Contents

A MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR...........................................................................................................................................3

REFLECTIONS FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE WORLD: STUDYING, SERVING, AND SHARING IN QUITO, ECUADOR...........................................................................................................................................4

LATIN AMERICA’S EMERGING ENVIRONMENTAL DEMOCRACY.................................................................................................................6

STRANGER IN A FAMILIAR LAND: FINDING THE UNEXPECTED IN THE MIDST OF FIELDWORK.................................................................9

THE ACCIDENTAL PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL: AN INTERVIEW WITH FERNANDO HENRIQUE CARDOSO.............................................................11

THE EXCHANGE OF “VALUE ADDED” IN NORTH AMERICA: COMMERCE AND CULTURE..................................................................................14

JOURNALISM ARGENTINE STYLE: A SEMESTER IN BUENOS AIRES..............................................................................................................18

BENSON COLLECTION ARCHIVE DOCUMENTS ROOTS OF NAFTA DEVELOPMENT..................................................................................20

TRANSLATING BEYOND CULTURE: MY STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE IN CHILE......................................................................................23

CURATING THE MERCOSUL BIENNIAL IN BRAZIL: AN INTERVIEW WITH THE BLANTON’S GABRIEL PÉREZ-BARREIRO........................................25

RAPPORT CENTER INVESTIGATES AFRO-COLOMBIAN TERRITORIAL RIGHTS.........................................................................................28

INSIDE CIVIL SOCIETY IN MEXICO: THE RGK CENTER PARTNERSHIP........................................................................................................32

STRAUSS CENTER BRIDGES ACADEMIC AND GLOBAL POLICY DIVIDE...............................................................................................34

AMBITION VS. SUCCESS IN LATIN AMERICA’S LEFT.............................................................................................................................36

DIDÁ: EMPOWERING AFRO-BRAZILIAN WOMEN THROUGH THE ARTS..................................................................................................40

LOCATION, LOCATION, LOCATION: UT’S PRESENCE IN THE MAYA HEARTLAND..........................................................................................42

THE REPRESENTATIONAL FAULT LINE: CANDIDATES AND VOTERS IN MEXICO’S 2006 ELECTIONS.........................................................44

HITTING A “POPULAR” NOTE: MUSICAL CONTRASTS IN BRAZIL AND THE U.S......................................................................................48

LLILAS DRAWS ON A DIVERSE FACULTY.................................................................................................................................50

LLILAS VISITING PROFESSORS FOR 2006–07.................................................................................................................................52
A MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

THIS HAS BEEN AN EVENTFUL AND PRODUCTIVE YEAR AT LLILAS AS WE HAVE TAKEN UP the challenge of the University of Texas’s expressed commitment to developing closer institutional relations with Latin America in a broad range of fields. Mexico has figured prominently this last year, with President Powers’s visits to Mexico and the planned collaboration with Mexican universities in science and technology, business and education, as well as in the humanities and social sciences, which will culminate in a week of workshops in Mexico City in February 2008. The institute’s long-standing relations with Brazil also are being strengthened through cultural exchange programs in art, music, and the performing arts, and collaboration with Brazilian government research agencies over scientific and policy research. Perhaps the most significant trend, however, is the increasing amount of research collaboration that the institute and its faculty have throughout Latin America. The size of LLILAS and the number of its affiliated faculty enable the program to be truly Latin American in scope and diversity, as is seen in the student reports on study abroad and in the numerous conferences and workshops this past year and in the coming year on Mexico, Central America, and almost all the countries of South America.

The library, arts, and community-outreach interests portrayed in the last issue continue, as are shown by the reports on the Blanton’s involvement with the Biennial in Porto Alegre through the work of the Latin American art curator, Gabriel Pérez-Barreiro; the College of Fine Arts’s leasing a colonial mansion in Antigua, Guatemala, for Mayan studies and the forthcoming educational exchange visit of the musical and community development group, Didd, from Salvador in Brazil; and the donation to the Benson Latin American Collection of the NAFTA negotiations archive of the U.S.-Mexico business group, a donation that is the occasion for William Glade’s reflections on trade relations and “value added.”

We began the year with former Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s inaugural lecture of the annual Lozano Long lectureship series, in which he reflects on the realities of government—also to be the topic of the second Lozano Long lectureship by President Ricardo Lagos of Chile this coming March. The Lagos lecture will be the keynote at a conference on the performance of left-leaning governments in Latin America, looking at the experiences of Venezuela, Bolivia, Chile, and Brazil, the theme of Kurt Weyland’s article in this issue. This last year saw the continuation of our close inspection through conferences of the Mexican political process, a topic that is analyzed in Ken Greene’s article on candidates and voters in Mexico. The issues of activism and popular participation are the foci of three pieces in this issue: Peter Frumkin and Steven Smith discuss the emergence of civil society in Mexico; Rodrigo Sierra reflects on the relation between the environment and democracy; and Karen Engle covers the human rights project in Colombia. Human rights are an increasingly important concentration for both teaching and research in LLILAS, now strengthened by the appointment of Ariel Dulitzky of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS to LLILAS and to the Law School’s Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice.

As Nick Shumway pointed out in the last issue, area studies centers provide indispensable homes for the many scholarly and applied activities that gain insight from working in other cultures. Our challenge at LLILAS is to marshal the considerable financial resources needed for what is a feasible but ambitious program of study.

BRYAN R. ROBERTS, DIRECTOR
Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies
Whether it trickles mildly down the window pane in tiny rivers or comes cayendo chuzos de punto out of nowhere when the Forty Acres bus has already stopped running, I am reminded. Each time it’s rained since I’ve returned from studying abroad in Quito in fall 2006, I’ve been thankful for the rain, and no rainstorm passes without thoughts of the rural community of Turuku, Ecuador.

Turuku is a small, mostly indigenous community two hours north of Quito, where I had the privilege of doing service learning and field research for an anthropology class. While there, I was profesora for two days a week for six weeks, teaching English, art, music, and physical education classes in a public, bilingual Spanish/Quichua elementary school and studying the effects of migration on the community. Weekends were spent participating in community life: in the shared work of the mingas, in baking guaguas de pan for the Day of the Dead, or in discussing the kichwa cosmovision while sipping chicha (corn beer) from cracked mugs around the fireplace of our generous host and guide in the community, Raúl.

Raúl was a fountain of wisdom during my weekends in Turuku, and it is he who taught me to think differently about the rain. One early Saturday morning, as the clouds were still rising over Mama Cotacachi, the volcano that is believed to care for the indigenous people who live under her watchful gaze, Raúl took my research partner and me for a walk. As during all of our walks together, interesting conversation topics abounded: women and microenterprise, the controversial presidential candidates in the upcoming election, and the discrimination faced by indigenous schoolchildren. As we walked, the sky began to darken and thunder rumbled ever so quietly. Without thinking, I groaned, not wanting to be caught miles from Raúl’s house without an umbrella or poncho. Noticing my groan but not saying a word, Raúl redirected our path to show us the spring from which the people of the neighboring community got their water. It was a small spring, with a pool half a foot deep, but was the water source for more than 100 people, some who had to walk a couple of miles each morning to fill buckets before livestock came to drink from the pool in the afternoon. I believe this side trip in our walk was Raúl’s subtle way of telling me, “Be thankful for the rain, it comes as a gift!” and I left the spring with tears in my eyes, humbled by my narrow and selfish thoughts about the rain.

My experience that Saturday is just one small example of many that taught me the most important lesson I learned while abroad, that I am no dueña de la verdad, that I cannot make presumptions about the way people will act, what they will say or expect, or even the way they

Reflections from the Middle of the World: Studying, Serving, and Sharing in Quito, Ecuador by Jennifer Svetlik
see the world. “Traveling makes one modest,” said Flaubert. “You see what a tiny place you occupy in the world.” So many experiences I had humbled me and made me feel small in the world, but also made me so excited to travel further and see what this world has to offer to those who choose to explore.

My travels around Ecuador led me to some amazing places, filled with beauty and excitement, realities and complexities. I danced salsa in the sand and sipped piña coladas in a hammock on the Ecuadorian coast, but also was able to meet politically active Afro-Ecuadorians working to improve the school system in an area ignored by the government. In the Galapagos Islands, I saw a fascinating abundance of wildlife, sat with a multitude of sea lions on the beach, saw so many gigantic tortoises that they became almost commonplace, and snorkeled with sharks, but I also spoke with fishermen on the islands, several who had lost relatives in a recent storm. I traveled six hours deep into the Amazon rainforest and spent the most amazing four days of my life there: watching gorgeous sunrises over the canopy, swimming with river dolphins, eating lemon-flavored ants, and even being defecated on by a howler monkey! But only an hour away, oil drilling was destroying rare species and upsetting the traditional lifestyle of the indigenous people who had lived there for hundreds of years. And even in Quito, where I studied and spent the majority of my time, I would take the crowded bus to the historic district at least once a week, to appreciate the richness of the history and the magnificence of the architecture there. It made me feel more alive to walk through those streets, even while I knew that orphan shoeshine boys slept in them at night.

Over four months, I fell in love with this land of complexities, a land of political turmoil and peaceful mountaintops, beauty in pain. I left my heart there, with my adorable and affectionate students in Turuku and with Raul’s generous family, at the base of Mama Cotacachi, where I felt most at home. I left my heart in the energetic rhythms of the Afro-Ecuadorians on the beach, with the indigenous guides in the Amazon whose families were organizing to speak against the oil companies’ actions. Part of me will remain in all the fascinating places I visited, but I have taken so much wisdom with me back to the U.S. as well. I learned to live simply in the present, as I did when my host mom would make her grandson and me sit quietly and name all the sounds that we could hear. I learned to become more aware of injustices and to educate myself in how I can best work toward change both at home and abroad. I learned to experience every situation with new eyes and to see all things as a gift, especially the rain.

A Plan II student, Jennifer Svetlik is a senior in the undergraduate program in Latin American Studies. Her study abroad experience was made possible through a Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Travel Scholarship.

... THE MOST IMPORTANT LESSON I LEARNED WHILE ABROAD [IS] THAT I CANNOT MAKE PRESUMPTIONS ABOUT THE WAY PEOPLE WILL ACT, WHAT THEY WILL SAY OR EXPECT, OR EVEN THE WAY THEY SEE THE WORLD.
Latin America’s Emerging Environmental Democracy

by Rodrigo Sierra

Environmental politics in Latin America are at a turning point. Social and economic transformations in the last two decades have resulted in a fundamental shift in the way the democratic process in general, and environmental politics and policies specifically, play out in the region. While still in an embryonic stage, the emerging environmental politics are those in which groups heretofore absent in the environmental debate are now taking relevant actions, establishing agendas, and forcing new allocations of the benefits and costs associated with resource use at all levels of society. The last decade witnessed unprecedented mobilizations of rural and indigenous communities and resource-rich towns seeking to reverse the environmental aggression of the last century. The fundamental political transformation is expressed as greater environmental governance, the strengthening of state environmental agencies, and, above all, increasing stakeholder participation in the making of environmental policies. New pressures for action develop, among other factors, by changes in the conditions of access and control of the region’s natural resources, developments in property rights, including liability measures, at various levels, from the state to the household, rapid urbanization, and improved living standards. Increased awareness of the potential value of environmental resources and an emerging concern for a quality of life associated with the conditions in which Latin American societies live are creating a new political process in which more diverse and broad social representations are coming to light.

Until the end of the twentieth century, Latin America’s environmental agenda was, at the state level, subordinated to the more pressing issues of the day: economic growth and security. For the most part, the environmental dimension was absent in the debate about economic and social development and very rarely appeared in the form of electoral agendas. In part as a reflection of this prioritization, few governments used economic and policy tools for improving the allocation efficiency...
of national environmental resources. Environmental policies and regulations were usually ignored, and environmental agencies granted limited and often ineffectual powers. At the level of the civil society, the environmental agenda was almost exclusively in the hands of elites. One could even say that the environmental agenda was part of a structural adaptation, designed to create jobs for a rapidly growing group of educated, environmentally friendly technocrats, who found employment and a reason to exist in the thousands of environmental nonprofit organizations that mushroomed everywhere in Latin America. They took advantage of a growing flow of funds from the north to establish protected areas, implement media campaigns, and, in general, to put forth an environmental agenda with minimal confrontation to the development paradigms of the day. Development was aggressive toward the region’s ecosystems and people. Governments saw in undeveloped areas, especially those still beyond the agricultural frontier, options to reduce social pressures in the more contested traditional agricultural regions. Frontier colonization schemes were common after the 1960s, resulting in rapid deforestation, desertification, and soil erosion. Protected areas were off-limits only when they did not contain valuable resources. Rivers were free conduits of industrial and urban waste. From Buenos Aires’s Riachuelo to Quito’s Machángara, urban metropolises saw their rivers and lakes critically polluted. Millions of emissions-spewing cars contaminated the air of the region’s cities, forcing driving restrictions in the worst cases, such as Mexico City and Bogotá. Urban and rural communities, which may or may not have perceived the environmental problems around them, had neither the political, institutional, nor economic resources nor the luxury to actively search for solutions or to be concerned with their surroundings, as long as these did not affect the means to future food and shelter. In some cases, the urban working class even opposed stricter environmental regulations because they saw in them a threat to their employment and their access to a consumer society.

**Policy Progress in the 1990s**

The last decade of the twentieth century was a period when the fundamentals for a new environmental era began to be constructed. New constitutions in Colombia and Ecuador codified the rights of indigenous peoples to their ancestral lands. Brazil instituted one of the most progressive forest policies in the world. The 1991 Colombian constitution redefined the country as multietnic and pluricultural. It was the basis for the passage of Law 70 in 1993 and Law 388 in 1997. Law 70 recognized the collective land rights of rural Afro-Colombian communities with traditional production practices and established mechanisms to protect their territories and cultural identity. Grass-roots organizations also developed at a rapid pace and found in the environment a rallying point for many of the political and technical components of their agendas. Indigenous organizations in particular have grown stronger and can now hold states and multinational corporations accountable for their actions in their territories. States were unable, or unwilling, to breach the conditions that even small communities began to impose. In Ecuador, the small but powerful Kichwa community of Sarayacu has resisted all attempts by the oil industry to penetrate its territory. Cities in Latin America are finding that the provision of key resources and ecological services, from water to solid waste disposal, previously clearly defined as public goods, are now controlled and restricted by rural communities. Because the sustainable management of these resources or the conditions that make them available, often referred to as environmental services, impose restrictions on they way they are managed by their owners, urban users have found it necessary to compensate them to secure access to what they need. Farmers from Costa Rica to Ecuador are now being paid for the environmental services their lands provide.

Perhaps the most telling development is that public environmental policy is increasingly responsive to popular opinion. More and more elected officials are using environmental protection to underpin their political campaigns. In this way, the social mobilization of the early twenty-first century is framing new environmental policy. To some extent, the strength of this new policy is anchored in the linking of social and environmental agendas. Environmentally minded politicians in Argentina’s La Rioja province have banned open-air mining using outdated technologies that would not be acceptable in developed countries and, under pressure from local citizen groups, have put this issue to a vote in a local referendum. Moreover, La Rioja’s process is followed closely in other Argentinian provinces since it is testing new ground in this emerging environmental democracy. Activism is widespread in Argentina, and for many reasons: contamination from paper mills on the border with Uruguay, polluting tannery mills and gold mines, and contaminated lakes. Similar demands by civil society have occurred in mining towns in Peru and Ecuador. The nonelites (indigenous groups, rural communities) have adopted the environment, along with other long-standing banners of nonelite political activism. Indigenous communities in Peru and Ecuador are holding national and international resource-intensive companies, in oil and mining, liable for the environmental impact of their actions over the past four decades.
The Changing Frontier

The expansion of agricultural frontiers, which were associated with extensive deforestation and habitat degradation in the tropical lowland and highland regions, also reached a turning point. In the 1960s, expansion was based on a de facto open frontier, where poor immigrant farmers, and later large, capital-intensive agroindustries, could occupy and expand the area farmed, often by cattle ranching in the case of small farmers, and cattle and industrial crops (soy, palm oil) for larger scale operations. Today, the open frontier is full. The increased establishment of clear property rights on the part of indigenous communities and other long-standing communities has, for all practical purposes, closed the frontier. In the past, frontier expansion in the Amazon, Choco, and Central American tropical forests came from the outside, as millions of poor farmers colonized these areas using newly constructed roads that decreased transportation costs, attracted by free land and expanding local markets in the form of towns and cities. Today, much of the remaining forest is in the hands of either the state, in the form of national protected areas, or of indigenous communities, as large territorial properties. While most of the time these lands are held communally, as a whole they constitute private property, where indigenous communities are able to exclude other users, farmers, and industries (such as the oil industry). In the Ecuadorian Amazon, 61 percent of the remaining forest is inside indigenous territories and 19 percent more inside protected areas. Similar trends have been reported in Brazil, Peru, and Colombia. Recent studies show that forest clearing slows down significantly where these rights have been established. The consolidation of national protected area systems also has played a key role in limiting deforestation. In the past four years alone, the Brazilian government has set aside 20 million hectares of Amazonian forest for protection, for a total of some 110 million hectares of protected forest—now the largest protected area system in the world.

To protect isolated indigenous communities, Ecuador designated a 1 million hectare area as an “untouchable zone,” where oil and logging are prohibited. Environmental organizations have successfully limited operations of oil companies with rights to important oil fields within this area. In a move that would have been unlikely a decade ago, the Ecuadorian government did not cookie-cut this area to allow development of these fields. Furthermore, in response to intense pressure from environmentalists and indigenous groups, in an unprecedented, if unlikely, experiment, the Ecuadorian government is seeking environmentally sensitive alternatives to the development of other large oil fields by asking the international community to compensate for the lost revenues of not taking environmentally damaging actions. Specifically, it is asking for half the revenues forfeited if oil extraction in a sensitive pristine Amazon rainforest is not carried out—$350 million. The success of such a strategy is unlikely because it would be difficult for even the largest donors to release such sums for biodiversity protection. On the other hand, the emerging carbon markets are already much larger, reaching tens of billions of dollars annually and globally. This option seems more plausible since the nondevelopment of these oil fields would prevent the release of almost half a billion tons of carbon.

But it is not only the institutional changes that directly affect attitudes toward public resources. Independent of environmental politics, the politics of development are also forcing new conditions that have an important, if unintended, environmental outcome. A forest transition, or the moment when forest growth overtakes forest clearing, is evident in many locales, so many in some cases that they have a clear national impact. In El Salvador, for example, forest cover has increased as a result of the contraction of agricultural land. Prof. Susanna Hecht of UCLA attributes this to the decline of the relative value of agricultural work, the growth of manufacturing and service work, the effect of large inflows of remittances, which accounted for 66 percent of foreign currency earnings for El Salvador in 2000, and more than a decade of civil war that forced thousands of people off rural lands.

