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This is my last report as President of LASA. I began to write it a few days after our meeting in Las Vegas, a city I will never forget, but it was interrupted because I had an operation. So if the FORUM is unusually late, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.

My main objective today is to express my deepest gratitude to all those who, for the past eighteen months, have contributed with their work, support, solidarity, enthusiasm, and affection to take LASA into the XXI century. To the members of the Executive Council –Sonia Alvarez, Arturo Arias, Arturo Escobar, John French, Merilee Grindle, Florencia Mallon, Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Joanne Rappaport, Kristin Ruggiero, Peter Ward, and George Yudice– sorry for the marathon meetings, but we accomplished every objective we had. I also want to take this opportunity to thank John French, LASA’s Treasurer, who worked very hard on several recommendations that will greatly benefit our association.

The transition has not been easy but I am delighted to report that it has been entirely successful. Not only does LASA have the kind of Secretariat that can best serve our membership at this point in time, but we managed to reorganize the Secretariat while organizing our XXV international congress as a reflection of the new Secretariat.

The membership saw the LASA Secretariat at work in Las Vegas and responded enthusiastically to Milagros Pereyra’s technological expertise and creativity. I did not hear a single expression of nostalgia for the long tables covered with endless rows of papers, most of which ended up cluttering the entrance of the LASA offices. The CD-ROM, I was told repeatedly, was a wonderful idea.

To Milagros Pereyra, Sandy Klinzing, Maria Cecilia Q. Dancisin Jennifer Crawford, Benjamin Denk, Kate Foster, Natalie Mauro and Sharon Paris, thank you so much for taking care of all the details—big and small—essential for the success of a congress.

As I raced along the corridors of the Riviera, I was stopped on numerous occasions by colleagues, algunos veteranos de muchos congresos y otros participantes por primera vez, who insisted on telling me how much they enjoyed the program and how exciting and interesting it was.

Much of the credit for the Las Vegas program, of course, goes to Kristin Ruggiero, who worked hard and long, with patience and efficiency to produce our program. She counted on the invaluable help of numerous colleagues, our track chairs, who read the thousands of proposals emailed to the Secretariat, ranked them and sometimes also prepared new panels. My gratitude to all of them for their excellent work.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of LASA who generously gave their time to serve on the prize committees. These are important activities for the association and they are only possible because of the volunteer work of numerous members. I am also very grateful to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, John Tuman and the members of the local arrangements committee for their support and the splendid reception that marked the opening of our congress.

In addition to the usual presidential and special feature sessions, some of them organized by generous colleagues, there were a few innovations. Peter Ward, the editor of LARR made all the arrangements for 4 sessions sponsored by LARR. Fortunately, the retirement of LaVonne Poteet did not put an end to our Film Festival and Exhibit. Under the enthusiastic direction of Claudia Furman, LASA members enjoyed a rich and varied program. A final innovation was the 4 p.m. break in the regular schedule for special readings by writers. Our guests this year were Sergio Ramirez, Elena Poniatovska, and Luisa Valenzuela.

The absence of our Cuban colleagues, despite the efforts of friends and colleagues, was a profound disappointment for many of us. See pages 15-23 for a selection of the numerous articles and letters concerning the denial of visas to all the Cuban scholars scheduled to participate in our Las Vegas International Congress.
When Isms Become Wasm: Structural Functionalism, Historical
Materialism, Feminism,
Post-Modernism and Activism
by June Nash, Kalman Silvert Awardee
Distinguished Professor Emerita of Anthropology
The City College of the City University of New York

In the pragmatist tradition in which I came of age in the 1940s, the ideologies of communism, fascism, and socialism were treated as distortions of the political process and clearly opposed to truth. This was summed up in a column called “Quotable Quotes” in the Readers Digest at a time when that periodical served as one of the prime vehicles for disseminating the hegemonic interests of the United States during World War II: “We are all looking forward to the time when isms become wasms”. By the time I entered graduate school in the 1950s, I learned to appreciate a deeper layer of isms encapsulated in the paradigms in which we contained our field data. I have watched at least four of these paradigmatic isms sink into wasms. Evolutionism was already dead on my arrival at the University of Chicago, kicked out of sight by physical and social anthropologists alike for its tendency to equate survival with superior genes and progress with what was closest to our own racial and social persuasion. I took my qualifying exams in the heat of the next great wave of structural-functionalism introduced by Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski. Its superiority to the putative histories and eurocentric assumptions spawned by Tylor’s unilinear evolution lay in the heritage of ethnographic field studies fostered by its progenitors that inspired practitioners into the 1970s and 1980s even as it was attacked and finally eroded by historical materialism and feminism. Postmodernism has still not been completely defined as its critics line up to demolish it in the new wave of activism. Caught in the cracks of each of these schemata were enough ethnographic crumbs to feed the shock troops of the next wave. A good ethnographer, I learned, provides enough evidence for the de-constructions and re-interpretations responding to changing interests and the conditions that foster them.

This review of some of the isms I have seen reduced to wasms asserts the importance of grounding anthropological paradigms in the practice of ethnography. I shall consider some of the lasting contributions of ethnography that survived the paradigmatic shifts of the past and go on to assess the impact of cultural critique.1 My major concern is that those who espouse postmodernism as an ideology are promoting an inversion of anthropological perspectives that disparages ethnographic sources of insights. Yet while the reflexivity cultivated by the cultural critique may begin by masking in new terms some of the old eurocentric positions on global processes, it has also cultivated multiple perspectives This reawakening to meanings contained in ethnographic descriptions from the past may be furthered by the emerging commitment to collaborative research in social activism.

Structural Functionalism and Boasian Cultural Materialism

I arrived at Chicago on the crest of structuralism and functionalism when these two British imports were written into all proposals. We ventured into the field not simply to find out what was there, like Columbia University’s Boasian cultural materialists or California’s Kroeberian cultural anthropologists, but to do a “structural functionalist” study of whatever we discovered. Radcliffe-Brown had taught at Chicago just a few years before, and Evans Pritchard was still fresh in the memory of students who had drunk with him in Jimmies on 57th Street. In fashioning our ethnographic inquiries, we were enjoined to read Sir Henry Maine in order to appreciate the transformation from status in simpler societies to contract in more complex societies. It all seemed to fit so well, with Durkheim’s organic and mechanical opposition echoing the polarization of Toennis’ Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft and yielding the folk urban dichotomy.

But even as we learned the dichotomies in which we were expected to frame our structural functional inquiries, we picked up from our mentors the complexity of simple societies and the contradictions expressed by the folk. Few of Redfield’s critics read the ethnographic context in The Folk Culture of Yucatan (1941). In exploring the lifeways of newly arrived folk in Dzitas, the bustling center of henequen commercialization in the Yucatan peninsula, he shows how Mayas from the countryside move from ethnic categories into proletarian status on the lowest rung of the labor force. This transition of rural peasants to proletarians was rediscovered in a Marxist (or historical materialist) framework by Sydney Mintz a couple of decades later. Positivists of Redfield’s era found empirical support for the folk and urban society in a synchronic model with the remote Quintana Roo community representing the past, Dzitas the burgeoning present, and Chan Kom the future of Yucatan—and Mexican society. Never mind that historians later demonstrated that the charmed religious cofradia described by Redfield in Itzas was the core of a guerrilla group that, even before CanCun was taken over by Club Med, was staging a war of resistance to the modernization processes represented in henequen producing centers. Nor should we be disturbed that Chan Kom was not a traditional folk community but the advancing front of indigenous people moving into lands they claimed under the agrarian reform act of 1917. The fact was, as Morris Janowitz, a sociological colleague of Redfield at the University of Chicago, maintained in a paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association in the 1960s that Redfield’s central thesis regarding the movement of ideas, behaviors, and technology from urban centers to periphery in regionally integrated economies held up empirically better than any other thesis in social science of that era.
Redfield encouraged debate in his seminars with his students and with his colleagues. He likened progress in social science to the movements of the fox in Aesop’s fable, contradicting, backtracking, leaping over adversaries, while that in the physical sciences was the step-by-step advance of the hedehog, whose insectivorous habits enjoined a careful scrutiny of the terrain and exhaustive reconnaissance of its resources. An early student of Redfield, Sol Tax, wrote one of his first great papers, “World View and Social Relations in Panajachel” (Tax 1937) debunking the folk mystique as he demonstrated the secular, commercial outlook of the penny pinching Panajachelenos. Sol Tax, who was more the hedehog than the fox, eschewed most isms, (unless you include in this category empiricism); he taught us to appreciate the complex interworkings of Panajachel onion growers who rejected the ox and plow and other colonial innovations based on a rational calculus of the greater returns from intensive cultivation of cash crops rather than fodder for animals on lands whose values had been driven up by tourism. Tax was faulted for calling the petty commercial exchanges of Panajachel “Penny Capitalism” (Tax 1950) since they did not result in the accumulation of capital, but he, along with others of his generation, proved the rational allocation of resources by peasants. This characteristic was—in his time—denied to the peasantry whom most developmental specialists saw as mired in traditional patterns. It took another four decades for the “new” developmental critique (Escobar 1995) to reinvent his early insights.

We might have written a postmodernist ethnography from what we learned in socializing with our professors in the Haskell tea room or working for them as work study students. Tax was the ultimate empiricist, as I learned from retyping the second and third drafts of “Penny Capitalism” with its endless tables of products and earnings. He once said in a seminar that within a few summers of fieldwork with the Fox he had become such an expert on the kinship and marriage exchanges that Fox Indians came to ask him advice on whom their children could marry without violating incest prohibitions for collaterals. Tax was also a very intuitive person who rarely allowed this characteristic to appear in his text: he once compared his own reluctance to pass the grocer on his street corner in Hyde Park while carrying two huge bags of groceries from the supermarket to the equanimity of the Panajacheleno buying corn from a producer who sold it a peso a kilo cheaper than his brother within view of each other in the local market.

These off-stage views of our professors cued us into insights that did not appear in ethnographies of the era. When Fred Eggan could be persuaded to sing a Hopi chant, we were closer to what had attracted us into the field than when we fell asleep in lectures devoted to dyadic pairs in southwestern kinship systems. McQuown relaxed from his painstaking review of thousands of three by five cards bearing phonemes of Mayan languages only when he was in the field, driving at breakneck speed on unpaved roads of Chiapas in the University of Chicago jeep. Then, when we were least able to engage in critical dispute while hanging on to the uncushioned seats in the back of the Chicago jeep, he confided that within Mayan townships there were Tzeltal speakers who were five hundred years apart in Swadish’s glottochronological scale. Washburn’s knowledge of functional anatomy allowed him to critically assess the discrepancy in the Plitdown jaw and skull a decade before Carbon-14 showed the impossibility of their being fragments of the same organism. Julian Pitt Rivers gave one of his best lectures on a very postmodern theme, showing that the game of conquest in which Don Juan was engaged challenged the basic structure of kinship in shaming the victim, not engaging in the sexual act itself. It seems that in the mythology surrounding Don Juan he departed leaving his victims in a compromised setting, not en flagrant delit.

Even as we were cultivating the role of “concept destroyers”, the title of a skit we presented to the faculty that caricatured our role as anthropological critics, we absorbed the subliminal advice of our professors that there was a world worth discovering out there. The subscript was that we could best realize this by leaving our preconceptions behind and finding out what people were thinking, saying and doing in the field. Following McQuown’s advice just to listen, and especially with a tape recorder, I carried a huge tape recorder—in those days they weighed more than ten pounds—wherever I went during my fieldwork in Amatenango del Valle, a Mayan community in the highlands of Chiapas. I recorded rituals, interviews, court cases, and even off-stage behavior when people were drinking and relaxing. The tape recorder even went to events from which I was excluded, carried by Mariano Lopez Lin, who became my research assistant after he finished his term as mayor of the town. The morning after a marital counselling session to which I had not been invited, Mariano appeared with the recorder to help me transcribe and translate the tapes. The tape was twisted and somewhat damp. It was the reel to reel model that required care in its operation. After we unscrambled the tape we were able to recapture the last fragments before the trouble began. “Let’s play it back to hear what we all said,” one voice remarked in Tzeltal. Expletives ensued and then came the part that Mariano did not want to translate. I figured it out from McQuown’s glossary of Tzeltal phrases and a key term I had picked up from a Twin Brothers’ story: “Let’s take it out back and pee on it!” Apparently they had done just that.

Mayas are excellent listeners since they are trained to develop this sense from childhood. Service in the civil religious hierarchy promotes hearing the words of elder men and women who are the ritual speakers (tutl k’oo, me’il k’op), and repetition in rhymed couples of significant words in prayers cultivates their awareness of what they hear. The verb to hear is the same as that to feel, sh?awayti, and curer diviners can hear and feel by pulsing a patient what the blood is saying. This allows them to understand the past and to anticipate the future. It is the best lesson an anthropologist can learn. I shall try to show later how their ability to listen prepares Mayas to live more successfully in the postmodern world than those who attempt to dictate the terms of survival to others.

**Historical Materialism and Feminism**

Our cohort of University of Chicago “structural functionalists” doctorates were beginning to get jobs, often replacing culturologists of the California Kroeberrian school in the 1960s. Simultaneously the new broum of historical Marxism was beginning to sweep the eastern seaboard. Columbia University
graduates Eleanor Leacock, Sidney Mintz, Eric Wolf, Morton Fried, and Robert Murphy were exploring neo-Marxist propositions that had been closeted during the age of McCarthyism. In their revisionist views of hunters and peasants we began to perceive these modes of production in greater complexity than the ways of life described by our anthropological predecessors. Leacock reviewed ethnohistorical data proving that agnatic clans not only were not typical of northeastern groups but would have sealed their fate at an even earlier age because they did not allow the flexibility of bilateral consanguineous kinship groupings, with women often playing central roles in the governance of communities as well as in hunting itself. Eric Wolf showed that peasants, far from demonstrating the idiocy of rural life as they were caricatured by Marx, were the revolutionaries of the twentieth century and, as Mintz demonstrated in Puerto Rico, the emergent proletariat and bearers of the new class struggle.

My metamorphosis as feminist and Marxist—I do not feel that I am a part of either category but I have seen my name linked with these leanings—began in the 1970s with my fieldwork in Bolivia. My encounter with Marxism came in the field where Bolivian miners took upon themselves the project of educating me in their basic principles as well as the daily praxis of mine union activism. I came to know more about Trotskyism than I would have received in most graduate schools, especially in the United States where it was treated as a failed branch of Marxist Leninist philosophy. I attended lectures sponsored by the Federation of Mine Workers Unions given by Guillermo Lora, Rene Zavaleta Mercado, and other illustrious Marxists-Trotskyists of Bolivia, and I borrowed books from the miners' own libraries. To find a vibrant branch of a neglected philosophy put into practice in the periphery of modern industrial society is a lesson that I have never forgotten. Judging from my mentors, Trotsky was a more dedicated dialectician than Marx. Mineworkers invented dependency theory before it became a common substratum of development thinking among intellectuals associated with the Economic Commission of Latin America. The Thesis of Pucaraya drafted by Guillermo Lora in 1946 maintained that commodity-producing industries in Latin America were increasingly expropriated of the value of their products, and that the poverty of Bolivian Miners was precisely due to their integration into world capitalist markets.

As an anthropologist working with a holistic frame of analysis, I spent as much time in the community listening with women, children, and the retired as in the mines. They taught me, and underground workers confirmed, that all of their workplace struggles began at home, where the inability to meet life work demands of consumption and fiestas was experienced and where women standing in line at the commissary decided when it was necessary to strike. Their labor heroes included housewives whose voices, like that of Domitila Barrios de Chungara, became increasingly important in the declining years of tin production when the mining communities were struggling for survival (Nash 1975). I considered my book, We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us, (Nash 1979) to be a critique of Marxism since his emphasis on wage earning workers in the production site caused him and his followers to overlook the reproductive settings in which women predominated. But in the politics of footnoting, citing an author appeared to be committing oneself to an ideology, and I became categorized as a Marxist.

My awareness of feminist consciousness followed on the heels of the civil rights movement, but I did not allow it to penetrate my research and writing until I participated in a 1971 Social Science Research Council Planning meeting. In the opening session where I was the only woman among 50 or more social scientists, I listened to the men projecting the funding for research projects in the coming decade without reference to the gender or ethnicity of the researcher or of the population studied. That night I drafted a critique of the four dominant paradigms in Latin American social science: neoliberalism, neo-Marxism, dependency and developmentalism from what I called a feminine perspective. When I presented it the next day, I concluded with a plea for inclusion in the research process of "women and natives of the cultures scrutinized...[who] not only find the old paradigms wanting, but the very construction of social reality appears to be based on preconceptions that do not yield to a changing reality." When I finished not a word was forthcoming. The chairman called for a break. One of the men came up to tell me he wished his wife had been there to hear me. An economist asked me when I would be satisfied that a critical mass had been reached so that I could relax. It was then that I turned to Helen Safa to plan the conference that took place in Buenos Aires in 1974 that led to Sex and Class in Latin America (Nash and Safa 1975).

 Cartesian dichotomies came under criticism as colonized subjects became their own ethnographers. In the early 1970s there was a growing literature (summarized in Nash 1975) criticizing the colonialist background of our discipline and calling for its decolonization. The opposition of civilized and primitive was no longer acceptable and even the euphemisms of simple and complex or developed and underdeveloped were anathema to the new cohort of anthropologists responding to a post-colonial world. Third World anthropologists—I include here the colonizers who had migrated from their "home" countries—also exposed the inadequacies of some of our most cherished assumptions. Max Gluckman (1947) launched one of the first and most severe attacks on functionalism as he criticized Malinowski for his a-historicism and failure to see conflict as part of an integrated colonial picture. Talal Asad (1973) showed that the mystique of holism presumably encompassing all aspects of "tribal" life yet leaving out imperialist institutions "observed the systematic character of colonial domination and masked the fundamental contradictions of interest." But criticism like that of Vilakazi (1972), who excoriated all anthropologists as part of "the superstructure of racial colonial domination" in the presence of "the gun and the anthropologist" was, according to Maquet (1964) an overly simplistic view. Maquet recognized the sympathetic view of liberation movements held by most anthropologists prior to independence, but he pointed out that even when they played an advocacy role, they were still linked to the colonial power structure and were being judged in those terms.

