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It is a tremendous privilege to serve as LASA president as we plan the historic 50th Anniversary Congress for next May in New York City. The association began in New York in 1966, in the wake of the Cuban Revolution’s brash challenge of hemispheric hegemonies, and LASAs early development was in great measure tied to the deepening of the region’s (not so) cold and dirty wars of the 1970s and ‘80s. Since I came of age as a historian and a “Latin Americanist” around this time, mentored by Emilia Viotti da Costa, one of Brazil’s leading intellectuals who had herself been expelled from the Universidade de São Paulo and forced to re-create her intellectual and political life in the North, it is not surprising that my apprenticeship was steeped in the hemispheric debates and interdisciplinary reverberations about Latin America’s neocolonial past and the dissident models of development (many emanating from the global South) about how to overcome it. Nor is it surprising that my intellectual and political agendas have often turned on questions pertaining to the United States’ formidable and complex presence in Latin America, and its intersection—in political-economic, social, and cultural terms—with Latin America’s tumultuous “Century of Revolution.” That century would ultimately wend its way from what was Latin America’s first great revolution, in Mexico, seven years before the Soviet revolution, through the implementation of the Central American Peace Accords in the mid-1990s. But it was during the late 1960s, ’70s, and ’80s that the region’s brutal Cold War left an indelible imprint in Latin America’s killing fields and barrios and on so many LASA members, north and south. For many of us who came to study the era’s social movements, forms of repression, and memory struggles, Latin America seemed suspended in those critical decades “between tragedy and promise,” as my fellow historian Steve Stern has aptly put it. Now, as LASA celebrates its first half century, it seems terribly important to critically take stock of where Latin America and LASA have been and, more importantly, where they may be headed. Over the past 50 years, LASA members have gone from grappling theoretically with the region’s neocolonial condition, guided by a few metanarratives, to deconstructing the multivalent and transnational processes, flows, actors, identities, and knowledge that shape its potential for transformation in a postcolonial, post-atrocity moment. In the span of a half century, the field itself has changed and an array of new approaches, methodologies, and collaborative strategies make the study of Latin America more exciting and relevant than ever before.

As a historian, one of the very few who have presided over our association in recent decades, I am proud to oversee our anniversary Congress. My professional life has developed in connection with LASA’s evolution, and my penchant for interdisciplinary historical research owes more to LASA’s congresses than I can acknowledge. The association’s generative force in my life has often seemed serendipitous: LASA congresses kindled ideas for international symposia and volumes; galvanized extended discursive communities; and even birthed a long-lived seminar (with my late wife and colleague Patricia Pessar) that integrated historical and anthropological approaches. (To extend the generative metaphor, we used to joke that our new twenty-five-year-old son had been conceived after one of the memorable Gran Bailes!) Like many of us, I just returned from the inspirational Congress in San Juan, continuing to marvel at the potential for interdisciplinary renovation and innovation that LASA epitomizes. Among the memories I will treasure from San Juan are the standing-room-only welcoming ceremony that featured two young women who brought down the house and underscored LASA’s changing demographics: boricua poet and writer Mayra Santos Febres and Oaxacan hip-hop artist Mare Advertencia Lirika. Also deeply inspiring was the speech by Kalman Silvert Lifetime Achievement Award honoree, Chilean sociologist Manuel Antonio Garretón. Manuel Antonio inflected the disciplinary challenges that attend studying political parties and national political processes in a cross-disciplinary and socially conscious context, and ended by expressing his commitment to the pluralism of LASA, especially the San Juan Congress’s commitment to the kind of grassroots collaborations that have marked the relaunching of the Otros Saberes initiative. It seems to me that if LASA and area studies have any prospect of navigating the formidable economic, epistemological, and often ideological challenges posed by the burgeoning presence of “global” and “security” studies, they will have to assert their own claims to appropriate and refashion global studies. As past president Charlie Hale has pointed out, this will entail a continuing commitment to the core principles that have always guided LASA: deep contextual understanding based on language, culture, and history; new conceptualizations of interdisciplinary and grassroots collaboration; and a broadening of the processes of community building, social transformation, and of knowledge formation itself. A timely reengagement with these principles, long staples of LASA’s
mission in its first half century, will help to sustain us during the next 50 years.

Program chairs Ariel Armony and Amy Chazkel discuss the structure of the landmark 2016 New York Congress, “LASA at 50,” elsewhere in this issue. Here, I want to allude more generally to the broader goals of LASA during its anniversary year. We have never been bigger or more diverse: LASA is now approaching ten thousand members, almost half of whom live in Latin America. Since over 20 percent of our membership are students, in keeping with our goals of promoting a more diverse and engaged association, the Executive Council and Secretariat are working with student members to enhance their participation and better represent their interests. In the same spirit of promoting a more vital and inclusive LASA and building on the energy of the San Juan Congress, we look forward to promoting the Otros Saberes website and launching the third phase of Otros Saberes in New York City. The rationale is clear: the creation of new methodologies and intellectual practices, enhanced by social media, have enabled Latin American studies to expand notions of collaboration, research roles, and knowledge production. The vitality of Otros Saberes and the possibilities it affords to promote partnerships between academic scholars and intellectuals and knowledge producers based in civil society constitutes one of LASA’s most exciting initiatives moving forward.

LASA’s return at 50 to the great hemispheric metropolis in which it debuted in 1966 is fortuitous for many reasons. Most importantly it allows us to critically take stock of Latin American studies and chart new directions in a transnational, multicultural urban center that itself underscores the extent to which the field has changed. New York should provide an ideal location for featured sessions on the intersection of Latin American and Latino/a studies; the possibilities for meaningful immigration reform; the shifting parameters of relations with Cuba; an intergenerational conversation among leading journalists who have reported on Latin America over the long haul; a frank discussion of the divergence or convergence of research agendas in the global North and South; and an examination of new dimensions of Latin American studies and global studies across dynamic North-South and South-South contexts—to name but a few. To build interest toward the 2016 LASA Congress, future issues of the LASA Forum will feature dossiers on several of these themes.

The 50th Anniversary Congress will afford us an opportunity both to celebrate our long-running enterprise and to subject it to critical scrutiny. Through several special events within the Congress and outside it, “LASA at 50” will also provide an opportunity to experience a unique Latin American, Caribbean, and global city. In a variety of cultural contexts we will interrogate conventional notions of North and South, core and periphery, inner borough and outer borough, and in the process expand our understanding of Latin American studies. I encourage you to join me in New York to celebrate our first 50 years and begin talking about the next 50! ■
From the Outgoing President

by Debra Castillo | Cornell University | dac9@cornell.edu

Once the LASA secretariat signed the contract with the historic, 53-year-old salsa band El Gran Combo, we knew that this conference was a guaranteed success. Of course, far in advance of that agreement, members had already submitted their proposals for 2015, indicating their enthusiasm for LASA and for its return to Latin America.

This recent LASA Congress in San Juan, Puerto Rico, enjoyed the highest number of total proposals from our members since Rio de Janeiro, when we were still on an 18-month schedule; and we ended up with nearly five thousand registered participants. We faced some unexpected last-minute challenges: bad weather in parts of the United States, including the flooding of Houston’s airport, which caused a wave of last-minute reroutings and cancellations, and challenges in Puerto Rico with new shipping companies and new customs requirements, which held up books for some of our exhibitors as well as delaying arrival of LASA’s own conference materials.

Nonetheless, energy was high. Beginning with the electrifying presentations by Puerto Rican poet and novelist Mayra Santos Febres and Zapotec rapper Mare Advertencia Lirika at the inaugural session, association members knew that they were at a different kind of conference. This high level of energy was present everywhere during the four days of the conference, including in the overall high quality of panels, which created a domino effect of packed rooms and exceptional levels of participation at sessions. While I was unable to attend many of the sessions myself, I was aware of the extraordinary attendance and of the eager comments and questions continuing into hallways after panels formally came to a close. Many, many people at this conference preferred to engage in intellectual debates rather than allowing themselves to be seduced by the nearby beaches or the attractions of Old San Juan (although the adjacent pools and beaches were gratefully enjoyed).

As was evident from the conference theme “Precariedades, exclusiones, emergencias,” this conference focused on an effort to increase diversity in our association at all levels, including welcoming unprecedented numbers of indigenous and Afro-descendant scholars, featuring a significant representation of intellectuals coming from outside of traditional academic circuits and (as reported by the Cuba Section) an exceptionally high number of scholars from Cuba. Program co-chairs Luis Cárcamo-Huechante and Rosalva Aida Hernández Castillo worked tirelessly with the track chairs on special sessions focused on the conference’s central concepts, and with the support of Milagros Pereyra Rojas and Pilar Rodríguez, along with the rest of the Secretariat staff, created opportunities and incentives for proactive track chairs. I want to thank all the track chairs for their extra efforts this year, especially in making invited guests feel welcomed and for creating additional spaces for conversation within and outside of the panel presentations.

I also need to recognize the track chairs who have been particularly proactive in creating buzz and encouraging participation from colleagues in areas that were not well represented in recent LASA congresses, and who were able to make extraordinary strides at LASA2015 in gaining greater visibility for important disciplines, including linguistics and language study, public health, performance studies, Latino/a studies, urban studies and city planning, and the Otros Saberes project, among others. Regarding Otros Saberes, LASA2015 was able to close the cycle opened almost ten years ago in the Puerto Rico LASA2006 with the launch at this conference of a website dedicated to Otros Saberes, as well as energizing scholar-activists to begin thinking toward phase three of the initiative, both through this year’s conference sessions and the organization of a new LASA section.

Among other highlights for this LASA was the exhibition of 20 selected photographs, including the prize winner and honorable mentions in the contest for LASA program image, an exhibition made possible by Mexico’s CIESAS, which reproduced the images for us. Our film festival curator, Claudia Ferman, reported record attendance at the films and special events, which included participation of filmmakers Vincent Carelli (Brazil), Iván Sanjines (Bolivia), and Marta Rodríguez and Fernando Restrepo (Colombia), all of whom are well known for their work in marginalized communities, where they foster sharing of knowledge and filmmaking practice among indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples. We also enjoyed the opportunity to exchange ideas with Manuel Antonio Garretón (Chile), Kalman Silvert Award winner, whose ongoing commitment to activist scholarship in support of social renovation and democratic process is an inspiration to us all.

Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui and Lynn Stephen were co-recipients of the Martin Diskin Lectureship award. While Rivera Cusicanqui was unable to be with us in Puerto Rico, Lynn Stephen shared a moving personal testimony on, precisely, the genre
Ser testigo presencial—Acompañando, presenciando, actuando

Me siento muy honrada por presentarles la conferencia LASA/Oxfam America en memoria de Martin Diskin. Trabajé con Martin en MIT en 1984, 1986 y 1987, pero lo conocí por primera vez cuando me mudé a Boston en 1979. Martin fue un mentor importante para mí mientras estuve escribiendo mi disertación de doctorado y temprano en mi carrera, hasta su muerte en 1997 a la edad joven de 62 años. Me acuerdo cuando llegó a la defensa de mi disertación doctoral y me aseguró que haría preguntas difíciles a los miembros del comité para que discutieran entre ellos y no se enfocaran en mí. Mucho de lo que me formó como intelectual y alguien dedicado a la justicia social salió del tiempo que pasé con Martin. Me acuerdo en particular del trabajo que realicé con él en un proyecto acerca de las políticas de asilo para los refugiados centroamericanos en Estados Unidos. Mientras escribi mi disertación también trabajé como asistente legal y pude ayudar a cientos de familias para que pudiesen satisfacer los requisitos de IRCA, ayudar a cientos de familias para que pudiesen satisfacer los requisitos de IRCA, así como en docenas de casos de asilo político de El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras y Nicaragua. Mi plática de hoy en memoria de Martin se titula “Ser testigo presencial”. En lo que sigue me gustaría hablar acerca del testimonio en relación con cinco temas principales:

1. El testimonio y su papel en la literacidad indígena a través del tiempo.

2. La trayectoria del testimonio desde las narrativas individuales heroicas hasta las narrativas colaborativas/collectivas.

3. Género, testimonio y la resistencia a la lógica del sistema colonial/moderno de género.

4. Archivar y el poder del testimonio para influir las percepciones de la historia y los eventos.

5. Académicos y la movilización del testimonio: las políticas del testimonio experto para los refugiados y migrantes centroamericanos.

1. El testimonio y su papel en la literacidad indígena

Narrar. Testificar. Ser testigo. El testimonio oral se refiere al relato que una persona hace acerca de un evento o vivencia, contado por medio de su boca a través de un acto del habla. Es un recuento oral de la percepción que una persona tiene de un evento a través de la vista, el oído, el olor y otra información sensorial. Significa ser testigo de algo y proviene de la palabra del latín testis. El testimonio oral también tiene aspectos de performance y aspectos públicos. Los testimonios son eventos que juntan la memoria y la replicación del conocimiento. ¿Qué podemos aprender acerca de las diferentes formas en las que los testimonios funcionan hoy en día a través de las consideraciones históricas?

Antes de la conquista española, los pueblos indígenas en México tenían varios sistemas de escritura que se pueden encontrar en códices, mapas y glifos en la arquitectura. Investigaciones recientes sobre la literacidad indígena durante el periodo colonial sugieren que debemos descartar la noción que la literacidad indígena se perdió ante lo que se volvió una circulación totalmente oral de los idiomas indígenas, o que los pueblos indígenas están cambiado solo recientemente de una cultura oral a una escrita. Por ejemplo, la investigación reciente de Joanne Rappaport y Tom Cummins acerca de cómo los pueblos andinos recibieron y subvirtieron las
convenciones de las representaciones pictóricas y alfabéticas españolas sugiere una comprensión amplia de literacidad que incluye elementos alfabéticos, pictóricos, orales y corporales, incluso el performance oral.

Historiadores como Mark King y John Monaghan han sugerido que los códices mixtecos —que constituyen cerca de la mitad de los libros de antes de la conquista española que sobrevivieron— pueden ser tratados como guiones o partituras para un performance (King 1994, 102–103). Monaghan escribe:

Para determinar cómo la información de los códices pudo haberse transmitido, se debe señalar que los códices se basaban, con toda probabilidad, en tradiciones orales […] King (1988) argumentó encarecidamente que fueron producidos con la intención de ser leídos en voz alta. Ello sugiere que la información en los códices se ponía a disposición de audiencias más amplias a través de su presentación en forma pública y que deberíamos de ver a estos documentos no solamente como tiras cómicas que se deben leer, sino como guiones que se deben representar (perform). (1990, 133)

El trabajo de estos antropólogos sugiere que las formas orales de larga duración del performance y las diferentes formas de literacidad estaban conectadas en las comunidades e historias indígenas. Ya que los idiomas indígenas tienen una larga historia de oralidad, performance e, inclusive de ser usados por escritor (por lo menos por las élites) hasta la mitad del siglo XVIII, necesitamos centrar el análisis de los testimonios en un espacio que los considere en todas estas dimensiones.

2. De un individuo heroico compartiendo una voz colectiva a narrativas colaborativas

Mis primeras experiencias en la grabación de testimonios fueron, por supuesto, cuando era una estudiante de posgrado que estaba escribiendo la disertación doctoral. Luego trabajé como asistente legal y tomé declaraciones en español de refugiados centroamericanos que estaban buscando asilo político en Estados Unidos. Después de terminar mi programa de doctorado y obtener mi primer puesto como profesora en Northeastern University en Boston, fungí como intérprete para activistas de derechos humanos y de otros ramos que venían de gira desde El Salvador y Guatemala. En una de estas ocasiones fui la intérprete de María Teresa Tula de Co-Madres de El Salvador. Nuestra relación comenzó cuando yo fungí como su intérprete en sus pláticas en el área de Boston en 1991. Durante ese mismo año comenzamos a grabar 40 horas de su testimonio, el cual fue editado, traducido y publicado en 1994 en inglés como Hear My Testimony: María Teresa Tula, Human Rights Activist of El Salvador, y en 1995 en español como Este es mi testimonio: María Teresa Tula, luchadora pro-derechos humanos de El Salvador.

Al tiempo en que estábamos trabajando juntas en el libro, el modelo reinaante de los testimonios era el de Rigoberta Menchú. También estaba familiarizada con los testimonios dentro de la literatura nativoamericana, las narrativas de esclavos afroamericanos y, por supuesto, en Latinoamérica, en donde el género específico de testimonios fue formalmente reconocido en 1970 a través del Premio Literario Casa de las Américas en Cuba. El primer testimonio de El Salvador fue el de Roque Dalton Miguel Mármol, publicado en 1982, que cubre la vida de Mármol de 1905 a 1954. Durante la década de los setenta otros dos testimonios aparecieron en El Salvador, escritos por líderes del FMLN. Varios testimonios publicados en la década de los ochenta por mujeres como No me agarran viva: La mujer salvadoreña en la lucha (1982) de Claribel Alegria y Nunca estuve sola (1986) de Nidia Díaz precedieron al testimonio de María Teresa Tula. Si bien el contenido de este grupo de testimonios ofrece una perspectiva colectiva de la historia contada desde los ojos de una persona y muchos de los autores evitan el pronombre personal “yo” a favor de “nosotros”, varios de estos relatos son contados a través de las acciones, persistencia y esperanza increíbles de una persona en particular. De este modo, también son narrativas heroicas de sobrevivencia y superación de lo que a menudo son verdaderamente obstáculos y experiencias asombrosas. Estos tipos de narrativas son vehículos poderosos para abrir espacios culturales y públicos, para responder a las versiones oficiales estatales sobre eventos e historias, y para escribir narrativas históricas alternativas en los tribunales y en la memoria social.

En los 21 años que han pasado desde que Este es mi testimonio fuese publicado, mucho ha sucedido en la vida de los testimonios y nuestro entendimiento de cómo se deben componer las narrativas colectivas y colaborativas. El proceso por el que atraviesamos en los seis proyectos iniciales de investigación colaborativa sobre las políticas culturales indígenas y de los afrodescendientes en la primera ronda del proyecto Otros Saberes resultó en la producción de narrativas colectivas en la forma de reportes, videos y capítulos académicos enfocados en las prioridades estratégicas en la vida de la comunidad, organización o movimiento social con el que se trabajó. Hay algunas importantes lecciones que surgieron de este proceso, las cuales están resaltadas en la introducción al
Mi experiencia en el proyecto Otros Saberes y, en otros proyectos previos de investigación colaborativa en Oregon, me facilitó tener discusiones con observadores, activistas y participantes del importante movimiento social en Oaxaca en 2006, así como con los ciudadanos que se oponían al movimiento; discusiones acerca de qué tipo de proyecto de investigación se llevaría a cabo, cuáles métodos se utilizarían, qué resultados serían deseados y qué tipo de proceso colaborativo podría funcionar dadas las restricciones de tiempo, recursos y lugar. Las conversaciones iniciales se enfocaron en la urgencia de responder a las violaciones de derechos humanos y de la necesidad de diseminar puntos de vista que no estaban exponiéndose en los principales medios. Esta visión se fue expandiendo así como el proyecto continuó por varios años e incorporó muchas ópticas diferentes sobre el movimiento social de 2006.

Grabé cerca de treinta testimonios de un rango grande de personas que incluía a maestros y otros quienes fueron detenidos, torturados y encarcelados ilegalmente por sus actividades políticas, así como de mujeres que habían participado en la toma y reprogramación de las estaciones de radio y TV. También comencé a grabar testimonios de aquellos que no fueron parte del movimiento social, pero que se vieron fuertamente afectados por él, como madres y amas de casa de la clase trabajadora, profesionistas de la clase media, estudiantes, empresarios y artesanos. No todos ellos apoyaron el movimiento.

La metodología que desarrollamos —en consulta con los trabajadores de derechos humanos, maestros, y otros en Oaxaca— era que nosotros prepararíamos versiones en borrador de los testimonios, los subtitularíamos, los copiaríamos en DVD y los revisaríamos con las personas que nos los proporcionaron. Este paso en nuestra metodología probó ser de crucial importancia: no solamente pudimos discutir personalmente con todos cómo se vería su testimonio en vídeo y realizar los cambios que querían, sino que también pudimos obtener una amplia gama de opiniones e ideas acerca de cómo mejorar la página Web que estábamos elaborando y, luego para mí, acerca de cómo enmarcar el libro. Este proceso consultivo nos llevó a videograbar entrevistas con expertos y líderes en movimientos indígenas, el movimiento de maestros, los movimientos de mujeres y los movimientos de derechos humanos, y con aquellos quienes jugaron papeles clave en la producción de la TV y radio comunitarias locales, así como en la creación de medios populares. También añadimos testimonios en vídeo de participantes indígenas en el movimiento en otros lugares como Juxtlahuaca, en el occidente de Oaxaca, y Los Ángeles.

Me di cuenta que la forma de proporcionar testimonios —de ser testigo, de relatar los eventos y las vivencias del 2006— era una experiencia visceral y emocional para todos con los que habló. La urgencia con la que todos hablaron acerca del movimiento social y el conflicto del 2006 casi siempre resultó en tramos largos de narración reflexiva y en recordar eventos, sentimientos y emociones que incluían una identificación fuerte con ser oaxaqueño; interpretado, por supuesto, desde varias perspectivas y con múltiples significados.

Al sumergirme una y otra vez en las narrativas que había grabado, que había compartido en forma de transcripciones con nuestros participantes y que habían sido editadas como vídeos, me llamó mucho la atención la importancia fundamental que tenía el testificar —no solamente para los individuos, sino también para el movimiento social. Esta importancia también fue evidente en las grabaciones en vídeo de eventos públicos y emisiones radiofónicas. El poder del testimonio oral fue amplificado no solamente emocionalmente para aquellos quienes hicieron los relatos y escucharon, sino también se amplificó a través de su reproducción en formas múltiples al ser grabado, difundido por radio y TV, textualizado y luego diseminado a través de múltiples canales de transmisión. Pude observar una forma de producción del conocimiento que sacó de los archivos.
orales de conocimiento y luego los reproducido en conjunto con formas escritas o visuales.

3. Género, testimonio y la resistencia a la lógica del sistema colonial/moderno de género

Una de las preguntas sobre las que he pensado considerablemente es acerca de las formas en las que el testimonio se intersecta con el género y, desde luego, otras categorías de la diferencia. Desde mi punto de vista, y siguiendo el trabajo de la filósofa feminista María Lugones, el género en sí es una introducción colonial constituida simultáneamente con la raza (2007). Para poder entender cómo el testimonio trabaja a través del género, necesitamos entender cómo el género se co-constituye junto con otras categorías de la diferencia y es encarnado a través de representaciones específicas (en el sentido de performance) de narrativas. Género, raza, clase, etnicidad y otras categorías histórica y mutuamente constituidas se leen en el cuerpo humano y también se encuentran codificadas en las estructuras sociales y legales, así como en códigos culturales. El proyecto teórico de Lugones se ha enfocado en hacer visible la instrumentación de lo que ella llama el sistema colonial/moderno de género, proveer una forma “de entender, de leer, de percibir nuestra realtalidad al sistema de género” y, ultimadamente, rechazarlo (2008, 1–2). Ella nos explica que la modernidad “organiza el mundo ontológicamente en términos de categorías atómicas, homogéneas y separables” (2010, 742). La realidad, ella sugiere, “está organizada en términos de categorías dicotómicas en una relación de oposición: mente/cuerpo, público/privado, razón/emoción, hombre/mujer, blanco/negro. Cada término de cualquier oposición dicotoma se encuentra en una relación evaluativa de la otra” (2014, 1). Lugones, construyendo sobre el trabajo de las feministas de color como Kimberlé Crenshaw, sugiere que debemos de reconceptualizar la lógica de la intersecionalidad para evitar la separabilidad —la separación de las categorías de diferencia. Raza y género, por ejemplo, no son categorías discretas que se superponen en un diagrama Venn. Si vemos a las categorías de raza y género como separadas entonces es posible que solamente veamos al grupo dominante como la norma: “‘mujeres’ se refiere a mujeres blancas burguesas, ‘hombres’ se refiere a hombres blancos burgueses, ‘negro’ se refiere a hombres negros heterosexuales” (Lugones 2008, 4). En realidad, solamente podemos ver a las mujeres de color, sugiere Lugones, si nos alejamos de la lógica categórica que apunta la forma en la que las mujeres de color son teorizadas en el sistema de género colonial y moderno. Aquellos que no son percibidos como categóricamente homogéneos son “desaparecidos. Las mujeres indígenas y negras son desaparecidas” (2014, 2). Tenemos que movernos fuera del uso de las dicotomías jerárquicas y la lógica categórica para hacer visibles a las mujeres de color. Lugones sugiere que buscuzemos “conocimientos, relaciones y valores, así como prácticas ecológicas, económicas y espirituales no modernas (no premodernas)” que no se constituyen en concordancia con una lógica dicotómica, jerárquica y “categórica” (2010, 743). ¿Qué significa esto para el testimonio y el acto de testificar?

El testimonio oral como un acto encarnado del habla les permite a las personas representar historias personales dentro de las categorías fusionadas/inseparables de identidad como género, raza, etnicidad, clase, sexualidad y más. Cuando las personas testifican, se representan a sí mismos en toda su complejidad. Uno de los ejemplos que he utilizado para ilustrar esto es el testimonio de Fidelia Vázquez, a quien conoci dentro de una estación de radio en la ciudad de Oaxaca que estaba ocupada por decenas de mujeres el 5 de agosto de 2006. Su acto del habla al testificar posciona al género en relación a una serie de otras autoidentidades constitutivas fusionadas en su ser. Ella dice:

Soy una mujer nacida en Oaxaca con la sangre zapoteca y mixteca. Nosotras las mujeres oaxaqueñas pedimos que la mujer sea tratada con los mismos derechos que el hombre. La misión de la mujer es crear, educar, conducir, participar […] por esto es que [las mujeres oaxaqueñas] nos encontramos en este lugar. Estamos en este lugar, ocupando Canal 9, firmes y decididas […] Desde el campo y la ciudad, las mujeres oaxaqueñas ya estamos cansadas de aguantar, soportar esa carga, esa represión de los gobiernantes como lo es el actual gobierno de nuestro estado que recae en la persona de Ulises Ruiz Ortiz […]

Salimos a la calle el día primero de agosto a decirle a Ulises Ruiz que se vaya de Oaxaca. Las mujeres amparadas en la organización de la asamblea popular estamos exigiendo su salida. Les pedimos que si han venido hasta este lugar, sean portavoces de que somos mujeres pacíficas, que somos mujeres oaxaqueñas, que los ricos, por el hecho de reconocer de que somos morenitas, chaparritas, gordas, creen ellos que no representamos a nuestras etnias, a la gente. Les decimos que están equivocados. Somos nosotras la cara de Oaxaca. Nos da lástima que el gobierno no reconozca el valor, la grandeza, el corazón, el amor tan grande que hay dentro de nosotros […] Oaxaca/México
siempre ha sido un país libre. Estamos aquí porque queremos que exista la democracia y si para que sea real tenemos que morir, lo vamos a hacer. No nos van a sacar de aquí [del Canal 9], porque ya decimos hoy: ¡Basta! ¡Basta!