The Seed Has Been Planted

To be sure, environmental democracy in Latin America is only in its infancy. The turning point, however, seems to be now. Latin America is entering what Timothy O’Riordan, the well-known American environmental philosopher, saw as the third phase in the evolution of environmental politics. At this stage, the distribution and use of political power and economic resources, working conditions, technology, and patterns of consumption have given rise to a whole new set of “environmentally active actors,” who are not only demanding a new development agenda, but also creating economic value out of the region’s natural resources, such as biodiversity, through increased domestic tourism, formerly an exclusively international phenomenon, and green markets. Governments have begun taking account of some, not yet many, environmental costs associated with resource use. This is often under pressure, to be sure, but twenty years ago no amount of pressure would have had this effect. States have begun to give more regulatory power to their environmental agencies and to work more closely with their judiciary in environmental matters. Even suspicion of environmental risk may now be enough to trigger action. The Brazilian Environmental Agency (IBAMA) closed a large soy processing plant and port in the Amazon because it did not have the required environmental impact assessment, and the Ecuadorian Ministry of the Environment recently stopped new road construction by oil companies in the Yasuni National Park. Yet the process is still full of contradictions. While much of what is happening is grounded in this strengthening of property rights and corporate liability, there has been strong opposition to other types of privatization, most notably, of water. Indigenous and rural communities have become active opponents of plans to create markets for environmental services because of the fear that their access to water, erosion control, and other environmental commodities and services will be privatized and under corporate control. Likewise, indigenous organizations are not always interested in increased government control and, in particular, the designation of areas inside their territories as protected. Much remains to be done. According to FAO’s State of the World’s Forests 2007 Report, Latin America and the Caribbean lost 0.5 percent of its forest area between 2000 and 2005, 20 percent faster than in the previous five years. Most urban waterways continue to be polluted and the air contaminated. However, the seed has been planted and the transformation is under way.

Rodrigo Sierra is Director of LLILAS’s Center for Environmental Studies in Latin America (CESLA).
I traveled back home to Ecuador in May 2007 to spend two months doing fieldwork with an indigenous community in the central Andean province of Cotopaxi. I wanted to better understand the way in which a group of families living at the rim of the volcanic crater of Lake Quilotoa were providing tourist services to the lake’s visitors in order to complement their local economies.

Those two months were probably the most fulfilling and enjoyable, but also the most difficult, that I have experienced as a graduate student. I will share here some of the unexpected situations from which I learned that flexibility and empathy might be just as important as the research plan when entering an unfamiliar social setting, especially an indigenous one.

In Ecuador, the diversity of regions and cultures becomes apparent even among Ecuadorians when someone penetrates a community whose history, geography, and livelihood contrast so sharply to his or her own. Therefore, it was not so much Quilotoa’s adverse environmental conditions, such as the bitter cold found at 12,500 feet, that concerned me; rather, questions related to the politics of research raced through my mind from the moment I first contemplated living in the community for two months: How would I introduce myself into the community, how would I overcome language barriers, how much information should I give the community about myself and the work I wanted to accomplish, and how would I deal with a possible negative response from the community?

I first gained access to the community through some indigenous friends in a nearby village who then introduced me to a family in Quilotoa. Once in the community I met some of the community leaders, and very shortly thereafter I became aware of the most critical concerns leaders and families had with regard to my presence. They wanted to know why I was interested in writing about Quilotoa and who would benefit from the information produced. After answering all their questions, it became clear that I should adapt to cultural expectations and fulfill the tradition of communal reciprocity. Thus, the community and I agreed that I would have access to information in exchange for volunteer work in the communitarian hostels, as long as I promised to bring the study back to the community so they could use it for their own benefit.

Some may assume that my status as an Ecuadorian national would benefit my research, but interestingly, being an Ecuadorian mestiza seemed to create more discomfort and suspicion among the indigenous people than foreigners did. With time I understood that people in Quilotoa see foreigners as good clients and an opportunity to build international tourist networks, thus increasing social prestige. On the other hand, Ecuadorian mestizos like me reminded them about their history of oppression, not to mention the constant struggle to maintain land and natural resources in indigenous hands.

Moreover, despite being a woman, I experienced great difficulty in gaining the indigenous women’s trust. “A married woman like you should have at least two children by now. Are you sick?” asked one woman. Another echoed the first, claiming that marriages in the cities do not last. Their initial opinions about me made it very difficult to communicate, further complicated by a language barrier due to the fact that community women speak mostly Quichua.
Spending time with women means gaining access to their intimate space, namely, the kitchen. It took me some time, but after they witnessed that I was a quick potato-peeler and interested in learning about traditional cooking, they opened up, talking about their roles as housewives, mothers, farmers, and recently hostel administrators. 

As the weeks went by, I wanted to learn about everyday life in different households, so I tried to stay in various hostels, living with several indigenous families. I thought this move would decrease any perception of favoring one family over another. However, by moving around, I created resentment among some households, who understood my actions as disloyal. I compensated by participating in communitarian work projects. Although a unique balancing act, the process afforded one of my most important observations: despite strong kin ties, there exists an intense competition among the different families. In one case, a host family thought I was spying for a previous household, perhaps stealing their business contacts, and they refused to talk to me. It was not until I participated in the organization of their hostel’s welcome party for a group of tourists that they started to see me as a friend.

Collecting information from outsiders in the community was even more complicated. For example, interviewing mestizo entrepreneurs who own hostels near Quilotoa required an understanding of the historical indigenous struggle for land and resources. The community considered the mestizos as land invaders and unfair competition. Memories of forced labor on the hacienda are still fresh among indigenous people; since this only recently ended in the 1960s after centuries of oppression, they fear losing the little they have gained. After community members saw me conversing with someone considered a menace to the community, I was required to answer a series of questions. I patiently answered all of them, making sure they understood that my work required me to gather information from every influence on the community, and assuring them that I did not favor any party.

After two months, I had enough empirical information to return to Austin. I look back on the research experience with the realization that, despite the fact that the initial research questions, timetable, and methods were useful as points of reference and aided in jumpstarting the research, many of them had to be reformulated, rescheduled, and continuously readjusted according to the reality I encountered. Such flexibility and empathy guided the Quilotoa research, making evident the correlations between new tourism ventures and the shared indigenous memories of oppression and struggle, which mirrors the reality I found among the many families and community members who shared their stories with me and, if I may say so, also their hearts.

Maria Belén Noroña Salcedo graduated from the University of Texas at Austin with an M.A. in Latin American Studies in spring 2007. Her fieldwork in Ecuador was funded by a Summer Field Research Tinker Travel Grant.
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The Accidental President of Brazil: An Interview with Fernando Henrique Cardoso

by Catherine Pees Scott

FERNANDO HENRIQUE
Cardoso gave the inaugural Lozano Long Lecture, “The Accidental President of Brazil,” based on his book of the same title, at UT on September 13, 2006. Catherine Pees Scott, then a second-year master’s student at LLILAS with a research focus on social policy in Brazil, interviewed the former president at the Stephen F. Austin Hotel earlier that day.

CPS: As we speak, history books are being written and scholars are defining what they believe were your major accomplishments as finance minister and president. What would you most like to be remembered by? What were your greatest achievements as president of Brazil?

FHC: I would say my greatest achievement was the consolidation of institutions that allowed for more democracy and consequently a better life for the people. A better life because they have instruments or channels to make demands of their government and their involvement means true democracy.

Of course, as Minister of Finance I created the Real Plan that brought financial stabilization to Brazil, and this is probably a very important achievement because it took years and years to stop inflation. And the other day, one of my friends said, “You have to remember that since the days of Brazilian independence, we never had stabilization (true stabilization) so this is important.” Anyhow, even to achieve stabilization and maintain it as President, I used democratic instruments. The people were informed about the process of implementing the plan, they were given time to react and be heard. It was a kind of dialogue.

So I think what was important was democracy and the building of institutions to assure democracy.

CPS: You have seen politics from various angles: from your family’s long
FHC: It's possible but difficult. During my tenure as president, we enacted a number of reforms—you know that in modern society you have reform all the time. It's a matter of attitude; more traditional people prefer not to change anything. And they are always accusing the "reformers" of being self-serving and the poor will suffer the consequences. It's not necessarily true, but they use this as an excuse not to change. So in the modern society we have to create the spirit of change, to adapt to new situations. Brazil has always had this double aspect because it is a very mobile society. Social mobility is very high in Brazil. It is an informal society. On the other hand we have privileges, so you have also hierarchies. And you have also immobility in social terms, which is not good, I would prefer a more dynamic society. So we have this double aspect, which is not yet very clear. Probably because we started from the original viewpoint coming from the Iberian Peninsula, from the Portuguese and Spanish; they had never been properly motivated by the spirit of capitalism, they had always been patrimonialists, putting the church first, followed by property and family and THEN, finally, market and rule, if you are acquainted with Weber's views on the spirit of capitalism.

CPS: In your book, you explained how, in politics and governance, compromise is highly valued and alliances become necessary...

FHC: Are necessary. It is critical to figure out how to make alliances without losing face. This is important, and this we cannot measure in advance, it depends on what you achieve.

CPS: Yes, and your history plays a role in your reality and how you either spend it or continue it.

FHC: Certainly.

CPS: You have an entire chapter dedicated to the jeitinho [a Brazilian "way" or approach to obstacles, whether parking a car or negotiating business] and its ubiquitousness in Brazilian culture and life. But you went on to say that the jeitinho has no place “at the table anymore in Brazilian politics.”

FHC: I hope. Jeitinho has a double meaning. One meaning is good—that you try to solve problems rather than to put up obstacles; which is not bad, it's an attitude, “Let's try to solve this, let's try to help you.” That's positive. But there is another meaning, which is to disregard the law, the rules. Not to effect rules. And when I say, “hopefully,” it's not yet clear if the Brazilian civic culture is strong enough—in the democratic sense—to respect the rule of law. It's not possible to have democracy without the rule of law. You are probably familiar with one of my favorite authors, Sergio Buarque de Holanda, who wrote a very beautiful essay on Brazil and the different aspects of Brazil entitled Roots of Brazil [Raizes do Brasil]. In this book, he has a chapter on the cordial man, and very often people believe he was praising the cordial man, but in fact he was criticizing him by saying that the cordial man in Brazil means that you follow your heart so you are allowed to be/do as you please, but consequently you are not respecting the rule of law, you only respect your impulses. In one sense the jeitinho is good, but in another it can be damaging. [It does not have] universal rules, so you have privileges.

CPS: Perhaps an example of political jeitinho can be seen in the political corruption scandals of 2005.

FHC: Again, the jeitinho is present, unfortunately.

CPS: Even parties with a strong conviction for honesty [the Partido dos Trabalhadores, PT] ended up mired in accusations of corruption, specifically the caixa dois [2003 presidential campaign finance scandal]. What do you think are the prospects for significant campaign finance reform? Is reform possible in Brazil?

FHC: It's possible but difficult. During my tenure as president, we enacted a number of reforms—you know that in modern society you have reform all the time. It's a matter of attitude; more traditional people prefer not to change anything. And they are always accusing the “reformers” of being self-serving and the poor will suffer the consequences. It's not necessarily true, but they use this as an excuse not to change. So in the modern society we have to create the spirit of change, to adapt to new situations. Brazil has always had this double aspect because it is a very mobile society. Social mobility is very high in Brazil. It is an informal society. On the other hand we have privileges, so you have also hierarchies. And you have also immobility in social terms, which is not good, I would prefer a more dynamic society. So we have this double aspect, which is not yet very clear. Probably because we started from the original viewpoint coming from the Iberian Peninsula, from the Portuguese and Spanish; they had never been properly motivated by the spirit of capitalism, they had always been patrimonialists, putting the church first, followed by property and family and THEN, finally, market and rule, if you are acquainted with Weber's views on the spirit of capitalism. So in some parts of Brazil, this [capitalism] is not the real spirit that really motivates people...
to behave accordingly. In other parts, yes, like in São Paulo and the south, it is widespread, [but] it is not yet a predominant viewpoint. I think it’s still important to try to continue to struggle in order to modernize more and more. Without losing our characteristics, and that is the point, how to use only the good aspects of jeitinho, the good aspects of “cordiality” and not the bad ones. How to produce a blend, not to form ourselves into Anglo-Saxons, because we are not. But how to not be so comfortable being so tied to the past.

CPS: Speaking a bit about social mobility, my own perspective is that education is an enormous tool for social mobility.

FHC: It is the main source nowadays.

CPS: Many states across the U.S. are spending less and less on higher education thereby forcing public universities to rely on alternative sources of funding. By contrast, the Brazilian federal government and state governments fully fund public universities and provide excellent higher education. While FUNDEF redistributes funds to help poor states provide better education, what other prospects for alternative sources of funding are being pursued?

FHC: If you look at the expenses, the budget in Brazil, we are expending considerable amounts of money on education. If you look at the cost per university student in Brazil, we spend $15,000 a year per student, which is much more than the U.S. If you look at primary education, it’s one-third of what the U.S. spends. We need to balance these expenses. It’s not enough to have more funds, but also to better use the funds already available. And also, in terms of the management of the educational system, we are losing ground in some areas of Brazil with respect to education. It’s not because of lack of money but rather lack of competent teachers and administrators. To increase the quality of teachers, we need to increase salaries. So in that sense, we need more money.

As I used to say, Brazil is no longer a poor country; it is an unjust country. This is terrible, because we have no excuse not to behave properly. We have such potential to do better.

On the other hand, now there is a beginning of awareness by the wealthy people that education is a basic right of all Brazilians—because it is not comfortable to be wealthy surrounded by poor. They are nonemployable people; they don’t have the skills to be absorbed by the market. So there are some movements in society in order to press the public opinion and business to put money in public schools, to patronize some public schools. So this is beginning.

I would say that the Brazilian future will heavily depend on our capacity to understand that the coming twenty years are crucial. Other countries are going to pass us. China, all of Asia, Korea. And this is basically due to the lack of education; basic education and education overall. And more emphasis on our nontraditional education, not just the humanities, but also technical education: mathematics, etc. Our future depends on it; it depends on the leadership to emphasize education.

CPS: Much of your legacy continues today just as you left it, while some programs and policies have changed. One example of change is that of the Bolsa Escola Program, previously an independent program administered by the Ministry of Education, and now it is joined with many social assistance programs under the umbrella program Bolsa Familia and administered by the Ministry of Social Development. Are you happy with the transformation of this program?

FHC: No, because I think that Bolsa Escola is more focused on education than Bolsa Familia. Bolsa Familia is almost only about income distribution, it’s important for other purposes. Bolsa Escola is an instrument to give people the capacity to, in the future, behave by themselves, while Bolsa Familia creates an army of dependent people. It’s a kind of new clientelism. These guys are good for ideas, but in practice they put together a bunch of assistance programs under one. Each ministry was looking after one specific goal and so now it’s all together. Nobody is looking specifically at what is the result of that effort. So I have some doubts. Of course, we have all the opportunity to justify because it’s important to redistribute income, but behind the idea is neoclientelism.

CPS: What would you like for the future of Brazil?

FHC: Brazil has to understand that he belongs to the world, he can no longer consider himself isolated from the world, he belongs to the world. He has to react and to dialogue with the world, open views, in that sense. I think that provided you have better education, if you keep democracy, and if the government can continue to offer stability, investments will come. Because we have an important market and refer to the case—even the universities of Brazil are ok—if you compare with other parts of Latin America. Very few countries have as high a level as Brazil in technological efforts. We made an enormous effort in the area, for example in oil research and deep waters. We have been able to produce good aircrafts, so we are now producing computers. So we are becoming more and more integrated in that sense. But it depends on more education and more democracy and less populism. Because what is the bad view of populism is that people are looking just at today and not ahead, so they are looking at immediate needs and not the long run. A nation has to be built looking ahead; look what is happening now in China. The Chinese have looked ahead—not that I necessarily agree with how they have—a long view, vision. And in Brazil the vision is almost always behind. And I think we are always approaching the good moments, but never get there. So I hope that Brazil will get there.

CPS: What is does the future hold for you? Your tenure at Brown will be up in 2008.

FHC: I’m teaching there for a short time; most of the time I spend in São Paulo, and I have my foundation/institute there, giving talks, conferences, participating in different initiatives. Even now I am going to New York to participate in the Clinton Initiative, and I belong to a large NGO, WRI in America. I’m also president of the SP orchestra. Engaged in many things. I do write books, articles. Regularly, once a month, I publish in newspapers. So I think that as a former president, I don’t want to be engaged directly in electoral campaigns or in party life, but as a former president being a citizen, I have the responsibility to express my views. That is what I am planning for the future. I am very grateful to be in Brazil. I had different offers in America and other parts of the world too. But I am seventy-five years old too, I suppose that at the end of my contract with Brown I will stop having regular teaching activities, but I will not stop being active in political life. It’s impossible to be inactive.
The Exchange of “Value Added” in North America: Commerce and Culture

by William Glade

International Trade, Investment, and Migration are, conventionally, the major cross-border exchanges and principal measures of regional integration. When the markets that organize them work well, they promote the well-being of all participants, though not in equal measure. Additionally, these three transactional categories, which focus on what economists call “private goods,” are amenable to analysis by sophisticated techniques nested in well-developed theories. Yet, despite their analytical utility for handling most questions, the three classifications fail to capture, at least in the North American case, all relevant cross-border exchange transactions.

A few years ago, former President Vicente Fox, mindful of European developments, called for moving beyond the expected completion of NAFTA to a North American Community (NAC) with stronger social, administrative, and economic linkages. From a purely economic perspective, the NAFTA commitments are now almost achieved, and the NAC looms as a possible next step. If, however, we use a multidisciplinary analytical lens that comprehends all exchange transactions, not just those in the balance of payments and migration figures, it would appear that, in North America, regional community building has, in fact, been going on for more than 150 years. Hence, in the long view, the purely economic arrangements are the ones that need to be updated to bring them into correspondence with what social and cultural exchanges have been producing for a very long time.

In the most decentralized way imaginable, people have been “voting” de facto for community long before the issue ever reached the level of presidential imagination and, thus, the agenda of policy discussion. Though the U.S. government was obliged by circumstances (9/11) to turn a deaf ear to the Fox proposal, the process of forming a North American cultural commonwealth continues apace, laying an ever firmer basis for the postulated North American Community. In time, no doubt, the architects of policy will begin to catch up with this people-centered process of social and cultural formation, though the official conceit will surely be that the goal was of their inspiration and creation.

Contextualizing the Package of Trade, Investment, and Migration Flows
In retrospect, the seeds of a regional cultural community were planted with the secession of Texas from Mexico and sprouted to a new level when the Mexico-U.S. war transferred a huge swathe of Mexican territory, with all the people dwelling thereon, into an expansionist U.S. For most people, borders mattered little in those days and the central government was a distant abstraction, especially for the new Spanish-speaking residents of the U.S. As their numbers grew, customary family ties, now cross-border in nature, were maintained and enabled later new arrivals to be readily absorbed into the life of the Southwest. For decades, people moved back and forth across the border as inclination
and resources permitted. In time, even the distinction between permanent, temporary, and repeat residence “abroad” began to blur for Mexicans who were born below and along the frontier region. The distinction between “home” and “el Norte” was no less vague. As in still later decades, the transborder social and cultural networks that accumulated over time facilitated the northward movement of others from Mexico when railway construction, mining, petroleum drilling and extraction, and ranching got underway in the latter half of the nineteenth century and new urban growth in the American southwest produced a need for workers in many fields.

This process of northward drift intensified early in the twentieth century. Labor-intensive commercial agriculture spread in California and the lower Rio Grande Valley, thanks to rail connections with growing markets, and labor demand was fueled further as southwestern population centers multiplied. With World War I, migrants fanned out, reaching into the mid-west and north-central states, taking jobs in both factories and fields. Like immigrants from more distant lands, the Mexicans began to assimilate, but with their cultural homeland right next door supplying a continuing flow of people northward, cultural replenishment was an inevitable and continuing fact of life. The relationship was fed further by a substantial step-up in migration that sprang from the need of the WWII economy for civilian workers from Mexico.