The prevalence of Cartesian dualities was so deeply imbedded in our subconsciousness that even while anthropologists were trying to escape the patriarchal colonialist framework of thought they fell back on these props of earlier ideologies. Early feminist
critiques drew on both Aristotelian and Cartesian dichotomies of women to essentialize the female nature in yet another mode. Simone de Beauvoir (1952) accepted Hegel's view of man as the active principle, thus assuming, in accord with Aristotle's law of contradiction, the opposite qualities of passivity ascribed to women. Levi-Strauss (1969, 1970) reaffirmed the characteristic of passivity in his updated Adam and Eve myth. He viewed women as "the supreme gift" with which men set up the network of intergroup ties that provides a basis for exogamic marriage exchange, thus ensuring the dominance of the social over the biological in the family through the incest taboo. With this groundwork laid, it was then only a short step for Ortner (1974) to further essentialize women in her correlation of women with nature as man is to culture. This is the argument that Eleanor Leacock and I made to expose the eurocentric and patriarchal basis for the new feminist paradigm (Leacock and Nash 1977).

The reason I bring it up at this point, long after the authors themselves have abandoned the earlier position, is to show how pervasive the old dualistic essentialism can be. Once uprooted, it leaves a gap that stresses the credibility in a world beyond one's imagining. The dominance of objectivism—that is, in philosopher Richard Bernstein's terms (1983:8-9, cited in Milberg and Pietykowski 1994:87) "the conviction that there is or must be some permanent, ahistorical matrix or framework to which we can ultimately appeal in determining the nature of rationality, knowledge, truth, reality, goodness, or rightness," defied the growing evidence for the relativistic nature of knowledge and meaning as well as subjectivist input into the construction of that world. Those marginalized from mainstream ideologies regarding society became the major voice of criticism. The decentralization of the dominant subject delineating the objective world was for some so unsettling that the promoters of the new ism proceeded to reduce the scope of reality by finding shelter in the new semiotic world. Significantly the first anthology reasserting their privileged position (Clifford and Marcus 1986) excluded any of the critiques from feminists and decolonialized subjects whose work they found "beneath their standards."

Post-Structuralism and Post Modernism

Post-structuralism staked out its domain in a minefield of posthumous isms as the fox jumped blithely from post-industrialism to post-modernism, sometimes building on the very same propositions cast in a new language. What differentiates the post-structuralists from post post-hoc posturing is the skepticism fostered in the disengagement from the modernist projects. Few post-modernist anthropologists who situate themselves in the ideology and not just the landscape of late capitalism would want to relate their philosophy to structuralist propositions contained in Alain Touraine (1971) and Daniel Bell's (1973) construct of post-industrialism because of their emphasis on the economic domain. Some might entertain Frederic Jameson's (1982) insightful comments on the postmodern landscape, but fewer anthropologists would condone the lone read economists like Aglietta (1987), Liptiez (1987) and Mahane (1987) who try to assess the meaning of global integration of production and exchange. And David Harvey's brilliant exposition of the global reach by dominant interests into the economic and political affairs of people until recently marginalized is ignored by those who dance on the cultural perimeters of postmodernism. Yet most of these theorists were trying to grasp the central problems anthropologists experienced in field settings throughout the world: the diminishing significance of class in the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the rising importance of identity in a transnational world, and the resurgence of religious movements.

Attempts to correlate the fragmentary lifestyles and identity issues of gender and ethnicity that dominated struggles in the 1970s and 1980s with declining capital earnings, the destruction of social welfare provisions and the flight of capital into Third World countries without class-based union movements were written off as examples of vulgar determinism. Once one relegates the positivist basis for an empirical social science to what Marx would call the dustbins of history, issues of gross national product and the demographics of work roles have little relevance. Yet when we approach these issues from our own ontological position as academicians, I have seen a marked correlation among my colleagues between the decline in grants, which do, after all, follow the decline in earnings at the Ford Motor Company or the reduced returns from corporate taxes to government granting agencies, with the decline in the sense of progress that marked the modernist era. The denial of a world beyond the imaginings of social scientists may indeed be related to the very loss of the old props to eurocentric and androcentric representations are removed. It is no wonder that Steven Sangren (1989:405) faults postmodernist discourse for the "misleading and surprisingly unrevealing ways that diminish their own claims to 'reflexivity,' 'polyphony' and 'dialogue' as core values."

Interpretive Anthropology and the Cultural Critique

The hermeneutics approach as practiced by anthropologists raised even more doubts of the truth value of our "texts" than when applied to literature. By exposing the artifice in ethnographic writing, Clifford Geertz opened to suspicion the very question as to whether the understanding of humankind was advanced by fieldwork. When literary critics attack their prey, the ultimate humanistic worth of the works is usually left intact even if they might fault the writer for failed metaphors or sloppy synecdoches. Yet in anthropology the very success of such literary tropes seems to be proof of the chicanery or deception practiced by the author of a felicitous phrase. Firth's lyrical yet apologetic "egoistic recital" of his entry into Polynesian life in We the Tikopia (1936) is in vain for hermeneutically inclined audience since his being there in Tikopia gives him no more license to speak about the "other" than reading travel books in the British Library or, as Frazier did, in his own study (see Geertz 1989 pp. II et seq). Yet Geertz's skepticism that launched the interpretive paradigm was a mild antecedent to what has followed. From a position in which "facts" and "data" are understood not as "objective entities" but rather as social meanings attributed by social actors—including the fieldworker—in interaction with others (Wilson 1983) there has developed increasingly an indifference to validating by any means outside the text taken as the ultimate reality. Yet this vanity comes at a time when growing wealth differences, measurable in an infinite number of indices are affecting the quality of life and the very fabric of society.
The most extreme involution set loose by the interpretive trend was voiced by Stephen Tyler (1986) in the first issue of the journal Cultural Anthropology. Bent on the destruction of the whole project of Western Reason, which Tyler claims is “crumbling unannounced into oblivion,” he sets out to dispel the “whole spell of representation and project a world of pure arbitrariness without representation” in order to engender a “new kind of natural sign to parallel a new kind of nature” (Tyler 1986:133). There is no escape, Tyler warns us, either in dialogical anthropology or reflexivity, since in the first case it is the anthropologist who represents native speech and in the second the anthropologists merely reconfirms his/her own objectives. For those who might wonder about the future of anthropology given the attack on the authorial stance, he adds a footnote assuring them that in this new nihilistic world “In order for the new writing to be born it must first be disconnected not only from the voice, but from the eye as well. It must break the whole spell of representation and project a world of pure arbitrariness without representation.” Hence, Tyler assures us, “There is no burden of authorship, for that new nature will not depend upon the truth or falsity of any utterance.” It will also one might add, not require any burden of fieldwork nor even criticism from readers.

The involution of the discipline of anthropology in a cultural critique that questions not just ways of representing the other, but of the very process of representation is more than coincidentally bound to the critique by feminists and anti-colonialists of androcentric and eurocentric models. This mood is reflected in (or possibly emanated from) the humanities where “Subjectivity, history and truth are being questioned by white, male academics,” Nancy Hartsock (1988) points out, “at the very moment that such concepts are appropriated by previously marginalized groups”. The decline in the hegemonic position of the core industrial countries in which anthropology developed has precipitated a decline in the position of male white elites that has led to this soul searching. Identity takes precedence over class as the certainties of class privilege are denied.

Once Aristotle’s axioms were kicked out from under the elite academic establishment by feminists and others who were colonized by it, the self-constituted leaders in the field are proposing a savage nihilism which denies the truth value of any representation (Schremp 1989:17). In their posturing I am reminded of the infant observed by Lacan (1977:p. 2) “still sunk in his motor incapacity and nursing dependence,” yet totally enchanted with his own image reflected in the mirror. Arrested in this “mirror stage”, the dominant discourse in the field now uses the world’s stage to confront the anthropologists’ own image as they check their own pulse and mount their own infantile fantasies in an imaginary rendition of what is out there. This self-image is then projected in literary references or the texts of deceased anthropologists that serve as a virtual field site to elaborate, criticize, romanticize, or simply plagiarize. In textual analysis, context is frequently ignored as the “inner rifts and dissonances of textual system are privileged” (Przybylowicz, Hartsock and McCallum 1985:9).

Admittedly an on-going critique of our practice of anthropology is essential to the enterprise. Historical materialism of the 1970s indicated the vacuity of community studies viewed as timeless wholes, homogeneous and largely unchanging. The critiques of functionalist studies that reified the status quo under colonialism published in Dell Hymes’ anthology Reinventing Anthropology (1969) led to an efflorescence of historically situated and empirically grounded writing. The contributors’ questioning of the traditional/modern dichotomies made it possible to expand a theory of process situating studies of colonized cultures within a world wide framework of capitalist advance.

A critical reading of past ethnographies might well pick up on positive insights that shed light on contemporary findings as well as stressing the distortions of a colonialist past. Many postmodern discoveries were quotidian insights of ethnographers in the 1950s as they entered field situations that were ripe with the conflicts and contradictions of formerly “tribal” cultures in the new nations of Africa and Asia. Lloyd Fallers’ close association with Uganda chiefs enabled him to see in their role “the meeting point, the point of articulation, between the various elements of the patch work...A man who was head of the Anglican church and the boy scouts was also a polygamist.” McKim Marriott pointed to the paradox of over-development as the basis for resistance to modernizing development programs in India. He found that the very over-determination of cultural practices in highly interrelated customary practices made it of questionable merit if not impossible for Indian peasants to adopt changes considered more rational by the developers.

A good ethnography can provide the basis for a completely new view of the people and processes studied. That is what Worseley was able to do in his re-reading of Fortis’ analysis of the Talensi. Using Fortis’ own data, he was able to show that the fissioning of kinship branches was due as much to land policies of the colonial government as to inherent propensities in the kinship structure. Annette Weiner did not simply trash Malinowski for his failure to include women in his ethnographic field, but, rather, showed the critical junctures in men’s politics that depended on the show of women’s wealth at funerals. Her ethnography deepened as it complemented Malinowski’s picture.

These insights gained from rethinking previous ethnographies in the light of subsequent studies are not cultivated in the new cultural critique. The tendency was to rediscover the same colonialist authoritarianism (Clifford and Marcus 1986) or blind spots to native ingenuity among developing agents (Eschorb 1995) only to mount their critique on what is presented as a tabula rasa. Their own dependence on insights of their predecessors is ignored, as Sangren (1987) points out of Said’s anti-orientalism and the gathering swarm of critiques buzzing in its wake.

The discovery of truth is not what the cultural critique is about. Truth itself is a suspect category, and the reality of the field is as much under question as the interpretations of it. In the words of one acolyte, “facts” and “data” are understood not as “objective entities” but rather as “social meanings attributed by social actors—including the fieldworker—in interaction with others,” (Wilson 1983:697) yielding an endless chain of imagery pointing to their own master image. Wilson concludes that researchers find it easy to discard the hypothesis testing, formulation of
specifically defined variables, and concern with reliability of the ethnographic summary that marked scientific method. Textual analysis has shifted to another aim, as textualism is glorified, fetishized, and made an end in itself divorced from the experience of the self and the other. Fantasy takes over where empiricism ends. In his deconstruction of Chan Kom, the “village that chose progress” in Redfield and Villa Rojas restudy, Castaneda (1995:132), exhorts us to understand ethnography as the “presentation (not representation) of a culture, that is, a simulation in Baudrillard’s sense.” Thus we rediscover a culture that is invented in discursive and geographic space through an ethnographic complicity as Chan Kom... becomes the paradigm of Yucatec Maya culture in the guise of a modernizing Maya Folk.

In the wake of the representational crisis in anthropology, Bruce M. Knauff (1994) shows that the “reflexive” anthropology, that is, “the privileging of literary self-consciousness and tropic creativity over sustained social analysis,” lacks “a rigorous, systematic, or comprehensive portrayal or analysis of social action.” He concurs with Jarvis (1987) who wrote that “The postmodernists have produced the ultimate argument for armchair anthropology,” and concludes that their “self-involuted textualism and fragmentation protect recent developments from explicit and critical awareness of their own assumptions.” (Knauff 1994:118). Margery Wolf (1992) is another of those critics of the self-styled postmodernists who have preempted the terrain only to nullify analysis of these most interesting times. In A Thrice Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility, Wolf relates an event in three modes, a fictional short story based on an incident which she observed as a field assistant in Taiwan in the 1960s, field notes which she recorded at the time, and an academic article published in the American Anthropologist. Each of these is analyzed in a postmodern and feminist approach. Yet even as Wolf admits variation in the approaches, she does not yield the field to those postmodernists who deny any validity to objective accounts.

This nihilistic trend in the cultural critique comes at the precise moment when the last frontiers of subsistence production are being trespassed, when the flow of capital from core industrial countries to periphery is reversing as debt ridden Third World countries are carrying the burden of capital accumulation in a most brutal and excessive exploitation of the poorest among the poor. Those who presume to be the prophets of the postmodern condition, as Knauff (1994) so presciently related, are reluctant to specify postmodern suppositions. Harvey (1989) has clearly marked the terrain of this postmodern geography, yet those who are absorbed in the cultural critique prefer to excoriate their past and present colleagues who venture into “the field”. This has left the most exciting breakthroughs to applied anthropologists and political activists.

Peripheral vision of the post-modern fieldworkers

In the wake of the crisis of representation in anthropology, I would like to redeem the peripheral vision of anthropologists arrested in Lacan’s “mirror stage” by making a foreground of the people we choose to study. In this realignment of fieldwork with the word of the subject at its center rather than the text of the anthropologist, listening and hearing become for the anthropologist “the central and unifying sense” of humanity as Herder (Zengotita 1989:51) maintained in the eighteenth century. Observation was privileged in the age of colonialism, as nineteenth century explorers were frequently shown on mountaintops, pointing to what was of importance to an admiring female and native audience. Observation of non-verbal communication is, of course, still essential, but our stance as “objective observer” must be modified by greater heed to the interpretations of those who are the central actors in the event. This is not what the cultural critique seeks. When we enter into the imaginary construction of the data we bring back with us, there should be enough on which to hang—and defend—our own representation. Fieldwork is still essential because we lack the imaginative skills to capture the wide range of human possibilities that are still extant. I think this was what Sol Tax was suggesting when he tried to tell us how difficult it was to imagine anyone’s conditions of being, even another in our own culture.

In order to convey the significance of such a refocusing of our attention back to people we study, I shall draw on another allegory of the mirror, this one taken from the Zapatista seer, El Viejo Antonio of the Lacandon Rainforest (Expreso, Tuxtlas Gutierrez, December 30, 1994).

There was a great stone where all those who were born in the world were walking in the paths of the first gods. With all that tramping above it, the stone became very smooth, like a mirror. Against this mirror the first gods blew into the air the first three words. The mirror did not withdraw the same words that it received but rather returned three other times three different words. The gods spent the time this way, throwing the words at the mirror in order that more come out until they were bored. Then they had a great idea, and they made a path over another great rock and another great mirror was polished and they put it in front of the first mirror and this returned three times three different words that they blew out, with all the force they had, against the second mirror, and this returned to the first mirror, three times three the number of words that it received, and so they were throwing out more and more different words, the two mirrors. Thus it was that the true language was born.

Zapatistas, like many indigenous people, are now disseminating their own words, but they now rely on international visitors and media representatives to help disseminate them. On the second anniversary of the Zapatista Uprising in January 1996, I participated in what Comandante David called “the Fiesta of the Word”. In this National Forum of Indigenous People over four hundred indigenous people, along with leading Mexican intellectuals and international observers like myself, joined twenty-four Zapatistas to review the contents of the dialogue between the government and Zapatista leaders in the preceding fall. The proceedings took place in six sessions, each with about fifty to a hundred participants with four Zapatistas sitting quietly throughout each session, listening to what everyone said about the proposals set forth. For eight days the assembled group spoke and listened to each others words. The document called the San Andres Agreement was presented and signed by the government.
representatives in the Commission for Agreement and Peace (COCOPA) on February 16, 1996. Even after a change in government in 2000 the agreement has not been implemented by the Mexican congress.

The relativism of knowledge and the urgency of subjectivity is taken for granted in the pluralpolitical, plurireligious, and pluricultural settings in which Mayas find themselves in the newly colonizing areas of the Lacandon rainforest and the urban barrios to which highland indigenous people who have dissented with caciques have migrated. There we can discover new understandings of what liberty, democracy and equality might be in the postmodern world as those who were excluded from the earlier dialogue begin to appropriate them: “Justice,” El Viejo Antonio goes on in his allegory of the mirror to say, “is not to punish, but to give back to each what s/he deserves, and that is what the mirror gives back; Liberty is not that each one does what s/he wants, but to choose whatever road that the mirror wants in order to arrive at the true word; Democracy: is not that all think the same, but that all thoughts or the majority of the thoughts seek and arrive at a good agreement.”

The Zapatista call for autonomy of indigenous pueblos is not to isolate themselves from modernizing influences, but rather to embrace this diversity in a governance that responds to a multiplicity of cultural traditions. They are the emergent “subjects of history” whose daily practice has prepared them to live in the postmodern world and who, in making their own history, are shaping a new moral community. Anthropologists can help bring this, and other visions of postmodern condition from the people we study, to replace the mirror self-image of a skeptical and jaded discipline. Those who are focusing on these emergent autonomous communities find it necessary to engage in activist participatory research that goes beyond our participant observation. Since their subjects are under fire in the transformative social change they are bringing into being, their presence is not tolerated as it once may have been.

**Activist Anthropology: Promise and Perils**

Activist anthropology stems from some of the same values related to social justice that inspired Sol Tax to promote “action anthropology” a half century ago with the Fox Indians. While conducting a field research team with the Fox in 1948, he crystallized in a letter to the students some of his thoughts about introducing change for progress in the Fox reservation. In the process of carrying out the agreed upon action with the Fox, he felt that the students would learn more about culture and personality, social structure and everything else. Action anthropology often meant specific involvement in projects usually conceived and managed by the anthropologist and carried out with Indians. Among those projects in the Fox Reservation were the production of TamaCraft industry, organization of a community center, and encouraging citizenship and active participation in democratic processes (Blanchard 1979).

A decade later the Cornell Anthropology Department carried out a similar project in Vicos, Peru that was overtly directed toward overcoming the paternalistic codes of behavior in the feudal agriculture still persisting in highland Peru in the 1950s and 1960s. Yet because the initiatives were those of the anthropologists, who, in the words of one of the Vicos students, became the new *patrones*, the Fox and Vicos projects were often criticized as “paternalistic”. Nonetheless they satisfied the “citizen interests” as Tax called it (Blanchard 1979) of the anthropologists in contributing to the society by generating artistic talents of the people they study and enabling them to earn much needed cash. Action anthropology was later called “applied anthropology” as development agencies expanded the range of their projects to rural and indigenous areas.