María Lugones y Fidelia Vázquez nos ofrecen sugerencias poderosas acerca de cómo teorizar el testimonio y las formas en las que el género se fusiona con la raza, etnicidad y otras categorías a través del sistema colonial/moderno de género. Ella y otras mujeres literalmente demandan ser vistas, escuchadas, reconocidas, visibilizadas y que se les dé autoridad como representantes del pueblo contemporáneo, en este caso “El pueblo de Oaxaca”. La presencia física, el acto del habla al ofrecer testimonio, la codificación de ese testimonio en texto, en video, en audio y las formas en las que el testimonio viaja, también sugieren estrategias de representación. En lugar de separar al género de otros elementos constitutivos de la identidad, el acto testimonial sugiere una representación más compleja del individuo. Este perspectiva se ve reflejada en el trabajo colaborativo de un grupo de nueve colegas enfocado en Pueblos Indígenas, Género y Justicia y Pluralismo Legal en Estados Unidos, México y Guatemala (con las Dras. Irma Alicia Velásquez Nimatuj, Rachel Sieder, Morna Macleod, María Teresa Sierra, Mariana Mora, Vivian Newdick, Shannon Speed, Margo Tamez, R. Aída Hernández).

Así como la representación del individuo viaja y se encaja en otros contextos —en una comisión de la verdad, en un vídeo de YouTube, en las noticias en la TV, en la radio, en un tribunal, en un salón de clases— la reproducción de ese individuo pone al género y otros elementos dentro de marcos más amplios y diferentes. El contenido de un testimonio puede rozar en contra de, ofrecer fricción en un nuevo contexto y sugerir nuevas formas en las que la constitución del género y otras identidades y experiencias necesitan ser repensadas. Esto puede ser un esfuerzo consciente de parte del testimonizante, o puede ser algo que pasa completamente fuera de su esfera de influencia o pensamiento. Mi punto principal es que el género y sus partes constituyentes se rehacen constantemente a través del acto del habla original del testimonio y luego a través de su representación y re-representación en diferentes contextos. En las palabras de Lugones, el testimonio de Fidelía y sus codificaciones y viajes representan actuaciones que desafían la lógica de las dicotomías, honran la multiplicidad y sugieren una lógica de coalición (ver Lugones 2014).

4. Archivar y el poder del testimonio para influir las percepciones de la historia y los eventos

En mi último libro, Somos la cara de Oaxaca, utilizo el trabajo de Diana Taylor en estudios del performance. Taylor sitúa algo de su discusión en la tensión entre los conceptos del archivo y el repertorio:

El archivo incluye pero no se limita al texto escrito. El repertorio contiene performances verbales—canciones, oraciones, discursos—y prácticas no verbales. La división entre lo escrito y lo oral captura, en un nivel, la diferencia entre el archivo y el repertorio que estoy desarrollando en cuanto que las formas de transmisión difieren, así como los requisitos de almacenamiento y diseminación. El repertorio, ya sea en términos de la expresión verbal o no verbal, transmite acciones encarnadas en vivo. Como tales, las tradiciones se almacenan en el cuerpo a través de varios métodos neumónicos y se transmiten “en vivo” en el momento a una audiencia en vivo (2003, 24).

Taylor propone que los estudios del performance nos permiten “tomar en serio el repertorio de prácticas encarnadas como un sistema importante de la forma de conocer y de transmisión del conocimiento” (2003, 26). En mi interpretación de Taylor, sugiero que veamos al performance de los repertorios como si formara parte de los archivos de conocimiento. Para mí, su metodología sugiere formas en las que podemos entender los testimonios así como son narrados en tiempo y espacio real y que luego adquieren una segunda, tercera, cuarta vidas y al infinito cuando viajan a través de la prensa, del Internet, la radiodifusión, la televisión, los chismes y otras formas de codificación humana. Los testimonios registrados y diseminados por los trabajadores de derechos humanos son ejemplos excelentes de narrativas orales que son parte importante de los archivos de conocimiento. En mi investigación sobre el movimiento de Oaxaca encontré que el archivo histórico creado a través de testimonios, su arreglo y diseminación en diferentes formas, resultó en recetas para nuevas formas de organización impulsadas por los medios sociales; para nuevas relaciones horizontales y formas de toma de decisiones; para los derechos a hablar y ser escuchado; para la democracia participativa; para que las mujeres transformaran los medios públicos y comerciales; para críticas encarnadas del poder; para formas híbridas de identidad racial urbana y étnica; para alianzas indígenas y no indígenas; para estrategias creativas para reclamar derechos; para ocupar espacios metafóricos y físicos; y para desafiar inequidades.
El testimonio oral le permite a la gente ser testigos presenciales, archivar sus memorias de los errores cometidos y representar identidades y experiencias complejas. Las narrativas testimoniales son altamente efectivas como recursos literarios en la escritura de ficción y en formas híbridas. En un proyecto actual estoy analizando el papel de Elena Poniatowska como una intelectual pública y un actor cultural y político en México. Estoy explorando cómo Poniatowska elaboró de una manera poderosa crónicas políticas, su activismo y sus desafíos periodísticos a las “historias oficiales” del Estado acerca de eventos históricos clave en el México contemporáneo y su papel en ampliar la verdad histórica y la memoria social para incluir varias perspectivas.

En el México contemporáneo, el término ‘crónicas’ se puede referir a ensayos cortos escritos como reportes para periódicos o a piezas periodísticas más largas escritas en un estilo literario pulido, algunas veces descrito como narrativas testimoniales. La crónica es un género importante en la literatura mexicana sin contraparte en inglés (excepto posiblemente por unos cuantos ensayos en el New Yorker — aunque estos no le ponen énfasis a las narrativas testimoniales como lo hacen las crónicas). En México, la crónica es un género literario que sirve como puente entre la política y la cultura. Elena Poniatowska se ha destacado tanto en las formas largas de la crónica como en las cortas; los analistas de su carrera temprana (como periodista especializada en entrevistas) le dan el crédito de haber inventado el estilo de crónica mexicana y un estilo único de la literatura de ficción elaborada con personajes y situaciones de la vida real.

Los testimonios orales son ingredientes clave de sus crónicas largas. La práctica del testimonio oral ha sido definido de manera amplia como una forma retroactiva de ser testigo de eventos devastadores de una historia que “esencialmente no ha terminado” y es “en cierto sentido hecha realidad por el proceso (en sí interminable) de ser testigo testimonial” (Felman y Laub: 1992, xv, xvii; Sarkar y Walker 2010, 7). El testimonio oral utilizado por escritores como Poniatowska entonces se convierte en un vehículo para ampliar la verdad histórica por medio de expandir quién puede legítimamente hablar y ser escuchado en una sociedad dada.

Las crónicas, novelas testimoniales y otras obras de Elena Poniatowska han sido cruciales para ampliar la verdad histórica mexicana, ya que ella documenta narrativas que surgen de las calles. El amigo y colega cronista de Elena Poniatowska, Carlos Monsiváis (1987), señala las obras La noche de Tlatelolco (1971) y Fuerte es el silencio (1980) de Poniatowska como contribuciones seminales al género contemporáneo de las crónicas mexicanas. Beth Jørgenson, una analista de largo tiempo del trabajo de Poniatowska, escribe que la crónica contemporánea mexicana “posada en el umbral entre la literatura y la incidencia, narrativa y ensayo, documento y figura, cultura elite y popular y la investigación y la incidencia...hace una contribución a la democratización de la cultura y a imaginar una democracia más inclusiva y auténtica” (Jørgenson 2012, 8).

La movilización de la narrativa testimonial de Elena Poniatowska en su obra y activismo ha sido crucial junto al trabajo que otros han realizado para construir narrativas nacionales alternativas alrededor de eventos como la represión del movimiento estudiantil de 1968, la respuesta ciudadana al terremoto de 1985 y el movimiento Zapatista que emergió en 1994, las campañas de López Obrador, Ayotzinapa. Por medio de tejer narrativas testimoniales en la ficción, Poniatowska es capaz de tener un impacto aún más poderoso en sus lectores. Podemos pensar en la obra de Poniatowska y las narrativas testimoniales que ella codifica y disemina como parte de lo que ha influido la percepción pública en México sobre ciertos eventos históricos clave, y la ampliación de la narrativa y memorias históricas. Yo hago un argumento similar en cuanto al papel de las narrativas testimoniales en los movimientos sociales.

En el movimiento de 2006 en Oaxaca, los testimonios fueron transmitidos en la radio y televisión, compartidos en las manifestaciones públicas, en las calles, en las barricadas, alrededor de las mesas de cocina, en las prisiones, en las oficinas de derechos humanos y en frente de soldados, la policía y oficiales de gobierno. El testificar repositionó significativamente a varios oradores previamente excluidos como ciudadanos activos que pueden hablar, ser escuchados, reclamar sus derechos y desarrollarse como nuevos sujetos políticos. Una de las tareas clave de organización asumida consciente o inconscientemente por varios sectores del movimiento fue la de crear avenidas para que las personas pudieran contar sus historias acerca de cómo se dieron cuenta de lo que estaba mal, cómo se concebían a sí mismos como personas capaces de reconocer lo que estaba mal y articular lo que debía de ser, y cómo crearon una comunidad con otros quienes habían sido agraviados en formas similares y podían soñar en formas similares para hacer lo que se tenía que hacer para corregir las cosas. Esta comunidad de otros, en el caso de Oaxaca, se convirtió en ‘El pueblo de Oaxaca’.

El testimonio es un vehículo crucial para crear experiencias y sentimientos de
políticas apasionadas que son centrales para cómo la gente vive y siente la lucha colectiva. La experiencia de testificar y también ser testigo de otros cuando testifican (directa e indirectamente), es una parte importante de cómo se desarrollan las identidades políticas en los individuos, cómo esos individuos buscan proverles a otros el conocimiento y la confianza para analizar el mundo desde sus lugares sociales en particular, y cómo grupos de personas participan en el trabajo ideológico para cambiar los discursos políticos públicos, así como las perspectivas. Esto requiere que primero se tenga un enfoque analítico para revelar los momentos cruciales y emotivos en el desarrollo personal de los activistas individuales. Después requiere un enfoque más amplio para examinar cómo las identidades colectivas se mueven más allá de los individuos y las organizaciones específicas, para adoptar una vida ideológica independiente en relación con otros discursos políticos públicos e ideologías (ver Brodkin 2007).

El análisis que los activistas crean puede ser legitimado a través de circunstancias temporales y/o estructurales (como en Oaxaca en el 2006) que crean una apertura para la emergencia de una nueva narrativa política que es escuchada y validada por otros actores políticos. Al estudiar las formas de producción del conocimiento en las que se involucran los activistas y el proceso mediante el cual se insertan en el ámbito político y cultural dominante, podemos entender cómo los discursos públicos pueden cambiar o cómo son desafíados. El testimonio como una forma de producción del conocimiento y su archivo en cintas de audio o video, en texto o en el cerebro, es una epistemología importante para entender la formación de nuevas identidades políticas que se encuentran detrás de procesos de reivindicación de derechos y la ampliación de conceptos de ciudadanía y participación política.

5. Académicos y la movilización del testimonio: las políticas del testimonio experto para los refugiados y migrantes centroamericanos

El testimonio experto combina la experiencia que se le da al testimonio a través de su “estado ontológico como un reporte de las condiciones ‘en el campo’ en sitios escondidos, inaccesible y peligrosos” (Carr 2010; Tate 2013, 58), con la credibilidad de los académicos por su entrenamiento, grados, publicaciones de su investigación y reconocimiento profesional, por medio de lo cual pueden acceder supuestas formas objetivas de análisis como son los datos, la estadística y la teoría (Tate 2013, 58; Andrews y Greenhill 2010; Greenhalgh 2008). Winifred Tate escribe que “aceptados como conocimiento legítimo de política pública por algunos, los testimonios son deslegitimizados por otros como anécdotas y carentes de rigor analítico” (2013, 58). Los antropólogos culturales, como testigos expertos, pueden potencialmente interrumpir la desacreditación de los testimonios a través su duplicación como expertos académicos que se basan en la investigación y en la información de primera mano, en combinación con testificar y usar la información para fortalecer e interpretar los testimonios de otros. Al mismo tiempo, la dependencia en un experto académico para “apoyar” la declaración de una persona, tanto en un juicio criminal como de inmigración, automáticamente resalta la serie de marcos diferenciadores que existen entre los dos actores y lo que representan. Al nivel más alto se encuentra una priorización de ontologías. El experto académico hace una representación de la ciencia moderna basada en la supuesta objetividad, la recolección de evidencia de todas partes y la interpretación teórica acreditada por una institución académica occidental y un grado educativo alto. La “historia” o “declaración” del encausado no es válida en sus propios términos, ya sea por la experiencia de vida específica o la información que contiene o por el sistema de conocimiento que representa. El experto académico puede realizar afirmaciones basadas en la investigación etnográfica —la cual a menudo involucra observaciones, observar las historias en acción, la solicitud de narrativas, conversaciones, grupos de enfoque y otras formas de personas hablando y diciendo, lo cual se reempaqueta como “información etnográfica”. Debido a que estas historias están enmarcadas en la teoría, no son percibidas como testimonios, sino como información. Al actuar como testigos expertos, los antropólogos culturales son llamados a menudo a simplificar la complejidad, a hacer argumentos culturales y a educar a los jueces.

Realizar este trabajo requiere caminar una línea muy fina entre tratar de interrumpir lo que a menudo son estereotipos raciales, étnicos, nacionales y de género y proveer información matizada y contextual, y trabajar con un abogado para construir un caso convincente que podrá convencer al juez. ¿Cuáles son las implicaciones, por ejemplo, de propagar una defensa como un “pandillero centroamericano refugiado” cuando, de hecho, un análisis más profundo revela que los niños escapándose de la violencia de las pandillas, que están buscando la reunificación con sus padres en Estados Unidos, son parte del mismo sistema que empujó a otros niños a unirse a las pandillas buscando protección en primer lugar? (Zilberg 2015). En varios de los casos criminales y de asilo político en los que he estado involucrada como una...
testigos expertos hay mucho en juego – a menudo la vida o la muerte cuando la deportación a lugares de conflictos violentos probablemente podría resultar en la muerte o en grandes daños. Hay otras cosas que están en juego, sin embargo, que producen reales desafíos en la arena de las políticas del conocimiento y la representación.

Para poder discutir esto, es necesario dar un paso atrás y echar un vistazo histórico. Voy a hacer eso en relación a lo que ha sido llamada la reciente “crisis humanitaria” de mujeres y niños refugiados de los países de triángulo norte de Centroamérica: El Salvador, Guatemala y Honduras. Lo que quiero sugerir es que veamos cómo las políticas de seguridad nacional y de asilo de Estados Unidos de la década de los ochenta en relación a Centroamérica fueron la base de las estrategias posteriores de defensa de la frontera, inmigración y deportación de la década de los noventa en adelante. El discurso actual de “Prevención a través de la disuasión”, la cual empuja deliberadamente a los migrantes y refugiados a corredores de desierto extremadamente peligrosos que causan muertes y lesiones.

En junio de 2014 el Presidente Obama etiquetó la presencia de más de 50,000 niños sin acompañar, provenientes de México y Centroamérica, que habían cruzado la frontera entre México y Estados Unidos desde octubre de 2013, como una “crisis humanitaria”. Durante el año fiscal de 2014, la Aduana y Protección de la Frontera de Estados Unidos reportó haber aprehendido a 68,541 menores sin acompañar, un aumento de un 77 por ciento en comparación con el año fiscal anterior. Setenta y cinco por ciento de los niños que aparecen sin un abogado son ordenados que se vayan de custodia en ORR reciban acceso a representación legal. Los estudios muestran que el tener representación legal aumenta significativamente las oportunidades de los niños para permanecer en Estados Unidos. Una revisión del Repositorio de Acceso a los Registros de Trámites (Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse o TRAC por sus siglas en inglés) de 100,000 casos juveniles en tribunales de inmigración entre 2005 y junio de 2014 muestra que “el 90 por ciento de los niños que aparecen sin un abogado son ordenados que se vayan de Estados Unidos”.

Ahora regresará a la cuestión de las políticas de producción y representación del conocimiento en el testimonio de Ronald Reagan, Estados Unidos ha elaborado una serie de políticas integradas que continúan en formas diferentes y más severas hasta el presente. Las políticas económicas y de seguridad de Estados Unidos crearon categorías de personas de Centroamérica y México que podían ser sistemáticamente excluidas de Estados Unidos por ser categorizadas como peligrosas, criminales, sin mérito y con un valor social y humano más bajo que el de los ciudadanos estadounidenses. Al mismo tiempo, estas mismas políticas facilitaron la entrada de un gran número de personas a Estados Unidos con un estatus migratorio incierto para que pudiesen trabajar como trabajadores, al consolidarse los modelos neoliberales de comercio y gobernanza en el hemisferio. Hoy en día, estas políticas han convergido en la política actual de defensa de la frontera conocida como “Prevención a través de la disuasión”, la cual empuja deliberadamente a los migrantes y refugiados a corredores de desierto extremadamente peligrosos que causan muertes y lesiones.

Desde la década de los ochenta bajo Ronald Reagan, Estados Unidos ha indocumentadas que fueron parte de esta migración eran, en gran parte, invisibles en la mayoría de las representaciones en los medios. Es importante notar que también están buscando la reunificación con sus familias. La mayoría de los niños centroamericanos encuestados que fueron deportados a El Salvador reportaron que la razón principal por la que habían realizado el viaje difícil de sus casas a través de Centroamérica, México y Estados Unidos era la reunificación con sus padres (Kennedy 2014).

La Ley de Seguridad Nacional (Homeland Security Act) de 2002 manda que la Oficina de Reasentamiento de Refugiados desarrolle un plan para que los niños en custodia en ORR reciban acceso a representación legal. Los estudios muestran que el tener representación legal aumenta significativamente las oportunidades de los niños para permanecer en Estados Unidos. Una revisión del Repositorio de Acceso a los Registros de Trámites (Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse o TRAC por sus siglas en inglés) de 100,000 casos juveniles en tribunales de inmigración entre 2005 y junio de 2014 muestra que “el 90 por ciento de los niños que aparecen sin un abogado son ordenados que se vayan de Estados Unidos”.

Ahora regresará a la cuestión de las políticas de producción y representación del conocimiento en el testimonio de Ronald Reagan, Estados Unidos ha...
expertos y el papel del testimonio en ese proceso.

Un abogado me envió la siguiente petición:

Estoy preparando una solicitud de asilo para un cliente de 18 años de edad que huyó de Guatemala cuando fue amenazado por una pandilla de que si no se unía a ellos, lo matarían. Estoy buscando a un experto quien pueda explicar hasta qué punto las pandillas tienen control y poder en Guatemala, y particularmente cómo el rehusarse a unirse a una pandilla/resistirse al reclutamiento de una pandilla y rehusarse a cooperar puede ser considerado una opinión política —esta es la teoría del caso que estoy desarrollando.

Me preocupa, así como a otros antropólogos culturales a quienes se les ha pedido ser testigos expertos, la producción de categorías de asilo que suprimen la historia de intervención política, militar y económica de Estados Unidos y que convierten dicha historia en una de seguridad mutua, defensa de las leyes y desarrollo económico (ver Speed 2015; Zilberg 2015).

En un manuscrito reciente, la antropóloga Elana Zilberg analiza la categoría de “Refugiado de guerra entre pandillas” la cual comenzó a aparecer en los tribunales de inmigración a principios de la década de 2000. Ella explica que los abogados comenzaron a buscar testimonio experto que pudiese “fortalecer el reclamo que estos jóvenes además de escapar de amenazas específicas encaradas por un individuo, constituían un “grupal social” por ser blanco de pandillas para reclutamiento forzado, extorsión, violencia sexual y asesinato” (2015). Zilberg dice que hasta hace poco tiempo, ha sido casi imposible ganar un caso de asilo como un “refugiado de guerra entre pandillas”. Luego ella recalca algo importante: “Otorgar el asilo a estos peticionarios (basado únicamente en la categoría de refugiado de guerra entre pandillas) sería reconocer el fracaso de las políticas de inmigración y aplicación de la ley, sin mencionar el fracaso o la falta de voluntad del Estado de El Salvador para proteger a los ciudadanos salvadoreños. Este giro irónico en la emergencia de esta nueva clase de refugiados cierra el círculo que nos lleva a la década de los ochenta y al regreso de los reprimidos en más de una manera: la participación continua de Estados Unidos en la producción y reproducción de la violencia en El Salvador” (2015). Esto ocurre a través de campañas de control de tolerancia cero conocidas como ‘mano dura’ que aumentaron la tasa de homicidios y pusieron a un número récord de hombres jóvenes en prisión.

Varios de nosotros buscamos insertar nuestro testimonio experto en el contexto de una serie compleja de factores históricos, políticos, económicos y culturales que vinculan a Estados Unidos, México y Centroamérica. Aquí el concepto de ‘transfronterizo’ es importante, pues nos sugiere cómo las políticas y prácticas de defensa de la frontera, seguridad y militarización afectan a las personas que están viviendo en los espacios de redes de migración y comunidades multisituadas. Al ir y venir a lo largo de estas fronteras en Centroamérica, México y Estados Unidos, los migrantes y refugiados también se están moviendo dentro de una cultura globalizada de militarización que ha sido consolidada y expandida en la región a lo largo de la historia del apoyo que el gobierno de Estados Unidos ha otorgado a los Estados y ejércitos de El Salvador, Guatemala y México. Las políticas y estrategias regionales de seguridad, crecimiento económico, interdicción por drogas y reclutamiento laboral trabajan junto a la militarización. Algunos de los resultados de esta integración incluyen la extensión de patrones de violencia militarizada de los ejércitos a la policía, tanto en Estados Unidos como en Centroamérica (Zilberg 2011), al crimen organizado y de regreso de nuevo, ahora y en el pasado (Santamaría 2013; Garzón Vergara 2013); la promoción de los acuerdos de libre comercio que aumentó en gran medida la desigualdad económica y la pobreza y dejó a muchos con poco o sin empleo; la integración de negocios de drogas, dinero en efectivo, armas de fuego y tráfico humano cuando México y Centroamérica se convirtieron en productores y puntos de transferencia importantes de drogas hacia el mercado de drogas lucrativo en Estados Unidos (Vogt 2013); la construcción de muros fronterizos que empujaron al tráfico migratorio hacia corredores de desierto desolados controlados por el crimen organizado y facilitaron la extensión de los secuestros y la extorsión como parte de la migración.

Si aceptamos el reto de representar la serie de asuntos contenidos en la historia de una persona en su complejidad histórica, política, cultural y económica, entonces podemos llegar a un enfoque que yo creo que aprendí de Martin Diskin. Nosotros estudiamos y trabajamos en casos de asilo individual de El Salvador y Guatemala a mitad de los ochenta, pero también vimos las causas complejas y el papel directo que tuvo el gobierno de Estados Unidos en provocar que los refugiados huyeran de El Salvador y Guatemala. Además analizamos el proceso por medio del cual la Secretaría de Estado de Estados Unidos certificaba que los gobiernos de ambos países estuviesen “realizando progreso en derechos humanos” y cómo los jueces
utilizaron esa justificación para denegar la gran mayoría de las solicitudes de asilo de dichos países. Como mentor, Martin me enseñó a entender, antes que nada, en dónde residían mi política, privilegio y ciudadanía, qué tipo de responsabilidad eso me daba y, entonces, me empujó a indagar en el registro histórico de la intervención de Estados Unidos en Centroamérica. El me animó a ver tanto los patrones estadísticos en el otorgamiento de asilo, como el papel de los abogados, expertos y jueces y, especialmente, de las opiniones de la Secretaría de Estado. También siempre me dijo que algo del análisis más sorprendente podía encontrarse en las declaraciones e historias de los solicitantes de asilo. El seminario de Martin me mostró muchas de las herramientas que he seguido utilizando hasta este día en mi trabajo con el testimonio y el estudio de su impacto en el mundo.

Conclusiones

Narrar. Testificar. Ser testigo. Ser testigo presencial. Concluyo testimoniando ante todos ustedes acerca del regalo que Martin Diskin me dio como una estudiante de posgrado en Boston, el cual he cargado conmigo hasta hoy en día e impartido a muchos de mis estudiantes y colegas. Los procesos de presentar, escuchar y codificar los testimonios orales y de otras formas son fundamentales para la producción y replicación del conocimiento. La experiencia de testificar, así como la de ser testigo presencial de otros, es un proceso en el cual se desarrollan las identidades políticas de los individuos, cómo dichos individuos buscan proveer a otros el conocimiento y la confianza para analizar el mundo desde sus lugares sociales particulares, y cómo los grupos de personas participan en el trabajo ideológico para cambiar los discursos y percepciones políticas públicas y ampliar la memoria social. Les agradezco la oportunidad de compartir mis ideas y canalizar a Martin. Martin Diskin presente. Martin Diskin presente. Martin Diskin presente.
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Brazil 2015 and Beyond: The Aftermath of the 2014 Elections and Implications for Dilma’s Second Term
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What is the direction of Brazilian politics? What is the legacy of the Workers’ Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores, PT) and how will it affect Dilma Rousseff’s second term in office? These are the questions that oriented a symposium held at the Latin American Institute at Freie Universität Berlin on January 30, 2015, as part of the Brazilian studies initiative funded by the German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, or DAAD). The purpose of the conference was to debate expectations regarding Dilma Rousseff’s second term in office in light of recent events and the 12 previous years of PT-led coalition governance in Brazil. Analysts reviewed the trajectory of the PT in power since 2003 and surveyed the broad challenges facing the Brazilian democratic regime exactly 30 years after the military withdrew from power in 1985.

Scholars from five countries and six different institutions—Freie Universität Berlin, Universidade de Brasília, IPEA (Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada), Oxford University, Universidad de Salamanca, and CEDLA (Center for Latin American Research and Documentation, Amsterdam)—met to discuss policy scenarios for Dilma’s second term. The papers resulting from the symposium cover political, social, economic, and environmental dimensions and draw on diverse sources of data. In general, the tone is one of concern and mild pessimism. Despite the considerable advances of the Lula-Dilma years, challenges exist on numerous fronts. There is little doubt that the road ahead is strenuous and uncertain. Difficulties in the relationship with other parties in the coalition, especially the Party of the Brazilian Democratic Movement (PMDB), with civil society, and with economic sectors prove to be daunting. We begin this dossier by focusing on the aftermath of the 2014 election and the current landscape of executive-legislative relations in recent years to speculate about scenarios for 2015–2016.