“Citizenship” was defined more in cultural than legal terms. Voting and government tended to be of little consequence for the Hispanic population on either side of the frontier. The demographic and cultural basis was developed for an ever-broadening range of cross-border exchange transactions between the neighboring countries, only a small portion of which would be registered in balance-of-payments exercises and census taking. In due course, a Hispanic support system of merchants, service providers, and similar businesses developed, just as they did for other immigrant enclaves. As this happened, the inertial element in cultural conservation increased. Maintaining key portions of the “old” way of life became increasingly feasible as a kind of cultural anchoring.

The process of resettling el Norte accelerated as families fled the violence of the Mexican Revolution in the ‘teens and ‘twenties to take refuge in a peaceful and booming U.S. economy. While the bulk of those who headed north came from humble social origins and entered appropriate segments of the urban and rural employment markets, there also came a growing number of those endowed with greater assets of human and social (not to mention financial) capital, some permanently, some temporarily. Business and professional travelers and scholars, to say nothing of those on shopping expeditions, have long been part of this massive demographic exchange, providing ongoing links between the production and educational systems of Mexico and the U.S. Even tourism, both ways, served as an important vehicle of communication and cultural transfer.

Of key importance as developers of knowledge capital and cultural assets and as conduits of intercountry communication have been such interpreters and makers of culture as artists, writers, photographers, filmmakers, and musicians. All the major Mexican artists, for instance, have worked in the U.S. Since mid-century, large numbers of Mexican academics also have lectured and taught at universities all around the U.S.

The importance of the Hispanic cultural market is evidenced by a growing presence of Mexican popular culture north of the Rio Grande that goes back many years. As precursors of today’s Univision, Telemundo, Azteca Americana, and Hispanic Television Network, the early Mexican-made silent films began to be screened in the U.S. in the 1920s, followed in the 1930s by sound-pictures. By 1941, there were, according to Agrasánchez’s fine study, approximately 145 theaters in the U.S. that included Spanish-language films, chiefly of Mexican origin, in their programming, the bulk of them in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, with smaller numbers in twenty-three other states.

Meanwhile, before the Civil War, Americans began to read about Mexico, and from after the Civil War and the French intervention, they formed a growing counter migration to that country—tempted, in part, by the 1844 William H. Prescott’s best-seller Conquest of Mexico, the popular travel accounts penned by writer/businessman John Stephens in the same general period, and the more or less contemporary writings of the engineer E. G. Squier. All three men whet the appetite of educated Americans for information about what must have seemed an American Egypt, given the unfolding discoveries of striking antiquities, dramatic landscapes, and an exotic culture. If this provided the roots of a kind of American “Orientalism,” as Edward Said might have put it, it nevertheless helped to attract legions of Americans to Mexico when the Porfirián era ushered in several decades of economic modernization and expansion. Thousands of gringo railway and mining engineers, ranchers and other landowners, financiers and merchants, petroleum workers and technicians poured into the country to participate in the long expansion. Like the Mexicans migrating northward, they and the business travelers and tourists heading south, became channels for conveying information and knowledge, as well as skills.

American musicians, artists, writers, and political pilgrims were steadily attracted to what was going on in Mexico. Particularly useful, in stimulating more general interest in the country were such popular writers as Richard Halliburton and the archaeologist Ann Axtel Morris. Leading figures like Nelson Rockefeller, who became enamored with Mexican culture thanks to coaching by René d’Harnoncourt, later director of MoMA, did much to foster a wider interest in that country. After WWII, thousands of American students, many financed by the GI Bill, headed south to study in Mexico. Senior scholars joined the trek, particularly as political changes drew in historians, political
Identifying Transactional Flows and Exchanges

Thanks to the social foundation that grew from these circumstances, people routinely slipped back and forth across borders largely unNOTED. Goods, not always declared to an official overseer, have just as routinely flowed both ways as well, and services have been purchased as needed on either side of the frontier, with indifference to nationality. As people tended to their ordinary family affairs and visited friends in hometowns north and south, movements of capital that took place as intrafamily transactions also eluded detection. Myriad service transactions have likely eluded reckoning in the balance of payments, in which the trade in goods has historically been much more accurately estimated. Conditions along the Mexico-U.S. border have exaggerated the accounting difficulty.

Allowing for the measurement problems associated with these conditions, it is evident that the three core flows of products, capital, and labor do not by any means catch all cross-border transactional flows that have contributed value to the well being of individuals, households, firms, and even, in lesser measure, non-profit/non-governmental organizations—or, for that matter, the largely sidelined governments. That many of these ancillary transactions historically have taken place as externalities of the core processes of exchange may complicate the accounting task, but it does not diminish the significance of these other, partly non-market, transactional flows.

Hence, an indeterminate but probably huge volume of exchanges (and unilateral transfers) has occurred on an unreckoned basis in the penumbra of balance-of-payments accounting. With movements of people, for instance, have come spreading social networks now identified as social capital. So, too, with human capital. Equally relevant has been the cross-border transmission of cultural preferences, tastes, and customs. Santa Claus and trick-or-treating witches and goblins have headed south, while piñatas and quinceañeras have migrated northward. And while cultural transplants to Mexico have included hamburgers and hot dogs, gringo aficionados of “costumbres mexicanas” have been well nourished by an ethnic distribution system that ensures that tamales and tortillas are never out of reach—along with a sorcerer’s apprentice supply of tequilas.

High culture, too, has spread. In New York City, the Philharmonic Orchestra of the Americas, led by the young Mexican conductor Alondra de la Parra, has featured Mexican and other Latin American music since its opening Town Hall performance in November 2004. And Daniel Catán’s operas have been performed in both Houston and San Diego—not to mention the operatic tenors Rolando Villazón and Ramón Vargas.

Given the growing interpenetration of the neighboring societies, an increasing number of binational organizations have grown up to facilitate, stimulate, channel, and shape cross-border interactions in a growing number of fields. Business life, for instance, has benefited from the American Chamber of Commerce in Mexico, while for a critical period the Rodman Rockefeller–instigated Mexico-U.S. Business Committee had an important hand in fashioning a much closer bilateral relationship. In the academic, nonprofit, and governmental area, the associational fabric is even richer, with multiple, one could even say a welter of, organizations facilitating cross-border communication.

Assessing Value Added

The value of undocumented cross-border transactions of culture, people, goods, and services, and, estimated separately, of the institutions/organizations that structure and facilitate them, is not readily available in the conventional migration and balance-of-payments statistics. As undocumented migration is itself a matter for estimates with a considerable margin of error, and the value of all the transactions that accompany migration currents is even more problematic in measure-ment terms, this makes the total interaction all the more a matter for conjecture. Especially with the movement of people, whether legal or illegal, came movements of mail through the postal service, of books, reports, working papers, and periodicals, not to mention a steady flow of person-to-person oral communication. Moreover, the whole exchange process has been magnified enormously by additional trans-border communication: e.g., electronically transmitted information (the Internet and long-distance telecommunication) and trade in such cultural artifacts as films and radio and television broadcasts. Similar transfers of value added, moreover, take place in innumerable professional and scientific meetings, business conferences, symposia, conventions, fairs, and so on. Even the movement of goods transmitted additional knowledge capital and technological capacity, including what is embodied in design, engineering, and product specifications. It goes without saying that the negotiation of licensing agreements and suchlike has allowed production itself—or, more exactly, production capabilities—to move across national boundaries in integrated systems. This single most important factor of production, knowledge capital, has been transferred from one economy to another in a volume only hinted at in the available statistics.

That intellectual property composes an ever-growing share of value added in the modern economy; the transfer of intellectual property and knowledge capital, whether in duly constituted transactions or in pirated forms, has assumed an especially critical role in the larger scheme of production relations, right alongside the ample cultural resources that have been widely disseminated throughout North America. Thanks to these developments and the information distribution systems they have created, the information base on which all decisions are taken and choices made has come to cover virtually the whole of North America, and this, as economic theory instructs us, also produces allocational gains from the more efficient decisions made on the basis of drastically enriched options.

What seems unmistakable is that the movement of students, professors, researchers, business specialists, many other professionals, and ordinary people across national frontiers not only has fortified the information base but also has increased the capacity to generate...
such capital and the complementary resources that figure in production. In the long run, this flow of knowledge is the largest and most important flow of all in influencing the long-term capacity to raise aggregate output, but reckoning its magnitude and estimating the value it adds fall well short of what is needed for precise reckoning. Complicating the picture is the fact that much of this transfer of knowledge has taken place as a spillover or adjunct effect (i.e., as an “externality”) of other exchange processes. The ultimate value of these exchanges is realized only over a very long period of time and in diffused form. Hence, assessing the ultimate size and distribution of the beneficial impacts defies exact calculation, though we know intuitively that it is huge.

This said, two other considerations also serve to make benefit estimation an especially formidable task. Given the multiple sources of added value in such large, complex, and dynamically interacting economies as those that compose North America, the data presented in balance-of-trade and investment flows are very distant approximations of the value added that is being transferred internationally within the region. Some of the transfers serve to enhance welfare or well-being directly by adding to the value of current consumption, but other cross-border transactions contribute, on a probably more sustained basis, by increasing productivity and the capacity to produce. Both consumption and investment, therefore, benefit.

Think, for example, of a museum or library, both of which cultural producers have been strengthened by cross-border exchanges. Consumers (visitors, readers) of these repositories of knowledge benefit directly by enriched offerings of exhibitions and books, but production in the long run thrives as well as users become more productive in the future in their respective fields of labor. The cultural infrastructure of a nation is, in this sense, no different from other forms of infrastructure such as electricity generating and transmission systems, highways, railways, or hospitals.

A final consideration complicates further the cost-benefit analysis of regional integration in North America. While most of the exchanges counted in the usual reckonings consist of private goods (i.e., goods acquired by individuals and companies for their particular use and benefit), many of the exchanges we have been describing serve to increase the supply of public goods: the consumption of which by one in no way diminishes the consumption by others and from which no one can, practically speaking, be excluded: e.g., most knowledge capital and the general supply of human capital, much organizational and social capital, and so on. All tend to enrich both the range of long-term consumption options and the capacity to innovate and increase output. The mutual understanding and knowledge sought by, for example, the Fulbright program and most other cultural exchanges confer immense long-term benefits on the societies in which they take place. And this is true in general whether the channels of exchange are situated in the private commercial sector, the public sector, or the not-for-profit independent sector.

Not of least consequence are the global public goods represented by (a) more harmonious international relations or regional peace and (b) reliable transactional frameworks of international law. If we are nowadays increasingly aware of the importance of such global or international public goods as a more orderly system of exchange rates, a well-functioning trading system, and a secure contract regime and property rights, we are also more appreciative of the averted extinction of assorted animal species and flora, thanks to international conventions and agreements, and to the preservation and more effective utilization of cultural heritage goods, natural preserves, common water resources, and so on. Greater regional security is an indispensable component of national security, and cross-border collaboration in law enforcement, if ever it can be attained, is integral to a comprehensive national scheme for reducing criminality. The benefits of these public goods may be incalculable, but they are also undeniable. We need not dwell, of course, on the effects of the public “bads” that ensue when regional cooperation breaks down—or fails to materialize.

We are, Mexico, Canada, and the United States, in this together willy-nilly and destined by geography as well as history to form a regional community. It may seem rather too grand, if not grandiose, to credit President Fox with prophetic powers, but the vision he articulated so sparely is de facto, as Washington would probably put it, a road map of the territory we are destined to traverse. We have been traveling that route already for many decades. In the grand reckoning of public policy, therefore, there is probably something to be said for turning on the headlights of foresight and forethought to steer the process as smoothly as possible rather than blindly hitting the many bumps and potholes that dot the way—or even running off the road.

William Glade is Emeritus Professor of Economics of the University of Texas at Austin, from which he retired in May 2007 after thirty-six years of teaching. He is also former director of the Institute of Latin American Studies, now the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies.
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**DR. GLADE RETIRES**

Dr. William Glade, who has taught in the Economics Department at the University of Texas since 1971, retired on May 31, 2007, after more than thirty-six years at UT. He was honored with a luncheon hosted by the Economics Department on May 10 and with a farewell dinner at UT’s Texas Club on May 26.

A Ph.D. of UT Austin, Dr. Glade was Director of the Institute of Latin American Studies from 1971-86. He was also President of the Latin American Studies Association from 1979-80. Prior to coming to UT, Dr. Glade taught at the University of Maryland and the University of Wisconsin. His research focused on comparative economics, international business, and money and banking. Dr. Glade held numerous consulting positions for government agencies including the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the United States Information Agency, and the Ford Foundation.

A widely respected economist, Dr. Glade will be greatly missed around campus by his colleagues and students at the university, but they wish him a long and satisfying retirement.
FOR A STUDENT, RESEARCHER, OR JOURNALIST, there is no better experience than studying abroad. I went to Argentina in the fall of 2006, and I spent four months taking graduate courses in the master’s of journalism program at the Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), thanks to a Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Study Abroad Scholarship.

Buenos Aires has more than 3 million inhabitants in the city proper and around 12 million in the so-called Gran Buenos Aires area. It also has one of the largest middle classes in Latin America and a solid national identity. It is known for being one of the most European cities of the region, but it also reflects the contradictions and contrasts of the continent. Regarding academics, UBA has an important tradition. It was founded in 1821 and now has thirteen departments and seventy-two undergraduate professional career concentrations. More than 30 percent of the national scientific research is conducted in this institution.

While the master’s in journalism is a recently created graduate program, it has a very experienced faculty. It is important to mention that Argentina is world-renown for the excellence of its journalists and writers. So it seemed a great opportunity to study in situ my two main areas of interest. I took three seminars at the UBA: Cultural Journalism, Press and Society, and Political Journalism.

It was remarkable the way Argentine professors linked all the areas of study with national politics. This is especially understandable in a country with such a dramatic recent history and constant confrontation between the press and the political power. The bloody military dictatorship that started with the coup of 1976 maintained strong control over the press (despite the fact that mainstream media initially supported the coup that removed Isabel Peron from power). From its first appearance, the military said that it “would not allow any sort of opposition.” This assertion led to one of the cruelest Dirty Wars in the region, which culminated in approximately 30 thousand desaparecidos (missing persons), including at least 100 journalists. In addition, the coverage of the Falkland Islands war (between Argentina and Great Britain) was an event in which the media went along with the military’s lies and created an overwhelming amount of disinformation, the excess of which finally contributed to the end of the military dictatorship in 1982. Most of the professors I had at UBA had experienced this period of Argentine history, and some had worked as journalists at the time.

I especially enjoyed the Political Journalism course, taught by Mabel Thwaites, former editor of the newspaper Clarin. It was an insider’s view of how politics are managed within the mainstream media, and she also provided an overview of the relationship between reporters and politicians. Prof. Alejandro Horowitz was perhaps the most controversial faculty member. He taught the Press and Society course.
from a historical point of view. While he offered a detailed critique of several aspects of political power, our final paper for the course was to analyze how the military coup of 1976 was reported in the major Argentinean newspapers, and how that coverage could be interpreted. Last but not least, Prof. Daniel Ulanovsky conducted a useful seminar/workshop on the art and potential of narrative journalism. In addition, my classmates brought varied viewpoints to the discussion, sometimes controversial. The students had very different backgrounds, and music were very active). But Palermo is also a great place to listen to people from all over the city, both rich and poor. I was particularly interested in hearing citizens’ opinions on the consequences of the national economic crisis of 2001 and getting involved in the daily cultural dynamics.

Despite a superficial prosperity among the middle class, corruption was one of the main characteristics in Menem’s government during the 1990s. Following the Asian economic crisis, the newly elected President Fernando de la Rúa economy began to stabilize due to a drastic devaluation of the currency, and since 2003 the country has had a period of constant economic growth. But the scars of the crisis were still apparent everywhere—discussed in every taxi or bus I took, in every conversation with the people I met, and at every dinner table at which I was present.

I won’t have enough space here to tell all the stories I collected or relate all the impressions that I gathered. I have written down many of them, but others remain inexpressible, that kind of knowledge one gains only after living a considerable amount of time in a new city. Both academic and practical experiences in Buenos Aires were stimulating, and I even wrote a few stories that were published in newspapers. However, the local friends I made there are the most vivid image I carried with me on the plane back to Austin.

Paul Alonso is a master’s candidate in the Latin American Studies program with Journalism. His study abroad experience was made possible by a Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Study Abroad Scholarship.

but most were undergraduate professors or journalists trying to reflect more profoundly on their profession. Their comments and local knowledge were incredibly valuable.

But my learning experience in Argentina did not end there, and it did not include only graduate studies. The studio I rented was in the middle-class neighborhood of Palermo, on the eighth floor of a building in Guemes Street, close to the Bulnes metro stop. The neighborhood of Palermo mixes commercial and residential areas. There are many restaurants (with diverse prices and quality) and a wide variety of cultural events (theater and music were very active). But Palermo is also a great place to listen to people from all over the city, both rich and poor. I was particularly interested in hearing citizens’ opinions on the consequences of the national economic crisis of 2001 and getting involved in the daily cultural dynamics.

Despite a superficial prosperity among the middle class, corruption was one of the main characteristics in Menem’s government during the 1990s. Following the Asian economic crisis, the newly elected President Fernando de la Rúa

in 1999 faced a country where unemployment had risen to a critical point and the economy was entering a recession. When the economic crisis worsened, the middle class criticized and distanced themselves from government policies. In 2001, people began withdrawing large sums of money from their bank accounts, causing a run on the banks. The government enacted a set of measures (the infamous Corralito) that effectively froze all bank accounts, allowing for only minor sums of cash to be withdrawn. This led to a popular insurrection that climaxed in the violent incidents of December 19 and 20, 2001. The following year the

IT WAS REMARKABLE THE WAY ARGENTINE PROFESSORS LINKED ALL THE AREAS OF STUDY WITH NATIONAL POLITICS.
IT’S A CLASSIC AMERICAN story. Dedicated individuals with a shared vision build a grassroots consensus among peers, attract a broader acceptance in their community, capture the attention of government policymakers, and effect significant change on an international scale. That this particular classic story resulted in the North American Free Trade Agreement may strike many as surprising, yet it is documented in the correspondence, position papers, meeting minutes, and daily press reports of the newly acquired Mexico-U.S. Business Committee archives at the Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection. “This behind-the-scenes view of the origins and early development of NAFTA will be an invaluable resource for researchers looking at it from many angles as far into the future as we can imagine,” says Ann Hartness, head librarian at the Benson Collection. “Rarely are records documenting the interactions of private citizens and the governments of two nations made available to the public in such a systematic way.”

The Mexico-U.S. Business Committee (MEXUS) archives at the Benson Collection currently comprise the records of Rodman Rockefeller, chairman of the U.S. Council from 1981 to 1994, and those of executive director of the U.S. Council Guy Erb and Trade Subcommittee chairman Robert Herzstein, central figures to the efforts for trade liberalization that contributed directly to NAFTA. In its more than seventy boxes of documents, the collection presents a rich resource for examination of the private sector’s perspective on international trade and economic development and the actions by which the committee was able to accomplish its goal of the free trade agreement between the United States and Mexico. Erb, who along with Herzstein was recently in Austin to attend the conference NAFTA and U.S.-Mexico Relations: In Retrospect and Prospect sponsored by LLILAS, the Mexican Center,
and the Benson Collection, notes, “Most of the politico-economic analysis of the roots of the NAFTA concentrates on the actions of the two governments after President Salinas and his team approached U.S. negotiators in 1990. Very little has been done on the pre-Salinas period. The interaction of MEXUS and President Miguel de la Madrid’s government is particularly well documented by the UT archive and should be of interest to U.S.-Mexico research for years to come.”

