This was *not* meant to be derogatory. The phrase stuck with me as a significant contrast from Kal, who was a great synthesizer intellectually. He was thinking in the grandest terms. His was "big theory." In "Man's Power," Kal was trying to answer the most difficult questions.

While an undergraduate, Kal influenced me to learn Spanish. Not necessarily related to his teachings, but one vivid memory from his class was Don Bross saying in Spanish, "President Kennedy has just been shot."

PC: What might you recall from his ethics, values, or philosophy?

EPV: Kal was a highly principled person. He did not hide his disdain for

totalitarianism and violent aspects of politics. I read Chris Mitchell's essay on Kal's reaction to NYU's procedure for dismissing junior faculty. I did not observe this aspect of Kal, but it was consistent with other impressions of him. He was not willing to compromise beyond a certain point. He was against repressive forces holding back human dignity in Latin America and everywhere. I believe that Kal had strong ethics and they reinforced my own.

PC: Did you continue with Latin American interests?

EPV: After Dartmouth I went to graduate school at Yale in political science but did not emphasize Latin America. My main interest was American politics and political behavior. I went back to Dartmouth to do research for my dissertation and had some contact with Kal, but not really in close touch. Then in 1968–69, he asked if I'd like to be at the Ford Foundation. I went for interviews at Ford in Latin America. He helped to get me hired. I worked in New York, Venezuela, and Colombia. I was with Ford from 1969 to 1971, but I was not around Kal very much. Later I went into a business that did not have a Latin American component. I attended Kal's 1976 memorial service.

PC: How would you describe him, in one or two sentences?

EPV: Kal Silvert had a great and powerful intellect that synthesized diverse areas of knowledge. All who were around Kal would agree that he had a compelling personality. At Dartmouth, he attracted a following of students devoted to him. Part of his personality was a fantastic sense of humor. He was sociable and fun to be with. For those who continued in

academia, his influence was important for our own writing and teaching.

Kal had spent so much time in Latin America, this direct experience gave him many anecdotes. He once told us about a heated dispute he had in an Argentine restaurant. After things calmed down, Kal's adversary left the restaurant. An anarchist approached Kal and said, "Would you like me to go outside and break his arm?"

PC: If you were to think of the ten persons who inspired you as a young professional, would Professor Silvert be on the list? If so, what number in importance?

EPV: Kal would certainly be on the list of ten. He had a tremendous influence on the Ford Foundation and while in academia. He would be right up at the top at number one or two.

Bios

James C. Cason received his AB degree from Dartmouth College in 1966 and MA from the School of Advanced International Studies (Johns Hopkins) in 1968. After joining the U.S. State Department, his career included postings in El Salvador, Venezuela, Portugal, Italy, Uruguay, Panama, Guatemala, Bolivia, Honduras, Jamaica, and Cuba, culminating as U.S. Ambassador to Paraguay. His bold diplomatic style resulted in his expulsion from Uruguay and wide press coverage while Chief of Mission in Cuba. He speaks Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Guarani, and serves as President of the Center for a Free Cuba. Currently he is the elected mayor of Coral Gables, Florida. *Contact:* 1040 Alhambra Circle, Coral Gables, FL 33134, jimccason@yahoo.com, Tel. 305-409-4061.

Peter Shurtleff Cleaves, a 1966 Dartmouth College graduate, obtained his MA from Vanderbilt University and PhD from the University of California at Berkeley. He has held executive positions at the Ford Foundation (Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Mexico, Central America), the First National Bank of Chicago (Panama and Northern South America), the University of Texas (Institute of Latin American Studies), the AVINA Foundation (Brazil, Spain, Portugal, Ecuador, and as executive director), and the Emirates Foundation (CEO, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates). Aside from English, he conducts business in French, Spanish, and Portuguese. Currently he provides advisory services for foundations, nonprofits, and Gulf investors entering Latin America. *Contact:* 3605 Flamevine Cove, Austin, Texas 78735, pcleaves@driconsultants.com, Tel. 512-328-9190.

John Francis Keane, who graduated from Dartmouth College in 1966, pursued postgraduate studies at Georgetown University. After serving in the Peace Corps in Colombia, he began his U.S. Foreign Service career with postings in Vietnam, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Guatemala. He was Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs responsible for Public Diplomacy, Canada, and Central America. From 2003 to 2005, he was U.S. Ambassador to Paraguay. Currently, aside from his longtime interest in birding and sailing the Potomac, he coordinates the speakers program for the Washington-based American Foreign Service Association. *Contact:* 6572 Elmdale Road, Alexandria, VA 22312, keanejf7444@yahoo.com, Tel. 703-642-2214.

Peter Titcomb Knight received academic degrees from Dartmouth College (AB

1962), Oxford University (BA 1964), and Stanford University (MA 1965 and PhD 1970). His early career included appointments at the Brookings Institution in Washington, DC, and the Ford Foundation in Lima, Peru. At the World Bank, his positions included participation in the 1980 World Development Report team, and lead positions in the Brazil Department and the Economic Development Institute. He established the Electronic Media Center, later merged into the External Relations Department. He is proficient in several foreign languages (Portuguese, Spanish, French, and Russian), and current activities revolve around e-government and e-learning with numerous clients and writings in these areas. *Contact:* Avenida Atlántica 4022/302, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil, ptknight@gmail.com, +55 (21) 2522-9167 and +55 (21) 7519-9033.

Walton Napier Smith graduated from Dartmouth College in 1962. He served in the U.S. Army in Saigon, Vietnam, and at the Pentagon, before earning his law degree at Harvard University. He worked several years as a lawyer for Amtrak before joining the firm of Lord, Bissell & Brook, where he represented clients from offices in Washington, Chicago, and Atlanta. Currently he is owner of Soque ArtWorks, a gallery of unique art and craft created in mountainous regions of Georgia and nearby states. *Contact:* 575 Fenwick Wood, Clarkesville, GA 30523, wnsmith@soquesmiths.com, Tel. 706-754-8036.

