President's Corner
by Helen I. Safa, University of Florida

The International Congress in Mexico City was the largest and liveliest we have ever had. The large number of visiting delegations from China, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Spain pointed up the international nature of the Congress. Nearly 2,000 persons registered for the Congress, but attendance is estimated at 3,000. Latin Americans constituted 785 of the registered participants, and their presence really lent this Congress a Latin flavor. Many panels and papers were in Spanish and Portuguese, a practice I hope we can continue, even for meetings held in the United States. I also hope that LASA will continue to encourage the participation of Latin Americans in our association, and welcome the suggestions of colleagues in this regard (e.g., one person has suggested we continue to print abstracts in all languages). Certainly we should begin to plan for additional meetings outside the United States—we have already been approached by Puerto Rico and Spain for future congresses.

The LASA Congress also dealt with several important issues confronting the association. The most important of these was the publication of the CIA ad in the summer issue of the LASA Forum, which caused considerable concern, particularly among our Latin American colleagues. I want to express my appreciation to all of those who helped us deal with this issue in Mexico City, particularly Mario Ojeda, whose efforts were unfailing on behalf of a rather unpopular cause. His participation points up the importance of having Latin Americans on the Executive Council and in other activities of the association. I also want to commend those who attended the business meeting in Mexico City for their restraint and constructive approach to this problem.

Our thanks are also due to the Ad Hoc Committee appointed to investigate the CIA issue, which completed a thorough, careful report in record time. I have just received this report and have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the members of this committee nor the Executive Council. In my opinion, certain issues raised in the report, which is published in this issue, clearly point to the need for clarification in LASA, both in terms of policy and procedure. This is a matter with which the Executive Council will have to deal at its next meeting, now scheduled for March. In the meantime, the report, in my judgment, clears up any suspicion of malice on the part of officers of the association involved in the publication of the CIA ad. It also gives evidence that the ad was not directed simply at LASA, since it was submitted to and published in other professional journals and area studies newsletters.

The CIA ad raises again the issue of LASA’s public image. Some feel that LASA has abandoned a commitment to pluralism when it adopts resolutions at the business meeting or presents panels critical of our government’s foreign policy or condemning violations of academic freedom and human rights in Latin America. But many of LASA’s members, including myself, feel that, as scholars, we have a responsibility to the people of Latin America to call attention to these problems. We are committed not only to greater knowledge and understanding of the area, but to putting this knowledge at the service of social justice. This should not blind us to opposing viewpoints or challenges to our facts or theories. This is the difference between commitment and dogmatism. Dogmatism signifies the loss of a pluralist perspective; commitment, in my opinion, does not.

The Ad Hoc Committee report on the CIA episode complains of a certain passivity on the part of the Executive Council during the Domínguez presidency. I certainly do not plan to continue this pattern. As a first step in the involvement of members in the affairs of the association, I have taken care in the formation of task forces to continue to broaden participation as much as possible, including different regions, disciplines, and political persuasions. All who volunteered their services were incorporated. I also made an attempt to include greater participation by women and Latin Americans, and to provide the task forces with at least a minimal budget.

We have just constituted a new task force on Nicaragua, headed by Thomas Walker and Richard Fagen. The first charge of this task force is printed elsewhere in this issue. The task force on Nicaragua brings the total number to seven, the members of which are also printed in this issue.

I especially want to thank the members of the Task Force on Women, headed by Beth Miller, for the lovely luncheon held in my honor at the LASA Congress. The plaque which they gave me already hangs framed in my office, and will be cherished as a memory of this event and of our warm friendship.

The Task Force on Scholarly Relations with Latin America has been temporarily suspended in view of our need to redefine our relationship to other social science and Latin American associations outside the United States. Richard Sinkin and I attended the first congress of the recently formed International
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Federation of Latin American and Caribbean Studies held in Caracas immediately following the LASA Congress. The founders of this federation include several distinguished Latin Americans, such as Leopoldo Zoa de Mexico and Candido Mendes and Darcy Ribeiro of Brazil, who have urged us to join for over a year now. We shall decide on our formal participation in this federation at the next Executive Council meeting. At that time we also hope to have an advisory report by Carmelo Mesa-Lago, outlining his views on LASA’s role vis-à-vis these other organizations.

Despite the serious problems created by the CIA ad, it is possible to look at the issue in more positive terms. The crisis pointed up certain flaws in our organization which should have been corrected earlier. It proved the tolerance and dedication of our members through the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, in the business meeting, and in Mexico City, generally. Clearly, LASA is important to us and if we work together to remedy these problems, we can build a stronger and more effective organization.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING,
XI INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS,
MEXICO CITY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1983

President Helen I. Saña called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in the Hotel Fiesta Palace. In her opening remarks, she noted that the XI Congress was the first LASA meeting to be held outside the United States. She also recognized the exceptional efforts of the Program and Local Arrangements Committee by presenting gifts to co-chairs Mario Ojeda and Robert Van Kemper as well as Peter Smith (principal fund raiser for Latin American travel to the congress) and Javier Torres (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico).

Christopher Mitchell, chair of the Program Committee for the XII International Congress in Albuquerque (18-20 April 1985), reminded the meeting that now was the time to begin planning for the next congress and urged all interested participants to respond quickly to the call for papers and panels in the upcoming LASA publications.

Louis Goodman presented the Media Task Force Award for outstanding journalistic coverage of Latin America to Raymond Barr of the New York Times.

Robert Trudeau, member of the Task Force on Academic Freedom and Human Rights, presented a resolution on U.S. relations with Cuba. After being moved and seconded, the voting members passed unanimously the following language:

Whereas the U.S. government has pursued a policy of hostility toward Cuba;

Whereas the U.S. government is denying many U.S. citizens the right to travel to Cuba as tourists; and

Whereas professional scholars must seek special clearance from the U.S. government if they wish to do research in Cuba;

Therefore be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association urge the U.S. government to end its policy of hostility and to begin negotiations for the further normalization of relations between the two countries, including the lifting of obstacles to travel.

Robert Trudeau then presented a resolution on Guatemala.

After being moved and seconded, and some discussion about the role of LASA as a lobbying organization, the voting members unanimously passed the following language:

Whereas in the period since the last meeting of LASA the overall level of political and military repression has reached unprecedented heights in Guatemala, including a marked increase, in 1983, of repression directed against members of the academic community; and

Whereas the U.S. government continues to provide military, economic, and symbolic support for the government of Guatemala;

Be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association urge the Guatemalan government to cease its violations of human rights and academic freedom;

Be it further resolved that LASA urge the government of the United States to cease its support for the Guatemalan government, should that government not cease its violations of human rights immediately; and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be forwarded to the president of the United States, the secretary of state, the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the president of Guatemala, the Guatemalan Human Rights Commission, and the Democratic Front against Repression (FDCR).

Robert Trudeau then presented a resolution on universities in El Salvador. After being moved and seconded, discussion centered on the recipients of the resolution and specific language regarding a change from “reopen the campus” to “return to the university the control of its own elected officials.” As amended, the following resolution passed unanimously:

The Latin American Studies Association deplores the violation of academic freedom and human rights in higher education in El Salvador, evident in attacks against the National University and the Universidad Centroamericana.

LASA therefore calls upon the government of El Salvador:

1) to return to the university the control of its own elected officials, allocating funds to restore the university buildings and equipment, and to pledge to support the autonomy of both universities and the restoration of academic freedom;

2) to end all harassment of faculty, staff, and students and to release all university personnel imprisoned without due cause; and

3) to prosecute those responsible for acts of violence directed against the Universidad Centroamericana in recent weeks.

Upon ratification by mail ballot, the resolution shall be sent to President Alvaro Magana of El Salvador, Ambassador Thomas Pickering, Secretary of State George Schultz, the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. (NOTE: Brief form—complete wording will be on mail ballot.)

Robert Trudeau presented a fourth resolution on the visa policy of the United States. After being moved and seconded, the resolution was amended twice. In the first instance, “and public officials” was added to the list of those being denied entrance visas to the U.S. The second amendment added the language “for participation in educational activities” and passed by a vote of 81 for and 47 against. The final version passed unanimously:
Whereas the U.S. Department of State’s actions regarding the entry of Latin American scholars, other professionals, and public figures has shown a pattern and practice of denial of visas; and

Whereas such denials of visas deprive U.S. citizens and scholars of a free exchange of ideas;

Be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association urge the Department of State to cease denying visas to Latin American scholars, other professionals, and public figures for participation in educational activities.

A fifth resolution covered the denial of visas by the United States for entrance of representatives of the people of Nicaragua. After being moved and seconded, the following resolution passed with three dissenting votes:

Whereas the U.S. Department of State has denied visas to representatives of the people of Nicaragua on several occasions;

And whereas these actions deny the rights of the academic community and of the people of the United States to a free exchange of information;

Be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association condemn these actions of the U.S. Department of State; and

Be it further resolved that the Latin American Studies Association convey this resolution to the Secretary of State and urge the Department of State to permit entry into the United States for representatives of the Nicaraguan government and people.

The following resolution was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously:

The members of the Latin American Studies Association deplore and condemn the so-called covert aid given by the government of the United States to the former National Guardsmen of the Somoza dictatorship and other anti-Sandinista forces who are attacking Nicaragua from Honduras and Costa Rica.

U.S. aid to counterrevolutionary forces seeking to destabilize or overthrow the government of Nicaragua is illegal on several counts. Moreover, aid to forces formerly associated with the Somoza dictatorship means that the U.S. government is supporting known violators of human rights.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association urge the U.S. government to cease immediately its support for these activities and to accept immediately, in deed as well as in word, the mediation of the “Contadora Group” of Latin American leaders with respect to the Central American situation.

The seventh resolution concerned the recent situation in Chile. After being moved, seconded, and twice unanimously amended, the assembly passed the following language:

The Latin American Studies Association, the hemisphere’s largest organization of scholars specializing in the study of Latin America, deplores the violence perpetrated by the government of Chile’s Armed and Security Forces since May, 1983, including the killing of a number of Chilean citizens peacefully demanding the reestablishment of democracy in Chile.

The Latin American Studies Association urges the government of Chile:

1) to release all individuals arrested for participating in strikes and political demonstrations; and

2) to respect the right to strike and the freedom of assembly.

This resolution shall be forwarded to the president of Chile, the ambassador of Chile to the United States, the secretary of state of the United States, the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Without amendment or dissent, the voting members passed the following two resolutions:

The revolutionary upheaval in El Salvador is primarily a response to decades of social inequity, undemocratic rule, and brutal repression of prior attempts at reform. Continued violations of human rights by the government of El Salvador and associated paramilitary groups have been well documented.

The Latin American Studies Association calls for an end to U.S. military aid to the Salvadoran government and calls upon the U.S. government to change its policy to one of full support for the initiatives of the Mexican government and the “Contadora Group” to bring about a negotiated settlement to the Salvadoran civil war.

Whereas immigration policy is one of the most critical aspects of United States relations with Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean; and

Whereas the Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1983 (Simpson-Mazzoli Bill) pending in Congress would drastically reverse the liberalization of U.S. immigration law achieved during the past 20 years; and

Whereas the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill would sharply curtail the ability of Central American refugees to apply for political asylum and deny them the right of appeal to the federal courts; and

Whereas the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill would place an arbitrary ceiling on the annual volume of immigration, thereby denying many present U.S. citizens and resident aliens the right to reunify their families; and

Whereas provisions of the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill would permit U.S. employers to import “temporary” workers in a fashion reminiscent of the notorious “Bracero programs” of the 1940s and 1950s; and

Whereas U.S. Latino associations, civil rights organizations, and church groups such as the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, have expressed grave concern that the Simpson-Mazzoli legislation would subject Latinos to new forms of employment discrimination; therefore

Be it resolved that the Latin American Studies Association call upon all members of Congress to vote “no” on the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill.

Upon ratification by mail ballot of the membership, notification of this resolution shall be sent to Senator Edward Kennedy; Representative Tip O’Neill, Speaker of the House; and the Committee on the Judiciary.

President Safa reminded the assembly that the resolutions just passed must be submitted to the full membership and approved by ballot before they become an official statement.

President Safa then began the open section of the Business Meeting by introducing the measures that the Executive Council took in its regular meeting in regard to the publication of the recruitment ad by the CIA in the LASA Forum. She
announced that the Executive Council had voted to prohibit all future advertising from defense and intelligence related agencies of any government. In addition, an Ad Hoc Committee was appointed to carry out a thorough investigation into the placement of the ad with the charge that the report should be available for the winter volume of the *Forum*. She also reported that the Executive Council drafted and published an ad in several Mexico City newspapers rejecting all connection between LASA and the CIA.

Joe Bollinger introduced a “sense of the body” resolution with the understanding that if passed it would not constitute an official LASA position:

1) The role of the CIA in undermining democracy and social progress in Latin America is well known to scholars in the United States and throughout the hemisphere.

2) Because the work of the CIA and other such intelligence agencies is incompatible with the ethical norms of our profession, in which open public discussion and evaluation of all scholarly research is a fundamental tenet, LASA in previous years developed ethical and professional guidelines to prevent CIA utilization and manipulation of our profession and our association.

3) This broad policy should have been applied to all aspects of the association’s work. The members of LASA assembled in Mexico City deeply regret, however, that this policy was never explicitly applied to our publication guidelines, resulting in the unfortunate decision within the LASA Secretariat to publish the CIA ad.

4) We endorse the steps which the Executive Council is taking to investigate this incident and to prevent a recurrence.

5) The text of this motion will be published in Mexico City newspapers, at the latest on Saturday of this week, said papers to include *Uno Más Uno*.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and passed with 6 dissenting votes.

A second “sense of the body” resolution was introduced with the following language:

Once the Ad Hoc Committee has determined who was responsible for the acceptance of the CIA ad, their names shall be published and the LASA authorities, in the name of the entire membership, shall require the resignation of those responsible.

The resolution was moved and seconded. The vote was 42 for and 34 against.

President Safa thanked those who attended for their patience and cooperation and the meeting was adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

**FINAL REPORT OF THE 1983 LASA PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

Submitted by Robert V. Kemper

The XI International Congress of LASA has now passed into history. More than two years of work by LASA staff members, program and local arrangements committee members, and hundreds of scholars in diverse academic disciplines from many countries culminated in a congress of unprecedented dimensions.

During the three-day gathering in Mexico City, 1,953 persons registered for the congress, and more than 1,700 scholars were involved directly as session organizers, coordinators, paper presenters, or discussants. Approximately 50 percent of the program participants were from the United States, about 25 percent were from Mexico City and the provinces, and the remaining 25 percent were from Latin America, Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia, and even China. More than 31 percent of the program participants were women, a figure somewhat higher than that of the previous two LASA meetings in Washington, DC, and Bloomington, Indiana.

There were 273 sessions of all types available to congress participants—in comparison with just 111 sessions at the 1982 LASA meeting in Washington. In Mexico City, more than 600 hours of sessions were divided among 139 panels, 70 workshops, 23 committee and business meetings, 18 breakfast round tables, 9 public forum sessions, 8 special event sessions, 5 film festival sessions, and one post-congress tour. (What is remarkable, given the problems of travel funding these days, is that less than 8 percent of the sessions were canceled at the last minute.)

In addition to the usual sessions, the congress was highlighted by the Thursday night Fiesta Mexicana at the Palacio de Mineria sponsored by El Colegio de Mexico, UNAM, and the Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores of the Mexican government; by the Thursday evening LASA business meeting at which numerous important resolutions were passed regarding internal LASA affairs and external political situations (for details on these resolutions, see elsewhere in this issue); by the Friday evening speech by Lic. Ricardo Valero, subsecretario de relaciones exteriores; by the excellent film festival coordinated by LaVonne Potteet and attended by hundreds of enthusiastic filmgoers; by the large book exhibit assembled by Harve Horowitz; by the Gran Baile de Salsa on Saturday night; and by the Sunday tour to Cholula and the Universidad de las Américas organized by Adriana Bianchi.

Although raw numbers give some idea of the scale and the scope of the Mexico City congress, the qualitative excellence of the program must be judged from anecdotal remarks overheard in the hallways and elevators at the congress, by the completed questionnaires submitted to the 1985 Program Committee, and by letters to the *LASA Forum*. At this point, it appears that the overall impression of the quality of sessions and papers is “very good” to “excellent.” Indeed, it appears that a number of sessions and papers are likely to be published in book or journal formats. In the meantime, the *Abstracts* volume sold at the congress and still available through the LASA Secretariat serves as a noteworthy summary of the rich intellectual flavor of the congress.

The *Abstracts* volume, in its 182-page bilingual format, includes summaries of more than 95 percent (213) of the sessions in which formal papers or presentations were made. With regard to abstracts of individual papers, the *Abstracts* volume contains 755 summaries, most of which are in English and Spanish. By way of comparison, for the 1982 LASA meeting in Washington, DC, only 33 session abstracts and 135
individual paper abstracts were published. Thus, anyone with the Abstracts volume in hand has a useful record of the Mexico City congress and a source of mailing addresses and/or academic affiliations for session organizers and paper presenters. We hope that the Abstracts volume and the program will be of continuing value to all Latin Americanists interested in building their professional and social networks from country to country and discipline to discipline. You can still obtain the Program and Abstracts at a very reasonable cost through the LASA Secretariat.

Before we all turn our attention away from Mexico City and toward the 1985 LASA meeting to be held in Albuquerque, we must pause to thank those who made the Mexico City congress possible. First, I should like to thank Richard Sinkin and the LASA Secretariat staff members in Austin for their continuing support and confidence as we worked together to develop the program and to deal with the logistics of local arrangements. Second, to Theo Crevenna, Lanny Sinkin, and all of the students who labored through four days of hectic registration activities at the Fiesta Palace we give our highest praise. LASA is lucky to have Theo as head of the Local Arrangements Committee for the 1985 meeting. Third, special appreciation must go to Peter Smith for his dealings with the funding agencies which helped to lend a more international flavor to the list of participants in the congress. LaVonne Poteet did a remarkable job in assembling and coordinating the film festival throughout the congress. My guess is that she has created a long-term role for the film festival within future LASA meetings. Finally, but perhaps most important in terms of the realities of bringing the congress to fruition, we must acknowledge the marvelous work of Mario Ojeda and his colleagues at EL Colegio de Mexico, the splendid job of Julio Labastida, Javier Torres, and their colleagues at UNAM, and the able support of other Mexican committee members such as Larissa Lomnit and Adolfo Rodriguez Gallardo. Through the hard work of these and many other individuals, the congress in Mexico City avoided many of the disasters which have befallen other recent international gatherings in Mexico City. Even the problems created by the CIA advertisement in the summer 1983 LASA Forum were kept to a minimum and appear to have had little impact on congress participation.

In closing this eighth and final report to the LASA membership regarding the Mexico City congress, I would like to add the personal note that what I have come to call my "Adventures in LASAlandia" have been rewarding beyond anything I might have anticipated when I was asked to co-chair the Program and Local Arrangements Committee. All of you, with very few exceptions, have been remarkably cooperative in dealing with the paperwork that I forced upon you. For me, the essence of this experience has been to see that, despite national and disciplinary boundaries, the spirit of Latin American studies can be nurtured so that our mutual endeavors will lead to a better understanding of theoretical and pragmatic concerns facing the Americas. Now, it is "On to Albuquerque!" and best wishes to Christopher Mitchell, Theo Crevenna, and all those who have the opportunity to develop the 1985 LASA meeting. I trust that all of us will offer them the kind of support required to give Albuquerque, like Mexico City, a special place within the history of LASA and Latin American studies.

FIRST REPORT OF THE 1985 PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Call for Panels, Papers, and Special Events

The Program Committee for the XII LASA Congress, to be held 18-20 April 1985 in Albuquerque, New Mexico, met to plan for that congress during the Mexico City LASA conference. The committee looks forward to building on the achievements and experience of the 1983 meeting so that the association’s 1985 gathering may be thought-provoking, scholarly, international, intellectually balanced, open, and lively. Participation by Latin American and Caribbean scholars is particularly encouraged. All of us with a concern for Latin American and for Latin American studies will need to work vigorously to meet these goals, especially because necessary time schedules set a brisk pace.