In contrast to the action and applied anthropologists who promoted the reproduction of a given status quo, activist anthropologists today take their lead from the people they study, adapting their talents and resources to the needs and interests of the people they join as they become engaged in transformative actions for structural change. The activist approach permits greater access to privileged sources of information than strictly scientific ethnography, but this comes with greater risks in representing one’s findings. No matter how hard one seeks balance, some doors are closed at the moment that others are opened since associations with those who are considered an opponent will mitigate trust. It is rare to find an anthropologist like Charles Hale who was able to maintain a credible presence with protagonists of the Nicaraguan Revolution that found themselves on opposite sides of the table as the conflict moved from that between Sandinistas and national elites to one between Sandinistas and the Miskitu Indians (Hale 1994). Yet this tension between distinct perspectives within a common cause is the essence of uniting theory to practice since it generates the discussions and actions that make for an evolving process.

Activist anthropology grows out of the conflict situations that anthropologists encounter in field sites throughout the world where there is little tolerance for neutrality. Those who have engaged in it, as Barrie Thorne (1983) learned in her activist research with war resisters during the Vietnam War period, guilt mixes with euphoria as participation in events as an observer-collaborator often means sharing the excitement but not the full risk as others. Thorne found that she was suspected of being a federal agent there to detect illegal activities of the draft resisters. Nonetheless protagonists of activism often value the role of observers in such crisis situations for itself, as I discovered when I joined a march of Bolivian mine workers opposing the closing of national mines in 1986 (Nash 1992). Since there were no immediate journalists on the scene when the ten thousand marchers were surrounded by the army to prevent them from continuing on to La Paz, many came up to talk with me when they saw me with pen and paper recording the event. There is, as well, the anxiety as to what revelations would injure the movement once they were printed. As a participant activist, the ethnographer finds himself/herself an instrument of the research, reflecting on feelings and emotions raised by the events in which she/he was involved as a participatst. In the process of assessing the personal risk involved in participatory action, the ethnographer is sensitized to greater awareness of the implications of those who make up the social movement. Activist anthropology need not imply that the anthropologist renounces scientific criteria or the theoretical
premises that informs the discipline. On the contrary, it means situating oneself in the field of social action, defining and often clarifying to oneself the particular perspective which conditions his/her research. I have seen greater transparency in the work of activist anthropologists than that of self-styled "objective" scientific researchers who have not felt required to divulge what motivates the choice of research topics or the relations with those who provide them with information. One of the ways in which activist research is developing is in collaborative work with the subjects of inquiry.

This kind of collaboration is cultivated as we enter into an intense dialogue during periods of crisis with people of a distinct cultural perspective yet one which we are intent on sharing. Marco Tavanti, an Italian Catholic priest who worked collaboratively with the Tzotzil group that called themselves The Abejas developed collective discussions of the events that led up to the horrifying massacre of 45 members of the community. He would raise issues to the diverse assembly of men and women, young and old, Protestant and Catholic, and government party PRI adherents and Zapatistas, asking them to reflect on this in common. He would challenge them to take their collaborators seriously and question their own premises, much as is done in a focus group (Tavanti 2003:25-26). He maintains, and his monograph on the community that lived through this traumatic period and transformed the tragedy into a collective memorial proves, the positive advantages that can be gained from such a collaborative research design. The goal as he points out is as follows:

Experiencing and welcoming diversity creates new cross-cultural and ‘syncretic’ standpoints that are essential for interpreting our globalizing society. The point here is not just that foreigners interpret society from a standpoint of foreigners and indigenous from a standpoint of indigenousness. Rather, it is the experience of moving across localities and identities that generate new perspectives.

Anthologies such as Women of Chiapas: Making History in Times of Struggle and Hope co-edited by Christine Eber and Christine Kovic (2003) succeed in such a collaborative project by going beyond the usual network of the ethnologist to provide a broader scope for inquiry into the dynamics of social change in process. This is particularly marked by their inclusion of creative works that allow the writers to explore their inner psyche and its relations with a collective group as they imagine alternative scenarios. Plays, songs, prayers life histories and testimonials embody the experience of indigenous life and struggle that go beyond ethnographic representation. These creative texts draw upon everyday forms in which women express their sentiments and reflect on salient issues in their lives. Yet because the creativity involves imagination, the question of ethnographic validity arises. How do we know that they represent “the truth”? What are the criteria of validity when the usual canons of ethnographic authority are dismissed? These canons include long-term, intimate acquaintance with knowledgeable members of the group whose intelligent perceptions are probed in many different contexts. Can we accept the texts on their own merit, or is the authority of the ethnographer still operating though not given authorship?

The editors answer some of these questions in the section overviews by providing the deeper layers of meaning for the texts. Prayers are the most commonplace yet most elaborated forms of speech in Mayan cultures. Those chosen as collaborators are respected by their communities and their testimonies have stood up in many different occasions. As they participate actively in the social movements occurring in Chiapas, the contributors unite their voices with those of the women’s cooperatives, church groups, political parties and non-governmental organizations with whom they work. In these collective actions they connect their strategic needs as wives and mothers with their desire for structural change of their position as doubly oppressed.

This linkage of personal needs with the desire for change is characteristic of the processions and demonstrations that I have noticed in women’s activist groups in Chiapas. Their tendency to link their movement with strong ritual and religious symbolism was particularly evident in the Women’s Day march in 1995 when the women all carried white flowers and candles as they were accompanied by incense bearers. These are the quintessential elements of the traditional festivals in indigenous communities. Although the march was a highly politicized event, with strong claims for peace and against militarism since it occurred a month after the invasion of Zapatista communities in the Lacandon jungle, the context was enhanced by these symbols to evoke the peace and justice they claimed. It was also validation for their appearance in public, since church and religions celebrations were the only events that women participated in publicly without men.

These symbolic references to the sacred and to the special relationship of women to the Mother Earth often alarm First World activists who join the ranks of indigenous people. Yet we have much to learn from the anxiety raised in both these contexts. Our cultivated distancing from the spiritual sources of collective behavior may prompt in us disdainful reactions when we find the conviction of mobilized people expressed in religious terms. Yet Zapatistas draw upon these sources latent in the Christian Base Communities that thrived in the Lacandon rainforest during the ministering of Bishop Samuel Ruiz who drew from Liberation Theology in formulating his own theology of rebellion. Religion has always provided a powerful stimulus to the wretched of the earth, whether directing them to the world after death or before. Indigenous communities of the Lacandon rainforest drew from passages of Exodus in the Bible the message of liberation of the Israelis and applied it to their own condition of liberation from the slavery of the plantations in which they worked (Leyva Solano 1996). In Acteal, the Chenalhó hamlet where paramilitaries trained and financed by the Institutional Revolutionary Party massacred 45 members of the Christian Base Community that called themselves “The Bees”, religious faith fortified their commitment to resistance against the government and reconciliation with the community following the tragedy (Tavanti 2003). The strength of conviction in the justice of their struggle fortifies their movement precisely because of the martyrdom. This was as prevalent in early Christianity when it appeared as the religion of slaves and poor people subjugated or dispersed by Rome as it was in the workers socialist circles in the nineteenth century (Engels 1959), and as it is today in Chiapas.
Just as the referential system of religion in the politics of indigenous peoples raises hackles with the sophisticated outside observer, so too does the self-referential language of motherhood and identification with the earth often used by the women in these movements. In the postmodern, deconstructive mode still fashionable in anthropology, the very category of women is decried as essentialist.2 Certainly a reductionist view of Third World women as people with “‘needs’ and ‘problems’ but no freedom to act” (Chandra Mohanty, cited in Escobar 1995:8) merits criticism, but the critique should not end with the statement of the problem. We must go beyond deconstruction of the rhetoric to discover the incentives generating a common collective image among indigenous movements. Only then will we understand, as they do how the struggle for dignity is essential to overcome their former subjugation at home and in public. As one Mayan activist put it when he spoke from the floor at an AAA meeting in the 1980s: “We were despised and subordinated as Indians, so we fought as Indians. Now we are not ashamed to call ourselves Indians.” And as an indigenous woman in the actors’ group Fomento para la Mujer Maya said on the tenth anniversary of their founding in February 2004, “We were despised as women in our homes and in public, and that is why we organize as women.” Cultural expressions provide a venue for formulating new conceptions of identity that are less threatening than strictly political settings. Warren’s (1998) study of pan-Maya activists in Guatemala during the genocidal wars provides a case in point. By promoting the revitalization of Indian languages, cultural icons, and identification with territories, pan-Mayanists hope to transform their relations to the state and civil society. This represents only one of the many ways in which Mayas of Guatemala are reasserting their heritage in contemporary struggles. Communities of Populations in Resistance and Committees of Campesino Unity were other contexts in which indigenous people joined with mestizos to contest the genocidal attack on small plot farmers of the western highlands and the colonizers of the Ixcan during the 1980s. Like Guatemala Mayas, Chiapas Mayan women are confronting the structural factors deriving from neoliberal policies that reduce social welfare and expand military budgets. To do it as women whose special responsibility is the care and nurturance of children is not to diminish alternative positions, but to complement them. The task of the activist anthropologist is to discover and act on the alternatives posed by indigenous people themselves, not to deconstruct their language as they seek common cause with other women.

There is no doubt that activist anthropology involves us in greater risks as well as rewards. This may not be a matter of choice. In conditions of massive social upheaval, no neutrals are allowed for long term participant observation. Collaboration promotes a creative tension that the processes of change, going beyond the events to clarify the conflicts and resolutions that enter into transformative change.

ENDNOTES

1 Among those who have dominated this approach are George E. Marcus and Michael J. Fischer (1986), Clifford and Marcus (1986). A distinct understanding of “anthropology as critique is provided by Canadian anthropologists (Lem and Leach 2002) in which a political economy of power relations is central to the problematic.

2 Kenneth Burke has a more scholarly take on “isms” when he states that “whereas ‘isms’ look positive, they are all negatively infused, taking their form anthropetically to other ‘isms’ (some elements of which paradoxically they often end by incorporating)” (Burke 1970:24, cited in Boon 1989). Plagiarism is clearly apparent in the evolution of scholarly paradigms as well as political ideologies.

REFERENCES


Hale, Charles. 1994


Nash, June and Helen Ickan Safa 1975. Sex and Class in Latin America. Praeger


On Cuba

LASA Statement
October 6, 2004

To the LASA Membership:

On September 29, 2004, I was informed by the Office of Cuban Affairs that 61 Cuban colleagues who were planning to participate in our international congress had been denied visas. The announcement was not entirely new because I had already received an email from Cuban colleagues. Needless to say, they were enormously disappointed.

I was also told by the Office of Cuban Affairs that the decision had been taken "very recently" and "very high up." The reason for the denial, I was told, was that there were 68 political prisoners in Cuba and the United States Government could not accept that situation. However, other people have been given different explanations. Senator Judd Gregg was told that Cuban government officials cannot be given a visa to enter the United States and since scholars work for governmental institutions, they cannot be given visas.

Whatever the real reason or reasons, the decision itself and the manner in which the Department of State made it are deplorable.

In order to avoid the crisis atmosphere that surrounded the granting of visas to our Cuban colleagues in the 2003 LASA congress and conscious of the new measures for screening applicant visas adopted by the U.S. government after September 11, 2001, the leadership of LASA, together with members of the Cuba Section from the United States and from Cuba, decided to approach the State Department to discuss the possibility of expediting the visa granting process. On November 20, 2003, Michael Erisman, co-chair of the Cuba Section, met with Mr. Richard Beer in the U.S. Interest Section in Havana. They agreed to begin the process very early and in an orderly fashion, something our Cuban colleagues endorsed with enthusiasm.

On May 6, 2004, the Executive Director of LASA, Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, and I had a meeting with two high ranking members of the Office of Cuban Affairs. We agreed to initiate the process as soon as possible and to remain in contact periodically. By mid May more than half of the participants had submitted their applications and had completed their interviews in the Interest Section. By July, almost all the applications had been submitted. The LASA Secretariat monitored the process and was periodically in contact with the Department of State. At no point were we told that the Cuban scholars were ineligible for a visa by virtue of being a "government employee." We were led to believe that for the first time we were doing things with sufficient time and that the decision would not be long.

Throughout our dealings with the Office of Cuban Affairs, some colleagues from the Cuban Section were inclined to press for an early decision but we were convinced that we were following procedures that would establish a precedent for future congresses. Unfortunately, the importance for the Bush administration of those sectors of the electorate opposed to any kind of relations with Cuba hardened U.S. policies and produced unprecedented travel restrictions. The fact that the final decision was to deny all the visas, something which has not happened since Cuban scholars began to attend LASA meetings in 1977, is an indication of the new rigid stance adopted by the Bush administration towards scholarly exchanges between Cuba and the United States and how far it is willing to go to undermine them.

Since the State Department decision became known, the Secretariat, the Cuban Section, both in Cuba and in the United States, and our colleagues in the University of la Habana, have been in constant contact. The media picked up the story in Cuba where our colleagues held a press conference and issued a statement deploring the decision and explaining what is LASA and its importance for Cuban scholars. I was contacted by the Asahi Shimbun of Tokyo. Various articles were published in the Dallas Morning News, the Miami Herald, the Associated Press, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and the New York Times. John Coatsworth, Mike Erisman, Bill LeoGrande were extremely helpful contacting the office of Congressman William Delahunt, co-chair of the fifty-two member bipartisan House Cuba Working Group. They sent information to his chief of staff, Steve Schwadron, who was also very supportive, and acted as a conduit to inform various members of Congress concerned with the issue. I contacted two senators, Judd Gregg from New Hampshire and Patrick Leahy from Vermont, and they both got in touch with the Secretary of State. After the New York Times article appeared, the AAUP wrote a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell, so did the American Association of Political Science, the Modern Language Association and the American Historical Association. The bipartisan House Cuba Working Group also wrote a letter to Secretary Powell asking him to reconsider the decision. I too wrote a letter to the Secretary of State on behalf of LASA.

While both our Cuban colleagues and the LASA leadership are delighted with and thankful for the warm support and interest displayed by the press, members of Congress, and other professional organizations, we are left with a bitter taste because of the absence of Cuban scholars at our Las Vegas meeting.

We believe however, that this is the time to reaffirm LASA's commitment to maintain its longstanding relationship with Cuban scholars, researcher, and intellectuals. As members of our organization, they will continue to be welcome to their/our international congresses, opened to them in the middle of the Cold War. In the statement they issued in Havana, they wrote that:

"los Congresos de LASA han propiciado oportunidades para que se conozcan y divulguen resultados del quehacer investigativo de científicos sociales, escritores, y artistas cubanos. Al mismo tiempo han contribuido para que se actualicen en sus respectivos campos de especialización. Además, habría que decir que los intercambios, y especialmente los congresos de LASA han dado un espacio para la exposición de resultados de investigaciones
realizadas y de otras que se encuentran en curso, cuya divulgación ha permitido una visión más objetiva y real de lo que acontece en la Cuba de hoy.

Es verdaderamente la aspiración de la academia cubana que el intercambio entre los especialistas de ambos países [Estados Unidos y Cuba] continúe, se consolide y amplíe; y esto pueda contribuir en la perspectiva futura, como un pequeño pero significativo aporte, al desarrollo de un clima de distensión bilateral en el prolongado conflicto entre los dos países.”

In the next few weeks a newly created LASA Task Force will consider options and will determine what must be done to guarantee the continued full participation at LASA congresses not only of our Cuban colleagues but of all those scholars around the world concerned with Latin America and the Caribbean.

Marysa Navarro
Charles Collis Professor of History
Dartmouth College
LASA President and the members of the LASA Executive Council

Latin American Studies Association
October 6, 2004

The Honorable Colin Powell
Secretary of State
Department of State
2201C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr Secretary:

I am writing to you as President of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA), the paramount professional organization of scholars and practitioners concerned with Latin America and the Caribbean. It is the one Association that brings together experts on Latin America and the Caribbean from all disciplines and diverse occupational endeavors, across the globe. With more than 5,000 members, LASA is the largest organization of its kind in the world.

I am writing to protest the decision of the United States Government to deny visas to 61 Cuban scholars who were going to participate in our international congress to be held in Las Vegas, from October 6 to 9. On September 29, I was informed by Mr. Daniel Fisk of the State Department that all requests for visas by Cuban scholars had been denied. The single reason given to me was that there were 68 political prisoners in Cuba and the United States Government could not accept such a situation.

The following day, Senator Judd Gregg of New Hampshire, made inquiries at the Department of State on behalf of LASA at my request. He was informed that there is a law in the United States that does not permit a Cuban Government official to be granted a visa to enter the United States. Since Cuban scholars work for government institutions, they could not be given a visa.

Whatever the real reason or reasons may have been for such a decision, I would also like to protest the manner in which the State Department has treated our organization and our Cuban colleagues.

In order to avoid unnecessary delays, as was sometimes the case in the past and last year in particular, and in view of the new measures adopted after September 11, 2001, for screening visa applicants, the LASA leadership approached the Office of Cuban Affairs to attempt to expedite the granting of visas to the Cuban scholars attending our congresses. On May 6, 2004, the Executive Director of LASA, Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, and I went to Washington and met with Mr. Kevin Whitaker and Mr. James Bean. We agreed to begin the process as soon as possible and to keep in touch periodically.

With the collaboration of the University of Havana, by mid-May, a majority of the Cuban scholars planning to participate in our congress had submitted their applications and had completed their interviews at the Interest Section. By the end of July, almost all applications had been presented. The whole process seemed to advance in a timely and orderly fashion. The LASA Secretariat was periodically in touch with the office of Cuban Affairs. At no point were we told that there was no need to pay for the visas— as the Cuban scholars had done— because no Cuban scholar could receive a visa or that no Cuban scholar would be given a visa because she or he was a “government employee.” We believed that we were doing the right thing until September 29, 2004, when we learned that the visas had been denied—less than a week before the beginning of the conference.

The decision of the United States Government is unprecedented. For the first time since 1977, when Cuban scholars began to attend LASA congresses, not a single scholar residing in Cuba will participate in our discussions. This means that three panels will be cancelled, forty-five additional panels will be reorganized and other activities organized by universities such as Harvard University, the University of Saint Thomas, (Minnesota), the University of Florida, Sarah Lawrence College and many others will also have to be cancelled. In issuing a blanket denial of visas to our Cuban colleagues, the United States Government has dealt a serious blow to the academic freedom of LASA members.