Eric Paul Veblen, a Dartmouth College graduate in 1964, received his MA and PhD degrees in political science from Yale University. His Ford Foundation tenure included postings in Caracas, Venezuela, and Bogotá, Colombia. As an academic, he accepted teaching appointments at Vassar College and Texas A&M University, after

which he entered the private sector. For over three decades he held executive positions at Pacesetter Personnel Services (formerly Industrial Labor Service), until recently reducing his time dedication to attend to other interests. *Contact:* 3501 Carriage Lane, Plano, Texas 75023, eveblen@verizon.net, Tel. 972-964-4867. ■

Final Report on the 31st International Congress in Washington, DC

by GWEN KIRKPATRICK | Georgetown University | mgk7@georgetown.edu
and KENNETH M. ROBERTS | Cornell University | kr99@cornell.edu

From May 28 to June 1, nearly 4,000 LASA members and guests converged on the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington for the Association's 2013 International Congress. The Congress started with a series of pre-Congress workshops directed primarily to younger members of the profession, for example, workshops on publishing, databases, and a visit to the Library of Congress. The awards and welcoming ceremony on Wednesday evening was highlighted by an address from José Miguel Insulza, Secretary General of the OAS, followed by a reception hosted by Georgetown University.

Conference attendees participated in over 900 different panels, roundtables, and special sessions. These events took place in the spacious meeting facilities of the Marriott Wardman Park, and many addressed the Congress theme of "Latin America: Towards a New Social Contract?" The LASA Film Festival, again curated by Claudia Ferman, was an important complement to the panels and workshops. The Book Exhibit offered a streamlined way to explore new publications and to meet with editors. Of course, much of the real intellectual and social exchange took place in informal meetings among friends and colleagues.

The Washington setting provided LASA members not only with attractive social and cultural opportunities but also with access to sites of historical and political importance, national and transnational government agencies, and a variety of nongovernmental organizations with activities in the Latin American region.

As expected, the shift from an 18-month to a 12-month conference cycle reduced the number of proposals for a program with a limited number of available slots. Over 1,500 proposals were submitted for panels or individual papers, approximately

one-third less than for the San Francisco Congress of 2012. Given the ample number of meeting rooms in the Marriott Wardman Park, this decline in the number of proposals allowed track chairs to reduce the rejection rate and accept a much higher percentage of proposed papers and panels. A higher acceptance rate was an objective of LASA for this Congress cycle, so we are pleased to have made progress toward meeting this goal. We expect the new annual cycle to help alleviate space constraints, balance supply and demand, and allow for more inclusive and manageable Congress programs.

As has been the case in recent Congresses, the rate of acceptance for prearranged panels was greater than that for individual paper submissions. LASA's experience suggests that prearranged panels are more likely to cohere intellectually than panels that are cobbled together by track chairs from individual paper submissions. We thus encourage LASA members to continue to play a proactive role in organizing panels around a common theme that provides for greater analytical focus. **Please note that under the annual conference cycle, proposals for LASA2014 will be due in just a few months, on September 3, 2013.**

By all indications, members have been enthusiastic about recent program and technological innovations introduced for LASA Congresses. This is especially true of the pre-Congress workshops, which have been well attended and generated very positive reviews, and of the "LASA app" real-time conference software that runs on tablets and smart phones. Future Congresses are likely to make greater use of social media to foster communication among LASA members and to facilitate program coordination.

We have heard from many members who found LASA2013 to be rewarding and

enjoyable, so with our work on that Congress now complete, we would like to offer a special word of thanks to all the track chairs* who generously devoted their time and energy to evaluate proposals and shape the final program. Their volunteer spirit makes LASA what it is today. We would also like to express our gratitude to the outgoing president, Evelyne Huber, and the members of the Executive Council for their leadership and support. Finally, we thank the remarkably efficient and patient staff of the LASA Secretariat at the University of Pittsburgh, who did so much to make LASA2013 a success—Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Sandra Klinzing, Pilar Rodríguez, Soledad Cabezas, and Israel Perlov. We wish our successors, Florencia Garramuño and Raúl Madrid, great success with the planning of LASA2014. We know that the support of the LASA membership and the LASA Secretariat will continue to make LASA Congresses the site of rich intellectual, professional, and personal growth.

* Silvia Ares de Kurlat, Santa Arias, María Isabel Belausteguigoitia Rius, Merike Blofield, Sarah Brooks, Maxwell Cameron, Rubí Carreño, Marcos Cueto, Guillermo de los Reyes, Mary Finley-Brook, Patrice Franko, Elías García Rosas, Ben Goldfrank, Margaret Keck, Marcus Kurtz, Jorge Lanzaro, Juan Pablo Luna, Lillian Manzor, Leonilde Sérvolo Medeiros, Mariselle Meléndez, Eyda Merediz, Carmen Millán, Paula Miranda, Egon Montecinos, Scott Morgenstern, Raúl Necochea, Elías Palti, Aldo Panfichi, Leigh Payne, Anthony Pereira, Enrique Peruzzotti, Joanne Rappaport, Matt Samson, Gonzalo Saraví, Andrew Schrank, Ana Serra, Ken Shadlen, Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui, Catalina Smulovitz, William Stanley, Joel Stillerman, Augusto de la Torre, María Amelia Viteri, Alexander Wilde, Wendy Wolford, Ana Wortman. ■

LASA Business Meeting

LASA President's Report

LASA President Evelyne Huber welcomed everyone to the Business Meeting. Huber reported that this was the first Congress on an annual schedule and it has worked out extremely well. The reason for the transition to an annual Congress was to be able to limit the proposal rejection rate, which had been running at about 30 percent. This time all panel proposals were accepted and the rejection rate for individual papers was very low. The transition was a huge job for the Secretariat and was accomplished well by Milagros Pereyra, Maria Soledad Cabezas, Pilar Rodriguez, Sandy Klinzing, and their colleagues in Pittsburgh. There were about 3,500 registered participants. This Congress can boast a reasonable schedule, with a 45-minute time slot for lunch, and still end at 6:00 pm instead of 8:00 as with the 18-month Congresses. The Congress program chairs did a fantastic job of organizing a nice set of invited panels, and Gwen Fitzpatrick secured space at Georgetown University for the Welcoming Reception. This time the leadership team of Huber, Past President Maria Hermínia Tavares, and President-elect Merilee Grindle were proactive in contacting the State Department regarding Cuban visas. The team was joined by a number of past presidents in signing a letter to the State Department, and they were joined by other professional associations who wrote their own letters of support. Lastly, Huber reported that the Association continues in good shape and in good hands.

