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LASA2010 will take place in Toronto from October 6 to 10. Thanks to the efforts of Program Chairs Javier Corrales and Nina Gerassi-Navarro, as well as the dedicated efforts of dozens of track chairs and co-chairs, and literally thousands of LASA members who submitted proposals for panels and papers, by the time this issue of the LASA Forum is published, the Congress program will be completed. Even before LASA2010 convenes, work is already beginning on the next LASA Congress—May 23–26, 2012, in San Francisco.

This issue of the Forum marks the bicentennial of the outbreak of the wars of Independence with two striking essays by Jorge Domínguez of Harvard University and Leandro Prados de la Escosura of the Universidad Carlos III. Each in its own way confronts long-cherished conventions about the political impulses (Domínguez) and economic consequences (Prados) of the multiple civil and international conflicts that made Latin America independent. Domínguez points to the forgotten (and sometimes desperate) liberality of some loyalist commanders and the corresponding loyalism of the slaves they freed and the indigenous subjects whose rights they defended, especially in the Andes. He draws a complex and nuanced portrait of the meaning of independence and its legacies. Prados challenges the view that the Latin American economies fared poorly after independence. In absolute terms, most of the new republics suffered setbacks that retarded economic growth for two or more generations. Nevertheless, the economies of the rest of the pre-industrial world did no better than Latin America in the nineteenth century. Zero or low growth may have been the best the Latin American economies could do, he suggests, so comparing them to the fast growing success stories of the North Atlantic may not be fair or even useful.

The On the Profession essays in this issue take note of a relatively new phenomenon in Latin American studies—the revival and expansion of work on Latin America’s economic history. Last January, as Carlos Marichal reports, Mexico hosted the Second Latin American Economic History Congress at which scholars from all over Latin America as well as Europe and the United States presented an astounding total or more than 300 papers. Economic historians have formed new national associations or revived older institutions in nearly a dozen countries, including Uruguay (host of the first Latin American Congress), Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, and Argentina. The essays by Luis Bertola (Uruguay), Graciela Márquez (Mexico), and Adolfo Meisel (Columbia), provide a glimpse of the intellectual ferment and organizational activity that have swept this field into a new and dynamic stage of its development.

Returning to organizational matters, the LASA Executive Council met in Toronto in February. The Council discussed whether to change the frequency of LASA Congresses from once every 18 months to once a year (probably in the spring). The change would certainly make it easier to remember when the next LASA Congress will meet. It could also increase opportunities for participation while keeping the size of the Congresses small enough to meet in less expensive, smaller cities both in Latin America and the United States. And it would make LASA’s finances more manageable. On the other hand, the change could pose challenges for regional associations that schedule their meetings in the LASA off years and even make it more difficult for members to attend every Congress. The Executive Council will revisit this question when it meets during the Toronto Congress in October. Members are urged to communicate their views to the LASA Secretariat or to any of the members of the Executive Council.

The LASA Executive Council also accepted a recommendation from the editors of the Latin American Research Review who proposed that LASA rely mainly on the Internet to make LARR accessible to Latin American members. The cost of mailing paper copies of the journal to Latin America now far exceeds the membership dues LASA charges to Latin Americans. As postage rates continue to rise and Internet access expands, it makes sense for LASA to stop mailing paper copies except to those members willing to pay a surcharge to cover postage costs. An added benefit of this change in policy is that LARR will now be available for free download to all users in Latin America. The next issue of LARR will contain a full explanation of the new policy.

Finally, this issue of the Forum contains a request for proposals for two important activities of the Association that are now up for renewal or reassignment. The first of these is the editorship of the Latin American Research Review, LASA’s flagship journal. LARR is currently edited by Philip Oxhorn, who has done a truly splendid job along with his collaborators at McGill University. The second is the directorship of the Film Festival, a popular and valued feature of every LASA Congress. LASA is greatly indebted to the current film festival director, Claudia Ferman of the University of Richmond, who has served in this post since 2004.

See you in Toronto.
Economic history has been advancing notably as a research and teaching discipline in Latin America for some time now, but it is really at the big meetings that the richness and diversity of topics and methodologies come to the fore. This was apparent in the recent Second Latin American Economic History Congress (CLADHE-II), which took place this past February 3-5 in Mexico City.

The conference venue was the Cultural Center run by the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) at the magnificent Plaza de las Tres Culturas. The sessions were held in the former building of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which has a privileged location, with views of the great pyramid of Tlatelolco. Box lunches were served in the sixteenth century monastery of Tlatelolco, where the teaching friar, Bernardino de Sahagún, wrote his famous account of the history as well as cultural and religious traditions of Pre-Hispanic peoples and societies. The Plaza de las Tres Culturas is also known as the site of the terrible massacre of Mexican students in 1968, and as one of the sites where the great earthquake of 1985 hit savagely and destroyed many large buildings and killed thousands.

More than 400 researchers from Latin America, the United States and Europe (mainly Spain and Portugal) participated in the Congress. There were 27 panels, with over 300 papers presented, as well as 13 roundtable sessions and book presentations. For the first time in the region, there was a session that allowed doctoral students to present their research interests.

The subjects covered in the panels included a session on the origins and trajectory of income distribution and inequality in Latin America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; two sessions on the history of industrialization in Latin America; four panels on the history of transport, services and ports; three sessions on evolution of enterprise, including family firms and global companies; and a panel on the history of corruption in business and politics.

There was also an innovative Brazilian session focusing on labor history, a Colombian panel on the economic history of that country in the last two centuries, and a Caribbean session on the history of banks and monetary policy. In the latter session the participating researchers announced the creation of the Caribbean Economic History Association, which will hold its first major meeting in 2011. There were also two comparative sessions on the tax history of Latin America, from the colonial period to the present, and two panels on the history of trade and foreign investments in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Uruguay as well as U.S. and British trade with the countries of the region. Finally, there were two panels on the current financial crisis of the early twenty-first century, seen in historical perspective.

The Congress was a collective effort that was successful due to the collaboration of the economic history associations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Uruguay. The Spanish and Portuguese economic history associations participated as specially invited collaborators. The increasingly international focus of the field can be evaluated by the growing participation of scholars from different countries who publish a variety of economic history journals. An important roundtable hosted a series of presentations organized by Guillermina del Valle, editor of the journal América Latina en la historia económica, published in Mexico since 1995. Among the participants in this session were the editors of the Uruguayan Review of Economic History, two on-line journals published in Argentina (one on industrial history and the other on the history of enterprise in Latin America), the Brazilian Economic History Review, and no less than four Spanish economic history journals that frequently publish articles on Latin America.

The Congress in Mexico has consolidated regional conferences as ideal academic forums to debate ongoing economic history research from the Americas and the Iberian Peninsula, as well as to discuss global and comparative perspectives with other regions. Latin American economic historians are very active in the International Economic History Association (IEHA). Currently, Salomón Kalmanovitz (Colombia) and Luis Bértola (Uruguay) are on the Executive Committee of the IEHA, and there is a well-established Latin American participation in all recent World Economic History Congresses.

CLADHE-II has shaped the research themes and agenda of the region’s economic history. It has also promoted the strengthening of international research networks. This is clear in topics such as long-term inequality, foreign trade, long-term economic growth, as well as in fiscal and banking history. The list of panels can be found at <http://www.economia.unam.mx/cladhe/sessions.php>. Papers may be consulted and downloaded at <http://www.economia.unam.mx/cladhe/simposiosyponencias.php>. •
La renovación de los estudios sobre historia económica en Colombia
La Asociación Colombiana de Historia Económica

por Adolfo Meisel | Centro de Estudios Económicos Regionales, Banco de la República, Colombia | ameisero@banrep.gov.co

La creación de la Asociación Colombiana de Historia Económica (ACHE) es un hecho institucional que está ayudando al proceso de renovación de los estudios sobre historia económica en Colombia. Para entender en qué condiciones surgió analizamos a continuación el desempeño de este área en los últimos años y luego el contexto específico en el cual se dio la fundación.

En un ensayo publicado en 1997, el economista Jesús Antonio Bejarano argumentó que desde finales de la década de 1980 se observó un estancamiento en los estudios sobre historia económica de Colombia. En buena medida el argumento de Bejarano se refería a la falta de interés de las nuevas generaciones de historiadores por esa temática, prefiriendo una orientación hacia los temas culturales y las mentalidades. Su visión de las perspectivas de los estudios de historia económica colombiana era bastante pesimista.

Lo que hemos visto en la primera década del siglo XXI, es todo lo contrario del cuadro muy desconcertado de Bejarano sobre el futuro de la historia económica en Colombia. Si bien es evidente que varios de los programas de historia que tiene el país le dan una casi nula importancia al tema de la historia económica, y en esto tal vez la excepción es la Universidad Nacional, y que las nuevas generaciones de historiadores no se interesan por el tema, también hay síntomas esperanzadores.

Lo que ha sucedido a comienzos del siglo XXI es un renovado interés de los economistas por el estudio de la historia económica nacional. Creo que varios factores ayudan a explicar esto. Uno de ellos es que a nivel internacional en las últimas décadas la discusión sobre el crecimiento económico en el largo plazo ha sido una de las áreas de mayor desarrollo. Tanto los trabajos de crecimiento endógeno de Robert Lucas y Paul Romer, como los de Douglass North y Daron Acemoglu y sus asociados, han sido muy influyentes en este sentido. También es probable que el fin de la virtual hegemonía del marxismo y el enfoque de la dependencia hayan contribuido para atraer hacia la historia económica a las nuevas generaciones entrenadas en la ortodoxia económica. Adicionalmente, los recientes enfoques han permitido a los nuevos practicantes de la historia económica colombiana, así como a muchos miembros de las anteriores generaciones, encontrar nuevas preguntas, métodos y fuentes que han revitalizado los estudios sobre el tema.

Fruto de lo anterior, en la primera década del siglo XXI se han publicado una serie de contribuciones que han dejado sin piso el pesimismo expresado por Bejarano en 1997. Trabajos como el de María Teresa Ramírez y Álvaro Pachón, La infraestructura de transporte en Colombia durante el siglo XX, (2006), y el de Salomón Kalmanovitz y Enrique López, La agricultura colombiana en el siglo XX, (2006), son buenos ejemplos de la renovada vitalidad de la historiografía económica colombiana. Estos dos trabajos ilustran varias de las características principales de las nuevas investigaciones: uso de la teoría económica ortodoxa y la econometría, construcción de grandes series estadísticas, utilización de fuentes nuevas o poco utilizadas.

Los sitios donde se están produciendo el mayor número de investigaciones en historia económica de Colombia en la actualidad son la Universidad de los Andes, el Banco de la República y, más recientemente, la Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano. La Universidad de los Andes tiene una larga tradición en los estudios sobre historia económica de Colombia, y muchas de las tesis de economía, tanto de pregrado como de maestría, se han convertido en clásicos de la historiografía nacional. También las publicaciones de sus investigadores han sido influyentes en este campo, destacándose, entre otros, el ensayo de Álvaro López Toro, Migración y cambio social en Antioquia durante el siglo XIX, (1968). El papel de la Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano en esta materia es mucho más reciente, pero es de gran relevancia, especialmente para entender la creación y consolidación de la ACHE, como explicaremos más adelante. En la Facultad de Economía de esa universidad se ha reforzado la investigación en historia económica desde el nombramiento de Salomón Kalmanovitz como decano.

El Banco de la República, que es el banco central del país, ha jugado desde hace muchos años un rol activo en los estudios de historia económica. La mayor parte de esa influencia se ha dado por la vía de las publicaciones que realiza. También, y en menor medida, la influencia se ha dado a través de la financiación de algunos proyectos de investigación en este campo, lo cual realiza a través de la Fundación Para la Investigación y la Tecnología.

Más recientemente, el Banco de la República inició hacia el año 2000 un programa académico destinado a celebrar sus ochenta años de creación en el 2003 por medio de la promoción de varios trabajos de investigación sobre la economía nacional en el siglo XX. El Gerente General del Banco de la República en esa época era Miguel Urrutia, quien empezó su vida académica como historiador económico, y escribió su tesis doctoral en economía en Berkeley sobre la historia del movimiento sindical en Colombia. Uno de los primeros resultados de ese programa fue la publicación en el 2002 del libro El crecimiento económico colombiano en el siglo XX, a cargo del Grupo de Estudios del Crecimiento Económico (GRECO).
En el 2004 el Banco de la República, dentro del programa que hemos mencionado, realizó un seminario sobre la historia económica de Colombia en el siglo XX con presentaciones sobre el tema fiscal, monetario, transportes, industria, agricultura, educación, entre otros. Esos documentos fueron publicados en el 2007 en el libro editado por Miguel Urrutia y James Robinson, *Economía colombiana siglo XX, Un análisis cuantitativo* (la traducción de ese libro al inglés será publicada por el David Rockefeller Center de la Universidad de Harvard en el 2010). Con los expositores y comentaristas del seminario del 2004 se llevó a cabo en Villa de Leiva un coloquio sobre el futuro de los estudios de historia económica colombiana y las alternativas para fomentarlos. Entre los participantes extranjeros de ese coloquio estaban John Coatsworth, James Robinson, Stephen Haber y Luis Bértola. Uno de los temas al cual se le dedicó mayor atención fue el de la creación de la ACHE. Se puede decir pues, que fue en esa reunión donde surgió la idea original para su creación.