An Unpredictable Campaign with an Expected Outcome

The 2014 presidential election was the closest in Brazil’s modern history. Only 3.28 percent of the vote separated the winning reelection bid of the PT’s Dilma Rousseff from Aécio Neves, the PSDB (Brazilian Social Democratic Party) runner-up in the second round. Given the level of economic and political dissatisfaction in the country in the two years prior to the election (clearly illustrated by a wave of popular protests beginning in June 2013), followed by very low levels of growth, high interest rates, and resurgent inflation in 2014, the ability of the opposition to challenge the PT’s hegemony was enhanced. Similarly to Lula’s reelection in 2006 and to her own first election in 2010, Dilma benefited from the votes of the poorer, less developed regions of the country. The 2014 Brazilian Electoral Panel Study (BEPS) shows that lower income groups voted predominantly for Dilma, regardless of their level of social mobility. High levels of employment, high minimum wage, and several social programs including Bolsa Família, Minha Casa Minha Vida, and Tarifa Social, among others, are responsible for the PT’s electoral success, as initial multivariate analysis at the individual and aggregate level show. Aécio, on the other hand, gained the vote of the richer and more developed regions of the country, and, in particular, of a specific sector: the traditional middle class with upward mobility, also as shown by the 2014 Brazilian Electoral Panel Study.

The process leading to this outcome was both unexpected and unprecedented in Brazilian history. The levels of vote intention volatility were higher than in prior races, due mainly to the tragic death of PSB (Brazilian Socialist Party) candidate Eduardo Campos in a plane crash immediately prior to the beginning of the free electoral airtime on radio and TV (Horário Gratuito de Propaganda Eleitoral). This shocking turn of events led to a spectacular rise in the vote intentions for Marina Silva, the vice presidential candidate on Campos’s slate and successor as PSB presidential candidate. Initially almost immune to criticism due to the harrowing circumstances of her entry into the race, for a moment Marina toppled the polls and seemed poised to defeat the PT in an expected runoff. Yet the remainder of the campaign saw a massive and intensive media blitzkrieg against Marina, encouraged and abetted by the PT. The levels of negative campaigning in the weeks that followed, with successful accusations of inconsistencies in Marina’s government proposals, led to a steady decline in popular support for her. This culminated in an also unprecedented recovery of Aécio in the final days of the election. Certainly, the constant attacks by the PT against Marina and a very solid performance by Aécio in televised debates (especially in the final, widely viewed clash on Rede Globo) proved decisive to reverse his earlier slide and propel him into the second round against Dilma. In this way, the 2014 contest became the sixth consecutive presidential election in which the top two finishers came from the PT and the PSDB, with the last four of these contests decided by runoffs.

The much shorter second round (October 5 to 26) again saw successive PT attacks against Aécio, portraying him as a bon vivant and as a scion of the political elite,
traditionally indifferent to the plight of the poor. Thus, even in a highly unfavorable economic environment, the government was able to win reelection, depending heavily on an aggressive campaign against its key challengers. Yet the price of that strategy—treating political adversaries as mortal enemies—seems rather high, given the national divisions that have emerged in the wake of the election. The opposition’s newfound determination combined with the dissatisfaction among certain members of the PT coalition, especially sectors of the opportunistic, catchall PMDB, peaked in the aftermath of the election. Differently from the reelection of her predecessor Lula in 2006—which was an almost seamless transition from a first term to a second, in a context of economic boom and high presidential popularity— the political circumstances seemed much more turbulent as Dilma’s second inauguration approached.

Honeymoon in Hell

Despite the gathering clouds in 2014, few predicted that the situation would be so unfavorable to the Dilma government in 2015. Immediately after the election, Dilma perceived emerging tensions in her relationship with Congress. The tone of the PSDB-led opposition was more aggressive than at any previous point in the Lula-Dilma years. The reshuffled cabinet was significantly criticized, especially for some members with political trajectories that would place them in direct opposition to what the PT defended in the past, the most obvious being the conservative senator Kátia Abreu—the “chainsaw queen” of agribusiness—as minister of Agriculture. Relations with Congress deteriorated rapidly with important losses in some crucial votes. In fact, legislative data collected by CEBRAP show that Dilma was not able to win approval of a single bill initiated by the executive branch in 2014. This was a notable first in the democratic regime that began in 1985.

But the worst was yet to come. Political analysts often refer to the three first months of a new administration as the honeymoon period. Yet for Dilma Rousseff, early 2015 was a honeymoon in hell. First, the PT lost the race for the presidency of the Chamber of Deputies. The PMDB candidate Eduardo Cunha, who—while nominally a member of the governing coalition—has always been extremely critical of the Dilma administration, was elected in the first round with almost double the vote tally of the PT candidate, Arlindo Chinaglia. The jockeying for power in the Chamber of Deputies was extremely harsh: again marked by processes of intimidation and cutthroat campaigning from within the PT-led alliance itself. The result was a deeply divided governing coalition, with both houses of Congress controlled by the PMDB and with a flamboyant tormentor of the government, Cunha, heading one of them. The one consolation for the PT was to have a more friendly figure from within the PMDB, Renan Calheiros, elected as president of the Senate.

One immediate consequence of Cunha’s victory was the final approval of a constitutional amendment that requires the mandatory implementation of all budgetary amendments approved by Congress. The PT opposed this constitutional reform, which significantly weakens the discretionary authority of the executive branch and deprives Dilma of one of the main ways to discipline her unruly coalition. Cunha also fast-tracked a political reform package in which he himself took a leading role. By the end of May 2015, this process was moving toward the implementation of yet another constitutional amendment, this one ending the possibility of immediate reelection for holders of executive office. In his first five months as Chamber president, Cunha presided over 121 roll-call votes, the busiest legislative session in over 20 years, leading some analysts to conclude that the PMDB-led Congress was beginning to wrest control of the national agenda from the PT-led government.

Petrobras, Popularity, and Impeachment?

Finally, adding to the unfolding scenario of chaos, independent investigations of a bribery scheme in Petrobras generated compelling evidence that over R$200 million were stolen from the state-owned oil giant and diverted to cover the campaign expenditures of the PT, PMDB, and PP (Progressive Party), the key parties in the governing coalition. There are accusations that Dilma’s reelection campaign was funded in part with these illicit resources. Beginning in February of this year, press coverage of President Dilma became relentlessly negative, with new accusations in the Petrobras affair emerging almost daily. Key allies fell victim to the investigations, including Dilma’s close personal friend Maria das Graças Foster, the CEO of Petrobras (forced to resign), and João Vaccari Neto, the PT party treasurer (arrested by the Federal Police on suspicion of receiving bribes). By April, Dilma’s electoral triumph had changed to a new record: the worst presidential approval rating in Brazilian history. Polls in mid-April showed only 13 percent public support, with 62 percent disapproving and 63 percent believing she should face impeachment hearings.

As we write these lines, Brazil is in flux, with the highest levels of political uncertainty since the government of
Fernando Collor de Mello in the early 1990s. The opposition is organizing massive popular demonstrations against the government, some demanding Dilma’s impeachment, with some fringe elements going even further to demand military intervention. The PT, for its part, has declared that it will also mobilize its supporters to prevent “undemocratic” attempts to replace the government. The implications of such a divisive scenario are not simply a headache for Dilma’s inner circle and spin doctors; they represent an unprecedented “stress test” for Brazilian democracy and its much-heralded model of coaltional presidentialism.

A Look at the Dossier on Brazil

Although the PT has won four consecutive presidential elections using the number 13—the party’s official designation on the ballot—the superstitious might somehow believe that the PT’s 13th year in power (2015) is an unlucky omen. A more rational interpretation would hold that any party winning four consecutive national elections will sooner or later fall victim to fatigue, scandal, or both. Even prior to her recent tailspin, Dilma Rousseff was working overtime to maintain both the Cardoso legacy of economic stabilization and the Lula legacy of social inclusion, while at the same trying to jump-start economic growth after the end of the commodities boom and prepare Brazil for the sporting mega-events of 2014 and 2016. This is a tall order by any standard.

To review the challenges facing Dilma in her second term, this dossier begins with an article by Lucio Rennó on the “electoral hangover” facing Brazil in 2015. Rennó finds that the image of a Brazil fractured by class struggle is somewhat misleading and that the 2014 election can be understood with reference to more conventional explanations of the vote—such as simple voter evaluation of the incumbent Dilma in 2014. Sérgio Costa, Barbara Fritz, and Martina Sproll then examine the apparent exhaustion of the recent Brazilian economic boom, with particular attention to the impact of the economic slowdown on the ongoing processes of economic redistribution. The text by Fábio de Castro and Renata Motta examines the disappointing performance of the PT government on environmental issues: a technocratic reliance on the neodevelopmental model has widened the gap between the state and civil society organizations in environmental politics, leading to ecosystem degradation and social injustices. Roberto Pires then examines one of the ostensible successes of the PT in power, the creation of participatory institutions of direct democracy. Pires argues that these institutions have now stalled and are facing a “midlife crisis”: in certain policy areas, participatory spaces frequently reproduce the socioeconomic inequalities of the larger society, failing to include those frequently excluded from “formal politics.” The challenge for Dilma’s second term will be to revive those spaces, perhaps via a political reform that would reconnect direct and indirect forms of democracy. Finally, Rodrigo Rodrigues-Silveira reviews some of the key issues that face the ongoing political reform debate in 2015–2016, particularly the issue of intergovernmental coordination.

Notes

1 The 2014 BEPS was composed of seven waves of interviews over the course of the campaign, starting in May/June and ending in November, after the second round. The data will be publicly available by the end of 2015. The analysis that underpins the findings discussed above is available upon request from Lucio Rennó (luciorenno@unb.br).

2 Data from the Banco de Dados Legislativos, www.cebrap.org.br.
The Brazilian 2014 Presidential Elections: A Country Fractured by Class Struggle?

by Lucio Renno | Universidade de Brasília | luciorenno@unb.br

Drama was the defining trait of the 2014 Brazilian presidential election, one of the most eventful in the country’s modern history. A series of unpredictable events, one of them tragic, marked the campaign, yet the final result was much as expected: a close victory of the Workers’ Party (PT) over the Brazilian Social Democratic Party (PSDB) in the second round. Given the backdrop of the election—high levels of dissatisfaction with the economy and the government’s performance; rising inflation; slow growth; and a strong and charismatic PSDB candidate, Aécio Neves—the small margin of victory was unsurprising.

If the outcome of the election was predictable, the process that took us there was one of a kind. The oscillation in vote intention during the campaign was impressive: for a few weeks in August and September, and for the first time since 2002, the Worker’s Party (PT) candidate did not sit atop the polls alone. The dynamic of the campaign was drastically altered by a specific event: the tragic death of Eduardo Campos, the Brazilian Socialist Party (PSB) candidate, in a plane crash on the coast of São Paulo State. Marina Silva, his vice presidential running mate and successor, vaulted immediately to the top of the polls, moving into a statistical dead heat with incumbent Dilma Rousseff of the PT. Polls also showed Marina victorious in a possible runoff with Dilma. This turn of events came in mid-August, just as candidates took to the airwaves for their free radio and television time, which is traditionally when the campaign kicks into high gear.

The story of the election can be summarized by the effective negative campaigning by the PT, first against Marina Silva in the first round and then against Aécio Neves in the October runoff. The 2014 campaign will be remembered for the spectacular evaporation of Marina Silva as a direct consequence of her inability to react efficiently to PT attacks. A second important aspect was the impressive turnaround of Aécio Neves in the final days, even the final hours, of the first round. After Marina replaced Campos in mid-August, the presidential election had apparently become a two-woman race, and Aécio looked set to finish a distant third (some allies even urged him to drop out of the presidential race altogether). This would have been a bitter outcome for Aécio and his PSDB, which had finished first or second in every presidential election since 1994. Against all odds, however, Aécio managed to perform very well in televised debates, especially the final one on Rede Globo some 72 hours prior to the first round. Helped by the rapid meltdown of Marina Silva, his debate performance spurred a wave of support from undecided voters and some last-minute defections from the Marina camp.

In this article I explore some possible consequences of this harsh, tortuous, and competitive election. One aspect of the 2014 election has caught the attention of political scientists and pundits alike: a possible class divide in which poor people from the Marina camp supported the Workers’ Party (PT) over the Brazilian Social Democratic Party (PSDB) candidate, Aécio Neves, his debate performance spurred a wave of support from undecided voters and some last-minute defections from the Marina camp.

As noted above, the 2014 campaign featured a large dose of negative campaigning, especially by the PT. This tactic proved extremely efficient against Marina, who had difficulty in responding to accusations of inconsistencies in her government program, especially with regard to her proposal for an independent...
percent of the vote between the first and second rounds of the election. Dilma, on the other hand, picked up 12 percent of the vote between both rounds. Our survey overestimated her final performance. Still, both candidates had similar acceleration in vote intention in the final leg of the campaign, something our data do capture well. In sum, Aécio fared better in fending off the PT attacks and came much closer to defeating the PT than did his PSDB predecessors in 2010, 2006, and 2002.

Class Voting in the Presidential Elections

Was Aécio able to capitalize electorally on some specific social group? Did Dilma fare better in other groups? This is essential to understand if there is, in fact, a class bias in the distribution of vote choice across the country. To some, such as José Agripino Maia (DEM-Rio Grande do Norte), an important opposition leader, the answer was clear: “Uma coisa ficou muito clara: na maioria dos Estados do Sudeste, no Centro-Oeste, ou seja, no Brasil moderno, no Brasil que produz, a vitória de Aécio Neves foi acachapante.”

For the opposition, the geographical divide of the country reflects class lines: the wealthy and prosperous supported the PSDB whereas the poor and social welfare dependent supported the PT.

However, opposition politicians were not alone in espousing this view. Lula da Silva often used the “us-against-them” rhetoric in order to situate his political project, and that of the PT, on the side of the poor and the opposition’s project on the side of the elites. As he claimed: “A elite brasileira está conseguindo fazer o que nós nunca conseguimos: desertar o ódio de classes.” In the same speech, he declared that the campaign was not Dilma’s struggle alone: “Não é uma briga dela [Dilma], mas é a
Do the data support this apparent consensus among the two main adversaries in current Brazilian politics? The answer is: in part. We examined all possible patterns of relationship between social class and vote choice as well as introduced an indicator of social mobility, in the hope that the combination of class and mobility might be important to understand Brazilian electoral cleavages. We also analyzed the determinants of vote choice in the first and second rounds using a multiple regression model. What we find is that only one specific group differentiated itself from the vote patterns of others, all of which tended predominantly to support Dilma. Aécio received massive support from the “traditional” middle classes and, in particular, those that perceived upward mobility in the past decade. Aécio harvested his support not from the economically vulnerable, but from the established middle classes.

Figure 2 depicts this reality very clearly: the vote for Aécio tends to be concentrated within a specific group. He won among the middle class and among those with (subjective) upward mobility. In similar graphs, which we omit for space reasons, we can easily see that the vote for Dilma is drawn from all social sectors, although she fares much better among the lower and lower-middle classes.

Based on these data, we come to a conclusion that raises doubts about the apparent class divide in Brazil. Only the traditional middle class with upward social mobility appears to behave differently from the others in its predominant support for Aécio and particular dislike of Dilma and the PT. All other groups generally gravitated toward Dilma. The pattern, then, does not seem to be one of social class. Our ongoing multivariate analyses of the BEPS data show that the determinants of vote choice are government evaluation (i.e., assessment of Dilma’s performance in office), partisanship, views on social policies, and, to a lesser extent, ideology. Class and social mobility take a back seat here. In other words, the oversimplifying “class cleavage” story tends to obscure underlying currents of electoral behavior that are much more complex and interesting.

Notes
1 The 2010 BEPS is available at http://www.iadb.org/en/research-and-data/publication-details,3169.html?pub_id=IDB-DB-105. We expect the 2014 dataset to be made public by the end of 2015, respecting a normal embargo period.
2 “One thing is very clear: in the majority of the states in the Southeast, in the Center-west, that is, in the modern Brazil, in the productive Brazil, Aécio’s victory was overwhelming.” http://noticias.bol.uol.com.br/ultimas-noticias/eleicoes/2014/10/27/brasil-moderno-deu-vitoria-a-aecio-neves-diz-chefe-de-campanha-do-tucano.htm. Translation by the author.
3 “The Brazilian elite is being able to do what we were never able to accomplish: awaken class hatred.” “It’s not her (Dilma’s) fight, but a fight of a political project. It’s a project of social inclusion against one of social marginalization.” See http://www.folhapolitica.org/2014/06/ao-comentar-ataques-dilma-lula-fala-em.html. Translations by the author.
4 Both of these variables were measured based on self-classifications on social class scales (low, low-middle, middle, middle-high, and high). The indicator of social mobility was based on the differentiation between perceptions of current and past social class.
5 All results available upon request from the author: luciorenno@unb.br.
Dilma 2.0: From Economic Growth with Distribution to Stagnation and Increasing Inequalities?
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Brazil seems to have experienced a “moment of equality” (Therborn 2015) during the last decade. Income inequality, as measured by the Gini index, was reduced from 0.60 to 0.53 between 2000 and 2012. There have also been changes on other dimensions, for example in terms of race and gender inequalities. On the one hand, Brazil is following the trend of almost all Latin American countries. On the other hand, its inequality remains astronomically high in comparative perspective; the average Gini of the OECD world stands at 0.31 (World Bank data from 2012).

The jumping-off point of our analysis is the concept of “entangled inequalities.” This concept focuses on both the multidimensionality of inequalities, including socioeconomic, ecological, and power asymmetries, and on their historical and transnational character, that is, the interdependencies between domestic and exogenous and between past and present inequality structures (www.desigualdades.net; see Braig, Costa, and Göbel 2015). Against the background of this broad concept, we ask in this brief article: Which have been the driving forces of this moment of equality? Is it simply a parenthesis or a historical breakthrough in Brazil, a country once dubbed as “Belindia” for its coexistence of industrial diversification and historically rooted inequality since colonial and slavery times? How will the expected low economic growth in Dilma’s second term affect social inequalities?

Glory and Misery of PT-Driven Macroeconomics

Redistributive policies and their effects in Brazil by the PT-led government during the last decade have been shaped by a complex interplay of international and domestic factors. At the international level, despite huge swings, commodity prices remained high most of the time, pushing an expansion of mining and export agriculture activities in the country. Global capital flows were mostly abundant, even if highly short-term and unstable. Both terms of trade and financial inflows pressed for an appreciation of the dollar exchange rate in real terms of around 40 percent between 2004 and 2012.

At the domestic level, within the so-called macroeconomic “tripod,” priority has been given since the first Lula administration to inflation control, pursuing a policy of high floating interest rates and primary fiscal surpluses. The favorable terms of trade for Brazilian commodities such as soy and iron ore strongly added to growth, despite rather austerity-oriented monetary and fiscal policies. Here, the revaluation of the currency gave a helping hand to keep domestic prices under control. This harsh policy came in combination with active industrial policies, such as a public investment program and generous public credit, combined with wide-ranging social policies.

Economic orthodoxy then gave way, at least for several years, to a more developmentalist approach, during which strong growth, trade surpluses, and low inflation allowed a relaxation of orthodox policies. Starting gradually from 2006, but especially during and in the aftermath of the so-called global financial crisis, Brazil gained an international reputation for combining an anticyclical fiscal policy, capital inflow controls to dampen the upward trend of the currency, and an expansion of the social safety net.

However, the main drivers of growth have not resulted in productivity gains nor in an increase in the technology content of products made in Brazil. Much to the contrary: consumption spurred the massive import of consumer goods—made cheap by the high level of the Brazilian real against the US dollar—and a boom in the domestic service sector. The trade balance dramatically reflects this process of deindustrialization, pushed by a domestic consumption boom and a massively overvalued exchange rate. Still, in 2006, Brazil not only enjoyed a net trade surplus, but about two-thirds of this surplus was composed of intermediate or final consumer goods. In 2013, the country had a net trade deficit of manufactured or semimanufactured goods of some 60 billion US dollars, mirrored by an export surplus almost exclusively concentrated on commodities (IEDI 2014). As historical experience shows and the early months of 2015 have demonstrated once again, commodity prices do not remain high forever.

Also at the level of domestic politics, Dilma’s nomination of the new finance minister, Joaquim Levy, as well as other economic policy makers known for their links with financial markets, have dimmed the perspectives for economic heterodoxy and renewed economic growth.

Labor Market Dynamics between Formalization and “Precarization”

There is a broad consensus that the dynamic forces behind the recent decline of income inequality in Brazil since 2000 derive from favorable economic conditions with their positive effects for the labor market, improvement in average schooling as well as from a variety of social policies (UNDP 2013; Lustig, Pessino, and Scott 2013). Nonetheless, a closer look at current trends in labor and social policy reveals contradictory developments threatening the
sustainability of recent redistribution effects.

At first sight, a real turnaround can be ascertained compared to the dramatic deterioration of the labor market in the 1990s. No less than 20 million new jobs have been created since 2003 (Ministério da Fazenda 2014) and it is worth pointing out that many of these are in the formal labor market. This implies significant social changes as the mainly young and recently formalized workforce thus benefits from labor law and social provisions. Attempts at further inclusion have been reinforced by measures of the Lula-Dilma governments targeting formalization through programs for small and microenterprises and for domestic workers, and via stronger enforcement of labor legislation by the Ministry of Work and Employment.

Still, there is a controversy about the quality, qualification, and sustainability of the new formal-sector jobs. What kind of jobs have been created for which kind of workforce, and what are the underlying contradictory dynamics in the labor market? (See the debate in Sproll and Wehr 2014.) Again, complex entanglements with transnational processes have to be taken into account. First of all, in the wake of a flexible and financialized capitalist regime of accumulation, comprehensive restructuring of work and production processes as well as a marked deregulation and flexibilization of labor relations can be noted globally, also in Brazil. The degree of flexibilization of labor in the Brazilian labor market is extremely high, as for example revealed by a turnover rate of 43.1 percent in 2012 (against 41.8 percent in 2002); most employment situations had a duration of less than one year (45 percent lasted even less than six months), demonstrating insecurity and lack of stability of the newly created jobs (Druck 2014). Hence there is a contradictory situation of simultaneous formalization and precarization which also debilitates traditional social protection schemes linked to the period of employment. Outsourcing can definitely be considered one of the main drivers of precarization as it has become a generalized strategy in all economic sectors, including the public sector and state companies. This indicates a major transition even within the state apparatus itself. Outsourced work in 2011 corresponded to 23.5 percent of formal employment in Brazil (CUT 2011). Usually, outsourced work is more precarious in terms of payment, working time, working conditions, turnover rates, and health risks. There are diverse forms of outsourcing: among others, the number of self-employed has grown at great pace. These forms of precarization also clearly indicate a deterioration of the organizational capacities of trade unions. At the same time, a considerable inclusion of new segments of the population into formal employment in Brazil can be noted, particularly young, black, and female workers whose employment conditions had formerly been limited to the informal sector. Recent changes in the labor market thus also point to new segmentations concerning class, race, and gender. However, the depicted processes of precarization impact on the reproduction of gendered and racialized structures of the labor market.

Social Policies and the Neglected Tax Reform

Since 2003, the federal government has implemented a broad range of social policies including both pro-poor measures and targeted programs for particular groups such as Afro-descendants, women, “traditional populations,” and so forth. The corresponding social outcomes are auspicious: between 2002 and 2013, the poverty rate (including extreme poverty) declined from 48.4 percent to 21.1 percent of Brazil’s population. In the same period expenditures on social policies jumped from 12.7 percent to 16.8 percent of GDP. Cash transfer programs in favor of poor families have occupied a prominent role during this phase. While a previous program benefited some 3.6 million families as of 2002, the Bolsa Família program in 2013 was transferring average benefits of about R$142 to 14.1 million families (see CEPAL 2014 and Bielschowsky 2014). Among nominal recipients of Bolsa Familia stipends, 93 percent are women and 73 percent are persons of color. Despite their crucial importance in reducing poverty, Bolsa Familia and other cash transfer programs have only a negligible effect on mitigating income inequality: these programs can explain only a small fraction of the reduction in the Gini coefficient (Medeiros and Souza 2013; Lavinas 2013).

Among the focal policies implemented since 2003, the quotas law passed in 2012 is probably the most comprehensive measure. According to the new law, 50 percent of all places to study at federal institutions of higher education are reserved for students coming from public schools in proportion to the share of black and indigenous population living in the respective region. Since about 1.1 million of 7.3 million enrolled undergraduate students in 2013 in Brazil studied at federal institutions (INEP 2014), and blacks and indigenous represent about 51 percent and 0.5 percent of Brazilian population, the federal quotas program, if fully implemented, will distribute about 283,000 study places according to racial and ethnic criteria.

In recent times, income inequalities between women and men and in a slighter
magnitude between blacks and whites have decreased. In 2002 women’s average income stood at 49.9 percent of the male average, rising to 58.4 percent in 2012; average Afro-descendant income in 2002 corresponded to 47.2 percent of the average for whites, increasing to 54.6 percent in 2012 (IPEA 2013). This reduction of socioeconomic distance between women and men as well as between blacks and whites cannot be explained, at last not solely, by gender- and race-related policies. While these policies improve blacks’ and women’s agency, these policies contain crucial relevance for mitigating power asymmetries à la longue, but the measures have reached so far only a small fraction of Brazil’s total female and black population, producing minimal socioeconomic effects at the aggregate level.

Much more relevant here is the national minimum wage. By law, annual adjustments are equal to the sum of inflation in the last 12 months plus the economic growth rate from two years earlier. This policy has led to a real increase of the minimum wage of some 75 percent between 2002 and 2013. Since women and blacks are still overrepresented in low-wage labor sectors, they benefit more from the increasing minimum wage than do men and whites.

The aggregate impact of current minimum wage policy is also expressive in terms of general redistribution, as detected by various econometric simulations which show that the rising minimum wage is the most important driver of recent decline of inequalities in Brazil (Saboia 2014). Although the new cabinet of Dilma Rousseff decided to extend the current adjustment policy, recent (and expected) very low economic growth rates will necessarily lead to a stabilization of real minimum wages with negative consequences for redistribution in terms of both class and gender- and race-related inequalities.

Finally, tax policies, as a decisive instrument for promoting redistribution, have substantially changed since Lula came to power in 2003. Tax revenues encompassing about 36 percent of GDP are comparable with numbers found in various OECD countries. However, the disproportionate participation of indirect taxes, responsible for about half of revenue, the modest taxation of income (the highest income rate is 27.5 percent; in Sweden, it is 56.6 percent), and the mild burden of capital and finance profits lead to a regressive impact of taxes in Brazil’s final income structure. In Brazil, taxation policies do not decrease but rather increase the Gini coefficient.