Report of the LASA Secretariat

LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra reported that the 2012 membership year achieved an individual membership total of 7,633, a 15 percent increase over 2011. Of

this number, 1,849 were new members for 2012. Thus far for 2013 there are 4,685 individual members, representing a 39 percent decrease since 2012. However, LASA is just at midpoint in its membership year and she does expect that number to increase significantly during the Congress and afterward, as individuals register to be able to submit their proposals for LASA2014.

Institutional memberships currently number 35, representing a decline of 7 percent since 2012. She does not expect this number to increase; there has been a recent decline in institutional memberships due to the increasing availability of digital journals.

Regarding fund-raising, LASA received financial support for Congress travel grants once again from the Open Society Foundations and the Inter-American Foundation, and from the AVINA Foundation for LASA Life Memberships for the next four recipients of the Kalman Silvert Award.

The LASA Endowment has risen to \$4.5 million. An independent firm was brought in to conduct an evaluation of the Endowment managers. They determined that the oversight provided by Morgan Stanley Smith Barney was excellent and reasonably priced; thus LASA will continue with the current managers. The next Congress will take place in Chicago and President-elect Merilee Grindle will report on that.

Report of the XXXI Congress Program Committee

LASA2013 Program Co-chair Gwen Kirkpatrick reported that she and Co-chair Kenneth Roberts had reached out to

international scholars to serve as track chairs. They also combined some small tracks from the previous year. There were more submissions of panel proposals than individual papers. They were able to accept 100 percent of the panel submissions and most of the individual submissions. Moving to an annual cycle reduced the number of submissions, and the hotel is sufficiently large to accommodate many sessions.

The pre-conference workshops drew considerable interest. Some that had been successful in the past were being repeated. *Latin American Research Review* editor Philip Oxhorn organized two workshops and another took place at the Library of Congress.

Lastly, Kirkpatrick reported that the co-chairs also tried to avoid having other panels compete with the presidential panels. One panel was organized by Cynthia Arnson of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Roberta Jacobson, Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, also participated in a panel that discussed the main issues in U.S.–Latin American relations. There was another panel on gender as well. Kirkpatrick also attempted to form a panel with granting agencies, but only the National Endowment for the Humanities responded. She recommended that this attempt be repeated since younger scholars are very interested in the subject.

Vice President's Report

Vice President Merilee Grindle indicated her delight at being elected vice president of LASA, a role that will be followed shortly by the title of president, and then past president. As vice president her primary job is to name individuals to committees

and to work with the program co-chairs to name track chairs for LASA2014. Thus far she has contacted over 100 individuals, and about 98 have been delighted to agree to serve. This speaks well about the level of commitment of the membership to the Association. The new program co-chairs are Raúl Madrid (University of Texas at Austin) and Florencia Garramuño (Universidad de San Andres in Buenos Aires). LASA2014 will take place in Chicago from May 21 to May 24. The theme is Democracy and Memory. The theme mirrors a set of activities that Grindle and her colleagues are planning at Harvard. It also commemorates the 40th anniversary of the coup in Chile (this fall) and the 50th anniversary of the coup in Brazil. What is attractive about this theme is that there is virtually no discipline that has not been engaged in thinking about democracy and memory. The program co-chairs and Grindle will formulate panels to discuss what is remembered, how it is remembered, and what the legacies are in terms of the current social and political institutions in Latin America today. She is looking forward to a very busy year. Lastly, Grindle acknowledged that she is a long-term fan of LASA, which brings individuals together as no other institution can.

Resolutions

Vice President Grindle reviewed the resolutions process, which includes (1) submission at least 30 days prior to the Executive Council (EC) meeting; (2) submission with the signatures of at least 30 LASA members in good standing; (3) review by the Resolutions Subcommittee where they are discussed; (4) discussion at the meeting of Ways and Means; and (5) submission to the full EC for consideration. If at least two-thirds of the EC approves

the resolutions they are presented at the LASA Business Meeting and then mailed to the LASA membership for a vote. Grindle asked if the members present wished her to read the two resolutions that had been approved for presentation; members responded that they could read them themselves. The Secretariat will send the resolutions electronically to the membership within the next few weeks. For a resolution to be approved it must be voted upon by at least 20 percent of the current membership and approved by the majority of those voters.

New Business

Long-standing LASA member Sheryl Lutjens presented a petition on behalf of herself and several members. The petition sought to call attention to their concerns regarding the need for increased discussion between LASA leadership and the membership when important decisions were being taken. One of these concerns had to do with the change from an 18-month Congress to an annual schedule, as well as the selection of the later part of May for the Congress dates. It was believed that the decision had been taken without previous consultation with the membership, and that, although it had positive results in terms of increased proposal acceptance, it did place a financial burden on many members to attend an annual event. The Sections also felt a burden to prepare proposals and organize events with such a quick turnaround.

The selection of May for the Congress meant that since most universities have completed their academic year at that point there was no option to sponsor a Latin American scholar for the Congress and then have him or her spend time on a U.S.

campus as well, collaborating with colleagues.

Lutjens then referred to the Association's previous decision to not host Congresses in the United States as long as there was a general denial of visas for several would-be Latin American participants. The membership was not consulted when Congresses did return to the United States in LASA2013. Lutjens reported her understanding that 13 Cuban and 2 Mexican scholars had been denied visas for this Congress.

Lastly, the previous year the EC had voted to change the policy regarding the approval of resolutions. In 2012 the resolutions had failed not because of a lack of favorable votes but because more than 20 percent of the membership failed to respond regarding approval of the resolutions.

President Huber responded to the points raised:

A survey was conducted with the membership regarding the scheduling of the Congresses. A full 70 percent of the membership responded and the majority voted for the move to an annual Congress. In regard to location of the Congress, a lot depends upon the space within potential hotels and the cost involved to the membership. A number of parameters have to be considered in deciding upon the Congress venue. The date of the Congress was also carefully reviewed to avoid conflict with other associations. In regard to hosting Congress outside the United States and the denial of visas, Huber reminded her colleagues that a number of visas had been denied for Canada as well. Vice President Grindle referred to the "experimental nature" of the move to an annual Congress. The decision will be

LASA2013 Awards and Recipients

reviewed after three Congresses. Thus far it seems to have been effective in reducing the number of proposals rejected.