Unos años después, uno de los participantes de la reunión de Villa de Leiva, Salomón Kalmanovitz, cuando ya no era miembro de la Junta Directiva del Banco de la República y se desempeñaba como decano de la Facultad de Economía de la Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano, retomó la idea de conformar la asociación y convocó a un amplio grupo de economistas, historiadores e historiadores de empresas para crear la asociación. Su fundación ocurrió el 3 de mayo de 2007.

La estructura de la ACHE se compone de un presidente, un vicepresidente, un secretario, un fiscal, los vocales y la asamblea. Desde la fundación el presidente ha sido Salomón Kalmanovitz y el vicepresidente Miguel Urrutia.

Los objetivos básicos de la asociación son la promoción de la investigación en historia económica, la creación de una red de personas que en el país están interesadas en el tema, la vinculación de la red local a las redes internacionales en este campo, la difusión de publicaciones, la circulación de información sobre seminarios, simposios, cursos y convocatoria de historia económica en Colombia y en el extranjero, y el logro de la presencia de los colombianos en las organizaciones internacionales del área.

En general uno podría decir que la mayoría de los miembros de la ACHE son economistas que trabajan el tema de historia económica, pero también se desempeñan en la investigación de otras temáticas económicas. Pero entre sus participantes también hay historiadores, sociólogos y administradores de empresas.

El apoyo institucional de la Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano ha sido definitivo para la consolidación de la asociación. Esa universidad cubre los costos de la remuneración del secretario, un joven historiador económico, que realiza todo el trabajo logístico y mantiene al día la página web.

La labor de la ACHE hasta la fecha ha sido especialmente útil para promocionar los nuevos trabajos y para mantener informados a los miembros sobre la realización de conferencias pertinentes al tema que se realizan en el país y en el exterior. Hacia el futuro su principal reto es la organización de encuentros nacionales e internacionales sobre el tema, así como la publicación de un boletín informativo.
La Asociación Mexicana de Historia Económica
Un proyecto consolidado

por Graciela Marquez | Centro de Estudios Históricos, El Colegio de México | gmarquez@colmex.mx

La Asociación Mexicana de Historia Económica, A. C. (AMHE) se fundó en 1998 con la finalidad de promover y fomentar los estudios en historia económica en México. Hasta ese momento el intercambio académico entre los historiadores económicos se realizaba en el marco de congresos generales o congresos internacionales pero no contaban con un espacio común. La única excepción era la Asociación de Historia Económica del Norte de México (AHENME), fundada en 1992 gracias a la iniciativa, entre otros, de Mario Cerutti. A fines de los años 1990 Carlos Marichal tomó la iniciativa de convocar a un grupo de investigadores y profesores para formar una instancia que facilitara el contacto entre colegas de las distintas universidades e instituciones del país. Con ello se seguían los pasos de otras asociaciones en Iberoamérica. Una vez constituida, la AMHE eligió al que sería su primer consejo, el cual estaría integrado por una mesa directiva y seis vocales. Estos últimos tendrían la responsabilidad de secundar todas las actividades propuestas por la mesa y colaborar en las tareas de gestión y relaciones interinstitucionales que la AMHE emprendiera.

La primera mesa directiva de la AMHE estuvo integrada por Leonor Ludlow, Aurora Gómez e Inés Herrera, presidenta, secretaria y tesorera, respectivamente. Durante este periodo fundacional, la AMHE delineó una agenda, que años posteriores daría forma a los ejes rectores de su actividad académica y gremial. En primer lugar, se planeó el diseño de un portal del Internet que albergara toda la información de difusión, actividades, proyectos y encuentros académicos que permitieran integrar a la amplia red de investigadores en historia económica del país. Este portal también permitiría estrechar y consolidar relaciones con las asociaciones hermanas de historia económica que existían a nivel internacional.

La página de la AMHE entró en funciones en el mismo año de 1998, siendo la primera encargada de su administración Aurora Gómez.

En 2000 fueron electos para la mesa directiva Carlos Marichal, Aurora Gómez y Guillerminda del Valle, como presidente, secretaria y tesorera, respectivamente. Entre sus actividades más importantes estuvo la organización del primer Congreso de Historia Económica, celebrado en octubre del año de 2001, en el Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM). En el marco de este primer congreso se distribuyó el primer número del Boletín de la AMHE. Esta publicación, a lo largo de sus ocho ediciones, dio cuenta sobre los avances en la disciplina, ofreciendo a sus lectores información referente a las actividades de la AMHE, a los congresos y seminarios celebrados a nivel nacional e internacional, las novedades bibliográficas, la producción de tesis y notas sobre fuentes y archivos.

Con la realización de este primer congreso, la publicación del Boletín y el funcionamiento del portal del Internet se consolidaron los objetivos propuestos desde su fundación. En 2001 el número de agremiados llegó a más de ochenta, quienes participaron en la elección de una nueva mesa directiva. Dos años más tarde, la estafeta fue recibida por Carlos Marichal, Antonio Ibarra y Luis Anaya, en los cargos de presidente, secretario y tesorero. El segundo Congreso de Historia Económica se celebró en octubre de 2004, con la participación de poco más de dos centenas de destacados investigadores de procedencia nacional e extranjera. Para este año, el número de agremiados se duplicó, sumando poco más de 150 miembros.

En ese mismo año los miembros de la AMHE eligieron a una nueva mesa directiva encabezada por Antonio Ibarra como presidente, Luis Jáuregui como secretario y Gustavo del Ángel como tesorero, quienes continuaron con las labores de difusión e intercambio de la AMHE. En el Tercer Congreso de Historia Económica aumentó sensiblemente la participación de colegas de otros países, particularmente de España, Brasil, Uruguay, Argentina y Chile. Celebrado en la ciudad de Cuernavaca, Morelos, en octubre de 2007 el congreso contó con la participación de poco más de 200 ponentes. Al tiempo, el número de agremiados superó las dos centenas. En este mismo año Luis Jáuregui fue electo presidente y Mario Trujillo y Mario Contreras secretario y tesorero respectivamente. Aunque existían contactos previos con otras asociaciones de América Latina, en diciembre de 2007 la AMHE junto con las asociaciones de Argentina, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, México y Uruguay convocaron al Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Historia Económica. En la llamada “Declaración de Montevideo” se establecieron compromisos para difundir y promover las investigaciones y enseñanza de la historia económica, para lo cual la AMHE auspiciaría un portal de Internet cuya finalidad era “crear un ámbito de encuentro e intercambio entre las asociaciones”. Además, se seleccionó a México como sede del segundo Congreso Latinoamericano de Historia Económica. En febrero de 2010 se celebró dicho evento con una participación cercana a los 300 ponentes.

A lo largo de sus poco más de diez años de vida, la AMHE no sólo se ha consolidado como organización académica a nivel nacional, sino que juega un destacado papel en el concierto de asociaciones internacionales en la materia, como socia de la International Economic History.
La Asociación Uruguaya de Historia Económica
Un carácter fuertemente internacional

por Luis Bertola | Universidad de la República, Uruguay | lbertola@fcs.edu.uy

Association and como impulsora de importantes proyectos como el de la creación de la Asociación de Historia Económica del Caribe. La AMHE también ha celebrado múltiples convenios de colaboraciones entre diversas instituciones entre las que cabe destacar al Archivo General de la Nación, la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México y El Colegio de México.

Asimismo, la AMHE ha reconocido el trabajo de jóvenes investigadores mediante los premios Luis Chávez Orozco y Fernando Rosenzweig, los cuales son otorgados cada dos años a las mejores Tesis de Licenciatura y Maestría en Historia Económica. Pero la AMHE no sólo se ha interesado por reconocer a las nuevas generaciones, también creó un Consejo de Honor el cual tiene la misión de reconocer el trabajo de destacados historiadores mexicanos. Al día de hoy este Consejo está conformado por Carlos Sempat Assadourian, Jan Bazant, Marcello Carmagnani, Enrique Cárdenas, Mario Cerutti, Francisco Calderón, Enrique Florescano, Leonor Ludlow, Carlos Marichal, Guadalupe Nava, Ricardo Torres Gaytán (†), Enrique Semo y Leopoldo Solís. ■

La Asociación Uruguaya de Historia Económica (AUDHE), fundada en Montevideo en octubre de 1992, es una organización no gubernamental autónoma, constituida por personas que cultivan profesionalmente la historia económica.

Tiene por finalidad estimular y promover la investigación, la enseñanza y las publicaciones sobre temas relacionados con la disciplina; estimular el contacto con organizaciones profesionales similares en el exterior y la participación de sus integrantes en eventos internacionales; intercambiar información y alentar las relaciones interdisciplinarias; contribuir a la preservación de todo tipo de fuentes históricas, y en general impulsar aquellas actividades que concurran al fomento y la difusión de la historia económica.

La iniciativa para la creación de AUDHE fue de Raúl Jacob. En 1991, Luis Bértola y Julio Millot invitaron a Jacob a constituir el actual Programa de Historia Económica y Social en la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales. Jacob, quien venía de participar del Congreso Internacional celebrado en Lovaina en 1990 y que venía desempeñando su actividad en la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, explicó la necesidad de que se creara, además, una asociación que reuniera a quienes cultivaban la historia económica desde distintas perspectivas y que permitiera una fluida relación con la comunidad latinoamericana e internacional. Este último aspecto habría de constituir un rasgo particularmente relevante de la historia de AUDHE.

Los miembros de AUDHE provienen de muy diversos sectores del quehacer académico, pero se han concentrado principalmente en tres núcleos de la Universidad de la República:

• Instituto de Ciencias Históricas y Centros de estudios interdisciplinarios sobre Uruguay (CEIU) y América Latina (CEIL) en la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación.

• Área de historia económica (a cargo de las cátedras de historia económica del Uruguay e historia económica universal) y equipo de Historia Económica del Instituto de Economía, ambos en la Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración.


A estos grupos orgánicos de investigación y docencia se suma el aporte de diversos profesionales que desde variados lugares desarrollan actividades convergentes. En particular, cabe señalar el gran empuje de los profesores de historia en enseñanza media, quienes con suma avidez se acercan a los...
problemas de la historia económica, realizando importantes aportes de investigación y demandando esfuerzos docentes y de difusión de los resultados alcanzados.

Desde sus comienzos AUDHE se preocupó por profundizar los lazos académicos con instituciones similares de la región y el mundo. De ello da cuenta la fluida relación con las Asociaciones de Historia Económica de Argentina y Brasil, así como la participación como miembro pleno en la Asociación Internacional de Historia Económica desde 1994.

Los miembros de AUDHE, desde sus núcleos académicos de referencia, poseen una importante articulación regional e internacional, tanto en el plano docente como en el de la conformación de redes de investigación.

La actividad más importante que ha venido desplegando AUDHE es la realización de sus jornadas de historia económica cada cuatro años. Esta actividad no solamente ha venido ganando en dimensión, sino también en internacionalización.

Las Primeras Jornadas de Historia Económica se realizaron en 1995, cuando se presentaron y discutieron sesenta trabajos. En las segundas jornadas (1999) el número de ponencias trepó a más de 180 y se produjo una marcada diversificación del origen de los visitantes del exterior, aunque obviamente se mantuvo el predominio de argentinos y brasileños, junto al importante componente doméstico. En las terceras jornadas de 2003 hubo 248 ponencias e intervenciones con participación de 297 personas: 117 de Argentina, ochenta y cinco de Uruguay, setenta de Brasil, nueve de España, siete de México, dos de Francia y Estados Unidos, y uno de Austria, Chile, Perú, Portugal y Venezuela.

Este carácter fuertemente internacional de las jornadas de AUDHE fue la principal razón para que al momento de estar organizándose las cuartas jornadas a fines de 2007, y debido a la creciente internacionalización de todos los congresos de las demás asociaciones nacionales, madurara la idea de organizar un Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Historia Económica. Y los colegas argentinos propusieron que ese congreso coincidiera con las cuartas jornadas uruguayas. Al Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Historia Económica celebrado en Montevideo en diciembre de 2007 se le llamó CLADHE-I, porque existía la convicción de que habría un CLADHE-II, como realmente ocurrió en México el presente año. El CLADHE-I realizó con total éxito, con el componente organizativo local pero organizado conjuntamente por las cuatro asociaciones nacionales existentes a la fecha (Argentina, Brasil, México y Uruguay) y en el proceso se crearon las asociaciones de Colombia y Chile, así como recientemente se constituyó en México la del Caribe.

La participación en Montevideo fue estupenda: hubo 636 autores de ponencias (más de 500 ponencias): 230 argentinos, 152 brasileños, diecisiete de Chile y de Colombia, cincuenta y dos de México, sesenta y cinco de Uruguay y varios colegas de otros países latinoamericanos en menor número, además de veintiuno de Estados Unidos y Canadá, veintiséis de España y Portugal y otros quince europeos. Haber sido huéspedes de semejante evento fue motivo de mucho orgullo para la colectividad uruguaya de historiadores económicos.

La vitalidad de AUDHE también se manifiesta en la realización de las Jornadas Internas de Investigadores que se han venido realizando anualmente desde 1994. Bajo diferentes formatos, ellas se han constituido en un ámbito fructífero para el intercambio académico y en un instrumento relevante para la maduración de la disciplina.

Este complejo proceso de lenta pero notable acumulación llevó a que AUDHE se lanzara a editar el Boletín de Historia Económica.

El Boletín procurara ser una vía de intercambio entre la comunidad de investigadores y entre ésta y un amplio público que quiere conocer los avances en la disciplina, ya sea a través de artículos breves o reseñas bibliográficas. Asimismo, el Boletín ha estado siempre abierto a contribuciones de colegas de otros países que enriquezcan el espacio de diálogo de la disciplina.