The concentration of wealth is also impressive. Based on analysis of 25 million tax declarations, Castro (2014) concludes that only about 406,000 taxpayers (about 0.2 percent of the national population) possess about 47 percent of all declared properties and titles. According to his simulations, a “simple” introduction of a tax rate of 15 percent for capital and financial profit combined with brackets of 35 percent and 40 percent for high salaries could reduce the Gini coefficient by about 20 percent.

Since 2003, the PT has never felt strong enough to promote major tax reforms. In the current political coalition directed by Dilma Rousseff, seen by critical voices within the PT as a “neoliberal backlash,” a progressive reform of the Brazilian tax system is not visible on the horizon.

Conclusion

During the party’s 12 years in power, the two PT presidents have achieved impressive economic and social results. In this period, GDP per capita grew about 64 percent, poverty was drastically reduced, and income distribution became notably less unequal. These triumphs derive more from specific sectoral policies and a favorable external economic conjuncture than from structural change induced by a coherent political project. Economically, persistent low productivity in the industrial and service sector combined with a “re-primarization” of exports in a context marked by falling commodities prices have stifled growth. Socially, existing drivers of redistribution seem to have reached their limit. In this context, reviving economic growth and continuing to promote social redistribution require structural reforms in both fields. By this, we mean countercyclical public investments in order to promote productivity and kick-start the economy, and also the introduction of comprehensive redistributive policies such as progressive taxes and structural labor market reforms that can curb precarization.

Since January of this year, the embattled Dilma Rousseff has opted essentially for the opposite strategy: cuts in public expenditures, a proposed tax reform with no progressive redistribution, and concentration on social policies that have low redistributive impact. For this she was rewarded with a contraction of −0.2 percent in GDP growth in the first quarter of 2015. The most likely results of this strategy are continued economic stagnation and rising social tensions.
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The environment has become a contentious issue in national politics in Brazil. The commodification of the economy are now coming to the fore. The deforestation rate in the Amazon has gone up again after a decade of steady decrease; environmental conflicts have increased and intensified; violence in rural areas has deepened in the last decade; and, more recently, shortages of water and energy have plagued urban areas. Although most of these impacts resulted from policies implemented more than a decade ago, they are symptoms of a deeper political problem rooted in anemic levels of democracy, participation, and social justice under the Dilma government. The neodevelopmentalist model—based on expansion of natural resources extraction, large energy and infrastructure projects, and a centralized decision-making process—could hardly have produced a different outcome (Zhouri and Laschefski 2010). In this essay we argue that environmental politics in Brazil has suffered from an increasing distance between the civil society and the state, on one hand, and an increasing distance between rural and urban social movements, on the other. Next, we briefly describe these two processes since Dilma took office in 2011 and consider their implications for her second term, which began in January 2015.

The Distance between Civil Society and the State

Dilma inherited a damaged relationship with civil society organizations (CSOs), a state of affairs for which she herself was partly responsible. As a cabinet minister under Lula, her pet project was the Growth Acceleration Program (PAC), during which she opted for a technocratic style over a democratic decision-making process. As president, she placed conservation policies at the lowest priority on the national agenda, pushed her development agenda forward, and kept her distance from CSOs. Three illustrative examples help to understand how the polarization between the state and civil society organizations has surfaced.

Dilma faced the highly politicized process of negotiating a new Forest Code at the outset of her first term. In Congress, she had to deal with the fierce Rural Caucus, which controlled the bill-drafting process and biased it toward the interests of agribusiness. Academics and activists repeatedly called for a wider debate and wrote letters and policy recommendations fully supported by empirical evidence. The government turned a blind eye to their claims. The final text, approved in 2012, legitimates flexible reforestation obligations and provides legal mechanisms to reduce conservation units. As expected, with several gaps and ambiguities, reforestation has gone down and the deforestation rate has gone up since 2012 (Imazon 2015).

A second example is the construction of hydroelectric power plants in the Amazon. By using a discourse of “energy security,” Lula resited repeated protests from CSOs, bypassed the mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and injected BNDES (Brazilian Development Bank) funding into colossal hydroelectric projects. Dilma followed Lula in confronting not only indigenous and peasant movements but also national and international organizations, escalating the Belo Monte dam construction into one of the most polarized socioenvironmental conflicts in the country (Justiça Global Brasil, n.d.). The technocrat Isabella Teixeira was appointed as minister of the Environment in order to facilitate environmental licensing (e.g., Hall and Branford 2014) and the reduction of protected areas as well (Bernard, Pena, and Araujo 2014). Dilma ignored Free, Prior, and Informed Consent with indigenous populations and called for a state of emergency to suppress and criminalize socioenvironmental mobilizations against the hydroelectric projects.

The final example addresses the role of civil society organizations in the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012 (also known as “Rio + 20,” held two decades after the historic United Nations Conference on Environment and Development of 1992 in Rio de Janeiro). Despite their broad attendance, effective participation of CSOs in the Brazilian delegation was kept to a bare minimum. As host of the event, the Brazilian government created different channels of dialogue with CSOs (e.g., the Socioenvironmental Arena at the People's Summit, the Multi-Stakeholder Commission), but adopted a conservative position on climate governance with strong support for a mainstream development model. The result was a vacuous document with a wish list of mainly nonbinding commitments. The outcome was strongly criticized by social movements, researchers, and progressive politicians as a step backward from Rio 1992 (Hochstetler and Viola 2013).

These three examples reveal how conservation and rural populations have lost relevance on the national agenda, widening the gap between the state and the CSOs in environmental politics and leading to ecosystem degradation and social injustices. They reveal a clear prioritization of the neodevelopmentalist approach, relying on technocratic solutions to support elite groups. The result is a lack of dialogue between the state and the civil society.
The Distance between Rural and Urban Social Movements

When the recent wave of street protests began in 2013, many described these events as a new social movement in Brazil reflecting the enhanced consumption of the emergent urban middle class. If these analysts looked outside the urban centers, however, they would have realized that protests, social unrest, and oppressive measures by the state have long been part of the daily life of many rural populations. Physical distance, combined with the euphoria of insertion into the consumption market in the new millennium, helped the state to conceal the struggles of the rural poor from the emergent urban middle class. Given low levels of attention from a highly urbanized Brazilian population, the national government has made virtually no effort to tackle environmental injustices caused by state-driven development policies.

The social bases of the PT-led government, which have historical ties to and wide support among urban workers and organized unions, also share this new conception of development in which ever-growing segments of society are included in the labor and consumption market. For them, the places in which commodity extraction and hydroelectric mega-projects take place are distant abstractions; and they often conclude that peasants and indigenous and other traditional peoples should simply be incorporated into the labor and consumption markets (Fellet 2014).

Despite the apolitical, technocratic stance taken by the national government, social movements remained important allies of Dilma in the presidential elections of 2014 (Questão Indígena 2014a, 2014b). While critical of the neodevelopmentalist model, rural leaders urged their bases to vote for the incumbent government as the lesser of two evils: they feared that opposition parties would pursue an openly neoliberal project (Brasil 247, 2014). Now these same rural leaders are demanding that the PT-led government address their agenda: implementation of land reform and creation and protection of indigenous territories, as well as infrastructure and policies to support small-scale production systems (Ferreira 2014). These movements of the rural poor have declared their willingness to fight for their rights and demands (Rádio Brasil Atual 2015). However, their main challenge is to reframe their narrative in the direction of a more urban-inclusive socioenvironmentalism.

Toward a New Socioenvironmentalism

Environmental politics under Dilma goes beyond issues of biodiversity conservation, climate regulation, and carbon mitigation measures. It touches upon the neodevelopmentalist model based on commodity expansion, or recommodification of the economy, and reliance on energy- and water-intensive production activities. It also touches upon attempts to minimize citizenship through recentralization of political decisions regarding the environmental impacts of large-scale projects and limited participation of local communities and civil society organizations. Ultimately, it touches on core issues of inequality, as rural populations have borne the costs of the emergence of an urban middle class whose hunger for energy and material goods is fed by the expansion of unsustainable activities in ecologically and social sensitive areas (Castro 2014).

For now the scenario seems grim. The recent appointment of Kátia Abreu—one other than the leader of the Rural Caucus in Congress—as minister of Agriculture, shows that the neodevelopmentalist model based on commodity expansion is only deepening. The increased repression and violence in the rural areas, which brought Brazil to an uncomfortable position as the most deadly country for environmental activists in the world, has closed the political space for contestation and active participation. The only opportunity to strengthen socioenvironmental movements appears to lie in the cities. Urban civil society has shown its ability to innovate its mobilization strategies during the street protests of 2013 and to fight against more neoliberal trends in the recent presidential elections in 2014. In July 2013, a constitutional amendment that would have curtailed the power of the Ministério Público was defeated by a large majority of the Congress. Similarly, on the eve of the last parliamentary recess in December 2014, Congress voted down another constitutional amendment that would have assigned responsibility for demarcation of indigenous territories to Brazil’s 27 states, rather than to the federal government.

While the historic mobilizations of June 2013 were articulated mostly by the urban middle class, showing only limited solidarity with the rural poor, recent energy and water rationing has reminded city dwellers that environmental degradation in remote areas concerns them as well. Perhaps this is the beginning of a much-needed alliance between rural and urban social movements that could bring strong pressure to bear on the state. With an invigorated socioenvironmentalism linking the rural and urban poor and middle classes, Dilma 2.0 could be compelled to take a more progressive approach to the environment in 2015 and beyond.
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The Midlife of Participatory Institutions in Brazil

by Roberto Pires | IPEA, Brasília | roberto.pires@ipea.gov.br

In little over four decades, Brazil transformed itself from an authoritarian regime with low levels of associative life and few opportunities for public participation into a hotbed of “participatory democracy” in the global South. Nevertheless, despite the impressive advances of the post-1985 democracy, it is possible to say that today, participatory institutions in Brazil are experiencing a midlife crisis. That is, they can no longer be considered to be novelties or democratic innovations as they had been previously treated by many specialists. Yet they have not achieved full maturity and thus cannot be viewed as systematic and defining features of government activity and policy making in Brazil. In this short article, I advance a critical assessment of the midlife of participatory institutions in Brazil. I highlight the significant achievements of participatory institutions in terms of their diffusion, but I call attention to current challenges that limit their effectiveness and full incorporation into the country’s administrative and political systems—challenges that must be urgently addressed by the recently reelected PT-led government.

The promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, in addition to restoring democratic institutions and the rule of law, provided support for the spread and development of a varied set of participatory institutions—formal processes that create opportunities for citizens and social movements to participate in decision making, implementation, and evaluation with regard to public policy. These include policy councils, conferences, participatory budgeting, public hearings, and consultations, among others (Avritzer 2009). Such channels linking civil society and governmental actors have been incorporated into local, state, and national levels of government in two distinct phases.

The first phase, from the mid-1980s to the late 1990s, can be characterized by the emergence and dissemination of participatory institutions at local and state levels of government. Following the pioneering experiences of Porto Alegre, Lages, Pelotas, and Ipatinga in the late 1980s, participatory budgeting experiences diffused throughout the country, reaching more than two hundred municipalities in the early 2000s (Marquetti, Campos, and Pires 2008). In addition, local policy councils were widely adopted in areas such as health care, education, and social welfare. These councils reached coverage of over 80 percent among the 5,563 municipalities in the country (Munic/IBGE 2009). At the state level, policy councils have also been widely implemented. On average, each of the 27 Brazilian states has 13 councils in different policy dimensions (Estadíc/IBGE 2012).

The second phase, starting in the 2000s, marked the diffusion of participatory institutions to the federal level of government. Since 2003, we have been observing a vigorous process of incorporation of channels and mechanisms for interactions between government and civil society actors. More than 15 new policy councils were created—an increase of 50 percent from the previous period—and many others have been revamped to bring in representatives from social movements and other organized actors. Between 2003 and 2011, some 85 national public policy conferences were held, debating priorities for policy making in areas as diverse as women’s and LGBT rights, education, environmental protection, urban and regional development, and disaster relief. More than 6 million people took part in these debates (IPEA 2013). In addition to policy councils and conferences, other channels such as public hearings and consultations, negotiation roundtables, joint task forces and committees, and ouvidorias (ombudsman-like offices inside government bureaucracies) have been increasingly mobilized to create links between government actors and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and civil society and citizens’ demands and proposals, on the other.

The impressive advance of participatory institutions throughout Brazil raises questions about their effectiveness. Are these participatory institutions actually making a difference? To what extent and under what conditions can participatory institutions really influence policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation? Answering these questions involves complex methodological issues, and the evidence available so far suggests a pattern of mixed results (Pires 2011).

On the one hand, a spate of recent studies have demonstrated that these participatory institutions have important consequences for policy making and government activity. For example, research conducted by various scholars has documented the influence of citizens/users of public services in deliberations about service delivery within local-level councils. At the national level, recent evaluations have revealed the influence of public deliberations in national conferences on both the formulation of policies by the federal government and the national legislative agenda. Other analyses have focused on comparisons between municipalities with developed participatory institutions and municipalities without (or with incipient) channels for participation. The findings suggest that the presence of participatory institutions is associated with better performance in service delivery, pro-poor resource investment allocation, and lower levels of corruption and mismanagement (a review of these studies is available in Pires 2014).

DEBATES
On the other hand, civil society activists are often quite vocal about their dissatisfaction with regard to the actual outcomes of participatory processes. Indigenous populations often feel marginalized in the policy-making processes affecting their territories; urban housing movements frequently complain about having their demands subordinated to real estate interests, and so on. Occasionally, the media, politicians, and bureaucrats also point out the fragilities and unfulfilled promises of existing participatory institutions. Therefore, in spite of significant advances observed in many cases, there are persistent obstacles that threaten a more systemic pattern of effectiveness for participatory institutions in Brazil.

One of these challenges derives from the unequal distribution of opportunities and channels for participation across the different policies and areas of state intervention. Despite the impressive multiplication of forms of participation in the last three decades, incorporation of participatory institutions has generally been biased toward the areas of government dealing with social policy—such as health care, education, social welfare—and toward the enforcement of new individual and collective rights, such as those for youth, the elderly, women, LGBT individuals, and the disabled. Yet other crucial areas of state activity, such as the provision of infrastructure and support for economic development, have remained relatively immune to the entire participatory transformation of recent decades. This situation reinforces a pattern of unbalanced access to the state by social sectors that are traditionally disadvantaged (or lacking political influence). Social actors whose access to the state is dependent on the availability of participatory channels currently face a perplexing situation. While they find multiple opportunities to participate and influence the provision of social policies—for example, by taking part in policy councils or attending national conferences and public consultations—they find no channel to present their demands and discuss infrastructure and economic development policies. Furthermore, within government circles, such an imbalance favors the emergence of conflicts of power and jurisdiction between those agencies that practice participation and other bureaucracies that insulate themselves from society.

In the view of many analysts, such unequal distribution of opportunities for participation was at the heart of the June 2013 protests and is also the cause of contention in the construction of the Belo Monte Dam. The government invested considerable sums of public resources into infrastructure in preparation for the FIFA World Cup in 2014 (e.g., building stadiums, transportation infrastructure, and urban redevelopment) without setting up a process for consultation with organized groups in civil society. Many of these public works involved evictions and urban transformations that did not necessarily benefit the poor (e.g., little investment in public transportation, an increase in bus fares, etc.). It is still difficult to fully comprehend the conditions leading to such massive protests. Nevertheless, the absence of participatory channels to discuss these typical urban development problems, in a context of deep lack of trust in elected politicians, certainly contributed to motivating youngsters to march on the streets of cities throughout the country, seeking to be heard and taken into consideration in policy-making processes. In the Belo Monte Dam case, one of the largest ongoing infrastructure projects in the country, indigenous and local populations have been consistently bypassed in their efforts to participate, debate, and influence the project. They were “consulted” in only a few and inadequate public hearings as part of the environmental licensing process. The absence of adequate opportunities and channels of participation to discuss the project, in the context of energy policies, has led activists to resort to judicial institutions, such as the Ministério Público and the court system.

Another challenge has to do with the quality of the operation of participatory institutions in the country. Most of the policy councils do not rely on proper administrative staffing and resources, which frequently impacts negatively on the preparation and holding of meetings, as well as on the quality of discussions and decisions produced by participants. The quality of participatory institutions can also be judged by their ability to mobilize the plurality of actors affected by the policies under discussion. While in some policy areas, councils and conferences have been very successful in bringing together the various stakeholders, especially those traditionally disadvantaged, in other areas participatory spaces frequently reproduce the socioeconomic inequalities of the larger society, failing to include those frequently excluded from “formal politics.” In addition to deficits in mass communication and public reporting, these issues have been contributing to distancing participatory institutions from civil society, especially from the emerging, new actors (such as youth movements and cyber activists) who rely heavily on information technology and social media.

In sum, the analogy to a midlife crisis seeks precisely to highlight a situation in which significant victories have been achieved (i.e., impressive diffusion and important cases of effectiveness) together with the
perception that some challenges are still to be met in the process of maturation. Reflections triggered by midlife crises often lead to productive adjustments and reforms. In the case of participatory institutions in Brazil, these adjustments necessarily involve the approximation and incorporation of these institutions into the political system. This could be achieved in two ways. First, governments in the local, state, and federal executives should start thinking and practicing participation more systematically by diffusing participatory institutions across their agencies and connecting up the multiple channels into coherent networks of state-society interactions (in other words, the idea of systems of participation). Second, political reform could not only improve the functioning of electoral procedures, political parties, and legislative chambers but also bring in participatory institutions as important mechanisms for the aggregation of preferences, for popular consultation, and for making policy decisions across both the executive and legislative branches. This is necessary to transform current participatory institutions into more stable, equally distributed, and better-performing features of the Brazilian system of government.
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Intergovernmental Relations and State Capacity in Brazil: Challenges for Dilma’s Second Term and Beyond

by Rodrigo Rodrigues-Silveira | University of Salamanca | rodrodr@gmail.com

Beginning in June 2013, Brazil’s largest cities experienced massive waves of protests. Citizens demanded improvement of public services and an accounting of how public funds were being expended on huge, short-term infrastructural projects. The lavish resources being channeled to the FIFA 2014 World Cup and the 2016 Olympic Games stood in sharp contrast to the low quality of public transportation, health services, and education.

Most protesters are young residents of the larger cities, where poorly managed urbanization has generated living environments resembling fictional dystopias. These are places where pollution, urban segregation, extreme levels of inequality, and violence are commonplace. However, not all metropolises are the same. They are extremely uneven in terms of their local state capacity and infrastructural power to deal with persistent challenges.

Why is this important for understanding federal relations in Brazil? My argument is that the existence of fragile mechanisms of federal coordination embedded in many Brazilian policies has made possible the existence of “nonpolicy spaces” or “spaces of political noncooperation.” Although these spaces can be observed everywhere and in different policies, they are particularly meaningful in metropolitan areas or regions. They also constitute situations that reveal limits to both horizontal and vertical forms of cooperation under Brazilian federalism.

In order to illustrate this argument, I will address two major elements of policy making directly impacted by federal relations: the 2015 political reform (now under discussion in Congress) and the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Olympic Games. One of the most debated issues in the current political reform debate in Brazil is the possibility of introducing some form of mixed-member proportional system of representation, wherein part of congressional seats would be allocated through a system of single-member districts and the rest through a proportional system in multi-member districts. This solution would reduce the number of parties and thus tackle the problem of extreme fragmentation in the Brazilian National Congress.

The central problem lies in the almost completely independent organizational logics of territorial and electoral administrations. The first, handled by the Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics (IBGE, in its Portuguese acronym), is responsible for defining the boundaries of all administrative divisions of the state, as well as generating all the documentation and statistics for the analysis of social and demographic phenomena within their territories. The second, under the control of the Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE, in its Portuguese acronym), is the organ responsible for registering voters, holding elections, and publishing the results. Electoral management is carried out using an independent territorial system almost entirely independent from IBGE guidelines.

This absence of coordination would not be a problem if it did not directly affect the possibility of linking demographic and socioeconomic data (produced according to the official IBGE territorial divisions) with electoral data. This is not an issue when entire cities are concerned, but it is crucial within neighborhoods of big cities. In some capitals it is almost impractical to try to match these two kinds of information. The problem lies when the creation of single-member districts within big cities is required.

Even when the matching is possible (using GIS or other techniques), there are still controversies on how to draw the lines in order to divide neighborhoods into districts. Let us consider a hypothetical reform scenario in which half of São Paulo’s 70 seats in the Chamber of Deputies are elected in 35 single-member districts and the other half are elected using a single multimember district with 35 at-large seats covering the entire state.

According to the population of the state (44 million inhabitants, according to the 2010 demographic census), each single-member district would have to include 1.25 million citizens (the total population divided by 35 seats). This means that the capital city of São Paulo, with its 11.9 million residents, would be allocated 9 seats and would therefore need to be divided into 9 territorial districts.

This hypothetical situation raises many questions: how would the TSE carve up the city? What would be the political consequences of one map versus another? There is little knowledge (and actual debate) about this apparently technical matter, both in academia and among political actors. If the voting patterns of both Dilma Rousseff (who won the periphery of the city) and Aécio Neves (whose support was concentrated in central neighborhoods) in São Paulo in the 2014 presidential election is taken as an illustration, the way the lines are drawn can affect significantly the performance of some parties over others. There is a tremendous space for political gerrymandering, given that we have no encompassing study on the demography of potential districts in Brazil.

This problem is deepened by the fact that the demarcation of neighborhood boundaries is an exclusive jurisdiction of local legislative bodies. Without this legal
Deficiencies in intergovernmental structural problems in her second term. Years will be affected by the degree to build the usual political disputes between parties. Governability in coming years will be affected by the degree to which Dilma Rousseff can overcome these structural problems in her second term.

Deficiencies in intergovernmental coordination are also expressed clearly in the preparations for the 2016 Olympic Games. Rio de Janeiro, like other Brazilian state capitals, suffers from a chronic problem of urban segregation combined with high levels of violence. One particularity, though, is that most favelas are clustered either within or on the edges of middle-class neighborhoods. These slums are places where drug trafficking and lack of public authority are commonplace. This situation generates challenges in terms of both public security and state penetration in Rio’s urban territory.

Most infrastructure initiatives related to the 2016 Olympic Games are the responsibility of the local government: urban development, transportation, communication, and urban mobility in general. In this respect, many advances have been made. Nonetheless, when competences between levels of government are not clearly defined or recognized by citizens, coordination problems emerge immediately.

Two policy dimensions are particularly salient. The first is public security. Traditionally, policing is a state-level responsibility with little or no federal jurisdiction or capacity to intervene. However, policies toward drug trafficking are now under the control of the Federal Police. The combination of violence and its association with drug trafficking in Rio de Janeiro creates a political impasse wherein the state of Rio de Janeiro heaps blame on the federal government, and Brasilia responds by claiming that public security is not its constitutional attribution. Both are right and wrong. They are correct in pointing to each other’s jurisdictions but they are wrong in not recognizing that both have responsibility to solve the problem, either via informal arrangements and collaboration or through formal institutional changes that would allow cooperative behavior by actors from different levels of government.

The second is sanitation. The Olympic sailing competition next year will be held in the Bahia da Guanabara, which has long been extremely polluted due to an insufficient system of sewage treatment. Sanitation is a concurrent competence of both state and local governments, but most of the work is done by a public company controlled by the state of Rio de Janeiro. The systematic absence of investment in sewage treatment in Rio and surrounding cities has led to a major deficit in terms of capacity. This means that only a multilevel, coordinated program can solve the problem.

The federal government was initially insensitive to the problem and argued that this was not its jurisdiction (as stated publicly by Dilma Rousseff in the first presidential debate in 2014). It is commonplace among political scientists to claim that states do not work because they lack the capacity to regulate. But in the Brazilian case, we see precisely the opposite problem: there is an excess of regulation whenever the expenditure of public monies is concerned. The process of contracting firms for infrastructural projects is slow and subject to numerous limitations. The consequence is severe delays in producing deliverables, and many Brazilian observers are concerned that infrastructural improvements will not be completed in time for the 2016 summer games.

To a large extent, the problems referred to above are perpetuated by a legalist-formalist perspective on intergovernmental relations. Most conflicts derive from the absence of a clear understanding of the particularities of metropolitan regions and the challenges they face in providing basic services to their citizens. Joint coordinated actions of all three levels of governments, through both formal and informal arrangements, are urgently required in
order to deal with chronic urban problems—from violence, to transportation, to overcrowded hospitals.

Although the 2013 protesters were clamoring for higher-quality public services, they were also appalled by the consequences of unordered and unplanned urban growth. The usual suspect in a federal system (the federal government) was naturally held up as the main culprit, thus putting Dilma Rousseff on the defensive. However, as I have argued above, the origins of poor services and urban chaos are more complex. Solving these problems will involve reinventing the architecture of intergovernmental relations and rethinking dominant perspectives on how the state should work. Yet with her second term already marked by anemic economic growth, declining popularity, and a fragmented, rebellious Congress, it is unlikely that President Rousseff will be able to introduce new mechanisms capable of dealing with these perverse, deeply rooted practices in Brazilian federalism. ■
We are honored and thrilled that Gil Joseph asked us to serve as program co-chairs for LASA2016 in New York City. This Congress represents a great opportunity to celebrate the extraordinary accomplishments of the people who created, nurtured, and contributed so much to this association. It also is a chance to examine—with a critical, analytical eye—the way we think about Latin American studies in the context of our changing world. We hope to organize this anniversary meeting in a way that honors the perennial fields of study that remain relevant year in and year out but also introduces new thematic tracks that contribute to a thoughtful and constructive rethinking of Latin American studies.

We expect that LASA2016 will be the largest conference in the history of the association. We are proud and deeply grateful for the work of a wonderful group of colleagues from North, Central, and South America, the Caribbean, and Europe who have volunteered to serve as track chairs.

Track chairs will be responsible for scoring all proposals submitted to them using the following criteria: (1) significance and appeal for the field and scholars in related fields, (2) clarity and coherence in the presentation of theme or argument, and (3) compliance with submission instructions. The co-chairs of each track may also organize at least one highlighted LASA panel or workshop, which ideally would include some particularly noteworthy presenters and address topics that connect the track with the overall theme of the Congress.

LASA often receives numerous individual submissions that, while frequently of excellent quality, are difficult to assemble into coherent panels. Young colleagues in Latin America and the Caribbean often have to submit individual paper proposals because they have not yet developed professional networks. To address this issue, LASA will implement an online platform...
immigration and its debt to Latin American intellectual production. While these plans are not yet concrete enough to publish in this Forum, we ask that you stay tuned for exciting news in the months to come.

very youngest, budding scholars and at the same time benefit from the wisdom and experience of seasoned scholars, activists, journalists, and others who have been eyewitnesses to and participants in these first 50 years of LASA’s history. The city of New York itself—in so many ways, a Latin American city—will loom large in the planning of this conference. We are planning events that highlight and stimulate discussion on dimensions of this global city such as its Latin American

paper-matching system that will allow individuals to connect with others working on similar topics.

