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A MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

THIS YEAR HAS BEEN AN EXCEPTIONALLY BUSY ONE FOR LLILAS AS WE HAVE ORGANIZED OR helped to organize some thirteen conferences and numerous lectures. We also have initiated nine faculty-led research clusters. An elected Executive Committee of fifteen members was established for the first time, as was an external Advisory Council with the mission of assisting the institute with fund-raising and advice on enhancing our outreach activities. The library, arts, and community-outreach interests appearing in the last issue continue, as are shown by the reports on the Benson Google project, on outreach activities by our outreach director, Natalie Arsenault, and on the Brazilian artist-in-residence, Matheus Rocha-Pitta. Our increasingly close ties with the College of Fine Arts are highlighted in the focus on the Music faculty in our faculty profiles section.

Noteworthy among our conferences was Transitions in the Cuban Revolution, which marked an initiative to establish exchange relationships with the Universidad de La Habana led by Associate Director Jonathan Brown, who comments on Cuba in this issue. Placing Latin America within a global context has been another aspect of this past year’s activities. We collaborated with the Center for Asian American Studies on the conference Asia in Latin America and with the Center for Mexican American Studies and the other Title VI Area Studies Centers on the conference Political and Cultural Economies of Water in the 21st Century, which reviewed the worldwide challenges to water supplies from economic development and climate change. The Institute of Latin American Studies Student Association (ILASSA) has, as in the past, organized and, mainly through its own efforts, financed a superb annual conference that attracts participants from all over the U.S. and Latin America. This issue includes a report on that conference and also a timely reflection on the need to secure its financial future.

The research clusters are intended to link faculty and graduate students more closely into the activities of LLILAS, including Portal, through regular meetings to discuss and plan research and suggest conferences, visiting speakers, and professors. The Democratization cluster helped organize this year’s annual Lozano Long Conference, The Performance of Leftist Governments in Latin America: What Does the Left Do Right?, which drew speakers from Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela. The keynote speaker and participant was former Chilean President Ricardo Lagos, who delivered the second annual Lozano Long Lecture. This issue includes an interview with President Lagos, as well as reflections on the conference by one of its organizers, Raúl Madrid. Arturo Arias discusses memory and revolution in this issue, themes that have been part of his contribution to the Human Rights and Humanities clusters, in a piece that ties in with the conference Image, Memory, and the Paradox of Peace, which examined the effects of the 1992 El Salvador Peace Accords. Nora England, a member of the Indigenous Studies cluster, contributes an article here on indigenous languages, and Ariel Dulitzky, a member of the Indigenous and Human Rights clusters and a former Tinker Professor, talks about his long experience in human rights work. The newly established cluster, Science, Technology, and Development Policy, brings into the institute faculty working on development policy issues such as are reported in the Jackson School’s article on the Latin American Forum on Energy and the Environment. A related research cluster, Environment, Development, and Social Change, is represented in the article on the Santo Domingo urban community development initiative by students of Bjørn Sletto, co-chair of the cluster. Several excellent conferences also are planned by the clusters for 2008–2009.

The Brazil Center has been very active through its Brazil and Amazon weeks and its sponsorship of numerous cultural events and exchanges, such as the visit of Matheus Rocha-Pitta, Brazilian artist-in-residence. The Mexican Center has organized several events, including a conference on the impact of U.S.-Mexico migration on the rural areas of both countries. Of particular note was the center’s initiative in organizing for the University of Texas the first meeting outside Mexico of the Mexican Association of Universities and Research Institutes, ANUIES. This meeting brought more than seventy Mexican university and institute presidents to Austin as well as high-ranking government officials and political leaders. The one-day meeting included five panels in which Mexican and U.S. educators discussed aspects of actual and potential collaboration in higher education between the two countries. The ANUIES event was another important step in our growing collaboration with Mexico on research and teaching. We signed a research collaboration agreement this year with the Mexican Ministry of Social Development, SEDESOL, and through the initiative of Vice Provost for International Studies Terri Givens, we had a very successful five-day meeting in Mexico City with Mexican universities in which UT researchers discussed their research with Mexican colleagues in the humanities, social, economic, and policy sciences, education, science, and technology. LLILAS interns who helped with conference organization in Mexico report on their impressions of the event in this issue.