In this report, we will describe (1) the committee’s call for applications from those wishing to participate on the program at Albuquerque; (2) the types of meetings that may be organized for the XII LASA Congress; and (3) the committee’s guidelines and suggestions for especially important topics that ought to be included.

Applications Deadline—15 April 1984

At the back of this issue of the Forum are two printed forms. One is a “Proposal for Organized Session,” including space for a concise explanation of the session’s purpose, full information on the organizers and participants in the session, plus the titles of the papers they plan to present. This is the basic application form for requesting inclusion on the Albuquerque program. The committee strongly encourages the submission of panel proposals. If you wish to propose an individual paper, simply substitute the word “paper” for “organized session” on this form, and omit the participant list.

The second form is a “Proposal for Special Events and Meetings,” (not panels or workshops) including film showings, public forums, receptions, and business meetings for diverse groups related to LASA. These additional or ancillary meetings help give a LASA congress variety and pluralism. The committee welcomes imaginative proposals. Please provide full and detailed information.

All applications should be mailed in time to be received by 15 April 1984 to Prof. Christopher Mitchell, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, New York University, New York, NY 10003, USA.

Types of Organized Sessions at Albuquerque

Three major types of sessions will constitute the bulk of the program in Albuquerque:

A. PANELS—devoted to established areas of research and composed of formal papers prepared especially for the occasion. These papers should be written in advance of the meeting. A paper distribution facility will be made available at Albuquerque, and it will be the responsibility of authors and panel organizers to be sure that fifty (50) copies of each paper arrive on time. These papers should be addressed to Local Arrangements Committee, LASA, c/o Latin American
Institute, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.

B. WORKSHOPS—less formal than panels, affording an opportunity to share research or teaching experiences in new fields of study. Special perspectives, techniques, or methodologies may be shared or shaped at such meetings. Workshops should stress discussion and exchange of ideas, and should strive to include members of the audience actively in the group’s work.

C. BREAKFAST/LUNCH DISCUSSION GROUPS—intended to examine new areas of research and formed by small groups (usually no more than ten persons who sign up to participate in specific discussion groups when they preregister for the meeting). Organizers of breakfast/lunch discussion groups serve as leaders of focused and inclusive table conversations, with flexible and informal procedures.

Guidelines and Suggestions

The committee presents a number of substantive guidelines indicating areas that it considers of particular interest for the Albuquerque program.

The committee especially encourages proposals for organized sessions dealing with

The Chicano experience in the U.S.
Hispanic-American communities in the U.S.—especially comparisons among Chicano, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Cuban, and other communities’ experiences
Latin American views of the United States and of U.S. hemispheric policy
Comparisons among Latin American nations’ handling of common or shared problems—e.g., land reforms, specific industries, development of rapid transit systems
The graphic and plastic arts in Latin America
Latin American nations’ international debts, and their local social/political consequences
The politics and public policy of language in the hemisphere, including policies of bilingualism
State enterprises and state banks in Latin America
New directions in Latin American literature and literary studies
Redemocratization at a time of economic austerity
Latin American women: contemporary issues and their relations to traditional research concerns
The borderlands: on both sides of the Rio Bravo
Stratification within the Andean or Mexican peasantry
Reindianization of indigenous communities
Migration within the Southern Cone
Role of the “informal sector” in development
The Catholic Left and the secular Left—Is an alliance possible?
Military institutions in Latin America: political, social, and economic dimensions

The committee plans to organize a series of “state-of-the-discipline” panels at which one author will assess the achievements and prospects of a particular discipline in Latin American studies. Invited discussants representing that field will offer comments on the review essay. We plan to invite especially promising but relatively junior scholars to prepare these “overview” papers following a long-standing LASA tradition of professional openness. We would welcome suggestions for appropriate potential authors and discussants.

The committee would like to explore members’ interest in “public forums.” These sessions would examine issues of broad current concern in Latin American affairs—e.g., U.S. policy toward the hemisphere or the plans and problems of innovative Latin American governments. Formal papers would not be presented; rather, informed and lively speakers on each topic would be sought in such forums, avoiding the pitfalls of partiality and polarization. The committee welcomes suggestions of topics and speakers for public forums, and also seeks comments on whether members’ interest would justify the scheduling of a “common hour” for such events.

The committee for the Albuquerque gathering has also adopted the following procedural guidelines:

—In the great majority of cases, participants will be limited to one role on the Albuquerque program, in order to broaden opportunities for all applicants. A panel organizer may also present a paper on her/his (or another) panel, and invited Latin American participants may be permitted multiple inclusions.
—Panels and workshops will be limited in size in order to assure orderly and full discussions. Six speakers, including discussants, will ordinarily be the absolute limit for each panel, and panel/workshop organizers will be strongly encouraged to set and maintain a schedule that permits opportunity for questions and discussion from the audience.
—Paper abstracts will be requested from each approved presenter so that a set of abstracts as complete as the fine volume produced at Mexico City may also be presented at Albuquerque.
—Paper presenters will have the responsibility (as noted above) to send, in a timely way, fifty copies of their completed paper to Local Arrangements Committee, LASA, c/o Latin American Institute, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.
—The Program Committee will meet promptly after 15 April to review proposals for organized sessions and for papers and to make choices as to inclusion in the Albuquerque program. Proponents will be notified as promptly as possible following that meeting with specific information on appropriate next steps.

Suggestions Received Thus Far by the Program Committee

In response to the questionnaire distributed at Mexico City, and in separate communications, the Program Committee has thus far received these provisional suggestions for organized sessions:

“The Politics of Transition to Democracy: Theoretical Issues and Comparative Perspectives”
“Bolivia, the Legacy of the Military”
“Israel-Latin America, 1953-1983”
“Transnationalism in the Caribbean Basin”
“Los movimientos independentistas en el Caribe en el siglo XIX”
“Estado y sociedad en América Latina—El futuro de su relación”
“Local Implications of the Internationalization of Latin American Agriculture”
“Democracy in Latin America: Colombia and Venezuela”
“Alternate Frameworks for the Study of Revolutionary Movements and Transformations in Latin America”
“Updating the Geopolitical Problems of the Southern Cone”
“Autoritarismo y democracia en la izquierda latinoamericana (1968-1983)”
“Mercados de trabajo y migración internacional”
“Crisis económica, conflicto político y educación en América Latina”
“Alternate Frameworks for the Study of Revolutionary Movements and Transformations in Latin America”
“Concept and Implementation of Democracy in Latin America”
“Spanish in the Americas: Historical and Socio-Linguistic Issues”
“Agricultural Land Use and Technology in Latin America”
“La educación superior y los derechos humanos en América Latina”
“Management in a Puerto Rican Environment”
“Legal Aspects of Political and Social Change in Latin America”
“Verbal Violence in the Literature of the Southern Cone”
“La novela mexicana después del 1968: Crisis social y desarrollo de las letras”
“La metahistoria y una interpretación del ensayo contemporáneo”
“Contemporary Latin American Thought”
“Literature in the Prisons of Hispanic America”
“El intelectual mexicano ante la sociedad: Fuentes, Paz, Zepeda”
“A Political Analysis of Urban Water Distribution: The Water Crisis in Monterrey, Mexico”
“Infrastructural Development in Central America—An International Small Business Administration Agency”
“Crítica a la política de estabilización de FMI para América Latina”
“The Formation of Entrepreneurship in Latin America: Comparative Evidences”
“Análisis semiológico de productos culturales”
“The Demographic and Fertility Transition in Latin America”
“Vida cotidiana en las grandes ciudades”
“La teoría sociológica clásica y el análisis de la realidad latinoamericana”
“Development in Brazil: Dilemmas and Alternatives/Desenvolvimento no Brasil: Dilemas e Alternativas”
“Marriage and the Family” (in Latin America)
“Rural Development in Brazil”
and Papers:
“Using Art and Photography to Teach Latin American Studies”
“The Financial Structuring of an International Small Business Administration Agency”
“La formación del empresariado en Colombia”
“La imagen del machismo en expresiones de cultura popular”
“Role of European Political Ethics and Philosophy in Latin America”
“Spanish in the Americas: Some Historical Milestones”
“The Seasons of a Colombian Executive Woman’s Life: A Study of Adulthood between 30 and 50 Years of Age”
“Indian Organizations in Argentina”
“Agropecuarian Change in Peru and Bolivia: An Archaeological Perspective”
“El carácter elitista de la universidad latinoamericana”
“Constraints on Effective Management in Puerto Rico”
“State of Siege of Rule of Law in Latin America”
“Armando Villadare”
“Lectura política de la novela mexicana: Carlos Fuentes”
“The Meaning of Latin-American Democracy (a model) Applied to Colombian and Venezuelan Examples”
“A Review of the Malvinas/Falkland”
“Características socioeconómicas de los hogares urbanos en Colombia con migrantes en otros países”
“El papel político de la Iglesia Católica en el México contemporáneo”
“Democratic Transition in Comparative Perspective”
“Relaciones internacionales y política exterior de Brasil”
“Guerrillas in Latin America, 1953-1983”
“U.S. Foreign Policy toward the Caribbean Basin or Cuban Developmental Aid Programs: Castro’s Quiet Diplomacy”
“Coverage of Mexico in the U.S. Press”
“Puerto Rico: El grito de Lores primer intento de independencia política nacional”
“State, Social Movements, and Class Conflict in Nicaragua: 1979-1985”
“The Clash of Popular Expectations and Social Delivery Systems in Revolutionary Nicaragua”
“State, Church, and Minority Rights in Nicaragua”
“The Impact of Sandinista Foreign Policy in Latin America” and Workshops
“Outcomes and Perspectives in Nicaragua since 1979”
“The Multinationals in Puerto Rico”
“Techniques for Teaching Latin American Studies”

We urge potential session organizers to consider including these paper proposals in their applications. Similarly, we encourage those who volunteer individual papers to examine the list of proposed session titles to find a “home” for their papers. Potential session organizers or paper writers may also wish to consult with other members of the 1985 Program Committee:
Prof. Werner Baer, Department of Economics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA, (217) 333-2682;
Prof. Eliana Rivero, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA, (602) 621-3123;
Prof. Ina Rosenthal-Urey, Center for US-Mexican Studies, University of California-San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92039, USA, (619) 452-2111.
Report of the
AD HOC COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE PUBLICATION OF A CIA EMPLOYMENT
ADVERTISEMENT IN THE LASA FORUM

Professor Helen I. Safa
President, LASA
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Florida, Gainesville
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dear President Safa:

I am transmitting to you herewith the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate the Publication of a CIA Employment Ad in the LASA Forum. This committee was constituted by the LASA Executive Council on September 27, 1983. We were asked to make our final report to the Council by November 1, 1983. The committee's charge from the Council was "to investigate all matters of fact concerning the appearance in the July, 1983 issue of the LASA Forum of an advertisement placed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency."

Copies of this report are also being sent, as of this date, to all members of the LASA Executive Council. Since our committee was not charged with making recommendations for further responses or actions by the Executive Council concerning this matter, we request that our report be placed on the agenda for discussion at the Council's next meeting. We have noted in the report several of the remedial actions already taken by the Executive Council, at its September, 1983, meeting in Mexico City.

I wish to take this opportunity to express personal thanks to my colleagues on the Ad Hoc Committee, Paul Doughty (Professor of Anthropology, University of Florida-Gainesville, and a past President of LASA), Marysa Navarro (Professor of History and Women's Studies, Dartmouth College), and Arturo Valenzuela (Professor of Political Science, Duke University). All of them have treated this matter with the utmost seriousness and have worked with great skill and diligence to complete this unpleasant but essential task in a very short period of time. Hundreds of hours have been devoted to this investigation, which we have tried to make as thorough, accurate, and fair as humanly possible. The enclosed report presents the unanimous findings and conclusions of the four committee members concerning our charge.

We request that this letter and attached report be published, in full, in the next (January, 1984) issue of the LASA Forum.

Sincerely,
Wayne A. Cornelius
Chair, Ad Hoc Investigative Committee;
Vice President, LASA;
Gildred Professor of U.S.-Mexican Relations,
University of California, San Diego

November 1, 1983

CONDUCT OF THE INQUIRY

The Ad Hoc Committee began its work in Mexico City immediately after receiving its charge from the LASA Executive Council. Over a four-day period, we conducted detailed personal interviews with most of the principal figures who had direct knowledge of the matters under investigation. All of these interviews were conducted by the full committee, including a conference-call interview with former LASA Forum Editor Jack Lowry, who was in Austin, Texas. After leaving LASA's International Congress in Mexico City, committee members individually conducted several additional interviews with persons who were believed to be knowledgeable about the handling of the CIA ad, or about previous alleged incidents in LASA's history involving possible contacts with U.S. government agencies which might have established precedents relevant to the case under investigation. Transcripts of these subsequent telephone interviews were prepared and circulated to all members of the committee.

The committee interviewed a total of 26 persons. They included:

Jorge I. Domínguez, President of LASA from January 1, 1982, to July 1, 1983; Past President and member of the LASA Executive Council, July 1 - September 28, 1983.

Richard Sinkin, Executive Director of LASA, July 1, 1981-present; Editor of the LASA Newsletter/Forum, July 1, 1981 - April, 1983.


Cornelia Butler Flora, member of the LASA Executive Council and chairperson of the Editorial Board of the LASA Newsletter/Forum, March, 1982 - present.

Norman Whitten, member of the LASA Executive Council, January 1, 1983 - present.

Ginger Miller, Associate Director of LASA, summer, 1982 - August 30, 1983.

Helen Safa, Vice President of LASA, January 1, 1982 - July 1, 1983; President of LASA, July 1, 1983 - present.

In addition, the committee interviewed four past Presidents and one former Executive Director of LASA concerning any knowledge they might have about relevant precedents, and several faculty members and student assistants at the University of Texas, Austin, where the LASA Secretariat is located. The co-program directors for the 1977 National Meeting of LASA in Houston were also interviewed, concerning a report (which proved groundless) that some sort of organized, LASA-authorized personnel recruitment by CIA representatives had occurred during that meeting.
All of the committee's interviews with principal figures, and most of the other interviews as well, were tape recorded with permission of the interviewees. The interviews were later transcribed verbatim, and the accuracy of the transcripts was verified word-for-word by the committee chair. The resulting 400+ pages of interview transcripts were used as primary source material for the present report, along with copies of memoranda, correspondence, and other documents furnished to the committee by the interviewees.

We feel confident that all persons associated with LASA who had any direct, independent knowledge of the handling of the CIA ad published in the *LASA Forum* were identified and interviewed by the committee. In addition, a series of interviews was conducted with persons external to LASA, including representatives of the New York City advertising agency which placed the CIA ad, one former employee of the CIA, and representatives of the other major foreign area studies associations in the United States, all but one of which was also asked to publish the same CIA ad in their newsletters.

Finally, we conducted a search of all available past issues of the *LASA Newsletter/Forum*, dating back to 1967, in an effort to identify all relevant LASA resolutions, motions, guidelines, and other official statements of Association policy which had been published prior to July, 1983. The committee attempted to obtain, from the LASA Secretariat, a full compilation of the resolutions and motions that had been approved by LASA since its founding, but we were advised by the Executive Director that no such collection exists. In fact, the current Secretariat has in its active records only those resolutions that have been passed since 1981, when the Secretariat moved from the University of Illinois to the University of Texas, Austin.

The data collected from all these various sources was distributed to all members of our committee, and the full committee convened twice by conference call for four and one-half hours to discuss the evidence and drafts of this report.

**LASA: THE LINES OF AUTHORITY AND THE DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY**

The organizational structure of LASA divides decision-making authority among several distinct branches (see the comprehensive organizational chart appended to this report). At the top of the organization is the elected Executive Council, consisting of its six members, the elected President of LASA, the Vice President (and President-elect) of LASA, and the immediate Past President. Meeting about twice yearly, this group is responsible for LASA policy at all levels of operation, as well as LASA's formal relations with other organizations. Working directly under the Executive Council and the President is the Executive Director of LASA, a person appointed by the Council at the time the Association selects the site of its headquarters, the Secretariat. The Executive Director is a non-voting member of the Executive Council.

The President of LASA, now elected to an 18-month term which coincides with the cycle of LASA's international congresses, presides over a rather complex and far-flung set of LASA officers and activities. In the past year, LASA had a total of at least 95 elected and appointed officers, including the Executive Council (6 regular members, 2 alternate members), the President, Past President, Vice President, Vice President-elect, Executive Director, Associate Director, Editor of the *LASA Forum*, the chairperson of the Forum's Editorial Board, two additional members of that Editorial Board, Editor of the *Latin American Research Review (LARR)*, five additional staff members of LARR, 25 members of the LARR editorial board, the chairperson of CLASP (the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs), five other members of the CLASP Steering Committee, eight chairpersons of LASA Task Forces, and approximately 32 additional members of the Task Forces.

Thus, the "span of control" in the LASA organization is surprisingly wide, with scores of individuals dispersed at different locations around the United States and Mexico (at present). It is primarily the responsibility of the Executive Director, and secondarily of the President and the Executive Council, to maintain contact with this large population of officers. This is done through the annual or twice-yearly, face-to-face meetings of the Executive Council and other organizational units, telephone calls, and correspondence.

CLASP and LARR, whose activities are "reviewed" periodically by the LASA Executive Council, operate in a relatively autonomous fashion. The Secretariat, including the Executive Director, takes its instructions from the Executive Council, with the President acting as the Council's spokesperson. The LASA constitution requires Executive Council approval of the Executive Director's appointment, and the holder of that office acts upon the advice and with the consent of the Executive Council. The President and the Executive Director are not empowered to make Association policy independently of the Council.

**PAST RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS AS LASA POLICY**

There is nothing specific in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Association about how LASA "policy" is determined. Neither do the By-Laws state explicitly that resolutions or motions approved at LASA Business Meetings and subsequently submitted to a mail ballot of all members are to be considered LASA "policy," binding upon the Association's officers. The membership's vote for particular resolutions or motions certainly implies LASA policy stances, however. The Executive Council can also approve policy statements on its own initiative, and has done so on many occasions between LASA's national meetings. Having said this, we now turn to the question of whether LASA did, in fact, have a preexisting "policy" which would have excluded, a priori, any advertisement placed by the Central Intelligence Agency from any official LASA publication.
The only resolution which we have been able to identify which seems to address even tangentially the issue at hand is a "Resolution of LASA Guidelines for Relations Between U.S. Scholars and Universities and Latin American Scholars and Universities under Repressive Regimes." This resolution resulted from discussions begun at LASA's Seventh National Meeting (Houston), continuing through the Eighth National Meeting (Pittsburgh). The final set of guidelines was prepared for the Executive Council by a subcommittee of which Jan Knippers Black was the chairperson. They were published in preliminary form in the June, 1979, issue of the LASA Newsletter; presented as a resolution by Professor Black and passed unanimously at the Business Meeting at the Ninth National Meeting of LASA (Bloomington); published in final form in the LASA Newsletter of December, 1980; and approved by the membership through mail ballot.

The most relevant portion of these guidelines is the first article: "Covert operations and covert sponsorship of open operations have no place in scholarly pursuits. For the sake of the integrity and effectiveness of the profession as a whole, LASA members must shun all projects the purposes and sponsorship of which cannot be openly acknowledged." Read carefully, this statement does not provide operative policy guidance for determining the acceptability of the CIA ad which was proposed to the LASA Secretariat last April. That advertisement for employment was more than "open" in its description of the ad's purpose.

The guidelines prepared by the Jan Black subcommittee exhort LASA members to be against disinformation, self-censorship, discrimination against scholars who have been critical of their own or other governments, and human rights violations; to eschew personal involvement in governmental intelligence-gathering activities under the guise of scholarly research; and to support open, independent scholarship throughout the hemisphere. However, the guidelines say nothing about working for one government against another; they only imply that this be done in free conscience and openly.