Para el primer número fuimos honrados por Josep Fontana con la entrega de un artículo redactado especialmente, donde pone a punto reflexiones anteriores sobre la disciplina. El Boletín se ha venido publicando regularmente de forma anual y el último año pasó a editarse exclusivamente en formato digital <http://www.audhe.org.uy/boletin.htm>.

Las Quintas Jornadas de Historia Económica de AUDHE serán realizadas en 2011.
Loyalists, Race, and Disunity during the Spanish American Wars of Independence: A Grumpy Reading

by Jorge I. Domínguez | Harvard University | jorge_dominguez@harvard.edu

Simón Bolívar may have gained unusual insight into Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s expression that human beings must sometimes be “forced to be free,” as he pondered why the Viceroy in Lima was so successful at first preventing, and later delaying, the independence of all of Spanish South America. In the second decade of the nineteenth century, Peruvian Creoles seemed to have found a new mission as the militant center of royalist loyalty in South America.1

At least half of the troops sent from Lima to reconquer Chile under General Mariano Osorio in 1818 were Peruvian-born. Peruvians, including free blacks in the army, who had subdued revolts in the early years of the South American wars. Even as Peruvian independence approached, most of the fighting on behalf of the independence of Peru was done by non-Peruvians. Peruvians accounted for only 42 percent of the fighting forces, and 48 percent of the casualties, on the independence side at the battle of Junín in August 1824; the rest were from countries to the north and south. To the very end, Peruvian recruits were insufficient to replenish the losses of the independence armies.

A similar picture of Bourbon loyalty is found among Peruvian elites. Of the fourteen Peruvian Members of Congress who remained in Lima during the brief Spanish reoccupation in 1823, eight switched to become royalists. Peru’s first president, José de la Riva Agüero, would soon thereafter propose to the Viceroy that Peru should become a monarchy under a Spanish Prince selected by the Spanish King and, until then, the Viceroy should continue to rule. A year later, Peru’s second head of government defected to the Spanish side during the second Spanish reconquest of Lima.

As Spanish America in 2010 takes note of the moment that came to be known as its independence two hundred years earlier, it is important to remember that the wars that tore apart Spain’s American empire are best understood as simultaneous and interconnected civil and international wars. In choosing to study the process of Spanish American independence, it has been too easy to forget the loyalists ready to fight on behalf of the Crown, not just in Peru but in many other Spanish-American colonies as well. Indeed, if loyalty had not been such a widespread and powerful phenomenon, the wars of independence would not have been such a large-scale event. In the viceroyalty of New Spain and the Captaincy-General of Caracas—honored in patriotic histories for their struggles for independence—many loyalists successfully held independence back without needing to import many Spanish troops.2

Loyalists were a part of the shared experience of North and South America during the respective wars of independence. From Lima, Peru, to Lexington, Massachusetts, the European empires had many supporters. In Spanish America, the loyalists won the first rounds of the wars of independence, except in the Viceroyalty of Buenos Aires, though they would eventually be defeated almost everywhere. In North America, many loyalists fled to rump British North America—Canada. From South America and New Spain, many fled to Cuba and Puerto Rico and helped to ensure that these would remain Spanish colonies for nearly a full additional century, even after the majority of their people may have come to prefer independence. Cuban Creoles, however, needed little Spanish help to defend their link to Spain and defeat feeble pro-independence efforts in Cuba.

The racial order of the Spanish empire also broke down during the second decade of the nineteenth century and the interaction between the breakdowns of the political and racial orders proved explosive. On July 13, 1811, the patriot Supreme Junta of Caracas called upon citizens to defend the new independent republic, but it insisted upon going into battle with a racially segregated army. Articles VII and XVI of the Junta’s decree asked citizens to gather “in Trinidad Plaza… The whites would enlist before the Church; the blacks to the east, and the mulattoes to the south… The slaves would remain at home at their masters’ command, without leaving them except under government orders.” Militia battalions of whites and blacks would remain segregated, except that the top two officers of the black battalions would be white. Racial salary differentials persisted.

Compare that to the response of the royalist leadership in the city of Valencia. Valencia rose against Caracas and pledged loyalty to the king. The royalist forces in Valencia abolished slavery and proclaimed the civil equality of all citizens. When the patriot republican armies of General Francisco de Miranda attacked Valencia, that city’s black militiamen were among its main defenders.

The counter-independence strategy of Crown officials fighting Caracas pro-independence Creoles built upon this racial divide. Royalist officials mobilized Afro-Venezuelans to fight Creole Caracas independence. As Bolívar put it unsympathetically, “a revolution of blacks, free and slave, broke out in the eastern coastal valleys, provoked, supplied and supported by agents of [Spanish General] Monteverde. These inhuman and vile people, feeding upon the blood and property of the patriots… committed the most horrible assassinations, thefts, assaults, and devastation.” Alas, royalist officer José Tomás Boves came to lead thousands of troops, of whom fewer than two hundred were Spaniards, while most were Afro-Venezuelans. The war’s racial character deepened. In July 1814, Bolívar’s armies were defeated, the republic collapsed, and the army of Boves entered Caracas, proclaiming the restoration of the empire. As Bolívar put it, still without much understanding of what had occurred: “Your brothers, not the Spaniards, have torn the country apart.”3
The motivations for loyalty varied a great deal, of course, across the expanse of a Spanish America that ranged from Río Negro to the central prairies of North America. Viceregalist Límites as well as the black plainmen who followed Boves in their triumphant war against Bolivar and Caracas Creoles responded to different circumstances, constraints, and opportunities. The key point is, precisely, the enormous variety of reasons why a great many people in Spanish America across the economic hierarchies and the color spectrum resisted those who clamored for independence and often fought with their blood and guts against independence.

Distributive and political conflicts gravely weakened the newly independent Spanish American republics. This helps to explain in part why the second quarter of the nineteenth century was in part a prolonged extension of the civil and international wars that broke out approximately two centuries ago. From Argentina through Peru to New Spain, the half century from the 1810s to the 1860s was in many ways a disastrous time with long-term consequences in human suffering, foregone economic growth, catastrophic political instability, and recurrent warfare. Next to independence itself, this is a key legacy of the processes unleashed in 1808 and more fully in 1810.

A second legacy was the problem of identity. If the national elite lacked a nation, how could it be built? “How to make patriots out of traitors?” asked some who thought unkindly of their adversaries. How to make citizens out of enemies? How to persuade Creole elites to think as José Martí—in a master stroke of propaganda that has served Cuban rulers well down to the present—that there are no blacks and no whites but only Cubans? The newly independent states took decades to rebuild the capacity of the imperial bureaucratic state. The development of schools would await the twentieth century, for the most part, outside of the River Plate, the central valley of Chile, and some other isolated spots. The construction of an identity as Venezuelans that embraced all Venezuelans, we now know more clearly, has taken long enough to explain some of the basis of support today for Presidents Hugo Chávez and Evo Morales, among others.

A third legacy, related to but distinct from the above, is the restoration of a racial order after the painful human toll of the wars of independence. By the sesquicentennial of Spanish American independence, comparisons between race relations in the United States and Latin America looked invariably favorable to the latter. Slavery, some wrote, was not so bad, and racism not so severe under the Spanish Crown and successor republics. A collective amnesia washed over much of the thinking about the terrible violence and racism that had characterized so many who so proudly once called themselves patriots, yet defended slavery or segregation. The process of a restoration of Gramscian hegemony in matters of race is one of the impressive, albeit sad and tragic white elite accomplishments in Spanish America and Brazil, unsuccessfully challenged, with some exceptions, until well into the second half of the twentieth century.

A fourth legacy is the challenge of comparative research. Three empires were battered in the Americas. The British empire in North America split in half—and just in half. The Portuguese empire in South America became independent as a single entity, with the newly independent Brazilian empire beating back local and regional challenges. Only the Spanish empire shattered—why? All too often scholars fail to examine the counterfactual. Suppose New Spain had retained its territory from Costa Rica to Texas and California. Suppose Brazil had splintered as much as independent New Spain did. Suppose Colombia or Argentina had fragmented into smaller pieces.

More generally, why did this variation recur in imperial histories? Other Portuguese colonies (Angola, Mozambique) became independent without shattering, emulating Brazil. Francophone Africa and Francophone Indochina broke apart into many of their components. British India partitioned but independent India did not, even though it seemed vulnerable to fissiparous tendencies. The former Soviet Union broke up into pieces, albeit peacefully for the most part. Little regions can split off (Uruguay, Panama, Kosovo, Slovakia, Abkhazia); big places may stay together (Brazil; the United States in the 1780s; Nigeria despite the Biafran civil war; independent India).

Finally, there is a legacy from the breakdown of the Spanish American empire for the construction of a wider international order. For the most part—with apologies especially to Paraguayans and Bolivians—the Audiencia boundaries of Spain’s South American empire became the boundaries of the independent republics, and those boundaries, also for the most part and with the same apologies, have endured until our time. Ut i possidetis juris—the process just described in its international legal formulation—was a Latin American invention in its empirical application, which has contributed to the management of post-imperial international orders ever since. It was replicated during the processes of decolonization in Africa and Asia after World War II and upon the breakdown of the Soviet Union. Violation of the hitherto administrative boundaries of the newly independent countries in Spanish America, Asia, Africa, or the former Soviet Union has been rare, while attempts at the construction of federations grouping those once-administrative units did not fare well (Gran Colombia, the United Arab Republic). Spanish America’s principal contribution to the international order upon its independence has been this unacknowledged statecraft.
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Assessing Independence
The Economic Consequences

by Leandro Prados de la Escosura | Universidad Carlos III de Madrid | prados@clio.uc3m.es

Domínguez continued...

Endnotes

1 I am grateful to Sebastián Mazzuca for his comments. Errors are mine alone.

2 I first explored these and related themes in Insurrection or Loyalty: The Breakdown of the Spanish American Empire (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980).


4 Ibid., I, 305.

5 Quoted in Laureano Valenilla Lanz, Cesarismo democrático (Caracas: Tipografía Garrido, 1961), 19.

Why did British America and Latin America develop so differently after independence? Failure to achieve sustained and balanced growth over the nineteenth-century, according to Stanley and Barbara Stein, resulted from the persistent colonial heritage. The colonial economic background was reinforced by local conditions (lack of political unity, conflict of economic interests, highly concentrated income and poverty) and, in particular, by British informal imperialism.

Christopher Platt has argued, in turn, that independence had very limited impact in post-colonial Latin America, and only after 1860 was the lagged effect of independence noticeable. The break with Spain, far from confirming the integration of Latin America as a dependent partner in the world economy, “reintroduced an unwelcome half century of ‘independence’ from foreign trade and finance.” Nineteenth century Latin America was, hence, “shaped by domestic circumstances,” and economic growth was constrained by lack of human and physical capital, shortage of industrial fuels, and small markets.

The differences between British North American and Iberian American colonies, and their long-run effects on growth, also have been stressed by the new institutional economic historians; their radically different evolution reflected the imposition of distinct metropolitan institutions on each colony. Douglass North’s main proposition is that different initial conditions, in particular the religious and political diversity in the English colonies as opposed to uniform religion and bureaucratic administration of the existing agricultural society in the Spanish colonies are behind differences in performance over time.

Why should institutions be taken as entirely external impositions? Initial inequalities of wealth, human capital and political power conditioned, according to Stanley Engerman and Kenneth Sokoloff, institutional design and, hence, performance in Spanish America. Large scale estates, built on pre-conquest social organization and extensive supply of native labor, established the initial levels of inequality. Elites designed institutions protecting their privileges. Government policies and institutions restricted competition and offered opportunities to select groups. This was in sharp contrast with white populations’ predominance, evenly distributed wealth and high endowment of human capital per head in British North America.

John Coatsworth and Gabriel Tortella reject the connections between Iberian institutions transferred to America and the initial unequal distribution of income and wealth, stressing that the caste system deliberately weakened the grip of local elites on the indigenous population and limited the growth of wealth inequality by recognizing indigenous property rights and guaranteeing indigenous population access to land.

Factor endowments do not provide, according to North, Summerhill and Weingast, sufficient explanation of post-independence behavior. They stress the sharp institutional contrast between the independent United States (a constitution and well-specified economic and political rights) and post-colonial Latin America (civil and international warfare). In their view, the absence of institutional arrangements capable of establishing cooperation between rival groups led to destructive conflict that diverted capital and labor from production and consigned the new republics to poor performance relative to the United States.
The literature surveyed so far uses the United States as the yardstick to measure Latin American achievements over the nineteenth century. The income gap between colonial British and Latin America widened in the half century after independence. The United States doubled Latin American product per head in 1820 and more than trebled it by 1870. Is this approach adequate to unravel the causes of Latin America’s poor performance? Focusing on the contrast with North America inevitably leads to a negative assessment of Latin America’s economic and political behavior both before and after independence. In fact, per capita income divergence between rich and poor countries is the dominant feature of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the comparison conflates the initial conditions in the new republics with their post-independence performance. And, even more crucially, it diverts attention from the real issue: the extent to which Latin America under-performed in terms of its own potential. That the new republics fell behind the United States or northwestern European nations does not necessarily imply that development opportunities were missed. Differences in geography, public policies and political institutions all mattered in shaping Latin American countries’ long-run economic performance. On the basis of predictable large differences in human (and physical) capital to labor ratios it could be hypothesized that different steady states probably prevailed in British and Latin America.