I regret to write to you in these circumstances but ask that you address the situation immediately so that our Cuban colleagues may attend the Congress.

Sincerely,

Marysa Navarro
Charles Collis Professor of History
Dartmouth College
LASA President

Washington Office on Latin America
October 1, 2004

WOLA Condemns Administration Decision to Deny Visas to Cuban Scholars; Calls It Political Move

“The decision to deny visas to more than sixty Cuban scholars to attend the international congress of the Latin American Studies Association is an outrageous move by the Bush Administration. It’s sad to see the Administration playing politics on an issue of academic freedom. No one believes that giving some Cuban professors short term visas to do presentations at an academic conference threatens the security of the United States,” said Geoff Thale, Senior Associate for Cuba at the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA). WOLA is a human rights and social
Justice advocacy organization, based in Washington; it was involved in sponsoring the visit of five Cuban academics. They were part of group of sixty-five Cuban academics whose visas were denied, in a decision confirmed yesterday by the Bush Administration. “Cutting off academic exchange between scholars obviously hurts U.S. academics and researchers, whose access to information and scholarly dialogue is being limited. More fundamentally, it contravenes the principle of academic freedom for scholars,” said Thale. State Department officials cited the continued imprisonment since March 2003 of 68 dissidents in Cuba as one reason for the denial of the academics’ visas. “We condemn the Cuban government’s detention of dissidents, and its limits on political expression. But punishing Cuban academics by denying them visas for academic exchange with the United States is not the right response. There’s a certain irony in denying Cubans the opportunity to talk in the U.S., as a way of responding to Cuba’s arrests of its own critics,” said Thale. “There is an important principle in play here. Scholars ought to be able to meet and exchange information, and points of view; our government shouldn’t be in the business of denying visas to legitimate scholars.”

“After forty years, one would think that the U.S. government would recognize that attempts to isolate Cuba have done nothing to improve human rights and democracy on the island,” commented Rachel Farley, WOLA Program Officer for Cuba. “This is not a carefully calibrated foreign policy step, but a blatantly political move: five weeks before an election in which the Cuban-American community in Florida is a key constituency, the Administration is playing to hardliners by preventing Cuban academics and university professors from meeting with their counterparts from the U.S. and Latin America,” noted Farley. The New York Daily News highlighted the arbitrary nature of the incident, contrasting it with the case of “three Cuban-Americans with long and proven ties to terrorist activities in this country and abroad [who] were given a celebrity welcome to the U.S.” The Daily News commented, “Terrorists yes, scholars no? It doesn’t make sense.”

“If the U.S. wants to encourage democratization in Cuba, it ought to encourage dialogue with scholars and thinkers in Cuba, and with ordinary citizens, on the future of the island. Instead, we’re cutting off contact for domestic political reasons. This is a short-sighted and counterproductive approach,” said Farley.

**Universidad de La Habana**

**October 1, 2004**

Niego el Dpto. de Estado de Estados Unidos visas a académicos e intelectuales que participan en el XXV Congreso Internacional de LASA, a celebrarse del 7 al 9 de octubre en Las Vegas, Nevada, Estados Unidos.

El 28 de septiembre 2004 la Sección de Intereses de Estados Unidos en Cuba comunicó oficialmente a la Universidad de La Habana la negación de las 65 solicitudes de visas, aduciendo en algunas de ellas la aplicación del Artículo 212F, que académicos e intelectuales cubanos habían presentado desde el pasado mes de mayo con el propósito de participar en el XXV Congreso Internacional de Latino American Studies Association (LASA), a celebrarse del 7 al 9 de octubre Las Vegas, Nevada.

Esta decisión ha causado gran malestar en la comunidad académica cubana y norteamericana ya que existe una fuerte tradición de intercambios, si bien es cierto que a partir de los sucesos del 11 de septiembre de 2001, los obstáculos que ha impuesto la Administración Bush para que el mismo se desarrolle han sido crecientes. Un ejemplo de ello es que en el transcurso del presente año solamente 5 profesores de la Universidad de La Habana (UH) han podido cumplimentar invitaciones de instituciones norteamericanas. Cabe señalar que antes de la ya citada fecha se producían unas 25 salidas de profesores de la UH a ese país.

Quiénes eran los cubanos que iban al XXV Congreso Internacional de LASA?

Son 65 académicos e intelectuales cuyas disciplinas se desglosan de la siguiente forma:

- 5 demógrafos
- 3 psicólogos
- 21 economistas
- 14 sociólogos
- 10 historiadores
- 1 químico
- 1 abogado

filósofos, 2 politólogos, 2 lingüistas y 4 historiadores del arte.

Como resultado de la ausencia de los cubanos el programa académico del evento se ve afectado, de hecho hay 45 paneles que podrían incluso tener que suspenderse, 2 de los cuatro paneles de la Sección Cuba ya han sido cancelados y las 3 reuniones de la Junta Directiva de dicha Sección se tendrán que hacer sin la presencia de los 3 miembros cubanos.

Además de ello, otras actividades académicas organizadas por la Universidad de Harvard, Universida de St Thomas, la Universidad de Florida, Gainesville y Sarah Lawrence Collage tendrán definitivamente que ser canceladas.

Cuál ha sido la participación de los académicos e intelectuales cubanos en los Congresos de la Asociación de Estudios Latinoamericanos?

En octubre de 1977, el primer grupo de académicos cubanos viajó a Estados Unidos a sostener reuniones con sus colegas en diferentes universidades norteamericanas, entre ellas Yale y Johns Hopkins, y además para participar en el VII Congreso de LASA a celebrarse en Houston. A partir de esa fecha y hasta septiembre de 2001, la asistencia de cubanos de la Isla a estos Congresos ha sido casi ininterrumpida.

Los aspectos más significativos del intercambio de LASA con la academia cubana han sido precisamente la continuidad de la participación y el carácter creciente de estos, incluso en medio de circunstancias no siempre favorables al desarrollo de los intercambios. Ello ha estado condicionado por las tensiones recurrentes que introduce el conflicto bilateral entre Cuba y Estados Unidos, y en especial durante la década del 80 por la rigidez de la política norteamericana durante el doble mandato de la administración Reagan.

El año 1983 marcó un hito en la relación con LASA, dada la amplia representación de cubanos en el Congreso que tuvo lugar en Ciudad México en septiembre de ese año. En 1988 se vivió un momento de revitalización, al triunfar las gestiones y
presiones de los directivos de LASA ante las autoridades estadounidenses y lograr que a partir de entonces se estableciera una especie de compromiso con el Departamento de Estado encaminado a garantizar la aprobación de las visas – que bajo la Administración Reagan habían sido tradicionalmente denegadas – para los académicos e intelectuales de Cuba invitados a este evento y otras actividades de LASA.

En ese año de 1983 reaparecen los cubanos en el Congreso de Nueva Orleans y se enriquece el intercambio entre LASA y las instituciones de la Isla, al iniciarse un plan que contemplaba la creación de varios grupos de trabajo con integrantes de los dos países, que operaban mediante la realización de encuentros en Cuba y los Estados Unidos, así como apoyando la presencia de cubanos en los Congresos.

Al extenderse posteriormente este mecanismo y aprobarse nuevos grupos de trabajo, se llegó a contar con la asistencia de alrededor de treinta cubanos. Así ocurrió en 1991 en Washington y en 1994 en Atlanta, donde además de asistir al desarrollo del evento, funcionaron los citados grupos. Bajo el concepto de esta suerte de equipos de investigación conjunta, participaron 44 especialistas cubanos, quienes atendían esferas de los estudios que abarcaban desde los temas económicos, políticos e históricos hasta los del cine, la literatura y el pensamiento martiano.

El año 1997, en Guadalajara, marca otro momento relevante en los vínculos entre LASA y Cuba, al asistir una nutrida representación cubana y adoptarse una nueva estructura de trabajo, la Sección Cuba que sin dudas ha posibilitado una mayor coherencia, planificación y atención a los intereses de los académicos miembros.

En septiembre de 1998 al Congreso de Chicago asistieron más de 70 cubanos; en marzo de 2000 al Congreso de Miami fueron 99; en septiembre de 2001 en Congreso de Washington participaron 87 y en el de Dallas celebrado en marzo de 2003 estuvieron presentes 64 cubanos.

Otro elemento interesante de la presencia de cubanos en LASA es que a partir de 2001 se comenzaron a dar los pasos necesarios para hacer efectiva la membresía de cincuenta cubanos residentes en la Isla gracias a un donativo de la Fundación Mac Arthur, membresía ésta que se ha mantenido hasta los momentos actuales.

Una valoración de este intercambio.

Realmente los Congresos de LASA han propiciado oportunidades para que se conozcan e divulguen resultados del quehacer investigativo de científicos sociales, escritores y artistas cubanos. Al mismo tiempo han contribuido para que se actualicen en sus respectivos campos de especialización. Además habría que decir que los intercambios, y especialmente los Congresos de LASA han dado un espacio para la exposición de resultados de investigaciones realizadas y de otras que se encuentran en curso, cuya divulgación ha permitido una visión más objetiva y real de lo que acontece en la Cuba de hoy.

Es verdaderamente la aspiración de la academia cubana que el intercambio entre los especialistas e instituciones de ambos países continúe, se consolide y amplíe; y esto pueda contribuir en la perspectiva futura, como un pequeño pero significativo aporte, al desarrollo de un clima de distensión bilateral en el prolongado conflicto entre los dos países.

**Book Launching Becomes Protest**

By Lorena Barberia

Sixty-five chairs sat empty in protest for the denial of visas to the same number Cuban academics. A book launching party transformed into a special session on “Academic Freedom and Scholarly Exchange with Cuba” at the 2004 Latin American Studies Association (LASA) International Congress. The October 8 session, hosted by the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies (DRCLAS) was to have been a cheery event, a panel to celebrate the publication of The Cuban Economy at the Start of the Twenty-First Century, a book on the Cuban economy, the latest volume in the David Rockefeller Center Series on Latin American Studies.

The panel was to have included all three editors – Jorge I. Domínguez, Omar Everleny Pérez Villanueva and Lorena Barberia— as well as most of the contributors. However, one week before LASA, the U.S. State Department denied visas for each and every of the 65 Cuban scholars who had been planning to come to LASA, whether they taught psychology, poetry, or politics. The unprecedented action meant that the co-editor of the volume and four authors of chapters in the book could not participate in the panel. DRCLAS changed its plans and marked the occasion by hosting a session to discuss the denial of visas to the Cuban scholars and more broadly the issue of academic freedom and scholarly exchange with Cuba.

The panel, now with a different focus, drew a standing-room only audience, facing the 65 empty chairs, each with the name of an absent Cuban and his or her institution. DRCLAS Director John Coatsworth, U.S.-based editors, Jorge Domínguez and Lorena Barberia, and Steve Schwadron, chief-of-staff to Congressman William Delahunt (D-MA) addressed the audience and read a statement from the volume’s Cuban co-editor and discussed appeals by the Cuba Working Group of the U.S. House of Representatives to Secretary of State Colin Powell.

In his introductory comments, John Coatsworth read from his preface to the new volume, stressing, “We have learned from our Cuban colleagues, from their knowledge of their fields and their passion for truth, from their resilience in the face of the difficulties their country has faced, from their patriotism, and from their extraordinary warmth and humanity.” Coatsworth added that the decision to deny visas to attend the LASA congress also violates the academic freedom of U.S. scholars. Weatherhead Center for International Affairs Director Jorge Domínguez disputed characterizations made by the U.S. State Department that questioned the academic credentials of Cuban scholars, reading passages from the book to prove his point.

In response to the decision by the U.S. State Department, Coatsworth announced that DRCLAS will launch its book on the Cuban economy in Mexico, where Cuban academics have no problem obtaining visas. The rescheduled panel will include all Cuban
co-authors and the Cuban co-editor, as well at the U.S. editors and authors. The location and date will be announced shortly. Coatsworth stressed, "the panel will have to take place outside the U.S. in a country which respects academic freedom more than the current administration."

*The article was first published in Revista, The Harvard Review of Latin America, Fall/Winter 2004-2005

**American Association of University Professors**

*October 5, 2004*

The Honorable Colin L. Powell
Secretary of State
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Powell:

I am writing to express the deep concern of the American Association of University Professors, the paramount organization in the United States devoted to advancing the principles of academic freedom, over the reported decision of the Department of State to deny visas to all 65 Cuban scholars scheduled to participate next week in an international conference sponsored by the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) to be held in Las Vegas.

We understand that scholars from Cuba have attended similar conferences in this country before. We also understand that officers of LASA had been meeting with the State Department’s Office of Cuban Affairs since May of this year to avoid last-minute problems that characterized previous requests for visas, that the department informed the scholars of its negative decision only last Tuesday, and that the blanket denial of visas to a group of Cuban scholars is unprecedented. A spokesperson for the Department of State is reported to have explained the department’s decision as follows: "Restricting access of Cuban academics to the United States is consistent with the overall tightening of our policy. Our policy is not about restricting academic exchanges or freedom of expression. It is the Castro regime that does that through restrictive issuance of passports and exit permits only to those academics on whom it can rely to promote its agenda of repression and misrepresentation."

We do not see how the Department of State can, on the one hand, deny visas to foreign scholars because their government is seen to "promote [an] agenda of repression and misrepresentation," and, on the other hand, affirm its commitment to freedom of expression. This Association has long held that the free travel of scholars is an indispensable part of academic freedom. We ask that the Department of State not bar scholars who wish to enter this country for legitimate academic reasons. We do so out of the conviction that the unfettered search for knowledge by foreign scholars meeting with academics in the United States is indispensable for the strengthening of a free and orderly world. We urge that the State Department reconsider its decision and issue visas to the Cuban scholars.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Bowen
General Secretary

**American Political Science Association**

*October 5, 2004*

The Honorable Colin L. Powell
Secretary of State
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Powell:

I am writing to express the grave concern of the American Political Science Association about reported decisions of the United States government to deny visas to Cuban scholars scheduled to attend the imminent meeting of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) in Nevada. It is our understanding that all of the Cuban scholars scheduled to attend the meeting were denied visas, after lengthy delays, and that a blanket denial of all visas for Cuban scholars to attend the LASA meeting is unprecedented.

The American Political Science Association has historically been pleased to join with the government of the United States in support of academic freedom and in opposition to use of visa denials to suppress free intellectual exchange. When the International Political Science Association meetings were last held in the United States we had very positive exchanges with the Department of State in assuring that appropriate scholars from the former Soviet Union would be free to receive visas to enter the United States for scholarly purposes, and we have never lost sight of how this occurred at a crucial time in the lead-up to that nation's peaceful transition to democracy.

We are troubled now to see the United States appear to back away from supporting academic freedom in international exchange. It appears that decisions to deny all visas have not been based on a case by case determination of risks to US national interests posed by the individuals involved. Rather we are left with the conclusion that the visa denials were a blanket decision that has the effect of using obstruction of intellectual exchange as a component of our foreign policy.

We object to this approach in principle and also find it counterproductive to US interests. The Cuban intellectuals affected by this decision have substantial influence over students and leaders in Cuba. By denying these Cuban scholars opportunities to engage with US and other scholars from world democracies we lose an extraordinary opportunity to promote debate and change within Cuba itself.

We are also concerned that this decision will signal to scholars in the world that the US is no longer an inviting environment for intellectual exchange. This has very real and immediate implications. The Latin American Studies Association itself will now surely need to reassess whether it can fulfill its mission to bring "together experts on Latin America from all disciplines and diverse occupational endeavors, across the globe" if future meetings are held in the United States. It would be an enormous loss to US national prestige, to scholarly advancement, to culture, economics, and governance in the Americas, and, for that matter, to US commerce and convention trade, should this happen.
We urge the administration to reconsider this decision, and also to issue a clear statement of reaffirmation of a national policy to oppose the use of visa denials to restrict academic freedom.

Sincerely,

Margaret Levi
President

Members of Congress
October 7, 2004

The Honorable Colin L. Powell
Secretary of State
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As co-chairs of the bipartisan House Cuba Working Group, we write to convey our deep disappointment with the apparent decision by State Department officials to deny visas to 65 Cuban scholars and researchers who were seeking to participate in the annual congress of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) that will take place this week in Las Vegas. We certainly appreciate the difficulty of assessing the suitability of potential visitors in a post-September 11 environment. And we would not presume to second-guess the weighing of the many factors that must be considered when reviewing each case - if that, in fact, had occurred. The State Department explained the wholesale rejection of everyone of these applications as reflecting our political differences with the Castro regime. In our view, this rationale is baseless and hypocritical. The principal impact of the decision is to undermine important scholarship - not only for Cubans, but across the United States and the entire hemisphere. We are particularly dismayed because this approach completely contradicts the guidance we have received personally on this precise question from senior officials of this Administration.

As you know, LASA is the professional association for scholars who study Latin America. Thousands of university professors and researchers attend its annual meeting, with hundreds of panel discussions on Latin American history, politics, art and culture. Cuban scholars are members of the Association, as are many other Latin American academics and professionals, and Cuban scholars have participated in LASA meetings for many years.

While the Administration has decided over the last two years to restrict other types of educational exchange between the US and Cuba, no such new policy has been promulgated with respect to this type of conference - and for good reason. It seems inarguable that free exchange between scholars, whatever their political views, is a cherished American value, and of special importance to the academic community in the United States. Denying Cuban academics visas to participate in a scholarly conference is at odds with fundamental notions of academic freedom. That is presumably why we routinely admit academics from Iran, China and dozens of other countries around the world - and why President Reagan authorized academic exchanges with Soviet scholars during the Cold War.

We know some of these Cuban applicants personally, including one who has been permitted to visit the US in the past no fewer than eleven times. Among these scholars are individuals who are precisely the kinds of independent free-thinkers who will be essential in the post-Castro Cuba envisioned by this Administration, and who should be encouraged to work with American counterparts. The Cuban scholars, who collectively have authored 120 books, range from economists and linguists, to art historians and sociologists, from chemists to psychologists.

We understand that Cuba's designation on the US list of terrorist nations means that Cuban visa applicants face special scrutiny; but special scrutiny is very different from no scrutiny. It is clear that the US State Department has denied all these requests not because each application is deficient, but solely because of the country of origin of the applicants. We were fully prepared for the possibility that some - or even many - of these petitions might be denied, either for security reasons, flight risk, or more routine considerations. It is not remotely credible, however, that all of these applications are so flawed.