The Black subcommittee guidelines, as well as numerous debates at LASA national meetings over the years, certainly imply that LASA as an organization would not condone the activities of the CIA (or of any other such agency) in any way, including the publication of a personnel recruitment ad in an official publication of the Association. However, this is not clearly enunciated in any published statement of Association "policy." More importantly, the LASA Constitution lacks clarity with respect to policy establishment and enforcement. There are few, if any, clear guidelines for new LASA officers, either in the Constitution or By-Laws, or in any codification of resolutions and Executive Council actions.

However, we believe that there was a general posture or shared understanding among successive sets of LASA officers concerning the sensitivity of LASA's interactions with U.S. government agencies, which was at least enough to have flagged the proposed CIA ad as an item requiring discussion by the full Executive Council. This general posture was clearly reflected in the Council's discussion and rejection of a proposal made to the Council at its April 14-15, 1983, meeting in Austin, Texas, by Robert Ward of Stanford University. Dr. Ward, representing the Center for Research in International Studies at Stanford University, presented to the LASA Executive Council a proposal for the establishment of a "National Council on International Research and Manpower," the basic purpose of which would be to provide funding for policy-oriented research and training in international studies. The proposed entity would work initially through the "University Forum" of the U.S. Department of Defense, and subsequently it would be housed in the National Security Council. According to the minutes of the LASA Executive Council's April, 1983, meeting, "Ward asked the EC to provide a LASA endorsement of the project."

Several members of the Executive Council spoke strongly against any LASA endorsement or participation in the Ward project, arguing that the Defense Department/National Security Council ties were unacceptable and would cause negative repercussions within the LASA membership. Council members Cornelia Butler Flora and Norman Whitten argued that LASA should take the lead in attempting to block the formation of the entity proposed by Ward, by communicating LASA's opposition to other scholarly organizations. The Council voted unanimously to request that LASA's name be deleted from the Ward proposal. Our committee regards the Executive Council's action in the case of the Ward proposal as the clearest indication of how it would have ruled on the matter of a CIA ad proposed for publication in the LASA Forum, if the matter had ever been brought before the full Council for decision.

HOW THE CIA AD REACHED THE LASA SECRETARIAT

The CIA advertisement published in the July, 1983, issue of the LASA Forum was placed through a New York City advertising agency (Staley, Falcone, and Gainer; now renamed, Gainer and Falcone). An official of that agency, while refusing to specify all the publications where that particular ad was placed, told our committee that this ad was sent to "a dozen places." He characterized the advertisement as a routine recruitment ad, of which his agency handles hundreds.

We obtained independent confirmation of the fact that the same CIA recruitment ad that appeared in the LASA Forum, containing exactly the same wording, also was sent to several other academic newsletters. The Personnel Service Newsletter of the American Political Science Association published the ad in its June, 1983 (Vol. 27, No. 9) issue. While the Middle Eastern Studies Association has not published an ad having the same language, its Newsletter has included recruitment ads for CIA positions in at least three issues published in 1982 and 1983.

In mid-May, 1983, the African Studies Association received a request from the Staley, Falcone, and Gainer agency to publish an ad for a "senior insurgency analyst" in the African Studies Review. The African Studies Association's Executive Council voted on May 20, 1983, to reject the ad,
on the grounds that its publication was not consistent with the policies of the Association. In early October, 1983, the Asian Studies Association received a request from the Gainer and Falcone agency to publish the same CIA ad, and the Association scheduled it for publication in the November-December, 1983, issue of its personnel registry. However, the Association's secretariat is currently reviewing the decision to accept the ad, and a final decision is pending.

The ad apparently was not sent to the American Anthropological Association, since that organization has a policy (adopted in December, 1980) of "declining job advertisements from government intelligence agencies." The AAA also endorsed, in 1982, a resolution opposing the employment of anthropologists in the CIA and U.S. military intelligence, and in training students for such work.

From this evidence our committee determined that LASA was not singed out by the CIA for placement of this particular ad, whether to deliberately jeopardize LASA's International Congress in Mexico City or for any other purpose. The ad was placed in the LASA Forum as part of a large-scale recruitment campaign by the Central Intelligence Agency to expand its staff of analysts specializing in the study of "insurgency, terrorism, and political instability" in the Third World.

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**

**April 11 or 12, 1983:** An employee of Staley, Falcone, and Gainer (a New York City advertising agency representing the CIA) telephoned the LASA Secretariat in Austin, Texas, and asked whether LASA would publish in its newsletter an ad soliciting applicants for a "senior analyst" position. The call was taken by Jack Lowry, Managing Editor of the LASA Forum. Lowry's response was noncommittal; after discussing advertising rates, he promised to "check it out and call them back" (Lowry's words to our committee).

**April 12 or 13, 1983:** Lowry told Richard Sinkin (Executive Director of LASA) about the CIA ad request, expressed his concern about it, and asked whether LASA had a policy on accepting advertising from the CIA. Sinkin replied that, to the best of his knowledge, LASA had no such policy, but that he (Sinkin) would raise the subject with LASA President Jorge Domínguez during the meetings of the LASA Ways and Means Committee and Executive Council which were to begin the evening of April 13.

**April 13, 1983:** LASA's Ways and Means Committee (President Domínguez, Vice President Helen Safa, Treasurer Susan Kaufman Purcell, Executive Director Sinkin) was scheduled to meet in Austin on the eve of the full Executive Council meetings. Ways and Means never met formally because two committee members (Safa and Kaufman Purcell) did not arrive in Austin on time. While they waited for the other Ways and Means members to arrive, Domínguez and Sinkin sat by the pool of the Villa Cupri Hotel (where Executive Council members were to be lodged for the Austin meeting) and discussed informally a wide range of subjects, many dealing with the upcoming Mexico City Congress of LASA. During this conversation, according to testimony by Sinkin, he mentioned the request to place a CIA ad in the LASA Forum. Domínguez was asked if LASA had a policy on accepting advertising from the CIA. Domínguez answered that, to the best of his knowledge, there was no policy. Sinkin then asked: "What do we do?" Domínguez replied: "Well, I guess we should accept the ad." (In a letter addressed to the LASA Executive Council dated September 6, 1983, as well as in testimony to our committee, Domínguez stated that he has no recollection of a discussion with Sinkin on the subject of a CIA ad, either on April 13 or at any time prior to publication of the ad.)

**April 14-15, 1983:** LASA Executive Council met in Austin. The subject of the CIA ad was not raised at any point in the two days of formal Executive Council meetings. A request by Robert Ward of Stanford University for LASA endorsement of an international studies consortium with links to the U.S. Department of Defense and the National Security Council was discussed and rejected by the Council.

**April 14 or 15, 1983:** During a break in the Executive Council meetings in Austin, while strolling with Domínguez and Sinkin back to the Council meetings, Council member Norman Whitten was asked by Sinkin about the policies or experiences of associations of U.S. anthropologists concerning contacts with the CIA. Sinkin mentioned that a request has been received to publish a CIA employment ad in the LASA Forum. Whitten expressed strong concerns about the pending ad, and asked Domínguez to place the matter on the agenda of the Executive Council for discussion that day or the following day. According to Whitten, Domínguez replied that he "would think about it." (Neither Domínguez nor Sinkin can now recall the details of this conversation.)

**April 18, 1983:** President Domínguez sent a memo to the Executive Council recommending that Jack Lowry be appointed Editor of the LASA Forum, in recognition of his key role in producing that publication. Richard Sinkin had previously been listed as Editor, with Lowry as Managing Editor. Domínguez's recommendation was subsequently approved by the Council through mail ballot. Sinkin told our committee that he was not consulted by Domínguez regarding the decision to appoint Lowry as Editor of the LASA Forum.

**Late May or early June (probably around May 30), 1983:** The CIA recruitment ad arrived, in the form of camera-ready copy from the New York advertising agency representing the CIA, at the LASA Secretariat. It was received by LASA Forum Editor Jack Lowry. Sinkin was doing research on the East Coast when the final ad arrived and did not see it before
it went to press. Lowry did, however, show the ad to several persons at the Institute of Latin American Studies at UT-Austin, getting negative reactions from them. The CIA was billed (through its advertising agency) for the cost of the quarter-page ad, which was $50.

Early or mid-June, 1983: Summer issue of the LASA Forum containing the CIA ad went to press.

July, 1983: Copies of the summer issue of the LASA Forum were mailed to the membership.

August, 1983: Publication of the CIA ad in the LASA Forum prompted letters to LASA President Helen Safa from several Latin American scholars (including all Mexican members of the program and local arrangements committees for the LASA International Congress in Mexico City), requesting a complete investigation of the matter and asking LASA to repudiate publication of the ad. Several Latin American scholars saw the ad as a deliberate CIA provocation and an attempt to "destabilize" the Association and disrupt the Mexico City meetings.

August 17, 1983: President Safa and Executive Director Sinkin released an open letter, sent to all LASA members, expressing deep regret about the CIA ad, characterizing its publication as "a serious error in judgement" and asking the membership to make suggestions for the formulation of advertising guidelines for LASA publications. They also announced that the editorial staff of the LASA Forum had been instructed not to accept any further advertising from the CIA or other defense or intelligence agencies pending the formulation of the advertising policy. (This announcement by the President and Executive Director did not, in itself, constitute establishment of a LASA policy concerning the acceptance of CIA advertising, since the Executive Council had not yet met to consider the matter.)

September 14-28, 1983: News articles about the CIA ad and commentaries by Latin American scholars and journalists (Gregorio Selser, Aurelio Ramos, Lorenzo Meyer, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser) were published in major Mexico City newspapers. While voicing their strong support for LASA, several of the commentators saw publication of the CIA ad as an attack directed against LASA which required a prompt and vigorous repudiation from the LASA membership and officers.

September 27, 1983: LASA Executive Council met in Mexico City to discuss the publication of the CIA ad and consider possible responses. Publication of a statement on the matter by the Executive Council in two major Mexico City newspapers was authorized. The Council voted unanimously to instruct the LASA Secretariat not to accept any further advertising from the CIA or from any other defense or intelligence-related agencies of any government. The Council also established an ad hoc committee to investigate publication of the CIA ad in the July, 1983, issue of the LASA Forum, chaired by Wayne Cornelius and including Paul Doughty, Marysa Navarro, and Arturo Valenzuela as members. Additional steps were approved by the Council to insure that, in the future, all potentially sensitive matters concerning LASA operations would be considered by the full Executive Council rather than by the Ways and Means Committee.

September 29, 1983: Near the end of the LASA Business Meeting in Mexico City, two motions were discussed and approved concerning publication of the CIA ad. One motion called for publication of a second set of ads in Mexico City newspapers, affirming that LASA did have ethical and professional guidelines which should have prevented publication of the CIA ad and expressing regret that these standards were not applied in the case of the ad which appeared in the LASA Forum. The general consensus among those who voted for this motion seemed to be that the absence of a specific advertising policy excluding advertising from the CIA should not be equated with a lack of any relevant ethical standards or guidelines. The second motion approved at the Business Meeting, by a vote of 42 to 34, called for the resignations of all LASA officers who were found to be responsible for publication of the CIA ad. (Because under the LASA Constitution motions are only advisory to the Executive Council, and are not put to a vote of the full membership, they represent only the sense of those attending the Business Meeting.)

September 30, 1983: The LASA Executive Council reconvened to consider the motions passed at the end of the Business Meeting on September 29. The motion authorizing publication of new ads in Mexico City newspapers, based on the text approved as part of the motion, was approved; the motion requiring resignations of all LASA officers found to be responsible for publication of the CIA ad was disapproved. The Council agreed to discuss possible further responses to the situation at its next meeting (scheduled for April, 1984), after the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Publication of the CIA Ad made its report to the Council.

HOW THE AD WAS PUBLISHED: AN ANALYSIS

The primary thrust of our inquiry concerned the handling of the CIA ad by all those who knew of its existence prior to publication in the LASA Forum. How was publication authorized? Who made the decision? Who else was consulted? What steps were followed in handling the proposal from the New York advertising agency which requested space for the CIA ad? Could publication have been averted if the ad had been handled differently by the principals within LASA? In this section we present the Committee's findings and conclusions with respect to these questions.
Our investigation established that upon receiving the telephoned request from a New York City advertising agency representing the CIA, Jack Lowry (at that time Managing Editor of the LASA Forum) consulted with Executive Director Sinkin about whether to accept the ad. Sinkin was unaware of any explicit LASA policy on advertising -- either in general or specifically concerning employment ads from the CIA -- but promised to check with Jorge Domínguez, the incumbent President of LASA.

Sinkin was correct in his initial response to Jack Lowry that LASA had no policy on the content of advertising that would appear in either the LASA Forum or in the Latin American Research Review. A policy to regulate the content of advertising in these publications had never been discussed, either by the respective editorial boards or by the LASA Executive Council. While editorial guidelines for the Forum had been drafted by Cornelia Butler Flora, chairperson of the Forum’s Editorial Board, these guidelines specified only that “all material [published in the Forum must] conform to accepted editorial standards, avoid personal innuendo, and promote the dissemination of ideas of significance to the membership.” Editorial Board chairperson Flora confirmed to our committee that she interpreted her charge, in developing the editorial guidelines, as being limited to substantive articles that might be submitted for publication in the Forum.

Whether there was a more general LASA policy against relations with the CIA and other government agencies which would, by extension, have excluded a CIA employment ad from the Forum is an issue that we have addressed in a preceding section of this report. Richard Sinkin was unaware of the ethical and professional guidelines adopted at the Bloomington national meeting of LASA, which urged LASA members to avoid participation in classified research projects. He first learned about these guidelines from Jan K. Black’s remarks at the LASA Business Meeting in Mexico City, three months after the CIA ad was published in the LASA Forum.

Similarly, President Jorge Domínguez did not recognize the existence of any specific LASA policy which would have prevented publication of the CIA ad in the LASA Forum. As Domínguez told our committee, “The real question is, how do you translate into actual policy the general norms of the profession. It seems to me from the general norms of the profession...that the Association would have nothing formal to do with the CIA. The question of an ad; however, is a separate matter.” Domínguez emphasized that there was no advertising policy to serve “as an intermediary between the norms of the profession and the actual decisions of a working editor.” In sum, neither Domínguez, nor Sinkin, nor Jack Lowry recognized the existence of a binding LASA policy that would have excluded the CIA ad a priori.

According to three persons interviewed by our committee -- Richard Sinkin, Norman Whitten (a member of the LASA Executive Council), and Jack Lowry -- Domínguez was consulted about the propriety of accepting the CIA employment ad. Sinkin and Whitten’s knowledge of this consultation was direct; Lowry’s was indirect, relying upon a report made to him by Sinkin. However, Domínguez denies any knowledge of this consultation. In his statements to the LASA Executive Council and to our committee, in September, 1983, Domínguez had “no recollection of a discussion with Richard Sinkin specifically on the subject of the CIA ad....However, it may well be that Richard did raise the subject with me...on the evening prior to the Austin Executive Council meeting. If so, I certainly did not focus on it.”

In Sinkin’s account, the matter of the CIA ad was discussed by Domínguez and himself, during the informal poolside meeting on the eve of the April, 1983, Executive Council meetings. Sinkin affirmed that Domínguez “indicated that we did not have a policy excluding the CIA...recruitment ad...The following day, I informed Jack [Lowry] that Jorge and I had agreed that the ad should be accepted.”

It should be kept in mind that neither Domínguez, nor Sinkin, nor Lowry was aware, at that time, of the actual content of the CIA ad that would eventually appear in the LASA Forum. The telephoned request for space that had been received by Jack Lowry mentioned only a recruitment ad for a “senior analyst.” The rather innocuous tone of the initial request contrasts sharply with the final ad copy, which sought “SENIOR INSURGENCY/ TERRORISM AND POLITICAL INSTABILITY ANALYSTS.” There is no evidence that Sinkin or Domínguez saw the final ad copy or knew of its content prior to publication. Sinkin has told the LASA Executive Council that if he had had the opportunity to review the final ad copy, he would have withheld the ad for further consultation with the Forum’s editorial board.

Forum Editor Jack Lowry received the final ad copy from the advertising agency representing the CIA, inserted it into the page proofs for the summer issue of the Forum, and sent it to the printer. At no time did Lowry alert Sinkin, or any member of the Forum’s editorial board, or any member of the LASA Executive Council to the content of the CIA ad prior to publication. Lowry believed that the authorization to publish which he had received from Sinkin and Domínguez was unconditional, i.e., publication of the ad was not made contingent upon the form that the final ad copy might take. Prior to publication Lowry did, however, show the final ad copy which he had received from the CIA’s advertising agency to several other staff members at the Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas-Austin, expressing to them his concern that the ad might be offensive to many members of LASA. He also discussed the earlier decision to accept the ad with Ginger Miller, who was Associate Director of LASA at the time.

Lowry’s concerns about the political sensitivity of the CIA ad were never communicated to anyone else in a position of authority within LASA. He told our committee that, in retrospect, he should have discussed the decision to publish the ad with Cornelia Butler Flora or other members of the Forum’s editorial board, but he did not do so because he did not see the editorial board as “anything more than a group of names on paper,” and because the authorization to publish which he had received from Sinkin and Domínguez was sufficient, in his view, to proceed.

In fact, according to testimony from both Jack Lowry and Cornelia Butler Flora, the editorial board of the LASA Forum was never consulted about anything, at least prior to
publication of the CIA ad. Neither was the incoming LASA President, Helen Safa, consulted about the ad prior to publication. Of the members of the LASA Executive Council at the time when the decision was made to accept the ad, only Norman Whitten became aware -- accidentally -- of the pending ad.

All persons interviewed by our committee told us that, in their judgement, the LASA Executive Council would have disapproved the publication of a CIA employment ad if the matter had ever been considered by the Council. Thus, the fact that the ad never became an agenda item during the Executive Council meeting in Austin is crucial to the outcome. Norman Whitten told our committee that he explicitly requested a discussion of the CIA ad by the full Executive Council, but that this request was downplayed by President Domínguez. Whitten attributed this to the busy agenda which had already been set for the Austin meeting. Since this was the first Executive Council meeting which Whitten had attended (his term of office began in January, 1983), he deferred to President Domínguez's conduct of the meeting and did not insist that the CIA ad be debated by the Council. He now regrets that he did not raise the issue again during the Austin meeting. Whitten came away from the brief conversation with Sinkin and Domínguez thinking that the matter of the CIA ad would be handled "behind the scenes," and that no such ad would actually be published.

In the handling of the CIA ad within LASA, there were a number of "fail-safe" points at which publication could have been halted. Three months elapsed between the initial telephone call from the CIA's advertising agency and delivery of the typeset copy of the Forum containing the ad to the printer. Editor Lowry, upon receiving the initial request, could have consulted with only one or more members of the Forum's editorial board. According to his testimony to our committee, he felt that he lacked the independent authority to determine the appropriateness of publishing such an ad. But he consulted only with the Executive Director (Sinkin), who in turn raised the matter only with President Domínguez. Domínguez could have halted publication either by instructing Sinkin and Lowry not to accept the ad, or by taking the matter up with the full Executive Council. Sinkin could have consulted with other LASA officers, including the Executive Council member (Cornelia Butler Flora) who had been appointed to chair the Forum's editorial board, either before or after discussing the ad with Domínguez.

Either Domínguez or Sinkin could have inserted the matter in the agenda for discussion at the Executive Council meeting in Austin, which began just after the initial telephone call concerning the CIA ad was received by the LASA Secretariat. Even though there was no formal agenda item concerning it, the issue of the pending ad could have been raised at some time during the Austin meetings of the Council, by Domínguez, Sinkin, or Whitten. In fact, the Council's lengthy consideration of the Robert Ward proposal for LASA participation in an international studies consortium linked to the U.S. National Security Council, which occupied the majority of the Austin meeting of the Council, would have provided an excellent opportunity to bring up the question of publishing an ad from the CIA.

Ginger Miller, as the second-highest officer in the LASA Secretariat at the time of these events, was also aware of the pending CIA ad, was strongly opposed to its publication, yet did not question the decision to publish it in any conversation with Domínguez, Safa, or any other member of the Executive Council in the pre-publication period. In her retrospective view, such consultations outside the normal chain-of-command would have been seriously disruptive to the work of the Secretariat, at a time when numerous tasks had to be accomplished in preparation for the International Congress in Mexico City. According to their testimony to our committee, Lowry and Miller did not feel that they were in a position to question a decision to publish the ad which had been made at higher levels of authority.