Founded in 1951 under the auspices of the Council of the Americas and still active today as the North American Business Committee, the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee was a binational private enterprise organization that worked to build bilateral consensus within the private sector on economic issues of public policy. But before the early 1980s, as historian George W. Grayson writes in his recent history The Mexico-U.S. Business Committee: Catalyst for the North American Free Trade Agreement, “casualness, flexible agendas, modest attendance, and informal meetings characterized sessions” of MEXUS. That changed in 1981 when Rodman C. Rockefeller became chairman of the U.S. Council. Rockefeller was determined to “renew and reinvigorate” participation in the organization. Under his leadership and that of his Mexican counterpart Carlos Rojas Magnon, chairman of CEMAI, the Consejo Empresarial Mexicano para Asuntos Internacionales, MEXUS focused and intensified its efforts to encourage the liberalization of bilateral trade policy. “By the 1980s,” recalls Herzstein, “Mexico’s government and business were increasingly populated by energetic, very well-educated young leaders, many of whom had attended universities in the U.S. or Europe. They saw economic, political, and social possibilities that had not been realized in Mexico. They were ready to change things, and notions being advanced by MEXUS coincided with their own views and received their prompt support.”

The early 1980s were a watershed period for U.S.-Mexico relations. Protectionism characterized the politics of both countries, with Mexico wary of the economic leviathan to its north, and the United States uneasy about labor competition. The U.S. economy was in recession, and the Mexican economy in a state of crisis. In 1982, President José López Portillo stunned the international markets by nationalizing the Mexican banks and imposing strict exchange controls. Capital fled Mexico along with nervous investors. Official channels for dispute resolution and consensus building were not functioning as lawmakers lacked the motivation and vision of the marketplace. In this environment, members of MEXUS agreed that decisive action was needed. They saw an opportunity at their 1982 plenary meeting in Ixtapa, Mexico, when there was “a hiatus between Mexican administrations … and the designated officials for the next term are seeking business’s advice on economic policy much more than is the case once they and their policies are in place.”

In their paper for the 1982 meeting in Ixtapa, U.S. Council members Erb and Herzstein presented their call for action. The first step was a bilateral framework agreement to establish the ground rules for trade:

“This behind-the-scenes view of the origins and early development of NAFTA will be an invaluable resource for researchers looking at it from many angles as far into the future as we can imagine,” says Ann Hartness, head librarian.
a significant partner for long-term trade and investment. Prospects for renewed growth in trade and investment between the two nations would be enhanced if the two governments made progress toward a mutually acceptable commercial agreement.”

While MEXUS members intentionally maintained a low profile—they were known for their “non-papers” that described key talking points for the use of Mexican and American policymakers—they began deliberate and targeted efforts in the U.S. and Mexico. Their early action plan included, “a meeting in the U.S. arranged by the Commerce Department or the USTR’s Office; a meeting in San Antonio during the visit there of high Mexican officials, including President-elect de la Madrid; and a smaller meeting in Mexico than the one in Xxtapa with no more than 10 American business persons with a similar number of Mexican counterparts.” Always aware of how the public could be distrustful of business interests, they noted, “Some concern was expressed that even a meeting of that size would attract negative and counterproductive Mexican press attention.”

The committee’s work achieved a breakthrough in February 1985 at a meeting of MEXUS members with Mexican President de la Madrid at Los Pinos, the presidential palace. “My friends, Mexican and American businessmen,” de la Madrid said, “I agree that Mexico must seek, together with its trading partners and especially with the United States of America, a frame of reference that will give us all greater assurances and thus make it possible to plan exporting efforts that are so necessary for the country’s economic recovery.” Signaling a significant shift in Mexican policy, he continued, “The convenience of a bilateral treaty between the U.S. and Mexico to cover the basic aspects of our economic relations has been mentioned. The Mexican government is willing to consider an arrangement [of] this nature.” Herzstein recalls that de la Madrid’s speech, “even though worded in a rather dry and undramatic way, caught the attention of the business leaders. The President obviously took pains to be sure we heard the message: the next day Rodman, Guitty and I were called to Commerce Secretary Hector Hernández’s office, where he asked us to help see that this message got attention in the U.S. media.”

After President de la Madrid’s groundbreaking speech, Mexico made rapid advances toward trade liberalization with the United States. In an op-ed for the New York Times Herzstein wrote that the shared border could “bring enormous benefits if suspicious neighbors are willing to acknowledge their joint destiny and permit greater economic integration.” Mexico entered GATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, in 1986. In November 1987, the bilateral framework agreement that MEXUS had advocated since the beginning of the decade was signed.

Barely had the ink dried on the framework agreement than MEXUS was pushing for the next objective: a full free trade agreement. In a 1988 letter to Presidents-elect George H. W. Bush and Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Rockefeller and Juan Elek, then chairman of CEMAI, urged that the leaders “make steady progress toward a comprehensive agreement to liberalize, and eventually remove, obstacles to trade and investment between our two countries. This measure will enable enterprises and workers to combine their talents, capital, and technology to compete more effectively in global markets and will promote development in both countries.” Within six years the agreement had been negotiated by Bush and Salinas, and signed by the Clinton administration. “MEXUS developed a consensus among key Mexican business leaders in favor of a comprehensive trade and investment agreement [FTA],” Erb remarks about the Business Committee’s contributions to the landmark agreement. “Thus when President Salinas announced his support for an FTA he had a foundation of support that allowed him to confront the protectionism that had been common in the Mexican business community until then. In the U.S., as a result of the Business Committee’s work major corporations and business organizations lined up in support of the NAFTA soon after the Bush-Salinas agreement to open FTA negotiations.”

In 1996, Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo presented Rodman C. Rockefeller with the Orden Mexicana del Águila Azteca, the highest decoration given by Mexico to foreign nationals. In his acceptance speech, Rockefeller described his work with the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee: “We promoted an exciting, powerful, novel idea—that the private sector has the power to provoke change. Through our ideas and our capital, we could influence public policy, economies and people’s well being. Imagine our excitement when President Miguel de la Madrid, and subsequently President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, not only believed in the concept but openly espoused it for the future of Mexico.”

At the February 2007 conference on NAFTA, participants examined the impact of the agreement—positive and negative—and analyzed the negotiation process to “understand who benefited and who lost after the implementation of the treaty.” The Benson Collection hosted a reception and exhibit highlighting key documents from the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee archives. The display also featured a few of the hundreds of books and journals available in the library that examine the history and consequences of NAFTA. Mexican and American businessmen and women, policymakers, and academics continued their discussions from the conference over wine and quesadillas. “It was an exciting event,” observes head librarian Ann Hartness, “but the Benson Collection’s work has just begun. The archives receive thorough cataloging, preservation, and a detailed online inventory [available at http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/]. As more collection material gets digitized, scholars will be able to begin their investigations on the Internet, though for the foreseeable future a visit to the library for immersion in the collection will be necessary to get the full scope and context of the history.”

The Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection is the special collection library and archives at the University of Texas for materials by and about Latin America and Latinos in the United States. Begun in 1921 with the purchase of the extensive private library of Mexican bibliophile Genaro García, the Benson Collection now holds nearly one million bound volumes and four thousand linear feet of archives. One of many recent exciting additions to the Benson Collection, the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee archives illustrate the depth of the library’s and the university’s commitment to the study of the U.S. relationship with Mexico and other Latin American countries. The Benson Collection is currently working to acquire more archives from the committee—from both the American and Mexican sides—to fully document the historical negotiations that led to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Christian Kelleher is the Archivist for the Benson Latin American Collection of the University of Texas Libraries.
TRANSLATING BEYOND CULTURE:
My Study Abroad Experience in Chile

by Laura Coco

WHEN I ANNOUNCED TO MY FRIENDS AND FAMILY that I would be traveling to Valparaiso, Chile, to study abroad for six months, the first question they had was usually, “Where?” Chile is a relatively unfamiliar area to most Texans, even to me, but it was that mysteriousness (and the hundreds of miles of coastline) that drew me to it. After living there for six months, I was able to absorb the history, culture, and language of Chile, and through e-mails home I shared what I learned with my friends and family.

My correspondence home probably sounded as if I was living in constant excitement. Within the first few weeks, I had met the President of Chile and traveled to the driest desert in the world. While in the desert, I went on a six-hour bike ride to see the most beautiful sunset in the world at the Valley of the Moon, but was grossly unprepared with only twelve ounces of water. After arriving at the Valley (and after many failed attempts at buying water from other tourists), I came to a realization that, in hindsight, was painfully obvious: after the sun sets, it is dark. In the small town of San Pedro I was lucky to find a bike with gears, let alone one with a headlight, so I made the three-hour ride home in complete darkness in a single file line with eight other friends. Besides minor mishaps—such as when one person stopped and the rest of the line came crashing down on top of him—I survived the experience to e-mail the story home and practically give my mother a heart attack.

Becoming the fifth member of a Chilean family was my favorite part of this study abroad experience. I was welcomed into a family as a sister of two little brothers and was encouraged to call my host parents Mom and Dad. They invited me to Friday night movie night, when the whole family piled into the parents’ bed to watch a movie and eat junk food. I gladly jumped right in, literally, making for a crowded bed but a great chance to bond with my new family. My little brothers’ favorite thing to do was to jump out from behind desks, tables, or doors to scare me—a joke that was only made more hilarious if it caused me to spill hot soup. My host dad had a dry sense of humor and loved to discuss politics with me over dinner. My host mom was a full-time housewife who took on all of the responsibilities of the household while wearing high heels and flawless makeup. They treated the language barrier with a sense of humor and patience, and eventually helped me improve my Spanish skills to near-fluency.

When my own parents decided to visit, I was excited at the thought of finally having something familiar in a strange land. What didn’t cross my mind was the fact that, since my dad is deaf and neither
of my parents knows Spanish, I would be translating from English to Sign Language to Spanish. Although this was exhausting, I was happy to be the conduit of communication between two sets of parents—biological and Chilean. My parents and I visited the School for the Deaf in Valparaiso, where thirty deaf students shared a handful of computers and no textbooks, a sharp contrast to the Texas School for the Deaf, where there are hundreds of students studying in classrooms equipped with cutting-edge technology. The school’s director told us that no deaf Chilean student has the opportunity to go to college because the government provides no funding for interpreters. When the students met my dad, a deaf man with a Ph.D., they were given hope for a better future and learned that … the language barrier increased even more because Chilean Sign Language is different from American Sign Language. But somehow everyone managed to communicate and understand each other. My parents left Chile with thirty new pen pals and a greater appreciation for the Americans with Disabilities Act.

When friends and family read my e-mails home, they started to wonder if I ever went to school. Although I was enrolled in classes, four-day weekends and frequent holidays allowed me to travel to Chiloé, a haunted island in southern Chile, to Argentina for the most delicious meat in the world, and to La Serena where I star-gazed through the world’s largest telescope. I also went sand-boarding, parachuting, ate eggs cooked in a geyser, tasted llama, and taught English twice a week to a classroom of forty young Chileans.

Understandably, adjusting to life back in the States was difficult. During the past six months, my “normal” had become spontaneously hopping on a bus and traveling to new cities, meeting new people, and trying new food. To ease back into life in the U.S., I kept in close contact with the friends I made in Chile and shared my stories and photos with anyone who would listen. It is only now, six months after returning from Chile, that I am able to fully appreciate my experience there and to understand how it has enriched my life.

Laura Coco is a senior in the undergraduate program in Latin American Studies. Her study abroad experience in Chile was made possible through a Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Travel Scholarship. ✹
Gabriel Pérez-Barreiro, the curator of Latin American Art at UT’s Blanton Museum of Art, was recently chosen to be chief curator of the Mercosul Biennial, which takes place in the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre in the southern state of Rio Grande do Sul. Mercosul, or Mercosur in Spanish (from Mercado Común del Sur in Spanish or Mercado Comum do Sul in Portuguese), is a regional free trade agreement established in 1991 among the South American nations of Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Paraguay (Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru currently have associate member status). The Biennial emerged in 1996 as an attempt by business and artistic leaders in Porto Alegre to establish their city as an alternative to the Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo cultural axis and the dominance of the São Paulo Biennial. While the economic alliance eventually failed, the Mercosul Biennial achieved greater success as it asserted a regional, South American identity in contrast to the international model used in São Paulo.

Gabriel has used this opportunity to explore an alternative model for exhibiting contemporary art, one that emphasizes the role of education in making the work of art comprehensible to the viewer. The solution that he eventually developed is based on the idea of “the third bank of the river,” the title of a 1962 short story by Brazilian author João Guimarães Rosa. In this story, a man decides, suddenly and inexplicably, to live on a boat in the middle of a river on whose banks he had previously lived a normal life with his family. After a time, his family is forced to accept the man’s stubbornness, and the ecology of the river itself becomes changed by his presence as the third bank of the river. For Gabriel, “This metaphor of a third bank resonates on many levels with a deeply human and contemporary need to move beyond the binary oppositions that structure our lives.”
Having known Gabriel for several years and addressed some of the issues of art education in my own work, I was eager to sit down with him and find out more about his involvement with the Biennial.

EA: I was wondering if you could begin by describing the process by which you were chosen to become the curator of the Biennial.

GPB: Well, the invitation really came out of the blue. I was never expecting it, mostly because I was familiar with the Biennial, and they had a structure—which was a Brazilian chief curator and then a curator from each of the countries of the Mercosul bloc—and I did not fit any of those categories. But I did know the person who had founded the Biennial, Justo Werlang. He had been president of the first edition Biennial and vice president of the following five and was about to be elected president of the sixth and, but I did not know any of that. He was just someone I knew in his activities as a collector and as president of the Iberê Camargo Foundation with which I had some contact because I had gone there to give a talk a few years ago about the Blanton. So he was someone who was very much in my peripheral vision.

Justo and I met in Buenos Aires exactly a year ago at the ArteBA art fair and he said, “I really want to meet with you—there are a few things on my mind and I would just like to get your feedback.” So we went for a coffee and he sent me an e-mail with what he identified as the critical issues for the Biennial. It was the kind of thing that I love talking about—cultural policy—and I thought he just wanted an outside perspective to help him think through some of these ideas, but we ended up having a four-hour coffee. And we were talking about the major challenges, which were the repetition of the model, the fact that the current generation of Brazilian curators did not know Latin American art the way an earlier generation had, and at the end he asked me to send in a proposal.

EA: How did these issues with past Biennials develop as problems? Did Justo arrive at these criticisms on his own, or did they come from the general public?

GPB: I would not want to give the impression that there was a major crisis. I think what Justo was doing was to anticipate problems rather than try to solve them after they have already happened. It is an event that gets almost a million visitors, so there is a general acceptance of it, people are excited about it. I think when we started to dig under the surface, the question was not so much “What are people criticizing?” it was “Is this Biennial responding to needs in the right way?”

The event is like a parachute that just lands once every two years and by the time the public gets used to it, it goes away and two years later there is something different. That was making the Biennial into a sort of theme park—it is a problem that all biennials are facing.

EA: I was wondering how you came up with the idea of the Third Bank—were you already familiar with the work of Guimarães Rosa or did someone suggest him to you? Also Paulo Freire—I think it is very striking that you chose two Brazilian intellectuals to form the theoretical underpinnings of the exhibition. I wanted to find out more about how you came to these choices and whether you see them as ameliorating the fact that you are not Brazilian?

GPB: It is really funny because everything is relative—Rio Grande do Sul has a relationship with Brazil that is like the relationship of Texas to the United States—they are very proud of their separate identity. I thought people would welcome the fact that I was using the work of a Brazilian writer, but the first thing they said was, “Yeah, but Guimarães Rosa is from Minas Gerais, not Rio Grande do Sul,” which had not even crossed my mind.

That was not my first idea—at first I was thinking through the structure, the issue of regional versus global—either the exhibition could be very local, focusing only on the countries of Mercosul or the Benetton model, “Holding hands across the planet,” like the São Paulo Biennial. I kept thinking that both models were problematic and that there had to be a third way. I came across the idea of the Third Bank about eight years ago in a song by Caetano Veloso, and I thought it was such a great idea that I would have to use it some
EA: It seems that the educational component is a major aspect of the Biennial—how did you end up choosing Luis Camnitzer to be in charge of this part?

GPB: He was definitely the first person I spoke to, the first person I invited to work with me on this. It was clear from the first conversations with Justo that this was going to deal with education in a very serious way, education in the broader sense, with the visitors. It was really the question of what do you do with this audience, with an audience that is not the art world because most biennials are made for people like me. The first person I thought of was Luis. I felt like I needed someone who has thought more about this than I have, someone who has dealt with Latin American pedagogy in a way that I have not. Most of my debate is informed by issues in American or European museums and the issues are different in Brazil. Luis is very familiar with both worlds. He is very connected to that tradition in Latin America, but also knows the American scene very well, and we were always talking about the differences between them.

EA: And this is based on his work as an artist?

GPB: More on his work as an educator.

EA: I am not very familiar with his work as an educator.

GPB: It’s funny, because that is how I met him the first time. I did a workshop with him in Madrid in 1999 or 2000 called Art and Education: The Ethics of Power and it was a life-changing experience. It was really amazing—I thought this is someone who has such a clear and wise structure for thinking about art education. He never heard his living as an artist—he was not commercially successful for most of his life and had a day job teaching art, which he took really seriously. That is most of what we talked about, not his art work. As we got more involved, he got more excited about it. He did not realize the potential of the project we were dealing with and, really, neither did I. As we went through those first months, he would tell me that it was his life’s project. No one had ever put him in the position of saying, “Here are a million people, here are two hundred and fifty thousand teachers”—the scale of the project is out of control. To not scare him, I would lie about the numbers and get him excited about it, then release them to him little by little.

EA: I was wondering about the possible connections between your ideas for this Biennial and the structure of America/Americas (the exhibition of the American and Latin American permanent collections at the Blanton)—I saw a continuity in the theme of what I refer to as anti-regionalism—was this conscious for you, is it something you have been thinking about for a long time?

GPB: Well, anti-regionalism is hard, those are two very loaded words. I tend to think about it as cultural geography—it’s like a Third Bank thing, like the question of whether Fabián Marcaccio is Argentinean or American, what we did was turn around and say that is not the right question—we need to change the categories and be able to talk about him being both of those things. Its not an either/or situation—your life is an accumulation of contexts, not a zero sum. If we manage to get rid of that division in the museum, what do we do with something called the Mercosul Biennial? Why do we assume that the artists live in a bubble? I think there are a lot of parallels—thinking about America/Americas really helped prepare me for the Biennial.

EA: Do not know if you want to answer the question of how this has been affecting your work at the Blanton (laughing).

GPB: That is fine—I should answer that question. Actually, it’s impossible. I am supposed to be doing 50 percent at the Blanton and 50 percent at the Biennial, but actually I am doing 150 percent at both. It was innocent and cute to think I could hold two jobs in two different countries and continents. Actually, it has been fine—the museum has been really flexible in allowing me to do this and giving me the structure to do it—I have been able to maintain all of my obligations at the museum. The only good thing about it is you get a lot of air miles and sometimes can get upgraded.