This decision is especially perplexing because it is at complete odds with guidance offered over the past year by Administration officials - to LASA officials, to various universities sponsoring other activities involving Cuban visa applicants, and directly to Members of Congress.

You may recall that a similar problem materialized last year, when visa applications from more than 100 Cuban scholars invited to the 2003 LASA conference languished without final State Department action, some for nearly a year. This resulted in a Capitol Hill meeting for several House Members and Senate staff with Deputy Assistant Secretary Fisk and representatives of other federal agencies. The immediate purpose of that meeting was to ascertain the status of these longpending visas. The overarching objective was to clarify the Administration's protocol for evaluating visa petitions from Cuba intended for scholarly exchange and specifically to identify possible reasons for the lengthy processing delays.

The discussion at times was contentious, as when Mr. Fisk cited the lack of any bureaucratic tickler mechanism to keep track of applications forwarded to - but never retrieved from - the FBI, DEA or CIA; and when he conceded that State Department computers had trouble deciphering Hispanic surnames. Overall, however, the meeting was constructive; Mr. Fisk conceded the need for greater efficiency, clearer criteria, more inter-agency accountability and better public consultation. Within days, nearly all the visas were granted; as far as we are aware, the resulting visits proceeded without incident. And all concerned resolved to stay in touch to avoid such confusion in the future.

Accordingly, to help anticipate and preempt any possible glitches for the following year's conference, LASA officials met over the following months with US State Department personnel in both Washington and Havana on a number of occasions. These meetings covered visa application protocols and set specific timetables. The LASA representatives carried these directives to their national membership and to potential Cuban visa applicants. The applications were filed in a manner and on deadlines consistent with this
guidance. Any reasonable person would have concluded that the State Department would review the merits of these applications. That apparently was not the case.

As the 2004 conference date approached, LASA and other interested organizations repeatedly sought clarity about particular applications, and again were led to believe that the petitions were being reviewed individually. Finally, a week before the conference was to start, the State Department confirmed that none of the applicants would be approved because of US outrage about the detention of Cuban dissidents.

We are also strong critics of the Cuban government's crackdown on freedom of speech and association. But the arrests in Cuba occurred in spring of 2003, and the US Interest Section in Havana has issued countless visas since then. Moreover, at no time during the extended conversations with LASA officials throughout 2004 did this question ever arise. It is worth noting that this is the first time in 25 years that the US government has prevented all invited Cuban scholars from participating in LASA conferences.

More to the point, we do not believe that the way to encourage democracy in other countries is to close our border to their scholars. And after such extended and intensive efforts over the last year to work with the Administration on these procedures, we frankly are angry to learn that US scholars - as well as Members of Congress - have been treated in such a cavalier and disrespectful fashion. We have no ability or desire to speculate about the motives for the way the State Department has handled these applications. We all know that the Administration is pursuing a course with respect to US-Cuban relations that diverges dramatically from the mainstream of the US Congress. On three separate occasions in recent weeks, the full House has voted to repeal specific White House restrictions on travel to and from Cuba. For four consecutive years, the House has approved lifting the travel prohibitions altogether; last year, the Senate approved the same provision.

Sincerely,

Jeff Flake

William Delahunt
Members of Congress

Middle East Studies Association
October 11, 2004

The Honorable Colin Powell
Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Powell,

I am writing to add the voices of the board of the Middle East Studies Association to those of the Latin American Studies Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Historical Association and others to express our dismay regarding the rejection last week, without explanation, of some sixty-one visa applications from Cuban scholars and intellectuals who were to have participated in the LASA annual meeting 7-9 October.

This unprecedented rejection of Cuban scholars' participation in US academic fora would in and of itself be sufficient for deep concern regarding the US government position on free enquiry and open exchange of ideas. Such exchange has long been a hallmark of the US educational system; indeed, it has contributed to the strength and superior reputation of this system at home and abroad over the years.

We in MESA are particularly disturbed by this rejection, as it comes on the heels of the revocation - also without explanation - of the visa of Tariq Ramadan, a prominent Egyptian-Swiss scholar of Islam, who was scheduled to assume a Luce Professorship at Notre Dame this semester, and about whom we wrote, expressing our dismay several weeks ago. Combined with other, similar, if less high profile, cases, we can only conclude that this rejection of visas for prominent scholars is part of an evolving trend which, whether intended or not, amounts to censorship, and leads to a circumscribing of free public intellectual and policy debate in this country.

Such developments are particularly surprising given the contents of the 2004 Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, which carries the seal of the US Department of State itself in which "Exposure to American culture and values through personal relationships and understanding" is argued to be key to the success of long-term public diplomacy programs. (p. 18). The document also acknowledges the "increased perception that US borders are no longer open to friendly business people, students....America's historical influence with international business leaders, students and other

It is too late for a review of the case of these Cuban scholars. The damage done to the image of the US as such cases proliferate is hard to quantify, but must certainly be far greater than any gains being made through new public diplomacy initiatives at this critical time the international image of the United States has plummeted in an unprecedented way. As scholars who have ourselves benefited from programs and policies of exchange between the US and the Middle East, we are extremely disturbed by these developments. For a country with the tremendous resources of the United States there must be ways to ensure security without compromising the basic values that have contributed to the positive image people had of our country in the past.

Sincerely,

Laurie A. Brand
President
Middle East Studies Association

U.S. Denies Cuban Scholars Entry to Attend a Meeting
October 1, 2004

By Nina Bernstein, The New York Times

The Bush administration has denied entry to all 61 Cuban scholars scheduled to participate in the Latin American Studies Association's international congress in Las Vegas next week, deeming them "detrimental to the interests of the United States."
The last-minute move, which comes on the heels of new restrictions on travel by Americans to Cuba, is provoking anger and dismay among leading American academics, who called it an unprecedented effort to sever scholarly exchanges that have been conducted since 1979.

Darla Jordan, a spokeswoman for the State Department, said that the decision reflected the stricter policies toward Cuba announced last year by President Bush as a strategy to hasten the end of Fidel Castro’s government. Citing 68 members of the opposition in Cuba who remain in prison there after being arrested in 2003, she said, "We will not have business as usual with the regime that so outrageously violates the human rights of the peaceful opposition."

But organizers of the conference, to be held next Thursday through Saturday, said they learned of the denial only on Tuesday, after months of assurances by State Department officials that the visas were on track. Those rejected include poets, sociologists, art historians and economists, among them a professor who was a visiting scholar at Harvard last fall and others who have frequently lectured at leading American universities.

"This is attacking one of the fundamental principles of academic life in the United States, which is freedom of inquiry," said Marysa Navarro, a historian at Dartmouth who is president of the association, the world’s largest academic organization for individuals and institutions that study Latin America. "I asked when was the decision made, and I was told that it was very recent and it was very high up, so it was either the secretary of state or the White House."

"It's an election year," she added, "and I think we're being held hostage to satisfy that sector of the U.S. electorate which is against any kind of relations with Cuba."

The Bush administration has undertaken tough measures against Cuba in the pre-election season that administration officials say are intended to help establish Cuba as a democratic free-market state. But critics say the measures are chiefly devised to strengthen the incumbent's backing among Cuban-Americans in Florida, a swing state.

"Restricting access of Cuban academics to the United States is consistent with the overall tightening of our policy," Ms. Jordan said, noting that Cuban academic institutions are state run. "Our policy is not about restricting academic exchanges or freedom of expression. It is the Castro regime that does that through its restrictive issuance of passports and exit permits only to those academics on whom it can rely to promote its agenda of repression and misrepresentation about Cuba and the United States."

But this characterization of the invited Cuban academics was angrily rejected by John Coatsworth, director of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard. "I can tell you with a certainty that that's a lie," Professor Coatsworth said, noting that among the scholars denied visas are five contributing authors to a book on the Cuban economy in the early 20th century, which the center is publishing next month.

He said that one, Omar Everleny Pérez Villanueva, who was a visiting scholar at Harvard last fall, even wrote his dissertation on the benefits of direct foreign investment in Cuba.

"They are honest, they're courageous, they do superb work," Professor Coatsworth said. "These are the kind of people who let the Soviet Union become Russia. This policy of restricting people-to-people contacts only benefits those who would benefit from violent change instead of a peaceful transition."

Professor Navarro said that the United States had not imposed blanket restrictions on scholars from other countries where political dissidents are jailed. Among the presenters at the conference are four scholars from China who apparently had no difficulty with visas, she said.

Though 75 percent of the association's 5,000 members live in the United States, its international congress, held every 18 months, draws participants from all over the world. Forty-five sessions out of 600 will have to be canceled, organizers said, including panels on contemporary Cuban poetry, gender in Cuban literature, and Cuban agriculture.

The message it confirms to the rest of the world, said Kristin Ruggiero, a historian who directs the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "is that the borders are closing."

U.S. Denies Visas to 65 Cuban Scholars Planning to Attend an Academic Conference
October 1, 2004

By Sara Lipka, The Chronicle of Higher Education

All 65 Cuban scholars who had planned to attend an international conference of the Latin American Studies Association next week in Las Vegas were informed on Tuesday that their requests for U.S. visas had been denied.

The conference is held every 18 months, and on previous occasions the U.S. Department of State has refused to issue visas for some Cubans who sought to attend. This is the first time that the entire delegation has been turned away since the first Cubans participated in the conference, in 1979.

Representatives of the association, which is commonly known as LASA, expressed frustration that the State Department had announced its decision so close to the date of the conference. "Those of us who are suspicious say that it's not by accident — it's simply part and parcel of making the process as complicated and as stressful as possible," said H. Michael Erisman, co-chairman of the association's Cuba section and a professor of political science at Indiana State University. "But that's just a conspiratorial theory."

Mr. Erisman had visited the U.S. Interests Section in Havana last November to “work out a procedure which we hoped would avoid any of these kind of last-minute crises," he said. The Cuban scholars, who were told that their visa-application process would take approximately three months, applied as early as April for this month's conference.

In May, Marysa Navarro, president of
LASA and a professor of history at Dartmouth College, and Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, the association's executive director, met with officials in the State Department's Office of Cuban Affairs, in Washington.

"We were given every indication that decisions would be made on the merits of individual cases," Ms. Navarro said in a written statement issued on Wednesday.

Mr. Erisman said he believes that the Cuban scholars' visa applications "were pushed upstairs, and the decisions were made at a higher level than would normally have been the case." When the Cubans learned of the blanket denial, they quickly informed their U.S.-based colleagues, and both groups sought explanations from the State Department.

Those inquiries were met with different responses, said Ms. Navarro, asking a reporter, "What did they tell you?" Steven L. Pike, a spokesman for the State Department, blamed the problem on the Cuban government of Fidel Castro. "Restricting access of Cuban academics to the United States is consistent with the overall tightening of our policy," Mr. Pike said. "Our policy is not about restricting academic exchanges or freedom of expression. It is the Castro regime that does that through restrictive issuance of passports and exit permits only to those academics on whom it can rely to promote its agenda of repression and misrepresentation."

In denying the visas, the State Department cited a 1985 proclamation by President Ronald Reagan declaring the presence in the United States of Cuban-government employees "detrimental to the interests of the United States." (All professors are public employees in Cuba.)

LASA officials said they planned to protest the department's decision, "but I think all of us know that that's a long shot," said Mr. Erisman.

Meanwhile, at least three conference panels in which the Cuban scholars were to have participated have been suspended. And the scholars themselves must cancel and seek reimbursement for their airplane flights, which were already reserved. Furthermore, the $100 visa-

application fee paid by each Cuban is not refundable, a policy that will create economic hardship for the professors, who earn approximately $40 per month, according to Mr. Erisman.

One of the Cuban delegates, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said that the scholars had spent up to a year preparing papers to present at the conference. "Suddenly, with this decision that we can't participate, all of that is up in the air," she said. "We consider it an unjust measure without rationale."

**U.S. denies visas to 61 Pitt-bound Cubans**

*October 1, 2004*

By Lillian Thomas, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

The State Department has denied visas to 61 Cuban scholars who were scheduled to present papers at the University of Pittsburgh-based Latin American Studies Association's international congress next week.

The scholars found out the visas were denied on Monday and the association was notified Wednesday. The denial at the last moment came as a surprise because the association had been in regular contact with State Department officials for months, said Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas.

"I was confident because we'd been in close contact with the State Department since May," she said. "We met with officials, and we kept calling each other. I knew some would be rejected as usual, but not 100 percent."

State Department spokesman Edgar Vasquez said the visas were denied based on Section 212F of the Immigration and Nationality Act. "This act suspends entry into the United States of officers and employees of the Cuban government and Communist Party with very limited exceptions," he said. "Cuban academic institutions are state-run and the Cuban government tightly controls the activities of its academics."

The act has not previously been used to prevent academic exchanges.

"It is consistent with the overall tightening of our policy recommended by the report for the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba and as directed by the president," Vasquez said.

Asked whether President Bush ordered the visa denials, Vasquez said "the president has been pretty clear" about his views on Cuba.

Association officials said the visa denials so close to the Wednesday opening of the conference in Las Vegas are causing many problems. All 61 Cubans were presenting papers at the congress, said Pereyra-Rojas, and they were participating in 45 sessions (out of about 600 sessions altogether). Some sessions may have to be canceled, and money paid for airline reservations may be lost.

"If they knew from the beginning, they should have told us not to apply because they didn't want any academic exchanges," said Pereyra-Rojas.

"Our policy is not about restricting academic exchanges or freedom of expression," said Vasquez. "The Castro regime has a policy of restrictive issuance of passports and exit visas only to those academics on whom it can rely to promote its agenda of repression and misrepresentations about Cuba and the United States."

A statement from the Washington Office on Latin America, an advocacy organization based in Washington that sponsored some of the Cuban academics who were denied visas, called the decision "outrageous."

"It's sad to see the administration playing politics on an issue of academic freedom," said Geoff Thale, senior associate for Cuba at the organization. "No one believes that giving some Cuban professors short-term visas to do presentations at an academic conference threatens the security of the United States. Scholars ought to be able to meet and exchange information, and points of view; our government shouldn't be in the business of denying visas to legitimate scholars."
LASA2004 in Las Vegas, NV

Final Report from the Program Committee
by Kristin Ruggiero, Program Chair
University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee
ruggiero@uwm.edu

The Program Committee for the LASA2004 Congress relinquishes the reins of Congress organizing with some relief, but also with some sadness. I have calculated that if we added up the number of months each person on the Program Committee spent on putting this Congress together, that we would end up with a total of about twelve years! That's a lot of service to LASA. But I learned in this process that ours is only part of the service that goes on in this organization which makes us all proud to be involved in the running of it. LASA members spent countless hours putting together sessions, finding just the right person to fill out the discussion, and then graciously accommodating additional members who had submitted individual proposals. I would like to thank them for their enthusiastic participation in organizing the sessions and their commitment to inclusiveness. They achieved a program that was diverse and challenging. One only has to consult Table 1 to see the richness of the group of people who came together in Las Vegas. 31.87 percent came from outside the United States, most from Latin American countries, but countries such as Fiji, Greece, India, Japan, and Taiwan also figure in this list.

The Track Chairs and Section Chairs of the 2004 Congress proved to be an excellent team of creative and industrious people, along with Claudia Ferman, who gathered together a very impressive group of films and directors for the film festival. The local arrangements committee, headed by John Tuman at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and composed of Tom Wright, Doug Unger, and Pat Scales all of UNLV, and Sondra Cosgrove of the Community College of Southern Nevada, hosted a spectacular welcome reception (with the help of Tony Sanchez and Bob Bass) and paved the way for a smoothly running Congress by providing numerous volunteer registration workers.

The LASA Secretariat, headed by Executive Director Milagros Pereyra and composed of Maria Cecilia Dancisin, Jennifer Crawford, and Sharon Paris, designed and implemented (all in just eighteen months) an online proposal submission and evaluation process. This and several other innovations greatly streamlined the organization process. Refinement of the system will continue, I am sure, under my successor as Program Chair, Frances Aparicio. Sancy Klinzing, along with LASA President Marysa Navarro, coordinated the fund-raising activities of the past eighteen months. Despite an inhospitable economic situation at U.S. foundations and agencies, LASA was able to secure funding support for 151 travel grants. Table 2 shows the distribution of these grants by country of provenance of the recipient.

Under Marysa Navarro's energetic leadership, I believe that the Program Committee can count the LASA2004 Congress a great success in its intellectual endeavors and in its commitment to academic freedom. As I wrote in my message in the Summer 2003 Forum, every time we meet as LASA, borders come down. What happened at LASA2004 certainly challenges this thought. Minus our Cuban colleagues who were denied visas to come to LASA, we did however get to meet as an organization and group of voices that will continue to try to advocate for academic freedom and the value of international exchange.

Marysa Navarro
acknowledges
Congress Chair
Kristin Ruggiero
Table 1: Number and Percent of Participants by Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N° of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>61.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N° of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 3665

Table 2: Grant Requests and Acceptance Rates by Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 498

ENDNOTES

1 Numbers and percentages based on original program book. Any changes noted in the program supplements are not included.

2 These figures are based on the notifications of awards initially sent out in the Summer of 2004. The final distribution and total number may differ because not all awards were accepted. Proposals were accepted only from residents of Latin America and the Caribbean for LASA2004. The recipients shown as “United States” and other countries outside Latin America and the Caribbean were Student grantees.
President Marysa Navarro began at 7:15 p.m. by welcoming members to the business meeting of the Association's XXV Congress. She indicated that the first portion of the meeting would be dedicated to the Awards Ceremony, and turned over the podium to Past President Arturo Arias, chair of the Kalman Silvert Award Committee.

Presentation of LASA Awards

Arturo Arias reported that at the Silvert Lecture that morning the Kalman Silvert Award had been presented to June Nash, one of the founders of the Graduate Program in Anthropology at the City University of New York and one of the “great pioneers of feminist studies in anthropology, author of two classical books, and a wonderful role model of a committed, ethical scholar who does first-rate work”. (Members of the committee included Thomas Holloway, Franklin Knight, Peter Ward and Jean Franco.)

Navarro then recognized this year’s recipient of the LASA/Oxfam-America Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship, Jonathan Fox, who would be honored at the following day’s Martin Diskin Lecture. (Norma Chinchilla had chaired, with Ruth Behar, Mary Goldsmith, Lowell Gudmundson, Enrique Mayer and Ray Offenheiser serving on the committee.)