In summary, our committee, for the reasons we have elaborated, concludes that the CIA ad was included in the summer, 1983, issue of the LASA Forum by its Editor, with the authorization or tacit consent of the principal executive officers of the Association, without consulting either the LASA Executive Council or the Editorial Board of the Forum, which the committee believes should have been consulted on such an issue.

PROBABLE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

In an effort to suggest plausible explanations for the decisions, actions, and inactions described in previous sections of this report, the committee wishes to call attention to the following factors:

Lack of a LASA Memory

In its 17-year history, LASA has had no procedure for compiling, cataloguing, and communicating to successive sets of officers the numerous resolutions, motions, sets of guidelines, Executive Council actions, and precedents which have been generated over the years. As a result, these official actions -- at least some of which might have offered some guidance, however indirect, regarding the publication of an ad from the the CIA -- have not been incorporated into the ongoing, operational policies of the Association. There is, in short, no ongoing, collective LASA memory. Each new Executive Director, each new member of the Executive Council, each new President of the Association, has received at best only a fragmentary transmission of the decisions taken by his or her predecessors and by the membership as a whole (through the resolutions procedure).

While it could be argued that, through an accumulation of Executive Council discussions and actions, membership resolutions, Business Meeting debates, etc., LASA had developed a generalized "policy orientation" against ties with the CIA or other government agencies, this general posture had not been translated into an explicit operational policy or
by-law of the Association; and in April, 1983, neither the Executive Director nor the President of LASA felt that their actions were constrained by such an operational policy.

During his presidency, Jorge Domínguez began to compile information on LASA procedures and guidelines, as part of his overall effort to codify and strengthen the Association’s administration. The result was a 32-page “LASA Briefing Paper,” a copy of which, according to Domínguez, was supposed to have been distributed to each new member of the LASA Executive Council. However, as of September 27, 1983, neither the incumbent President of LASA (Helen Safa) nor the Vice President (Wayne Cornelius) even knew that such a compilation of LASA procedures and guidelines existed; neither had received copies of it. This document, a useful compendium as far as it goes, is nevertheless incomplete: for example, it does not include the guidelines developed by the Jan Black subcommittee that were approved at the Bloomington national meeting. Nor does this or any other document known to us compile the numerous resolutions that have been approved by the LASA membership over the years.

**Excessive Proceduralism**

Ironically, the new emphasis on codifying the rules and regulations governing LASA’s operations during the Domínguez presidency may have contributed to the destructive outcome in this case. Given this emphasis, it may have become easier to lose the “big picture” and become blinded by minutiae. In their testimony to our committee, Sinkin, Lowry, and Domínguez all mentioned the absence of an explicit editorial guideline for the *LASA Forum* which would have excluded the CIA employment ad *a priori*. As Sinkin recalled for our committee, this was “very much in keeping with Jorge [Domínguez]’s stress on codifying all that we were doing...the ‘procedure approach’ to things, rather than focusing in on the content....”

The emphasis on proceduralism and the lack of an explicit operational policy on the content of *Forum* advertising seem to have made it easier for those involved to proceed with publication of the ad, despite its obvious political sensitivity. As Sinkin told our committee, when the CIA ad proposal was first brought to his attention by Lowry, he promised to ask Domínguez about it, because “I didn’t remember anything in the guidelines about advertising content. The only thing I remembered was that we would have advertising, and the rates [charged] would be the same as LARR’s.” Once publication had been authorized, Editor Lowry interpreted that authorization as a statement of LASA policy. When asked by our committee why he failed to contact Sinkin on the East Coast and alert him to the full contents of the CIA ad, after it had been received at the Secretariat, Lowry explained: “Because I felt that the determination had already been made that our policy was to accept recruiting ads from the CIA...regardless of what was in them.” Sinkin, on the other hand, did not consider consulting with other LASA officers because “I felt that I had authorization from the President of the Association to run the ad.”

**Highly Centralized Executive Decisionmaking Style**

During the Domínguez presidency, the role of the Executive Council in LASA decisionmaking was clearly subordinated to that of the President and the Executive Director. According to the LASA Constitution, it is the Executive Council -- not the President nor the Executive Director -- that is supposed to function as the key decisionmaking body. During 1982 and the first half of 1983, most decisions about LASA affairs seem to have been made by the President and communicated to the Executive Director for implementation, with only minimal outside consultation. The most frequent mode of communication was by written memorandum, from the President to the Executive Director, but Domínguez and Sinkin also conferred frequently by telephone. Members of the Executive Council were called upon occasionally to vote by mail ballot on some of the President’s initiatives. For example, the initiative for elevating Jack Lowry from Managing Editor to Editor of the *LASA Forum* was taken by Domínguez and communicated, by mail, to the Executive Council for ratification.

Thus, while the President and the Executive Director consulted each other quite regularly, their consultation with other LASA officers during this period was minimal. In the case of the editorial board for the *LASA Forum*, it was nonexistent. Domínguez rarely (if ever) consulted with his Vice President, Helen Safa, by telephone, although he usually sent her and other LASA officers copies of memoranda that he had written to the Executive Director, heads of LASA Task Forces, and others. However, according to Safa, Domínguez did not seek her opinion on the matters discussed in these memos before he sent them out.

This managerial style undoubtedly made for greater efficiency in conducting the Association’s business, and it also facilitated the formalization of LASA procedures, which was a high priority under President Domínguez and which was welcomed by the Executive Director. However, the highly concentrated authority structure may have contributed to poor working relationships and breakdowns in communication within the Secretariat, which, in turn, may have made subordinate personnel less likely to take steps to block publication of the CIA ad, or at least to make their concerns about the ad known to others in positions of authority in LASA. President Domínguez’s highly efficient style of conducting Executive Council meetings also seems to have deterred Council member Whitten from insisting upon a discussion of the pending CIA ad by the Council at its April, 1983, meeting.

Domínguez himself, in a “President’s Corner” article published in the Spring, 1983, issue of the *LASA Forum*, expressed concern about the decline in Executive Council participation in the governance of LASA. He noted that, because of decreasing financial resources, “The LASA Executive Council meets less frequently than would be optimal. There has been an effort to consult with its members by phone or, more often, by mail on matters of continuing importance. It must remain Association policy, as implemented by the President, to retain collegial rule as our
operating governing principle, despite the rising costs." The episode of the CIA ad has only underlined the importance of that basic principle.

The Pursuit of a More 'Pluralist' LASA Image

Both President Domínguez and Executive Director Sinkin seemed concerned by LASA's public image as "a one-sided, partisan and ideological organization where 'leftists' use the business meeting to put forth resolutions that reflect their views" (quoted from Jorge Domínguez, "The President's Corner," LASA Newsletter, Vol. 13, No. 2, Summer, 1982, p. 1). While both considered this image to be inaccurate in many respects, they nevertheless were sensitive to how it diminished LASA's influence and credibility with some groups (especially U.S. government officials and some foundation officers). Domínguez's "President's Corner" article just cited, and steps that he took to "discipline" (his word) the Business Meeting over which he presided at LASA's 1982 national meeting in Washington, were pursuant to his goal of reshaping LASA's external image toward one of greater ideological pluralism, even-handedness, and tolerance for dissenting viewpoints.

Both Sinkin and Domínguez told our committee that they now consider the publication of the CIA employment ad to have been a serious mistake which should not be repeated under any circumstances. It is possible that, at the time when such an ad was first proposed by the CIA's advertising agency, their political sensibilities had been dulled by the pursuit of "pluralism" in LASA's public relations. In this context, the decision to publish the ad without extensive outside consultation and deliberation about its possible impact on LASA's relations with many important constituencies (especially Latin American scholars) becomes more understandable. As Domínguez himself recalled to our committee, "It is possible that... Dick [Sinkin] might have said something about a particular ad -- CIA or otherwise -- and I just didn't focus on it."

Non-Functioning Forum Editorial Board

During his term as LASA President, Domínguez took the initiative to establish an Editorial Board for the LASA Newsletter (subsequently renamed the LASA Forum). The stated purpose of this Editorial Board was to advise the Editor and Managing Editor of the newsletter on matters of general policy and structure of the publication, as well as to "evaluate, in consultation with the editorial staff, the appropriateness and timeliness of material to be published." A member of the LASA Executive Council, Cornelia Butler Flora, was appointed as chair of the Editorial Board, and in late March, 1982, she was asked by President Domínguez to develop some general guidelines describing "what kinds of things have gone and should continue to go into the Newsletter," and "about the kinds of opinion pieces, or even short scholarly notes, that might go into the Newsletter."

Flora subsequently drafted an editorial policy statement for the newsletter, which was adopted by the Executive Council; however, it did not touch upon the nature or content of advertising which might appear in the publication. As Flora recalled to our committee, "It never occurred to me [to address the question of advertising]. I'm not sure I even knew that we took advertising. I always viewed job announcements as a service."1

From its creation in March, 1982 through June, 1983 (when the issue containing the CIA employment ad went to press), the Forum's three-person Editorial Board (with the editor of LARR as another member, ex officio) was never involved in the actual production of the newsletter, nor did it function as an advisory body to the Editor (Sinkin until April, 1983; Lowry thereafter) and Managing Editor (Lowry, up to April, 1983). Chairperson Flora can recall only a single instance of consultation with her during her tenure, which concerned the publication of some membership responses to a substantive article written by Abraham Lowenthal and published in the March, 1982, issue of the newsletter. As recalled by Flora, "One of our problems was that Jack [Lowry] always felt he had to go through Richard [Sinkin] and would never bring anything to the Editorial Board directly." Thus none of the Editorial Board members knew anything about the CIA ad published in the July, 1983, issue until after publication, despite the clear implication in the editorial guidelines for the newsletter that material which was potentially sensitive or offensive to the LASA membership was to be cleared with the Editorial Board.

Closed Agenda-Building Process for Executive Council Meetings

We have emphasized that the failure of the LASA Executive Council to consider the appropriateness of the CIA ad prior to publication was a crucial element in this case. A brief, informal discussion of the request for the ad between Sinkin and Domínguez the evening before the start of the Executive Council meetings in Austin, and a second conversation about the matter involving Sinkin, Domínguez, and Council member Norman Whitten during a break in the Austin meetings did not lead to a discussion of the issue by the full Executive Council, even though the Council at those same meetings devoted more than an hour to discussion of the Robert Ward proposal, which raised similar issues.

The simplest explanation for this is that the Ward proposal was on the formal agenda for the Austin meeting of the Executive Council and the pending CIA ad was not. Follow-

1At its September, 1983, meeting in Mexico City, the LASA Executive Council asked Editorial Board chairperson Flora to develop draft guidelines for advertising in the LASA Forum. These guidelines will be reported to the Council and considered for adoption at its next meeting. The Secretariat was also instructed to involve the Forum's Editorial Board more actively in the production of future issues.
ing a longstanding LASA practice, the agenda for that meeting had been developed by the incumbent President, in consultation with the Executive Director, and circulated in advance to Council members. Executive Council members were not formally polled prior to the meetings to solicit possible agenda items. And President Domínguez’s practice in presiding over Executive Council meetings was to adhere strictly to the prepared agenda.  

IMPLICATIONS FOR LASA AS AN ORGANIZATION

LASA is a large and diverse organization of scholars of several disciplines, which in recent years has become an increasingly international association. Many scholars from Latin America have joined the Association and participated in its international congresses (and played a key role in organizing the most recent congress, in Mexico City). Their presence on the Editorial Board and in the pages of the Latin American Research Review, and their service on LASA’s special commissions and Task Forces have immeasurably enriched our Association, making it the leading scholarly organization of its kind.

These close ties and working relationships between U.S. and Latin American scholars were forged with some difficulty over the last decade. One of the major stumbling blocks to understanding among researchers in the North and South resulted from covert activities undertaken by agencies of the U.S. Government, and the suspicion that U.S. scholars may have collaborated directly or indirectly with those agencies. These suspicions were reinforced by the Project Camelot incident, which was widely condemned within the academic community. Not only were U.S. scholars concerned about the ethics of such a relationship; they realized that their ability to carry out field research depended on confidence and trust in the host countries that their objective was a scholarly one.

The sensitivity of LASA to these issues was reflected in the adoption at the Bloomington national meeting in 1980 of a resolution dealing with professional ethics, which urged members to refrain from engaging in classified research. More recently, it was reflected in the unanimous decision of the LASA Executive Council at its April, 1983, meeting to disassociate LASA from the Robert Ward proposal for a Defense Department-sponsored international studies consortium. Though this is an initiative aimed at providing significant funding for international studies in the United States, and though it is not “covert” in nature, the Executive Council considered that its links to the U.S. national security apparatus made the project ill-advised.

It is clear from this record, and from the views of the individual LASA officers interviewed by this committee, that the publication of the CIA ad in the LASA Forum resulted to a considerable degree from inadequate consultation within the leadership structure of the organization. In the course of our investigation we found absolutely no evidence of relationships between the CIA and any elected or appointed official of LASA which might have influenced the handling of the ad. Neither do we believe it was the intent of those LASA officers who knew about the forthcoming CIA ad to establish any tie -- formal or informal -- between LASA and the CIA through publication of this ad.

The Committee hopes that, in the words of President Helen Safa and Executive Director Richard Sinkin, LASA members will “not allow a single error of judgement to jeopardize the good work the Association does for all of us.” LASA is an important vehicle for the work of thousands of scholars committed to the study of Latin America, and we are confident that it will continue to play this role in the future. While our committee was not charged by the Executive Council with providing a set of guidelines for the future, we hope that the Association will review its internal operations so as to prevent an incident such as this one from recurring.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne A. Cornelius (UC-San Diego), chair
Paul L. Doughty (University of Florida)
Marysa Navarro (Dartmouth College)
Arturo Valenzuela (Duke University)

November 1, 1983
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2 At its meeting in Mexico City (September, 1983), the Executive Council took several steps to open up the agenda-building process and assure that its future meetings would not be limited only to discussion of items on the written agenda. Council members will also be encouraged to bring up any matter of concern to them during an open discussion period to be built into the schedule for each Council meeting.
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Academic Freedom/Human Rights Task Force
Lars Schoultz, Cochair, Department of Political Science, Hamilton Hall 070-A, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514;
Robert Trudeau, Cochair, Department of Political Science, Providence College, Providence, RI 02918;
Riordan Roett, School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC 21218;
Thomas Farer, Wilson Center, Latin American Program, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560;
June Nash, Department of Anthropology, CUNY, New York, NY 10021;
Ivan Jaksic, Puerto Rican Studies, 1013 Samuel Clemens Hall, SUNY, Amherst, NY 14260;
Tommie Sue Montgomery, Department of Political Science, Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY 14850;
Jan Flora, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, Waters Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506;
Anthony Stevens-Arroyo, Department of Puerto Rican Studies, Brooklyn College of CUNY, Bedford Avenue and Avenue H, Brooklyn, NY 11210.

Cuba Task Force
Nelson Valdés, Chair, Department of Sociology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131;
Max Azcued, Department of Economics, Business, and Political Science, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, Edinboro, PA 16444;
Lisandro Perez, Room 126 Stubb, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5411;
Alfred Padula, Department of History, University of Southern Maine, College Avenue, Gorham, ME 04038;
Meg Crahan, Occidental College, Luce Professor, 1600 Campus Road, Los Angeles, CA 90041;
Franklin Knight, Department of History, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218;
Manuel Perez-Stable, Ediciones Vitral, Room 1101, 1133 Broadway, New York, NY 10010;

Hispanic Task Force
Rudy de la Garza, Chair, Center for Mexican American Studies, Student Services Building 4.120, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712;
Oscar Somoza, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, University of Denver, University Park, Denver, CO 80208;
Generosa Vásquez, Facultad de Estudios Generales, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, PR;
Virginia Sánchez-Korrol, Department of Puerto Rican Studies, Brooklyn College-CUNY, Brooklyn, NY 11210;
Silvia Arrom, Department of History, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520;
Amado Lay, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, MN 56082;
Pedro Castillo, Department of History, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95060;
Yolanda Prieto, 195 Bennett Avenue, no. 2B, New York, NY 10040.

Media Task Force
Cynthia McClintock, Chair, Political Science, George Washington University, Washington, DC 20006;
William LeoGrande, Political Science, American University, Washington, DC 20016;
Richard Newfarmer, Overseas Development Council, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, DC 20036;
Louis Goodman, Wilson Center, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, DC 20560;
Nora Hamilton, Political Science, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90007;
Kenneth Sharpe, Political Science, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA 19081;
Edward J. Williams, Department of Political Science, Social Science 316, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

Nicaraguan Task Force
Thomas W. Walker, Cochair, Department of Political Science, Bentley Hall, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701;
Richard Fagen, Cochair, Department of Political Science, Stanford University, Stanford, OH 94305;
Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, California State University, 25800 Hillary, Hayward, CA 94542;
Michael Conroy, Department of Economics, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712;
Nola Rinhardt, Department of Economics, Pierce 13, Smith College, Northampton, MA 01063;
Charles Stansifer, Center of Latin American Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66044;
John Weeks, Department of Economics, The American University, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20016.

Spain Task Force
Terry McCoy, Chair, CLAS, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611;
Lawrence Graham, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall, Unit 1, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712;
Howard J. Wiarda, Center for Hemispheric Studies, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1150 Seventeenth Street, NW, Washington, DC;
Leon Campbell, Department of History, University of California-Riverside, Riverside, CA 92521;
Federico Gil, Political Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514;
Judith M. Buechler, Department of Anthropology, Hobart and William Smith College, Geneva, NY 14456.

USSR Task Force
Cote Blasier, Chair, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260;
Alejandro Portes, Department of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218;
Richard Newfarmer, Overseas Development Council, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, DC 20036.

Women’s Task Force
Beth Miller, Cochair, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0358;
Marysa Navarro, Cochair, Department of History, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755;
Judy Ewell, History Department, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185;
Edith Couturier, (NEH), 7210 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, MD 20015;
Helen Delpar, History Department, Box 1936, University of Alabama, University, AL 35486;
Virginia Leonard, Department of History, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455;
Racquel Kersten, Humanistic Studies, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, WI 54302;
Kristina Demaree, Department of Modern Languages, California State University, Chico, CA 95929;
Susan Tritten, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056;
Lynn Bolles, Afro-American Studies, Department of Anthropology, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME 04011;
Elena Urrutia, Colegio de Mexico, Llivia 248, Jardines del Pedregal de San Angel, Mexico 20, DF, MEXICO;

CHARGE TO THE NICARAGUAN TASK FORCE
Cochairs: Thomas W. Walker and Richard Fagen
Members: Michael Convoy, Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, Nola Reinhardt, Charles Stansfield, John Weeks
Charge: The basic purpose of the committee is to promote the fullest possible exchange of persons, ideas, and materials between scholars and academic institutions in the United States and Nicaragua. To this end the following activities comprise a partial but not necessarily complete list of activities that should be undertaken and encouraged by this task force.

1) Acting as a scholarly clearinghouse for information about travel and research.
2) Facilitating speaking engagements by Nicaraguan scholars and public figures at American universities and other relevant institutions.
3) Encouraging and promoting the participation of Nicaraguans (government officials and scholars) in LASA and regional Latin American studies meetings.
4) Encouraging and promoting the participation of LASA members in scholarly meetings and congresses in Nicaragua.
5) Looking into the possibility of eventually setting up a formal relation(s) with a Nicaraguan scholarly association(s) such as the Central American Historical Institute, the Nicaraguan Association of Social Scientists, etc.