EA: In conclusion, I have been thinking about the fact that UT has a strong tradition of interaction with Brazil in Latin American Studies. It seems that a lot of people at UT are probably interested in this project because it has the potential to create more relationships and improve ties between both the region of Latin America and Brazil, and I was wondering how you see that, the potential or what has already happened; also the idea that cultural exchange should not be a one-way street, but should go both ways?

GPB: That is a really important principle, and I think that is the big challenge for area studies in general that traditionally have been based on a Cold War model—a them and us mentality. This search for more collaborative, two-way projects is really important. At the museum, we are starting a new initiative to bring more artists-in-residence. We are just signing an agreement with the Iberê Camargo Foundation in Porto Alegre to bring a Brazilian artist-in-residence to UT with the Brazil Center, so we have been doing some of that before and are starting to formalize those arrangements. We are talking to a group in Argentina about having a bilateral exchange so we would partner a UT faculty artist with an artist in Argentina and they would host each other for a few months. I think there is a lot of potential in those kinds of relationships because they are organic—they figure out where their interests are. I am excited to see what will come out of it in the future and if we can keep working those relationships, because there is a lot of curiosity and excitement on both sides.

Erin Aldana is a Ph.D. candidate in art history, specializing in contemporary Brazilian art. She became acquainted with Gabriel during an internship she served at the Blanton.
RAPPOPORT CENTER INVESTIGATES
AFRO-COLOMBIAN TERRITORIAL RIGHTS
by Karen Engle

The Islas del Rosario form part of a national park off Colombia’s Caribbean coastline. Isla Grande can be reached from Cartagena in a speedboat in an hour and is a popular tourist destination. It is populated by some of Colombia’s wealthiest “whites,” and has a local “native” community. The latter are Afro-descendants who mostly make their living through the tourist industry. They trace their history to the arrival of slaves in nearby Barú in the 1600s. Many of these slaves eventually purchased their freedom, and subsisted from fishing, collecting fruit, and tending livestock in the Islas del Rosario.

On March 23, 2007, I spent the day on Isla Grande with two Latin American Studies graduate students, Josh Clark and Sylvia Romo. We traveled to the island on a tourist boat with our “guide,” Luis, an Afro-Colombian activist. He was the only Afro-descendant on the boat, as locals generally travel on a small craft that, due to the direction and strength of the current, is often unable to return the same day.

We exited the boat with mission in hand. We had spent the previous week with six other UT students in Bogotá and in the nearby displaced community of Soacha, investigating the territorial rights of Afro-Colombians for a report to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The majority of the Afro-descendants with whom we had met were from the Pacific coast region, so we decided to spend some time in the Caribbean, where we had heard there were a number of urgent and legally complicated matters. One of those matters was on Isla Grande.

As we embarked on our mission and headed toward our destination, some of the German tourists on the boat began to follow us. The official guide of the boat called to them to follow her instead; they were going snorkeling.

We went to visit community leaders and Javier Morales, or “Cuco” as he is known on the island. Cuco is an Afro-Colombian who moved to Isla Grande forty-five years ago from Barú. He was eight-years-old at the time. Because he worked as a child and his family had few to no resources, he told us, he never learned to write nor even ride a bicycle.

More than twenty years ago, he and his wife moved to and began tending four hectares of land near the edge of the island. Called “Buena Esperanza” (“Good Hope”), the property is registered in the name of Garcés, a “white” man who rarely comes to the island, and essentially has given Cuco free rein over the property. Cuco is raising his family on the land and has constructed a restaurant and some small, eco-friendly, guest facilities there. He charges the equivalent of US$70 a day for a simple, palm-thatched one-room hut for two (with meals). The price is a bargain on this island.

The day before our visit, nine police officers, several authorities from the Colombian Institute of Rural Development (INCODER), and a representative of the Ministry of the Environment arrived at Cuco’s door with orders to evict him from the property. They left six or seven hours later with full stomachs (thanks to their prospective evictee’s notorious hospitality) and after having engaged in extended conversation with
Cuco, community leaders, and over 100 residents from the nearby village of Orika. When the officials boarded the boat back to the mainland, the situation remained unresolved.

Although the police arrived with an eviction notice, the government’s original aim seems to have been to pressure Garcés to sign an agreement for the use and enjoyment of the land in exchange for rent and acknowledgment that the land belongs to the state. In fact, the Colombian government has designated the island’s lands as “baldíos reservados de la Nación” (“uncultivated national lands”) and, since 2001, has been involved in a process of “recuperating” the island. By the end of March 2007, it had reached rental agreements with nearly 80 percent of the island’s occupants—mostly white owners of vacation houses and hotels. INCODER has served eviction notices to many of those who have refused to enter into this agreement. Because Garcés has refused to agree to pay rent, Cuco was the recipient and subject of the eviction.

As we drank coffee in Cuco’s open-air restaurant, we tried to get a grasp on what had happened the previous day. We arrived with a copy of Cartagena’s morning newspaper with a front-page mention of the events, and a quarter-page inside article under the headline “Nativos Impedieron Diligencia: Desalojo Choco con Problema Ignorado” (“Natives Obstruct the Law: Eviction Clashes with a Neglected Issue”). The neglected issue to which the newspaper refers is that the expulsion notice would either directly displace or force an agreement between a black occupant and the state. In this sense, it would seem that Cuco’s attempted eviction and the protest it incited were unforeseen results of the implementation of the state’s plan.

For native community leaders, however, the eviction order had clear and foreseeable implications for Afro-Colombian rights to property across the region. Indeed, Cuco has become a cause célèbre for the native community that is attempting to gain title over part of the island using Ley 70, a 1993 law that created a process by which Afro-Colombian communities could apply for collective title for the lands they occupy. On its face, the part of the law that facilitates collective titling does not apply to the Caribbean region. Yet, Colombia has a progressive Constitutional Court, and some have argued that it should read such coverage into the spirit of the law. In response, INCODER insists that the island does not comprise lands that are subject to titling under Ley 70. Cuco’s attempted eviction has provided a way for the community to pressure the government to move forward.

Even when Afro-Colombian issues are considered in discussions about a free trade agreement, the extent to which they result from structural discrimination is often overlooked.

---

STUDENT DELEGATION TO COLOMBIA

From the participants . . .

“The trip helped to solidify my interest in human rights law. It was extremely beneficial to learn about human rights in a real life setting and meet people whose lives have been directly affected by the issues that we are studying.”
— Amber VanSchuyver

“The experience was engaging and humbling at the same time, and I hope that with the report that we will submit to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights we will increase the pressure on the Colombian state to protect and respect all of its citizens.”
— Paul Di Blasi

---

Left to right: 1) Cuco’s restaurant on Isla Grande del Rosario, 2) Delegation members meeting with residents of Isla Grande del Rosario, 3) Cuco in his restaurant
forward with an official consideration of its Ley 70 application. Cuco has added to that pressure by, thus far, refusing to sign any agreement with the government for use of the land.

The case of Isla Grande del Rosario is representative of many of the issues at play on Colombia’s Atlantic coastline. Although Afro-Colombian communities have only recently begun to organize and identify themselves as culturally distinct in the region in the last ten years, the prevalence of both direct and systemic discrimination based on race is undeniable. In the department of Bolívar, where Cartagena and the Islas del Rosario are located, 66 percent of the population is black. Although Cartagena is known for its cosmopolitan appeal and world-class hotels and restaurants, it is also one of the poorest cities in the country. The poverty rate exceeds 75 percent, while 25 percent of the population lacks basic necessities.

In general, we were told that the departments in the Atlantic region have the lowest economic development indicators in the country, with the exception of the Pacific department of Chocó. The region has a high rate of infant mortality, and several of the departments have among the highest levels of malnutrition in the country.

President Bush and Colombian President Alvaro Uribe met in Bogotá on March 11, the day after the UT students arrived, and again in Washington on May 2, 2007. These visits, and some U.S. congressional opposition to the prospective free trade agreement, have brought Colombia back to the attention of the media in the United States. Many activists in both countries have tried to use (opposition to) the free trade agreement to push the Bush administration to pressure the Uribe government to improve its human rights record and significantly reduce paramilitary activity. Some members of Congress are refusing to consider a free trade agreement until the Uribe government has shown measurable and sustained progress in these areas.

Even when Afro-Colombian issues are considered in discussions about a free trade agreement, the extent to which they result from structural discrimination is often overlooked. Indeed, when economic disparities in Colombia are discussed, the disproportionate effects of poverty on Afro-descendants are often ignored. An Associated Press article from April 22, 2007, for example, is entitled “Poverty, Crime Cloud Cartagena’s Tourism Hopes,” but only makes one somewhat veiled reference
The UT Colombia Delegation with members of the youth dance group La Palma Negra in Soacha, a displaced community south of Bogotá. Standing (from left): Paul Di Blasi (Law), four members of La Palma, Elizabeth Walsh (Delegation Coordinator), Josh Clark (LLILAS), Prof. Karen Engle, and Alysia Childs (Anthropology); kneeling (from left): Nicki Alam (Public Policy), Amber VanShuyver (Law), Kendall Zanowiak (LLILAS), Sylvia Romo (LLILAS), and member of La Palma (not pictured, Sarah Cline, Rapoport Center).

to race. Seemingly as a way to inform its readers that Afro-descendants live in the region, the article quotes a priest who runs the Afro-Caribbean Cultural Center. The article points to Cartagena’s 15 percent unemployment rate to support its claim that in Cartagena “the gulf between Colombia’s rich and poor is at its widest.” Yet, it fails to discuss which parts of the population are most likely to be poor. The AP story reflects the way that these issues are often discussed on the Caribbean coast itself, even among some of those who would be identified as “black.” Discussions of disproportionate effects based on race draw attention to a painful history of slavery, exclusion, and persistent power differentials from which many would prefer to distance themselves.

Still, as the tourism industry has expanded and been dominated by mega-projects in the Caribbean, Afro-Colombian communities have been literally pushed to the margins, where their existence continues to be threatened. It is estimated that 50 percent of internally displaced Colombians are of African descent. Their displacement, of course, is not solely a direct result of armed conflict. With regard to the Caribbean, the early 1970s’ development of Boca Grande, the tourist beach center of Cartagena, led to one of the first forcible displacements of between 2,500 and 3,000 residents of a fishing village, most of whom were Afro-Colombian. Continued development along the coastline between Cartagena and Barranquilla has led to similar displacements for the past thirty-five years.

Afro-Colombians are likely to be further marginalized by the free trade agreement that has been proposed between the countries. Like our foreign policy toward Central America in the 1980s, our economic and political relationships with Colombia once again point us to the ways in which the United States is implicated in human rights violations “abroad.” In fact, the students can attest to the fact that Colombia is not so far away; it might well have taken them longer to drive to South Padre Island in spring break traffic than to fly to Bogotá.

Karen Engle is the Cecil D. Redford Professor in Law and Director of the Bernard and Audre Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice at the University of Texas at Austin.
CIVIL SOCIETY IS EXPLODING AROUND THE WORLD and in Latin America in particular. In countries like Mexico, civil society organizations are stepping up to deliver critical services, to pressure government reform, and to build important new networks of collaboration. According to the Federal Register of Civil Society Organizations (CSO), in Mexico from 2000–2006 there was an increase in the number of registered CSOs from 1,222 to 2,236 representing an 82 percent growth rate. The actual number is much higher as this figure does not capture the many unregistered CSOs and community groups working informally throughout Mexico.

According to Manuel Arango, the founder of the Mexican Center for Philanthropy, civil society in Mexico is best thought of as progressing through three different and important historical periods. From the 1500s to the mid-1800s marked the period when the Catholic Church was the dominant Mexican institution organizing community life. It was the central provider of charitable relief to the poor. The second period, from the 1860s to the 1960s, marked the emergence of the state as the principal provider of social services in education, health, and human services. The third period extends from the 1960s to the present and is marked by a rapid growth in citizen participation and a developing civil society sector. Mexico is now emerging from a culture of paternalism into an era in which civil society organizations have greater influence over the way in which public problems are framed and addressed. All of which raises interesting and significant questions regarding the role of civil society organizations in Mexico and across the region.

But what exactly do we mean by civil society? The term has come to cover all formal and informal organizations that use public and private funds to formulate solutions to community problems and implement programs aimed at addressing these needs. Civil society organizations include everything from local associations and unions, to human service delivery organizations, to groups that advocate for policy changes.

Operating between the state and the market, these organizations are both a way for citizens to express and enact their values and a way in which basic human needs are met.

With an eye to understanding better the role of civil society in Mexico and building on UT’s longstanding close ties with universities in Mexico, the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service at UT Austin developed the Bilateral Civil Society Educational Partnership (BCSEP) program in collaboration with four Mexican universities: Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP); El Colegio Mexiquense in Toluca; Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM or “the Tec”) in Mexico City; and Universidad de las Américas (UDLA) in Puebla. The formal goal of this effort was to move students in exchanges between Mexico and the U.S. The end result of this multi-year collaboration has been a much deeper appreciation of the fundamental challenges and opportunities facing Mexican civil society organizations. Funded through a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the partnership coalesced in response to a Higher Education in Development/USAID request for funding proposal. The RGK Center was able to identify viable partners for the BCSEP with expertise in Mexican civil society studies. The partnership represented a strategic blend of teaching institutions and research institutions.

The principal work of BCSEP involves student exchanges through an innovative Civil Society Summer Institute (CSSI). This program is an intensive six-week term designed for Mexican graduate students who cannot participate in a full academic semester exchange. Mexican students take two civil society graduate courses at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. The courses focus on the nonprofit sector with an emphasis on practical learning through case studies, fieldwork, and nonprofit site visits. Courses in the past have included: Improving the Management of Nonprofit Organizations in North America, Contemporary Issues in Civil Society Studies, and Working with Boards,
CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS INCLUDE EVERYTHING FROM LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS AND UNIONS, TO HUMAN SERVICE DELIVERY ORGANIZATIONS, TO GROUPS THAT ADVOCATE FOR POLICY CHANGES.
Ambassador Bob Strauss has had a career that few people can match. From modest beginnings in the west Texas town of Stamford, this graduate of the University of Texas and the UT School of Law has risen to the commanding heights of the worlds of law, business, and government. He founded one of the country’s most influential law firms, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. Corporate leaders at home and abroad have relied on his negotiating talents and business savvy. Presidents from Lyndon Johnson to George W. Bush have turned to him for advice and counsel. He has served as U.S. Special Trade Representative, the president’s personal envoy to the Middle East peace process, and America’s last ambassador to the Soviet Union and its first to the newly reborn Russia.

But Ambassador Strauss’s biggest legacy also may be his most generous: endowing the creation of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law at UT. The Strauss Center was founded as a multidisciplinary center dedicated to promoting policy-relevant discussion and research on pressing issues in global affairs.

“Globalization is rapidly remaking the world as we know it,” says James M. Lindsay, the center’s Director and the Tom Slick Chair for International Affairs at the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs. “It is creating new sources of wealth as the global economy expands. But as we saw on 9/11, it is also spawning new problems and vulnerabilities. The Strauss Center was created to examine how these issues are going to affect our world in the 21st century—and to generate workable policy solutions that the public can embrace and policymakers can enact.”

The Strauss Center formally began operations in late 2006. It is part of the broader commitment that UT President Bill Powers has made to improve and expand the university’s programs in global affairs. “President Powers was one of the guiding forces behind the center’s creation,” according to Francis J. Gavin, the center’s Director of Studies. “We now have a unique opportunity to make a major contribution to life on the UT campus and to national and international policy debates.”

One of the Strauss Center’s guiding principles is to bridge traditional academic divides and operate campus-wide. This commitment to multidisciplinary work is built into the center’s very DNA: it was founded as the result of a collaboration among the College of Liberal Arts, the LBJ School of Public Affairs, the School of Law, and the Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation. The UT faculty who have joined the center as fellows during its first six months in operation have come from a half-dozen different schools on campus.

“The tremendous diversity of our fellows in terms of their professional training and experience is the center’s great strength,” says Gavin.
"Issues in world affairs today are complex and multidimensional. Finding answers to these problems requires mobilizing experts from across a range of disciplines."

A second guiding principle behind the Strauss Center is a commitment to bridging the gap between the world of ideas found at UT and the world of action beyond the campus. The center actively seeks to involve not just scholars but also policymakers, business leaders, and nongovernmental officials in its work.

"UT faculty are doing research that can help people solve real-world problems," Lindsay says. "At the same time, policymakers, business leaders, and nongovernmental activists bring insights to the discussion that enrich the research we do. It's win-win for everyone."

The Strauss Center is equally committed to bringing a diverse set of views into the discussion. "Throughout his career, Ambassador Strauss has had a unique ability to transcend partisan politics and to bring together different cultures, nations, and organizations," observes Gavin. "We want to do the same thing here at UT. We want to be known as the place that encourages broad and respectful discussion."

The Strauss Center's senior staff bring considerable academic and practical experience of their own to global affairs. Lindsay is an award-winning political scientist who has more than a dozen books on various aspects of American government and foreign policy to his credit. He was previously Vice President and Director of Studies at the Council of Foreign Relations in New York. Earlier in his career he served on the staff of the National Security Council under Bill Clinton. Gavin is the first Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs at the LBJ School and a distinguished diplomatic historian. He is also the director of the Next Generation Project, a multyear national initiative designed to identify new leaders in American foreign policy. Jill Angelo, the Strauss Center's Associate Director and an alumnus of the UT School of Law, served in the White House of George W. Bush. She also has worked in the private sector giving strategic advice and counsel to clients on communications and public policy issues.

The Strauss Center's work spans a wide array of substantive issues. It has four broad programmatic areas: America's role in the world, science and technology, energy and the environment, and global development and governance. Under each of these topics the center operates specific projects that bring together UT faculty with similar interests.

One of the center's first major projects is the Future of North America Initiative. In conjunction with the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies at UT, the center is working to establish a network of researchers at universities and think tanks in Canada, Mexico, and the United States interested in exploring the deepening ties among the three countries. The North America initiative will focus on three key topics: promoting regional economic development, enhancing mutual security, and managing natural and environmental resources. The initiative will assess major economic, demographic, and political trends within North America and evaluate competing policy proposals for shaping the region's future.

"The growing interconnectedness of Canada, Mexico, and the United States is a smaller example of the broader process of globalization," says Lindsay. "It is a natural topic for the Strauss Center to tackle, given UT's tremendous strength in Latin America and the extensive ties the state of Texas has to Mexico."

Collaborations with partner universities will figure prominently in other Strauss Center research efforts. The center already has struck a partnership with the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO), Russia's premier university for the study of world affairs. Under the terms of the collaboration, the Strauss Center and MGIMO will conduct joint research on the major policy challenges created by globalization.

"By working together we can identify where Russian and American interests overlap and where they diverge," says Gavin. "That can help Moscow and Washington develop more productive relations."

The Strauss Center also is collaborating with the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and the European University Institute on a project to analyze the prospects for promoting cooperation among democratic countries on global issues. This summer the three universities hosted a conference on creating a "concert of democracies" that attracted distinguished scholars and former policymakers from around the globe.

The Strauss Center seeks to establish itself as a leader among academic research institutes devoted to global affairs. Its staff recognizes that is an ambitious goal. But they are not intimidated by the task that awaits them.