A substantial number of Asian, African and Eastern European countries shared, at the time of their independence, some of the initial conditions of the new Latin American republics: demographic patterns (a delayed demographic transition and persistent high fertility until late in the twentieth-century); low population density (except in Asia); a high share of adult population employed in agriculture; low levels of social and human capital; poor contract enforcement; and weak governments yielding to interest groups. At the time of independence, Latin American republics had levels of income more similar to most countries in Asia and in Africa than to the United States. Perhaps, then, a more appropriate approach is to compare the post-colonial economic performance of Latin America to those of other parts of the periphery (Asia and Africa) during the late twentieth century.

Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson stress the differential impact of colonialism. They contrast societies in which colonialism led to the establishment of “institutions of private property,” allowing a broad sector of the society to receive returns on their investments, with those in which colonialism imposed “extractive institutions,” under which most of the population risked expropriation at the hands of the ruling elite or the government. The former, they argue, prospered relative to the latter. European colonialism led paradoxically to the development of relatively better institutions in previously poor areas, while introducing extractive institutions or reinforcing bad institutions in previously prosperous places. The reason is that poor areas were less densely populated, enabling Europeans to settle in large numbers and to develop their own institutions that encouraged investment and growth. Conversely, where abundant populations showed relative affluence, the Europeans established “extractive institutions” (forced labor and tributes, often existing already in the pre-colonial era, over the locals) with political power concentrated in the hands of an elite. This represented the most efficient choice for the European colonizers, despite its negative effects on long-term growth.

Were Spanish Mesoamerica and the Andes examples of colonial “extractive institutions”? In the case of the viceroyalties of Mexico and Peru, the exploitation of silver deposits centered economic activity on those locations where the deposits were found and conditioned population settlement, the location of urban centers, and fiscal policies.

There are interesting connections between Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson’s interpretation of different colonial patterns and Stanley and Barbara Stein’s counterfactual “had the Englishmen found a dense and highly organized Amerindian population, the history of what is called the United States would record the development of a stratified, bi-racial, very different society.” The Steins contend that “the existence of a huge, under-populated virgin land of extraordinary resource endowment directly facing Europe and enjoying a climate comparable to that of Europe represented a potentiality for development that existed nowhere else in the New World.”

Both distinctive institutional and geographical features suggest significantly different outcomes for British North America and Latin America before and after independence. On these dimensions Latin America is more comparable with Asia and Africa. Conditions were more similar between most Latin American countries and the European colonies in Asia and Africa than between Latin America and British North America, with the exception of the similarities between Latin America’s Southern cone and Australia and New Zealand. It could be added that in empty lands more efficient institutional settings went hand by hand with better factor endowment (higher human capital/labor and physical capital/labor ratios).

The similarities between Latin America and other colonial experiences suggest that the
subsequent performance should be comparable. We can see this by contrasting assessments of post-independence performance as well as GDP levels and growth rates in Sub-Saharan African and the Latin American countries. The striking degree of coincidence between the rather different appraisals by present-day development economists, in the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, and those by economic historians, in the case of Latin America, suggest that post-independence Africa (and, presumably, Asia) is a more appropriate benchmark of comparison for Latin America than the U.S. exception. Nonetheless, the different timing of independence in Latin America (prior to the first wave of globalization) and in Africa and Asia (during the first stages of the second globalization) surely had a distinctive impact on economic growth.

How do Latin American countries compare to other countries, especially to former European colonies in Asia and Africa? Did Latin America fall behind before 1870? Comparing Latin America to the United States, three distinctive phases appear: a sharp decline up to 1870, followed by a soft deterioration up to 1913 and relative stability up to 1973, opening another period of significant decline reaching up to the present. Thus, in the binary comparison with the United States, only the pre-1870 and the post-1973 periods can be deemed responsible for today’s Latin American retardation. However, these results are largely conditioned by crude guesstimates for Brazil’s and Mexico’s performance. If these two countries are excluded, the picture changes and the relative position of Latin America remains unaltered over 1820-1913 to decline thereafter, especially after 1973. It appears, therefore, that in our state of knowledge no definitive conclusion can be reached.

A more illuminating picture for the nineteenth century derives from a country-by-country analysis. The scant estimates available suggest that over 1820-70, while the relative position of Mexico and Brazil to the United States halved, Argentina, Colombia, Cuba, and Venezuela experienced only moderate relative declines, while Chile and Uruguay kept their positions mainly unchanged.

The assessment of Latin American performance has been carried out, so far, using the United States as the relevant benchmark. The fact that, over the nineteenth century, most countries, including those of Western Europe, fell behind when measured by U.S. standards renders that yardstick questionable.

If Latin America’s performance is compared to that of other regions, the picture changes dramatically. During the half century after independence (1820-70), the decline relative to the United States for the Latin American countries for which some information exists is deeper than in the case of Western Europe, but similar to that of the European periphery and Russia, and much milder than in Africa and Asia. So even though her position worsened to the U.S. and Western Europe, it remained unaltered in comparison to Eastern Europe and improved to the rest of today’s Third World.

The fact that Latin America’s position relative to the United States during the Golden Age was unaltered is at odds with the catching-up experience in large areas of the periphery (Southern and Eastern Europe, Southeast Asia) where the gap with the United States in terms of income per head was significantly reduced and, again, Latin America underperformed relative to Asia after 1973.

Blaming the inheritance of Spanish Ancien Régime institutions in Latin America as opposed to non-absolutist (post-1688) institutions in British America does not seem to be a solid explanation for the differing economic performance of the two regions, especially if the scope is widened to include the post-independence performance of British (and French) former colonies in Africa and Asia. British North America appears as an exceptional example of success that cannot be used as a yardstick to measure Latin American success.

The Toronto Congress will feature three innovations. Here is a brief description of each.

Grant-writing Session

The first innovation is a special session on successful grant writing led by representatives from the Fulbright Association and the Inter-American Foundation. This special session will provide tips to both junior and established scholars on how to write stronger grant proposals. Since most grant applicants rarely have a chance to meet with individuals involved in evaluating applications, this session affords prospective grantees scholars a special opportunity. The Fulbright and the Inter-American representatives have agreed to detail as much as possible the do’s and don’ts of grant writing. For anyone with questions about how the evaluations of academic grant proposals are undertaken, this promises to be a not-to-be-missed session.

Pre-Congress Workshops

The second innovation is a series of workshops held prior to the opening of the Congress on October 6. LASA has never had a pre-Congress program, in contrast to many comparable associations. The LASA Executive Council enthusiastically approved our recommendation to initiate this program for 2010. The pre-Congress workshops are designed to give attendees a chance to participate in a kind of “graduate seminar for scholars” led by academics distinguished in their fields. Each workshop will have a syllabus and be in session from two to three hours. Enrollment will be limited, but the workshop leaders are committed to ensuring that accepted participants have diverse backgrounds.

For LASA2010, the following pre-Congress workshops will be offered:

1) Democracy, Economic Growth, and Equity after the Crisis. Evelyne Huber, UNC, and Robert Kaufman, Rutgers/Columbia, co-directors.

2) Latin American Independence: A Bicentennial Perspective. John Chasteen, UNC.


The workshops will be held in the afternoon of Wednesday, October 6. Because it is a pilot program, just three workshops will be offered this time.

Please bear in mind that these sessions are by application only. To learn more about the program and the application procedure, visit <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/eng/congress/precongress_program.asp>.

We want to publicly thank our team of inaugural workshop leaders. They have volunteered to lead these sections as a service to our organization and the profession. We hope you consider applying to one of these workshops.

On Getting Published

The third innovation is more an enhancement than an innovation. For the past several years, Philip Oxhorn of McGill University and editor of the Latin American Research Review, has organized Congress sessions on “getting published.” These sessions have been a huge success, based on the consistently high attendance levels, but the allotted time has not allowed for coverage of the many and diverse issues of relevance. This year, the time allotted for this event will be extended to three hours, and Professor Oxhorn will invite editors from more journals and publishing outlets to ensure that more fields and writing venues are covered. More information can be found at <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/eng/congress/precongress_program.asp>.

We hope you find these innovations/enhancements exciting. We have thoroughly enjoyed working with track chairs, LASA Sections, the LASA President, the Secretariat, the local Toronto-based organizing team, and the Executive Council in putting together an exciting program for LASA2010. Even though the final program has not been finalized yet, we already know that these innovations will make this year’s congress one not to be missed.
Welcome to T.O.!

by Tommie Sue Montgomery | Newcastle, Ontario | tsmada@sympatico.ca

T.O.—as Toronto, Ontario is known in these parts—offers friendly people, great restaurants, many cultural activities, cutting-edge architecture, and excellent public transportation, all accessible to the Congress hotels.

It's a city to walk in—above and below ground. Safe streets? In a 2009 national survey, Toronto's crime rate ranked 29th among Canadian cities—and far below every other major North American city. Toronto invites you to escape the confines of the Hilton and Sheraton and go exploring. See <http://www.toronto.ca/about_toronto>.

Toronto sits on the northwest side of Lake Ontario so South is toward the lake; West is toward the airport and Michigan; East leads to Montreal and North will take you in the direction of inukshuks—well beyond the boreal forests. October brings fall weather: average high is 14°C / 57°F; average low, 4°C / 39°F. Expect rain 10 out of 31 days. Bring clothes you can layer.

Getting Around

Bad weather? Take the escalators in each hotel—or others in which you may be lodged—down to the PATH, a 27 km. underground network of shops, eateries, and entertainment that connects buildings and open spaces between Union Station at the south end with the Eaton Centre and Atrium, two malls, on the north. In between you will find concourses to Roy Thompson Hall, home of the Toronto Symphony; the Air Canada Centre, a major sports and entertainment venue; the CN Tower—west of Union Station—with its spectacular views, especially at night, of the city and Lake Ontario; The Bay (Hudson Bay Company, founded in 1670, is the oldest company in North America), and Nathan Phillips Square, across from the Sheraton. You will find a PATH map among the goodies you receive when you arrive. Or check it out at <http://www.toronto.ca/path/pdf/path_brochure.pdf>.

Looking for breakfast before your first panel? The PATH concourse between the Sheraton and The Bay offers several places for breakfast and lunch that open at 6:30 or 7:00: Druxy’s, Sweet Rosie’s, Café Supreme, YogenFruz, Bagels & Bites, Quesada Mexican Grill. For lunch you can also find sushi, souvlaki, Chinese and Japanese eateries. The Bay’s Express Café, just inside the PATH entrance, opens at 7 a.m. and offers light fare until 7 p.m.

Public transportation includes bus, subway, streetcars, and light rail if you are headed out of the city. Find the map for all these services at <http://crazedmonkey.com/toronto-transit-map>. If you decide to do a bit of sightseeing, be sure to ask for a transfer on any mode of public transportation; this enables you to pay one fare and go from streetcar to subway to bus, or vice versa. If you plan to jump on and off several times, a day pass is your best bet.

Culture

There are three art museums within walking distance of the Congress venues. The Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), at University Avenue and Bloor Street West, offers permanent exhibitions from world culture and natural history. When LASA gathers, a special exhibit, The Warrior Emperor and China’s Terracotta Army, will be running. To learn more go to <http://www.rom.on.ca>.

The only significant Latin American collection in Toronto can be found at the Gardiner Museum located on University Avenue across from the ROM. It houses a significant collection of Pre-Columbian ceramics that is well worth an hour’s visit. <http://www.gardinermuseum.on.ca>.

If you walk the 12 blocks to the ROM or the Gardiner, you will pass the University of Toronto on your left and Queen’s Park, the seat of the Ontario Provincial Legislature on your right. Or you can jump on the subway at Osgoode, University Avenue and Queen Street, and go north three stops to Museum. Bloor Street West and East is lined with upscale stores, bistros, and more down-scale eateries. Yonge Street—the longest street in Canada running from Lake Ontario to Thunder Bay on the north coast of Lake Superior, 2000 km. away—divides east and west.

The Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) and the ROM have undergone significant face lifts in recent years. Daniel Libeskind designed an angular crystal façade for the ROM that you either love or hate—but you won’t forget! Canadian-born Frank Gehry (he of Bilbao Art Museum fame) took on the AGO renovation and turned a non-descript modern building into a shell befitting of its contents. The AGO houses significant art collections from Europe and Canada, including a terrific Henry Moore sculpture room and newly displayed paintings from Canada’s most famous early 20th century artists, the Group of Seven. <http://www.ago.net>.

A Great Multicultural City

Toronto’s population of 2.48 million (over 5 million in the Greater Toronto Area-GTA) is home to more than 90 ethnic groups who speak over 140 languages and dialects; over 30 percent speak a language other than English or French at home. Forty-seven percent of Toronto’s people identify themselves as members of a visible minority.
Latin Americans comprise 2.6 percent of this number. This wonderful mix means that you will find identifiable ethnic neighbourhoods and restaurants to match. The best way to enjoy all of them is to walk around, take in the sights, sounds, and aromas, then choose a restaurant whose menu appeals.

With the largest Chinese population of any North American city, Toronto has several “Chinatowns,” the original and closest of which lies on and around Spadina Avenue, nine blocks west of University Avenue and the Congress hotels.

Little Italy lies west of Chinatown. Take the University or Yonge subway to Queen’s Park or College, respectively. Hop on a westbound streetcar and hop off at Bathurst, the next major north-south street after Spadina. This area starts jumping after 8:00 and it’s not all Italian. For Latin music and dancing (as well as a campy drag show every weekend) check out El Convento Rico at 750 College Street.