LASA NOMINATING COMMITTEE, 1984
Chair: Hugh M. Hamill, Jr., Center for Latin American Studies, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268, (203) 486-4464 or 486-4964; Past Chair: Douglas Graham, Department of Agricultural Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, (614)422-8011.
Members:
Norma Chinchilla, Social Science, 882 Lees Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90815;
Merlin H. Forster, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Texas at Austin, Batts Hall 110, Austin, TX 78712;
Cynthia McIlvain, Department of Political Science, George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, (202)676-6589;
Lisandro Pérez, Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, (504)388-5352;
Alex M. Saragoza, Center for Latin American Studies, Program in Mexican Studies, 2334 Bowditch, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, (415)642-2088;
Charles Wagley, Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, (904)392-0375;

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE CLASP STEERING COMMITTEE

Purposes
The Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs (CLASP) is the institutional affiliate of the Latin American Studies Association. As such, it has the responsibility of stimulating all facets of Latin American studies throughout the United States. Its specific programs range from the stimulation of research activities and the funding of professional workshops to the encouragement of citizen outreach activities and the development of teaching aids for the classroom.

Membership and Dues
CLASP currently has over 140 members. Several of these are major Latin American studies centers throughout the United States and, of necessity, these institutions play a major role in the development of CLASP activities. Nevertheless, many other types of institutions belong to CLASP. Other members include medium-sized state universities, small liberal arts colleges, foreign libraries, an affiliate of a major oil corporation, an association of Latin American geographers, the Smithsonian Institution, and a department of the Mexican government. These points simply testify to the fact that CLASP both depends upon and usefully serves a wide variety of institutional members.

Annual dues for regular members are $60. Membership entitles the institution to the receipt of the Latin American Research Review and LASA Forum, participation in the CLASP-assisted workshop program, receipt of all CLASP publications, and the right to have its representatives elected to the national Steering Committee. Groups of schools or professional associations can form consortia to join CLASP as a single member. In this case, copies of LARR and all other
publications would be sent to one member of the consortium only and workshop proposals should encompass programs involving the entire membership of the consortium.

Specific Programs
The particular mix of CLASP-sponsored programs has varied over time. During the past year or more, CLASP has tried to develop a coordinated position regarding the future scope and funding of Latin American studies programs. To this end, a set of long range goals and recommendations was brought together in the CLASP publication, “New Directions in Foreign Language and Area Studies: Priorities for the 1980s.” This important publication is available to all CLASP members and it has provided a foundation for the work of the LASA Washington Office in its contacts with the federal government. CLASP also has underwritten a greatly expanded workshop program on member campuses and in conjunction with the meetings of local regional councils.

Organization and Officers
The activities of CLASP are directed by a Steering Committee of five persons serving four-year terms. Four of the members are elected from a list of institutional representatives submitted to the membership by the Steering Committee. The fifth person is appointed by the Steering Committee itself.

All paid membership categories carry eligibility to vote and, with the exception of associate members, to serve on the Steering Committee. CLASP fully subscribes to and supports the principles of equal opportunity/affirmative action and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The current members of the Steering Committee are Richard E. Greenleaf, chair (Tulane University); Laura Randall (Hunter College-CUNY); Merilee Antrim (San Diego Community College-Mesa College); Charles Stansifer (University of Kansas); and Donald R. Shea (University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee).

Some of the programmatic responsibilities of CLASP will be coordinated and expanded upon by three newly formed committees. These are the Committee on the Profession (chair: Richard E. Greenleaf, Tulane); the Committee on Scholarly Resources (chair: Laura Gutiérrez-Witt, University of Texas); and the Committee on Teaching and Outreach (chair: Robert Knowlton, University of Wisconsin/Stevens Point).

Current Projects
1) Compilation of a new functional “Directory of Latin American Studies Programs in the United States.” Foundation support has been requested.
2) Planned publication at Tulane of “Images of Latin America,” financed by CLASP and Tulane for use in precollegiate classroom teaching.
3) Assembling a select list of course outlines and bibliographies of courses on Latin America for reciprocal use of the constituency.

The following section of the LASA Forum contains articles and opinion pieces submitted by readers. The views expressed in them are solely those of the authors; the Latin American Studies Association does not endorse, approve, or censor them.

BOLIVAR AND CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICA
by Gonzalo Palacios

(Editor’s note: Dr. Gonzalo Palacios, the author of the following article, is the director of cultural affairs at the Embassy of Venezuela in Washington, DC, and is the coordinator of the U.S. bicentennial celebration of the birth of Simón Bolívar. This article is an edited version of a speech delivered at the Americas Society meeting in March of this year.)

I must warn you that my links to Bolívar are such that my feelings about this great man are most favorable, if not altogether those of pure admiration. Bolívar was also a Palacios, a fact that was drilled into my conscience from my earliest childhood. Also, and perhaps for me a more meaningful fact, I became thoroughly familiar with the Liberator’s thought as I wrote my doctoral dissertation at Catholic University in Washington some years ago, the title of which was “The Notion of Freedom in the Political Philosophy of Simon Bolivar.”

More than to establish any credentials for writing this brief article, I want to emphasize my bias in favor of the genius of the gran caraqueño, the great visionary whose Pan American Utopia we, the heirs to his legacy, have failed so miserably to implement over a century and a half after his death. It has not been my usage when writing articles or speeches to start on a negative note: here I will do so. I repeat: we have failed to implement the vision which Simón Bolívar delineated for us with his life and in his writing.

If in 1815 and again in 1818 the English speaking world read Bolívar’s words regarding his impressions that the disintegration of the Spanish colonies was similar to that of the fall of the Roman Empire, it would not be too far fetched to compare the present turmoils in our hemisphere to the disintegration not of a particular empire or “sphere of influence” as it is called in our own day, but a way of life to which we had grown accustomed. I speak of the disintegration of a much deeper reality than that which can be established by political and economic institutions: I speak of the virtual collapse of traditional cultural structures by which we, of the so-called “New World,” could define our national character until not long ago. If out of the ruins of the Roman, the Spanish, and, in our own day, the British empires, new political systems were born “agreeable to their own interest” it may well be that out of the ruins of the cultural revolution taking place before our very eyes will rise “the grand state of prosperity which is destined for America.” With these words Bolívar ended his vision of the hemisphere from his hammock in Falmouth, Jamaica . . . And then again, maybe this time, the destruction of our ETHOS will produce a sterility
from which no new culture will be engendered.

What in fact is the Liberator’s message to us, here and now? Is there an ever-present, ever-valid message that Simón Bolívar reveals to us in his writings and in his life?

“World history represents the phase in the development of the principle whose content is the consciousness of Freedom.” These words by the German philosopher Hegel synthesize the Liberator’s work and the message to our generation. While Karl Marx would turn his philosophical mentor upside down by making the methodology of the spirit a dialectic of materialism, if one studies the development of Simón Bolívar’s *principia operationis*, we see a continuing emergence of the consciousness of freedom in his personality. For example, at odds with his stern uncle, Carlos Palacios, who became his legal guardian upon the death of his mother, Doña Concepción Palacios, when the child was not quite nine years old, Simón broke away from his uncle to regain his freedom and to live with his sister. The authorities, forced to intervene, tried to send him back to his uncle’s care, but the child refused.

From this incident on, through his departure at 16 to continue his education in Madrid and Europe, even and perhaps specially, his premature widowhood, all were steps that aided in the development of that principle by which Bolívar himself would make freedom the *only* motivation in his life. Whether in Rome in 1805 with his teacher Simón Rodríguez where he swore to dedicate his life to the freedom of his country, or ten years later, when he wrote that he loved the freedom of America more than his own glory, there is only one essential force that animated Bolívar throughout his entire life: the development of freedom in the world. For him, there is no other reason to exist than to liberate, to propagate freedom: “Liberator es más que todo…” “El título de Libertador es superior a todos los que ha recibido el orgullo humano.”

The very essence of Bolívar’s life, then, is freedom. This is the here and now of his message to us, the very substance, not the mere semblance of his genius but the quintessence of his person. Freedom and dedication to the cause of liberty, this is his legacy.

But we have failed to implement Bolívar’s vision; we have squandered our inheritance of liberty in order to satisfy the petty desires of mediocre men of power. We have extinguished the flame that Bolívar handed to us, and, in the darkness of a plethora of *isms* we have incarcerated and tortured our own brothers and sisters.

If we are to conclude this bicentennial in honor of Bolívar in a manner worthy of his spirit, let us reaffirm Bolívar’s hope for freedom in our America. We, like the prodigal son of the parable, can return home and reclaim our patrimony. We need to listen to the father of our country—as the peoples of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama call Bolívar—when he speaks about the nurturing and preservation of liberty and justice: “Las naciones marchan hacia el término de su grandeza con el mismo paso con que camina la educación.”

These words summarize Bolívar’s entire methodology toward freedom. There is no way to constitute a republican system unless society prepares citizens who develop virtues, such as honesty and justice... hombres virtuosos, hombres patriotas, hombres ilustrados constituyen las Repúblicas.”

Throughout his writings Bolívar insisted that education is the *coddio sine qua non* for the establishment and preservation of freedom among our countries. Against the contemporary background of civil strife in Central America, of economic bankruptcy of the various nations such as Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, of superpowers with microideologies confronting each other in our beloved American soil, where the lives of millions of our peoples are placed in jeopardy, let me recall now other words from Bolívar relative to what is happening at the very moment in El Salvador, in Nicaragua, in Grenada, in Suriname: “Yo sé muy bien que no hay guerra buena, más también sé que debemos defendernos contra las agresiones atroces de un Gobierno tan inmoral que desprecka absolutamente el derecho de gentes invadiendo el territorio amigo y amenazando con un exterminio absoluto a los que resistan...” Against this dark background we must contrast the light of education: “Un hombre sin estudios es un ser incompleto. La instrucción es la felicidad de la vida, y el ignorante, que siempre está próximo a revolverse en el lodo de la corrupción, se precipita luego infaliblemente en las tinieblas de la servidumbre.”

Not a man to favor military rule (“El sistema militar es el de la fuerza y la fuerza no es gobierno,”) nor dictatorship as a form of government although he had to accept that position (“La dictadura es el escolllo de las Repúblicas,”), the most consistent line of thought that can be detected in Bolívar regarding the creation of a form of government that would provide the greatest happiness to the greatest number was the education of the masses: “La educación forma al hombre moral, y para formar un legislador se necesita ciertamente educarlo en una escuela de moral, de justicia y de leyes.”

Current events in the American hemisphere not only justify a certain pessimism but impel anyone analyzing the contemporary scene to confront the civil wars that are tearing the human fabric of our nations. And yet, there remains the hope that all of us will dedicate our best efforts to turn the tide of bloody, mindless, ideological revolutions, the hope to stop each other from “plaguing the Americas with miseries in the name of Liberty” as the *Liberator* said of the United States: “Los Estados Unidos parecen destinados por la Providencia para plagiar las Americas de miseries en nombre de la Libertad.”

NOTES

5. Ibid., p. 1436.
6. Ibid., p. 1284.
8. Al Congreso de Angostura, ibid., p. 1135.
9. Ibid., I, p. 1103.
10. Ibid., I, p. 1073.
Jeane Kirkpatrick has emerged as "an architect of the administration's Latin American policies" (Washington Post, 1 August 1983). According to the New York Times (22 April 1983), she "is the central intellectual force behind Central American policy." In an administration noteworthy for lacking such expertise in high positions, Kirkpatrick stands out as "a Latin American expert who has traveled frequently to the region" (Newsweek, 1 August 1983).

I am not interested in establishing criteria to distinguish the expert from the nonexpert. My concern is the opposite: to deflate the notion that there is such a thing as scholarly expertise when it comes to contemporary U.S. policy toward Central America. Jeane Kirkpatrick may present herself to the U.S. public as a Latin American expert if she chooses. It is incumbent on those of us who sense the limits of her expertise to deflate that claim—not out of malice toward her but out of concern that Congress, the media, and the public not accede to her recommendations out of deference to her credentials.

Most of Kirkpatrick's scholarly writing has concerned political leadership in the United States: particularly the kinds of men and women who rise to positions of influence in parties and legislatures. When she has stayed close to the interviews and questionnaires that are her preferred tools, Kirkpatrick has produced craftsmanlike profiles of mainstream U.S. leaders. Her book on female state legislators was particularly well received. My comments regarding Kirkpatrick's Latin American expertise are not to be taken, then, as characterizations of her scholarship as a whole. Indeed, the first thing the media need to remember is that being professor of "x" does not make you an expert in "y". In the Who's Who-type biographies that abound, Jeane Kirkpatrick presents herself as a political theorist and student of U.S. politics, not as a Latin Americanist.

What attracted candidate Reagan to Kirkpatrick was not her understanding of Central America, but her ability to subsume Third World conflicts under Cold War categories. In the November 1979 Commentary article that caught Reagan's eye, Kirkpatrick reduced such struggles as Nicaragua's to friendly autocrats (potential democrats) challenged by Soviet-manipulated guerrillas. The primary concern of U.S. policy, Kirkpatrick argued, is to maintain credibility. Otherwise, "our friends" will think "the U.S. cannot be counted on in times of difficulty and our enemies will have observed that American support provides no security against the forward march of history."

Thus, it is the simplification of Latin American realities that has made Kirkpatrick popular with such policymakers as President Reagan and former National Security Adviser Clark, men a friendly official described as "not programmed to give up another country to Communism." Reagan approaches Central America the same way Kirkpatrick did Nicaragua in the Commentary article, not seeing complex societies shaped by specific histories, but abstract embodiments of two or three regime types and of two international allegiances. As in some medieval mystery play, one actor represents democracy, the other totalitarianism; one is a friend, the other a foe.

Reagan and Kirkpatrick also share a preoccupation with maintaining U.S. credibility. In essence this means that their focus is less on Central America than on how U.S. actions will be perceived in more important parts of the globe. Henry Kissinger—supported by Kirkpatrick to head the president's bipartisan commission on Central America—makes this explicit: "If we cannot manage Central America, it will be impossible to convince threatened nations in the Persian Gulf and in other places that we know how to manage the global equilibrium" (Newsweek, 1 August 1983).

These remarks are not intended to open a debate on U.S. policy but to draw attention to a pattern that would be surprising in anyone who was a serious student of Latin America. In this pattern Central America remains an abstraction, a cipher in the signaling between superpowers. There is little appreciation here for the distinct realities of individual Latin societies. The only concession Kirkpatrick makes to the particularity of these countries is her invocation of dubious cultural characteristics, such as the "Mediterranean" ethos of Argentines or the propensity to violence of Central Americans. In a 1980 paper titled "The Hobbes Problem," Kirkpatrick pondered down from her perch as a political theorist and pronounced El Salvador to be in a Hobbesian state of nature, thus needing "autocracy" as a solution. Too much U.S. emphasis on human rights, she wrote, only inhibits the government there from "using the force at its disposal."

This is precisely the perspective one might expect in someone who never had been to Latin America or seriously examined its history. Indeed, there is nothing in the publications by or about Kirkpatrick to suggest that this "Latin American expert" had been to the region prior to her 1981 appointment as Reagan's Chief Delegate to the United Nations. If I am mistaken on this, I would appreciate correction, for I consider the point telling.

Kirkpatrick's one book devoted to a Latin American topic dealt with the Peronist movement during the mid sixties, a time I happened to be in Argentina. Reviewing Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society, I developed the uncomfortable feeling that its author had never been to Argentina nor ever spoken to Peronists face to face. She seemed not to understand the nuances of the questionnaire her hired pollsters used to generate her data nor to grasp the political moment in which her respondents were living.

"Research from afar," I wrote, "makes other people's politics look far simpler than one's own. Is not 'condescension' the word we generally apply to such behavior?" (For this review, see Political Science Quarterly, vol. 89, p. 224.) David Jordan, whose politics I suspect are closer to Kirkpatrick's than to mine, came to a similar conclusion in another published review (American Political Science Review, vol. 69, p. 1485).

Since accepting her role in the Reagan administration, Jeane Kirkpatrick finally has traveled to Latin America. As an
emissary of the president to the leaders of besieged or autocratic governments, however, it is unlikely that she has been able to gain much sense of what is happening at the grassroots.

In sum, Kirkpatrick’s associations with Latin America are primarily those of a policymaker and a polemicist. Not only are those roles different from a scholar’s, in some ways they contradict scholarship. As spokesperson for the Reagan administration, for instance, Kirkpatrick has participated in the coverup surrounding the purpose and extent of the CIA’s not-so-covert attacks on Nicaragua. She has been associated with futile attempts in 1981 to rehabilitate the reputation of military regimes in the Cono Sur that continue to deny intellectual freedom. The State Department with which Kirkpatrick is associated has made it difficult for information to reach us from Cuba and has denied visas to authentic Latin American spokespersons invited to speak on U.S. campuses. If correctly reported, Kirkpatrick’s attacks on members of Congress who disagree with the administration’s Central American policy have verged on McCarthyism.

It is time, then, to puncture the media’s presentation of Jeane Kirkpatrick as one with scholarly expertise on Latin America.

OPINION: MORE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN PERU
by Fernando González Vigil

(Editor’s Note: Professor González Vigil is affiliated with the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, Peru, and is a visiting research associate at Columbia University.)

In the Summer 1983 issue of the LASA Forum Aníbal Quijano correctly explained the economic, social, and political components of the present crisis in Peru and its impact on human rights, up to early May 1983. My aim here is to update these concerns through a description of events occurring between May and August 1983 that reveal a drastic deterioration in the status of human rights and constitutional liberties in my country.

A basic factor has been the continuous worsening of the economic situation over the last four months. The available estimates of economic performance for all of 1983 show an almost 5 percent drop in GNP, an inflation rate of between 120 and 130 percent per annum, and an accumulated devaluation of over 130 percent per annum. All this is occurring amidst a vast number of industrial and commercial bankruptcies. It is not surprising, thus, that the government’s popularity has fallen to its lowest level, according to recent polls. Protests and strikes by workers and the newly poor middle class have been accompanied by repeated declarations by business organizations (industrialists, merchants, and bankers) opposing the economic policy; these declarations have grown even stronger in recent months. Criticism of economic policy has also been voiced by government members themselves. At the end of June, Mr. Grados Bertorini resigned as labor secretary owing, primarily, to his public disagreements about economic policy with the economic and finance secretary, Mr. Rodriguez-Pastor. The latter presented his own resignation in August—it was not accepted by President Belaunde. Mr. Rodriguez-Pastor felt that he had been deprived of his authority by the majority of congressmen of the “Acción Popular” (Popular Action), the official party, who proposed a law to freeze the prices of oil and basic staples. As a result, the government is finding itself increasingly isolated and under attack because of its stubborn insistence upon an economic policy which does not hesitate to depress the national economy for the sake of maintaining its “good image” with the IMF and private international creditors. Nonetheless, keeping in mind the upcoming municipal elections in November, the possibility that the government might make some minor economic adjustments cannot be discarded.

Another important factor has been the geographical spread of the armed struggle led by the “Sendero Luminoso” (SL), the “Shining Path.” In fact, a notable characteristic of the last few months has been the intensification of the attacks and assaults in Lima and in other regions of the country (central and northern Andes), so that the armed conflict is no longer a simple regional problem limited to the Ayacucho area. This would reflect both an intense geographic mobility of the SL members and the incorporation of new groups into the armed struggle. As the impact of the SL on national political life intensifies, the government’s nervousness and its propensity to extend its oppressive tactics to the people, the unions, and the progressive forces of the opposition are also growing.

The most spectacular examples of this state of affairs include the following events. On the night of May 27, five high tension towers were destroyed, and Lima was left without electricity (and as a result, without water and gasoline) for several hours. Simultaneously, other areas of the capital were shaken by dynamite explosions directed against factories, bank branches, and local police stations. A fire with the images of the hammer and sickle lit up San Cristóbal Mountain, which towers over Lima, and the chemical plant of Bayer was burning as a result of a bombing. The government’s reaction was to declare a state of emergency throughout the whole country for sixty days. It called for the death penalty for the perpetrators of the crimes; President Belaunde accused them of “betrayal of the homeland.” The poorer neighborhoods of Lima were targets of successive raids, which, after thousands of identity cards were checked, produced several hundred detainees. The unhealthy prisons of the capital overflowed with poor people whose guilt or innocence was difficult to prove. The raids and arrests continued throughout June, along with the guerrilla assaults. And even Mr. Isidoro Gomarza, the president of the largest Peruvian central union, the Central General de Trabajadores del Perú (CGTP), was jailed—without any justification whatsoever—for four days.