"Ambassador Strauss's long and distinguished career has set a very high bar for us to reach," says Lindsay. "We plan to reach it."

For more information on the Strauss Center, visit http://www.robertstrausscenter.org
In recent years, Latin America has experienced a rising tide of leftist governments. Hugo Chávez initiated this wave in 1998 by capturing Venezuela’s presidency with radical populist slogans and promises of profound change; he now wants to institute “twenty-first-century socialism.” Then in 2000, for the first time since the violent ouster of Salvador Allende in 1973, a president from the Socialist Party took office in Chile. And in Brazil, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva from the leftist Workers’ Party (PT) won the chief executive office in late 2002. As progressive leaders of different stripes also have been elected in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Uruguay, the left now has the greatest control over government power that it has ever enjoyed in the subcontinent’s history.

The left’s success constitutes a striking reversal of the trends prevailing in the 1990s, when the global downfall of communism and the widespread enactment of market reform seemed to spell the defeat of the left. The pressure of the debt crisis and the failure of inward-looking, protectionist industrialization induced most Latin American governments to adopt the project of the right: They liberalized the economy, exposed domestic producers to stiff international competition, courted foreign capital, and slashed state interventionism. These neoliberal reforms weakened the political base of the left as well. Trade unions lost members and influence; civil society suffered fragmentation; and political parties decayed in collective organization and programmatic orientation.

The recent string of electoral victories therefore came as a surprise. What does this advance of the left mean for Latin America’s socioeconomic and political development? Can the left rectify the many problems that market reforms created, aggravated, or failed to address, such as widespread poverty and weak employment generation? Can the left reinvigorate Latin American democracies, which suffer from deficient accountability and responsiveness? Or does the left threaten hard-won economic stability, such as the low inflation engineered by
neoliberalism? And do some leftist leaders with their radicalism and confrontational tactics endanger the quality and survival of liberal, pluralist democracy?

The Left and the Question of Constraints

Observers disagree on these important questions. Alluding to Chávez’s efforts to extend his influence in South America, a Bush government official worried in 2005 that the present situation poses the most serious threat to U.S. interests since the early 1960s, when the Cuban Revolution inspired and fomented insurrections throughout the region. And a Financial Times columnist in 2002 feared a radical backlash against market reform and predicted that Latin America was moving “back to revolution.” By contrast, some activists and academics hope that Chávez and Bolivia’s first indigenous president, Evo Morales, will challenge the economic constraints imposed by neoliberalism; frontally attack poverty and inequality; and turn their elite-dominated oligarchies into participatory democracies that give the lower classes an effective say in decision-making.

Latin America is too complex, however, to bear out the conservative fears or the progressive hopes. Global and domestic constraints of an economic and political nature leave limited room to maneuver. The region is deeply inserted in the international economy and depends on the capitalist First World for trade, capital, and technology. These links are tightening with the growing speed and volume of financial transactions. Reform measures that foreign investors perceive as irresponsible or threatening are therefore risky. Political-institutional structures also limit drastic change. Liberal democracy has consolidated, especially in the Southern Cone. Where it continues to face threats, a powerful international coalition is determined to defend its basic outlines, if necessary with sanctions. Through constitutional safeguards and institutional checks and balances, liberal democracy hinders efforts at radical transformation, which require the concentration of power.

These economic and political constraints create a dilemma for the Latin American left: Either it seeks to produce improvements inside the established framework, charting a gradual reform course that takes time to deliver. Or it attempts a more frontal assault, but incurs substantial transitional costs and runs the risk of eventual reversal and failure. As several scholars have noted, Latin America’s leftists have divided precisely on this issue, giving rise to two different strands. Given this heterogeneity, any overarching arguments, fears, or hopes about the left in the region are misguided. There is a world of difference between Chile’s Ricardo Lagos and Michele Bachelet, sustained by a stable party coalition, and populist Hugo Chávez, who leads an amorphous mass of followers. Whereas the Chilean presidents represent programmatically oriented, institutionalized, and firmly democratic parties, Chávez acts as the personalistic leader of a fluid, plebiscitarian movement with hegemonic aspirations. Accordingly, Lagos and Bachelet have charted a systematic yet moderate reform course, while Chávez claims to pursue a radical transformation, which he enacts with haphazard decrees.

Most basically, the different strands of the Latin American left divide precisely on the issue of constraints. The Chilean Concertación, Brazilian President Lula, and his Uruguayan counterpart Tabaré Vásquez from the leftist Broad Front have decided to work inside the established economic and political system, change it step by step, and effect improvements through gradual reforms that cumulate over time. By contrast, Venezuela’s Chávez, Bolivia’s Morales, and Ecuador’s new president Rafael Correa claim and seek to break existing constraints. They embark on revamping the representative-democratic political order and want to throw off the yoke of neoliberalism and move toward “twenty-first-century socialism.” Argentina’s Nestor Kirchner oscillates between these two poles, sometimes approximating the Venezuelan firebrand in rhetoric, style, and willfulness, but usually acting more pragmatically in his decision-making.

Which one of these political and policy approaches is more successful and promising? Should sectors who seek to improve the well-being of the poor take the reformist path and make improvements from inside the established system, or bet on the more radical effort to overturn and rebuild this system?

Economic Constraints and the Question of Development

Hugo Chávez proclaims to steer Venezuela toward twenty-first-century socialism. Given the obvious failures of Latin American capitalism and the deficient performance of market reform, this goal has stimulated excitement among some progressive observers. But what exactly does the Venezuelan president have in mind? So far, he has failed to outline his vision in concrete and realistic terms. The disparate
sustenance. In fact, the recent doubling of social programs will then lose their financial rational economic policies and large-scale bound to end at some point. Chávez’s expansionism in the economy, nationalized the hydrocarbon nationalization shows, Evo Morales will need the expertise and capital of foreign companies to develop his country’s gas reserves and thus obtain the voluminous resources required for stimulating domestic development, alleviating misery, and bringing social improvements. Thus, even leaders who claim to challenge global capitalism and trace an alternative development model are in fact constrained. Twenty-first-century socialism will not be achieved any time soon.

Chávez’s policy approach actually has many striking similarities to the oil rentier model that Venezuelan presidents traditionally pursued in boom times. During the bonanza of the 1970s, for instance, the government also boosted public spending, increased state interventionism in the economy, nationalized the oil industry, adopted leftist slogans, and led the Third World in its push for a “new international economic order” that would tame global capitalism and benefit developing countries through significant redistribution. Chávez has brought little innovation to this old pattern: When oil prices skyrocket, Venezuela takes a sharp turn to the left.

But of course, high oil prices sooner or later come down again. The boom of the 1970s was followed by a long bust, which caused painful economic and social losses throughout the 1980s and 1990s. The current boom is also bound to end at some point. Chávez’s expansionary economic policies and large-scale social programs will then lose their financial sustenance. In fact, the recent doubling of public expenditures is utterly unsustainable. It has already fueled the highest rate of inflation in contemporary Latin America, which the president has sought to suppress through price controls, causing deepening scarcities in turn. Thus, even during the present boom, Chávez’s haphazard and surprisingly old-fashioned economic model seems to be reaching its limits.

Anticipating these and other kinds of difficulties, the leftist parties governing Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay have from the beginning adhered to the pragmatic decision to accept prevailing economic and political constraints and use the room for maneuver inside them for effecting improvements. In their view, global capitalism is there to stay; frontal challenges are futile. At the systemic level, there is no alternative; contrary to radical-leftist slogans, no “new world” is possible. But international capitalism offers significant opportunities—not only constraints—for developing countries. Chile, in particular, has attained tremendous export success, which has helped fuel a long growth spurt and a very substantial reduction in poverty. Oppressed by a high tax burden that finances a good deal of “corporate welfare” and regressive social security spending, Brazil has been less successful, but after a steep decline caused by economic stabilization in the mid-1990s, poverty has fallen further under the Lula government; even the shocking levels of income inequality have begun to improve.

Skillful policy reforms can enhance the opportunities offered by the established economic order. Chile has made systematic efforts to upgrade its comparative advantages in international trade; to extend its commercial networks even further; and to invest in human capital through improvements in education and labor training. Thus, countries can better their own position in the global economy. They can also help reform the rules of the game, for instance by combating First World protectionism. With this purpose in mind, Brazil has taken a leading role in international trade negotiations. Thus, the moderate left has worked within the global economic system while forgoing unpromising efforts to challenge it frontally. The resulting socioeconomic improvements are more sustainable than the surprisingly limited accomplishments in Venezuela, where it took Chávez six years to effect a net reduction of poverty, despite the oil boom. By contrast, poverty steadily fell in Chile despite the recession of the late 1990s.

Political Constraints and the Question of Democracy

Corresponding to their stance on economic constraints, Latin America’s radical and moderate left have also diverged in their position on political-institutional constraints. Whereas the Brazilian PT, Chilean socialists, and Uruguayan leftists accept representative democracy, Chávez, Morales, and Correa have sought to transform it towards a (not very well-defined) participatory democracy. In fact, they depict profound institutional change as a precondition for the socioeconomic transformation they have announced. For this purpose, they have convoked constituent assemblies, trying to turn majoritarianism and popular sovereignty against the institutions of liberal, pluralist democracy.

Only Chávez, however, has actually managed to dislodge the established political class, dominate Venezuela’s political institutions, and establish personalistic hegemony. This concentration of power has hollowed out not only pluralist democracy, but also the official steps towards citizen participation. Mass associations have risen and fallen at Chávez’s discretion; the “base” has never managed to restrain this populist leader. Thus, where the left has thoroughly transformed politics, change has moved in a predominantly undemocratic direction. Moreover, Chávez’s power grab has stirred up tremendous polarization and conflict, in turn depressing socioeconomic development. For instance, a ruinous business strike in 2002–2003 helps account for Chávez’s great difficulty in alleviating unemployment and poverty.

Evo Morales, who has followed Chávez in convoking a constituent assembly, has been much less successful in revamping political institutions. Bolivia’s deep cleavages denied him a commanding position in the new assembly, which has been bogged down by disagreements over procedural rules. If Morales manages to transform the procedural framework, liberal democracy is likely to suffer, given the hegemonic tendencies inside his movement and its intolerance of opposition. But contrary to Chávez’s personalistic populism, Morales relies on a mass movement with strong rural and indigenous components. His capture of the government has furthered the political inclusion of ample sectors that previously had little political say. Thus, while Bolivian democracy may suffer in its
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Concertación introduced tripartite negotiations between unions, business, and the state for designing socioeconomic reforms in the early 1990s. Brazil’s PT and Uruguay’s Broad Front instituted participatory budgeting at the municipal level and thus gave citizens direct influence on public resource allocation. By respecting the scale at which popular participation can work properly, these initiatives have attained considerable success. In particular, they have not turned into instruments of plebiscitarian acclamation for populist leaders, as it happens so often with supposedly participatory institutions at the national level, such as referenda. Thus, these reforms have provided “value-added” to existing liberal institutions, rather than suffocating them, as in Chávez’s Venezuela. In sum, gradual efforts to enrich existing institutional structures look more promising than grand schemes to re-found democracy on new and untried bases.

Conclusion
The recent experiences of the Latin Ameri-
can left suggest a paradoxical finding: The
more ambition, the less success. The parties
that have accepted prevailing economic and
political constraints have achieved greater
and more sustainable accomplishments than radical leaders and movements that have tried to overturn these limitations. As European social democracy recognized many decades ago, a frontal assault on established structures entails great costs and risks. For instance, a true socioeconomic transformation requires a concentration of power that undermines liberal safeguards and allows an accountable and unresponsive elite to rule. While pain-
fully slow, a strategy of gradual reform that changes the existing economic and political system from the inside holds greater prospects of long-term success.
Politics is “the strong, slow boring of hard
boards,” as sociologist Max Weber wrote a
century ago. Banging one’s head on the wall
may be heroic, but it is not a promising strat-
gegy, especially for its supposed beneficiaries, Latin America’s poor.

Kurt Weyland is Professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin. His latest book is Bounded Rationality and Policy Diffu-
sion: Social Sector Reform in Latin America (Princeton University Press, 2007).
Carnaval 2007. The city of Salvador, Bahia, in northeastern Brazil, declared its theme: the samba. For one Carnaval group, it was the year of the Samba Lavadeira (Samba of the Washerwoman). More than 3,000 women and children danced in costumes made of bright blue fabric specially printed with black-and-white images of washerwomen. Leading the group, teenage girls carried large metal tubs, clothing, and water, their choreographed dance imitating the movements of washerwomen at work. Several elderly washerwomen, invited as honored guests, came after the young dancers. Following them was a sea of blue parading in front of a large flatbed truck—the trio eléctrico central to Salvador’s Carnaval—that carried Didá, an all-female band whose music pushed the group along the seven-kilometer parade circuit. For three hours, these women—many of them with young children in tow—danced while we completed the circuit, surrounded on all sides by revelers who sang along with the band.

I was fortunate to be there, along with Sue Anderson, an art teacher at the Bentley School in Oakland, California, atop the trio eléctrico, looking down on the festivities. As we began, the dancers performed in front of dozens of TV cameras, with each camera craning in for close-ups of the graceful dancers, powerful musicians, and lively singers. Reporters hopped onto the truck to interview Viviam de Jesus Queirós, Didá’s Cultural Director, who explained, “Carnaval themes are chosen through close observation of the moment in which Didá, and Brazilian society as a whole, is living. The focus is always to appreciate women and their achievements. Today we bring our 2007 theme to the street: Samba of the Washerwoman—Let’s Wash Clothes.”

Since its inception in 1993, Didá Educational and Cultural Association, a nonprofit organization with a mission to educate women and children through the arts, has sought to include women from Salvador’s lowest classes in its activities. Participation in the all-women Carnaval group is free, as opposed to the many groups in Salvador that charge several hundred dollars to participate. To make her costume, each Didá participant receives several yards of material in exchange for 2 kilograms of food, 1 liter of cleaning product, and 10 aluminum cans for recycling. Didá then distributes the food and cleaning products to needy women on International Women’s Day.

Staying true to its roots, Didá’s Carnaval theme paid homage to a class of work characterized by women’s participation. Since Brazil’s early colonial days, Afro-Brazilian women—first as slaves and then as free workers—hand-washed the clothes of the rich. Initially, the slaves used rivers and lakes to complete their task; along the banks of these bodies of water, women came together to work, talk, and sing. Eventually, with access to running water, women took the work into their homes. Today, because of technological advancements, the profession has declined, but washerwomen performed an essential role in Brazilian society until late into the twentieth century. For Carnaval, Didá celebrated their contribution to society.

LLILAS Outreach and Didá

In 2004, Professor Joseph Straubhaar, then-director of the Brazil Center, and I led LLILAS’s first overseas teacher training program, funded by Fulbright-Hays Group Project Abroad: Study Seminar and Curriculum Development Project in Brazil. Fifteen K–12 teachers from Texas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and California completed a four-week seminar in Salvador on the history and culture of Brazil. After the seminar, all participants were required to submit lesson plans based on their experiences in Brazil. These lesson plans are now housed on the LLILAS Outreach Web site and promoted through conference and educator in-service presentations throughout Texas and beyond.

During our residency in Brazil, the Fulbright group met with Didá to learn more about how nonprofit organizations in Salvador help their
THE WORK THAT DIDÁ DOES CAUSES THE COMMUNITY TO EVOLVE, TO KNOW ITS RIGHTS AND THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS . . . UNDERSTANDING THAT ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE WHEN THERE IS RESPECT.”
— NEGUINHO DO SAMBA

communities through educational and cultural programs. “Poor black women empowering themselves through music. This is an important group, an important movement for us to highlight,” comments Prof. Straubhaar, who organized the visit to Didá.

In 1993, Neguinho do Samba, former maestro of Olodum, one of Salvador’s most famous percussion ensembles, created Didá Educational and Cultural Association. Through Didá, which means “power of creation” in Yoruba, Neguinho promoted transformation through the drum. Traditionally, percussion groups in Salvador included only men. Didá was the first group to include—and specifically focus on—women. At the heart of Didá is the drum, and the traditional music and culture it evokes, but Didá also offers a variety of free educational activities in popular forms of art created and maintained by Africans and their descendants.

Didá offers eleven arts courses, ranging from percussion to African dance to theatre, to 600–800 students every year. Many students take city buses, traveling over an hour each way, to get from their neighborhoods in outlying low-income districts to Didá’s school in the center of the city. The school serves basic meals (three daily) to 40 percent of its students and two snacks every day to all of its students. Didá’s other initiatives include the Carnaval group; the band, which has toured nationally and internationally; a technical course in Afro-Brazilian beauty and hair styling; a merchandise store; the Sòdomo project, through which Didá supports its students in partnership with their schools and families; and a new vocational training program that will teach students to make drums and other musical instruments.

Central to all of Didá’s projects is the desire to promote a strong sense of self-esteem, identity, and citizenship through a focus on Afro-Brazilian culture. As Neguinho do Samba describes it, “The work that Didá does causes the community to evolve, to know its rights and the rights of others, its importance and the importance of others, so that we can have a society with more equality and freedom, understanding that anything is possible when there is respect. We all have the right to eat well, live well, and have a good education.”

Inspired by Didá’s social program, Sue Anderson, a participant in LLILAS’s Fulbright seminar, returned to Salvador in 2006. Sue actively sought funding to bring digital cameras and a photo printer to Didá, and spent the summer teaching photography at the school. Working with more than thirty students, ranging in age from 8–22, Sue taught four classes, four days a week. Viviam was so impressed that she immediately planned a show to exhibit the students’ work. The exhibit began as Carnaval 2007 ended—Sue and I had gone to Salvador to install the exhibit. Sue comments, “The project was a huge success and will be continued into the next three summers. Over sixty people attended the opening [of the exhibit in Salvador]. Even more important, to see the sense of pride and self-confidence in the smiles of the students was the real reward of the project. As one student said, ‘I feel like a real artist, I never want to stop making photographs.’”

This ongoing project, which is the direct result of UT’s first Fulbright seminar in Latin America, demonstrates the transformative power of the Fulbright program; both Didá and Sue have benefited from the project. On a larger scale, this project can be used to promote knowledge and understanding of Brazil. In spring 2008, LLILAS Outreach will bring the photo exhibit to Austin. In conjunction with the exhibit, Neguinho do Samba and Viviam de Jesús Queirós will visit Austin for a series of educational events. With support from ArtesAméricas, the joint Performing Arts Center–LLILAS project, Neguinho and Viviam will conduct a series of master classes with university and local musicians. Plans are also underway for a symposium and educator workshop related to Afro-Brazilian culture, women’s issues, and community organizations in Brazil. Following the Austin visit, the exhibit, Neguinho, and Viviam will travel to New Orleans, where the Stone Center for Latin American Studies at Tulane University will organize similar events. LLILAS Outreach’s relationship with Didá has been growing since the Fulbright seminar. Through Neguinho and Viviam’s visit, we hope to draw attention to the important work that Didá is doing and to encourage exchanges with students and faculty at UT. We want both to support Didá’s crucial mission and to highlight the social problems it is trying to address. In summary, as Viviam wrote in celebration of Didá’s thirteenth anniversary, “We understand that we are important to the stability of the community that we serve. The playing of our drums brings hope to hundreds of people, it always has been and will continue to be this way.”