There are several “Little Indias,” the closest of which is accessible by the Gerrard streetcar, and includes Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Afghan restaurants and stores. Take the Yonge subway to College Street, jump on streetcar No. 506 and head east for about 15 minutes. You will know you’ve arrived when you begin seeing stores with colourful saris in the windows.

Want Greek? Greek Town on “The Danforth” is one of the most vibrant ethnic areas in the city with restaurants to match. Take the Yonge-University subway to the Bloor-Danforth line, head east, and get off at Chester, Pape or Donlands subway stations. <http://www.greektowntoronto.com>.

Looking for Canadian food? The up-scale Tundra, in the Hilton, and Canoe, in the TD Tower (on the PATH-south) offer Arctic Char, PEI mussels, bison tenderloin, Ontario lamb, lake duck, Quebec foie gras, and roast hind of Yukon caribou. Bb33 Bistro, at 33 Gerrard West, just off Yonge, has Nova Scotia salmon, PEI mussels, Alberta beef burgers, and Quebec goat cheese and cranberry crusted salmon.

Latin American Restaurants and Clubs

The most well known of the Latino venues is the Lula Lounge, http://www.lulalounge.ca/, live music and visiting bands. Located at 1585 Dundas Street West, take the Dundas Street streetcar to Sheridan and walking west a half block. On the way you will pass the Brazil Bakery and Pastry. Lula’s offers a rich variety of Latin music from Salsa to Samba.

Looking for Mexican? Check out Burrito Boyz at 120 Peter St., one block east of Spadina between King and Queen; Rancho Relaxo at 300 College Street, one block west of Spadina; Milagro Restaurant and Cantina at 5 Mercer Street, 2 blocks east of Spadina and a half-block south of King; just off of John St; and Jalapeño’s Mexican Cuisine at 725 King Street West, one block west of Bathurst.

Many other Latin American restaurants are accessible by public transit. El Fogon is a Peruvian restaurant at 543 St. Clair West, 2 blocks west of Bathurst. Take the University subway to St. Clair West and walk west 5 blocks. Ba-Ba-Luu’s is an upscale restaurant (paella for 2 is $50) and salsa club at 136 Yorkville Ave., 2 blocks north of Bloor West. Cha-Cha-Cha at 11 Duncan St. in the theatre district, 2 blocks west of University between King and Pearl, features “new Miami cuisine.” Café Havana, 236 Adelaide St. West, is an easy walk, just one block south of the Hilton and 2 blocks west of University.

Other Locales

The harbour front, Queen’s Quay (pronounced “key”) offers a welcome change from the downtown canyons; walk into Union Station and look for the streetcar signs. Wind through a passageway to reach the tracks. Get off at any stop on Queen’s Quay and walk south to the boardwalk along Toronto Harbour. You will find a variety of eateries in the area.

Toronto’s population of 2.48 million (over 5 million in the Greater Toronto Area-GTA) is home to more than 90 ethnic groups who speak over 140 languages and dialects; over 30 percent speak a language other than English or French at home.
Woody’s on Church, established in 1989, and featured in the U.S. version of “Queer as Folk.” Another trendy pub is The Hair of the Dog at 425 Church.

Front Street (which 200 years ago was the lake front) between Union Station and Jarvis has a large number and variety of restaurants. One of the best is Le Papillon French Restaurant at 69 Front St., whose dinner and dessert crepes are outstanding.

The Distillery District is southeast of downtown, where converted distilleries now house restaurants, shops and the Soulpepper Theatre. It is most easily accessed by taxi.

For Canadian fast food nothing beats Tim Horton’s. You will find several in the PATH and every couple blocks downtown. Timmy’s has excellent coffee, a variety of teas (you have to ask or you’ll get black tea), great donuts (forget Dunkin’ or Krispy), bagels, soups, chilli, and cold sandwiches made to order. No hamburgers or French fries here. If you want to be mistaken for a Canadian, ask for a “double-double.” That’s a medium coffee with 2 sugars and 2 creams—and the term is in the Canadian dictionary!

Finally, a word about our money: the Canadian dollar is commonly referred to as the “Loonie.” Not because we’re crazy. It’s because the gold-coloured dollar coin has a loon on the flip side. Queen Elizabeth II graces all our coins. Which makes our $2.00 coin…what else? A “Toonie”! Welcome to Canada! 

The LASA Nominating Committee presents the following slate of candidates for vice president and members of the Executive Council (EC). The winning candidate for vice president will serve in that capacity from November 1, 2010 to April 30, 2012 and as president from May 1, 2012 to October 31, 2013. The three winning candidates for EC membership and the winning candidate for Treasurer will serve a three-year term from November 1, 2010 to October 31, 2013.

Nominees for Vice President
Jeremy Adelman  
Princeton University

Evelyne Huber  
University of North Carolina

Nominees for Treasurer
Cristina Eguizabal  
Florida International University

Steven Volk  
Oberlin College

Nominees for Executive Council
Manuel Alcántara  
Universidad de Salamanca

Carlos Alonso  
Columbia University

Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo  
Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Socialv

Gioconda Herrera  
FLACSO / Ecuador

Jeffrey Lesser  
Emory University

Maxine Molyneux  
University of London

Jeremy Adelman was educated at the University of Toronto, the London School of Economics, and Oxford University, where he received his DPhil in 1989. He has taught at the University of Essex (UK) and the Instituto Torcuato di Tella (Argentina); currently he is the Walter Samuel Carpenter III Professor of Spanish Civilization and the Director of the Council for International Teaching and Research at Princeton University. His research seeks to place Latin American history into broad comparative and connected global contexts, from the study of colonialism to challenges of contemporary globalization. Beginning with Frontier Development: Land, Labour, and Capital on the Wheatlands of Argentina and Canada, 1890-1914 (Oxford University Press, 1994), Republic of Capital: Buenos Aires and the Legal Transformation of the Atlantic World (Stanford University Press, 1999) and most recently Sovereignty and Revolution in the Iberian Atlantic (Princeton University Press, 2006), his books draw upon analytical insights of social scientists while remaining attentive to the nuances and contingencies of historical narratives. While committed to archival research for books and essays destined for specialized scholars, he has also sought to write for broader audiences, including the much-assailed entry-level student; Worlds Together, Worlds Apart: A History of Humankind from its Origins to the Present (WW Norton, 2008) is a co-authored textbook that (among other things) seeks to place Latin American developments in a global setting and make them accessible for the uninitiated college student. Jeremy Adelman’s recent awards include a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation scholarship and a Frederick Burkhardt Fellowship, American Council of Learned Societies. He is currently working on an intellectual biography of Albert O. Hirschman.
Adelman Statement
It is an honor to be considered as a candidate for the vice presidency of LASA, an organization I have belonged to from the time I was a graduate student; indeed it was my first professional affiliation. What has made the organization so great is the work of its leaders and the energies of its members over many years—a unique partnership that belies the classic aphorism of Robert Michels about the ineluctable “iron law of oligarchy.” It is distinguished for its vitality by being committed to supporting as much as possible the open flow of academic influences and exchanges back and forth between Latin America and North America, and has made major strides in being open to scholars from Europe, Asia, and beyond. This is the organization’s core, and it must remain a strong one through changing financial circumstances and the pressures on border-crossing. Its publications and its meetings—the media by which we exchange our views and findings—need to remain open and global. As a past member of the Executive Council, I have a sense of the complex factors that go into the decisions about where Congresses are held and how to make them inclusive and intellectually rewarding, and I have seen some skilled LASA leaders rise to the challenges. Budget cuts that confront us all threaten the mobility of the organization’s membership; it will be vital to keep or enhance the access to travel support to meetings, including support for targeted workshops between the big conferences. When necessary, it will be important for the organization’s leadership to defend publicly the principles of openness against those that would restrict it. At the same time, area studies and area-based research have been important for academic disciplines while movements in the disciplines have brought new life to Latin American studies; I am committed to sustaining the dialogues across what has often been a divide, all the more so as financial and cultural shifts pose some basic questions about what is Latin American about Latin America. Finally, while a bit unglamorous, it is nonetheless true that moving forward requires an effective working partnership with the LASA staff and other elected officers. I hope to bring my experience within the organization, as well as that of department chair (and of two separate departments) and university administrator, to the table in the effort to make decisions fairly, transparently, and responsibly.

Evelyne Huber is Morehead Alumni Professor of Political Science and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. She studied at the University of Zurich and received both her M.A. (1973) and Ph.D. (1977) from Yale University. Her interests are in comparative politics and political economy, particularly in the conditions that promote democratization and in the effects of democracy and political parties on social and economic policies, and on poverty and inequality. She came to the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill in 1992, from Northwestern University. While at Northwestern University she co-founded the Latin American Studies Program with the Historian Frank Safford. At UNC, she served as Director of the Institute of Latin American Studies and as Chair of the Curriculum in Latin American Studies, and as Co-director of the Carolina–Duke Consortium in Latin American Studies from 1994 to 1998, and again from 2000 to 2003. She is the author of The Politics of Workers’ Participation: The Peruvian Approach in Comparative Perspective (1980); co-author of Democratic Socialism in Jamaica (with John D. Stephens, 1986); co-author of Capitalist Development and Democracy (with Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John D. Stephens, 1992; Outstanding Book Award 1991-92 from the American Sociological Association (Political Sociology Section); co-author of Development and Crisis of the Welfare State (with John D. Stephens, 2001; Best Book Award 2001 from the American Political Science Association, (Political Economy Section); co-editor of States Versus Markets in the World System (with Peter Evans and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, 1985); co-editor of Agrarian Structure and Political Power in Latin America (with Frank Safford, 1993); and editor of Models of Capitalism: Lessons for Latin America (2002). She has also contributed articles to, among others, World Politics, Latin American Research Review, Latin American Politics and Society, Comparative Politics, Politics and Society, Comparative Political Studies, The Journal of Politics, Studies in Comparative International Development, Comparative Social Research, Political Power and Social Theory, Social Politics, Revue Française des Affaires Sociales, American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, and Economic Perspectives. She received the Distinguished Teaching Award for Post-Baccalaureate Instruction from the University of North Carolina in 2004, and a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation in 2010. She has been a Fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, the Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg in Delmenhorst, Germany, the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences in Uppsala, the Collegio Carlo Alberto in Turin, Italy, the Kellogg Institute at the University of Notre Dame, and the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. She has been active in both LASA and the American Political Science Association; in the latter as President of the Comparative Politics Section 2001-2003, Member of the Nominating Committee 2001-2002, and Member of the Taskforce on Difference and
Inequality in the Third World 2004-06. In LASA, she served as chair of the Nominations Committee in 1994-95, as a Track Chair for the 1998 Congress, and as Program Chair for the 2009 Congress in Rio. She also served on the Joint Committee on Latin America and the renamed Regional Advisory Panel on Latin America of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies from 1995 to 2001.

Huber Statement

I am strongly committed to advancing knowledge and understanding of Latin America through interdisciplinary and disciplinary research, teaching, and work in professional organizations. LASA has a proud history of playing a pivotal role in advancing these endeavors, and it would indeed be a privilege to lead the Association in supporting further progress in these areas. What makes LASA special is its truly international character. We have members from all over the hemisphere and the world beyond, united by their desire to understand better the historical development and present day social, economic, political, and cultural realities of Latin America. A better understanding of these realities on the part of scholars, policy-makers, and the public at large in turn is an essential precondition for formulating national and transnational solutions to the many problems faced by the countries of the region. Since LASA is based in the United States, the Association and its members have a particular responsibility to improve understanding of Latin America among U.S. policy makers in order to support more informed policy-making towards the region. The LASA Congresses are a central venue for the face-to-face exchange of ideas and information. Even in the information age, with an abundance of information available at the click of a mouse, there is no substitute for such direct scholarly interaction with the opportunity for debate about the quality and the meaning of the information. The scholarly exchanges at the Congresses allow for the emergence and dissemination of new ideas, and for an assessment of the continued relevance of older ideas and theories. The LASA Sections also make vital contributions to the intellectual connections among members of the Association through their ongoing activities. Given the importance of the Congresses, one of my priorities would be to continue the pioneering efforts made by previous presidents of LASA and the committees they appointed to raise funds for the LASA endowment and for Congress travel. It remains a reality that many colleagues from both South and North, particularly younger scholars, are able to attend the Congresses only if they receive financial support. And it remains essential that all voices be heard and able to make their contributions to our collective knowledge and understanding. I would also reinvigorate efforts to secure financial support for international collaborative efforts on new themes at the cutting edge of disciplinary and interdisciplinary research. I believe that only interdisciplinary approaches can yield answers to the complex questions raised by the world we live in, but I am equally convinced that a strong disciplinary grounding is highly advantageous for fruitful interdisciplinary research that will command respect in academic and policy-making circles. I further believe that international collaboration is indispensable to address the complex theoretical and empirical problems in contemporary cultures, societies, polities, and economies. The many edited volumes resulting from research projects supported by the Social Science Research Council are testimony to the success of such collaboration. With regards to the major issues that face the Association in the recent past, I strongly support LASA’s principled stand on academic freedom, and thus the decision to hold the Congresses outside the United States as long as the U.S. government blocks our Cuban colleagues from attending them. I also support LASA’s continued engagement for lifting the travel restrictions on U.S. scholars and ensuring a free flow of scholarly communication. Finally a note on the approach I would take towards leading LASA. Leadership in an academic organization requires a balancing act between delegation and inclusiveness on the one hand and acceptance of responsibility and efficiency on the other hand. I try hard to strike the right balance; where I fail in finding it, I mostly do so by emphasizing inclusiveness. I always try to learn from others, which means consultation with predecessors, elected EC members, and staff. Many people have served LASA with great enthusiasm, dedication, and distinction; their legacy is what I would want to build on and their energies what I would want to harness to continue in strengthening our collective knowledge and understanding of Latin America.