In July, the offices of the Policía de Investigaciones del Perú (PIP), the Peruvian detective force, located in the wealthy Miraflores neighborhood of Lima, were blown up (a torture chamber was believed to have been located there). A PIP
official who had carried out “intelligence operations” in Ayacucho died. While reaction to this attack in the immediate Miraflores area was limited to area and house searches, indiscriminate raids were conducted in the downtown and popular neighborhoods of the city. On July 11, the central offices of Popular Action were attacked in a daring, frightening terrorist incursion in which two party militants lost their lives and some thirty people were wounded. President Belaunde and high government officials reacted with explicable, although perhaps too excessive, emotion. They exhorted the police and the armed forces to carry the “war” to its ultimate extreme—the physical extermination of the “terrorists.” There appeared to be almost no room for the dialogue between the government and the SL that the attorney general himself had requested three weeks earlier, with the aim of seeking a political solution to the problem.

The principal leftist parties of the opposition (grouped in the “Izquierda Unida,” the United Left) condemned the terrorist actions of the SL on several occasions. They publicly reiterated their condemnation of the attack on the central offices of Popular Action and sent a high-level delegation to the wake to offer condolences and to participate in the burial of the victims. In spite of this stance, the government has not stopped its efforts to relate the SL to the other leftist and progressive national and foreign sectors. In recent months, research and social development centers, progressive intellectuals, and professionals have been the direct victims of repressive tactics, which, at times, employ the “counterinsurgency” methods so sadly remembered for their extensive use during the bleakest years of dictatorships in Latin America. Such is the case, for example, of Mr. Jaime Urrutia, director of the José María Arguedas Regional Studies Institute. Mr. Urrutia was kidnapped in a paramilitary action by six hooded men on May 6. He was released two weeks later, after strenuous interrogations that were unable to prove the charge that the SL was financed by institute monies.

Afterward, a violent campaign broke out against the research centers and the foreign institutions that finance them. It was begun by President Belaunde himself, who referred to “foundations which bring money into the country . . . to divide it up as perks among pseudo-intellectuals, who instead of building . . . dedicate themselves to dissipative activities and to planting the evil seed in the people’s souls, a seed which bears fruit . . . in destruction . . . in disgraces . . . in disagreements . . . with deaths.” In the following weeks, seventy research centers were threatened with intervention and the most important ones were periodically visited by treasury police and/or state security police; a McCarthy-style witch hunt by the press accused these institutions of supporting Marxism and subversion—among them were the Inter-American Foundation, Friedrich Ebert, Konrad Adenauer, CEBEMO, etc., and the interior secretary announced the preparation of a legal mechanism to regulate the use of funds sent by foreign foundations to the country.

The government’s desperate search for a “scapegoat” for its failures in economic policy and in the confrontation with the SL is evidently behind the campaign. It has certainly attracted the support of several reactionary sectors to the possibility of smothering these research centers through discouraging their foreign financial supporters (in the Dutch case, the nonpublic cooperation reached some nine billion soles per annum, or twenty-two times the total national budget for social research in Peru), because a large part of the significant work that they do (in the late 1970s, Peru was second in Latin America, after Mexico, in social science publications) questions the national reality and the causes of its backwardness and poverty. However, the principal objectives behind this campaign are, without doubt, to scare Peruvian progressive and democratic thought and to silence, through fear, the country’s critical awareness of the deepening economic crisis, which has become even more severe during this regime, and the growing institutionalized violence which encourages, rather than placates, the wave of violence that has broken out by the armed insurgency of the SL.

Thus, we are faced with yet another component of the so-called counterinsurgency strategy that has been taught since the 1960s by U.S. advisers and has been gradually applied since last year in Peru. The circle of repression grows and grows—from the armed groups to the subversive forces and then to the opposition. For this reason, it is vital to discover or to invent “the foreign connection.” With an obstinacy that should be dedicated to better causes and that approaches McCarthyism and xenophobia, the government has repeatedly tried to “prove” that its internal problems (SL, in particular) are nothing more than foreign manipulations by international Marxism and/or by its lackeys. This is the root of Belaunde’s attack, last January, on the progressive sectors of the church, the reasons for the jailing of three Danish citizens in early July for “directing terrorist activities in Apurímac” and their freedom in the face of the ridiculousness of the charge, and the expulsion in August of a French priest accused of being associated with the SL. But, when it comes to practicing institutionalized violence, the government carries out, without embarrassment or ceremony, a type of “repressive internationalism.” It publically solicits expert assistance from Argentina, West Germany, Italy, Israel, and other nations.

Notwithstanding the above, it is necessary to clarify that, at least until now, the violations of human rights and fundamental constitutional liberties is borne with greater intensity by the popular classes and in the provinces, in comparison to what is happening in Lima and among the middle class. The region of Ayacucho has been the scene of an unending series of arbitrary actions committed not only by the military and police authorities, but also by local civilians. A number of abuses attributed to the members of the army and the special police force, Sichis (“strongmen,” in Quechua), has been reported. Among them are kidnappings followed by horrible executions, beatings and mistreatment of women and children, plundering and burning of homes and community centers, destruction of crops and appropriation of animals in the Totora district (April 7 and 16) and in the communities of Matará (April 22 and June 2) and Quispillacta (during May). Members of other communities participated in the last two actions; they took advantage of the accusations of collaboration with the SL to seize lands and possessions of neighboring rival communities.

One repulsive element of this “counterinsurgency strategy” that has been systematically applied since the beginning of the year is precisely this active use of traditional intercommunity
rivalries in the destruction of villages that are presumed to collaborate with the guerrillas. These confrontations result in a high death rate among civilians, who are then quickly classified by the military and police as *senderistas*, supporters of the SL, or subversives. For example, 374 "subversive delinquents," 66 civilians, and 2 policemen died in nineteen confrontations reported in May and June. There is almost no way to verify this information. If the police reports do exist, they are not revealed; the bodies are not identified, nor are the deaths registered. Journalist and press freedoms are seriously restricted in the area, thus information is limited to sketchy, vague communiques or press notes issued by the military-political command.

Finally, the application of the "counterinsurgency strategy" also implies the recourse to paramilitary groups (as in the Urrutia case mentioned above), to illegal public executions and kidnappings that result in missing people or detainees maintained incommunicado for periods of time while being subjected to unpleasant interrogations. The principal victims of these acts are, aside from the peasants, teachers, students, and members of popular base (grass roots) organizations. For example, in April, four teachers were illegally executed near Paras. In May, three professors were added to the list of "missing detainees" and, for a while, students of the University of Huamanga and a leader of the shanty towns were detained without legal counsel. Of course, these examples refer only to situations and people that could be identified.

It is difficult to determine the real impact of these military and police actions on the combative ability and the power of the SL in the region. This political group called for a 48-hour general strike for 25-26 July. It achieved almost 100 percent participation among the population of Ayacucho owing to fear of reprisals by the SL in some cases, or to silent support for the guerrillas in other cases, and, certainly, as a demonstration of the general repudiation of the arbitrariness and abuses of the government's forces. The government is harassed and desperate due to its failure in economic policy and in the way it deals with the SL. Thus, it has dangerously accentuated its isolation and repressive activities over the last few months. Paradoxically, it is playing into the hands of the SL (which describes the regime as inherently fascist) and it is raising the economic and political suffering of the Peruvian people to levels which were unimaginable until quite recently.

**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORT ON PERU**

On 21 September 1983, Amnesty International released a report of its findings on human rights violations in Peru, stating that "Peruvian security forces have summarily executed hundreds of Andean Indians in massive counter-insurgency operations launched this year."

In a letter to President Belaunde Terry, the worldwide human rights movement said that until this year Peru had not figured among countries where official forces were reported to be abducting and killing unarmed civilians. But, said the letter, since January 1983, "disappearances" and extrajudicial executions in a nine-province emergency zone under military rule, "have been perpetrated with impunity and are increasing in number."

The report is available from Amnesty International, International Secretariat, 10 Southampton Street, London WC2E 7HF, United Kingdom.

**A REPORT ON INTELLECTUAL, CULTURAL, AND ARTISTIC FREEDOM IN URUGUAY**

By Louise B. Popkin, Department of Romance and Comparative Literature, Brandeis University, and Martin Weinstein, Department of Political Science, The William Patterson College of New Jersey

June 27, 1983, marked the tenth anniversary of the military coup that brought the present regime to power in Uruguay. During the past decade Uruguay's rulers have imposed the stability of the cemetery on their people, forcing hundreds of thousands into exile and systematically imprisoning, torturing, and murdering, at home and abroad, those opposed to their rule. So efficient have they been that Uruguay has enjoyed the dubious honor of having more political prisoners per capita than any other country in the world. Since the coup, the military has infringed on all aspects of life. Today most political parties remain banned, with hundreds of prominent Uruguayan citizens prohibited from participating in public affairs until 1991; former student associations and labor unions are illegal. Private social and sports clubs cannot meet or elect their officers, nor can any public event take place without prior police authorization.

One of the least publicized aspects of this situation has been its devastating effects on the cultural life of Uruguayans. As this report is intended primarily for members of LASA and given limitations of space, we have chosen as the focus for our discussion intellectual, cultural, and artistic freedom in Uruguay. The policies of the military dictatorship regarding freedom of information and expression have virtually destroyed the system of free public education created under the Batllista welfare state, creating a void in artistic production and resulting in a degree of cultural and informational impoverishment for the population at large unparalleled in the nation's history. Before the institution of repression, Uruguay had one of the most advanced school systems in Latin America. With freedom of expression, trade union activity, and the autonomy of the system all guaranteed by the constitution, primary, secondary, technical, and university education were characterized by a secular and modernizing approach to curriculum; by the application of rigorous academic criteria in teacher training and selection; and by a commitment to extending education to as broad a spectrum of society as possible. Academic programs were updated periodically to incorporate all currents of
contemporary thought; specialized institutes trained highly qualified teachers for the primary and secondary schools; academic posts were filled through open competitions; the literacy rate in Uruguay was comparable to that of most industrialized countries; and the system of education with its markedly democratic ideology played a much more fundamental role than in most countries in the development of a sense of national identity.

At the National University (Uruguay's only university), attention was paid increasingly to the provision and maintenance of research facilities, so that by 1965 research accounted for a fifth of the university budget and significant results had been obtained in such fields as medicine, agriculture, engineering, mathematics, economics, and sociology. High priority was given to the study from an indigenous perspective and public discussion of problems relevant to national life. Logical extensions of that commitment were the university's traditional rejection of any funding from abroad that might determine the nature or direction of studies undertaken, thus contributing to Uruguay's continued cultural dependence; and, in the years immediately preceding the June 1973 coup, frequent public stands in opposition to growing government repression.

According to late former Rector Oscar Maggiolo, repression against the university dates from 1968, when the authorities declared it a "haven for subversives" and began to withhold funds for research. By 1973, thanks to further attempts at economic strangulation involving budget cuts and delays in the delivery of allocated funds, the university had incurred a debt equivalent to a full year of its operating budget. Following a number of provocations and repressive attacks carried out by government troops and armed vigilante groups and the overwhelming victory in university elections of antidictatorial candidates, the university was formally intervened in September 1973. At that time, the Central University Council and those of the ten schools composing the university were placed under military control.

The rest of the school system had been intervened definitively in January of the same year when the governing councils of the remaining sectors (primary, secondary, and technical) were placed under the control of a newly created National Education Council (CONAE), whose members have since been appointed by the president of Uruguay on the basis of their political allegiance to the regime.

Intervention of the Uruguayan system of education was immediately followed by firings, forced resignations, and nonreappointments on a massive scale—estimated to have affected 70 to 90 percent of the university teaching staff, half the faculty of the teacher training schools, 40 to 50 percent of primary and secondary school teachers, and almost all the primary and secondary school inspectors. Many of those affiliated with the university (including two former rectors and six of the ten deans) have left the country; hundreds have been arrested (in 1981 the American Association of Atomic Scientists issued a list including 149 colleagues imprisoned in the sciences alone). Over 500 resignations and dozens of arrests resulted in the university when in 1974, the government began to require all those holding administrative or academic appointments in the school system to sign a "Declaration of Democratic Faith" swearing allegiance to the "Republican democratic form of government" (that was how the dictatorship characterized itself), and stating that they did not and had never belonged to any proscribed organization. Since virtually all those affected had belonged to the by then outlawed trade unions and the University Students Association (FEUU), they could choose only to lie about their past affiliations and risk sanctions if investigated, or to refuse to sign and resign or be dismissed; since then, political allegiance to the regime has generally replaced professional competence as a criterion for filling administrative and teaching posts.

Standards have declined as a result in both teaching and research. Research had already been impeded as a matter of policy; as early as 1968, the Uruguayan authorities had stated that the only research necessary was for development and that that could be obtained from the transnational corporations. The priorities of the military have brought about a sharp decline in budgetary allocations for public education (down from 21 percent of the national budget in the early 1960s to a mere 13.5 percent by 1981) relative to security expenditures (up from 14 percent to 40 percent for the same period). Increasingly hampered by scarcity of resources and of competent personnel, research has practically ground to a halt at the university in the years since intervention—especially in mathematics and statistics, in engineering, and in the natural and social sciences, where whole institutes and research facilities have disappeared. At the same time, the renewed procurement of funding from the multilateral lending institutions for such research as is now carried out is seen by many as detrimental to the development of an indigenous culture and technology. An oft-cited example of the authorities' lack of commitment to research is the ease of a strain of sheep specially bred for experiments in genetics at the School of Agronomy and eaten at a barbecue shortly after intervention.

The exodus of so many of Uruguay's professionals, the widespread policy of political patronage that determines appointments, and the authorities' pursuit of "ideological purity" have also affected curriculum and academic programs. In carrying out the academic policies consistent with their antidemocratic ideology, the authorities have purged university libraries not only of works of Marxist content or sympathies but of complete collections of the prestigious Mexican publication Cuadernos Americanos and the highly regarded Uruguayan weekly Marcha. In the School of Humanities and Social Sciences all authors suspected of "countervening the natural order" have been banned—including Antonio Machado (as the lyricist for Catalan protest singer Juan Manuel Serrat), José Martí, Jean Paul Sartre along with Marx, Engels, Hegel, and even Bertrand Russell (labeled a "communist snob" by a government official). Psychology students have been prevented from reading Pavlov ("for being Russian") and Freud ("for being repulsive and pornographic"); and in art history courses for undergraduates the use of slides has been forbidden because the nude figures in Renaissance painting were deemed "offensive to morality."

At the secondary level, textbooks and all printed matter felt to be or suspected of being "in conflict with the tenets of Western or Christian civilization" must be submitted to the
authorities for examination. Among banned writers have been Sartre, Kafka, Machado, as well as all those deemed "materialistic." In high school philosophy courses, references to twentieth century philosophical trends have been omitted in favor of topics such as "The Role of the Family" and "Communist Infiltration of Trade Unions." History teachers have been encouraged not to cover the French Revolution in depth, while stressing such topics as the Spanish Conquest, the Counter Reformation, and the Reign of Phillip II.

In all the above-mentioned instances as in the area of publishing and public performance, it is difficult to ascertain how many prohibitions of specific authors and works are still in effect or how widely such prohibitions were implemented, because the methods used to institute censorship have been indirect and insidious. Exile sources have repeatedly told us that in general, the Uruguayan government has attempted to shield itself from foreseeable criticism in this area by resorting to ambiguity and intimidation rather than to the more easily documentable use of formal blacklists and published decrees. Thus, most prohibitions have taken the form of statements, veiled threats, and arbitrary confiscations of published material carried out during visits to educational institutions, publishing houses, book stores, etc. (often at the discretion of the school inspector or government censor involved); or have been the result of self-censorship applied following such visits. What is clearer is that given the role traditionally played by public education in the political life of Uruguayans such an attempt at restructuring education represents nothing less than an attack upon the whole of national life.

A further area of concern within the school system involves the physical and moral climate which surrounds students. In student publications which have reappeared at the university and some lycées, constant references can be found to overcrowding, scarcity of supplies, outdated reading matter, and especially the "militarization" of academic facilities under the dictatorship. Security agents are present in classrooms at all levels and their denunciation of an antigovernment opinion is often sufficient grounds for dismissal. Students are subject to strict dress codes; and, since July 1982, strict protocol has existed even in matters such as who sits to the right of whom when subordinates and superiors travel together for official purposes.

Finally, especially in view of the growing high school dropout rate and declining enrollments brought about by economic hardship, several measures whose effect is to restrict enrollments have been regarded by most Uruguayans as contrary to the nation's democratic traditions in education, if not unconstitutional. These include the suspension of night classes formerly attended by students who hold full time jobs; the limiting of funds available for scholarships; and, especially, the institution of an entrance examination for admission to the university, which has until recently been open to all those who had in hand a high school diploma. To date 30,000 signatures protesting this policy have resulted in the substitution of quotas for the minimum scores initially used as cutoff points for admission to each school.

Before the beginning of repression in Uruguay, cultural production was intense and of high quality. A wide range of opinions could be found in the press; foreign publications were readily available on the newsstands; the book publishing industry flourished, as did music, the plastic arts, theater, and film. Culture was available to the populace at large at affordable prices. Ten years after the coup, all these areas of cultural life remain adversely affected by the regressive economic policies of the regime and the continued exercise of censorship.

The silencing of the opposition press (including the electronic media) which began gradually in the late 1960s was carried out using arbitrary tactics that included temporary and permanent closures; occupation of physical plants and sometimes, confiscation of equipment and assets; the detention, interrogation, torture, disappearance and exile of journalists; the imposition of severe penalties and fines for broadly defined offenses known as "Delitos de Imprenta"; economic pressures; the exercise of prior censorship; confiscation of foreign publications before they reached the newsstands. Many of the journalists arrested during that period remain in prison.

Despite the appearance in the last three years of several new publications which clearly constitute an opposition press, most of the tactics employed earlier remain in use; thus, although more is said than formerly at the initiative of journalists and publishers, it seems clear that the regime would prefer to restrict the activity of the mass media in Uruguay to what Mario Benedetti once referred to as "the demilitarized zone of recipes, horoscopes, and stamp collecting." We have estimated that in the 39 weeks that elapsed between 1 September 1981 (when Uruguay's current president took office) and 31 May 1982, 72 weeks worth of suspensions and closings were decreed; between 1 June 1982 and 1 June 1983, five publications were closed definitively with three others suffering repeated temporary closures of different duration. Most recently on 20 May 1983, the Blanco weekly La Democracia began a new six month suspension, the fifth since its founding in September 1981. During the past year so many additional repressive actions have been taken against members of the press, that even the conservative Intramericano Press Association has condemned the Uruguayan authorities for their closings, banning of foreign press, and frequent interrogations of journalists. Among the official reasons given for such actions have been the publication of interviews with or photos of prescribed political leaders; of cartoons satirizing prominent politicians; of articles criticizing the government's economic policies; and of statements criticizing the closing of other publications.

Noteworthy too is the closure (sometimes after decades of publication and owing to a combination of political and economic circumstances) of much of the regional press; of 270 regional papers publishing in 1962, only 70 remained by October 1982.

The book publishing industry has also suffered the effects of government policies. Rising costs and new laws eliminating certain tax exemptions which had protected book imports since 1912 have placed book prices beyond the reach of many Uruguayans. Economic and political pressures have forced the closing of many publishing houses, book stores, and cultural organizations involved in publishing, most recently the traditional Librería Tarino and Librería Losada with its affiliated
Galería de Artes y Letras.

As in the case of academic curriculum, a major factor contributing to the cultural impoverishment of Uruguayans has been the arbitrary—and sometimes official—banning of large numbers of works and authors, both foreign and Uruguayan (these have included at various times the classics of Marxism and works by Freud, Antonio Machado, Nicolás Guillén, Neruda, Brecht, García Lorca, Juan Ramón Jiménez, as well as the work of Uruguayan authors Onetti, Benedetti, Martínez Moreno, Galeano, Angel Rama, all in exile; Hiber Conteris and Mauricio Rosenkof, in prison; Julio Castro, disappeared and presumed dead; Francisco Espinola and Carlos Real de Azúa, deceased, to mention but a few). Such banning has meant that many works and authors formerly available in Uruguay cannot now be published there; banned works published abroad usually cannot be sold, commented on, or their authors even mentioned in the press except in passing; and Uruguayan customs officials have been supplied with blacklists and instructions to confiscate any copies they find in the possession of travellers.