Natalie Arsenault is LLILAS Outreach Coordinator.
The Interrelated Fields of Art, Art History, archaeology, and anthropology—all strongly represented at the University of Texas—are undergoing important changes, none more so than in the increased participation of Latin American voices and perspectives within an international dialogue.

To that end, the Department of Art and Art History's Mesoamerican Center is developing a special relationship with a local foundation in Antigua, Guatemala, that will result in exciting possibilities for UT faculty, staff, and students.

The Mesoamerica Center, founded in 1990 by the late Linda Schele, aims to facilitate knowledge and learning about Mesoamerican cultures and peoples, highlighting the interdisciplinary strengths of faculty and students throughout the university. Directed by David Stuart of the Department of Art and Art History, it focuses primarily on the integrated study of the arts, languages, and archaeology of Mesoamerican indigenous cultures. Affiliated faculty include Nora England of Linguistics, Julia Guernsey of Art and Art History, and Enrique Rodriguez Alegria, Brian Stross, and Fred Valdez of Anthropology.

The Mesoamerica Center has been eager to establish closer connections with scholars and students in Central America and Mexico, seeking a physical space that could be used for seminars, research, and teaching. This dream began to become reality in the summer of 2005, when Mesoamerica faculty and staff first met with members of the Fundación Pantaleón, a Guatemalan nonprofit foundation dedicated to advancing education and social and economic development for the country and its residents, especially through projects that benefit rural areas.

The Fundación Pantaleón owns a large seventeenth-century house nestled in the heart of Antigua, but had spent years searching for a meaningful use for the property, known as the Casa Herrera. It didn’t take much time for the two institutions to draft a mutually beneficial proposal for the Mesoamerica Center to inhabit the Casa Herrera. The location is perfect within Antigua, a famous colonial city designated “La Muy Noble y Muy Leal Ciudad de Santiago de los Caballeros de Guatemala” by the conquistadors in 1543. The town offers a wealth of educational and cultural resources available to visiting students and scholars and is centrally located in Guatemala, less than one hour from Guatemala City.

The Casa Herrera property is currently undergoing a massive restoration and adaptive reuse of its space; the Casa will continue to be owned by the Fundación Pantaleón, with the Mesoamerica Center as its sole occupant. Once restoration is completed, it will provide a premier location for the Mesoamerica Center to host seminars, workshops, conferences, classes, performances, exhibitions, archaeological and conservation project activities, and scholars in residence. Prof. Julia Guernsey, who is actively involved with art historical and archaeological research in La Blanca, Guatemala, states, “The Casa Herrera project is enormously exciting for the University, as it will provide an incredible research facility for those students and faculty engaged with the culture—both ancient and modern—of Guatemala and Latin America in general.”

Antigua has been designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and the beautiful restoration of the property, overseen by Guatemalan specialists, acts in accordance with these guidelines. The completed center will serve as a springboard for current research in Guatemala, bringing the built-in resources of the Mesoamerica Center to the heart of Maya culture.
CALLING ON THE RESOURCES OF THE MESOAMERICA CENTER, THE CASA HERRERA IS SET TO BE THE WORLD’S PREMIER SITE FOR THE INTERCHANGE OF IDEAS AND INFORMATION SURROUNDING MESOAMERICAN ART AND CULTURE.

A key advantage of having a Mesoamerica Center location at the Casa Herrera is the ability to allow international scholars, researchers, and artists to interact directly with their peers in Guatemala and neighboring Latin American nations, and to open many of these activities to the public. The Casa’s vision encompasses a year-round series of cultural and community events. In this endeavor, the role of the community as both audience and active participant is key.

John Yancey, Chair of the Department of Art and Art History, has provided leadership in his endorsement of this unique opportunity. “The Casa Herrera research center represents a very exciting initiative in the research and academic program of the Department of Art and Art History,” he says. “By providing a base of operations in Central America for international Mayan, Mesoamerican, and Pre-Columbian scholars to conduct research and research-related activities, the Casa Herrera represents a momentous opportunity for the Department of Art and Art History and the University of Texas. On my visits to the Casa Herrera site in Antigua, I was impacted by the astounding beauty and cultural richness of this city, as well as the ease of travel from Austin. This center will enrich the lives and work of scholars and students for many years to come.”

It is critically important that the Department of Art and Art History feature a Central American location for international collaborative research. Calling on the resources of the Mesoamerica Center, the Casa Herrera is set to be the world’s premier site for the interchange of ideas and information surrounding Mesoamerican art and culture.

The Mesoamerica Center’s presence at the Casa Herrera began as a conversation between two international institutions, the Department of Art and Art History and the Fundación Pantaleón; each was searching for a meaningful way to advance research and scholarship in Mesoamerica. The spirit of this initial dialogue will often resonate in small and large contexts at the Casa, from scholars-in-residence quietly conferring in the courtyard, to the noisy beginnings of a multidisciplinary conference settling down to engage with an international panel of scholars. Bryan Roberts, Director of the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies, adds his thoughts on the impact of the Casa Herrera to the University of Texas: “Casa Herrera gives UT a tangible and architecturally impressive presence in the Maya heartland of Central America. It will greatly facilitate UT’s work in Mayan studies, in other aspects of Central America’s past and present realities and, importantly, enhance collaboration with local institutions in Guatemala and elsewhere in Central America and Southern Mexico.”

Carolyn Porter is Director of Development in the Department of Art and Art History at the University of Texas at Austin.

Left to right: 1) Massive restoration is underway on the Casa Herrera property, 2) Adaptive reuse of space planned for many functions of Mesoamerican Center, 3) Antigua has been designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site
Even before the 2006 presidential election dissolved into a nasty street battle, it was widely perceived as strongly polarized. The two leading candidates, Felipe Calderón of the conservative National Action Party (PAN) and Andrés Manuel López Obrador of the left-wing Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD), staked out starkly different positions on key economic issues. Calderón promised continuity with free-market reforms, focusing on investment as the engine of growth. López Obrador argued that the neoliberal strategy would benefit only a few, and he promised to alleviate poverty through state spending on infrastructure and social welfare. Unlike in prior presidential elections where the PAN and PRD candidates downplayed their differences to challenge the dominant PRI with broad pro-democracy appeals, in this first post-transition election, the candidates made their differences clear.

The dust usually settles and even the most polarized campaigns typically yield to institutionalized opposition after Election Day. But in this case, the razor-thin margin of victory for Calderón at just 0.57% cast doubt on the outcome and led to increasing polarization. López Obrador rejected the official results, escalated his confrontation with the state well beyond what most had expected—from marches and blockades of major streets, to efforts to paralyze the Congress and plans to establish a parallel government—and he easily secured the loyal support of top PRD leaders and the active participation of hundreds of thousands of Mexican citizens. Faced with crowds in the capital, flaring tempers, and statements like “to hell with the institutions,” some commentators rang the alarm bell. Was the hard-fought campaign the tip of an iceberg that runs cold and deep between polarized camps in society? Could Mexico’s democratic train be running off the rails, guiding it not toward the station of stable institutions found in the United States and Western Europe but toward the wreckage of instability found in other Latin American nations?

We suggest a more optimistic reading. Although ideological polarization goes well beyond the polemical campaigns of the presidential candidates and extends to the PAN and PRD’s congressional candidates, it does not extend to the voters. The voters were in fact surprisingly immune to campaigns that attempted to draw them into partisan battles, and in the post-electoral period their influence may put the brakes on political conflict. If party elites pay attention to the issue mandates given by their supporters, then they will find ways to avoid legislative gridlock in the 2006–2009 Congress.

Our analysis is based on two unique surveys that give us an extraordinary view of both elite and mass opinion. The first is the Mexico 2006 Candidate and Party Leader Survey of congressional candidates for plurality district races that we conducted in the three weeks leading up to the election. The PAN and PRD generously furnished us with contact information for their candidates, without which we could not have accomplished the study. Unfortunately, the PRI refused to participate. However, prior work shows that although the PRI has a wide range of internal opinion at the elite level, it is relatively centrist in the electoral context.

The Representational Fault Line: Candidates and Voters in Mexico’s 2006 Elections

By Kenneth F. Greene and Kathleen Bruhn
the aggregate. Thus, since we are primarily interested in the degree of polarization between the two most distant parties on the left and the right, polling just PRD and PAN candidates fits our need nicely. The second survey is a more ambitious project called the Mexico 2006 Panel Survey that includes nationwide samples of voters at three points in time during the campaign. For this analysis, we use data from the May 2006 pre-electoral wave and the July 2006 post-electoral wave. Since we both participated in the design of the voter and candidate surveys, we were able to use the same questions for candidates and voters, and this correspondence improves our confidence about the findings.

Polarized Congressional Candidates

Congressional candidates from both parties agree on the key problems facing Mexico. When we asked them to name the most important problem, they spontaneously identified “crime and public security” most frequently, followed by “crime and public security.” PRD candidates were more likely to name poverty first, but poverty was still the fourth most frequently cited problem among PAN candidates. Another open-ended question asked candidates to identify the theme they personally emphasized in their congressional campaigns. Again, candidates from both parties named jobs and employment as their principal focus, followed by education, health, and social spending.

Consensus about Mexico’s major problems is where agreement ends. The candidates disagreed so substantially about solutions that they represent distinct worldviews. When we asked whether the government or individuals should be responsible for citizens’ personal economic welfare, 75% of PAN candidates opted for personal responsibility, while 68% of PRD candidates stated that the government should be partly or even fully responsible for citizens’ welfare.

A question about the appropriate size of government generated fascinating responses. We took a risk by constructing a potentially double-barreled question in an attempt to force a trade-off. Specifically, we asked if candidates preferred a government with fewer services and lower taxes or one with more services and higher taxes. Fifty-six percent of PAN candidates opted for a smaller government compared to just 11.7% of PRD candidates. However, only 40% of the PRD candidates openly chose the bigger state/more taxes option. Instead, a high percentage (48.1%) apparently insisted to survey interviewers that they wanted lower taxes and more services. Their position may simply reflect the official position of their presidential candidate that he could pay for his new social programs by cutting government waste.

On the critical question of commercial relations with the United States, PAN and PRD candidates endorse very different positions on the issue of privatization of the electricity sector—we asked respondents to locate not only their own personal position, but also that of their rival party. PRD candidates are pro-choice and oppose privatization while PAN candidates line up on the opposite side as pro-life and in favor of privatization. In addition, each group of candidates views the rival party’s position as more extreme than it actually is; however, this projection appears somewhat smaller than observers of Mexican politics might expect. In-depth interviews often suggest that rival candidates believe their opponents are extremist to the point of stretching credibility. Our data paint a different picture. We find general agreement about the amount of disagreement. This means that despite some projection that could complicate good faith negotiations in Congress, the perceptions are not so outlandish that the two delegations should be unable to communicate.

An important difference also emerged over the question of political openness. PAN candidates were significantly more likely to respond that “Mexico today is a democracy,” to anticipate that elections in their district would be clean, and to express confidence in the Federal Electoral Institute that administers federal elections. PRD candidates perceived that Mexico was less democratic and its elections less fair. These pre-election judgments not only help explain PRD support for López Obrador’s quixotic campaign and aggressive post-election protest, but also suggest differences between the two parties in terms of their levels of political trust.

For two questions—abortion and privatization of the electricity sector—we asked respondents to locate not only their own personal position, but also that of their rival party. PRD candidates are pro-choice and oppose privatization while PAN candidates line up on the opposite side as pro-life and in favor of privatization. In addition, each group of candidates views the rival party’s position as more extreme than it actually is; however, this projection appears somewhat smaller than observers of Mexican politics might expect. In-depth interviews often suggest that rival candidates believe their opponents are extremist to the point of stretching credibility. Our data paint a different picture. We find general agreement about the amount of disagreement. This means that despite some projection that could complicate good faith negotiations in Congress, the perceptions are not so outlandish that the two delegations should be unable to communicate.

All of this evidence indicates that ideological polarization extends beyond the presidential candidates at least to congressional candidates in the PAN and the PRD who are spread throughout the country. In both parties, legislative candidates were mostly drawn from the local political elite. They had resided in their districts for about thirty years on average, and they were more likely to have served as municipal or state party leaders than national ones. As a result, the differences we document are not limited to a potentially insular Mexico City elite, but represent real, substantive, and widespread ideological differences between these two parties both nationally and locally.

Moderate Voters

Elite polarization on the issues should have sent clear cues to the voters, potentially drawing them into highly charged partisan battles and cementing walls of difference between social groups. But voters by and large did not respond. Even with respect to their own partisan voters, candidates were more extreme on the issues of privatization, abortion, and social welfare. They were even more clearly out-of-step with independents and with the electorate in general. Since candidate-voter comparisons are so easily communicated graphically, we show alignments on four of the main issues in Figure 1.

PAN and PRD candidates endorse very different positions on the question of privatization of the electricity sector, but the voters are clustered fairly close together towards the center and against privatization. This creates a strikingly large distance between PAN candidates who appear as radical privatizers out-of-tune with a tepid base. On this issue, PRD candidates are much closer to the average voter, as well as to their own constituency.
Similar dissonance between candidates and voters appears on the issue of abortion in the case of rape. The PAN is closer to the voters in general, but finds itself on the opposite side of the issue. Perhaps the biggest surprise is that PRD candidates are much more in favor of legality than their core voters. While these differences are important for policymaking and may inform debates in Congress, they probably did not matter much in the election since the abortion question has never been as politically mobilized in Mexico as in other countries, including the United States.

Social welfare again divides the candidates more than the voters. PAN candidates are much more in favor of individual responsibility for citizens' social welfare than are their own constituents who want some level of government assistance. The bigger surprise, however, is that PRD candidates are in fact more in favor of government assistance than their core voters. We would typically expect voters to place more demands on government and for prospective legislators to hold back, knowing the real constraints on government spending. Not only does this not appear to be the case, but the rightward skew in preferences suggests that Calderón's campaign for jobs may have resonated more broadly than AMLO's call for poverty alleviation.

We found much more consensus between congressional candidates over the question of commercial relations with the United States, but this consensus put the PRD group in conflict with its presidential candidate and both groups in conflict with the voters.

Unsurprisingly, PAN candidates were uniformly in favor of expanded commercial relations with the United States; however, PRD candidates were almost as enthusiastic. Neither party's voters moved with them. Not only were PRD voters in favor of economic openness, but PAN voters were only somewhat more in favor of ties to the United States. Both findings are somewhat surprising. We would have expected PRD voters to be more opposed since they are drawn more heavily from the ranks of the poor and those in the south who have benefited less from free trade. We also would have expected PAN voters, often thought to draw from middle and upper class voters as well as northerners who benefit from free trade, to be more favorably disposed. This pattern casts some doubt on the productiveness of congressional campaigns that raised the issue of economic openness and indicates that López Obrador's campaign message that questioned close economic relations with the United States may have put him in conflict with most voters.

We also explored opinions about how clean respondents thought the July election would be when we interviewed the voters in May and the candidates in June. For space considerations, we do not represent these responses graphically. In this instance, candidates were much closer to each other than the voters. PRI and PRD voters were the most skeptical that the elections would be clean, while PAN voters apparently trusted in the elections much more than the political elites they supported. The level of skepticism about clean elections needs to be underscored here, given that analysts roundly applauded the non-partisan Federal Electoral Institute as a shining example of how new democracies should run elections. Yet substantial segments of the political class and voters did not agree. The polarization among voters, coupled with the post-electoral mobilization that has undoubtedly brought PRD candidates further to the left, indicate that the question of institutional reform will likely be an important political cleavage moving forward.

Finally, elite polarization and mass moderation were reflected in self-placements on the more abstract left-right scale that we show in Figure 2. As on the issues, candidates from the PRD place themselves on the left and those from the PAN place themselves on the right; they are clearly not self-identified “centrists.” In contrast, voter placements are more diffuse and spread across the left-right dimension.
There are important groups of voters who place themselves on the left and the right; yet, by far the largest group is centrist. We make no claims about the particular meaning of “left” and “right” in these data and want to draw attention to the fact that 27.5% of voters either could not place themselves on the scale or responded that they had no position. Nevertheless, those who do identify a position are far less polarized than candidates.

Conclusion
Mexico’s political class is deeply divided over ideology and major issues of national importance. These divisions extend beyond the rhetorical campaigns of the presidential candidates and to elites in both parties. Candidates from the PAN combine fiscal and social conservatism, much like Republicans in the United States. They are pro-life, favor privatization of the electricity sector and expanded commercial relations with the United States, and believe in investment and individual responsibility to reduce poverty. PRD candidates sharply disagree. They are pro-choice, want to maintain public ownership over the electricity sector, and endorse an expanded social safety net with greater government responsibility in providing for the poor. They also are more skeptical about the benefits of commercial ties with the United States, although this difference was much more muted than we expected. One might have expected these relatively clear positions to give voters strong signals that would help structure voting choices along ideological lines. Nevertheless, polarization does not extend to the mass level at present. Voters who identify with the PRD and the PAN agree with the candidates on some issues, but in general they cluster around the average voter that is generally quite centrist.

We draw three main conclusions from this examination of party-voter alignments. First, polarization is limited to the political elite and does not feed off deep political divisions in the electorate. This implies that despite the important transition from authoritarian rule under the PRI to competitive democratic politics by 2000, Mexico has not yet undergone a partisan realignment. It also implies that voters are strikingly resilient to ideological overtures by candidates who have tried and failed to “mobilize bias” on the most salient political issues.

Second, the type of representation in government we can expect from PAN and PRD candidates is one of “acting for” rather than “standing for.” Instead of striving to represent the average voter or even their slightly more polarized identified voters, the PAN and PRD seek to lead public opinion on the issues. While these elite divisions give voters clearly distinguished partisan options, they also yield parties that are out-of-step with the electorate and in some sense seek to contravene the public will.

Finally, the lack of severe polarization among the voters makes us cautiously optimistic about the prospects for passing legislation on contentious issues. Although Mexico’s combination of presidentialism with a multi-party Congress could continue to yield the kind of gridlock that plagued the Fox administration, the mandate from the voters would appear to underwrite compromise. Much will depend on legislators’ responsiveness. To be sure, the prohibition on re-election diminishes incentives for constituency representation; however, unless the PAN and PRD can claim the middle ground and prove able custodians of the public will, voters may reject their brand of politics and return to the centrist party that quietly waits out the storm in control of more Mexican governorships than any other party: the PRI.

Kenneth F Greene is Assistant Professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin and author of Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico’s Democratization in Comparative Perspective (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Kathleen Bruhn is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and author of Taking on Goliath: The Emergence of a New Left Party and the Struggle for Democracy in Mexico (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1996).
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InTroducinG bRAZIlIAN musIc and iTs issues to American graduate students, as I did at the University of Texas at Austin during the 2007 spring semester, was a challenge for several reasons. The first was a general one: Brazil is an immense country with immense musical variety. Worse, this variety is still quite poorly understood by Brazilians themselves. Studies of my country’s music can be generalized as largely dealing with Rio de Janeiro (which was Brazil’s capital from 1763 until 1960, a formative period for the nation and for the very idea of a national music) and with the northeast (where the country “began” in a way, and which retains, in the area of music as in others, an aura of original purity). The south, the huge Amazon region, and the central and western regions all possess musical traditions and unique music cultures of which university researchers still know very little or nothing.