Another member present encouraged the LASA leadership always to be “proactive” in regard to the potential denial of visas. LASA should also attempt to include Cuban resident scholars among the EC. Executive Director Pereyra responded that LASA had consulted with an attorney who specializes in issues regarding Cuba and OFAC regulations, and the attorney had advised that under current law Cuban resident scholars were not permitted to participate in the governing of the Association. Pereyra agreed to provide the letter including that opinion from the attorney. Pereyra added that LASA provides free Congress registration to Cuban scholars.

A final recommendation was that the Association make every effort to schedule the LASA Business Meeting at a time when it would not conflict with other sessions. ■

Kalman Silvert Award

The Kalman Silvert Award Committee consisted of Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida, Chair (Universidade de São Paulo), Julio Cotler (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos), Eric Hershberg (American University), John Coatsworth (Columbia University), and Philip Oxhorn (McGill University).

The 2013 recipient of the Association’s highest award, the Kalman Silvert Award, is Peter H. Smith, a scholar on United States and Latin American relations, and the Simón Bolívar Professor of Latin American Studies at University of California in San Diego. Smith obtained his PhD in comparative politics of Latin America from Columbia University in 1996. He has been a president of the Latin American Studies Association as well as being consultant to the Ford Foundation and the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. The following remarks are taken from Smith’s autobiographical statement in the spring 2013 issue of the *LASA Forum*. For the complete text, please see the *LASA Forum* article.

“The journey began many years ago when I yearned to take a summer trip to Europe, as many of my college classmates did at the time. The problem was a lack of funds, so I set out on a less expensive venture: a bus ride from New York City to Mexico City. I knew no Spanish, no Mexican history, no Latin American politics, nothing. . . . That trip changed my life. . . . I witnessed student protests, listened to expositions about all sorts of political values, and heard discussions (and diatribes) about Fidel Castro and U.S. imperialism. . . . Fortunately I enrolled for graduate study in history at Columbia University in 1961,

just in time for the inauguration of its renowned Institute of Latin American Studies. I was able to study with such luminaries as Albert O. Hirschman, Juan J. Linz, Frank Tannenbaum, and the indefatigable Lewis Hanke. . . . In subsequent years I embarked upon a program of self-education in political science, initially by auditing courses at the University of California, Berkeley. With the encouragement of Kalman Silvert, I determined to acquire a working command of quantitative methodology. This linkage of history and political science would define a core concern of my scholarly efforts: to analyze long-term patterns of political change in Latin America through the judicious application of cutting-edge methods in political science.

My first corpus of research focused on Argentina and resulted in two books: *Politics and Beef in Argentina* (1969), which examined political struggles over a key sector of the national economy from the 1880s to the 1940s, and *Argentina and the Failure of Democracy* (1974), based on a statistical analysis of roll-call votes in the Chamber of Deputies from 1904 through 1955. . . . These efforts also resulted in a book chapter on the breakdown of Argentine democracy in 1930. I then turned to Mexico and sought to unravel the political logic of its authoritarian regime. . . . I decided to examine the structure and transformation of the nation’s political elite from 1900 through the 1970s. I gathered and computerized data on the political biographies of more than 6,000 officeholders, and produced a book entitled *Labyrinths of Power* (1979). One significant by-product of this effort was a roll-call analysis of voting patterns in Mexico’s constitutional convention of 1917.

In the mid-1980s I received an invitation from the Ford Foundation to serve as co-staff director of a major project on U.S.-Mexican relations. The project produced a book-length study titled *The Challenge of Interdependence* (1988), led to encounters with presidents and dignitaries in both countries, and resulted in the publication of five volumes of background papers. Over the years I have edited or coedited more than a dozen anthologies on subjects ranging from historiography and methodology to regional economic integration, Mexican politics, U.S.-Mexican relations, drug trafficking, Latin America–East Asia relations, and women’s roles in Asia and Latin America.

Teaching has been one of my great pleasures. . . . In addition, I have drawn special satisfaction from teaching students in other countries—Argentina, Brazil, China, Ecuador, Mexico, Spain, and elsewhere. . . . All this work has allowed me to do an unexpected variety of things. I have traveled to most parts of the world; exchanged thoughts and ideas with public figures, prominent colleagues, and ordinary citizens; been the moderator for a monthly TV show; and expressed my opinions through op-eds and columns in national and international newspapers. I have even served as president of LASA. This career has been a privilege. It has been a responsibility as well. . . . I have relished the challenges, accepted the setbacks, and savored the satisfactions. To borrow a phrase from Maya Angelou, “wouldn’t take nothing for my journey now.”

Bryce Wood Book Award

Bryce Wood Book Award Committee members included Laurence Whitehead, Chair (Oxford University), Rosario Espinal (Temple University), Tulia Falletti (University of Pennsylvania), Paul Gootenberg (SUNY/Stony Brook University), Andrew Schrank (University of New Mexico), Doris Sommer (Harvard University), and Mary Kay Vaughan (University of Maryland, College Park).

Beyond the Lettered City: Indigenous Literacies in the Andes by Joanne Rappaport and Tom Cummins (Duke University Press, 2012) is the 2013 recipient of the Bryce Wood Book Award. The academic study of Latin America in English is flourishing, and this year’s Bryce Wood Prize Committee received over one hundred nominated volumes—nearly all of them valuable contributions to this broad interdisciplinary field. But one volume stood out as an exceptionally ambitious, thoughtful, and well-constructed achievement. *Beyond the Lettered City* combines fresh and challenging ideas about the foundations of literacy and the cognitive transformations produced under the impact of Spanish colonization, together with precise and evocative reinterpretations of well-chosen items of evidence, culled from the northern Andes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The theoretical ambition of the work is to expand our conception of literacy beyond the unilateral introduction of alphabetic writing (the theme made famous in Angel Rama’s seminal *Lettered City*). Rappaport and Cummins aim to promote a far broader and more interactive understanding of the cognitive impact of the colonial encounter. The symbolic structure of European thought—artistic, architectural, religious, visual, and urban—

framed and embedded its more strictly literary expression, and all of this contrasted with highly elaborated indigenous ways of imagining and portraying their world. *Beyond the Lettered City* enriches our understanding of literacy in general and of its distinctive place in comparative history. It also highlights the active and creative responses of the Andean populations who were abruptly exposed to these initially unfamiliar conventions, which they apprehended through the lens of their own prior symbolic systems.