The arbitrary use of banning, the requirement that police permits be obtained for all public events, and the presence of spies and paid informers at lectures, exhibits, book fairs, as well as shows, concerts, and recitals all conspire to lead to the exercise of self-censorship. A telling example in this connection is the National Book and Print Festival—one once an important affair, artistic and nonpolitical in nature, which took place in the Municipal Palace in Montevideo under the sponsorship of the Municipal Council. Since the political views of participants led the authorities to withdraw their support and refuse permission to hold the Festival on city property, it has been held as a garden party far outside the city limits—and that, only after consultation with the police regarding who can participate.

A final and especially reprehensible incident involving government interference in literary matters occurred in February 1982, when the jury which had awarded the National Literary Prize for 1981 to Idelfonso Pérez Valdez was obliged to reverse itself because the government claimed to have discovered "Marxist elements" in his work.

Censorship and economic hard times have also affected the world of public events, with a significant decline recorded in recent years in attendance at theaters, sports events, and especially movies. Many theaters and moviehouses have had to close or have fallen into disrepair. Others formerly occupied by independent theater groups have been taken over by the government for political reasons. Hit especially hard by the censors was the independent theater troupe El Galpón, which has been based in Mexico since the imprisonment and torture of its members and the destruction and confiscation of its property forced it into exile. All those associated with El Galpón are banned from working in Uruguay, as are others including Uruguayan actress China Zorrilla, Argentine actress Inda Ledesma, and Uruguayan playwright Antonio Larreta. Also prohibited have been adaptations of classic works which might imply attitudes critical of Uruguayan society; this policy has affected productions of Lope de Vega's Fuenteovejuna, Sophocles' Antigone, certain works by Berthold Brecht, and most recently Tennessee Williams' The Glass Menagerie.

Before censorship was imposed, Uruguay had a thriving film culture, with most world classics past and present available for viewing and discussion. Since the late 1960s many films previously available have likewise been banned, most recently Bertolucci's 1900 and Last Tango in Paris; Costa Gavras' Missing; Liliana Cavani's Beyond Good and Evil; Hector Babenco's Pixote and O Passageiro da Agonia; and Leon Hirszman's They Don't Wear Black Tie.

Finally, numerous musicians have been among the victims of repression, some because of their political views and others because their art is political in content. Classical musicians left the country in droves after being dismissed from the two national orchestras and sometimes prevented from working there; this was the case for Camerata Punta del Este, whose recordings have also been banned. Among musicians persecuted because of the political nature of their art are the so-called murgas, brass bands that perform at Carnaval and whose lyrics often contain critical commentary on current events. Over the years they have been prevented from using certain key words and referring to topics deemed sensitive; thus, in 1981 following the defeat of the military's constitutional project in a national plebiscite, all mention of the word plebiscito or reference to that event was forbidden; in 1982 the word pueblo could not be used nor could mention be made of the cost of living.

A second and larger group targeted by the censors is made up of the principal creators of the "Canto Nacional," a popular song movement that served, from 1969 to 1972, as an important vehicle of opposition to the increasingly repressive regime. Most of those singers (for example, Daniel Viglietti, Alfredo Zitarrosa, los Olímpicos) are in exile, some after serving prison terms. Their records are banned in Uruguay as is evidenced by signs to that effect on the walls of radio stations throughout the country. Broadcast of the work of certain foreign performers, including Mercedes Sosa, Jorge Cafrune, Violeta Parra, and Joan Manuel Serrat is similarly prohibited, while the routine denial of police authorizations for recitals has made it impossible for any of the above-mentioned artists still performing to do so in Uruguay. A similar fate has been shared by many young musicians who have drawn large and enthusiastic audiences around the country in what has been characterized as a resurgence of the "Canto Nacional" and one of the few manifestations of popular culture to appear within Uruguay since the coup. Their popularity has been met by official declarations about the dangers posed by such gatherings and by the repeated denial in recent months of permits for recitals.

By 1979, it was estimated that one in five Uruguayans had left the country, that proportion being much higher among academics, professionals, and artists. No laws or administrative procedures have been implemented to facilitate the return of these individuals, and the denial of renewals and outright cancellation of passports continue to be used as political weapons by the government. To see Uruguayan theater nowadays, one must go to Mexico City or Caracas. Uruguayan musicians can be heard in Porto Alegre and Amsterdam; the works of Uruguayan authors are published and sold in Madrid, Barcelona, Havana, and other Latin American capitals. Uruguay's best economists work in Mexico City and in Paris, and Uruguayan academics hold teaching and research appointments at the most prestigious universities of Europe and the Americas. This
massive and unprecedented brain drain and the exodus of the majority of Uruguay's most distinguished artists have deprived the country of long-term sources of skilled and knowledgeable experts and of much of its cultural life.

Selected List of Uruguay Resources
I. Organizations:
   - Convergencia Democrática Uruguay (CDU)*, 1341 G Street, N.W., no. 429, Washington, DC 20005;
   - Servicio Paz y Justicia (SERPAJ)*, General Flores 4050, Montevideo, Uruguay;
   - Uruguay Information Group*, P. O. Box 299, Rockefeller Center, New York, NY 10185
*Publishes a newsletter
II. Publications and News Agencies
   - Pressur, 1341 G Street, N.W., no. 419, Washington, DC 20005
   - Mayoria, Box 2071, c24-02 Angered, Sweden
   - Cuadernos de Marcha. CEUAL, AC, Apartado Postal 19-131, Mexico 19, DF
   - Secretariat International des Juristes pour l'Amnistie en Uruguay (SIIAU), 33 Rue Godot de Mauroy, Paris, France 75009.

The following organizations occasionally publish information on Uruguay: Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA); Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA); PEN-American Center; America’s Watch; Human Rights Internet; Amnesty International; Human Rights Office, National Council of Churches; Asociación Latinoamericana de Derechos Humanos (ALDHU).

LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
from the Committee of U.S. Citizens Living in Nicaragua

The last few days have seen a dramatic escalation in the Reagan Administration’s war against Nicaragua in the form of restricting the flow of people, goods, and information between that country and the United States. As Americans living and working in Nicaragua, we believe that with this action the administration has also moved to restrict the right of Americans to be exposed to any view of Nicaragua which differs from its own. We further believe that such action is intended to help justify a deeper U.S. intervention in Nicaragua and in Central America as a whole.

On 5 June 1983 the Nicaraguan government charged officials of the American embassy with participating in a conspiracy to murder Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Father Miguel D’Escoto and expelled three of them from the country. In retaliation, on 7 June the Reagan Administration ordered the closing of Nicaraguan consulates in six American cities and the expulsion of their personnel. This move leaves only the consulate of Nicaragua in Washington operating to facilitate travel and trade between our two countries. It is also a major step toward a full-scale break in diplomatic relations.

The restriction of consular ties between a great power and a small underdeveloped country is not simply a move in a game of diplomatic chess. Closing consulates in six key commercial centers will make the exchange of goods between our two nations much more laborious. As much of what they consume is either imported directly or made from imported materials, this will have a significant and negative effect on how Nicaraguans live. Equally important, the closings will make it much more difficult not only for Nicaraguans residing in the United States, but also for large numbers of Americans, to travel to Nicaragua to experience firsthand what is happening here.

We are all aware that the Reagan Administration is engaged in a campaign, of which this action is clearly part, to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. To justify that campaign the Administration has waged a propaganda war portraying that Government as totalitarian, fanatically “Marxist-Leninist,” and repressive of the rights of its citizens. The vehemence of these charges is matched only by the inability of Administration spokespeople to present any convincing evidence for them. Nevertheless, by sheer repetition the campaign has left its mark—increasing numbers of U.S. politicians, many of whom have never visited Nicaragua, have concluded that its Government is offensive and dangerous.

Fortunately, there are Americans who are willing to come to Nicaragua and look at its reality through different eyes. Indeed, a seemingly endless stream of U.S. citizens have trekked across the length and breadth of this country searching for their own version of its truth. By and large, those Americans have taken back with them a vision of Nicaragua that varies sharply from the Reagan Administration’s. It is a vision of a country governed by decent men and women who in the face of tremendous economic obstacles and the unrelenting hostility of the U.S. Government are attempting to improve the lives of the Nicaraguan people.

Far from fanatically Marxist, they conclude the Sandinist Government in Nicaragua has proven flexible in its approaches to development, leaving ample margin for the operation of a private sector. Rather than instituting a totalitarian state it has taken pains to shape a police force and military which treat people with respect. And far from trampling the human rights and religious sentiments of the Nicaraguan people, it has convinced prominent clergymen to serve in high posts. Above all, the Sandinists are generous—to enemies whom they have defeated, to foreigners who come here to help, even to Americans from whom they have often received in return only distrust and incomprehension.

Such a vision of what constitutes Nicaragua today is intolerable to the “statemen” of the Reagan Administration. They have therefore moved to sever communication between the United States and Nicaragua—the living bond between two peoples—in order to make their own paranoid vision of Nicaragua the only one that Americans are allowed to see. They reason that if the American people are exposed to that vision, sooner or later they will come to believe it. The administration will then be free to work its will against Nicaragua.
It is not by accident that Father Miguel d’Escoto has been chosen as a target of the Reagan Administration’s unreasoning hatred, for he symbolizes the decency and integrity which are characteristic of the Nicaraguan revolution. Even more unpardonable for Washington is the Maryknoll priest who serves as Nicaragua’s Chancellor incarnates the alliance between religion and revolution in this part of the world. When they found they could not stain his reputation, Reagan’s strategists turned to the only other thing they could think of—assassination. They wrongly believed that the death of one man can blunt the idealism that has sparked commitment to and sympathy for the Nicaraguan Revolution throughout the world.

They are wrong about other things as well. Although some Americans may be persuaded that Somocista guardsmen are “freedom fighters,” precious few Nicaraguans harbor such a frightful delusion. The Nicaraguan people know the National Guard for what it is—a gang of thugs who slit teachers’ throats, murder doctors, kidnap and kill innocent peasants and sabotage their harvests. They will never be convinced that such people are their “liberators.” They fought once to throw off the oppressive tyranny of the Guard and are fighting now against an attempt to reimpose it supported by the Reagan Administration and its allies in Honduras.

Let us hope that the Reagan Administration is wrong about one more thing. They are betting that the American people will be either too uncaring or too conformist to stand up to their vicious campaign of red baiting and fear of an illusory “Communist menace” in Central America. It is time for all of us to show by our actions that we will not be intimidated by the terror tactics with which these modern-day McCarthystes are attempting to silence opposition to their Nicaragua policy. It is our right to travel to Nicaragua to find out for ourselves what the government of that country is doing. We must not allow that right to be trampled on by an Administration that has aligned itself with the agents of repression in Central America.

If we do not act we will be granting the Reagans, the Clarks, and the Kirkpatricks carte blanche to continue their seemingly inexorable march toward full-scale intervention in this area of the world. That march can only conclude with the death of hundreds of thousands of people, in countries that have already seen tens of thousands die fighting repulsive tyrannies propped up for decades by the United States Government without the consent of our own people. Among the dead will be Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, Costa Ricans, and, yes, Americans.

11 June 1983
Contact person: James E. Goff, Apartado 3205, Managua, Nicaragua

IN MEMORIAM

William Earl Carter, 56, chief of the Hispanic Division, Library of Congress, died of melanoma on 14 August at his home in Bethesda, Maryland. Dr. Carter was born in Dayton, Ohio, and received a bachelor of arts degree in English from Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, in 1949, and a bachelor of sacred theology degree from Boston University in 1955. He earned his master’s and doctoral degrees in anthropology from Columbia University in 1958 and 1963 respectively. An internationally known anthropologist, Dr. Carter pioneered research on Aymara communities in Bolivia. In June of this year, he was the recipient of a joint proclamation from 28 Aymara communities, citing his outstanding contributions to the world’s understanding of their culture.

Dr. Carter was an active member of LASA and other associations dealing with Latin America. He is survived by his wife, Berta Garcia Roca Carter and three daughters. Memorial contributions should be sent to the William E. Carter Hispanic Scholar in Residence Fund, c/o Dr. Wayne Reitz, University of Florida Foundation, Gainesville, FL 32611, or to The Fund for the Huarpampa Park, c/o Mariano Baptista, Ambassador of Bolivia, 3014 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20008.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The International Communication Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication invites entries for its research paper competition. Papers are sought on any topic within the general framework of international communication, and the best papers will be presented at the AEJMC 1984 convention at the University of Florida in Gainesville, 5-8 August 1984. Four copies of each entry must be received by the competition chair no later than 1 April 1984. Papers may be of any length, must be typewritten or printed by a word processor, and double spaced. Submit papers to Prof. Owen V. Johnson, School of Journalism, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

The Southeastern Council of Latin American Studies will hold its annual meeting at Auburn University 12-14 April 1984, focusing on “The Many Cultures of Latin America.” Papers and panels are being solicited on this theme, with the hope of stimulating participation by the full range of disciplines represented among Latin Americanists. For further information, contact Prof. Jerry W. Cooney, History Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, phone (502)588-6817.

The Rocky Mountain Council on Latin American Studies is seeking panels and papers for its 32nd annual meeting to be held 23-25 February 1984 in Tucson, Arizona. Suggestions for panels or papers should be sent to Dr. Susan Deeds, Latin American Area Center, Social Sciences Building 216, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, phone (602)621-1137.

The RMCLAS 1984 Fall Meeting will be held 27-29 September 1984 at the Double Arrow Ranch in Seeley Lake, Montana. Papers and panels in all areas of endeavor by Latin Americanists will be considered, and should be sent to Prof. Stanley Rose, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812 or Ms. Julie McVay,
INSTITUTIONAL NEWS

The Wilson Center has announced that the founding secretary of its Latin American Program, Dr. Abraham F. Lowenthal, will leave the Wilson Center on 1 January to become a professor in the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. Dr. Lowenthal has directed the Wilson Center’s Latin American Program for almost seven years, during which it has become a major locus for advanced research and sustained discussion on hemispheric issues. Prior to establishing the program, he served as director of studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, as a research associate and lecturer at Princeton University, and as an official of the Ford Foundation in Latin America.

During Dr. Lowenthal’s leave, the acting secretary of the program is Dr. Louis W. Goodman, formerly of the Social Science Research Council as well as Yale and American University. An international search is now being initiated to select Dr. Lowenthal’s successor.

Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, began a new program in Latin American studies this fall, offering for the first time an undergraduate degree program designed to provide an education that integrates business skills and training with Spanish language proficiency and cultural knowledge and understanding. The program consists of a double major in business administration and Spanish, and features a four-month internship in a Latin American country following the junior year. Further information may be obtained from Dr. Mary H. Preuss, Acting Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages or Dr. Stewart Lee, Chairman, Department of Economics and Business Administration, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA 15010.

The University of Wisconsin Ibero-American Studies Program is hosting six distinguished visiting faculty members during 1983-84. Edward Larocque Tinker Visiting Professors for the fall semester are Fausto Izcaraay (Instituto Universitario Pedagógico Experimental de Barquisimeto, Venezuela), a leading researcher in mass communications in developing countries, and Portuguese legal scholar Boaventura de Sousa Santos (University of Coimbra, Portugal). Tinker professors for the spring semester include Paulo de Almeida Machado (Núcleo interdisciplinar para Ecologia Humana, University of Campinas, Brazil), José Pastor (University of São Paulo, Brazil), a sociologist and expert on Brazilian labor relations, and physicist Pier Mello (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México). Also visiting in the fall semester is Maria Irene Ramalho de Sousa Santos (University of Coimbra, Portugal), teaching a seminar on the modern lyric in the Department of Comparative Literature.

The University of New Mexico Latin American Institute hosted an intensive five-week summer institute on Brazil, 15 July to 19 August, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Twenty full-time college and university faculty from around the country, all Latin Americanists from institutions interested in developing strong Luso-Brazilian studies programs, participated.

Headquartered at Taos, the summer institute included intensive seminars examining critical issues in the development of Brazilian society, and an interdisciplinary approach to the study of Brazilian culture: guest lectures, films, slide shows, cultural events, beginning and intermediate Portuguese language instruction, and curriculum development work designed for each participant’s home institution.

The recently established Caribbean Migration Research and Training Program at the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida has sponsored a number of activities since its creation in 1980. These include the publication of a series of occasional papers, the first of which is a collection of selected papers from the Migration and Caribbean Cultural Identity Conference held at the University of Florida in October 1981. The second occasional paper is “Caribbean Workers in the Florida Sugar Cane Industry,” and a third paper on Haitian migration is due to appear soon. A bibliography on Caribbean migration and Caribbean immigrant communities outside the Caribbean will soon be published by the Reference and Bibliographic Department of the University of Florida Libraries in cooperation with the Center for Latin American Studies. A directory of professionals with Caribbean migration experience was also compiled as part of an effort to identify persons and resources of specialized knowledge in Caribbean migration.

Other activities of the program include sponsoring visiting faculty members and visiting scholars, cosponsoring a conference on popular culture, national identity, and migration with the NEH, and providing learning and research opportunities for students enrolled in the program.

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Approximately 6 to 8 students are selected each year by the Inter-American Foundation to work as volunteer interns at the Foundation Offices in Rosslyn, Virginia, where they have the opportunity to learn about development problems in Latin America and the Caribbean by participating in a range of foundation activities. Volunteers join foundation staff in project reviews, assist in analyzing grant proposals, write reports and background documents, and engage in project evaluations. Applicants must be advanced undergraduate or graduate students enrolled at least half-time, should have a demonstrated interest in Latin American and Caribbean affairs, and be able to speak and write Spanish, Portuguese, or French. There are no restrictions of citizenship, age, sex, or religion. An applicant should submit a curriculum vitae, a recent writing sample, and a list of references to Elizabeth Veatch, Inter-American Foundation, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Rosslyn, VA 22209. Deadlines for applications are October 1, February 1, and May 1.

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has made available a
grant for a continuing postdoctoral fellowship program to assist scholars wishing to conduct research in the manuscript collections in the Vatican Film Library at St. Louis University. Travel expenses and a reasonable per diem will be provided to scholars with well defined research projects for periods of research in the Vatican Film Library ranging from two to eight weeks, including periods of summer research. Interested scholars are asked to write for further information to the Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship Program, Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, Saint Louis University, 3655 W. Pine, St. Louis, MO 63108.

The 1984 Tinker Postdoctoral Fellowship Competition will be open to individuals who completed their doctorates between 1974 and 1981. The one-year award provides an $18,000 stipend and a $2,000 travel allowance. Applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States, Canada, Spain, Portugal, or the Latin America countries, and projects must concern Latin American or Ibero-American studies. For further information contact Miss Melinda Pastor, The Tinker Foundation, 645 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022. Phone (212)421-6858.

The Inter-American Foundation Latin American and Caribbean Fellowship Program is open to junior staff members of economic and social research centers in Latin America and the Caribbean. Fellowships are designed to strengthen capacities within Latin America and the Caribbean for research and training on development issues affecting poor and disadvantaged groups. Applicants should have a minimum of two years of research experience and a demonstrated interest in problems of poverty, local and community development, popular participation, or democratic institutions, and must have a commitment to returning to the institution with which they are currently affiliated after the program terminates. More information may be obtained from Latin American and Caribbean Fellowship Program, Inter-American Foundation, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Rosslyn, VA 22209.