Norma Klahn presented the Bryce Wood Book Award on behalf of Andres Avellaneda, chair of the committee. The Bryce Wood Award is presented to the outstanding book in the social sciences and the humanities published in English. The 2004 award recipients are Charles L. Briggs and Clara Mantini Briggs for their book Stories in the Time of Cholera: Racial Profiling During a Medical Nightmare, University of California Press, 2003. Klahn lauded the book as more than an account of a cholera epidemic in eastern Venezuela, but “an indictment of the social production of disease and its toll in human lives...cholera signals the collapse of political, economic, environmental, and social infrastructure throughout the region”. The authors also critique the “international health response to cholera and the collective, uncaring complicity of wealthier, white people throughout the world.” (Other members of the committee were Graciela Ducatenziker, Lynn Morgan and Karin Rosembllatt.)

The committee also awarded a Bryce Wood Honorable Mention to Leslie Salsinger for Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico’s Global Factories, University of California Press, 2003. Klahn praised the book as showing “how gendered subjectivities are produced on the shop floor and how these shape the production process”. The author “demonstrates how transnational production process is shaped by national and regional identities as well as gender...this book is tightly argued, creative and full of insights”.

The Premio Iberoamericano is presented to the outstanding book in the social sciences and the humanities published in Spanish. The award was presented by committee member Claudia de Lima Costa on behalf of chair Tulio Halperin Dongui. De Lima Costa indicated that participating on the committee had been a fascinating experience, and the discussion with other committee members had been extremely productive. The 2004 awardee is Juan Carlos Quintero Herencia for his book Fulgaración del Espacio. Letras e Imaginario Institucional de la Revolución Cubana, 1960-1971. (Committee members included de Lima Costa, Manuel Alcantara and Ana Maria Amar Sanchez.)

Claudia Gilman’s book, Entre la Pluma y el Fusil. Debates y Dilemas del Escritor Revolucionario en América Latina, was selected to receive a Premio Iberoamericano Honorable Mention.

The Media Award was presented by Ana Lau, committee member, on behalf of John Mraz, chair. The 2004 recipient, Julio Scherer Garcia of Proceso, could not attend the Congress because of health reasons. Scherer began his career with the newspaper Excelsior, where he was eventually named director in 1968. Under his guidance, Excelsior became one of the ten best newspapers in the world. Scherer used the newspaper to rebel against corruption and to denounce the Guerra Sucia. In 1976, Scherer and a group of his colleagues had to leave the newspaper because of his criticism of the presidency of Luis Echeverria. The creation of Proceso restored liberty and independence for generations of newspapermen and opened a period of freedom of expression that many young newspaper people have enjoyed. In 1996 Julio Scherer became Director of Proceso and dedicated himself to writing about power and politics. In the words of Jesus Blanco Ornela, “Don Julio les inoculó a muchos con su terquedad por la verdad.” Lau accepted the award on Scherer’s behalf. (Other committee members included Janice Hurtig, Ernesto Lopez and Veronica Schild.)

Claudia Ferman, Director of the LASA Film Festival and Exhibit presented awards to those films selected for the Merit Award in Film. Representatives of five of the films were present and were recognized with their awards: Amalio, director of Caracoles: New Paths of Resistance; Alex Rivera, producer and director of The Sixth Sense; Cristinne Hopkin, researcher for Nascendo no Brasil-Born in Brazil; Greg Berger, director and producer for Gringothon; and Randy Vasquez, producer and director, and Maira Guardado, protagonist, for Testimony, The Maria Guardado Story.

President Navarro acknowledged Dr. Ferman’s hard work in organizing the Film Festival, calling special attention to the innovations she had introduced.
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Norma Klahn presents the Bryce Wood Book Award to Charles Briggs and Clara Mantini Briggs

Claudia de Lima Costa presents the Premio Iberoamericano Book Award to Juan Carlos Quintero Herencia

Norma Chinchilla presents the Martin Diskin Lectureship Recognition to Jonathan Fox

Claudia Ferman with Randy Vasquez, one of the recipients of the LASA Merit Award in Film, with protagonist Maria Guardado
LASA Business Meeting

President’s Report

President Navarro began her report by presenting a special award to LASA2004 Program Chair Kristin Ruggiero. She acknowledged Ruggiero’s dedication to organizing the program and indicated how much she had enjoyed working with a fellow historian.

She began her president’s report with a reference to the announcement in 1966 by Kalman Silvert that he and his colleagues had just set in motion the establishment of the Latin American Studies Association. At the time, Navarro had barely completed her Ph.D., but indicated her certainty that Silvert, whom she knew, would be pleased to see that she had served as president of the association he helped to found. Navarro acknowledged again the enormous contribution of former Executive Director (E.D.) Reid Reading, but lauded the expertise of new E.D. Milagros Pereyra, who had brought a renewed energy and increased use of technology to the Secretariat.

Navarro also thanked Treasurer John French for his work and solidarity with the Executive Council. She acknowledged the contributions of the three EC members whose terms were ending. In addition to French they are Arturo Escobar and Florencia Mallon. The newly-elected Vice President is Charles Hale, and the EC members are Antonio Aguilar, Lynne Stephen and Elizabeth Jelin.

Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Milagros Pereyra thanked LASA members for their participation in the Congress, and without whose support it would not have been possible. Pereyra acknowledged the work of Maria Cecilia Dancisin, Congress Coordinator, and Jennifer Crawford, Membership Coordinator. For LASA 2004, 850 papers received electronically had been put on a CDrom for distribution. Other electronic innovations included on-line Congress pre-registration and a web-based searchable database of LASA member research interests. The expanded use of electronic communication had also meant a cost savings for the Association. The Secretariat also had made a concerted effort to review proposals from Cuban scholars and to initiate the process early for approval of visa applications. Sadly, despite all efforts, all 61 Cuban applicants had been denied. Pereyra asked that members not hesitate to communicate with the Secretariat and offer their suggestions for improvement of services to members. She thanked President Navarro for all her efforts during the previous 18 months of transition, Kristin Ruggiero for her dedication to the success of the LASA2004 Congress, Reid Reading for serving as a constant resource to her, and Sandy Klinzing, to whom she presented a clock as recognition of her “ten years of dedicated service to LASA”.

Report of XXV Program Chair

Program Chair Kristin Ruggiero indicated that she viewed the close of LASA2004 with very mixed feelings. She would now have time for other activities but would miss the LASA2004 Program Committee. Track chairs had spent countless hours reviewing and selecting proposals, and then additional hours assigning individual submissions to sessions. She thanked Claudia Ferman for her efforts with the LASA Film Festival, the Local Arrangements Committee headed by John Tuman and composed of Thomas Wright, Doug Unger and Pat Scales of UNLV and Sandra Csgrove of the Community College of Southern Nevada. Thanks also to Tony Sanchez and Bob Bass for contributions to the Welcoming Reception. Ruggiero acknowledged the Secretariat staff for their “enormous and tireless dedication to constructing the Congress”. E.D. Pereyra had introduced innovations that helped streamline the registration and proposal review processes. Finally she thanked Marysa Navarro for “bringing a sense of equity, generosity and good humor to the Congress and to (Ruggiero’s) life for the past 18 months”.

Report of the Treasurer

Treasurer John French reported that under Reid Reading and the new E.D., Milagros Pereyra, there had been a careful handling of the Association’s resources, and LASA was in a secure financial position. Also under Pereyra a process for defining procedures and elaborating on them had been formalized, so that future treasurers would have a more defined path to follow. New future initiatives include consultation with a financial consultant to make recommendations on financial procedures and oversee an audit. French had also worked with the Investment Committee to oversee the LASA Endowment and assured members that everything possible was being done to assure the good health of the Endowment and all the resources of the Association.

Report of the Vice President

Vice President Sonia Alvarez acknowledged that it was an honor to follow in the footsteps of her mentor Marysa Navarro. She thanked Navarro for steering the transition to a new Secretariat and presented Navarro with a plaque in her honor. The plaque reads: “Presented to Marysa Navarro Aranguren, President of LASA 2003-2004, for exceptional service to the Association and an enduring dedication to its mission, by the members of the Latin American Studies Association, October 8, 2004.”

Alvarez continued with reference to the LASA Strategic Plan. Attention will be given to operationalizing two remaining priority areas: 1) Enhancing the role of underrepresented groups and historically underrepresented voices in LASA, with particular attention to Afro-descendant individuals, and 2) continuing LASA’s tradition of engagement in the wider public debate which directly intervenes with the ability to carry on scholarly work (the denying of Cuban visas for example). Plans include targeted fundraising to bring underrepresented groups to LASA Congresses and to facilitate their continuing roles within LASA. To address the engagement of public debate, LASA will rely upon the expertise of LASA members and Sections to establish task forces to respond with agility to situations such as the denial of Cuban visas. Shortly, she will ask each section to designate a media liaison to be called upon to mobilize a quick response to issues as they arise.
Lastly Alvarez indicated that, based upon the work of the LASA Forum sub-committee, she will recommend a new format for the LASA Forum. Subgroups and sections will be invited to submit issues centered on debates of interest to the LASA membership.

Alvarez announced that Frances Aparicio has agreed to be LASA2006 Program Chair for the Congress that will take place in San Juan, Puerto Rico in March, 2006. The theme for the Congress is “Decentering Latin American Studies”. A further description will appear in the call for papers.

Proposed Resolutions

Alvarez briefly reviewed the resolutions procedure. She then indicated that two resolutions having to do with Cuba had been received by the Executive Council, and after friendly amendments, had been recommended for submission to the LASA membership. (Please see the text of the resolutions at the LASA website.) Alvarez then read the first resolution, submitted by Milagros Martinez.

The floor was then opened for discussion. Steve Schwadron, chief of staff of Congressman Bill Delahunt of Massachusetts, was invited to speak. Mr. Schwadron indicated that Congressman Delahunt is the Democratic co-chair of a bipartisan 52 member working group in the House of Representatives on U.S.-Cuban relations. The group had been working with LASA representatives on the issue of Cuban representation at the Congress. Schwadron reminded LASA members that for LASA 2003 more than 100 visas had been pending for, in some cases, over a year. One week before that Congress, the sub-committee had convened a meeting with representatives of the Harvard Rockefeller Center and senior State Department officials to determine the status of the applications and to learn about the visa review process in general. It is known that applications from Cuba receive special scrutiny for some unclear reasons as well. After that meeting all 100+ visas were granted. Soon after that Congress the group initiated a process to enhance the process, to set up checkpoints, etc. Despite these efforts the State Department had responded only days before LASA2004 and denied all Cuban visa applications. It was evident to Schwadron that there was no review based on the merits of each application. The role of the committee has been to assure that the State Department does fulfill its obligation to apply its rules equitably to applicants from around the world. The committee is concerned about restrictions which limit the opportunity of academics to do their jobs.

An additional speaker indicated her support of the resolution because it addressed academic freedom for all. There was some discussion regarding the number of Cubans whose applications had been denied, 61 or 65. The number is changed to 65, to accommodate four later added by the Cubans proposing the resolution. Acceptance of the resolution was moved and seconded. A count indicated a unanimous sense of the meeting in favor of the resolution. It will now be sent to the LASA membership.

Alvarez then read the second resolution, submitted by Ron Chilcote and Peter Ward on behalf of Latin American publishers.

“Therefore the Latin American Studies Association supports the Association of American Publishers and the Association of American University Presses lawsuit filed on September 27, 2004 asking the court to strike down the OFAC ruling.”

Ron Chilcote provided background on the particular incident that brought about the resolution. He asked that if approved, the resolution be very broadly distributed. Alvarez responded that the Secretariat will rely upon the resolution’s proponents to provide specific recipients.

Reid Reading reminded attendees that LASA had been co-plaintiff in a suit with the Center for Constitutional Rights during the Sandinista period in Nicaragua when notes taken by researchers were seized by customs officials. He recommended consideration of a co-plaintiff position again. Alvarez responded that the Executive Council had appointed a Task Force to address both resolutions’ concerns and make recommendations to the Executive Council on how to proceed.

Acceptance of the resolution as amended was moved and seconded. A voice vote indicated unanimous approval. The resolution will be submitted to the LASA membership.

There being no new business, President Navarro officially closed the meeting.

Sonia Alvarez presents a special recognition to LASA
President Marysa Navarro
NEWS FROM LASA

Newly Elected Officials Took Office November 1

Professor Charles R. Hale, University of Texas/Austin, is LASA’s new vice president and president-elect. He will serve as vice president until April 30, 2006, as LASA president from May 1, 2006 until October 31, 2007, and as immediate past president from November 1, 2007 until April 30, 2009. Joining Professor Hale on the LASA Executive Council as new Council members are: Professors Jose Antonio Aguilar, Centro de Investigaciones y Docencia Económica; Elizabeth Jelin, Consejo de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas; and Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon. Each will serve a three-year term.

Sonia Alvarez, University of California/Santa Cruz, assumed the LASA presidency November 1, will act in that capacity until April 30, 2006, and then as immediate past president until October 31, 2007. Marysa Navarro will continue on the Council as immediate past president until April 30, 2006. Joining the Council ex officio for the period November 1, 2004 until April 30, 2006, is Frances Aparicio, program chair for LASA2006

LASA Voluntary Support
By Sandy Klinzing

Give yourselves a big pat on the back! Because of your generous support, $5,497 was raised from members and friends for the LASA Travel Fund for LASA2004. When added to the $170,000 in foundation grants, and a credit from LASA2003 travel, a total of $189,282 was available for funding for Latin American and Caribbean scholars’ participation. In all, 146 grants were made, including 25 to Cuban participants, who ultimately were not able to obtain visas to travel to Las Vegas. The Student Fund also received significant support. Contributions totaling $6,700 provided grants for 24 student members to help defray the costs associated with their participation. LASA owes each and every donor a large debt of gratitude!

Since our last report, the following donors contributed to the LASA Travel Fund. Thank you!

Oscar Alatriste
Andres Avellaneda
Peter Blanchard
Jonathan Brown
Amy Chazkel
John Coatsworth
Trudie Coker
Javier Corrales
Jerry Davila
Rut Diamint
Susan Eckstein
Maria Dolores-Espinosa
Carmen Ferradas
Marisela Fleites-Lear
Jonathan Fox
Lessie Jo Frazier
Henry Frundt

Maria Pilar Garcia-Guadilla
Bruce Goldstein
Luis Guarnizo
Theodore Henken
Evelyn Hu-DeHart
Adriana Michele Johnson
Hal Philip Klepak
Mary Kubal
Ramon Larrauri Torroella
Ken Lindeman
Emily Maguire
Boris Wolfang Marañon Pimentel
Michael Millar
Sharon Múñica
Marysa Navarro Aranguren
Sutti Ortiz

Carlos Parodi
Thomas Perreault
Nancy Postero
Cynthia Radding
Gladys Rivera Herrejon
Cristina Saenz de Tejada
Alejandro San Francisco
Maria Cecilia Santos
Maureen Shea
William Smith
Peter Stern
Silvio Torres-Saillant
Mirei Uriarte
Martin Weinstein
Cynthia Wood
Angus Wrig

Thanks also to these donors to the Student Fund!

Silvia Alvarez Curbelo
Catherine Benamou
Rebecca Biron
Kirk Bowman
Robert Conn
Rut Diamint
Marc Edelman
Ramon Figueroa Tejada

Elizabeth Ginway
Bruce Goldstein
Theodore Henken
Margaret Keck
Ramon Larrauri Torroella
Ryan Long
Katherine McCaffrey
Alberto Olvera

Martha Rees
Michael Rolland
Jennifer Schirmmer
Diana Sorensen
Peter Stern
Alejandra Vallejo
Ian Peter Wogart
Many donors contributed to several funds at one time, and the Endowment also received major support. Contributors to the General Endowment include:

Helga Baitenmann
Kirk Bowman
Philip Brenner
Claudia De Lima Costa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gabriela Diaz de Gallegos</th>
<th>William Nylen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessie Jo Frazier</td>
<td>J. Timmons Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Adler Hellman</td>
<td>Vicky Unruh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Korzeniewicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And donors to the Humanities Endowment are:

Severino Joao Albuquerque
Trudie Coker
Brad Epps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elizabeth Ginway</th>
<th>Diane Marting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Goldstein</td>
<td>Anton Rosenthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Larrauri Torroella</td>
<td>Peter Stern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donors of $100 or more to either the Travel or Student Fund will receive a LASA mug. If yours has not already arrived, it will be forthcoming. THANK YOU TO ALL!

LASA Life Memberships

We reprint here a note prepared by Lars Schoultz on behalf of LASA Life Memberships. Thank you, Lars!

Dear LASA Colleague:

As you may remember, a decade ago LASA approached the Ford Foundation with what had become a regular grant proposal to bring Latin American scholars to our Los Angeles Congress. Ford agreed to help one more time, but pointed out that there were limits to what one foundation could do (at the time we were relying upon Ford almost exclusively), and especially that LASA was lagging far behind other professional associations in creating an endowment that could some day pay for part of these and other expenses — not just travel, but other important items such as subsidized dues for junior scholars and reduced-price subscriptions for struggling libraries.

LASA took that challenge seriously, and in the years ahead the Association hopes to receive bequests and other types of gifts, but to date the LASA Endowment has been built with a major one-time challenge grant from Ford and through life memberships — and that is why I am writing you: to ask if you would consider joining the 56 of us who have become Life Members.

It's easy, but pricey at $2,500, payable in three annual installments. (If you prefer you may tailor an individual program by contacting the LASA Secretariat.) Almost all of that amount, however, $2,200, will go directly to the LASA endowment and is therefore considered a contribution to a nonprofit/charitable organization — a 501(c)(3). (The rest goes to dues, which are also deductible if you itemize.)

May I point out the advantages?

1. Dues for senior people are $102/year. Assuming no increase in dues (which, as you know, is preposterous) and assuming you are in a 35% (federal and state) tax bracket, as most senior professors are, then the first-year tax savings is $805 in the form of a lowered tax bill. By not having to pay annual dues, you will re-coup the rest in 14.6 years.
2. At each LASA Congress you will receive an automatic invitation to the luncheon in honor of the Kalman Silvert Award recipient.
3. You will never again have to send LASA an annual dues check.
4. At each LASA Congress a special nametag will identify you as a Life Member — the idea is to make your friends think about signing up, too.

But, frankly, the idea is obviously not to offer you a great deal, but for your and my generations to help LASA onto a more solid financial foundation.

So, may I ask you on behalf of the other 55 Life Members if you will help? Please contact Sandy Klinzing at the LASA Secretariat (<sklinz@pitt.edu> or 412-648-1907) and ask her how you can become a Life Member. I promise you that it very well may be your best investment ever.