Cristina Eguízabal is the director of the Latin American and Caribbean Center and Professor of International Relations at Florida International University. Before joining FIU she served as a program officer at the Ford Foundation working on Peace and Social Justice first in New York and later at the Foundation’s Mexico City office. Her portfolio included programs on U.S.-Latin American relations and Latin American international relations and foreign policy. She also managed the Ford Foundation’s Cuba-related work. She has held research and teaching positions at the University of Costa Rica, University of Bordeaux, University of Miami, and the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) and has served as advisor to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the Confederacy of Central American...
make sure independent audits are conducted regularly. As a member of the Executive Council I will work in fulfilling LASA’s mission to continue to be the most important scholarly organization worldwide for those interested in better understanding Latin America and the Caribbean and their people.

Steven Volk (Brandeis University, BA 1968; Columbia University, PhD, 1983) is Professor of History at Oberlin College where he has taught since 1986. He has published on the formation of the Chilean state in the 19th century, and on U.S. relations with Chile in the 20th. His publications also include studies of U.S. policy toward Latin America, Frida Kahlo and Mexican nationalism, and gender and violence in Ciudad Juárez. He is currently finishing a monograph on U.S. historical memory and the overthrow of the Chile’s Popular Unity government. Volk has chaired the History Department and Latin American Studies at Oberlin College and is the Director of Oberlin’s Center for Teaching Innovation and Excellence. He has directed two NEH summer seminars, and has received two Fulbright fellowships. He co-authored grants to the Mellon, Hewlett, Ford, and Pew Foundations while at Oberlin. In 2003, Volk received the Nancy Lyman Roelker Mentorship Award from the American Historical Association, and various teaching awards at Oberlin College and in the state of Ohio. In 2001 he was presented with an award of official recognition from the Government of Chile for “Working to Restore Democracy in Chile.” He has taught at New York University, was a visiting lecturer and guest fellow at Yale, and was Research Director at the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) for 13 years. He chaired its board for many years, and has served on the boards of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Border Studies Program of the Great Lakes College Association, among others. He was elected seven times to Oberlin’s College Faculty Council and has chaired its General Faculty Planning Committee.

Volk Statement
I have been a member of LASA since its earliest days, while still a graduate student. Truth be told, my earliest encounters with the organization were likely more provocative than constructive, but I have grown not just increasingly fond of LASA over the years, but honestly proud to be a member. I belong to my disciplinary association because I have to; I belong to LASA because I want to. For me, LASA has become a model of what a well-run professional organization should be. It serves to encourage and facilitate critical discussion among its members and with a wider public whose interests are drawn to Latin America. To do this effectively, LASA has had to transform itself from an organization of Latin Americanists in the United States, to one in which the participation, insight, and engagement of colleagues from Latin America and the Caribbean is an essential reality. Our last Congress in Rio was a high point in that process. It has also meant increasing the organization’s ability to represent and advocate for the interests and perspectives of its members as LASA works to influence public debate and policy on issues of importance to scholars and teachers in Latin America and the Caribbean and academic Latin Americanists in the United States. I have long respected the organization’s decision to speak out on issues of concern to its members, and have come to appreciate the skill by which its leadership has used its critical voice to that end. LASA will continue to grow as it engages Latin Americanists in dialog about the future not just of the region, but of our planet, on a

Eguizábal Statement
I believe in transparency, accountability and teamwork. As LASA Treasurer I will work closely with LASA’s investment committee to make sure that the Association’s assets are invested wisely continuing the tradition of prudent fiscal management that has characterized it. If elected, I will work in strengthening the association’s financial procedures and systems. I will help establish strong lines of communication between the Investment and Fundraising committees. I will work closely with LASA’s Executive director and staff to make sure the Association fulfills its fiduciary responsibilities. I will also assist in preparing understandable financial reports that are presented to the Executive Council, members and general public on a timely basis. I will work closely with the Executive Council, making sure it exerts proper budget oversight and, with LASA’s president in

Universities (CSUCA), the Central American Institute for Public Administration (ICAP), the Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress and the United Nations University. She was President of the Costa Rican Political Science Association (1988-89). Her media work includes op-ed columnist for the daily La República (1994-96) and international news commentator on Costa Rican public TV Channel 13. In Miami, she is regularly invited as commentator on Oppenheimer Presenta. She serves on the boards of the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), Hispanics in Philanthropy (HIP), and Fundación Amistad and is a member of the Latin American Security Network (RESDAL), the Mexican Council on Foreign Relations (COMEXI) and the Editorial Board of Foreign Affairs Latinoamérica. Professor Eguizábal holds a Ph.D. in Latin American Studies from the University of Paris-Sorbonne-Nouvelle and has written extensively on Central American Security issues and Latin American Foreign Policies.
variety of levels. As a multi- and inter-disciplinary organization, LASA has played an important role in providing a forum in which scholars can explore and question some of the less useful strictures of single disciplinary approaches even as it investigates the future of its own regional orientation. Finally, LASA has an important role to play not only in the promotion of scholarship about Latin America and the Caribbean, but in the development of new pedagogies by which students can more actively learn about the region. As technology enables teachers to link students in San Francisco, Santiago, and Salvador on a daily basis, LASA needs to help foster the remarkable opportunities that are emerging on a pedagogical level. These developments require LASA to strengthen its financial base and carefully marshal its funds. The important process of increasing the participation of scholars outside the United States, for example, continues to pose serious financial challenges for the organization. It is the responsibility of the Treasurer to ensure that LASA's finances remain on a sound footing, a task that is even more daunting in the midst of this Great Recession. As a social and cultural historian, my academic training in not in finance, but I have had extensive experience running the budgets of many organizations and projects. Beyond that, as chair of numerous boards and committees, and director of many organizations, I feel confident in my ability to organize discussions efficiently, and ensure that important questions are asked and answered, and decisions are reached in the most productive and informed way possible.


En 1990 fundó la revista América Latina hoy que se edita en la actualidad en Salamanca. En esta ciudad ha organizado diferentes Congresos Internacionales como el Europeo de Latinoamericanistas y el I Congreso Latinoamericano de Ciencia Política, así como varias ediciones del Encuentro de latinoamericanistas españoles. Ha sido el primer Secretario General de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política entre 2002 y 2008. En 2008 la Universidad Nacional de San Martín le otorgó un doctorado honoris causa y en enero de 2010 el Gobierno de Chile le confirió la medalla de la orden Bernardo O’Higgins. Es miembro de varios consejos editoriales de revistas de ciencia política publicadas en América Latina. También es miembro del AmericasBarometer International Advisory Board, Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) de la Universidad de Vanderbilt (Nashville). Es autor de los libros Sistemas políticos de América Latina, Gobernabilidad, crisis y cambio y de ¿Instituciones o máquinas ideológicas? Origen, programa y organización de los partidos políticos latinoamericanos, así como de un centenar de artículos y de capítulos de libros fundamentalmente sobre política comparada latinoamericana con énfasis en cuestiones relativas a la democracia representativa y a las élites políticas. Es igualmente editor o coeditor de una veintena de libros entre los que destacan Politics and Politicians y con Flavia Freidenberg Partidos Políticos de América Latina (3 volúmenes). Ha sido profesor en diversas Universidades latinoamericanas de Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Guatemala, México, Nicaragua, Perú, República Dominicana y Venezuela, así como de la Universidad de Georgetown de Washington y del Instituto de Science Politique de Lille y París. Igualmente ha realizado estancias prolongadas como investigador en las Universidades de Carolina del Norte y de Notre Dame en Estados Unidos. Asiste regularmente a los Congresos de LASA desde 1990 y ha llegado a tener responsabilidades en el Task Force on Scholarly Relations with Spain conjuntamente con Federico Gil entre 1991 y 1994.

Alcántara Statement
Mi principal interés con respecto a las tareas a realizar desde el comité ejecutivo de LASA estriba en la incorporación de las personas que estudian América Latina desde Europa. La Universidad de Salamanca me ha brindado en los últimos años una excelente atalaya para relacionarme ampliamente con este sector que estimo debe estar más presente en LASA. Las distintas acciones que he llevada a cabo en Europa en torno al Consejo Europeo de Investigaciones sobre América Latina (CEISAL), del que la Universidad de Salamanca es una parte relevante de su Comisión Ejecutiva, así como los estrechos lazos con Universidades francesas, inglesas, portuguesas, alemanas y noruegas facilitan este empeño. Por otra parte debo subrayar el interés suplementario que supone mi trabajo investigador y docente en el ámbito de la política latinoamericana comparada, con especial énfasis en el terreno de las instituciones representativas y del papel desempeñado por la clase política. En este sentido aspiro a canalizar las propuestas de los y las más jóvenes promesas en dicho ámbito, así como promover la apertura al personal investigador de países que tienen una...
presencia menor en los Congresos de LASA. Por último debo señalar que un reto muy importante de mi gestión sería promover la posibilidad de organizar un Congreso de LASA, o alguna actividad de alto nivel patrocinada por LASA, en Salamanca, consiguiendo que la Asociación diera “el salto” oceánico.

Carlos J. Alonso is the Morris A. and Alma Schapiro Professor in the Humanities and Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Columbia University. He specializes in 19th- and 20th-century Latin American intellectual history and cultural production, and in modern literary and cultural theory. He is the author of Modernity and Autochthony: The Spanish American Regional Novel (Cambridge UP), The Burden of Modernity: The Rhetoric of Cultural Discourse in Spanish America (Oxford UP), and editor of Julio Cortázar: New Readings (Cambridge UP). He has also written numerous articles on Spanish American literature and culture. He was Editor of PMLA, the scholarly journal of the Modern Language Association, during 2000-03, and edited the Hispanic Review in 2003-05—a period that ushered in changes that led to an award by the Council of Editors of Learned Journals. He is currently the director of the Hispanic Institute at Columbia University and editor of its journal, the Revista Hispánica Moderna. The Revista received the 2009 Council of Editors of Learned Journals’ Phoenix Award for Significant Editorial Achievement.

Alonso Statement

Several years ago, it was commonplace to assert that scholars of literature in the United States typically made a professional choice between membership in LASA and membership in MLA—the assumption being that the first group was attentive to interdisciplinary concerns surrounding the study of literature, whereas the second addressed the literary text as an organic object and thought literary history possessed an internally coherent order of its own. Our discipline’s movement from literature to cultural studies in the last twenty years has rendered that stale dichotomy moot, inasmuch as a fruitful understanding of cultural studies requires a decidedly interdisciplinary perspective. This is why currently the best presentations on Latin American literary and cultural topics at MLA meetings are similar to those that you would hear in a typical LASA convention program. I believe that LASA and MLA should work to establish the sort of ties that characterize the latter association’s relationships with other area/regional-studies professional organizations, since their objects of study and the kinds of questions asked of them by their respective scholarly members are evidently converging. Similarly—and from a larger institutional framework—LASA’s international outlook and reach have long provided a salutary corrective to the insularity of the U.S. academic world. I am eager and willing to work toward the fulfillment of both of these worthwhile goals.

Rosalva Aida Hernández Castillo originaria de Ensenada, Baja, California, México es doctora en Antropología por la Universidad de Stanford; actualmente es Profesora Investigadora Titular “C” del Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (CIESAS) en la ciudad de México. Integrante del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores Nivel II. Ha vivido y realizado investigación de campo en comunidades indígenas mexicanas, con refugiados guatemaltecos en México y con migrantes norteamericanos en España. Por diez años trabajó en una organización no gubernamental con mujeres indígenas de los Altos de Chiapas, apoyando en el área legal y educativa. Sus áreas de especialización son la antropología política y jurídica, los estudios de género, los estudios poscoloniales y las metodologías co-participativas. Actualmente desarrolla una investigación sobre el racismo institucional en la justicia penal mexicana trabajando con mujeres indígenas presas. Aparte de dar clases en los programas de maestría y doctorado del CIESAS, en donde es profesora de tiempo completo, ha sido profesora invitada en la Universidad de Stanford, Universidad de John Hopkins, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, en la Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, en la Universidad de Deusto en el país Vasco, en FLACSO-Guatemala, en el Colegio de Michoacán, en el Instituto de Liderazgo Simone de Beauvoir y en la Universidad Autónoma de Morelos. Es autora de Histories and Stories from Chiapas: Border Identities in Southern Mexico (UT Press 2001) publicado en español como La Otra Frontera: Identidades Múltiples en el Chiapas Postcolonial (Porruá 2001 Premio Fray Bernardino de Sahagún) y editora de Descolonizando el Feminismo. Teorías y Prácticas desde las Másperas (Cátedra 2009), Etnofrafías e Historias de Resistencias (UNAM/PUEG/CIESAS 2009), Dissident Women:.Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiaapas (UT Press 2006); El Estado y los indígenas en tiempos del PAN: neoindigenismo, identidad y legalidad (Porruá 2004), Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias: the Indigenous Peoples of Chiaapas and the Zapatalist Rebellion (Rowman & Littlefield 2003); and The Other Word: Women and Violence in Chiapas Before and After Acteal (IWGIA 2001). Durante el 2003 recibió el premio LASA/Oxfam Martin Diskin Memorial Award compartido con el Dr. Rodolfo Stavenhagen, por sus aportes a la investigación socialmente comprometida.
Hernández Statement

Siendo LASA la sociedad académica de latinoamericanistas más grande del mundo, es contradictorio que su membresía de académicos latinoamericanos sea minoritaria en contraste con los académicos de países angloparlantes, por lo que de ser elegida como parte del Consejo Ejecutivo promovería y apoyaría las iniciativas que ampliaran su influencia y membresía en América Latina. Esto implicaría ampliar la difusión de sus publicaciones impresas y electrónicas tratando de fortalecer los vínculos con las instituciones de educación superior y de investigación de los países hispanoparlantes, lusoparlantes y francoparlantes. En este sentido sería importante promover la publicación de artículos y ensayos de reflexión en los cuatro idiomas oficiales de la asociación. Sería fundamental también alimentar su diversidad disciplinaria y teórica tratando de mantener y ampliar los espacios de debate interdisciplinario en los Congresos. El balance y la representación de las diversas disciplinas en los comités organizadores del Congreso es fundamental para promover esta diversidad disciplinaria. Asimismo, apoyaría las iniciativas que tratan de fortalecer los puentes entre la academia y la sociedad civil, promoviendo la investigación con pertinencia social que contribuya a la solución de problemas concretos, como es la iniciativa de la beca de Otros Saberes que ha logrado ampliar la influencia de LASA más allá de los ámbitos académicos.