The second reason relates to the peculiarities of the way in which the idea of “popular music” is thought of and lived in Brazil. At first glance, this attitude is not so different from the one adopted in the United States. In both cases, “popular music” is situated in a tripartite division in which it is distinguished, on the one hand, from “folk music,” and on the other, from “erudite” or “art music.” But behind this apparent similarity is hidden a significant difference in conceptualization. Allow me to discuss these differences by means of a few examples.

Choro is a type of instrumental music that came into existence in Rio de Janeiro in approximately 1870. According to its scholars, choro arose from some of the looser performances of musical scores, full of local swing, by Brazilian musicians who played polkas, waltzes, mazurkas, and other European dance genres. Gradually, choro became disassociated from dance and became a music of virtuosos, instrumentalists, and composers, all highly sophisticated and, to a certain extent, elite. Not by chance, many people compared it to jazz. But choro is considered by the majority of critics (whether academics or journalists) to be part of Brazilian popular music. Thus, I was more than surprised to discover that jazz, with which choro shares so much in common, is not generally considered to be “popular music” in the United States. Despite this, I didn’t find it difficult to understand the point: neither jazz nor choro is popular in the sense that Madonna or the Brazilian romantic singer Roberto Carlos is. The two genres—and in this Brazilians and Americans certainly agree—are not part of “pop music.” But in Brazil, “pop” is not just an abbreviation for “popular”—to the contrary, the two designations are seen by many to be opposites to a certain extent. In the United States, the expression “popular music”—or “pop music,” for the sake of abbreviation—seems always to refer to music that sells hundreds of thousands of recordings, plays to huge audiences on the radio, and is associated in some way with what the philosopher Theodor Adorno called “cultural industry.” (Both jazz and choro are, to be sure, somehow also related to the cultural industry, but that relationship cannot be said to best characterize them.) In Brazil, “popular music” is also, in part, defined by these same features, but not by them alone, and certainly not in the same manner as they define it in the United States.

Choro, like jazz, exists to a large extent in a cultural sphere independent of large record companies and the entertainment industry. Its inclusion in our idea of “Brazilian popular music” is tied to the fact that this category is seen not only, and perhaps not even principally, as show business or entertainment, but also as a major expression of national identity. In the United States, to the contrary, it seems that the concept of “popular music” is not especially tied either to the idea of artistic elevation or to national identity. Therein lies the difficulty in translating one idea to the other.

Another worrisome aspect of the subject relates to a phrase that is not just musical. The term cultura popular in Brazil is used to mean almost
the opposite of “popular culture” in the United States. Studies of media idols, radio and television programs, comic books, or advertising are more recent and fewer in number in my country than studies of folklore. Perhaps for this reason, academics and Brazilian cultural institutions tend to use the expression cultura popular as a synonym for folklore.

“But how can that be?!” asked my UT students, bewildered when I spoke of these things. In Brazil, “popular music” is the opposite of “folk music,” but “popular culture” is synonymous with “folklore.” The paradox can perhaps be explained in part by looking at the way in which the cultural influences of France and North America combined in Brazil. The connotations associated with the word povo are different in the two languages. In France, le peuple always has a political connotation, which cannot be said for the English the people, or people. The French equivalent of “people” would be les gens. In Brazilian Portuguese, the French le peuple is translated as povo, and the English “people,” like the French les gens, is translated as pessoas (persons). The former is politically charged; the latter is merely descriptive. In the land of Rousseau, the word is always used along with the definite article (le peuple), as if to accentuate their indivisibility. Of course in English, “the people” can also carry a political meaning, but the term is commonly used, without the article, to designate any more or less heterogeneous group of persons.

In Brazil, the word povo tends to be used more in the French sense. But the corresponding adjective, popular, is ambiguous, appearing with two different meanings. There is a “quantitative popular,” that which refers to the number of people reached, or records sold: this is the “statistical popular,” so to speak, or even the “popular by induction.” And there is a popular that refers to the povo as political entity: the “qualitative popular,” or even “popular by deduction.”

In Brazil, when we speak of “popular music,” these different conceptions of popular are in play. Since the end of the nineteenth century, the period of slavery’s abolition (1888), and the proclamation of the Republic (1889), until the beginning of the twenty-first century, when a former labor leader, representative of a Workers’ Party, takes office as president of the Republic, definitions of the “Brazilian people” (povo brasileiro) have been in debate. Intellectuals like Silvio Romero, Márcio de Andrade, Gilberto Freyre, Florestan Fernandes, Roberto Da Matta, and many others helped to make these definitions explicit. And, as Bryan McCann points out in his book Hello, Hello Brazil, even Brazilian musicians and lyricists have made their songs a laboratory of ideas about the povo and Brazilianness.

Thus, books as diverse as Cantos populares do Brasil (Silvio Romero, 1883), Música popular brasileira (Oneyda Alverenga, 1946), Pequena história da música popular (José Ramos Tinhorão, 1974), and songs as diverse as “História do Brasil” (Lamartine Babo, 1931), “Aquarela do Brasil” (Ary Barroso, 1939), and “Que país é este?” (Renato Russo, 1987), give testimony to the conceptual changes regarding the Brazilian povo and its musical expressions.

Through this process, the most expressive musical personalities—like Noel Rosa in the 1930s and João Gilberto in the 1960s—and proponents of the most dramatic artistic trends—like the tropicalist explosion of the 1960s—always associated the national-popular vein with the cosmopolitanism and consumerist orientation of the masses, typical of modern popular music, whose paradigm is, without doubt, North American. Add to this the fact that Brazilian folk music is not revivalist and not even very rural; its performers maintain in many cases a dynamic aesthetic dialogue with the recording industry. The result is that opposition between the ideas of “popular” and “folk” is, in my country, much smoother than it seems to be in other countries, including perhaps the United States. In Brazil, at least according to musicians, if “popular” is different from “folk” it is far from being its “opposite”; and they would conceive of “popular music” as different, to at least the same extent, from “pop music,” the latter perceived as having the least critical relationship with the market and cosmopolitanism.

This difficult mediation between quantitative notions of popular, politicized notions of popular, nationalism, and cosmopolitanism contributes a great deal to the contradictions and paradoxes, but also to the richness and the fecundity, of Brazilian popular music. My semester at UT was enormously helpful to my thinking on these contradictions and this richness from a comparative perspective. And despite—or perhaps, because of—the difficulties in translation, of both language and culture, I hope to have helped my students understand and appreciate Brazilian popular music more fully.

Carlos Sandroni was the Tinker Visiting Professor at LLILAS during spring 2007. A Ph.D. in musicology of the University of Tours, France, he is a Professor in the Graduate Music Program at the Universidade Federal da Paraíba.
LLILAS Draws on a Diverse Faculty

The diversity and high caliber of the faculty involved in Latin American Studies make UT Austin a magnet for students seeking an interdisciplinary focus of study. From History, Sociology, Government, and Anthropology, the four faculty below are representative of the scholarly excellence available to students in the LLILAS program.

Seth Garfield
Seth Garfield is the LLILAS Undergraduate Faculty Adviser and Associate Professor in the Department of History, which was recently ranked the #1 Latin American history graduate program in the United States by U.S. News and World Report.

A Ph.D. of Yale University, Dr. Garfield focuses his current research on rubber tapping in the Brazilian Amazon during World War II and the roots of contemporary popular mobilization in the rain forest. When Japan invaded the Malayan peninsula after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the United States lost access to 98 percent of its supply of natural rubber, a vital raw material for the war effort. The United States turned to Brazil to furnish latex from the wild rubber trees of the Amazon, subsidizing the relocation of more than 50,000 migrant workers and their families from northeastern Brazil to the rain forest.

“At first, I was drawn to this story by the riveting drama of the migrants,” Garfield notes, “but as I delved more deeply into the historical documentation, I became further intrigued in tracing the changes and continuities in cultural representations of the Amazon forest over the last half-century, as well as the ongoing global repercussions of the U.S. automotive industry’s dependency on raw materials.” Whereas contemporary political debate focuses on the problem of U.S. oil dependency, prior to Pearl Harbor, the nation’s overreliance on Asian rubber alarmed a number of policymakers, although little was done to avert a potential crisis due to entrenched corporate interests. And while nowadays the Amazon is often invoked in green politics as the lungs of the planet, during the war it was seen as the arsenal of the military-industrial complex. “In other words, we still look to the Amazon to ‘save the world,’ albeit in a different way,” Garfield points out. “It has been extremely laborious to gather and analyze the wealth of documentation on the wartime rubber project that is scattered among a dozen archives across the United States and Brazil,” Garfield adds, “but the intellectual and geographic journey has been well worth it.”

Dr. Garfield is the author of Indigenous Struggle at the Heart of Brazil: State Policy, Frontier Expansion, and the Xavante Indians, 1937–1988 (Duke University Press, 2001). Regarding his role as undergraduate faculty adviser, he notes, “It has been a delight to work with students in mining the innumerable resources that LLILAS has to offer.”

Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez
Immigration is an issue front and center in the news these days and one of particular interest to Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez, Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, who focuses on gender and sexuality of Mexican immigrant populations. A psychotherapist by training, she has worked with Latin American immigrants as a clinician, teacher, and sex educator in community-based agencies in California and Texas.

A native of Monterrey, Mexico, Dr.
 Juliet Hooker

Juliet Hooker began her UT Austin career in 2001 as a Rockefeller Postdoctoral Fellow at LILAS. The following year, she was appointed a tenure-track Assistant Professor in the Department of Government and the Center for African and African American Studies. Born and raised in Nicaragua, she earned her Ph.D. from Cornell University. She specializes in feminist theory, Latin American political thought, and critical race theory, as well as Latin American politics, with a particular focus on multiculturalism, racial and ethnic politics, and Afro-descendant social movements in Central America.

Professor Hooker is the author of Race and the Politics of Solidarity to be published by Oxford University Press. She also has written articles on multicultural citizenship and race and nationalism in Latin America, which have appeared in the Journal of Latin American Studies and the Latin American Research Review. Her work has also been translated into Portuguese and has appeared in academic journals in Latin America such as Tempo Social (São Paulo, Brazil).

During fall 2006, Dr. Hooker was a Visiting Fellow at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at Notre Dame University. In 2006 she received a “Junior Scholar in the Study of Democracy” grant from the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the Ford Foundation. She also was the recipient of a Houston Endowment Research Leave from LILAS during spring 2007.

Regarding her research and teaching at UT, Dr. Hooker says, “One of the most rewarding things about being at UT for me has been the fact that I have been able to combine my interests in political theory and Latin American politics in both my research and teaching here. Next year, for example, I plan to teach a graduate course that will serve as an introduction to Latin American political thought, and my second book project draws on the results of public opinion surveys that a colleague at UT and I carried out in Nicaragua. I’ve benefited immensely from being at a university with so many other scholars working on questions of race, ethnicity, and multiculturalism both in Latin America and other regions of the world.”

Shannon Speed

Shannon Speed is Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology, where she has taught since 2003. She is also an enrolled citizen of the Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma.

A Ph.D. of the University of California, Davis, she focuses her research on human rights, indigenous rights, and gender. Her country of particular interest is Mexico, specifically, Chiapas. For the past five years, she has been involved in organizing the Abriendo Brecha conference, which draws together scholars, activists, and others whose research and intellectual work are developed and carried out in alignment with communities, organizations, and movements working for social justice.


Regarding her involvement in activist research, Dr. Speed says, “For me the very best academic production involves the production of knowledge that emerges from and contributes something to the daily struggles of people—in the case of my own research, indigenous peoples—outside the university setting.”

Gonzalez-Lopez earned her Ph.D. at the University of Southern California. In addition to her appointment in Sociology, she is affiliated with LILAS, the Center for Mexican American Studies, and the Center for Women’s and Gender Studies. She teaches undergraduate and graduate courses on gender, sexuality, and qualitative methods.

Her book, Erotic Journeys: Mexican Immigrants and Their Sex Lives (University of California Press, 2005), investigates the ways in which sixty heterosexual Mexican women and men living in Los Angeles reinvent their sex lives as part of their immigration and settlement experiences.

Regarding another of her areas of interest, Dr. Gonzalez-Lopez says, “I am currently working on my second major project: incest in Mexican society. This project is in some ways an extension of my previous work on migration and sexuality, and it is the first sociological examination of incest in Mexico. In this study, I am exploring the social forces that make children and women vulnerable to becoming engaged in sexualized experiences (mainly involuntary) within the family context. I am conducting this qualitative project in four large urban areas in Mexico: Ciudad Juarez, Guadalajara, Mexico City, and Monterrey.

“As a teacher, I am interested in transforming my classroom into a space in which we can explore ways to promote critical thinking and help our students become active agents of social change within their families, communities, and future professions.”
LLILAS Visiting Professors for 2006–2007

Latin America offers a wealth of diversity from its landscapes to peoples and politics. Bringing new perspectives and regional insights to the study of Latin America is the goal of LLILAS’s Visiting Professors programs. Distinguished Latin American scholars and practitioners are brought to UT to teach courses or classes, greatly enriching the academic experience for both students and faculty by sharing their expertise and facilitating the exchange of ideas.

The Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Annual Visiting Professorship was established as part of the Long Endowment and supports visiting scholars to teach at UT for one semester. Prof. Marcela Cerrutti, who came for spring 2007, holds a Ph.D. in sociology with a specialization in population from UT Austin. She is a leading expert on urban markets in Latin America and the role and behavior of women within them. A former director of the Center for Population Studies in Argentina, she taught a course on “Internal and International Migration in Latin America.”

Also here in spring 2007 was Gustavo Chapela as Matías Romero Visiting Professor. This chair in Mexican Studies was created through an educational and research agreement between Mexico’s Ministry of Foreign Relations and UT to promote the presence and participation of distinguished Mexicans to foster greater understanding of their culture and society. Dr. Chapela is former director of CONACYT and the Instituto Mexicano de Petróleo and former president of the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana. He taught the course “Higher Education, Science, Technology, and Innovation.”

The Tinker Visiting Professor program was endowed in 1973 by the Edward Larocque Tinker Foundation to bring pre-eminent thinkers from Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula to the U.S. to encourage scholarly exchange across disciplines. João José Reis, the fall 2006 Tinker Professor from the Universidade Federal da Bahia, is an internationally renowned scholar of Afro-Brazilian history. His extensive research encompasses aspects of slave culture and rebellion, the African diasporic experience, religion and popular rituals, and urban history in Brazil. He taught “Research Seminar in Latin American History: Perspectives on Slavery in Brazil.”

Spring 2007
Paulo Fontes
Dr. Fontes is a historian of Brazilian labor and working-class culture in São Paulo after World War II. He also has studied internal migration from the northeast to São Paulo, the link between rural and urban workers, and the cultural aspects of popular organizations and politics.

Gilmar Jardim
Professor Jardim is a composer, flutist, arranger, and conductor. He is Chief of the Music Department at the Universidade de São Paulo and artistic director and head of the USP Chamber Orchestra.

Jorge Lanzaro
Dr. Lanzaro is Director of the Institute of Political Science at the Universidad de la República in Uruguay and a leading specialist on political parties and governmental institutions in Latin America.

Ruben Mercado
Dr. Mercado is an honor graduate of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) and received a Ph.D. in economics from UT Austin. His fields of specialization are computational economics, applied econometrics, economic development in Latin America, and macroeconomics.

Aldo Panfichi
Dr. Panfichi is Professor at the Catholic University of Peru and has written extensively on Peruvian politics, social movements, and the sociology of sports.

Teresa Sierra
Dr. Sierra is Professor and Researcher at CIESAS in Mexico City, from which she received the Casa Chata award (1995–96) for her research on “Indian Rights and Customary Law: A Case Study of the Nahua of the Sierra de Puebla.”

Julio Solórzano-Foppa
Julio Solórzano-Foppa is a Mexican writer, arts producer, and promoter researching the theme of arts and culture as a resource for development and job creation in Latin America. He was associate producer of the film Cronos, directed by Guillermo del Toro (Pan’s Labyrinth).

Carlos Sandroni
brought Carlos Sandroni, Professor in the Graduate Music Program at the Universidade Federal da Paraíba. A leading scholar of Brazilian northeast music, Dr. Sandroni retraced the steps of musicologist Mario de Andrade’s 1938 trek conducting musical fieldwork in the rural backlands. He taught “Current Issues Regarding the Music of Northeast Brazil.” (See article p. 48.)

LLILAS Visiting Resource Professors
The LLILAS VRP program brings scholars to UT for shorter periods. VRPs are invited by Latin Americanist faculty to lecture for 1–2 weeks in undergraduate or graduate classes. The VRP program seeks to enhance the international community of scholars working on Latin American topics; to establish and strengthen contacts between Latin American institutions of higher learning and UT; and to allow Latin American scholars access to UT library collections and archives. In 2006–07 LLILAS welcomed the following VRPs:

**Fall 2006**

**Liliana Obregón**
Dr. Obregón is Professor of International Law and Director of the New International Law Center at the Universidad de los Andes Law School in Bogotá, Colombia. She specializes in the history and theory of international law and international institutions in Latin America.

**Francisco Ortega**
Dr. Ortega is a distinguished colonialist and Director of the Centro de Estudios Sociales of the Universidad Nacional de Colombia. His research and writing focus on the political culture of colonial Spanish America.

**Aída Hernández Castillo**
Dr. Hernández Castillo is an anthropologist and activist who has worked with women’s groups and indigenous communities and is currently Professor and Senior Researcher at CIESAS in Mexico City.

**Maite Ezcurdia**
Dr. Ezcurdia is a graduate of King’s College London and is currently working in Mexico. Her research and teaching focus on cognitive science, problems in philosophy of language, and interpretive truth theories and philosophy of language.

**Diego Tatián**
Dr. Tatián is Professor of Philosophy at the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba in Argentina, where he is a mainstay of UT’s program there. While at UT, he conducted a seminar on the philosophical underpinnings of the thought of Jorge Luis Borges.

**Spring 2007**

**Paulo Fontes**
Dr. Fontes is a historian of Brazilian labor and working-class culture in São Paulo after World War II. He also has studied internal migration from the northeast to São Paulo, the link between rural and urban workers, and the cultural aspects of popular organizations and politics.

**Gilmar Jardim**
Professor Jardim is a composer, flutist, arranger, and conductor. He is Chief of the Music Department at the Universidade de São Paulo and artistic director and head of the USP Chamber Orchestra.

**Jorge Lanzaro**
Dr. Lanzaro is Director of the Institute of Political Science at the Universidad de la República in Uruguay and a leading specialist on political parties and governmental institutions in Latin America.

**Ruben Mercado**
Dr. Mercado is an honor graduate of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) and received a Ph.D. in economics from UT Austin. His fields of specialization are computational economics, applied econometrics, economic development in Latin America, and macroeconomics.

**Aldo Panfichi**
Dr. Panfichi is Professor at the Catholic University of Peru and has written extensively on Peruvian politics, social movements, and the sociology of sports.

**Teresa Sierra**
Dr. Sierra is Professor and Researcher at CIESAS in Mexico City, from which she received the Casa Chata award (1995–96) for her research on “Indian Rights and Customary Law: A Case Study of the Nahua of the Sierra de Puebla.”

**Julio Solórzano-Foppa**
Julio Solórzano-Foppa is a Mexican writer, arts producer, and promoter researching the theme of arts and culture as a resource for development and job creation in Latin America. He was associate producer of the film Cronos, directed by Guillermo del Toro (Pan’s Labyrinth).