In addition to panels made up of paper submissions accepted as part of the thematic tracks, the Congress will also include special panels that take stock of some of the most important developments in Latin American studies today and reflect on the past 50 years. Some of these panels will reach across generations to engage the

very youngest, budding scholars and at the same time benefit from the wisdom and experience of seasoned scholars, activists, journalists, and others who have been eyewitnesses to and participants in these first 50 years of LASA’s history. The city of New York itself—in so many ways, a Latin American city—will loom large in the planning of this conference. We are planning events that highlight and stimulate discussion on dimensions of this global city such as its Latin American

The 2016 meeting in New York City will celebrate LASA’s 50th anniversary, marking the milestone by returning to the great hemispheric metropolis that witnessed LASA’s inaugural Congress in 1966. The Program Committee seeks to promote a distinctive event that simultaneously looks backward and forward. “LASA at 50” will assess the evolution of Latin American studies over the past half-century, paying special attention to how the locus of the field has changed in terms of transnational actors and flows and the shaping of new identities. At the same time, the event will also explore the challenges of creating a more participatory, diverse, and socially just future for the region and its interlocutors.

The New York Congress thus has two interrelated dimensions. First, we hope to take stock of the global and regional trends that have affected LASA’s creation and evolution over its first five decades. This calls upon us to explore the major shift from a Cold War context—with its always exaggerated emphasis on a bipolar world—to an indisputably multipolar context that has been shaped by recent transformations in the global geography of trade and investment and the social, cultural, and political phenomena that have both produced and responded to such transformations. Part and parcel of such hemispheric and global change is the significant transformation in the growth and structure of LASA’s membership and its implications for the organization’s role in shaping Latin American studies, both within the hemisphere and beyond. As of 2014, LASA had grown to over 9,000 members, almost 40 percent of whom are from Latin America and the Caribbean. Of course, major political, economic, and cultural shifts in the region over the last several decades, as well as the changing face of US-Latin American relations—and that of broader North-South and South-South interactions—are vital for an understanding of how academic production on Latin America has changed in the hemisphere and the world.

Second, we hope that “LASA at 50” will advance a broadly inclusive, critical discussion about the future of area studies and Latin American studies. We seek to promote a discussion of the ways LASA engages with the continuing evolution of cross-regional interactions that dynamically shape transnational processes, not least South-South relations. The historic 50th Congress will encourage a cross-fertilization of area studies, bringing Latin Americanists into dialogue with scholars and activists from other regional associations. Part of this task might involve an examination of the notions of “area” and “region” (particularly their importance in terms of identity projects), and an interrogation of how collective spatial identities are transformed in the context of shifting modes of hegemonic power. For example, who are the area or region builders in the twenty-first century? And what is the coherence of Latin America as a unit of political, cultural, or scholarly analysis in this century, whose early years have witnessed formidable obstacles and challenges to the future of area studies as an enterprise (in relation, say, to the burgeoning presence of “global” and “security” studies)? These issues can be engaged at a theoretical level, but they also map onto LASA’s long-standing commitment to forge a regional future that reflects greater participation, diversity, and social justice. The New York Congress’s collective deliberations on the occasion of LASA turning 50 at a critical world-historical moment would thereby underscore our association’s decades-long enterprise of crossing borders, integrating knowledge and practice, and building communities.
You are invited to submit a paper or panel proposal addressing either the Congress theme or any topic related to the program tracks. LASA also invites requests for travel grants from paper presenters who qualify. Visit the LASA website for eligibility criteria. All proposals for papers, panels, and travel grants must be submitted electronically to the LASA Secretariat via the online proposal system by September 8, 2015, 5 pm.

The deadline to submit proposals is September 8, 2015, 5 pm.

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

No submissions by regular mail will be accepted. A confirmation email will be immediately sent once the proposal is submitted successfully.

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

**PROGRAM TRACKS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afro-Latin/Indigenous Peoples</th>
<th>History and Historiography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yoko Miki, Fordham University</td>
<td>Pedro San Miguel, Universidad de Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeca Ligiero, UNIRIO</td>
<td>Raymond B Craib, Cornell University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrarian and Rural Life</th>
<th>Human Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan Rus, CSEM/CES, Univ. de Ciencias y Artes de Chilapas</td>
<td>Sonia Cárdenas, Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro García Quintanilla, Universidad Autonoma de Yucatan</td>
<td>Anne M Lambricht, Trinity College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Studies: Critical and Historical Analysis</th>
<th>International Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christy Thornton, New York University</td>
<td>Andrés Malamud, ICS Universidad de Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Grandin, New York University</td>
<td>Eduardo Vila, Universidade de Brasilia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art, Architecture and Visual Culture</th>
<th>Labor Studies and Class Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Adele Greeley, University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Clifford A Welch, Universidade Federal de São Paulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Malosetti, CONICET, Nacional de San Martin</td>
<td>Luz Gabriela Arango, Universidad Nacional de Colombia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, Natural Resources and Environment</th>
<th>Latin@ Art and Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Manuel-Navarrete, Arizona State University</td>
<td>Arlene Davila, New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Suman, University of Miami</td>
<td>Karen Mary Davalos, Loyola Marymount University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Reichmann, USDA-ARS Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory</td>
<td>Gabriel R Sanchez, University of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities and Urban Studies</th>
<th>Linguistics, Languages and Language Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Healey, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth</td>
<td>Dale Koike, University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina M Mehtens, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth</td>
<td>Jacqueline Toribio, University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Society and Social Movements</th>
<th>Literary Studies: Colonial and 19th Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Stahler-Sholk, Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Gonzalo Lamana, University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose J Spalding, DePaul University</td>
<td>Stephanie Kirk, Washington University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Literary Studies: Contemporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aníbal Pérez Liján, University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Aníbal González, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott P Mainwaring, University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Priscilla Melendez, Trinity College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economics and Social Policies</th>
<th>Literature and Culture: Interdisciplinary Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva A Paus, Mount Holyoke College</td>
<td>Moira I Fradinger, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máximo Rossi, Universidad de la República, Uruguay</td>
<td>Gustavo Guerrero, University of Cergy-Pontoise, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Saint-Germain-en-Laye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy, Commodities and Development</th>
<th>Mass Media and Popular Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia A Santosom, Universidad del Pacífico, Peru</td>
<td>Matthew B Karush, George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Humphreys Bebbington, Clark University</td>
<td>Sarah Ann Wells, University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film Studies</th>
<th>Methods, Politics, and Practices of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica L Sites-Mor, University of British Columbia, Okanagan</td>
<td>Zeb Tortorici, New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne L Hershfield, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Kirsten Weld, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genders, Feminisms and Sexualities</th>
<th>Migration, Borders and Diasporas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jay Friedman, University of San Francisco</td>
<td>Alejandro Grimson, Universidad Nacional de San Martin, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Olcott, Duke University</td>
<td>Natalia V Gavazov, Universidad Nacional de San Martin, Argentina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History and Historiography</th>
<th>Pedagogy and the Politics of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro San Miguel, Universidad de Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Tatalis Padilla, Dartmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond B Craib, Cornell University</td>
<td>Ariadna Acevedo, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados (Cinvestav)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance and Visual Studies</th>
<th>Political Institutions and Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra T Vazquez, Princeton University</td>
<td>Miguel García Sánchez, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill M Lane, New York University</td>
<td>Rosario Quiñóelo, Universidad Católica del Uruguay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health</th>
<th>Political Institutions and Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Emmanuelle Birn, University of Toronto</td>
<td>Orlando J Pérez, Millersville University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Hochman, Fundación Oswaldo Cruz</td>
<td>Ricardo Córdova Macías, Fundación Guillermo Manuel Ungo, El Salvador</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religions and Spiritualities</th>
<th>Social and Digital Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Hatch, Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>Taylor H Jardine, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Espinto Santo, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile</td>
<td>Isabel Galina Russell, Universidad Autónoma de México (UNAM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Innovation</th>
<th>States, Markets and Political Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward F Fischer, Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Kirt G Weyland, University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey W Rubin, Boston University</td>
<td>Wendy A Hunter, University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South-South/Transregional Interactions</th>
<th>Transnationalism and Globalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer L Bair, University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>Denise E Brennan, Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Dussel Peters, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México</td>
<td>Kathleen M Lopez, Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Un)Rule of Law and Citizenship Rights</th>
<th>Violence and (In)security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo Bergman, Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero, Argentina</td>
<td>Enrique Desmond Arias, George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ungar, City University of New York-Brooklyn College</td>
<td>Lucia Dammert, Universidad de Santiago de Chile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nominations Invited**

**Nominations Invited for the 2016 Slate**

*Deadline: September 15, 2015*

LASA members are invited to suggest nominees for vice president and three members of the Executive Council, for terms beginning June 1, 2016. Criteria for nomination include professional credentials and previous service to LASA. Each candidate must have been a member of the Association in good standing for at least one year prior to nomination. Biographic data and the rationale for nomination must be sent by September 15, 2015 to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu).

The winning candidate for vice president will serve in that capacity until May 31, 2017, as president from June 1, 2017, to May 31, 2018, and then as past president for an additional year. Executive Council members will serve a two-year term from June 1, 2016, to May 31, 2018.

Members of the Nominations Committee are: Ramona Perez (chair), San Diego State University; Aníbal González, Yale University; Jurgen Buchenau, University of North Carolina, Charlotte; Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida, CEBRAP/University of São Paulo; Eva Paus, Mount Holyoke College; and Chuck Walker, University of California, Davis, who will serve as the liaison with the LASA Executive Council.

**Kalman Silvert Award Call for Nominations**

*Deadline: October 15, 2015*

The Kalman Silvert Award Committee invites nominations of candidates for the year 2016 award. The Silvert Award recognizes senior members of the profession who have made distinguished lifetime contributions to the study of Latin America. The award is given at each LASA International Congress.

Past recipients of the award are: John J. Johnson (1983); Federico Gil (1985); Albert O. Hirschman (1986); Charles Wagley (1988); Lewis Hanke (1989); Victor L. Urquidi (1991); George Kubičer (1992); Osvaldo Sunkel (1994); Richard Fagen (1995); Alain Touraine (1997); Richard Adams (1998); Jean Franco (2000); Thomas Skidmore (2001); Guillermo O’Donnell (2003); June Nash (2004); Miguel León-Portilla (2006); Helen Safa (2007); Alfred Stepan (2009); and Edelberto Torres-Rivas (2010); Julio Cotler (2012); Peter Smith (2013); Tulio Halperin-Donghi (2014); and Manuel Antonio Garretón (2015).

Nominations should be sent to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu) by October 15, 2015. Please include biographic information and a rationale for each nomination.

Members of the committee are: Debra Castillo (chair), LASA immediate past president; Merilee S. Grindle and Evelyne Huber, past presidents; Philip Oxborn, editor of the *Latin American Research Review*; and Manuel Antonio Garretón, 2015 Kalman Silvert awardee.

**Bryce Wood Book Award Call for Nominations**

*Deadline: October 15, 2015*

At each International Congress, the Latin American Studies Association presents the Bryce Wood Book Award to the outstanding book on Latin America in the social sciences and humanities published in English. Eligible books for the LASA2016 International Congress will be those published between July 1, 2014, and June 30, 2015. Although no book may compete more than once, translations may be considered. Anthologies of selections by several authors or reeditions of works published previously normally are not in contention for the award. Books will be judged on the quality of the research, analysis, and writing and the significance of their contribution to Latin American studies. LASA membership is not a requirement to receive the award. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers.

Persons who nominate books are responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to each member of the Award Committee and to the LASA Secretariat, at the expense of at the expense of those submitting the books. A nomination packet should include a copy of the nominated book and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address.

All books nominated must reach each member of the Award Committee by October 15, 2015. By March 1, 2016, the committee will select a winning book. It may also name an honorable mention. The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.
Members of the 2016 committee are:

Lillian Guerra (chair)
2427 NW 29th Place,
Gainesville, FL 32605

Paulo Drinot
University College London
Institute of the Americas
Gower St., London WC1E 6BT
UNITED KINGDOM

Joel Wolfe
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Dept. of History, Herter Hall
161 Presidents Drive
Amherst, MA 01003-9312

John Mill Ackerman
Ciudad Universitaria
Instituto de Investigaciones Juridicas
Circuito Mario de la Cueva s/n
Mexico City CP 04510
MEXICO

Joy Gordon
Loyola University
Philosophy Department
351 Crown Center
Chicago, IL 60660

Paul Eiss
Carnegie Mellon University
Dept. of History
240 Baker Hall
5000 Forbes Ave.
Pittsburgh PA 15213

Jennie Purnell
141 Stow Rd.
Harvard, MA 01451

John French
3106 Ithaca St.
Durham, NC 27707

Enrique Mayer
Yale University
Dept. of Anthropology
P.O. Box 208277
New Haven, CT 06520-8277

Daniel Wilkinson
Human Rights Watch
350 Fifth Ave, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10118

K. David Jackson
Yale University
Dept. of Spanish & Portuguese
P.O. Box 208204
New Haven CT 06520

Neil Harvey
3035 La Mirada Court
Las Cruces, NM 88011

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

Premio Iberoamericano Book Award
Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

The Premio Iberoamericano is presented at each of LASA’s International Congresses for the outstanding book on Latin America in the social sciences and humanities published in Spanish or Portuguese in any country. Eligible books for the 2016 award must have been published between July 1, 2014, and June 30, 2015. No book may compete more than once. Normally not in contention for the award are anthologies of selections by several authors or reprints or reeditions of works published previously. Books will be judged on the quality of the research, analysis, and writing, and the significance of their contribution to Latin American studies. LASA membership is not a requirement for receiving the award. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers.

Persons who nominate books are responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to each member of the Award Committee and to the LASA Secretariat, at the expense of at the expense of those submitting the books. A nomination packet should include a copy of the nominated book and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address.

All books must reach each member of the committee by October 15, 2015. The award will be announced at the LASA2016 awards ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.
To make a nomination, please send one copy of the journalist’s electronic portfolio of recent relevant work, complete mailing address of the nominee, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu) by October 15, 2015.

Members of the Media Award committee are: June Erlick (chair), Harvard University; Carlos Dada, El Faro; Peter Winn, Tufts University; Maria Teresa Ronderos, Semana.com; and Tracy Wilkinson, LA Times–Mexico DF Desk.

To make a nomination, please send one copy of the journalist’s electronic portfolio of recent relevant work, complete mailing address of the nominee, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu) by October 15, 2015.

Members of the Media Award committee are: June Erlick (chair), Harvard University; Carlos Dada, El Faro; Peter Winn, Tufts University; Maria Teresa Ronderos, Semana.com; and Tracy Wilkinson, LA Times–Mexico DF Desk.

Members of the 2016 committee are:

Jaime Pensado (chair)
University of Notre Dame
219 O’Shaughnessy Hall
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Araceli Tinajero
312 73rd St.
North Bergen, NJ 07047

Ricardo Salvatore
Donado 2775
Villa Urquiza
Buenos Aires, CP1430
ARGENTINA

Claudio Barrientos
Av. Lib. Bernardo O’Higgins 351
Depto. 1002A
Santiago, Region 13, 8320152
CHILE

Renata Keller
Boston University
Pardee School
152 Bay State Rd.
Boston, MA 02215

Mary Kay Vaughan
3127 W Palmer Blvd
Chicago, IL 60647

Allert Brown-Gort
2896 State Route 28
North Creek, NY 12853-2005

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

LASA Media Award
Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

The Latin American Studies Association is pleased to announce its competition for the year 2016 LASA Media Awards for outstanding media coverage of Latin America. These awards are made every year to recognize long-term journalistic contributions to analysis and public debate about Latin America in the United States and in Latin America, as well as breakthrough journalism. Nominations are invited from LASA members and from journalists. Journalists from both the print and electronic media are eligible. The committee will carefully review each nominee’s work and select an award recipient. The award will be announced at the LASA2016 awards ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored. LASA may invite the awardee to submit materials for possible publication in the LASA Forum.

Recent recipients of the awards include: Mauricio Weibel, Unión Sudamericana de Corresponsales (2015), Raúl Peñaranda, Página Siete (2014), Marcela Turati, De a Pie (2013), José Vales, El Universal de Mexico (2012); Carlos Dada, El Faro (2010); Mario Osava, América Latina Inter Press Service (2009); Hollman Morris, Colombia (2007); Maria Ester Gilio (2006); Julio Scherer, journalist, Mexico (2004); Eduardo Anguita, freelance journalist, Buenos Aires (2003); Guillermo González Uribe of Número, Bogotá (2001); Patricio Verdugo Aguirre of Conama, Chile, and Diario 16, Spain (2000); Gustavo Gorriti of Caretas, Lima, Peru (1998).
LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Dissertation Award
Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

The Martin Diskin Dissertation Award is made possible through the generosity of Oxfam America, LASA, and LASA members. This award is offered at each LASA International Congress to an outstanding junior scholar who embodies Professor Diskin’s commitment to the creative combination of activism and scholarship.

This distinguished dissertation award is made possible largely by a generous contribution from Oxfam America, an organization committed to grassroots work and one with which Martin Diskin was closely associated. Past recipients have included Ricardo Falla, S.J. (1998); Gonzalo Sánchez Gómez, Universidad Nacional de Colombia (2000); Elizabeth Lira Kornfeld, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Santiago, Chile (2001); Rodolfo Stavenhagen, El Colegio de México, and Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo, CIESAS, Mexico City (2003); Jonathan Fox, University of California/Santa Cruz (2004); William LeoGrande, American University (2006); Orlando Fals Borda (2007); Terry Karl, Stanford University (2009); Carlos Ivan Degregori, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (2010); Claudia Paz y Paz Bailey (2012); Stefano Varese, University of California, Davis (2013); Alberto Olvera, Universidad Veracruzana (2014); Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, and Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon (2015).

Nominations, including self-nominations, are welcome. A nomination should include a substantive nomination letter by a current LASA member, a current CV of the nominee, and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone, fax numbers, and e-mail address. To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than October 15, 2015, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu). The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

Members of the 2016 Martin Diskin Dissertation Award Committee are: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, Oxfam America.

LASA/Oxfam America Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship
Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

The Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship is offered at each LASA International Congress to an outstanding individual who embodies Professor Diskin’s commitment to both activism and scholarship.

This distinguished lectureship is made possible largely by a generous contribution from Oxfam America, an organization committed to grassroots work and one with which Martin Diskin was closely associated. Past lecturers were Ricardo Falla, S.J. (1998); Gonzalo Sánchez Gómez, Universidad Nacional de Colombia (2000); Elizabeth Lira Kornfeld, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Santiago, Chile (2001); Rodolfo Stavenhagen, El Colegio de México, and Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo, CIESAS, Mexico City (2003); Jonathan Fox, University of California/Santa Cruz (2004); William LeoGrande, American University (2006); Orlando Fals Borda (2007); Terry Karl, Stanford University (2009); Carlos Ivan Degregori, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (2010); Claudia Paz y Paz Bailey (2012); Stefano Varese, University of California, Davis (2013); Alberto Olvera, Universidad Veracruzana (2014); Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, and Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon (2015).

Members of the 2016 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Committee are: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, Oxfam America.

Members of the 2016 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Committee are: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, Oxfam America.

Nominations, including self-nominations, are welcome. A nomination should include a substantive nomination letter by a current LASA member, a current CV of the nominee, and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone, fax numbers, and e-mail address. To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than October 15, 2015, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu). The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

Members of the 2016 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Committee are: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, Oxfam America.

Nominations, including self-nominations, are welcome. A nomination should include a substantive nomination letter by a current LASA member, a current CV of the nominee, and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone, fax numbers, and e-mail address. To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than October 15, 2015, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu). The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

Members of the 2016 Martin Diskin Memorial Lectureship Committee are: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, Oxfam America.
the candidate’s qualifications for the Martin Diskin Dissertation Award.

All application materials must be submitted electronically no later than October 15, 2015, to LASA Executive Director Milagros Pereyra-Rojas (milagros@pitt.edu). The Martin Diskin Dissertation Award recipient will receive a $1,000 stipend. We encourage you to distribute this call for nominations as widely as possible with particular attention to circulating it among your colleagues and students. The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

The 2016 selection committee consists of: Sonia Alvarez, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Charles Hale, University of Texas, Austin; Lynn Stephen, University of Oregon; and Susan Eckstein, OXFAM America.

Charles A. Hale Fellowship for Mexican History

Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

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

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

To nominate a candidate, send these materials no later than October 15, 2015, to Milagros Pereyra-Rojas, LASA Executive Director (milagros@pitt.edu). The award will be announced at the LASA2016 Awards Ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.

Members of the 2016 selection committee are: William Beezley, University of Arizona; Daniela Spenser, CIESAS; and Romana Falcón, El Colegio de México.

Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Book Award

Call for Nominations

Deadline: October 15, 2015

The Latin American Studies Association offers the Luciano Tomassini Latin American International Relations Book Award to the author(s) of an outstanding book on Latin American Foreign Policies and International Relations published in English, Spanish, or Portuguese in any country. Eligible books for the 2016 award must have been published between July 1, 2014, and June 30, 2015. Anthologies of selections by several authors are not eligible. Books will be judged on the originality of the research, the quality of the analysis and writing, and the significance of their contribution to the study of Latin America and the Caribbean.

LASA membership is not a requirement for receiving the award. Books may be nominated by authors, LASA members, or publishers.

Persons who nominate books are responsible for confirming the publication date and for forwarding one copy directly to each member of the Award Committee and to the LASA Secretariat, at the expense of at the expense of those submitting the books. A nomination packet should include a copy of the nominated book and the nominee’s complete mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address.

All books must reach each member of the committee by October 15, 2015. By March 1, 2016, the committee will select a winning book. It may also name an honorable mention. The award will be announced at the LASA2016 awards ceremony, and the awardee will be publicly honored.
Members of the 2016 committee are:

Stephen Rabe (chair)
4308 Orchard Heights Rd., NW
Salem, OR 97304

Fernando Purcell
Pontificia Universidad Catolica
Instituto de Historia
Ave Vicuna Mackenna 4860
Casilla 6277
Santiago
CHILE

Felipe Loureiro
Instituto de Relações Internacionais
Universidade de São Paulo
Av. Prof. Lúcio Martins Rodrigues, s/n,
travessas 4 e 5
Cidade Universitária
CEP 05508-020 - São Paulo -SP
BRAZIL

Hal Brands
513 Hilltop Terrace
Alexandria VA 22301

Rose Spalding
DePaul University
Political Science Dept.
990 W Fullerton Ave
Chicago IL 60614

Dustin Walcher
Southern Oregon University
Dept. of History & Pol Sci
1250 Siskiyou Blvd.
Ashland OR 97520

Amelia Kiddle
University of Calgary
Dept. of History
2500 University Dr. NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
CANADA

Latin American Studies Association
Attn: Luciano Tomassini Latin American
International Relations
University of Pittsburgh
315 South Bellefield Avenue
416 Bellefield Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
USA
En este último editorial como coordinadores del Programa del Congreso LASA2015, realizado entre el 27 y 30 de mayo en San Juan, Puerto Rico, queremos compartir algunas reflexiones de lo aprendido durante el año y medio que duró el proceso de organización de este Congreso. Un notable logro es haber contribuido a expandir o fortalecer redes de colaboración Norte-Sur no solo entre quienes firmamos esta nota y la presidenta saliente Debra Castillo, sino con los coordinadores de Areas Temáticas, con los invitados a los paneles presidenciales, con los participantes en los Paneles Invitados y con todas las integrantes del Secretariado de LASA que hicieron posible este Congreso.

Un desafío: Abrir LASA

Abrir espacios en la academia para abordar experiencias y enfoques fuera de los marcos acostumbrados, y en diálogo con las voces y perspectivas de quienes se hallan inmersos en los procesos en discusión, todo ello implica un desafío mayor. Por eso, y dado el enfoque con que impulsamos este LASA2015, queremos agradecer a tantas y tantas colegas que, desde la vida cotidiana; pero a la vez poner en el centro de nuestras reflexiones la capacidad de agencia lingüística, cultural, política e histórica que emerge desde variados contextos, realidades y sujetos. Se trata de agencias y emergencias de variado signo que se expresan en movimientos sociales, comunidades indígenas, organizaciones de mujeres, comunidades afros, minorías sexuales, jóvenes, mujeres y personas, incluyendo la labor y las obras de artistas que, usando la escritura, la imagen, el sonido o el cuerpo, ponen de manifiesto las urgencias del presente. Se trata de movimientos de respuesta ante la desvalorización del trabajo y de la vida, aunque, al mismo tiempo, constituyen formas y prácticas que reivindican y afirman otras posibilidades, deseos y sueños de vida.

Con este marco, la escritora afropuertorriqueña Mayra Santos Febres y la artista zapoteca Mare Advertencia Lirika abrieron oficialmente el Congreso LASA2015 el miércoles 28 de mayo. Así, Mare puso en nuestros oídos y cuerpos un rap feminista que nos decía: “Has tenido la sensación de que las cosas andan mal, últimamente me ha pasado muchas veces…” Como mujer, joven e indígena en México, la voz y el arte de Mare nos invitaba a “escuchar” las importantes preocupaciones del presente: la violencia sobre los cuerpos morenos, el sexismio que encarcela a quienes deciden sobre sus propios cuerpos y la corrupción que secuestra los países y sus estados. Pensando y sintiendo en clave poética y rapería, Mare nos hizo bailar a todos y aplaudir al ritmo de su voz de resistencia. En paralelo, Mayra Santos Febres, novelista, poeta y ensayista afropuertorriqueña, comenzó con un texto en prosa para reflexionar el lugar de una mujer negra que escribe literatura y sus desafíos humanos, corporales e intelectuales en la aún predominantemente blanca y masculina “ciudad letrada” de la América Latina de inicios del siglo veintiuno. Santos-Febres expuso su experiencia: “Tuve miedo de ser una mujer negra que escribe,” a la vez que recordó a la también poeta afro-puertorriqueña Julia de Burgos, la que murió desahuciada en Harlem en 1953: “Julia fue mi heroína, mi modelo y mi pesadilla. Julia se asumió como negra y como escritora. Esa ella no se murió de desamor. Ni de alcoholismo. Julia de Burgos se murió de una inmensa depresión por no encontrar su lugar en el mundo,” señaló Santos-Febres.

Encontrar “su lugar en el mundo” es lo que hacen intelectuales, académicos y/o activistas indígenas, afrodescendientes, mujeres o de minorías sexuales; y es lo que igualmente hacen todas y todos quienes buscan forjar perspectivas y prácticas de saber fuera de las fronteras convencionales, normativas y disciplinarias de la academia. Algo de ese empeño se logró encarnar y expresar en este LASA2015, con variadas presentaciones y diálogos orientados a una práctica intelectual, académica y humana más comprometida con la justicia social.
**Voces e iniciativas en LASA2015**

Ha sido un esfuerzo pero sobre todo una felicidad abrir este Congreso de LASA a algunas de las voces y experiencias que, desde los márgenes, o en posiciones críticas dentro de circuitos hegemónicos, están construyendo otras formas de producir conocimiento y de incidir con el mismo en las realidades que estudian y, como en muchos casos, les afecta en el día a día.