Herrera Statement

Será un privilegio servir como integrante del Comité Ejecutivo de LASA. Mi propósito es trabajar para que el intercambio de conocimientos y prácticas académicas de todos y todas aquellas personas que investigan en y sobre América Latina tengan la oportunidad de ser cada vez más incluyentes y diversos. Especial atención será puesta en promover proyectos de fortalecimiento de metodologías y prácticas de investigación entre académicas/os jóvenes del continente, que alimenten procesos de producción de conocimientos basados en una relación más horizontal entre las instituciones, las fuentes de financiamiento, y sus integrantes de ambos hemisferios. También me gustaría ayudar a ampliar la relación de LASA con otras redes de investigadoras/los del continente, a través de la promoción de proyectos temáticos conjuntos e intercambio libre de información. Mi experiencia como investigadora ecuatoriana en LASA ha sido la de encontrar una red cada vez más plural en varios aspectos: intercambios intergeneracionales, temáticos, regionales, inter-nacionales, que configuran una idea de AL en su diversidad. Esta pluralidad no alcanza todavía otros aspectos más estructurales relacionados con las formas de producción de conocimientos en el continente; el desafío será trabajar para ampliar esa pluralidad.

Jeffrey Lesser is Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of History at Emory University. He is the immediate past president of the Conference on Latin American History, the American Historical Association’s largest affiliate organization. Following six years as Director of the Program in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, he currently serves as Director of the Tam Institute for Jewish Studies. Lesser received his B.A. and M.A. degrees from Brown University and his Ph.D.
from New York University. He is the author of *A Discontented Diaspora: Japanese-Brazilians and the Meanings of Ethnic Militancy, 1960-1980* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), *Negotiating National Identity: Minorities, Immigrants and the Struggle for Ethnicity in Brazil* (Duke University Press, 1999), winner of the Best Book Prize from the Brazil Section of the Latin American Studies Association, and *Welcoming the Undesirables: Brazil and the Jewish Question* (University of California Press, 1994) which won the Best Book Prize from New England Council on Latin American Studies. *A Discontented Diaspora* was published in Portuguese as *Uma Diáspora Descontente: Os Nipo-Brasileiros e os Significados da Militância Étnica, 1960-1980* (Editora Paz e Terra, 2008), *Negociando a Identidade Nacional: Imigrantes, Minorias e a Luta pela Etnicidade no Brasil* (Editora UNESP, 2001) and *A Questão Judaica* (Imago, 1995) and in Hebrew as *Brazil Ve-Hashela Ha-Yehudit: Hagira, Diplomatia Ve-Deot Kdumot* (Tel Aviv University Publishing Projects, 1997). He also is author of *Colonização Judaica no Rio Grande do Sul, 1904-1925* (São Paulo: Centro de Estudos de Demografia Histórica de América Latina, Universidade de São Paulo, 1991). Lesser has edited a number of volumes including *Rethinking Jewish-Latin Americans* (University of New Mexico Press, 2008; with Raanan Rein), *Searching for Home Abroad: Japanese-Brazilians and Transnationalism* (Duke University Press, 2003), and *Arab and Jewish Immigrants in Latin America: Images and Realities* (London: Frank Cass, 1998; with Ignacio Klich). Lesser has been an International Election Observer in Venezuela for The Carter Center. He was elected to the Executive Committees of the Brazilian Studies Association and the Conference on Latin American History and was Chair of the CLAH Brazilian Studies Committee. He has served on the LASA Nominations Committee and the program and prize committees of numerous organizations in both North and South America. A LASA presidential panel that Lesser organized in 2006 was published as “Centering the Periphery: Non-Latin Latin Americanisms,” *LASA Forum* 38:1 (Winter, 2007), 7-12. Lesser spent the 2006-7 academic year as holder of the Fulbright Distinguished Chair of the Humanities at the Center for Latin American and Iberian Studies at Tel Aviv University. In 2001-2002 he was a Fulbright Senior Scholar at the University of São Paulo and he has held visiting professorships at the University of Campinas and the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. He has received research grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Fulbright-Hays, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Ford Foundation, the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, the North-South Center and the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation.

**Lesser Statement**

I am honored to be nominated for the LASA Executive Committee. I have learned from my professional service over the years that nothing is more important than creating opportunities for and mentoring the next generation of academics. Thus my primary goal if elected is to expand still further LASA’s commitment to younger scholars of Latin America and the Caribbean, independent of their places of residence. The excitement, and thus commitment, of our newest colleagues will ensure LASA’s future as the preeminent organization in the field. Second, I am eager to move LASA towards an even broader international presence, especially by engaging colleagues in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Initial steps were taken at the LASA conferences in Puerto Rico, Montreal, and Rio de Janeiro, but still more must be done to reach out to our colleagues outside of the Americas.

These two goals emphasize that LASA must focus on the scholars who are its members while the organization allows us to move between the dual traditions of discipline and geography. I believe that the interdisciplinarity of my work, both methodologically and thematically, gives me a privileged position to work to help expand the traffic over the bridges between Portuguese and Spanish America, and between the various Arts and Sciences disciplines. Finally, I believe deeply in the value of scholarship. LASA is an intellectual forum that allows academics to do what they do best; research, writing and teaching. In doing so we inform actively the many social, cultural and political spheres with which we intersect.

Maxine Molyneux is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for the Study of the Americas, at the School of Advanced Study, University of London, where she teaches on the policy and practice of Latin American Development. She has written extensively in the fields of political sociology, gender and development, human rights and social policy, and has authored books on Latin America, the Horn of Africa and South Arabia. She has acted as senior adviser, consultant and researcher to various departments of the UN, the UK’s Department for International Development, and other development policy agencies and NGOs. Her current research is on social protection, rights, citizenship and development policy, and the link between economic and social policy in Latin America. Maxine Molyneux is a member of the SLAS Executive Committee, the Scientific Council of the GIS Institut des Ameriques at the University of Paris, and serves on the Editorial Boards of *Economy and Society*, *American Studies*, *The Journal of Latin American Studies*, and *Development and Change*. She is the editor.

**Molyneux Statement**

As a UK-based Latin Americanist I am part of LASA’s far-flung diaspora, one of those who make up around 45 percent of its non-US membership. If elected to the Executive Council, one of my goals would be to promote initiatives that will strengthen cooperation with European centres of Latin American studies through encouraging the work of trans-Atlantic and North-South scholarly networks. Much of my work as Director of the Institute for the Study of the Americas at London University is to support and to promote scholarly communities, through developing synergistic linkages among groups of scholars, organising conferences and workshops, promoting collaboration with scholars in the field over teaching and research, supporting publications, and encouraging high quality innovative research. These are all activities to which I have made a significant contribution, and are broadly in accordance with LASA’s objectives. I have no doubt that strengthening LASA’s European links will be of benefit to its membership, drawing on its existing institutional links and developing in some new directions. My two other goals are research-related. I am a political sociologist with two principal and interrelated areas of research which converge in the field of gender and development. My research applies a gender analysis to social, political and historical phenomena, engaging issues central to social theory, human rights, public policy and development studies. I have a strong interest in promoting comparative reflection on Latin America. Prior to joining the University of London’s Institute of Latin American Studies in 1994, I had learned much from researching and writing about other parts of the world. As Director of the Institute for the Study of the Americas, (ILAS’ successor), I am interested in how regional knowledge can be strengthened and challenged by encouraging comparative reflection on the historical, political and transnational processes that define the Western Hemisphere. Theoretical and empirical work on the diverse varieties of capitalism that have evolved in the hemisphere is just one of several major themes that are being fruitfully explored through this perspective. Secondly, in the social sciences there is also important work to be done on the interface between the academic and policy communities. My own research interests have spanned the scholarly and international policy worlds, in particular through an involvement in human rights work in Latin America, and in the ‘Beijing Process’, as a participant in the world of women’s rights advocacy, and in association with various departments of the UN. Bridging the divide between the policy, scholarly and advocacy worlds, and encouraging collaborations across these divides is something that LASA has already made a valuable contribution to, and I hope to add to that work particularly in an area that has been under studied until recently, namely social policy.
As we count down to LASA2010, the Association’s XXIX International Congress in Toronto, we are delighted to report that through member and friend support of the various LASA funds, including the Endowment, the Travel, the Student, and the Indigenous and Afro-descendant Funds, more travel grantees than ever will be supported. At the same time, contributions to the Diskin Lectureship will enable the Association again to recognize an established scholar whose work exemplifies scholarship and activism, and support for the Diskin Fellowship and the Charles A. Hale Fellowship for Mexican History will provide grants to aspiring scholars in the early phases of their work.

And so we take a moment for a most sincere Thank You to the donors who supported any of the LASA funds since our last report to you (many to multiple funds at the same time and many repeat donors), to the foundations who continue to assist LASA to meet its mission, to the LASA Fundraising Committee for its tireless efforts to increase support for the Endowment, and to the recipients of LASA grants who make us glad to work even harder on their behalf.

We gratefully acknowledge the following donors for their contributions to any of the LASA funds since our previous report in the winter issue of the LASA Forum. (Note that in the interest of conserving space all donors are included only once, regardless of the number of contributions or gifts to multiple funds.)

Sandra Aguilar Rodríguez
Sebastião Guilherme Albano da Costa
Elena Alvarez
Kirsten Appendini
Joseph Arbena
Moises Arce
Benjamin Ardiditi Karlik
Wendy Ashmore
Werner Baer
Helga Baitenmann
Beth Baker Cristales
Laura Barbas Rhoden
Sarah Barrow
Carlos Batista
Florentia Bazzano Nelson
Janine Berg
Emilie Bergmann
Ana Maria Bidegain
Mario Blaser
Robert Blecker
Kristen Block
Sandra Boschetto-Sandoval
Merle Bowen
Kirk Bowman
Eramis Bueno Sánchez
Steven Byrd
Amalia Cabanas
Kim Cameron-Dominguez
Cláudio Capuano
Manuel Ángel Castillo García
Roberto Cespedes Ruffinelli
Francie Chassen-Lopez
Nancy Churchill
Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld
Michael Coppedge
José Eduardo Corbeta
Lucía Helena Costigan
Robert Cooft
Margaret Crahan
James Martín Cypher
Alexandre Da Costa
Michael de Give
Juan Ramiro De la Rosa-Mendoza
Susan Deeds
Jorge Enrique Delgado Troncoso
Rut Diamint
Rainer Dombios
Héctor Domínguez-Ruvalcaba
Ariel Dorfman
Patrick Dove
Seth Doyle
James Dunkerley
Enrique Dussel Peters
Susan Eckstein
Marc Edelman
Hiromi Ehara
Anne Marie Ejdegaard Jeppesen
Laura Enríquez
June Carolyn Erlick
Juan Carlos Esparza Ochoa
Dionne Espinoza
Dina Fachin
Patricia Weiss Fagen
Suzanne Fiederlein
Kathleen Fine-Dare
Elizabeth Fitting
Cornelia Butler Flora
Jan Flora
Jonathan Fox
Maria Estela Dal Pai Franco
Bonnie Frederick
Elisabeth Jay Friedman
Henry Frundt
Alicia Girón
Michel Gobat
Mary Goldsmith
María Mercedes Gómez
Laura Gotkowitz
Jeffrey Gould
Tricia Gray
Caroline Hale
Lenore Hale
Roger Hale
Nora Hamilton
John Hammond
Howard Handelman
Inge Merete Hansen
Heather Hennes
Jesus Alejandro Hernandez-Ramirez
Betty Heyder
Yoshiaki Hisamatsu
Kathryn Hochstetler
James Howe
Jayne Howell
Jean Jackson
Nils Jacobsen
Gladys Jiménez-Muñoz
Jon Jonakin
Peter Jordens
Alvaro Kaempfer
Cristóbal Kay
Maria Teresa Miceli Kerbauy
A. Douglas Kincaid
Lisa Kowalchuk
Wendy Kramer
Sayuri Kuwabara
Aurélie La Torré
Cecilia Lucia La Torre Ramírez
Cecile Lachenal
Maria Lagos
Kathryn Lehman
Aluídio Lima
Amy Lind
Eloise Linger
Bernardo Lins
Irida López
Susan Lord
Kathleen Mahoney-Norris
Yolanda Martínez-San Miguel
Francine Masiello
Carmen Lúcia Guimaraes de Mattos
April Mayes
John Mayo
Cynthia McClintock
John-Andrew McNeish
Seth Meisel
Mariselle Meléndez
Evelyn Mesclier
Petra Mestankova
Rory Miller
Sylvia Mollo
Maxine Molyneux
Francisco Moran
Kimberly Morse
Silvia Nagy-Zekmi
Melanie Nicholson
James Nicolopoulos
Karoline Noack
Lincoln Narcelio Noronha
Liisa North
Adriana Ortiz Ortega
Gerardo Otero
Cynthia Palmer
Robert Pastor
Rossana Patron
Mario Pecheny
Hernan Perez Loose
Eric Perramond
David Pion-Berlin
Roque Planas
Juan Poblete
Aaron Pollack
Nancy Postero
Margaret Power
Jason Pribilsky
Marie Price
Ana Ramirez Barreto
Juan Rial
Rita Schwentesius Rindermann
Francesca Rivera
Karem Roitman
Reinaldo Roman
Maria de Lourdes Rosas-López
Joshua Rosenthal
José Ramón Ruisánchez Serra
Anais Ruiz
Estela Ruiz Larraguivel
Enrique Sacerio-Garí
Clay (Matt) Samson
Daniela Sandler
Maria Evelinda Santiago-Jiménez
Veronica Schild
Freya Schiwy
Ella Schmidt
Jalane Schmidt
Ben Ross Schneider
David Schodt
Sarah Schoellkopf
Rachel Sieder Henriette
Daniel Silva
Russell Smith
Oscar Somoza
Daniela Spenser
Peter Spink
Donald Stevens
Henry Stobart
John Stolle-McAllister
Lucy Frances Annie Taylor
Kimberly Terry
Susana Torres
Tania Triana
Joseph Tulchin
Miren Uriarte
Ivani Vassoler-Froelich
Vivianne Ventura Dias
George Vickers
Marcos Virgilio Silva
Ronald Waterbury
William Waters
Jean Weisman
Clifford Welch
Jurgen Weller
Robert Wilcox
Patrick Wilson
Justin Wolfe
Andrew Wood
Lawrence Woodward
Angus Wright
Patricia Zavella
Ana Celia Zentella
Marc Zimmerman
Eric Zolov
Clarence Zuvekas, Jr.