The volume shows how this multifaceted literacy operated as a social process in the formation of colonial society. The authors examine three ethnic groups (the Muisca, the Pasto, and the Nasa) in the non-Incaic setting of the northern Andes. They focus on nonelites: testators, local caciques, indigenous notaries, and communities seeking protection of their resources. Their analysis of intercultural communication is vivid and original (e.g., the drawing up of a will replete with religious ceremony, visual symbols, legal documents, and the inscription of such community valuables as snail shells or painted cloth mantles). Their use of concepts such as appropriation, mutual misunderstanding, and transculturalism is exemplary and sets a high bar for future studies. This is combined with a finely crafted and in-depth analysis of a broad array of colonial artifacts—ceremonial crosses, ceramics, churches, maps, murals, patents, portraits, urban grids, and wax seals—as well as of literary texts. Each item receives expert attention from the two authors in a volume that also sets an unusually high standard for collaboration between scholars drawn from distinct disciplinary backgrounds—one an anthropologist, the other an art historian.

Bryce Wood Book Award Honorable Mention

The Bryce Wood Book Award Honorable Mention was awarded to Isaac Campos for *Home Grown: Marijuana and the Origins of Mexico's War on Drugs* (University of North Carolina Press, 2012). This was a strong runner-up. *Home Grown* tells the remarkable and unfamiliar history that culminated in the decision of March 1920 by which the postrevolutionary Mexican state banned the cultivation and commerce of marijuana throughout the nation. It combines a challenging and unexpected reconstruction of the long Mexican history of production of this plant (initially imported from Spain to provide fiber for shipping) with a scholarly and persuasive account of how its health effects were misunderstood and sensationalized. Campos argues that while there is no scientific proof of a link between marijuana use and psychosis, in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Mexican popular, literary, and scientific thought, marijuana was believed to produce madness, violence, disorientation, and disorder in users. This belief in turn laid the foundations for the U.S. war on drugs. Campos establishes the internal Mexican origins of a prohibitionist urge strong enough to override well-founded expert attempts to correct hysterical misrepresentations. Although the contemporary implications are not developed, this history also has contemporary relevance concerning the self-reinforcing and negative consequences that follow from drug policies not founded on scientific evidence and not governed by public health principles.

Premio Iberoamericano

El Comité para el Premio Iberoamericano fue presidido por Elizabeth Jelin (CONICET-IDES) e integrado por Claudio Barrientos (Universidad Diego Portales), Saúl Sosnowski (University of Maryland) y Kurt Weyland (University of Texas at Austin). El libro ganador del concurso es *Revoluciones sin cambios revolucionarios: Ensayos sobre la crisis en Centroamérica* de Edelberto Torres-Rivas (F&G Editores, 2011).

Hay veces en que tenemos el privilegio de encontrar un caso donde convergen la excelencia académica, el compromiso cívico y la preocupación política. Eso es lo que se siente leyendo este libro: rigor académico, reflexividad y el fluir de la historia, en el que se es protagonista de una época y observador al mismo tiempo.

El libro narra la historia de tres procesos revolucionarios —El Salvador, Guatemala y Nicaragua— mostrando sus ilusiones y sus promesas para luego convertirse en fracasos: son esas “Revoluciones sin cambios revolucionarios” a los que alude el título del libro. Nos muestra que la revolución era necesaria y al mismo tiempo inviable e imposible. Como “espectador activo” de esos procesos, como especialista y analista de realidades en flujo, el autor, en esto que él mismo define como “ejercicio personal, de la cuarta edad” se permite una reflexión lúcida, introduciendo una perspectiva histórico-temporal donde las coyunturas y las urgencias pueden ser miradas en su devenir de más largo plazo.

El libro tiene densidad teórica y dialoga con una vasta literatura de las ciencias sociales. La discusión sobre la relación entre historia y sociología, o las concepciones de la revolución son temas planteados directamente en el plano

teórico. Después, a lo largo de lo que presenta como una narración de los procesos en cada uno de los tres países, los diálogos teóricos explícitos e implícitos se multiplican y aportan a la conceptualización de los procesos de cambio y transformación en general y de los procesos revolucionarios en particular.

Con una perspectiva histórica, el libro es un modelo de investigación empírica profunda. Torres-Rivas presenta información específica y datos pertinentes a su tema, información que relaciona directamente con sus preocupaciones teóricas. No se trata de una ‘mera descripción’; selecciona los hechos cuidadosamente y los usa para sustanciar sus líneas argumentales. De este modo, quien lo lee se encuentra con un tratamiento sistemático de la economía política centroamericana y de los profundos cambios que ha experimentado. Las diferencias y divergencias entre los tres países aparecen con nitidez; también los temas comunes y las maneras específicas en que se manifestaron en cada uno de ellos. Hay algo más, metodológicamente importante: se trata de un análisis comparativo, pero como los procesos de los distintos países no son independientes, el libro trabaja simultáneamente los aspectos relacionales, señalando las influencias mutuas y los procesos globales que afectan a toda la región.

La línea central de la argumentación está centrada en el Estado, sin desconocer el impacto de los factores socioeconómicos y de clase. Nadie puede dudar del poder de los grupos sociales dominantes y las oligarquías en América Central, y Torres-Rivas es el primero en reconocerlo. Habitualmente este reconocimiento va unido al supuesto de estados débiles y sin autonomía. Torres-Rivas reconoce el poder de las fuerzas sociales, pero centra su

atención en el papel de las instituciones y organizaciones políticas, incluyendo de manera focal a las fuerzas armadas, que a menudo actúan según sus propios intereses y no necesariamente como “brazo armado” de las fuerzas sociales dominantes. Por el otro lado, al preguntarse sobre las motivaciones de la oposición para llevar adelante la lucha armada y los intentos revolucionarios, se encuentra con la ausencia de democracia y la opresión política, y no solamente con la explotación económica y la dominación social. Como análisis de la política, Torres-Rivas evita poner el énfasis en las reglas institucionales formales considerando, además, la interacción de los factores políticos con los económicos y sociales.