Por ello, fue emocionante ser testigos y participes de reuniones que estaban fuera del programa oficial pero que sin duda ameritan ser destacadas y visibilizadas en esta columna de *LASA Forum*. Una reunión estremecedora, por su significación única, fue la reunión privada que sostuvieron participantes indígenas el día viernes 29 de mayo a las 6 de la tarde. Dado el hecho que este LASA2015 contó con cerca de 40 participantes provenientes de pueblos indígenas, fue posible esta reunión con una asistencia significativa de investigadores e investigadoras indígenas de Perú, Bolivia, Ecuador, Chile, Guatemala, Colombia, México y de la diáspora indígena en Estados Unidos, de orígenes maya k’iche’, maya yucateco, mapuche, aymara, quechua, kichwa, nasa, ayuujk/mixe, zapoteca, entre otros. Esta memorable reunión se realizó a partir de una disposición en círculo de los participantes indígenas y, alrededor del mismo, para escuchar, algunas invitadas e invitados no indígenas. El conversatorio se inició con “rituales de purificación,” a cargo de José Quidel (mapuche) y Rafael Cardoso (ayuujk/mixe) en colaboración con Judith Bautista Pérez (zapoteca).

Luego, se dio curso y desarrollo a un debate sobre el lugar de la investigación y la participación indígena en este tipo de foros académicos y en la academia global. A partir de ello, se estableció una red que, de seguro, se expresará en lazos de comunicación y colaboración futura.

Otro momento “fuera de programa” fue la auto-convocatoria de una serie de colegas a una reunión para discutir y elaborar colectivamente una propuesta para crear una nueva Sección en LASA: la Sección Otros Saberes. Esta iniciativa se liga a la historia de la iniciativa Otros Saberes en LASA. El proyecto Otros Saberes surgió en LASA hacia el año 2005, con el objetivo de promover colaboraciones entre productores de conocimientos situados dentro o fuera de la academia; más aún, esta innovadora iniciativa se planteó crear espacios de diálogos entre saberes y generadores de los mismos en función del mutuo enriquecimiento. Con el apoyo de fondos externos, LASA pudo apoyar diferentes proyectos colaborativos en el marco de este proyecto epistémico y metodológico.

Basados en lo hecho en años previos, en nuestra calidad de Coordinadores del Programa LASA2015, ayudamos al Secretariado a recolectar materiales resultantes de cuatro proyectos llevados a cabo en la segunda fase de la iniciativa y así pudimos lanzar en San Juan, Puerto Rico, el sitio web LASA Otros Saberes (http://lasa-4.lasa.pitt.edu/otrossaberes/es/). Con este trasfondo, y con nuestro apoyo, una serie de colegas —entre ellos, Charles Hale, Joanne Rappaport, Shannon Speed y Rachel Sieder— se propusieron dar un paso más en vistas a encaminar la institucionalización de Otros Saberes en LASA. Así, el sábado 30 de mayo, alrededor de 40 personas asistieron a una reunión donde se formuló una propuesta de Sección Otros Saberes que será enviada al Comité Ejecutivo de LASA en los próximos meses. Creemos que este fue un gran logro en función de diversificar y ampliar la conversación sobre metodologías, prácticas y experiencias de conocimientos en el campo de las humanidades, las ciencias sociales y los propios estudios de América Latina.

En esta misma sintonía, podemos destacar el hecho de que la Sección de Género y Estudios Feministas (Gender and Feminist Studies) decidiera realizar su Pre-Conferencia fuera de las paredes del Hotel Caribe Hilton y llevarla a las aulas de la Universidad de Río Piedras. De esta manera, el martes 26 de junio, día previo al inicio del Congreso, y bajo el tema “Activismo y academia dentro del movimiento feminista latinoamericano”, se llevó a cabo este encuentro, de carácter gratuito y abierto a los estudiantes locales. Dentro de esta Pre-Conferencia tuvieron un papel central las académicas activistas puertorriqueñas, quienes hicieron un balance sobre lo logrado en la isla en materia de justicia de género y expusieron sus estrategias para vincular su trabajo académico con el activismo feminista. Entre las presentadoras, estuvieron Elizabeth Crespo Kebler, importante figura del feminismo puertorriqueño y autora de un libro de historia del movimiento feminista en Puerto Rico a partir de los 1970s; Ana Irma Rivera Lassén, historiadora del movimiento feminista e integrante de la organización feminista latinoamericana CLADEM; Josefina Pantoja, Coordinadora de la Organización Puertorriqueña de la Mujer Trabajadora (OPMT), quien participa en la Coordinadora Paz para la Mujer y en el Movimiento Amplio de Mujeres; Esther Vicente, activista en favor de derechos sexuales y reproductivos, PROFAMILIAS de Puerto Rico; Loida Martínez, activista feminista que ha estudiado la equidad en la educación y en las universidades, entre otras. Este encuentro se realizó gracias al trabajo organizativo y las redes tejidas por Edmé Domínguez R. y Hillary Hiner, coordinadoras de la Sección Género y Estudios Feministas de LASA.
Es importante subrayar que esta apertura de LASA fue un eje compartido con la presidenta saliente Debra Castillo, quien realizó importantes esfuerzos por tender “puentes” más allá de los muros del Caribe Hilton. En esta línea, la posibilidad de realizar paneles abiertos al público en espacios culturales y académicos de San Juan no se materializó como esperábamos ya que para ello se requería un trabajo de logística y coordinación que no fuimos capaces de lograr. Lo que sí logramos fue que los estudiantes universitarios puertorriqueños tuvieran un precio preferencial de 10 dólares para participar en el Congreso. Más aún, invitamos el activista estudiantil Giovanni Roberto a exponer en la Sesión Presidencial sobre Precariedad y Acceso a la Educación Superior el sábado 30 de mayo. Esto nos permitió aprender de la historia y las luchas del movimiento estudiantil de la isla y los retos que enfrentan ante los recortes presupuestales y de matrícula que conllevan las reformas estructurales en el ámbito educativo.

El interés de la presidencia de LASA2015 y de parte nuestra por tener un LASA más diverso e incluyente implicó también organizar una reunión durante el Congreso con los estudiantes graduados y pedir para ellos un espacio de participación en el Consejo Ejecutivo de LASA. Esperamos que estas iniciativas logren continuidad en las presidencias de los años que vienen y así también las voces de los estudiantes se escuchen en los distintos espacios de LASA.

Salir de los marcos convencionales, normativos y disciplinarios de la academia y buscar la inclusión y el diálogo con otros sujetos que producen conocimientos y forjan experiencias alternas implica mucho trabajo. Como se sabe, no siempre se cuenta con los recursos y la disposición para poderlo hacer. Ojalá que este intento...
Seen at LASA2015
Film Festival 2015

LASA2015: “Precariedades, exclusiones, emergencias”

Kalman Silvert Award recipient Manuel Antonio Garretón (center) with Juan Pablo Luna, Merilee Grindle, Sofia Donoso, and Kenneth Roberts

Rosalva Aída Hernández Castillo, Mare Advertencia Linika, Luis Cárcamo-Huechante, LASA President Debra Castillo, and Mayra Santos-Febres at the Welcome Ceremony

The LASA staff
Este año la Sección preparó dos paneles para el congreso en Puerto Rico. El primero (“Pensando el presente: Logros y desafíos de la Bolivia de hoy”) contó con la participación de Lucila Choque (Docente, UPEA) y Pablo Mamani (Director de Sociología, UPEA). Annabelle Conroy fue Chair del panel y Elizabeth Monasterios comentarista. Por motivos de visa Lucila Choque no pudo asistir, pero envió su ponencia, que fue leída por Annabelle. El panel convocó un público de 49 personas y generó un debate sustancioso y enriquecedor. El segundo panel (“Re-orientando el debate crítico en torno a ‘lo andino’”) contó con la participación de Jorge Coronado (Northwestern University) y Fernando Iturralde (University of Pittsburgh). Este panel convocó a un público de 51 personas y, como el anterior, generó un debate intenso y enriquecedor. Martín Carrión fue Chair del panel y Núria Vilanova lo moderó.

Adicionalmente, el programa general del congreso incluyó 5 paneles especializados en Bolivia y 45 en los que se presentaron ponencias sobre Bolivia.

La membresía de la Sección se reunió el jueves 28 de mayo de 8:00pm–8:45pm. Asistieron 29 personas (22 miembros activos y 7 que formalizarán su membresía este año).

---

**Asia and the Americas**

By Adrian Hearn and Monica DeHart, Co-chairs

On May 28, 2015, at 8 pm, the Section for Asia and the Americas held its business meeting. The (then) co-chairs Adrian Hearn (University of Melbourne) and Kathleen López (Rutgers University) informed the meeting’s 18 attendees about the Section’s activities over the preceding 12 months:

On May 26 the Section hosted a pre-Congress workshop with sponsorship from the Open Society Foundations, entitled “Exploring the Dynamics of China-Caribbean Relations.” Travel grants from Open Society enabled the participation of three participants from China: Cui Shoujun (Renmin University), Haibin Niu (Shanghai Institute of International Studies), and Wang Li (Jilin University). The program also included Martin Garrett (UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office), Carlos Rodríguez-Iglesias (University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras), and Rafael Hernández (Revista Temas, Cuba). Hosted at the Caribe Hilton as part of the official LASA program, the event attracted approximately 35 attendees. A description of the event is available on the LASA program website: http://tinyurl.com/k5kkbb9.

The section panel “Debating Latin America-China Interactions (Part II)” continued this theme by featuring the three Chinese grantees in dialogue with Ariel Armony (University of Pittsburgh). It was preceded by a panel of the same name (Part I), which brought together papers from historical, cultural, economic, and geopolitical perspectives.

The Section’s membership has grown to 94, up from 68 in 2014, 73 in 2013, and 43 in 2012.

In preparation for LASA2015 panel proposals were coordinated via email for those interested in presenting on the topic of Asia and the Americas. Shortly before the Congress emails were sent to the member list with details of all such panels. A total of 17 panels at LASA2015 were dedicated to or included papers on Asia-Latin America ties.

The section co-chairs will continue to offer these services to members in advance of LASA2016. Furthermore, since LASA2016 will take place in New York City, the Section is considering partnering with a New York–based university to conduct a pre-Congress workshop on Asian and Latin American experiences with sustainable development.

During the meeting, Adrian Hearn and Monica DeHart (University of Puget Sound) were elected as co-chairs for the period 2015–2016, and the following executive council was elected: Vladimir Rouvinski, treasurer (Universidad Icesi); R. Evan Ellis (National Defense University); Junyoung Verónica Kim (University of Iowa); Zelideth Rivas (Marshall University); Leonardo Stanley (CEDES-Argentina); and Soraya Caro (Universidad de Externado, Colombia).

---

**Bolivia**

Por Elizabeth Monasterios, Chair

Número de miembros: 101 (hasta el 1 de mayo, 2015). Committee members: Virginia Aillón, UMSA, PIEB; Annabelle Conroy, University of Central Florida; Martín Carrión, University of the Sciences, Philadelphia; Núria Vilanova, American University, Washington, DC. Advisors: Guillermo Delgado, University of California, Santa Cruz; Chris Krueger, Red Bolivia Mundo; Isabel Scarborough, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Este año la Sección preparó dos paneles para el congreso en Puerto Rico. El primero (“Pensando el presente: Logros y desafíos de la Bolivia de hoy”) contó con la participación de Lucila Choque (Docente, UPEA) y Pablo Mamani (Director de Sociología, UPEA). Annabelle Conroy fue Chair del panel y Elizabeth Monasterios comentarista. Por motivos de visa Lucila Choque no pudo asistir, pero envió su ponencia, que fue leída por Annabelle. El panel convocó un público de 49 personas y generó un debate sustancioso y enriquecedor. El segundo panel (“Re-orientando el debate crítico en torno a ‘lo andino’”) contó con la participación de Jorge Coronado (Northwestern University) y Fernando Iturralde (University of Pittsburgh). Este panel convocó a un público de 51 personas y, como el anterior, generó un debate intenso y enriquecedor. Martín Carrión fue Chair del panel y Núria Vilanova lo moderó.

Adicionalmente, el programa general del congreso incluyó 5 paneles especializados en Bolivia y 45 en los que se presentaron ponencias sobre Bolivia.
Una vez alcanzada esta suma, el comité conformado por Linda Farthing, Nancy Postero, Chris Krueger y Guillermo Delgado-P. lanzará una convocatoria para concursar.

Gracias a Annabelle Conroy, la Sección ya cuenta con una renovada página web, a la que toda la membresía está invitada a contribuir.

Brazil
By John French and Ivani Vassoler, Co-chairs

Section Executive Council (EC) (2014–2015): co-chairs: John French (Duke University) and Ivani Vassoler (State University of New York); treasurer: Jessica Rich (Marquette University); EC members: Tracy Guzman (University of Miami), João Feres (Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, UERJ), Joseph Marques (Graduate Institute of International Studies), Sean Mitchell (Rutgers University). The Section concluded the 2014–2015 term with 262 members.

During the 2014–2015 academic year, the Section developed several activities.

Communications: Frequent contact with all members regarding the LASA Conference, section initiatives and tasks, plus other academic topics deemed of interest for the membership.

Conference panels: All members of the EC were deeply involved in the review and selection of panels for the 2015 LASA Conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The Section received eight panel proposals and selected four.
Section awards: All members of the EC were equally involved in the review and selection of the section prizes for the best book, article, and doctoral dissertation focusing on Brazilian studies. The Section received an exceptional number of submissions, all of excellent quality. The Section constituted subcommittees and their members work in coordination through several reviews. Due to the high number of submissions, the subcommittees decided to grant some honorable mentions as well.


Contributions: During the year, the Section was asked to support some LASA conference activities. After a discussion the EC reached a consensus to provide funds to contribute to the participation of Vincent Carelli in the 2015 conference in San Juan. Carelli is a French-Brazilian filmmaker residing in Brazil and the creator of Video nas Aldeias, a film project that mobilizes indigenous community of Brazil to tell their own stories by making videos. Carelli participated in the LASA Film Festival and met with members of the Brazil Section Executive Council. Funds provided: $300.

The section electoral process: Starting in March, the Executive Council engaged in a discussion on the renewal of the section leadership for the incoming 2015–2016 term. Following the LASA rules, the EC initiated the electoral process for the two co-chairs positions and two EC members whose terms expired on May 31. As soon as possible (last week of April), the EC sent several messages to the membership, first with a call for candidates and later with online anonymous ballots. During the process we received some informal inquiries from members who were in principle interested in joining the EC board. The membership was kept informed about the electoral process.

Conference arrangements: Concomitantly with the electoral process, the EC also held discussions in relation to the agenda for the section business meeting and reception in San Juan, PR. The business meeting agenda was approved, and the EC also agreed to hold the reception at the Caribe Hilton.

Several EC members participated in the conference as paper presenters, panel chairs, panel discussants, and/or workshop organizers. Several of us held working meetings with publishers and representatives of other sections towards future collaborations.

Business meeting: The section business meeting took place on May 28 (Caribe Hilton), with 35 members present, plus the EC. The meeting agenda was distributed to all present.

Despite the EC efforts to reach the entire membership, there are still members who are not receiving messages. During the meeting, questions emerged about the existence or not of a LASA platform that would facilitate contact with members of the sections.

Those serving in the EC and particularly the prize recipients placed requests to see recognition of their awards on the LASA website. An official announcement is important for employment purposes, promotion, and career advancement.

The treasurer’s report was submitted. The Section is in a good financial situation. During 2014–2015 the expenditures were: Book Prize ($250); Article Prize ($200); Dissertation award ($200); contribution to the LASA Film Festival ($300); section reception at the Caribe Hilton ($1,763.57). In April 2012 the amount of funds available to the Brazil Section was $10,359.00.

The renewal of the section leadership was also discussed in depth and a consensus was reached as follows: (1) The Section received 13 ballots through the online voting system. The members at the business
2015–2016 term, several EC positions will expire (the co-chairs, the treasurer, and two EC members). It is imperative, therefore, that we reach all members and encourage them to submit their candidacies to join the EC and continue with section work.

Center Directors
By Merilee Grindle and Ariel Armony, Interim Chairs

The Center/Institute Directors Section organized a workshop at the LASA2015 meeting in Puerto Rico with four objectives: to exchange experiences on the use of social media and funding models; to determine a strategy for electing future leadership of the Section; to consider future activities of the Section; and to encourage networking among members. The event, scheduled from 2:00 to 6:45 on Wednesday, May 27, was well attended, with an estimated 100 participants. The workshop accomplished its objectives as follows.

Paloma Diaz (University of Texas, Austin) presented a framework for use of social media such as Facebook and Twitter, using examples from the websites of several of the centers. It was suggested that her PowerPoint be made available to section members.

Ariel Armony (University of Pittsburgh) organized a panel of center directors who presented the funding models for their organizations and moderated a lively discussion. Rodolfo Dirzo (Stanford University), Scott Morgenstern (University of Pittsburgh), Leticia Salomón (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras), and Mark Overmyer-Velázquez (University of Connecticut) made presentations.

Reception. The section reception took place on May 29, San Cristóbal D, starting at 9:00 p.m. This was a great opportunity to meet members and talk to them about section activities and future plans, and about the 2016 conference. The reception was well attended, including the presence of members of other sections. Vincent Carelli (director of Video nas Aldeias) was present and was greeted by members of the Executive Council.

Sections general meeting: On May 30, the Brazil Section incoming co-chair, Joseph Marques, attended the LASA Committee on Sections meeting. Dr. Marques already submitted a report with a summary of the discussions.

Taking into account the results of the electoral process and the consensus that emerged during the section business meeting, the Executive Council is now constituted as follows: Co-chairs: Ivani Vassoler (State University of New York), renewed for an additional year, and Joseph Marques (Graduate Institute of International Studies), one year term; treasurer: Jessica Rich (Marquette University), term expires in 2016; EC members: Tracy D. Guzman (University of Miami), term expires in 2016; João Feres (UERJ), term expires in 2016; Tereza Albuquerque (Universidade Federal Fluminense), term expires in 2017; Adam Joseph Shellhorse (Temple University), term expires in 2017.

Plans for the 2015–2016 term. At the section business meeting in San Juan, a critical issue that emerged is the communication with members. Despite the efforts of co-chairs French and Vassoler to communicate with the membership, we are still observing some problems regarding reaching all of them. The Section currently communicates with members using Google Groups, but we would like to improve our capabilities (in terms of communication). First, Vassoler will update the addresses in Google Groups. Following discussions held in the section business meeting the EC will create a Facebook page for the Brazil Section.

The Brazil Section Executive Council consists of active and engaged scholars who are committed to the promotion of Brazilian studies. We are all aware of our tasks ahead. The Section will sponsor four panels for the 2016 conference, and all EC members will be involved in the selection process.

Based on the 2014–2015 experience, the Brazil Section expects a large number of submissions for its book, article, and doctoral dissertation awards. This is not a burden; in fact, we are all delighted to see that scholarship on Brazil is strong and growing. In order to engage the membership in the process, we may consider inviting some members to integrate the awards subcommittees.

The Brazil Section Executive Council seeks to increase the participation of members in all the Section’s initiatives. This is why communication is key. By the end of the 2015–2016 term, several EC positions will expire (the co-chairs, the treasurer, and two EC members). It is imperative, therefore, that we reach all members and encourage them to submit their candidacies to join the EC and continue with section work.
In an organizational meeting, participants agreed that Ariel Armony would be interim section chair in order to call for nominations for section leadership positions and manage an email voting process in coordination with the LASA Secretariat. Once elected leaders are in place, they will plan for next year’s section activities and panels. It is expected that nominations and elections will occur this summer in order to ensure that there is sufficient time to plan for LASA2016.

In the panel discussion, several participants suggested activities that the Section could encourage, including joint proposals for funding through LASA and efforts to collaborate more effectively with student and faculty exchanges and lectures by visiting scholars.

Participants in the workshop introduced themselves at the outset of the meeting and a concluding wine reception provided an opportunity for more interaction.

Central America
By Claudia Rueda, Co-chair

The Central America Section business meeting took place on Thursday, May 28, 2015. Approximately 25 members attended the meeting. We had a very busy meeting and discussed several important issues. Members decided to continue to use our budget to fund travel grants as well as an invited speaker for next year’s conference. We also voted to create a section Facebook page. We elected our new co-chairs: William Clary, a professor at the University of the Ozarks, and Ainhoa Montoya, a lecturer at the University of London’s Institute of Latin American Studies. Sophie Esch, a professor at Colorado State University, will continue in her second year as secretary-treasurer. We also voted for two new members of the advisory board: Hilary Francis, a fellow at the University of London’s Institute of Latin American Studies, and Christine Wade, a professor at Washington College. They will work with Héctor M. Cruz Feliciano of CET Academic Programs and Krystin Krause of the University of Notre Dame, both of whom will be completing the second years of their tenure on the board. At this year’s LASA we sponsored three panels as well as a talk by an invited guest speaker, Irma Alica Velásquez Nimatuj. We also awarded a travel grant of $750 to one scholar from Central America, Amanda Alfaro Córdoba, who is working on her doctorate at University College London. To determine the winner of the grants, applicants submit a letter of interest as well as a CV to a committee formed by the two co-chairs and the secretary-treasurer. The committee then reads the applications and chooses the winners.

Colombia
By Constanza López, Chair

In 2015, the Colombia Section sponsored three panels, co-sponsored the Film Festival, and gave a $300 student travel award to Marilyn Machado Mosquera. It also awarded the Michael Jiménez Prize to Jason McGraw for his monograph, The Work of Recognition: Caribbean Colombia and the Postemancipation Struggle for Citizenship (2014). This award is given in recognition to original research in the fields of anthropology, history, sociology, political science, and related areas that demonstrates excellence in conceptual terms as well as in its impact, creativity, and possible influence in Colombia and in the field of Colombian studies. On May 28, the Section held its business meeting with 42 members present, and it celebrated its reception at the restaurant Lemongrass Pan Asian Latino. For the coming year, the Section, which currently has 158 members, will sponsor three panels and will award the Montserrat Ordóñez Prize in recognition of a groundbreaking work that embodies a fresh and creative approach to the Colombian humanities. The Executive Committee for the year 2015–2016 includes the following: secretary-treasurer: Felipe Martínez Pinzón (Brown University); communications manager: Sandra Beatriz Sánchez López (Universidad de los Andes); vice-chair: Joseph Avski (Northwest Missouri State University); chair: Constanza López (University of North Florida); advisors: Alejandro Quin (University of Utah), Ginny Bouvier (United States Institute of Peace), and Leah Carroll (University of California, Berkeley); student representative: Diego Bustos (University of New Mexico). The Section publishes a monthly bulletin. We welcome all calls for papers and other communications that might be of interest to our membership (please send to lasacolombia@gmail.com).

Colonial
By Clayton McCarl, Executive Council member

The Colonial Section sponsored two panels at LASA2015. Mónica Díaz organized “Race, Religion and Resistance in Colonial Times” and Pablo García Loaeza organized “Colonial Materiality: Everyday Objects in Early Modern Spanish America.” The Section will sponsor a total of three panels at LASA2016.
This year saw the creation of the “Best Article in Colonial Latin American Studies by a Junior Scholar.” First prize was awarded to Daniel Nemser, assistant professor of Spanish at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, for his article “Archaeology in the Lettered City.” An honorable mention went to Vera Candiani, associate professor of history at Princeton University for “The Desagué Reconsidered: Environmental Dimensions of Class Conflict in Colonial Mexico.” The awards committee was chaired by section vice-chair Raúl Marrero-Fente.

The Section coordinated two social events during LASA2015. Mariana Velázquez, PhD candidate at Columbia University, organized a nightlife tour of Old San Juan held on the evening of Wednesday, May 27. On Thursday, May 28, following our section meeting, the Section celebrated an informal reception in the Caribe Hilton bar and lobby.

The officers for 2015–2016 are as follows: Raúl Marrero-Fente, chair; Mónica Díaz, vice-chair and chair of awards committee; Pablo García Loaeza, council member and secretary-treasurer, and Kelly McDonough and Ann de León, council members. Clayton McCarl, who is retiring from the council, will continue as the Section’s communications manager, and will co-edit the Section’s quarterly newsletter with Pablo García Loaeza through the end of 2015, at which time Pablo will take over as editor.

**Cuba**

Por Rafael Hernández, Co-presidente

Las principales valoraciones de la Junta directiva sobre el Congreso, y en particular la presencia cubana en LASA2015, se resumen a continuación.

Fue la participación más numerosa en un evento de LASA, y la mayor reunión de académicos cubanos en territorio bajo jurisdicción de EEUU en la historia de los intercambios académicos. Se otorgaron 168 visas. (La cifra de participantes residentes en Cuba registrados en el evento está pendiente por parte del Comité Ejecutivo de LASA al momento de redactar este Informe.)

Hubo 368 ponencias sobre temas cubanos, que se presentaron en más de 250 paneles dedicados total o parcialmente a Cuba. En este evento de LASA hubo una mayor inscripción y presencia de panelistas jóvenes, y de centros fuera de la capital que en congresos anteriores.

El principal déficit estuvo en la negativa de 51 visas, la mayoría a jóvenes académicos y no académicos, que la tramitaron por la vía personal, y que fueron objetados como migrantes potenciales. A pesar de estas visas negadas por la Sección consular, la oficina de Prensa y Cultura de la SINA cooperó en canalizar los trámites por vía personal, agilizar la entrega de las visas otorgadas, y mantuvo a la Sección Cuba actualizada sobre el número y situación de visas otorgadas, denegadas y pendientes.

El mayor grado de interés y participación lo tuvieron los temas económicos y sociopolíticos, así como los dedicados a la normalización de relaciones con EEUU, que se caracterizaron por la alta concurrencia y diálogo de los debates. Los que trataron temas sociales, demográficos (género, migraciones, etc.) y otros de relaciones exteriores, así como de temas humanísticos, tuvieron una participación relativamente menor. En este desnivel influyó la alta concurrencia de paneles simultáneos que caracteriza a este evento.

En la reunión final entre todos los jefes de Secciones de LASA y el Comité ejecutivo de la organización, se consideró un triunfo de su política hacia Cuba la presencia de un grupo tan numeroso y activo de residentes en la isla, a pesar de que el apoyo financiero brindado fue menor que otros años.

La Sección Cuba, que reúne a la mayoría de los académicos miembros de LASA dedicados a estudiar temas cubanos, cerró el periodo 2014–2015 con 533 miembros. (La cifra de los que renovaron esta membresía en mayo 2015 no está disponible todavía.)