Thanks, Lars

CALL FOR PAPERS FOR LASA2006 INCLUDED WITH THIS FORUM.

PLEASE NOTE CAREFULLY ALL INSTRUCTIONS AND THE APRIL 1, 2005 DEADLINE

We’ll see you in San Juan, March 15-18, 2006!
CALL FOR PAPERS
LASA2006 / De-Centering Latin American Studies

XXVI INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION
March 15-18, 2006, San Juan, Puerto Rico

LASA President: Sonia E. Alvarez, University of California/Santa Cruz
Program Chair: Frances Aparicio, University of Illinois/Chicago

Congress Theme: From its inception, LASA has proven to be a vital forum for scholarly collaboration and intellectual exchange among U.S.-based Latin Americanists and colleagues in Latin America, the Caribbean, and around the globe. Yet despite our growing international membership (currently nearing 30 percent), Latin American Studies, as an institutionalized knowledge formation, remains largely centered in the US and LASA is arguably still a “US-centric” area studies association. The 2006 Congress seeks to further the “de-centering” and transnationalization of the field by featuring sessions on how the study of Latin America, the Caribbean and its peoples is practiced in distinctive ways within the US (e.g., Latin American/Latina/o Studies), in Latin America and the Caribbean, and in other regions of the world. The Congress would hope to build on the wide variety of approaches and epistemologies that emerge from multiple positionalities and diverse geopolitical locations in collectively (re)imagining Latin American Studies for the 21st century.

You are invited to submit a proposal for LASA2006 addressing the above theme and/or any topics related to the program tracks listed below. A complete electronic copy of the proposal, including requests for travel grants by proposers residing in Latin America or the Caribbean, or requests for student travel grants, must be sent to the LASA Secretariat (lasa@pitt.edu or lasacongress@pitt.edu) by April 1, 2005. On-line proposal forms will be available at http://lasa.international.pitt.edu after December 1, 2004. The Secretariat will send confirmation of the receipt of the proposal via e-mail.

No submissions by regular mail will be accepted. E-mail inquiries may be sent to lasa@pitt.edu.

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

Agrarian and Rural Issues
Neil Harvey, New Mexico State University
Niruka Perez, University De La Habana

Art History and Architecture
Luis Aponte Pares, University of Massachusetts - Boston

Children, Youth and Youth Cultures
Vicky Mayer, Tulane University

Cities and Urban Studies
Brian Wampler, Boise State University

Citizenship, Social Justice, and Human Rights
Fiona Macaulay, University of Oxford

Culture, Politics, and Society
Marc Zimmerman, University of Houston
Liv Sovik, Universidad Federal Do Rio de Janeiro

Democratization
Kathryn Hochstetler, Colorado State University
Elizabeth Friedman, University of San Francisco

Economics: Local, Regional, Global
Alfred Montero, Carleton College

Education and Educational Policies
Rene Antrop Gonzalez, University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee
Anthony De Jesus, City University of New York

Environmental Issues and Environmental Justice
Yvette Percotico, University of Michigan

Expressive Cultures: Visual Arts, Music, Theater, and Dance
Luis Ramos Garcia, University of Minnesota

Film and Documentary Studies
Catherine Benamou, University of Michigan

Feminist Studies
Pat Zavella, University of California/Santa Cruz

Genders, Sexualities and LGB Studies
Juanita Diaz, State University of New York/Binghamton

Globalization and Transnationalism
Millie Thayer, University of Massachusetts/Amherst

Histories and Historiographies
Gabriela Arredondo, University of California/Santa Cruz

Christopher Boyer, University of Illinois/Chicago

Health, Science, and Society
Sonia Draibe, State University of Campinas

Indigeneities and Ethnicities
Mayle Blackwell, University of California/Los Angeles

Labor Studies and Class Relations
Marta Pana, Universidad De Buenos Aires

Latin/o/a in the United States
Gianetta Candelario, Smith College

Law, Jurisprudence, and Society
Viviana Kluger, Universidad de Buenos Aires

Literary Studies: Colonial and Nineteenth Century
Luís Fernando Reis, University of Arkansas

Literary Studies: Contemporary
Nicasio Urbina, Tulane University

Literature and Culture: Interdisciplinary Approaches
Silvia Spitta, Dartmouth College

Mass Media and Popular Culture
Arlene Dávila, New York University

Migration and Cross-Border Studies
Alejandro Grisoni, Universidad De San Martin
Jorge Duan, Universidad de Puerto Rico

Performance Studies
Diana Taylor, New York University

Politics and Public Policy
Celi Pinto, Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul

Race, Racisms, And Racial Politics
Edmund Gordon, University of Texas/Austin

Religion, Religiosity, And Spirituality
John Burdick, Syracuse University

Social Movements, Civil Society, NGO’s, and the Third Sector
Amalia Pallares, University of Illinois/Chicago

Technology, Scholarly Resources, and Pedagogy
Rory Miller, University of Liverpool
TYPES OF SESSIONS

Panels: Presentation and discussion of papers prepared specifically for the Congress. Proposals should include a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 6 papers. The Program Chair has the prerogative to add panelists to any session with fewer than six presenters. At the panels, papers should be summarized, only, to provide adequate opportunity for discussion and audience participation.

Workshops provide an opportunity for the exchange of information and ideas among several individuals. They are organized to address a theme; discussion is informal and papers need not be presented.

Events, Meetings, and Special Sessions: For LASA and non-LASA affiliated meetings, receptions and other special events.

Criteria for Selecting Papers, Panels, and Workshops

- Session proposal or paper is significant for the field.
- Session proposal or paper is clearly and succinctly presented.
- Session proposal or paper is conceptually and theoretically adequate.
- Potential of the proposal for enriching the proceedings of the Congress.
- For session proposals, diversity of the participants, including place of residence and institution, and level of education.
- Proposals addressing the 2006 Congress theme are encouraged.

The Program Committee will make judgments about the probable viability of panels composed wholly or mainly of proposed participants who would require significant travel support for travel over long distances. Notifications to all proposers are scheduled for mailing by September 23, 2005.

ROLES

There are several roles at LASA Congresses, including session chair, discussant, workshop participant, and paper presenter. A participant generally is limited to only two roles in the overall Congress program; only if an individual participates in a Section session may s/he have a third role (discussant, chair, workshop participant). Session organizer does not count as one of these roles. Nevertheless, for the duration of the Congress an individual is limited to only one paper presentation in a session of any type. Please follow the rules strictly and do not request exceptions.

General Instructions for Session Proposals and Individual Paper Proposals

- Ensure full consideration by following all instructions thoroughly.
- Provide sessions and paper titles in the language in which they will be presented. Sessions and papers may be in English, Spanish or Portuguese
- Indicate clearly the track for which the session or paper should be considered.
- Session organizers must list participants in the expected order of appearance.
- All addresses must be current and complete. Incomplete proposals will not be accepted. If the Secretariat is not notified of address changes, it is not responsible for missing correspondence.

Responsibilities of Session Organizers

- Obtain the approval of anyone you are proposing as a participant. This is imperative.
- Make sure that any individual proposed as a paper presenter does not (or will not) appear as a paper presenter on another session proposal, does not (will not) have more than two formal roles on the program (except as above) nor submit a proposal for an individual paper proposal on his/her own.
- Submit an electronic copy of the completed form to the LASA Secretariat (lasa@hopit.edu or lasasegretariat@hopit.edu) by the April 1, 2005 deadline.
- Once a session is approved, notify all participants to make sure they know the panel is approved and ensure that they are seeking independent funding to the extent possible.
- Be a 2005 and 2006 LASA member yourself and urge membership of all your panelists.
- Ensure that all participants are preregistered for the Congress. Participants must preregister by for LASA2006 or their names will not appear in the Program book. Deadline to pre-register is December 15, 2005.
- Report any changes in your session to the LASA Secretariat no later than November 20, 2005.
- If you are requesting travel funds for a participant, submit one electronic copy of the travel request form and the participant's one-page curriculum vitae, along with the session proposal by April 1, 2005.
- KEEP IN TOUCH with your panelists and discussants, making sure that papers are circulated among panel members, an electronic copy is sent to the Secretariat for the CD-ROM proceedings by December 15, 2005.

Travel and Lecturing Grants and Travel Grants for Students

Although LASA continues its commitment to award as many travel grants as possible, funds are always in short supply. LASA expects to fund fewer than 25 percent of the travel grant requests it receives.

- ACCEPTANCE OF A PAPER OR PANEL OR AN INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE DOES NOT GUARANTEE FUNDING. Proposers always are strongly urged to seek other sources of funds.
- No more than one participant per panel will be awarded LASA travel funding.
- Lecturing Fellowship applicants are required to fill out both sets of travel grant applications. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON TRAVEL REQUEST FORM FOR STUDENT TRAVEL GRANTS).
- Failure to accurately fill out every blank on the form will invalidate a travel grant application.
- Travel grant decisions are expected to be announced no later than November 30, 2005.

Congress Registration and LASA Membership

- Participants in LASA Congresses should be current members of the Association.
- Registration is required of all attendees and members enjoy considerable discounts on registration fees.
- ACCEPTANCE OF A PAPER OR PANEL OR AN INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE DOES NOT IMPLY EITHER COMPLIMENTARY REGISTRATION OR FUNDING.

PLEASE PREREGISTER! All accepted participants must pre-register for LASA2006 or their names will not appear in the Program book. Deadline to pre-register is December 15, 2005.

LOOK FOR THE LASA2006 CALL FOR PAPERS AND ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL FORM AT THE LASA WEBSITE AFTER DECEMBER 1, 2004

ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED BY APRIL 1, 2005
New Section Approved

The Executive Council has approved the creation of a new LASA Section entitled "Ethnicity, Race, and Indigenous Peoples". Proponents of the Section were Donna Lee Van Cott and León Zamosc. The Section’s mission statement reads "The section on Ethnicity, Race and Indigenous Peoples promotes research, teaching and collaboration with respect to ethnicity, race, and the concerns of subaltern ethnic groups, particularly indigenous peoples, while offering a broader disciplinary terrain for exploring social, economic, political, and cultural issues. The section promotes greater participation in LASA of indigenous and Afro-descendent scholars". For additional information on the Section please contact the co-chairs directly: Donna Lee Van Cott <dvancott@tulane.edu> and Leon Zamosc <lzamosc@ucsd.edu>. LASA Sections now number 29.

Decentralization and Sub-national Studies

The Section on Decentralization and Sub-national Studies is pleased to announce two awards for papers presented at the LASA2003. Best paper prize recipients are Tulia Falletti (Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania) and Maria Escobar-Lemmon (Department of Political Science, Texas A&M) and Erika Moreno (Department of Political Science, University of Iowa). Professor Falletti’s paper, «Of Presidents, Governors, and Mayors: The Politics of Decentralization in Latin America,» advances our understanding of the dynamic nature of the decentralization process and the transfer of decision-making power it entails. The co-authored paper by Professors Escobar-

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL NOTES

LASA Member Carmen Diana Deere has been appointed Director of the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida as of August 2004. She is Professor of Food and Resource Economics and Latin American Studies.

Lowell Fiet, miembro de LASA y profesor de teatro y literatura caribeña en la Universidad de Puerto Rico, publicó recientemente El teatro puertorriqueño reimaginado: Notas críticas sobre la creación dramática y el performance”, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Ediciones Callejón, 2004. El estudio se basa en cientos de reseñas y artículos que el autor, como crítico, teatrólogo y teatrista, ha publicado en Puerto Rico a través de más de veinte años. Su exploración destaca el desarrollo del teatro puertorriqueño desde varias perspectivas.

Miembro de LASA Roberto Follari publicó reciente el libro titulado "La proliferación de los signos: la teoría social en tiempos de globalización", Homo Sapiens ed., Rosario, Argentina. La obra discute algunos avances de la filosofía política, la filosofía de secas y los estudios culturales, advertidos como débiles en su definición ideológico-política y en sus bases metodológicas y epistémicas. Y de advertir la relación que ello guarda con la posmodernización cultural por un lado, y con la globalización capitalista con predominancia financiera, por otro.

LASA member Reid Andrews is the author of Afro-Latin America, (1800-2000), Oxford University Press, the first history of the African diaspora in Latin America from emancipation to present. According to Franklin W Knight “This highly accessible, masterfully authoritative account fills a long-standing void in the bibliography for Latin American Studies, American Cultures and the history of the Americas in general.”

Recientemente fue publicado el libro “Políticas de Ciudadanía y Sociedad Civil en tiempos de globalización", coordinado por Daniel Mato y publicado por la Universidad Central de Venezuela, el cual además de poder ser adquirido en librerías "reales" y virtuales" puede ser bajado gratuitamente a texto completo desde la sección “Publicaciones” de la página: <www.globalcult.org.ve>. El libro incluye ensayos de 15 destacados investigadores de América Latina, España, Estados Unidos y Japón, que desde perspectivas político-culturales estudian las políticas de ciudadanía y sociedad civil de actores tales como Estados, organismos internacionales, fundaciones, bancos multilaterales, partidos políticos, medios de comunicación, universidades, y diversos tipos de organizaciones y movimientos sociales.
IN MEMORIAM

On October 9, 2004 El Colegio de Mexico, LASA and Harvard University – David Rockefeller Center sponsor a memorial tribute to Victor Urquidi. Sheila Breen de Urquidi read the following statement sent in by Sidney Weintraub.

When Victor Urquidi died, Mexico lost a distinguished economic and social analyst, and I, and many, many others, lost a dear friend. Victor was a pioneer in addressing many aspects of Mexican development and he remained an innovator throughout his life. I met with Victor over many decades, visited him when I was in Mexico City or near Tepoztlán where he had a weekend home, and kept up with his latest activities. Over the years, I never ceased to be impressed with the new and important themes he addressed, always with great skill and insight. Mexico today has many fine economists and first-rate social commentators and activists, but Victor led the way. He was professionally expert, socially caring, indefatigable in his output, generous and gentlemanly in behavior, scrupulously honest, and always a teacher.

Victor was a model not only for his pupils, but for others who interacted with him as colleagues. I read some of Victor’s writings before I met him some three decades ago. His initial influence on my work was a study he worked on for the Economic Commission for Latin America (CEPAL) on Central American economic integration. I have worked much on this subject in my professional life, and Victor’s impact on my early thinking was invaluable. Based on my appreciation for his work on economic integration, I read one of his significant earlier publications, El desarrollo económico de México y su capacidad para absorber capital del exterior, which rigorously examined Mexico’s economic development process between 1939 and 1950. I got the impression then that Victor would not necessarily hew to the official line on development policy, but neither was he an anti-government contrarian. This early impression was reinforced over the years as I got to know him better and it became clear that his desire was to be constructive, whether for or against the official or conventional line. His constant theme was his country’s development, with a focus on economics, his professional formation, but extending well beyond that to important social issues.

Victor was forever curious to get into themes he had not personally explored earlier. There was a common thread to these investigations; they concerned Mexico’s economic and social development. In addition to economic integration and capital flows, they included Mexican job creation, its environment long before attention to this subject became commonplace, housing, population growth, and the role of the maquiladora in Mexican industrialization. He believed that maquiladoras provided little benefit for Mexico because the inputs used to produce their output came almost exclusively from foreign sources, mainly from the United States. This lack of connection of the maquiladora to the rest of Mexico’s industrial structure was undoubtedly true, but my argument was that policy should be used to correct this and that too many Mexican jobs and foreign-exchange earnings would be lost if the maquiladora were dismantled. To be fully candid, the integration of the maquiladora plants into the rest of the Mexican industrial structure still has not taken place; about 97 percent of their intermediate inputs are imported.

Victor’s contributions to Mexican economic progress never ceased during his lifetime, and I have no doubt that his thinking will help determine future policy as well. In addition to his writing and lectures, Victor was an advisor to many Mexican government leaders. This included advice to the Treasury during the years of Mexico’s “miracle” economic growth and to the Bank of Mexico. Victor was a member of the Club of Rome. Earlier, as indicated, he worked with CEPAL. El Colegio de México became the premier study and research center in Mexico during his long tenure as its president. He directed the Mexican publication El Trimestre Económico during its glory years when it was must reading for Mexican economists and foreigners interested in Mexican economic developments. He founded the Centro Tepoztlán on ground near his home there and this has become a leading center for discussion of important issues affecting Mexico.

Victor was a man of absolute integrity. He studied meticulously before he spoke or wrote about issues. What he said was often highly critical of official policy, at other times it was supportive. When critical, he offered constructive suggestions. His views were not for sale, and this was known by all influential persons in either the public or private sectors. Victor was never fearful of speaking the truth to authority, nor was he hesitant to defend the authorities against unwise or unfair criticism.

It was Victor’s friendship that was most valuable for me. We disagreed on nuances of economic policy from time to time, but never in any fundamental way. My thinking benefited greatly from these discussions. Indeed, I went out of my way to get his views on Mexican, hemispheric, and world issues because I knew that they would be well informed before he gave them. Victor and I came from separate countries and had different lifetime experiences—other than training in economics. This last feature, plus my abiding interest in what was his lifetime passion, Mexican development, were sufficient to eliminate most of the cultural biases in our discussions.

Victor was a gentleman, in his personal habits and in his professional life, and I took for granted that he would so behave in all his contacts. That was his way, even when he was being critical of some policy, idea, or suggestion. I will miss Victor, as will his students, collaborators, and friends. I will always remember that he was a man who cared deeply for his countrymen and who worked throughout his life on their behalf. I will miss our meetings and conversations, and I will miss his writings.

The one attribute his wife mentioned to me after he died was his integrity. I share this judgment. Integrity and caring were inherent in everything he did.
La Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales Sede Ecuador está buscando una profesora o profesor cuya especialización sean la política comparada y las relaciones internacionales. La FLACSO-Ecuador ofrecerá doctorados en ciencias sociales y maestrías en ciencias sociales durante el calendario académico 2004-07. La candidata interesada deberá tener un Ph.D. y experiencia como docente e investigadora. Por favor enviar una carta de aplicación y una copia del C.V. a Carlos de la Torre, <cdelatorre@flacso.org.ec>. Los candidatos y candidatas preseleccionados deberán estar dispuestos enviar tres cartas de recomendación y una copia de un trabajo escrito. La FLACSO es una institución académica de alto prestigio que busca la diversidad étnica y de género en su planta docente.