En suma, se trata de un libro teóricamente importante y empíricamente sólido sobre procesos políticos cruciales en una sub-región de América Latina. Sin embargo, no es —como ya se dijo al comienzo— un libro escrito desde un lugar puramente académico. Está inspirado en el compromiso político personal, lo cual le da una importancia particular. En sus páginas están los datos duros, pero también los ideales, utopías y sentimientos de su autor.

En el mundo de LASA, Edelberto Torres-Rivas no necesita introducción. Ganador del Premio Kalman Silvert en 2010, su trayectoria de investigación, de docencia y de gestión académica en FLACSO y en otras instituciones, en América Central y más allá de la región, indican a las claras su ubicación como uno de los grandes intelectuales latinoamericanos.

Media Award

The Media Award Committee included William LeoGrande, Chair (American University), Alma Guillermoprieto (journalist), and Karen DeYoung (*Washington Post*). The following text was delivered during presentation of the award by Chair William LeoGrande.

Marcela Turati is exceptional. She is the author of the 2010 book *Fuego cruzado: Las víctimas atrapadas en la guerra del narco* (Crossfire: Victims Trapped in the Narco-War), about the impact of drug violence on Mexican society. She writes for *Proceso* and previously reported for the Mexican newspapers *Reforma* and *Excelsior*.

Over the years, at *Proceso*, she has reported on the Zapatista uprising, government scandals, the drug trade, and the efforts of campesinos to protect themselves from machine-gun-wielding loggers and drug traffickers. Although the common element in many of these stories is violence, Marcela has focused her reporting not on the sensationalism of that violence but on the human dimension—on the victims of violence and the people who organize against it.

In 2007, together with a similarly committed group of reporters of her generation, she founded an association called Periodistas de a Pie (Journalists on Foot). It has become a reference point and a source of hope for journalists throughout Mexico, organizing workshops and creating a space where besieged reporters can find comfort simply in talking with colleagues facing the same dangers. Marcela and her cohort—including Daniela Rea, Daniela Pastrana, Alberto Najjar, and Elia Baltazar, to name a few of the most active participants—have taken real risks to

make Mexican journalism stand for something in these dreadful times. But in the face of these risks, the Periodistas have not backed down; they are the kind of people who ask themselves constantly, “If not me, who?”

Marcela Turati is also a recipient of the 2011 Ochberg Fellowship for coverage of violence and trauma from the Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma at Columbia University’s Graduate School of Journalism; the winner of the 2013 Louis M. Lyons Award for Conscience and Integrity in Journalism presented by the Nieman Fellows at Harvard University; and the winner of the 2013 Human Rights Award from Washington Office on Latin America.

LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Award and the LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Dissertation Award

The 2013 Diskin Committee consisted of Aldo Panfichi Huamán, Chair (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú), Richard Snyder (Brown University), and Peter Smith (University of California, San Diego).

For the Lectureship Award 15 submissions were received—only 4 from women and all from outstanding scholars with committed activist work that resembles Martin Diskin’s legacy. In the first stage, the committee prepared individual rankings of all the nominees, considering academic contributions, social commitment, and the quality of the endorsement received. For the second stage the committee defined a top three final round and by majority decided that Professor Stefano Varese was the selected scholar for this year.

Professor Panfichi Huamán indicates that his enthusiasm with the selection is also personal, for Varese is one of the most distinguished scholars from the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, where he prepared his bachelor and doctoral dissertations about the Campa indigenous people’s ethnohistorical and conflictive process of interaction with the state and modernity. This work would later be published as *La sal de los cerros*, his first groundbreaking contribution to contemporary anthropology. Charles Hale points out in his endorsement letter: “While Varese’s contribution in the early ’70s is noteworthy, what is truly remarkable is that he continued, for the next four decades, to stand at the forefront of this rapidly changing field. It is this visionary analytical acumen, the ability to shape the field and its future intellectual agenda, which makes Varese such an extraordinary

scholar. This acumen, in turn, is fundamentally shaped by Varese’s deep, consistent, and principled political engagement—as ‘witness’ and practitioner—with the peoples who have been his subjects of study.”

Eight applications were received for the Dissertation Award. All of them were from recently graduated PhDs and six were from women. Most of the dissertations dealt with Latin American politics and policies, and considerations regarding the state and natural resources, but a small group dealt with the Hispanicization of practices and spaces in the United States. Each of the committee members selected three top finalists, considering the academic quality of the dissertations, their linkage with contemporary Latin American problems, and the author’s commitment to the solution of social problems in the region. It became an utterly difficult assignment as all the research projects were faultless. In the end, two finalists were elected, and we couldn’t find any particular distinctiveness to choose one over the other. In this way, Erica Simmons and Lindsay Mayka became this year’s Martin Diskin Dissertation Awardees.

Erica Simmons’s dissertation is entitled “Markets, Movements, and Meanings: Subsistence Resources and Political Protest in Mexico and Bolivia” and was written for her PhD in Political Science at the University of Chicago. She examines resistance movements to market-oriented economic reforms from two case studies: one over the privatization of water in Cochabamba, Bolivia, in 2000, and the other regarding liberalization of Mexican corn markets in 2007. She contends that market-driven threats to subsistence resources are a particularly powerful locus for collective action because these resources

have taken on meanings beyond their apparent material value.

Lindsay Mayka’s dissertation for her PhD in Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley, questions the rationale that politicians follow when implementing participatory institutions, which, by design, limit politicians’ discretion. Under the title “Bringing the Public into Policymaking: National Participatory Institutions in Latin America,” she analyzes and compares the cases of Brazil and Colombia, arguing that participatory institutions are doomed unless they are embedded in a larger policy reform. She provocatively concludes that national participatory institutions can help deepen democracy but are destined to fail if deepening democracy is the main reason for their adoption.