La logística para la participación cubana contó con el apoyo decisivo del comité creado en Puerto Rico con ese fin. Este Comité de apoyo, surgido por iniciativa del Comité de solidaridad con Cuba, y la participación de representantes del Departamento de Estado de la isla, aseguró transporte, alojamiento, gestiones y contribuyó a la actividad central de la Sección Cuba.

Se realizaron varios eventos pre y post-LASA y paralelos al congreso, en universidades de EEUU, universidades e instituciones puertorriqueñas, así como en centros norteamericanos. En San Juan, estos fueron auspiciados por la Facultad de Administración de Negocios de la Universidad Interamericana, la Universidad
del Sagrado Corazón, y la Puerto Rico Foundation. Estas actividades tuvieron un saldo favorable, al facilitar información y análisis de primera mano sobre las facetas del proceso de cambio en Cuba, sus relaciones exteriores y con EEUU.

En la perspectiva del próximo LASA, sería conveniente proponer no solo paneles sobre las transformaciones económicas y las relaciones EEUU-Cuba que abordaron en LASA2015, sino sobre los cambios políticos, sociales, jurídicos y culturales que acompañan el proceso de manera integral, y que requieren ser explicados y compartidos desde el análisis de las ciencias sociales y las humanidades. La integración de estos paneles debería basarse en la calidad y diversidad, garantizando la presencia de investigadores y académicos no solo de Cuba, sino de latinoamericanos, norteamericanos, europeos y asiáticos dedicados a los estudios cubanos. En esta iniciativa deberían tener una presencia mayor las instituciones académicas y de investigación de todas las provincias, no solo de La Habana; así como asegurar la participación de jóvenes estudiosos destacados. Dada la flexibilidad de las reglas de membresía y propuestas de paneles en LASA, es previsible que profesionales procedentes de instituciones no académicas (medios de difusión, artistas, iglesias, etc.) y de otras áreas del sector no estatal se inscriban para participar en el próximo Congreso. Sería conveniente que la mayor parte de estos participantes pudieran canalizar sus gestiones por la vía institucional, mediante organismos y asociaciones profesionales u ONG, a fin de minimizar la vía personal, para evitar negativas de visa masivas.

El próximo Congreso de LASA tendrá lugar en Nueva York del 27 al 30 de mayo de 2016. El siguiente se celebrará en Lima, Perú, en la semana del 1ro de mayo de 2017.

Trabajo de la Sección Cuba. El trabajo preparatorio para LASA2015 fue realizado desde septiembre de 2014 por la actual Junta directiva, elegida en el pasado Congreso, compuesta por: Lisandro Pérez y Rafael Hernández (co-presidentes); Jorge Domínguez, John Kirk, Michael Bustamante, Omar E. Pérez; Félix Valdés y Raúl Fernández (no asistentes al evento en San Juan). Aunque no fue miembro de la Junta en este periodo, Milagros Martínez apoyó la organización de la participación desde la isla.

Actualización de datos sobre integración de la Sección. En la Sección estaban inscritos en el periodo anterior (2014–2015) 533 miembros. Al corte del 30 de abril, se habían re-inscrito 276 miembros. La cantidad total de membresía que se renovó para 2015–2016 está pendiente de la información que debe proveer el Comité de LASA. Se realizó la asamblea de trabajo de la Sección según lo previsto. La celebración de la recepción de la Sección el mismo día de la asamblea, acordada por la Junta directiva, no afectó su calidad, pues se cubrieron adecuadamente todos los tópicos que se abordaron en este Informe.

Agradecimientos. La Sección agradeció al Comité de apoyo en Puerto Rico (UPR, Interamericana, Sagrado Corazón) y de ONG (Puerto Rico Foundation) por la iniciativa de realizar algunos eventos pre-LASA sobre el tema de Cuba, y financiar viajes y alojamientos.

Participación de miembros residentes en Cuba. Todas las cifras de este evento rebasaron la participación histórica de residentes en la isla. El Comité de Programa de LASA aprobó 255 paneles donde estaban inscritos 368 participantes de Cuba. En el momento de realizarse la reunión de la Sección, se habían emitido 168 visas, 3 estaban pendientes y 51 habían sido denegadas.

El alto monto de visas denegadas afectó especialmente a jóvenes miembros de LASA, muchos de los cuales optaron por hacer la solicitud mediante la vía personal, no a través de instituciones cubanas. Aunque este año se hizo llegar a la SINA una lista que confirmaba el respaldo de la Sección Cuba a las gestiones personales de estos participantes, la alta tasa de rechazos podría indicar que el Consulado los evaluó como migrantes potenciales. Esta situación contradice los esfuerzos de la Sección Cuba por facilitar la incorporación de jóvenes investigadores y académicos a nuestras actividades, apoyada directamente por la
Presidencia de LASA ante el Departamento de Estado, y debe tomarse como experiencia para LASA2016.

Actividad académica de la Sección en LASA2015. Los 4 talleres organizados y patrocinados por la Sección se celebraron según el programa previsto en LASA2015. La integración de los paneles tuvo en cuenta la multidisciplinariedad, la presencia de investigadores de varias provincias, residentes fuera de Cuba y jóvenes. En el caso de un panel (“Dinámica demográfica”) la ausencia de panelistas afectó la participación prevista. La Sección recibió una beca de viaje de la Fundación Reynolds, que se utilizó para apoyar la participación de una investigadora de la Universidad de Holguín en uno de los talleres de la Sección.

Premio de la Sección 2015. Un jurado integrado por Miguel Barnet (UNEAC), Guillermo Grenier (Florida International University), Oscar Zanetti (UNEAC) y Jennifer Lamb (Brown University), y presidido por Iraida López (Ramapo College), otorgó el premio de la Sección Cuba de LASA por la obra de su vida consagrada a los estudios cubanos, y su aporte al intercambio académico con Cuba, al profesor y economista Carmelo Mesa-Lago. Este premio se entregará en el marco del próximo congreso.

Convocatoria a Premio Domínguez. Se anunció el establecimiento del Premio Lilia Rosa y Jorge José Domínguez, que convocará la Sección Cuba de LASA cada año. Este premio, cuyas bases se han circulado a todos los miembros, se otorgará por primera vez a la ponencia seleccionada como la mejor entre las aprobadas en el Congreso de LASA2015, y que sean enviadas por sus autores a la presidencia de la Sección Cuba en el plazo del 30 de junio del presente año. El jurado seleccionado por la Junta directiva de la Sección lo decidirá en un plazo acordado, y se adjudicará en el marco del Congreso de LASA2016 (New York, 27–30 de mayo).

El jurado de este premio está integrado por Claes Brundenius (Universidad de Lund, Suecia), Clotilde Proveyer (Depto de Sociología, UH) y Esther Whitfield (Universidad de Brown).

Otros puntos de la agenda. Se dio lectura en el pleno de la Sección a dos cartas enviadas por miembros que no pudieron asistir: Aurelio Alonso, premio de la Sección Cuba 2014, agradeciendo por el otorgamiento de este galardón; Milagros Martínez, a quien le fue denegada la visa para asistir al evento de la Asociación de Estudios del Caribe (New Orleans, mayo 2015). La Sección apoyó su protesta por esta negativa de visa sin ninguna explicación, ajena al estado de las relaciones entre los dos países y la voluntad de fortalecer el intercambio académico.

Informe financiero. La situación financiera ha mejorado mucho este año, debido a dos factores: el ahorro en gastos de recepción y el aporte de los miembros residentes en Cuba. Según el informe recibido de la Tesorería de LASA (17 de junio de 2015), hay $2,343.00 en la cuenta de la Sección Cuba. A este fondo, se suma el correspondiente al Premio Domínguez, cuyo endowment asciende a $11,000.00.

Antes de comenzar el congreso, según información de la misma fuente, había $3,246.39 en nuestra cuenta. Este año, gracias al Comité de apoyo, y a la colaboración del gobierno de Puerto Rico, se pagó solo $2,140.00 por la recepción (que es el gasto principal en que incurre la Sección), donde participaron 250 personas. El otro gasto en que se incurrió fue la adquisición de la placa para el Premio de la Sección a Carmelo Mesa-Lago ($116.98).

El otro factor que contribuyó a elevar el fondo fueron los donativos aportados por los residentes en Cuba, que totalizó $800.00.

Es importante que los miembros de la Sección Cuba, sobre todo los que viven fuera de la isla, y con mayores posibilidades económicas, consideremos la posibilidad de hacer una contribución mayor a la cuota de los $10 anuales para ser miembro de la sección. Varias personas lo han hecho, y se aprecia mucho; así como el aporte de los colegas isleños —y se les pide que continúen haciendo esta contribución.

Información sobre proceso de elecciones a la Junta de la Sección. Estas elecciones deben decidir sobre los cargos de los dos co-presidentes, y renovar los de dos miembros de la Junta directiva (Jorge Domínguez y Omar Everleny), además del Tesorero (John Kirk), quienes finalizan el periodo establecido. En cuanto la Junta directiva reciba la lista oficial de miembros de la Sección que han renovado su membresía para 2015–2016, de parte del Comité directivo de LASA, se enviará a cada uno la convocatoria para las próximas elecciones, donde se describen los mecanismos establecidos para la candidatura y votación.

A nombre de la Sección Cuba, la Junta directiva despide a los miembros que terminan su mandato, los felicita por su trabajo y dedicación, por el tiempo personal consagrado a garantizar el trabajo...
y a resolver problemas de toda índole de la Sección y de sus miembros.

Exhortamos a la renovada membresía para que proponga y elija a sus sustitutos, velando por la calidad, la transparencia y el rigor democrático del proceso.

Culture, Power, and Politics
By Justin Read and Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Co-chairs

The Culture, Power, and Politics Section has continued an upward trend in its activities and presence over the past year, through to the last LASA Congress in San Juan, Puerto Rico. For San Juan, we organized a three-part workshop on “Precarious Life/Vida Precaria” to reassess significant concepts in sociocultural thought across the humanities and social sciences: borders, agency, subjectivity, surveillance, and so forth. Discussions in each part of the workshop resulted in three convergent dialogues currently taking place in Latin American social and cultural studies. The first part (Juan Ricardo Aparicio, Arturo Arias, Mabel Moraña, and Oswaldo Zavala) resolved around migration, border crossing, and violence within Latin America, with particular attention to Central American migration from the southern Mexican border northward, and to narco-trafficking and its relation to the nation-state. The second part (Abraham Acosta, Jennifer Bickham-Mendez, Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Juan Poblete, Gilberto Rosas, and Angela Stuesses) tended to focus more on Latin American migrants within the United States, and the possibility of political mobilization in light of noncitizenship. The second part was also particularly attuned to women’s rights. The final part (Rebecca Biron, Luis Duno-Gottberg, Phillip Penix-Tadsen, Justin Read, and John Riosfrio) focused on technologies of global order and thought through the (mis)appropriation of surveillance technologies and digital code. It is clear that the field is moving toward greater critical-theoretical interrogations of sovereign monopolies on violence, nonstate actors from both above (narcos) and below (migrants), necropolitics, and “anthropotechnics.” The workshops were capped off by a well-attended reception with tapas and cash bar at the Congress.

For the immediate future, CPP will organize prizes for research articles and books, which we hope to announce at our section reception at the next Congress in New York City. We are also proud to report that section membership has been growing steadily, which should provide us increasing presence at future congresses as well as continued income for future activities.

The Section would like to pay special thanks to Juan Poblete for his years of leadership in the Section. Juan’s term as section co-chair came to an end in San Juan, but he will continue on the Section Board for the year to come. His post will now be filled for the next two years by Natalia Deeb-Sossa. Justin Read (University at Buffalo) will continue as co-chair for one more year. Abraham Acosta has been elected treasurer for the next year. In addition to Juan, the remaining board members will be Silvia Kurlat Ares and Luis Duno-Gottberg.

The next LASA Congress in New York City will mark the 50th anniversary of the association, and it will mark the 20th year of the Culture, Power, and Politics Section. Our workshops and activities next year, however, will not relish in the recent past but rather critique it, engage it, and revolutionize it. Our focus is not on the past two decades but on what is to come in the next two decades and beyond.

Defense, Public Security, and Democracy
By Kristina Mani, Co-chair

This year the Section undertook several initiatives. We sponsored a roundtable, “Challenges, Perspectives, and Possibilities in Defense and Public Security in Latin America,” as well as a reception during the 2015 Congress. We awarded prizes for outstanding scholarship and circulated a survey and newsletter to members. The Section has grown to 81 members, allowing us to sponsor two events for the 2016 Congress.

Awards. The Section sponsors two awards open to its members for best written work in the form of (1) a paper presented by a junior scholar at the last annual meeting, and (2) an article published during the previous year; each award carries a $200 prize. For 2014, there were no submissions for the first category but five in the second. A panel of the Section’s Executive Council (with recusals where appropriate) reviewed the submissions. The article award went to Rafael Martinez for “Subtypes of Coups d’État: Recent Transformations of a 17th Century Concept,” published in Revista CIDOB d’Afers Internacionals.

This year the Section presented its inaugural Award for Lifetime Achievement, in recognition of distinguished contribution to the field of civil-military relations and defense studies, to J. Samuel Fitch. We fielded nominations from all section members, and Fitch received overwhelming
support. His tremendous contributions to the study of civil-military relations in Latin America began with path breaking research on the armed forces of Ecuador in the 1960s, and continued over decades with rigorous scholarship. Ever generous with his time, Sam has been a model academic, mentor, and friend to many in the Section. His achievements set a high standard for future recipients of the award.

**Elections and position responsibilities.** At the business meeting, with about 22 members in attendance, we elected new officers and discussed future endeavors.

José Manuel Ugarte completed his term as co-chair, Raúl Benitez Manaut (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) was elected to begin a two-year term of co-chair, while Kristina Mani (Oberlin College) continues for a second year as co-chair. Miguel Navarro Meza (Academia Nacional de Estudios Políticos y Estratégicos) and Ana de las Mercedes De Maio (Escuela de Defensa Nacional) were elected to two-year terms on the executive council, from July 2015 through June 2017, replacing Jaime Baeza and Rafael Martínez, whose terms end in June 2015. Miguel and Ana will serve alongside fellow council members Sam Fitch and Pamela Figueroa, whose terms continue through June 2016. The first-year co-chair normally serves as secretary-treasurer for the Section. Updating of the Section’s web page and collating of the newsletter are responsibilities of the council, shared between one person in the second year of the term and one newly elected person.

**Future plans.** For the coming year, we look forward to maintaining and expanding membership by designing section sessions on timely and important themes and continuing to engage and reward the scholarship and achievements of those in the section community.

**Economics and Politics**

By Gabriel Ondetti, Chair 2014–2015

Following is a report of the section’s activities since mid-2014, when the last report was filed.

**Section elections.** In April–May we chose four new section officers: as chair, Anthony Spanakos; as secretary-treasurer, Steve Samford; and as council members, Antonio Botelho and Gabriel Ondetti. Two existing council members (Susana Nudelsman and Eduardo Silva) are in the middle of their two-year terms, so they will stay on for another year.


**Overview of business meeting.** The meeting was co-chaired by past section chair Mahrukh Doctor and incoming chair Anthony Spanakos (outgoing chair Gabriel Ondetti was unable to attend LASA). To begin the meeting, the co-chairs announced the results of the elections and the winners of the annual award competitions and recognized the contributions of both the outgoing officers and those members who served on the award committees. They also discussed the present state of the section’s finances and encouraged members to participate in the section by applying for awards and/or serving on award committees. With regard to new business, several members expressed interest in bringing policy makers to panels and were adamant that LASA should waive registration and membership fees for guests in such panels. Steven Samford, who represented the section at the chairs’ meeting, reiterated our position at that gathering. We also discussed potential panel topics and the possibility of a pre-LASA workshop. There was also a discussion of the use of the section’s website and it was decided that it would be better to pass information to the members via occasional emails. About ten people attended.

**Logros y retos.** This year we introduced a second travel grant and, once again, awarded our two article prizes. All of these awards were competitive and the articles that won were of very high quality and published in top journals. Our two panels dealt with very timely topics in our field and included scholars from both the United States and Latin America. The section continues to be very diverse in terms of age, gender, nationality, academic discipline, and other variables. It includes a number of members who are employed outside of the academic realm and even one former president of a Latin American country.

In terms of “retos,” we mainly seek to maintain the high quality of our LASA panels and to promote active member
This year the Section sponsored one panel and one workshop. The workshop was titled “Emerging Research on the Latin American Environment.” The panel was titled “Energy Politics and Policy in Latin America.” The workshop had good attendance and strong participation by audience members. Participants expressed concern that there were no presidential sessions on the environment at this year’s Congress. Based on participation and the agreement of attendees at the business meeting, the Section will continue to offer the “emerging research issues” workshop at the 2016 Congress. Challenges: Environment Section panels continue to be scheduled at times conflicting with other environment-themed panels from the Biodiversity Track. This negatively impacts the ability of researchers interested in environmental issues to attend our panels (as well as the ones offered at the same time from the Biodiversity Track). We appreciate the difficulty in scheduling such a large meeting and hope that LASA can continue to work to not put a panel on the environment from the Biodiversity Track in the same time slot as the Environment Section’s sponsored panels.

Europe and Latin America
By Roberto Domínguez, Co-chair

On May 28, 2015, at 7 pm, during the 32nd Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, in Puerto Rico, 14 members of Europe and Latin America Section (ELAS) gathered for its annual business meeting. Acting section co-chairs for 2013–2014, Roberto Domínguez and Erica Resende, informed section members and opened the conversation about the following items of the agenda:

Education and Education Policy / Educación y Políticas Educativas en América Latina
By Jorge Enrique Delgado, member of Executive Committee

The business meeting of the LASA Education and Education Policy Section took place May 28, 2015, in San Juan, PR. Fifty-one members attended and elected the Executive Committee 2015–2016: Oresta López (San Luis College, Mexico), chair; Teresa González Pérez (La Laguna University, Spain), co-chair; Enrique Martínez Larrechea (CLAEH University Institute, Uruguay), secretary-treasurer; and Vera Lucia Felicetti (La Salle University Center–Unilasalle, Brazil), Héctor R. Gertel (Cordoba University, Argentina), and Jorge Enrique Delgado (University of Pittsburgh, USA / Pontifical Javeriana University, Colombia), committee members. Erwin Epstein (Loyola University, USA) will be asked for his interest in continuing as committee member for another term. Oresta López presented a summary of the 2014 meeting minutes (available at http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/sections/educacion-politicaseducativas/). 2014–2015 secretary Mauricio Horn proposed creating an online voting system for the Section (to be determined) that has 102 members and a budget of US$1,971.98. Two awards will be created: “Lifetime Contribution to Education Research in Latin America” and “Best Scholarly Article” (for doctoral students and new doctors graduated between 2011 and 2015). The 2016 Awards will be named “Paulo Freire.” Starting in 2017, the Best Article Award will be named after a prestigious female educator (TBD). Two commissions will work on the criteria and call for nominees for the awards. Unilasalle will grant a scholarship to the Best Article awardee consisting of a one-semester tuition remission. Other members are invited to contribute with similar scholarships. Norberto Fernández invited the attendees to join the UNESCO Chair “Education and Future” Project. Section’s email: educacionlasa@gmail.com.

Environment
By Jennifer Horan, Chair

The business meeting focused on challenges for the Section and future planning for LASA2016 in New York. The Section continues to maintain an overall strong membership. Section chair Jennifer Horan reported that as of the last tally prior to the 2015 Congress the Section had 82 members. This means that the Section will be able to support two panels for the 2016 Congress. This past year there were no submissions for the Section’s best paper award and so the award was not given. This year there is one submission and one nomination so far for the best paper award. During the business meeting two section members volunteered to serve as readers on the best paper committee.

Elections were held at the business meeting. The Section reelected Jennifer Horan to serve as section chair. The Section elected Sheri Baver and Katherine McCaffrey to serve as council members.

This year the Section sponsored one panel and one workshop. The workshop was titled “Emerging Research on the Latin American Environment.” The panel was titled “Energy Politics and Policy in Latin America”. The workshop had good attendance and strong participation by audience members. Participants expressed concern that there were no presidential sessions on the environment at this year’s Congress. Based on participation and the agreement of attendees at the business meeting, the Section will continue to offer the “emerging research issues” workshop at the 2016 Congress. Challenges: Environment Section panels continue to be scheduled at times conflicting with other environment-themed panels from the Biodiversity Track. This negatively impacts the ability of researchers interested in environmental issues to attend our panels (as well as the ones offered at the same time from the Biodiversity Track). We appreciate the difficulty in scheduling such a large meeting and hope that LASA can continue to work to not put a panel on the environment from the Biodiversity Track in the same time slot as the Environment Section’s sponsored panels.
ELAS had $1,467.33 in its LASA account, an increase of $167.33 over the amount at the previous meeting in Chicago.

The number of ELAS section members has also increased from 67 to 103 and later decreased to 76.

As of today ELAS registers 76 members. The Section was authorized to organize two panels for the 2016 Congress in New York. The Section welcomed this additional panel because it was the first time in four years that the Section was authorized to hold two panels.

In preparation for the 2015 LASA Congress, members of the Section suggested some tentative topics for the two ELAS panels for New York: (a) subnational relations within transatlantic relations; (b) interregionalism in EU–Latin American relations and Latin American regionalism; (c) transatlantic academic studies; (d) security governance in the Europe–Latin America area.

ELAS organized one official panel this year: “Relaciones Europa–América Latina y el Caribe en vísperas de la Cumbre de Bruselas: Transformaciones de las relaciones transatlánticas y nuevas iniciativas de asociación y de cooperación,” chaired by Gonzalo Sebastián Paz. The Section awarded $293.46 to each of the presenters in the panel.

The co-chairs proposed that members of the Section would not be allowed to receive travel funding from ELAS in two consecutive years. The proposal was unanimously approved.

Both section co-chairs have urged ELAS members to try to mobilize colleagues to join ELAS in hopes to increase membership.

As of 2015 ELAS has a Facebook page and members are encouraged to post calls for papers and to share information about publications, research opportunities, etc. ELAS is still waiting for a volunteer to organize a Twitter account.

Next on the meeting agenda was the election of one co-chair for the 2015–2017 period, as Erica Resende’s term (2013–2015) came to an end. Pedro Caldentey del Pozo was elected by unanimous vote for a two-year term (2015–2017) as co-chair.

As for the composition of the Advisory Council, three new positions were opened: Pedro Caldentey del Pozo (2015–2017) left his position as he was elected co-chair; and Lorena Ruano and Sebastián Santander concluded their tenures (2013–2015). Three new members for the advisory council were elected for the term 2015–2017: Susanne Gratius, Miriam Saraiva, and Joaquín Roy. Bert Hoffmann will continue as member of the advisory board for the period 2014–2016.

Flavia Guerra Cavalcanti will continue as treasurer for the term 2014–2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.

**Film Studies**

*Por Cynthia Tompkins, Chair*

Como la sede de la conferencia era Puerto Rico, la Sección de Cine presentó un panel en homenaje a los directores de la isla: “Cine puertorriqueño en Super 8: Colectivo de cine Taller La Red” (Wed., May 27, 6:00–7:45 pm), que contó con la asistencia de Eduardo Canovas, Joaquín García, Carlos Malavé, y Poli Marichal. Cada director dio una presentación de diez minutos, seguida por la proyección de su trabajo. Además trajeron cámaras y rollos de película que circularon entre los presentes. María Cristina Rodríguez Pagán fungió de *respondent* e Isabel Arredondo, quien organizó el panel, de *chair*.

Asimismo, la Sección de Cine llevó el homenaje a los cineastas a la comunidad. En la noche del sábado, Isabel Arredondo presentó a la directora y artista plástica Poli Marechal, quien compartió su obra en Super 8. El evento se llevó a cabo en Beta Local, una galería de arte en el viejo San Juan, donde se dieron cita más de cincuenta artistas puertorriqueños, quienes participaron activamente de la discusión. Agradecemos particularmente la gentileza de Sofía Gallisá Muriente, fundadora de Beta Local, así como de Dorian Lugo Bertrán, quien compaginó el evento.

El tema del otro panel elegido por los miembros de la Sección fue, “Cine clásico latinoamericano: estrategias de inclusión y exclusión en la representación de la nación” (Sat., May 30, 8:00–9:45 am) y contó con la participación de Maricruz Castro Ricalde y de Fernando Couret. Mi más sentido reconocimiento a Paul Schroeder Rodríguez, por su labor organizando el panel. Además, la Sección ofreció un workshop (“Sistemas de distribución, acceso y circulación” Wed., May 27, 12:00–1:45 pm), que contó con la participación de Gilberto A. Sobrinho, Arturo Vargas, Emily Davidson, y Yari Pérez Marín, organizado y presidido eficazmente por Valentina Velázquez-Zvierkova.

La Sección comenzó con un fondo muy restringido ($1,100), ya que hace un par de años quedó en bancarrota, debido a lo cual se dispuso dejar un mínimo de $1,000. Debido a la precaria situación económica no se pudo colaborar con el festival de cine, ni celebrar una reunión de camaradería en el hotel. Siguiendo con las finanzas, agradecemos especialmente a LASA por haber dividido los costos de la invitación a los directores de cine, y hacerse cargo de la matrícula mientras la Sección pagaba la membresía, lo cual permitió dejarle $1,700 a la nueva administración.

Quisiera agradecer especialmente a Valentina Velázquez-Zvierkova, quien se encargó de enviar un sinnúmero de recordatorios a la membresía lo cual permitió conservar tres paneles asegurados para LASA 2016 en Nueva York.

Finalmente en la reunión de la Sección se votó unánimemente a favor de presentar paneles armados, en lugar de títulos, para los directores de cine, y hacerse cargo de la matrícula mientras la Sección pagaba la membresía, lo cual permitió dejarle $1,700 a la nueva administración.

Conforme decisión tomada en nuestra reunión de 2014 el chair se quedará en el cargo por dos años consecutivos. De esta manera mi cargo se extiende hasta el próximo congreso, en 2016, sin embargo fue aceptada la propuesta de que el chair u otro consejero pueda quedarse como miembro del consejo un año más para asesorar a los nuevos miembros en la logística de organización de actividades de la Sección. Elegimos en votación unánime nuevos miembros del consejo: Fina Carpena-Mendez (University of Oregon), anterior tesorera de la Sección es la nueva chair-elect, Pablo Laguna (Colegio de Michoacán, México) también miembro anterior del consejo es el nuevo secretario-tesorero y Bernardo Manzano (UNESP, Brasil) y Thais Tartalha (UNESP, Brasil) son los nuevos consejeros.