The Stanford University Overseas Studies Program (OSP) seeks a Director for the Stanford Center in Santiago, Chile. The Director is responsible for the continued development and support of the program, ensuring the highest quality in all academic and administrative aspects. The Director is charged with establishing and nourishing an intellectual and social environment that is supportive of excellence. Further information and a complete vacancy announcement are available at: http://osp.stanford.edu/

The University of Texas at Austin is accepting applications for a tenure-track Assistant Professor whose research and teaching interests focus on planning in Latin America. The successful candidate will be expected to teach four courses each academic year: two elective courses related to planning in Latin America, one core planning lecture course, and a third elective seminar that contributes to a substantive specialization within the planning curriculum. It is anticipated that the faculty member will coordinate the Joint Master Degree Program in Community and Regional Planning and Latin American Studies and will collaborate closely with the UT Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies (LILAS). Teaching experience in any of the following areas is also an advantage: planning methods, sustainable development/design, historic preservation, and urban design. The candidate must hold or be expected to hold a Ph.D. (by fall 2005) in City and Regional Planning or a related field with a research focus on Latin America.

Interested individuals should send via hard copy a letter of interest stating research, practice, and teaching interests; a complete curriculum vitae; and selected samples of academic and professional accomplishment to:
Dr. Patricia A. Wilson
Chair, Faculty Search Committee
The University of Texas at Austin
School of Architecture
1 University Station B7500
Austin, Texas 78712-0222
Deadline: January 31, 2005

The University of Puget Sound invites applications for a full-time, tenure-line position; begins Fall Term 2005. Teach social research (qualitative) methods, anthropological theory, and introductory cultural anthropology with specialization in at least two of the following areas: research methods, indigenous peoples of North, Meso, or South America, urban anthropology, and public policy issues (e.g. health, law, environment, education). Standard teaching assignment is three courses per semester. Other duties include participation in the university's core curriculum, continuation of professional development, advising students, and participation in departmental and university governance. Ph.D. in anthropology (ABD considered). Expertise in at least two of the following areas: research methods, indigenous peoples, urban anthropology, and public policy issues. Commitment to undergraduate teaching, active scholarship and liberal arts education in an interdisciplinary department also required. Must be able to employ an explicity cross-national, cross-cultural, and/or comparative perspective in teaching and research. We especially welcome candidates whose teaching emphasizes minority issues. University of Puget Sound is an equal opportunity, affirmative action educator/employer. To apply, submit letter of interest, a statement describing how you would contribute to the department and the liberal arts mission of Puget Sound, résumé, course syllabi, evidence of teaching excellence, a sample of scholarly work, and three letters of reference to:

Anthropology Search
University of Puget Sound
Campus Mailbox 1007
Tacoma, WA 98416-1007
Deadline: February 28, 2004

The Latin American, Latino & Caribbean Studies Program at Dartmouth College invites applications for an assistant professor, tenure-track position in Latino Studies to begin in the fall term of the 2005 academic year. We seek to appoint a colleague committed to innovative scholarship and teaching with a primary research focus on Latino populations in the U.S. The position will be a joint appointment in the Latin American, Latino and Caribbean Studies Program and a Social Science Department (Anthropology, Geography, History, Government, or Sociology). Candidates should hold a Ph.D. or be in the final stages of a Ph.D. program. Dartmouth is committed to diversity and encourages applications from women and minorities. Dartmouth College is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action employer. Complete applications should include a letter of interest, a current CV, at least three references, and reprints and can be sent to:
Israel Reyes
Chair of Latin American, Latino and Caribbean Studies
Dartmouth College
6026 Silsby Hall
Hanover, NH 03755
Review of applications will begin on January 15, 2005.
The Latin American and Caribbean Studies Center (LACS) of Stony Brook University will host a Rockefeller Humanities Residency Site in the academic year 2005-06. The theme of this Visiting Scholar program, "Durable Inequalities in Latin America," promotes new research on the core problem of how and why Latin America has maintained, across many centuries, the world's most radically unequal societies and cultures. Inequality has social, political, historical, cultural and ethical dimensions, beyond its usual focus in the hard social sciences. We seek primarily Latin American or Caribbean scholars, from any field (or topical interest) in the Humanities, Historical or Social Sciences, whose work expands or innovates on the study of inequalities. Writing projects may focus on how inequalities are produced over the long run through such identities and categories as class, race, region and gender or explicitly link inequalities throughout the Americas—in rising mal-distribution within the U.S., via the Latino/a diaspora, or other inequality-making connections and flows. LACS will offer two Fellowships of 8-10 months duration.

For information and application guidelines contact:
Paul Gootenberg, LACS Director
Latin American & Caribbean Studies
Stony Brook University
SBS N333
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4345
Tel: (631) 632-7517; Fax: (631) 632-9432;
E-mail: lacc@notes.cc.sunyeb.edu
Visit our website: http://www.stonybrook.edu/lacc
Deadline: February 1, 2005

The Latin American and Latino Studies Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago invites applications for “Latino Chicago: A Model for Emerging Latinidades?,” a three-year postdoctoral residential fellowship program. The aim of the program is to facilitate more systematic research on historical and contemporary cultural transformations among the diverse Latino communities in Chicago and their implications for understanding identity, migration, resistance, racism, cultural conflict and survival. We seek two junior Fellows for the academic year 2005-2006 whose research interests explore the contradictory location of Latino as in institutions such as education, labor, the media, religion, public health, and the law. Research projects that are interdisciplinary and that are centrally focused on Latino Chicago are most welcome. While we do not expect all applicants to have previously researched Latino Chicago, previous publications and research on the topics above will play a significant role in the selection of the Fellows. For further information and application procedure, visit our website <www.uic.edu/las/latamst/> or contact our Fellowship Coordinator:
Loirena Garcia
E-mail: <lorena@uic.edu>
tel. (312) 996-8749
ax (312) 996-1796.

The Summer Seminar is designed for Latin American scholars and non-academic professionals who want to deepen their understanding of the United States. Taught by distinguished academic experts and non-academic practitioners, the Seminar immerses participants in the analysis of U.S. political and economic history, the conduct of U.S. government at the national and local level, the structure of U.S. financial markets and corporations, the making of U.S. economic policy and foreign policy, U.S. political parties and elections, and U.S. mass media. The Seminar devotes substantial attention to discussion of contemporary public policy issues in the United States. Applicants must be citizens of a Latin American or Caribbean country. Additional information and application materials for the above programs can be obtained from the Center's website, <http://www.usmex.ucsd.edu> or by contacting the Center: Tel: (858) 534-4503, Fax: (858) 534-6447

The Center for Humanistic Inquiry at Emory University is accepting applications for three Junior and Post-Doctoral fellowships for an academic year of study, teaching, and residence in the Center. Awards will be announced in mid-April 2005. Application forms and further information are available from the Center for Humanistic Inquiry at 404-727-6424 or <chi@emory.edu>, on the web at <www.chi.emory.edu>, or write to:
CHI
1715 North Decatur Road
Atlanta, GA 30322
Deadline: February 24, 2005

The Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida will again offer Library Travel Research Grants for Summer 2005. These awards are funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Their purpose is to enable researchers—faculty and graduate students—from other U.S. colleges and universities to use the extensive resources of the Latin American Collection in the University of Florida Libraries, thereby enhancing its value as a national resource. At least three awards of up to $750 each will be made to cover travel and living expenses. Awardees are expected to remain in Gainesville for at least one week and, following their stay, submit a brief (2-3 pp.) report on how their work at UF Libraries enriched their research project and offer suggestions for possible improvements of the Latin American Collection. Researchers' work at the Latin American Collection may be undertaken at any time during the summer, starting May 15th, but must be completed by August 14, 2005. At least one grant will be made to a scholar from a Florida college or university.

To apply for a Library Travel Grant, send a letter of intent, brief library research proposal, travel budget, and a curriculum vitae to: Amanda Wolfe, Associate Director, PO Box 115530, 319 Grinter Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-5530. This information is also available at: http://www.latam.ufl.edu/outreach/outreachggr.html
Applicants must be US citizens or permanent residents.
Deadline: March 2, 2005.
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Sugar and the Making of the Atlantic World, 1450–1680
Stuart B. Schwartz, Editor
368 pp. $59.95 cloth / $22.95 paper

CHE’S CHEVROLET, FIDEL’S OLDSMOBILE
On the Road in Cuba
Richard Schweid
256 pp., 8 color / 52 b&w illus.
$27.95 cloth

RECREATING AFRICA
Culture, Kinship, and Religion in the African-Portuguese World, 1441–1770
James H. Sweet
320 pp. $35.00 cloth / $19.95 paper

CORN AND CAPITALISM
How a Botanical Bastard Grew to Global Dominance
Arturo Warman
Translated by Nancy L. Westrate
A 2003 Book of the Year, The Economist
288 pp. $49.95 cloth / $24.95 paper
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—New in Paperback—
MANIFEST DESTINY’S UNDERWORLD
Filibustering in Antebellum America
Robert E. May
A Choice Outstanding Academic Title
448 pp., 21 illus. $21.95 paper

—Highly Recommended for Course Use—
RACE AND NATION IN MODERN LATIN AMERICA
Nancy P. Appelbaum, Anne S. Macpherson, and Karin Alejandro Rosemblatt, Editors
Foreword by Thomas C. Holt
Afterword by Peter Wade
352 pp. $59.95 cloth / $19.95 paper
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Luis A. Figueroa

THE MYTH OF JOSÉ MARTÍ AND CONFLICTING NATIONALISMS IN EARLY TWENTIETH-CENTURY CUBA
Lillian Guerra
Envisioning Cuba
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Filibustering and Cuban Exiles in the United States
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Envisioning Cuba
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<tr>
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<th>Edition</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>ISBN</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Latin America</td>
<td>Thomas E. Skidmore and Peter H. Smith</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>November 2004</td>
<td>528 pp.</td>
<td>978-0-19-531169-3</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Latin America</td>
<td>Mark A. Burkholder and Lyman L. Johnson</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>432 pp.</td>
<td>978-0-19-531168-6</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy in Latin America</td>
<td>Peter H. Smith</td>
<td>Political Change in Comparative Perspective</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>400 pp.</td>
<td>978-0-19-531163-1</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil: Five Centuries of Change</td>
<td>Thomas E. Skidmore</td>
<td>(Latin American Histories series)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>272 pp.</td>
<td>978-0-19-531162-4</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics in Mexico</td>
<td>Roderic Ai Camp</td>
<td>The Democratic Transformation</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>304 pp.</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the United States</td>
<td>Robert H. Holden and Eric Zolov</td>
<td>A Documentary History</td>
<td>Edited by</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>384 pp.</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talons of the Eagle</td>
<td>Peter H. Smith</td>
<td>Dynamics of U.S.–Latin American Relations</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>432 pp.</td>
<td>paper / cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions of the Soul</td>
<td>Sharon Erickson Nepstad</td>
<td>Religion, Culture, and Agency in the Central America Solidarity Movement</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>254 pp.</td>
<td>978-0-19-531161-7</td>
<td>cloth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To order, or for more information, please call 1-800-451-7556.
In Canada, call 1-800-387-8020.
INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP for Calendar Year 2005 or Optional Three-Year Membership

LASA is offering a three-year membership option for the period 2005 to 2007. If you elect the three-year option, protecting you against any dues raises in 2006 and 2007, your membership fee is three times the fee for the single-year rate. Note that this three-year option does not apply to student membership, which already has a limit of five years, nor does it apply to publications, as their rates are subject to change each year. Please check only one of the following:

Payment for calendar year 2005 only
Payment for the three-year period 2006 to 2007

Last Name(s): ___________________________________________ First Name(s): ____________________________ Middle Initial: ______

Mailing Address: ____________________________________________________________

City: ___________________ State: ______ Zip: ___________ Country: _______________________

Business Telephone: ___________________ Home Telephone: ________________________

Fax: ___________________ E-mail: __________________________

Inst/Org Affiliation: ___________________ Discipline: ___________________________

Country of Interest #1: ___________________ Country of Interest #2: __________________

For statistical purposes only: Date of Birth (m/d/y): ___________________ Sex: ______

(Please see other side if adding a joint member)

MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR YEAR 2005 AND FOR THE THREE-YEAR OPTION

REGULAR MEMBER
with gross calendar year income of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>$33 $99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>$42 $126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>$52 $156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>$63 $189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $64,999</td>
<td>$75 $225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>$88 $264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 and over</td>
<td>$102 $306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENT

$25

JOINT MEMBERSHIP
(for second member at same mailing address as first member; one copy of publications will be sent.)

Choose this plus one other category. Add this to the rate for the higher income of the two members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LATIN AMERICAN RESIDENT
permanently residing in Latin America or the Caribbean (including Puerto Rico) with gross calendar year income of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>$25 $75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 and over</td>
<td>$38 $114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIFE MEMBER
$2,500 or $1,000 first installment $__________

Total Member Dues

SECTION DUES (Indicate Sections, if any, you wish to join)

Membership in LASA Sections is optional. The fee for Section membership is $8.00 per year, and just $5 for LASA Life Members. Please check the Section(s) below you wish to join and indicate either year 2005 or the three-year option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender and Feminist Studies
Haiti/Dominican Republic
Health, Science, and Society
Labor Studies
Latin America and the Pacific Rim
Latino Studies
Law and Society in Latin America
Paraguayan Studies
Perú
Political Institutions
Rural Studies
Scholarly Research and Resources
Sexualities Studies
Southern Cone Studies
Venezuelan Studies

Total Section Dues $_____

(over)
JOINT MEMBERSHIP (IF ANY)

If adding a joint member (same address required), supply the following information:

Last Name(s): ____________________________________________ First Name(s): ________________________________ Middle Initial: ________

Business Telephone: ____________________________ Home Telephone: ____________________________

Fax: ____________________________ E-mail: _________________________________________________________

Inst/Org Affiliation: _________________________ Discipline: _______________________________________

Country of Interest #1: ____________________________ Country of Interest #2: __________________________

For statistical purposes only: Date of Birth (m/d/y): ____________________________ Sex: __________________

OPTIONAL SPECIAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES FOR MEMBERS

NOTE: The multi-year option does not apply to the following products or services. Payment is for year 2005 only.

$51 Journal of Latin American Studies

$20 LASA Member Directory

$51 Bulletin of Latin American Research

$20 Air mail of LASA Forum (international only)

METHOD OF PAYMENT (Check one) PAYMENT MUST ACCOMPANY THIS FORM

Check payable to LASA
(in U.S. dollars drawn only on a U.S. bank)

Credit Card (only VISA and MasterCard are accepted)

VISA or MasterCard number: ____________________________

Expiration Date: __/____

U.S. dollar Traveler’s Check
(with your two signatures, payable to LASA)

U.S. dollar Money Order

UNESCO coupon(s)

Signature: ____________________________________________

If payment is by credit card, you may fax this form to (412) 624-7145. For all other forms of payment, mail to LASA, 946 William Pitt Union, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

SUPPORT FOR LASA

My contribution to the LASA Congress Travel Fund for participants traveling from Latin America and the Caribbean

$__________

My Contribution to the LASA Student Travel Fund to be used primarily for student participants traveling to LASA Congresses from locations outside Latin America and the Caribbean

$__________

My contribution to the LASA Humanities Endowment Fund

$__________

My contribution to the LASA General Endowment Fund

$__________

Total LASA Support

$__________

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE: ____________________________________________

Voluntary Support

Gifts to the LASA Endowment Fund help ensure the continuation and enhancement of special programs not covered by ordinary income. Contributions may be directed to the General Endowment Fund or the Humanities Endowment Fund, the latter providing support specifically for scholars in the humanities. Gifts in the form of bequests are also encouraged.

Contributions to the LASA Congress Travel Fund or the Student Fund provide assistance specifically for the next Congress. For tax purposes, gifts to any of the four funds may be fully deducted as a contribution to a non-profit organization. For more information, please contact the LASA Secretariat at (412) 648-1907.
Latino Chicago: A Model for Emerging Latinidades?
2005-2006 Visiting Scholar Program

The Latin American and Latino Studies Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago invites applications for “Latino Chicago: A Model for Emerging Latinidades?,” a three-year postdoctoral residential fellowship program. The aim of the program is to facilitate more systematic research on historical and contemporary cultural transformations among the diverse Latino communities in Chicago and their implications for understanding identity, migration, resistance, racism, cultural conflict and survival. Chicago has historically been an urban center where Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have interacted and where diverse forms of latinidad have emerged well before the more recent demographic diversification of the Latino population in the other regions of the US. In addition, the convergence of native-born Latinos and Latin American immigrants is also changing the ways in which Latino identity is conceptualized.

We seek two junior Fellows for the academic year 2005-2006 whose research interests explore the contradictory location of Latino/as in institutions such as education, labor, the media, religion, public health, and the law. While the presence of Latino/as is revitalizing and transforming these institutions from within, they are still subjected to various forms of racialization and exclusion. Research projects that are interdisciplinary and that are centrally focused on Latino Chicago are most welcome. While we do not expect all applicants to have previously researched Latino Chicago, previous publications and research on the topics above will play a significant role in the selection of the Fellows. For further information and application procedure, visit our website (www.uic.edu/las/latamst/) or contact our Fellowship Coordinator: Lorena Garcia at lorena@uic.edu, tel. (312)996-8749; fax (312)996-1796.


The Latin American, Caribbean & Iberian Studies Program (LACIS) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison will offer an Intensive Portuguese Institute in Summer 2005. This special eight-week course is designed for people wishing to study intensively beginning Brazilian Portuguese. Graduate students, faculty, and other researchers, and advanced undergraduates who need to develop communication skills and reading knowledge for research will find this special Institute particularly useful. The Institute will take place during the eight-week summer session at UW-Madison, June 13-August 5, 2005. There will be an orientation scheduled for June 10, 2005. Instruction is five days a week, four hours a day, and the course (listed as Portuguese 301-302) carries 8 semester hours of credit. The institute will be directed and taught by Professor Severino Albuquerque who will be assisted by a lecturer or teaching assistant. Knowledge of Spanish is required (2-3 years equivalency). The application deadline is May 6, 2005. Forms and details are available from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, 1018 Van Hise, 1220 Linden Drive, UW-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, (608) 262-2093, http://polyglot.lss.wisc.edu/spanport. A limited number of Title VI FLAS Fellowships are available to graduate students in conjunction with the Institute. Contact LACIS, 1155 Observatory Drive, 209 Ingraham Hall, (608)-262-2811, or http://polyglot.lss.wisc.edu/lacis