Charles A. Hale Fellowship for Mexican History

The Charles A. Hale Fellowship for Mexican History is awarded to Mexican graduate students in the last phase of doctoral research. The selection committee is charged with evaluating proposals based on scholarly merit and “the candidate’s potential contribution to the advancement of humanist understanding between Mexico and its global neighbors.” This year’s selection committee included Javier Garciadiego (El Colegio de México), Laura Gotkowitz (University of Pittsburgh), Eric Van Young (University of California, San Diego), and Richard Warren (Saint Joseph’s University), who served as Chair.

The committee chose to give this year’s award to Irving Reynoso Jaime of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Reynoso’s dissertation is entitled “Un estudio del radicalismo campesino: La política agraria del Partido Comunista Mexicana en los años veinte; La experiencia latinoamericana más avanzada.” This work builds on a growing historiography of Mexico that adds nuance and complexity to our understanding of relationships among diverse social actors and the emerging state in the aftermath of the Revolution. In this case, Reynoso focuses on the histories of radical agrarian groups in three different regions (Durango, Veracruz, and Michoacán) during the 1920s. Reynoso’s research promises to add significantly to the ongoing reassessment of Mexico’s postrevolutionary political evolution. The work also promises to contribute significantly to a broader understanding of the histories of agrarian movements and communism.

Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Award

The 2013 Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Award Committee consisted of Leslie Elliott Armijo, Chair (Portland State University), Michael Shifter (Inter-American Dialogue), and Juan Gabriel Tokatlian (Universidad Torcuato Di Tella).

In *Allende’s Chile and the Inter-American Cold War* (University of North Carolina Press, 2011), Tanya Harmer offers the hitherto underemphasized Cuban, Chilean, Brazilian, and inter-American side of the story of the election, administration, and overthrow of President Salvador Allende. In this absorbing, compulsively readable volume Harmer subtly displays both the political and the human story, drawing on newly available archives and extensive interviews with several of the aging participants and close observers. The conflicting perceptions, strategies, and personalities shine through, from Castro’s letter to the cautious Allende, which follows fulsome praise with the politely indirect observation that “someone once said” that a revolution requires “audacity, audacity, and more audacity” (142), to U.S. Secretary of State Rogers’s recommendation that Kissinger “encourag[e] the Chileans to do what they should” (54). The volume’s organization manages to be thematic yet mostly chronological, allowing the reader to absorb new information and analysis without the scholar’s craft impinging unnecessarily. It was the committee’s collective pleasure to select this book for the Premio Tomassini.

Luciano Tomassini Award Honorable Mention

While books intended as undergraduate texts relatively seldom receive scholarly prizes, the committee also was impressed with *Understanding U.S.–Latin American Relations* (Routledge, 2012), by Marc Eric Williams. The volume successfully integrates core elements of contemporary international relations theory, particularly from a realist perspective, with a briskly competent survey of U.S.–Latin American relations from the Spanish American War through the early twenty-first century. The committee was pleased to extend to Professor Williams honorable mention for the Tomassini Award. ■

LASA2013 Photos



At the Welcoming Ceremony with Program Co-chairs Gwen Kirkpatrick, Ken Roberts, Plenary Speaker José Miguel Insulza, and President Evelyne Huber



Kalman Silvert Awardee Peter Smith with President Evelyne Huber and Committee Chair Maria Herminia Tavares



Joanne Rappaport and Tom Cummins accepting the Bryce Wood Book Award from Committee Chair Laurence Whitehead



Alvaro Torres Rivas accepting the Premio Iberoamericano on behalf of his father, Edelberto Torres, from Claudio Barrientos on behalf of the Committee



Media Award Committee Chair William LeoGrande presenting the award to Margarita Torres, accepting on behalf of Marcela Turati and the Periodistas de a Pie



Diskin Committee Chair Aldo Panfichi Huaman presenting the Diskin Dissertation Awards to Lindsay Mayka (center) and Erica Simmons (left)



LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Lecturer Stefano Varese with panel participant Charles Hale and Committee Chair Aldo Panfichi Huaman

At the Welcoming Reception



Section News

Asia and the Americas Promoted Dialogue on the Trans-Pacific Partnership

The Section for Asia and the Americas hosted a high-level forum on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Pacific Alliance prior to the LASA2013 Congress. It was held at the Inter-American Dialogue in Washington, DC. The forum was entitled “China, Latin America, and the Changing Architecture of Trans-Pacific Engagement” (www.thedialogue.org/the_changing_architecture_of_trans-pacific_engagement). Funding from the Open Society Institute enabled the event to bring together four ambassadors from TPP countries with key analysts from Latin America, the United States, and China. The event program was coordinated by Adrian H. Hearn (Chair of the Section for Asia and the Americas) and Margaret Myers (the Inter-American Dialogue). The TPP’s wide-ranging provisions on private enterprise, human rights, labor standards, and freedom of online data make it impossible in the foreseeable future for China to join the negotiations. Several Chinese newspapers have therefore interpreted the TPP as an attempt to exclude China, while a prominent Chinese official has stated that the TPP is being used by the United States “as a part of its Asia Pacific Strategy to contain China.” International dialogue on the TPP that includes Chinese voices, whether through official or informal channels, has been lacking. Promoting such dialogue was the motivation for the forum. A public press conference at the event’s conclusion summarized its main themes. Following the event Dr. Hearn published an article in the *Australian Financial Review* on China’s announcement that it will consider joining the TPP.

Gender and Feminist Studies and Sexualities Studies Sections Pre-Conference

A region usually known for its Catholic religiosity and patriarchal institutions has expanded gender and sexual rights in an unprecedented manner, as we have seen the enactment of anti-violence and antidiscrimination legislation, gay marriage, and the world’s most progressive gender identity law. The daylong conference “Gender, Sexuality, and Struggles for Justice in Latin America: Legal, Political, and Social Dimensions” held at American University’s Washington College of Law on May 29 2013, just prior to the 2013 LASA Congress, brought together 82 legal practitioners, scholars, and activists from the Americas, Europe, and the Washington area to discuss and assess the advances made through legal activism. It was sponsored by the Washington College of Law Impact Litigation Project and the American University Center for Latin American and Latino Studies. This third collaboration between the Gender and Feminist Studies and the Sexualities Sections was a resounding success.