Durante la reunión dimos la bienvenida y felicitamos a dos nuevos miembros jóvenes que fueron beneficiados con becas (travel grant) de la Sección: Marcela Crovetto y Ramiro Rodríguez Sperat ($500 cada uno) quienes se comprometieron a apoyar en la organización de las actividades del próximo congreso y a cumplir con los compromisos estipulados en el edital de la beca, entre ellos la publicación del trabajo presentado en LASA. Se apoyó también a dos productores rurales locales Ian Roig y Benancio Borges, con los gastos de inscripción y membresía de LASA, totalizando $440, ambos participaron en un workshop de la Sección. La Sección también cubrió los gastos de transporte
con muy buen resultado esta pre-conferencia. Agradecemos también a los esfuerzos organizativos de Edmé Domínguez, actual co-presidenta, y a Hillary Hiner y Marianne Marchand que colaboraron en la planificación de los talleres de la tarde, orientados hacia discusiones en torno a las estrategias feministas para lograr el acceso pleno al aborto libre y las repercusiones de la crisis económica en el movimiento feminista.

En enero de 2015 abrimos el concurso de los premios Elsa Chaney y Helen Safa, como siempre orientados hacia nuestros académicos más “junior”. Para el Premio Chaney se consideraron trabajos en el área de estudios de género y mujeres en Latinoamérica. Para el Premio Safa, nuestro premio nuevo que busca honrar la memoria de Helen Safa, co-fundadora de nuestra sección, pedimos trabajos relacionados al área de ella, tales como intersecciones entre género, raza, clase y/u orientación sexual y estudios de política económica y trabajo. El Premio Helen Safa fue adjudicado a Shannon Drysdale Walsh y el Premio Elsa Chaney fue compartido entre María Laura Osta Vázquez y Liliana Castañeda Rentería. Les felicitamos a ellas y agradecemos el trabajo de nuestro jurado, compuesto por los miembros nuestro Consejo, Lucía Saldaña y Cristina Wolff, y Marianne Marchand.

En términos de finanzas, este ha sido un año difícil para la sección, principalmente por la falta de fund-raising en los últimos tiempos. Sólo fue gracias a las donaciones de algunos miembros generosos de la sección, como también a donaciones institucionales gestionadas por nuestra tesorera, Cecilia Santos, de la Universidad de San Francisco, y por nuestra co-presidenta, Edmé Domínguez, de la Escuela de Estudios Globales, de la Universidad de Gotemburgo (Iberofunden), que logramos cumplir con nuestros objetivos. Sin duda, este año tendremos que trabajar en esto.

Finalmente, recién en mayo 2015 nos contactó un miembro de nuestra sección, Vivian Martínez, ya que su postulación a una visa para este congreso había sido rechazada. Como sección logramos movilizarnos muy rápidamente y mandar una carta a la embajada con más de 100 firmas, lo cual tuvo como resultado el otorgamiento de la visa.

Para cerrar la business meeting, hicimos nuestras elecciones (que fue ratificado por mail posteriormente): Co-presidentas: Hillary Hiner y Roberta Villalón; Secretaria: María Stella Toro; Tesorera: Cecilia MacDowell Santos; Consejo: Edmé Domínguez, Carmen Heim, Lidia Possas, Adriana Piscitelli.

Además, por mail, formamos un pequeño comité de la sección para organizar la pre-conferencia 2016 compuesto por: Montserrat Sagot, Verónica Schild, Paloma Bonfil, Thais França Silva y Beatriz Padilla.

Gender and Feminist Studies/ Estudios de Género y Feminismo
Por Hillary Hiner, Co-chair

La primera actividad que llevó a cabo la sección fue la selección de los cuatro paneles de la Sección entre los meses de julio-agosto. Hicimos esto vía concurso público dentro de la sección y con muy buenos resultados, seleccionando tres paneles más una mesa redonda dedicada al tema del legado de Helen Safa. Posteriormente, durante los meses de octubre-noviembre 2014, la directiva empezó a discutir la posibilidad de hacer una pre-conferencia con nuestras colegas puertorriqueñas, pensando en sus experiencias y los retos de la colaboración activista-académica. Gracias al trabajo desempeñado por Alice Colón, académica feminista puertorriqueña y miembro de larga data de la sección, se logró organizar $570 para la realización de las visitas de campo a Toa Alta donde visitamos una finca agroecológica y Yabucoa, una comunidad de pescadores que revitalizó una antigua área de una petroquímica.

Fue informado sobre la actualización y alimentación de la página de la Sección con trabajos y publicaciones de los miembros que así lo deseen. Se mantendrá para el próximo congreso en New York 2016, como se ha hecho en los últimos años, la organización de un trabajo de campo. Para esto contribuirán con la organización algunos miembros de la Sección vinculados a universidades en New York. Serán organizadas también dos mesas conmemorativas de los 50 años de LASA, una de ellas en homenaje a Roger Burbach y la otra “30 años de agricultura en América Latina, pasado y futuro”.

Haití / Dominican Republic
By April Mayes, Co-chair

With about ten of its members present, the section voted to create a transition team so that its current co-chairs, Kiran Jayaram (York College) and April Mayes (Pomona College), will be formally replaced at the business meeting during the next LASA Congress in 2016. Elizabeth Manley (Xavier University) will serve as co-chair pro tempore.
had no nominations for either category. As we transferred and updated the Listserv this year it was surmised that many of the section contacts did not receive the notice about the prizes. The Section plans to revisit the Listserv to make sure that it has the most up-to-date information for each present and past member and section affiliate. This past year the Section also created a Facebook page and reinvigorated its LASA webpage in an attempt to increase communication among and between members, as well as to share publications, syllabi, and other education-related information. There was some discussion about creating a newsletter this year, but there was no response to the call for submissions. All communication strategies and their relationship to outreach and awards will be topics for discussion this coming year.

As of December 2014, the Section had 86 members and $5,208.39 in its bank account. The number of members dropped to 52 by May 1, 2015. No funds have been used by the Section between December 2014 and May 2015. Based on the number of section members as of May 1, the Section is entitled to organize one session for LASA2016.

Health, Science, and Society
By Rebecca J. Hester, Co-chair 2014–2015

Ten people attended the Health, Science, and Society Section business meeting held on Thursday, May 28, at Mojito’s Restaurant in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Given that a quorum was present, during the meeting it was voted to change the name of the Section from Health, Science, and Society to Health, Science, and Technology. The argument was made that the term “society” was an implied focus of all the work the Section does and therefore did not need to be included in the name. It was felt that the addition of “technology” would expand the focus and, hopefully, encourage more participation in the Section. LASA has been contacted about the name change and it is being implemented.

In addition to voting for a new name, the Section also held elections. The following is the new board: chair: Raul Necochea (UNC Chapel Hill); treasurer: Oscar Perez (Dartmouth College); secretary: Mary Clark (Tulane University); new board members: Eve Buckley (University of Delaware), Jadwiga Pieper-Mooney (University of Arizona), Rebecca Hester (outgoing co-chair, Virginia Polytechnic and State University); continuing board members: Julia Rodriguez (University of New Hampshire), Mariola Espinosa (University of Iowa). The Section would like to thank outgoing board members Pablo Gomez, Kate McGurn Centellas, and Jose Amador for their participation on the board these past few years.

Although the Section had attempted to give prizes this past year for the best dissertation and the best article in Latin American/Latin@ Health, Science, and Society, we...
entitled “National Borders, Securitization, and Migration Insecurity” organized by Sara Poggio (absent), Maria Amelia Viteri, and Alice Colón. The pre-conference was held on May 2015 and was well attended.

The Section also organized two panels: “Emigration Policies in Latin America: Inclusion and Exclusion at the Boundaries of the Nation-State”; and a second panel organized with the Southern Cone Section in an effort to collaborate with other sections and give our members the possibility to exchange perspectives from all disciplines.

The business meeting was attended by Maria Amelia Viteri, Alice Colón Warren, Anahí Viladrich, Cynthia Machado Campos, Patricia Zamudio, Ximena Poo, Camelia Tigau, Jeimi Arias, Veronica Montes, Ana Morales-Zeno, Teresa Figueroa, and Sara Poggio (via Skype).

We informed the members who were present of the growth in membership for the International Migrations Section as it started with 70 members in 2012 and grew to 101 members in 2013, reaching 137 at the moment. Based on this number, we are now able to organize three panels for LASA2016. This is very important for our members because most of them will be able to participate in sponsored panels in New York.

Discussion of activities for New York, 2016.

A pre-conference is to be held a day prior to the beginning of the Congress. There were several possible topics discussed and approved at the meeting, as follows: (1) Assessment of the immigration patterns from and to Latin American countries in the last 50 years, comparing the type of patterns of the past with the reality of the present.
Future objectives proposed were updating the website and the organization of a mini-conference at the next LASA. The election process began last week and we hope to conclude by the end of the week.

**Latina/o Studies**

By Carlos Ulises Decena and Kirstie Dorr, Co-chairs; Virginia Arreola, Secretary; Alexandra Perkins, Graduate Student Representative

The Latina/o Studies Section of LASA continues to be a vibrant and engaged intellectual community focused on fostering the linkages between ethnic and area studies. Its membership consists of a range of scholars whose teaching and research focus on US Latina/o communities and their transnational connections to other regions in the Americas. Our aim is to maintain a scholarly forum that highlights and addresses the politically urgent challenges and opportunities facing US Latina/o populations. During the period, the Section Council has worked diligently to streamline its institutional and leadership infrastructure, to improve communications with our dynamic membership, and to continue to provide spaces that feature some of the most cutting-edge and important scholarship in Latino studies today.

The Section leadership structure is organized around the council, which is made up of a collective of elected scholars that serve two-year terms: an initial year of “apprenticeship” during which new members share labor and collaborate with standing named officers, and a second year during which the first-year members welcome a new cohort of elected members and take on the leadership position of the council.

**Labor Studies**

By Cecilia Senén González, Co-chair

The Labor Studies Section business meeting took place on Thursday, May 28, and 12 members participated, including 3 members of the section committee. The discussion was animated and dynamic. We had a full exchange of opinions and we also discussed subjects for future panels for the LASA Congress 2016, such as labor studies from a historical perspective. During the Congress we organized one section panel titled “Trade Agreements, Global Value Chains, and Patterns of Worker Rights Violations and Labor Organizing in Central America, Mexico, Brazil and Argentina.” Some members of the Section Committee participated in the organization of other panels, one about labor relations in America Latina and another about employment relations and human resources management practices in multinational companies.

We held a competition for papers whose prize was two travel grants of US$500 each through a competitive process in which the co-presidents and secretary-treasurer chose a winner. To assign the grants, the applicants submitted their CV and filled out a form with the travel grant proposal. The key criteria were the importance of the field of study, clarity of the presentation, and appropriate theory. The winners were Joe Bazler, a PhD student from the Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, who studies teachers and teachers’ unions in Argentina (Buenos Aires, more specifically); and Natalia Ramírez Bustamante, a PhD candidate from Harvard Law School (Doctor of Juridical Science), for “Inclusion by Differentiation: Human Reproduction and Its Challenges for Women Worker’s Lives.”

A newsletter was started in 2013 but was discontinued in 2014 due to lack of human resources. We are looking into reestablishing it for 2015–2016.

Sara Poggio and Maria Amelia Viteri created a Facebook page for the Section, which already has 130 members.

One of the council members was selected to update the website.

We will call for an election after having a discussion of the future of the Section in terms of governance. The election will be carried out electronically before the meeting in New York.
Durante LASA2015 en Puerto Rico, la Sección de Medios Masivos y Cultura Popular presentó dos mesas. Una organizada por la membresía (“La cultura popular en los medios masivos”) sobre la relación entre cultura, medios masivos y mercado; y otra organizada por el Board (“Los paradigmas teóricos frente a la cultura: Prácticas, lecturas, reconstituciones”) sobre los nuevos desafíos teóricos y los nuevos vocabularios necesarios para pensar los cambios en nuestro campo de estudio. Ambas contaron con una nutrida asistencia y fueron seguidas de interesantes discusiones en las que intervinieron tanto los presentadores como el público. Lamentablemente, por cuestiones organizativas fue necesario suspender la recepción.

Durante el business meeting, se renovó el cargo de chair a Silvia Kurlat Ares (silviakares@hotmail.com) y de co-chair a Matthew Bush (Lehigh University). El resto de los miembros de Board (Pablo Alabarces, Pedro Pablo Porbén, Giancarlo Stagnaro y Juanita Darling) acordó permanecer en sus cargos por otro año. El Board decidió que para LASA en New York se mantendrá el mismo formato de mesas dado que la sección mantiene la posibilidad de hacer dos mesas (correlativas al número de miembros) para el 2016. Un llamado a los miembros saldrá en los próximos días.

En relación a este punto, se decidió volver a trabajar los listados del Google group para actualizar la información y agilizar las comunicaciones. Se decidió no incurrir en gastos y seguir acumulando capital por otro año (el tercero) para dejar que la sección afiance tanto membresía como
Student travel grants. Due to a budget surplus carried from previous years, the Section decided to spend the totality of the surplus on supporting students attending the Puerto Rico conference. Ten grants, in the amount of US$250 each, were given to the following section members: David Dalton, Erin Gallo, Tobin Hansen, Vasundarah Jairath, Anna Kingsley, Rafael Lemus, Mara Polgovsky, Victor Hugo Reyna, Bruno Rios, and Elyse Singer.


**Peru**
Por Jo-Marie Burt, Co-chair

La reunión de la Sección Perú fue dirigida por la co-chair Jo-Marie Burt y el secretario Carlos Parodi. El segundo co-chair Guillermo Salas no participó en LASA. Setenta y cinco personas asistieron la reunión.

Se informó sobre las actividades del año anterior, incluyendo la organización de tres sesiones en LASA y el co-auspicio de una
The Latin American Political Institutions Section (LAPIS) business meeting took place on Thursday, May 28, at 8 pm. About 10 to 12 people attended the meeting. We held elections for the 2015–2017 period. These are the new LAPIS officers: chair, Raúl Sánchez-Uribarri (La Trobe University, Australia); treasurer, Julieta Suárez-Cao (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile); members of the Executive Council, Moira MacKinnon (Universidad Nacional Tres de Febrero, Argentina), Santiago Basabe (FLACSO, Ecuador), Margarita Batlle (Universidad Externado, Colombia), and María Laura Tagina (Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina).

We had a productive meeting that summed up the activities of the past year. The Section was very active with its sessions, the two prizes, and the travel grants. As is our tradition, we awarded a prize for the best paper presented by a member of our Section at the 2014 Congress. In addition, we awarded a prize for the best book published during 2014 by a member of our Section. Furthermore, we awarded two travel grants. The following term we plan to continue the activities of the sessions, prizes, and travel grants.

As was decided in the 2014 business meeting, no prize money is allocated to the best paper and book awards. We believe that the recognition that comes with the award is far more important than the symbolic prizes we were giving ($100 for the best paper, $200 for the best book, to be split among coauthors in case of multiple authorships). We decided to use those moneys to increase travel grants or create new ones. Thus we discussed the possibility of creating a third travel grant specifically for graduate students.

Travel grants were awarded to Laura Cucchi ($600) and Raúl Sánchez-Uribarri ($600). The committee was formed by María Laura Tagina, Mariana Caminotti, and Felipe Botero. To apply for a grant, an applicant submits their CV and fills out a form with the title and abstract of their paper, the city from which they are travelling, the amount of funding already secured, and the amount of funding pending. The committee evaluates the documents submitted and decides who will receive grants.

The Best Paper Award was given to Katherine Bersch, Sérgio Praça, and Matthew M. Taylor for their paper “State Capacity and Bureaucratic Politicization in Brazil,” presented at the 2014 Congress in Chicago. The committee was formed by Alisha Holland, Brian Palmer-Rubin, and Julieta Suárez-Cao. To determine the winner, the committee reads the submitted papers and debates which one is the best in terms of overall academic quality and relevance to the study of political institutions in the region.
The Donna Lee Van Cott Best Book Award was given to Rebecca Weitz-Shapiro for Curbing Clientelism in Argentina. The committee was formed by Jennifer Pribble, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, and Raúl Sánchez-Uribarri. To determine the winner, the committee reads the submitted books and debates which one is the best in terms of overall academic quality and relevance to the study of political institutions in the region.

Scholarly Communication and Research
By Sarah Buck Kachaluba, Chair


The activities of the group have been centered on various aspects of open access (OA) scholarship and publishing. The group is going to explore ways in which open access can be discussed and advocated within the LASA community. We discussed some possible panel topics for 2016; here, again, open access is a main theme. We are exploring the possibility of inviting researchers who have published in OA to talk about their experiences with this type of publishing.

Another idea we have been discussing for the past few years is a panel on archives.

We continue to discuss, brainstorm, and flesh out ideas. We continue to support the idea so want to keep it on the radar for a possible future conference.

The section members also discussed raising awareness of the section within the Latin American librarian community to bolster participation.

At LASA2015 the Section sponsored the workshop “Bridging Scholarly Divides: Open Access Publishing in Latin American Studies,” organized by Pamela M. Graham (Columbia University). The panel was well attended and the discussion was wide-ranging and informative. Examples of Latin American publishers who are exploring the benefits of open access (OA) publishing were enlightening. In particular, the example of the Mexican OA journal Problemas del Desarrollo linking journal policy with university (UNAM policy) with government policy is a potential model for other countries. Most journal publishing in Latin America is done through openly accessible journals, not through commercial publishers. Platforms and portals such as SciELO and Redalyc have standardized publishing and promote a higher quality of scholarship. There was also discussion about how to make members of LASA more aware of OA publishing and that as an organization, LASA does not have a public position or statement on OA.

Sexualities Studies
By Maja Horn, Co-chair

The Sexualities Studies Section business meeting took place as scheduled on May 28 with a total of 16 members present. During our business meeting we elected by unanimous vote two new co-chairs for the upcoming year: Claudia Salazar (Sarah Lawrence College) and Marcos Wasem (Purdue University), Yolanda Martínez-San Miguel (Rutgers) will continue on for a second year as secretary-treasurer.

The jurors for the Sylvia Molloy and Carlos Monsiváis essay prizes did not receive sufficient entries to award section prizes this year. We elected new jurors for both prizes for the upcoming year. The jurors for the Monsiváis prize for best peer-reviewed article in the social sciences are James Green and Carson Morris. The jurors for the Molloy prize for best peer-reviewed article in the humanities are Carlos Riobó, Vincent Cervantes, and Dara Goldman.

Based on membership our Section was allowed to organize two panels. Our panel “New Critical Frameworks for the Queer Caribbean” took place as planned; however, our second panel, organized by section co-chair Laura Arnés, had to be cancelled because various Latin American participants did not receive sufficient funding from LASA to attend the Congress in Puerto Rico.

The Section also organized a joint reception with the Latino Studies and Haiti/Dominican Republic Sections on Friday, May 29, from 9 to 10:30 pm.

The Section and the new co-chairs are planning on organizing a pre-conference meeting for LASA2016 in New York.
Southern Cone Studies
By Fernando A. Blanco, Chair, and Cristián Opazo, Treasurer

The Section held elections for the treasurer position. Cristián Opazo (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile) was elected for the 2015–2016 term. Because the current chair, Fernando Blanco, was elected last October, he was reconfirmed as chair for the 2015–2016 term.


Fifty-two members attended the business meeting. The chair and the former treasurer Gloria Medina-Sancho reported that we have reached a total number of 221 members (May), increasing our section numbers by 45 new members.

In other news, there is a new journal online: Conversaciones del Cono Sur, https://conosurconversaciones.wordpress.com (editor: Leila Gómez; review editor, Laura Demaría; assistant editor, Victoria Garrett; Web designer, Katherine Karr-Cornejo).

Our first symposium will take place in Chile, August 4–7, 2015, with three keynote speakers (Jon Beasley-Murray, Francine Masiello, and Mabel Moraña), 350 accepted proposals, six featured panels, several roundtables, and one workshop on journal policies in the field of the arts and humanities.

Two more symposia are planned, in Montevideo, 2017, and Buenos Aires, 2019. Additionally, three publications will result from the symposium proceedings.

According to the Section’s number of members, four featured panels will be organized for LASA2016 in New York City.

A graduate student elected by the Section will serve as liaison between senior and junior colleagues. James Staig (University of Texas) will be the first to fulfill this role.

Subnational Politics and Society
By Lucas González and Eduardo Moncada, Co-chairs

Over the course of the last year the Section undertook a number of activities. The first major activity was to rename the Section, which was originally called the Section on Decentralization and Subnational Politics. The change in name was discussed and approved during the 2014 business meeting, where nearly a dozen participants concurred that the name change would better reflect the current membership’s broad range of theoretical and empirical interests while also signaling to potential members carrying out research with a subnational element the value of becoming a member of the Section. The Section was pleased to provide Dr. Rigoberto Soria Romo of the Universidad de Guadalajara with a travel award to support his participation in the 2015 LASA International Congress in Puerto Rico, where he presented a paper entitled “An Estimate of the Costs of Violence and Insecurity in the States of Mexico.” Finally, during the 2015 business meeting nearly a dozen section members discussed ways to increase the membership, including the use of social media.

Venezuelan Studies
By Alejandro Velasco, Secretary-Treasurer, and Javier Guerrero, Chair

Much of the meeting was devoted to discussing economic difficulties in Venezuela that have dramatically reduced how many scholars from Venezuela can participate in LASA. Javier Guerrero proposed using the Section’s budget to supplement travel grantees as much as possible, as well as to raise private funds to enable their participation. Those present verbally supported the proposal in principle, though no formal vote was taken.

The plenary voted on two other proposals: (1) to expand the eligibility of the Fernando Coronil Book Award to include books published by non-LASA members (currently only books published by LASA members are eligible); and (2) to allow Portuguese-language books on Venezuela to enter the competition. The first proposal passed by a hand vote of 13 in favor; 7
Further priority is to establish a topic for sponsored panels at LASA2016 and to continue to create outreach and social events during the Congress to provide opportunities for members to meet and to share their research.

This year the council organized a very well-attended double event with the local artist-run space Beta Local, in San Juan. More than 20 members of the Section, whose current membership is set at 112, met at the space to talk about their research and to hear the directors of Beta Local talk about their research, art practice residencies, and outreach activities in the community, and also how they interact with academia. This event was followed by the Section’s presence at the monthly community dinner that raises funds for Beta Local activities.

At the Congress, the Section sponsored two well-attended panels: the first, “Dis/placed Visualities,” considered archival photographs as a means of making histories of corporate and state violence visible and knowable, and contemporary art strategies that remediate violent histories to make them accessible to us today. The second panel examined the topic “Negotiating Identity at the Art Museum in Latin America” by charting the histories of different institutions in the region, their emplacement in urban landscapes and parks, the role of specific individuals in crafting the projects, and their interface with the state.

To conclude the meeting, Vicente Lecuna read the citation for the winning Best Paper in Humanities, which was presented to Charles Briggs for his article “Dear Dr. Freud” published in Cultural Anthropology (May 2014). Guillermo Guzmán read the citation for Best Paper in the Social Sciences, awarded to “Chismosas and Alcabuetas: Being the Mother of an Empistolado within the Everyday Armed Violence of a Caracas Barrio,” by Verónica Zubillaga, Manuel Llorens, and John Souto, published in the edited collection Violence at the Urban Margins (Oxford University Press, 2015). Guzmán also read a citation for Gabriel Hetland’s article “The Crooked Line: From Populist Mobilization to Participatory Democracy in Chávez-Era Venezuela,” which received honorable mention in the Social Sciences category, and appeared in Qualitative Sociology (December 2014). All winners will receive two years of LASA and SVS membership. (Awardees for the Social Science article will share the award.)

Visual Culture
By Lisa Blackmore, Incoming Chair

The Visual Culture Section had a very productive LASA2015. Prior to the business meeting the Section conducted its elections for the coming period, through which the members elected Lisa Blackmore as chair, Kevin Coleman as vice chair, Joaquin Barriendos Rodríguez and Miriam Haddu as members of the council, and Anna Kingsley as secretary-treasurer. The business meeting also provided an opportunity for a quorum of members to approve the move to create a prize to celebrate the work of visual culture scholars. The council will work to implement this as soon as possible. A further priority is to establish a topic for sponsored panels at LASA2016 and to continue to create outreach and social events during the Congress to provide opportunities for members to meet and to share their research.

This year the council organized a very well-attended double event with the local artist-run space Beta Local, in San Juan. More than 20 members of the Section, whose current membership is set at 112, met at the space to talk about their research and to hear the directors of Beta Local talk about their research, art practice residencies, and outreach activities in the community, and also how they interact with academia. This event was followed by the Section’s presence at the monthly community dinner that raises funds for Beta Local activities.

At the Congress, the Section sponsored two well-attended panels: the first, “Dis/placed Visualities,” considered archival photographs as a means of making histories of corporate and state violence visible and knowable, and contemporary art strategies that remediate violent histories to make them accessible to us today. The second panel examined the topic “Negotiating Identity at the Art Museum in Latin America” by charting the histories of different institutions in the region, their emplacement in urban landscapes and parks, the role of specific individuals in crafting the projects, and their interface with the state.
A social enterprise at the service of academic and other high social impact conferences.

Through a portfolio of services that include site selection, contract negotiation and logistical support, we support our clients efforts to promote collaboration by hosting superbly organized conferences around the world.

MaestroMeetings offers support through financial contributions and sponsorships that have a measurable impact on the profitability and visibility of conferences and other such events.

As a nonprofit, we are driven by an ingrained desire to collaborate and share information with other organizations. In addition to sharing our industry know-how one to one with our clients, we also make available to the general public relevant case studies, and industry data and articles.

CONTACT US TO LEARN MORE
Nonprofit organizations interested in learning more about MaestroMeetings hotel contract negotiation services exclusively for the nonprofit sector can visit www.maestromeetings.org.
LASA acknowledges all who provided the financial support essential to the success of the 33rd International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, which took place May 27–30, 2015, in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Our thanks go out to the Tinker Foundation, the Open Society Foundations, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs (CLASP), to the AVINA Foundation for its generous grant for the Kalman Silvert Award Life Memberships, and to Oxfam America’s contribution to the Martin Diskin Lectureship. As always, we are grateful to the Ford Foundation for its support of the LASA Endowment, as well as to the many members and friends who continue to provide endowment support. Proceeds from the endowment are used every year to support hundreds of Latin American scholars with travel grants.

We are also thankful to the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University for its contribution to the Student Fund, and to colleagues at the Universidad de Puerto Rico–Rio Piedras for their help recruiting volunteers and affordable housing for travel grantees. We greatly appreciate the contributions of all the individuals who contributed to the LASA Travel Fund, the Student Fund, and the Indigenous and Afro-Descendant Travel Fund.

Critical events would not have been able to occur at the Congress without the support of the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies (LLILAS) at the University of Texas, CIESAS, Meet Puerto Rico, and the Compañía de Turismo de Puerto Rico. Thank you!

Milagros Pereyra-Rojas
Executive Director, Latin American Studies Association
Thank you to our LASA2015 Sponsors & Contributors:
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 9,500 members, 45 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.