[For information on how you may make a donation to any of the funds please contact the LASA Secretariat at 412-648-1907. Are you employed by an agency or an NGO that may match employee contributions? If so, your gift will be all the more valuable. Please contact the Secretariat for more information.]
The Kalman Silvert Society was founded to perpetuate the legacy of this renowned Latin American scholar and LASA’s first President. The Society honors those who make commitments to LASA through planned gifts of lasting impact. Such generosity bolsters Association programs that will solidly benefit future generations of Latin Americanists by nurturing their scholarship for many years to come.

Long-valued programs not covered by ordinary income will receive substantial advantage. These activities include travel grants for Latin Americans participating in LASA Congresses, special seminars and workshops, and other projects involving scholarly inquiry. The LASA Endowment Fund has been the major source of income for such programs, but the Fund will need tangible future support.

Charitable gifts made during one’s lifetime are an effective form of giving because they allow for immediate tax deductions and reduce estate taxes after death. Hundreds of LASA members and friends have contributed in this fashion and continue to do so. Individuals who would like to make significant gifts to the Association but are currently not in a position to do so can defer their support: Planned Gifts help ensure that one has the necessary resources during a lifetime and also can benefit educational and charitable organizations named as beneficiaries.

Planned giving is possible through a host of mechanisms. Bequests are the most popular instruments. Any assets of value can be passed along in accord with a will or living trust. These include stocks, bonds, mutual funds, real estate, or cash. Other possibilities are life insurance gifts, gifts from retirement assets, among others. The first step is to seek the advice of professional advisors for counsel on personal legal, tax, or financial planning issues.

Kalman Silvert Society members are acknowledged in the LASA Forum and in other official publications—and are honored guests at receptions and other special events at the LASA Congress. The greatest premium of all is knowing that a gift to LASA will mean substantial returns for present and future colleagues in Latin American Studies.

Any gift to LASA may be general in nature or may be designated to fund a specific program, or type of scholarship or fellowship. Association staff would be pleased to present options. For additional information please contact the LASA Secretariat at 412-648-1907.
Membership Report 2009

**Individual Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total memberships</th>
<th>6,183</th>
<th>(37 percent increase over 2008)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New members</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed from 2008</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>(65 percent renewal rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed lapsed members</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member type**

- Traditional members: 4,415 (71 percent of total membership)
- Student members: 1,475 (24 percent of total membership)**
- Life Members: 77
- Joint Memberships: 216

**Member residency**

- U.S. residents: 3,371 (55 percent of total membership)
- Latin American residents: 1,872 (30 percent of total membership)***
- Other Non-U.S. residents: 940 (15 percent of total membership)

Three-year memberships initiated in 2009: 95

**Major disciplines represented**

- Political Science: 850
- Literature: 829
- History: 822
- Anthropology: 579
- Sociology: 530
- Latin American Studies: 291
- Economics: 202
- Education: 170
- Cultural Studies: 166
- International Relations: 133
- Social Sciences: 129
- Geography: 116

**Institutional Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total memberships</th>
<th>537</th>
<th>(19 percent decrease from 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New members</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed from 2008</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>(71 percent renewal rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed lapsed members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institution location**

- United States: 388 (72 percent of total membership)
- Latin America: 38 (7 percent of total membership)
- Other non-U.S.: 111 (21 percent of total membership)

* The 2009 increase in total individual memberships of 37 percent is the largest in LASA history. The next highest was 30 percent in 1995, the year of a Washington DC Congress.

** This number is somewhat higher than the average of about 22 percent students.

*** This figure is substantially higher than the average of 15 to 22 percent Latin American residents
Call for Applications to Edit the *Latin American Research Review*

Proposals are invited for the editorship of the Latin American Research Review (*LARR*), the journal of the Latin American Studies Association. The Review is published three times a year.

Manuscript selection duties will begin on January 1, 2012 and the first issue to appear under the name of the newly appointed Editor will be Volume 48, No. 1 (2013). Contracts to edit *LARR* normally are five years in duration, although LASA’s Ways and Means Committee may award a contract for a different time period. Candidates must hold a tenured position in an academic institution.

In accordance with LASA’s mission to publish high quality scholarship, the following criteria will be considered in selecting the *LARR* Editor:

1. Established record of scholarship;
2. Experience with and understanding of the wide variety of activities associated with journal editorship, including submissions, reviewing, and relations with Editorial boards;
3. Strong familiarity with the present state of the *Review*, its strengths and challenges, and a vision for its future;
4. Openness to the different methods, themes, theories, and approaches to the field;
5. Record of responsible service to scholarly publishing and evidence of organizational skill and intellectual leadership.

Expenses for travel to the LASA Congresses and to meetings of the LASA Executive Council, as well as expenses for necessary supplies, are included in the Editor’s budget. Allocations for office space or release time are not included. Institutions hosting the *Review* historically have provided half-time release from teaching for the Editor, additional release time for the Associate Editors, adequate office space, and salary support for an Editorial Assistant.

Applications should: 1) identify the candidate Editor and clearly set out her/his qualifications; 2) provide the names and qualifications of individuals proposed as members of a *LARR* Editorial Board; and 3) include a letter from the president of the host institution formally committing the resources and personnel of the institution necessary to support the work of the Editor, Associate Editors, and an Editorial Assistant.

The LASA Secretariat is responsible for all administrative, operational, and financial support functions associated with the publication of the *Review*, including maintenance of the subscriber/member database, production, and mailing as well as maintenance of *LARR*-On-Line.

Proposals must be received by **July 1, 2010**, directed to: Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Executive Director, Latin American Studies Association, 416 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. Applications will be reviewed by the LASA Ways and Means Committee, which will present its final selection to the Executive Council for approval. The LASA Executive Director will work out the contractual agreement with the nominee and the host institution. A final decision is expected by **November 1, 2010**.
Applications are invited for Director of the LASA Film Festival. The Festival is a key event at each International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association.

The new contract will date from January 1, 2011 and the new Director’s first Festival will be in conjunction with LASA2012. Festival contracts normally are for five years, although LASA’s Ways and Means Committee may award a contract for a different time period. Candidates must hold a tenured position in an academic institution.

In accordance with LASA’s mission to provide high quality events, the following criteria will be considered in selecting the Festival Director:

1. Established record of scholarship;

2. Experience with and understanding of the wide variety of activities associated with film festival direction, including inviting, evaluating, and selecting submissions, as well as programming film presentations;

3. Strong familiarity with the present state of the field, its strengths and challenges, and a vision for its future;

4. Openness to the different methods, themes, theories, and approaches to the field,

5. Record of responsible service to the field and evidence of organizational skill and intellectual leadership.

Travel to the LASA Congresses as well as expenses for necessary supplies are included in the Festival Director’s budget. Allocations for office space or release time are not included. The host institution conventionally provides some release time for the Director, adequate office space, and salary support for an assistant.

Applications should 1) clearly set out the qualifications of the proposed new Director(s) and the proposed advisory board; 2) indicate the Director(s)’s vision for the Festival over the next five years; 3) specify the nature and extent of the support provided by the host institution; and 4) include a letter from the president of the host institution formally committing the resources and personnel of the institution necessary to support the on-site work of the Director(s) and an assistant.

Proposals must be received by July 1, 2010, directed to: Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, Executive Director, Latin American Studies Association, 416 Bellefield Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. Applications will be reviewed by the LASA Ways and Means Committee, which will present its final selection to the Executive Council for approval. The LASA Executive Director will work out the contractual agreement with the nominee and the host institution. A final decision is expected by November 1, 2010.
Tenth International Congress of the Brazilian Studies Association

22–24 July 2010
Brasília, Brazil

2010 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of Brasília. Come be part of this year-long celebration through a conference that will feature 150 panels in all fields of Brazilian studies, special cultural events, and opening and closing ceremonies in Brazil’s modernist capital. On the final night of the conference BRASA will honor the eminent economist Werner Baer with our Lifetime Contribution Award.

For more information, see our Web site at www.brasa.org
UNIVERSIDAD DE PUERTO RICO
ARECIBO

CALL FOR PAPERS / CONVOCATORIA


UPR- Arecibo, 18-20 de noviembre de 2010

Homenajeadas, plenaristas y estudiosos invitados:
Rosa Montero, ESPAÑA
Elena Poniatowska, MEXICO
Mayra Montero, CUBA/PUERTO RICO

Ramón Luis Acevedo, Universidad de Puerto Rico, PUERTO RICO
Danny Anderson, University of Kansas, EE.UU.
Sofía Cardona, Universidad de Puerto Rico, PUERTO RICO
Diánela Elit, CHILE
Juan Gelpi, Universidad de Puerto Rico, PUERTO RICO
Beth Jorgensen, University of Rochester, EE. UU.
Guadalupe Santa Cruz, CHILE

El congreso incluye pero no se limita a los siguientes temas sobre literatura, cultura, sociedad, lengua y arte de España, las Américas y Puerto Rico:

Arte culinario y literatura
Arte y literatura
Carnaval
Cine, televisión y literatura
Cultura popular
Ensayo
Enseñanza del español
Estudios Culturales
Etnicidad
Exilio
Feminismo

Feticismo
Hispanos en EE. UU.
Historia
Iconografía
Lenguaje
Leyes y literatura
Lingüística
Literatura ajamizada
Literatura colonial
Literatura caribeña
Literatura española
Literatura mediterránea
Literatura mexicana
Literatura puertorriqueña
Literatura y otras artes
Migración
Mitología hispánica
Marginalidades
Otroda
Performance
Periodismo literario

Poesía lírica y épica
Posmodernidad
Sexualidades alternas
Siglo de Oro
Subjetividad
Teatro hispánico
Teoría literaria
Tradición indígena oral
y escrita

Los interesados en someter un trabajo para leerse en el Congreso lo pueden escribir y presentar en español, inglés o portugués. Se deberá enviar un resumen completo de una página para un texto de 8 cuartillas a doble espacio, 20 minutos de ponencia, acompañado de un curriculum vitae abreviado en o antes del 15 de junio de 2010. Los interesados en crear una sesión especial deberán informarnos del título de la mesa, nombre y dirección de los participantes. Favor de remitir la información pedida a la siguiente dirección:

Emma I. Domenech Flores
Presidenta Comité Timón
Universidad de Puerto Rico
PO Box 4010
Arecibo, Puerto Rico 00614

congresointernacionalareciboupr.edu
emma.domenech@upr.edu
(787) 815-0000, ext. 3751, 3760
Fax (787) 880-2245, 880-6277

Para más información sobre el Congreso visite www.upra.edu
The Latin American Studies Association (LASA) is the largest professional association in the world for individuals and institutions engaged in the study of Latin America. With over 5,500 members, thirty-five percent of whom reside outside the United States, LASA is the one association that brings together experts on Latin America from all disciplines and diverse occupational endeavors, across the globe.

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