A new privately-funded program to bring young journalists from the developing world to the United States for five months' practical experience with American news organizations has been announced by the Alfred Friendly Foundation in New York. The first group of participants will come together in Washington in June 1984 for a two-week orientation course under the direction of former New York Times correspondent Elie Abel. They will take part in seminars and lectures on the historic and present role of the press in American society and visit local and nearby newspapers, broadcasting stations, and other press facilities. Further information about the program may be obtained from Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

LASA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Seven U.S. Latin Americanists, sponsored by LASA, were in the Soviet Union from 28 May to 11 June 1983 to participate in a conference on social change in Latin America in Yerevan, Soviet Armenia. The group spent four days in Leningrad and three days in meetings in Moscow. Members of the group were Bruce Bagley, Cole Blasier, Carmen Diana Deere, James Malloy, Alejandro Portes, Helen Safa, and John Walton.

While in Moscow, members of the delegation met with Soviet Latin Americanists at the Institute of Latin America, the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, the journal Latinskaia Amerika, the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada, and the Ministry of Foreign Trade. The deputy director of the Institute of the International Labor Movement also met with the group. Two members of the LASA Task Force on Scholarly Relations with the USSR, Alejandro Portes and Cole Blasier, accompanied by LASA president Helen Safa, met with Soviet representatives Victor Volskii, Lev Klockovski, and Anatoliy Borovkov. An agreement was reached to hold a conference in 1985 on Latin America's revolutions in the twentieth century.

Shortly thereafter, Prof. John J. Johnson, editor of the Hispanic American Historical Review, and Robert J. Alexander of Rutgers University represented LASA at the 200th anniversary of the birth of Simon Bolivar on 14 and 15 June. While in Moscow, they also visited editors of scholarly journals and met with Soviet Latin Americanists.

COMING CONFERENCES

"Western Women: Their Land, Their Lives" is the theme for a conference cosponsored by the Southeast Institute for Research on Women/Women's Studies, University of Arizona and the Arizona Historical Society, to be held 12-15 January 1984 in Tucson. The conference is supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Arizona Council for the Humanities, and is designed to review recent research on Western women's history and to evaluate its significance for Western history, women's history, and American social history. Speakers include the most active researchers and scholars in the field and the conference is designed for scholars, museum, library and historical society personnel, and the public. For more information contact Janice Monk, SIROW, 269 Modern Languages, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. Phone (602)621-7338.

The Latin American Incian Literatures Association/Asociación de Literaturas Indígenas Latinoamericanas will hold its II International Symposium on Latin American Indian Literatures on 27-28 April 1984 at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Topics that have been suggested for panel discussions include written oral literature and modern literary compositions in Indian languages, oral literature of the 20th century, la novela indigenista, symbolic art and archaeology, symbolism in Latin American Indian literatures, myths in Latin American literature, Latin American Indian codices, acculturation and social structure in folktales and myths, and fieldwork in Latin American Indian literatures. Further information may be obtained from Dr. Mary H. Preuss, president, LAILA/ALILA, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA 15010. Phone (412)486-5100, ext. 244.
The Newberry Library Center for Renaissance Studies is pleased to announce its 1984 summer institute in the archival sciences, 18 June to 27 July 1984. Led by Dr. Vicenta Cortés Alonso, inspector general of archives of the Dirección General de Archivos y Bibliotecas, and professor of anthropology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, the institute will provide six weeks of intensive training in the reading, transcribing, and editing of Hispanic manuscript books and documents from the late medieval through the early modern periods. Instruction will be in Spanish. Faculty, qualified graduate students, and unaffiliated scholars are eligible to apply. The summer institute is part of a collaborative enterprise between the Newberry Library Center and the Folger Institute, supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Application deadline is 15 March 1984. For more information, contact Newberry Library Center for Renaissance Studies, 60 Walton Street, Chicago, IL 60610. Phone (312)943-3090.

“Cultural Dependency and Cultural Independence in Latin American Literature” will be the focus of a symposium sponsored by the University of Northern Illinois on 2-3 March 1984 at the Northern Illinois University campus in DeKalb. For further information, contact Prof. Monique J. Lemaire, symposium director, Foreign Languages Department, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115.

The Southwest Council of Latin American Studies (SCOLAS) will hold its seventeenth annual meeting 22-24 March 1984 on the campus of Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas. Interested parties should contact the program chairperson for further information. William J. Fleming, 1984 SCOLAS Program Chair, Department of History, Pan American University, Edinburg, TX 78539.

The University of New Mexico’s Latin American Institute, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, is cosponsoring a research conference on the Jewish experience in Latin America with the Latin American Jewish Studies Association. The conference will take place in Albuquerque 12-14 March 1984.

The research conference will focus on the modern period. Between 1850 and the present an estimated 400,000 European Jews and an additional number from western Asia migrated to Latin America. While majority-minority relations in Latin America have traditionally been underrepresented in scholarly research, recent years have seen the growth of research on Latin American Jewry. The conference is intended to summarize the existing state of research in such basic topics as the history of Jewish settlement in Latin America, the demography of Latin American Jewry, the infrastructure of Latin American Jewish communities, Jewish culture in Latin America, and Latin American Jewry in relation to national institutions. The conference hopes to establish a research agenda for the next decade.

LASA members who are interested in more information about this conference should contact the Latin American Institute, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, (505)277-2961.

The Universidad de los Andes will hold its 45th Congreso Internacional de Americanistas in Bogotá during 1985. The event will consist of specialized symposia on recent research and research in progress concerning man in the Americas, encompassing presenters from the fields of anthropology, archaeology, history, linguistics, sociology, political science, and economics, but open to all disciplines and multidisciplinary groups. The congress will take place the last week of June, 1985. For further information contact Nahra Rey de Marulanda, Comité Ejecutivo, 45° Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Rectoría, Universidad de los Andes, Apartado Aéreo No. 4976, Bogotá, Colombia.

The Center for Latin American Studies of the University of Florida will host an international conference on “Popular Culture, National Identity, and Migration in the Caribbean” on 19-21 February 1984. The conference is funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and will bring together a group of distinguished scholars in the humanities to examine the issue of ethnic and cultural revitalization in the Caribbean and among Caribbean migrants in the United States. The number of participants will be limited and drawn from Spanish, English, and French speaking areas of the Caribbean as well as from Caribbean scholars residing in the U.S. The congress will be open to the public and visitors are welcome both at the formal sessions and at the accompanying cultural events. Direct all inquiries to Charles V. Carnegie, Center for Latin American Studies, 319 Gringer Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611, phone (904)392-0375.

The purpose of the Rio Grande Forum is to provide opportunities for interested persons in and outside the University of Texas at El Paso to participate in the discussion of issues of importance to the border area and the Hispanic community of the United States and Mexico. Each semester two breakfast sessions are held at UTEP featuring knowledgeable speakers who may address timely topics, followed by a discussion period. It is hoped that through this program participants will gain reliable information that will serve to expand their understanding of local and regional issues. Coming sessions will feature Dr. Manuel T. Pacheco, College of Education, UTEP, 9 February 1984, speaking on “The Education of the Limited English Proficient Student: Trends and Issues,” and Mr. Ray Chavez, Mass Communications Department, UTEP, 5 April 1984, speaking on “The Hispanic Press: Historical Neglect and Contemporary Ramifications.” Further information may be obtained from Continuing Education, The University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968. Phone (915)747-5142.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT
AND RESEARCH

The Universidad de Oriente, Puerto La Cruz, Venezuela, is seeking professors in the field of economics and business administration who would be interested in coming to Venezuela several times per semester for one week at a time to teach in an
MBA program sponsored by the university. All correspondence should be addressed to Professor Juan Penate G., Escuela de Ciencias Administrativas, Universidad de Oriente, Puerto La Cruz, Venezuela.

Arizona State University is seeking applicants for a tenure-track position beginning in August, 1984, in Latin American history, with specializations other than Mexico, Brazil, and colonial history. Rank and salary will be dependent upon qualifications. Closing date for applications is 16 December 1983. Send vita and references to Professor Noel Stowe, Department of History, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287. Arizona State University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer. Qualified women and minorities are urged to apply.

A tenured position at the rank of full professor, with assignment of an endowed chair, is being offered by the department of political science of the University of California at San Diego. Expertise in Latin American politics and development, state theory and state-society relations, and international political economy concerning questions of trade, finance, business-labor-government relations, economic development, north-south relations, and U.S.-Latin American economic relations is required. The appointment holder will participate in the development of a major new interdisciplinary center for Latin American studies at UCSD. Appointment requires a Ph.D. and proven academic excellence demonstrated by superior scholarship and teaching. The position will close 15 February 1984. Send complete vita to Professor Wayne Cornelius, Department of Political Science (Q-057), University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093. UC-San Diego is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

California State University, Long Beach is seeking a dean for their School of Education, one of eight schools which constitute CSU-Long Beach. Its membership includes 62 full-time-equivalent faculty and 965 full-time-equivalent students in undergraduate and graduate programs. Candidates for the position should possess an earned doctorate and should be eligible for appointment as a full professor in one of the school's departments. College or university teaching experience, a record of scholarly activity, and administrative experience are important qualifications. Applicants should have a knowledge of and an interest in the broad spectrum of professional programs in the school, and should have the personal skills necessary to provide effective leadership. Letters of application, resumes, or requests for more information should be sent to Dean Search Committee, School of Education, Office of the Associate Vice President for Employee Relations, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840. CSU-Long Beach is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

The University of Illinois/University of Chicago Joint Center for Latin American Studies announces a Visiting Scholars Program for faculty from other colleges and universities (without major research facilities) to enable them to spend the summer of 1984 in residence at Chicago or Urbana doing research and writing on a Latin American topic. The combined UI/UC programs currently maintain over seventy full-time core faculty and library holdings encompassing at least 400,000 books and 6,100 periodicals, making the joint program one of the largest concentrations of human and material resources devoted to Latin American language and area studies in the United States. Awards covering travel and basic living expenses will be made to scholars for a one- or two-month period of residence at either university. The visiting scholars will be associate faculty of the Joint Center for Latin American Studies and will enjoy full access to libraries, faculty, and other facilities. Applicants should submit vitae and project proposals (no more than 500 words), briefly indicating how a period of residence would relate to the project. Proposals will be evaluated by a joint interdisciplinary faculty committee from the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois. Letters of application and a letter of reference must be received by 1 March 1984, for summer 1984 projects. Send applications, references, or inquiries to Visiting Scholars Program, UI/UC Joint Center for Latin American Studies, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

CALL FOR ARTICLES AND MANUSCRIPTS

UC-MEXUS announces the establishment of a new international scholarly journal, Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos, a quarterly publication that is a cooperative venture of the UC-Mexus Consortium and the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos is a forum for presentation and discussion of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research which relates to Mexico and its people and sets up an alliance among scholars from all disciplines to address issues which have broad implications for the country. Contributions may be synthetic, interpretive, analytical, or theoretical but must contribute in a significant way to understanding of cultural, historical, political, social, economic, or scientific factors affecting the development of Mexico. Any article not in itself directly related to Mexico may be accepted if it draws important comparative conclusions specifically to Mexico.

All contributions and editorial correspondence should be sent to Jaime E. Rodriguez, editor, Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos, 155 Administration, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717. Two copies of each contribution should be submitted, accompanied by a stamped self-addressed envelope of suitable size. Manuscripts will be published in either English or Spanish.

The Oklahoma State University Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures solicits original articles and reviews on Latin American literature for its new journal, Discurso literario, Revista de temas hispánicos. Write to Dr. Manuel Marcos, Discurso literario, director, Oklahoma State University, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Stillwater, OK 74078.

The Center for Inter-American and Border Studies at the
University of Texas at El Paso solicits manuscripts on U.S.-Mexico border topics for consideration for publication as working papers, occasional papers, monographs, and books. Nontechnical, short manuscripts (10-15 pages) are especially welcome for the working paper series. This series offers authors the opportunity to disseminate their ideas quickly to specialists who can provide feedback and useful suggestions. For publication guidelines and more information, contact Publications Program, Center for Inter-American and Border Studies, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968, phone (915)747-5196, 747-5157.

The Latin American Monograph Series at Ohio State University is now soliciting scholarly works in all disciplines related to Latin America. Manuscripts should range between 80 and 150 single-spaced, typed pages (or the equivalent for other manners of spacing). Final selection will be on the basis of quality of scholarship, clarity of expression, and the estimated importance of the topic to the scholarly community. Manuscripts (with self-addressed, stamped envelope for return) or inquiries should be sent to Thomas W. Walker, editor, Latin American Monograph Series, Center for International Studies, Burson House, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701.

The Foreign Languages and Literatures Department of Oklahoma State University wishes to solicit original articles and reviews on Latin American literature for its new journal, Discorso literario, Revista de ensayos hispanicos. For more information or to submit articles, contact Dr. Juan Manuel Marcos, Discorso literario, Oklahoma State University, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Stillwater, OK 74078.

GUIDELINES FOR TRANSFER OF EDITORIAL OFFICES OF HAHR

The editorial offices of the Hispanic American Historical Review (HAHR) moved from the University of Arizona to the University of New Mexico on 1 July 1980, and will move to a new institution on 1 July 1985. The new editors will assume responsibility for the February 1986 issue. Bids will be received during 1984 and the Board of Editors will make its determination at the annual meeting in December of that year. A subcommittee, consisting of board members whose terms overlap the transfer, will review the applications and make recommendations to the board at the December 1984 meeting.

Procedures to be employed include the following:
1) Formal bids and supporting data should be submitted to the managing editor in three copies. The managing editor will forward all necessary documentation to the subcommittee.
2) Bids should include the names and vitae of the proposed managing editor, associate editor, and book review editor(s).
3) The extent of university support (for example, released time, clerical support, graduate assistantships, telephone, postage, xerography, computer time, and supplies) should be included together with a statement of commitment from appropriate university administrators.
4) A covering letter from the proposed managing editor to the board should provide any additional information deemed appropriate.
5) The deadline for the receipt of bids will be 15 November 1984.

The current managing editor will be happy to respond to any questions raised by those considering making a formal bid. Please address inquiries to Dr. John J. Johnson, managing editor, Hispanic American Historical Review, Department of History, Mesa Vista 2077, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131.
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Dissertations on Latin America
Selected from Dissertation Abstracts International
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For Latin American Studies Association
Proposal for Special Events and Meetings

Please mail in time to be received by 15 April 1984 to
Prof. Christopher Mitchell
Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies
New York University
New York, NY 10003 USA

**TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY ALL INFORMATION:**

Title of session: ________________________________

Sponsoring organization: ________________________________

Type of event:

- [ ] Breakfast
- [ ] Luncheon
- [ ] Dinner
- [ ] Reception (paid by sponsor)
- [ ] Cash (no-host) bar
- [ ] Business meeting
- [ ] Organizing Meeting
- [ ] Informal Discussion
- [ ] Panel
- [ ] Board/Committee Meeting
- [ ] Workshop

Is event open to all interested parties? ___________________________
Do you plan to charge a fee for admission? _________________________

Provide a brief narrative description for possible publication:

Name and affiliation of chair: ________________________________

Name and affiliation of organizer (if different from chair): ________________________________

Preferred date and hour: ________________________________

List other groups whose simultaneous scheduling should be avoided:

Room set-up: [ ] Theater (auditorium) with head table to seat _______ people
[ ] Conference (up to 15 people)

Estimated attendance ________________________________

Will food/beverages be served? ________ If yes, give name, address, and phone number of the person to be billed:

Specify audiovisual equipment required:

- [ ] overhead
- [ ] electric pointer
- [ ] video (specify format very precisely)
- [ ] opaque
- [ ] tape recorder (playback only)
- [ ] carousel slide
- [ ] screen
- [ ] 8 mm
- [ ] 16 mm

Form completed by (include address and telephone number): ________________________________
PROPOSAL FOR ORGANIZED SESSION

A narrative description of not less than 75 nor more than 100 words is required for each organized session proposal. Three copies of this form are necessary. The reverse side is to be used for the list of participants. If you are proposing a paper, simply substitute “paper” for “organized session” in the line above. The completed proposal and the completed list of participants must be received by the Program Committee by the deadline—15 April 1984—to be considered for inclusion in the program of the 1985 LASA meeting in Albuquerque. Please provide all requested information—carefully, fully, legibly.

Mail, in time to be received by 15 April 1984 to:
Prof. Christopher Mitchell
Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies
New York University
New York, NY 10003 USA

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY ALL INFORMATION:

Title of Session: ____________________________________________

Type of Session: Panel Session ______ Workshop ______ Breakfast/Lunch Discussion Group ______

Organization sponsoring session, if any: ________________________________

Description (75-100 words) of the session:

Organizer: __________________________________________ Co-Organizer (if any): __________________________

Institution: __________________________________________ Institution: ________________________________

Address: __________________________________________ Address: __________________________________

Telephone (office): ______________ Telephone (office): ______________

Telephone (residence): ______________ Telephone (residence): ______________

LASA Membership Status of Organizer
Member: Yes No (circle one)

Brief biographical sketch of Organizer:

LASA Membership Status of Co-Organizer
Member: Yes No (circle one)

Brief biographical sketch of Co-Organizer:
**PROPOSAL FOR ORGANIZED SESSION (continued)**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Title of Session: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring Organization (if any):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:** List participants in order of their appearance in the session. Use an additional sheet if absolutely necessary, but note that sessions are normally 2 hours in length. At least 20 minutes should be set aside for discussion at the close of the session, after all papers have been presented. Multiple-part sessions may be proposed, but require strong justification regarding the number of participants and the importance of the topic. All session organizers should attach a detailed schedule of the proposed session and a descriptive statement adequate to convey fully the organizer’s intentions to the Program Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant:</th>
<th>Role in the Session:</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Discussant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Discussant</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Discussant</th>
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<tr>
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<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant:</th>
<th>Role in the Session:</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Discussant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Department</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Participant:</th>
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<th>Discussant</th>
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<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper, if any</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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1984 MEMBERSHIP FORM

JOIN LASA FOR 1984! All membership categories enjoy voice and vote in the conduct of the association. Membership categories for the calendar year 1984 are as follows.

Introductory—$18 (for new members as of January 1, 1980)

Regular
  under $20,000 annual income—$25
  between $20,000 and $29,999 annual income—$28
  between $30,000 and $39,999 annual income—$32
  over $40,000 annual income—$37

Joint: For two individuals at the same address. Highest individual income earned plus $11

Student—$15

Emeritus: For retired members—$15

Latin America, Caribbean, & Puerto Rico—$20 (for citizens of those areas who reside there)

Institutional Sponsor: Nonprofit—$60

Institutional Sponsor: Profit—$500

Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs—$60

Payment due January 1, 1984

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP
LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

NAME ____________________________________________________________

DATE OF BIRTH ___________________________ PLACE OF BIRTH ___________________________

MAILING ADDRESS ________________________________________________

________________________________________ COUNTRY ___________ ZIP CODE ___________

HOME TELEPHONE ___________________________ BUSINESS TELEPHONE ___________________________

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION ___________________________ DISCIPLINE/TITLE ___________________________

COUNTRY INTEREST/SPECIALIZATION ___________________________

GRADUATE STUDENT ______ Yes ______ No ___________________________

Signature of Professor ___________________________

JOINT MEMBERSHIP ______ Yes ______ No If yes, please list both full names above.

INSTITUTIONAL SPONSOR ______ PROFIT ______ NONPROFIT

CONSORTIUM OF LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAMS (CLASP) ___________________________

Dues and contributions to LASA are tax deductible. Please make out checks and money orders to the Latin American Studies Association and send to LASA Secretariat, Sid Richardson Hall, Unit 1, The University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA. NOTE: There will be a $10 charge on all returned checks.
LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

President: Helen M. Icken Safa (University of Florida)
Past president: Jorge I. Domínguez (Harvard University)
Vice-president: Wayne A. Cornelius (University of California, San Diego)
Executive Council:
(For term ending December, 1984): Cornelia Butler Flora (Kansas State University), James M. Malloy (University of Pittsburgh), Saúl Sosnowski (University of Maryland);
(For term ending December 1986): Carmen Diana Deere (University of Massachusetts), Mario Ojeda (Colégio de México),
Norman E. Whitten (University of Illinois), David Scott Palmer (Foreign Service Institute).

Executive director: Richard N. Sinkin (University of Texas)
Assistant to the Executive Director: Jana Greenlief (University of Texas)
Publications director: Mary K. Smith (University of Texas)