The discussion about the role of legal activism in the pursuit of social justice and equity issues was organized around two morning panels and an afternoon structured discussion session. The first panel offered an overview of several decades of legal activism, beginning with a description of the activities of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) LGBT rights unit, and recognizing the debt owed to feminist activism and scholarship in this field. It included discussions about the veritable boom in dialogic judicial activism on same-sex marriage in places like Colombia, Brazil, and Mexico. Advances in reproductive rights and the involvement of the IACHR to guarantee legal access in

Latin America was also discussed, as were challenges faced by attorneys and activists from Latin America working in the areas of diversity and reproductive rights in contexts characterized not by lack of legislation but by a disregard of the law and by impunity. The second panel continued this assessment of the challenges and limitations of legal activism by examining the entanglements of diverse groups with legal discourses of rights, and asking who is protected, how, and under what conditions. A bioethicist from Central America opened this discussion with a cautionary tale about the dangers of mobilizations whose diverse demands are channeled into single legal issues, and called attention to the limitations of IACHR as an effective tool in the region. Two feminist activists from the Washington area addressed the particular challenges faced by Latina LGBT migrants, for whom the transit through Mexico to the United States is already a nightmare and the pursuit of legal remedies in the United States typically poses insurmountable cultural and economic problems. A final presentation addressed the experience of Mapuche indigenous women in Chile with the law, and posed the question, what happens when laws meant to protect do not protect?

A spirited structured discussion followed in the afternoon. The limits of legal tools for social activism were considered by social scientists, activists, and legal experts and attorneys in a very fruitful, interdisciplinary exchange. Lawyers warned about the common assumption that the law acts like a “magic wand”; social scientists from Central America reminded us that the region, now labeled the most violent on the planet, is a place where the letter of the law of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights is simply disregarded. Where social struggles are not metaphorical

but very concrete, asked one, should we not consider the possibility of activism *delictivo*, the violation of the law as a legitimate tool?

Our event coincided with the death at the age of 90 of Dr. Henry Morgentaler, Holocaust survivor and family doctor whose well-publicized, repeated, and deliberate violations of Canada's restrictive abortion legislation in the 1970s and 1980s led to a major legal victory on reproductive rights.

The Colonial Section held its first business meeting at LASA2013. Members discussed the prizes the Section will award in the coming years, the publication of our quarterly newsletter, the organization of the Section's two sponsored panels for LASA2014, and a succession plan for the group's leadership. The Section celebrated its inaugural reception at the Cosmos Club near Dupont Circle on May 31. ■

THE ANNUAL RENEWAL THEOLOGY CONFERENCE

Renewal Across the Americas

Conference

February 28
- March 1, 2014

Regent University
Virginia Beach, VA

Call for Papers

Submission Deadline
November 30, 2013



Plan now to participate in this scholarly conference that seeks to promote research on the renewing work of the Holy Spirit as it unfolds across the Americas. The forum will foster mutual dialogue among scholars, professionals, and the broader public on the Pentecostal-Charismatic movements in Latin America and among Latinas/os.

Plenary session leaders include:



Virginia Garrard-Burnett
University of Texas
at Austin



Bernardo Campos
Pentecostalidad: Revista
Pentecostal de Teología



Arlene Sánchez-Walsh
Azusa Pacific University



Juan Sepúlveda
Servicio Evangélico
para el Desarrollo (SEPADE)

Register online at regent.edu/renewal-across-americas

The Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies

The Harvard Academy Scholars Program 2014-2015

The Academy Scholars Program identifies and supports outstanding scholars at the start of their careers whose work combines disciplinary excellence in the social sciences (including history and law) with a command of the language, history, or culture of non-Western countries or regions. Their scholarship may elucidate domestic, comparative, or transnational issues, past or present.

The Academy Scholars are a select community of individuals with resourcefulness, initiative, curiosity, and originality, whose work in non-Western cultures or regions shows promise as a foundation for exceptional careers in major universities or international institutions. Harvard Academy Scholarships are open only to recent PhD (or comparable professional school degree) recipients and doctoral candidates. Those still pursuing a PhD should have completed their routine training and be well along in the writing of their theses before applying to become Academy Scholars; those in possession of a PhD longer than 3 years at the time of application are ineligible.

Academy Scholars are appointed for 2 years by the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies and are provided time, guidance, and access to Harvard University facilities. They receive substantial financial and research assistance to undertake sustained projects of research and/or acquire accessory training in their chosen fields and areas. Some teaching is permitted but not required. The Senior Scholars, a distinguished group of senior Harvard University faculty members, act as mentors to the Academy Scholars to help them achieve their intellectual potential.

Post-doctoral Academy Scholars will receive an annual stipend of \$65,000, and pre-doctoral Academy Scholars will receive an annual stipend of \$31,000. Applications for the 2014-2015 class of Academy Scholars are due by **October 1, 2013**. Finalist interviews will take place in Cambridge on **December 5**. Notification of Scholarships will be made in January, 2014. For complete information on how to apply visit: www.wcfia.harvard.edu/academy.

**Become part of a unique,
up-and-coming program.**

Atlantic History Ph.D.

GRADUATE FACULTY

N. David Cook
(Latin America; Spain)

Aurora Morcillo
(Spain; Gender)

Gwyn Davies
(Ancient; Military)

Okezi Otovo
(Brazil; African Diaspora)

Rebecca Friedman
(Russia; Europe)

Bianca Premo
(Latin America)

Jenna Gibbs
(US; British Atlantic)

Darden Pyron
(US)

Sherry Johnson
(Caribbean; Environment)

Kenneth Lipartito
(US)

M^a. del Mar Logrono Narbona
(Mid East)

April Merleaux
(US; Transnational)

Aaron Slater
(British Atlantic)

Victor Uribe-Urán
(Latin America)

Chantalle Verna
(Haiti; US)

Kirsten Wood
(US)

**And we welcome
in 2013-14:**

Hilary Jones
(Africa)

Ricardo Salvatore
(Latin America)

history.fiu.edu/graduate/doctorate-atlantic-history



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Review 86

Literature and Arts of the Americas

**Special Issue:
Iconic and
Emerging Writers
& Artists**

Volume 46, Issue 1
May 2013

Americas SOCIETY

www.tandfonline.com/rev

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group

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 7,500 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.



LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

416 Bellefield Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

lasa.international.pitt.edu