The substantial increase in LLILAS-led activities in recent years has been based on the enthusiasm of faculty and the organizing abilities of staff. It has its downside in an increasing workload for staff, and I want to pay a special tribute to the skill and commitment with which they have faced the challenge. Organizing, publicizing, and publishing events and longer term program activities involve all LLILAS staff. The considerable achievements of this past year owe a great deal to their patience, hard work, and creativity.

BRYAN R. ROBERTS, DIRECTOR
Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies
Can UT Austin Play a Role in Cuba’s Academic Future? And Vice Versa?

by Jonathan C. Brown

February 2008. Dr. Givens had just informed Mr. Castro about the Letter of Intent that she, as Vice Provost for International Programs of the University of Texas, had just signed with her counterpart at the Universidad de La Habana, Dr. Cristina Díaz López.

"TE AGRADEZCO QUAL-quiera cosa que puedas hacer para el pueblo cubano [We are grateful for whatever you can do for the Cuban people]." Thus responded 83-year-old Ramón Castro, the avuncular elder brother of Fidel and Raúl, as Dr. Terri Givens briefed him during her visit to Havana in

The agreement (convenio) facilitates the exchange of professors, researchers, and graduate students between the University of Texas and Cuba’s flagship university. This convenio will increase the number of UT academics researching in Cuba and attending conferences there. UT also will invite more Cuban professors to the Austin campus. The agreement especially calls for more exchanges in the sciences. To that end, Charles “Chip” Groat, Interim Dean of UT’s Jackson School of Geosciences, already has begun to confer with scientists at the Universidad de La Habana. As yet, no undergraduate student exchanges will be pursued under this agreement. “Our relationship with the Universidad de La Habana will ensure that our faculty researchers and graduate students will have access to the materials they need to conduct their research,” says Vice Provost Givens, “but we can also hope that intellectual exchange will lead to better understanding and a chipping away of misconceptions on both sides.”

Dr. Givens’s luncheon with Ramón Castro included Jonathan Brown,
Associate Director of the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies, and Florida businessman John Parke Wright. The latter, who arranged the luncheon, has known Ramón Castro for ten years. (Wright is working to reestablish cattle industry relationships between Cuba and the U.S. and has been exporting top dairy and beef cattle to Cuba under a legal exception to the U.S. trade embargo.) Congress passed a law in 2000 that exempted food and pharmaceuticals from the boycott that the U.S. government has imposed on Fidel since 1960. The only catch: Cuba cannot pay for these goods with rum, cigars, or nickel. It can pay for U.S. food and prescription drugs—in advance—only with hard currency earned from hosting non-American tourists or selling its products to China, Canada, Mexico, and the European Union.

Ramón Castro’s interest in cattle stems from his management of the Castro family farm in the late 1950s while brother Fidel ran the Revolution from the Sierra Maestra and Raúl commanded a guerrilla front in the Sierra del Cristal. Both mountain ranges are located far from Havana in eastern Cuba. In contrast, Wright’s interest in Cuba developed from his family’s earlier shipping and cattle business in pre-revolutionary Cuba. His relatives owned La Candelaria, one of the island’s best cattle ranches, also located in the easternmost Oriente province. Fidel confiscated both La Candelaria and Ramón’s farm under the land reform law several months after the Revolution triumphed in 1959. However, since then, Cuban economic performance under socialism has not kept pace with other reforms in education, income and property redistribution, and health care. “Our work in agriculture aims to help increase the quality and quantity of Cuba’s livestock industry with cattle and cooperation from Florida, Texas, and Alabama,” Wright says. “Also, we have a joint cooperation agreement with the Holstein Association, USA, and with dairy cows being supplied to Cuba from Vermont, Maine, New York, and Pennsylvania.” The country’s economic partnership with the Soviet Union until 1990 and with Venezuela since 2000 and its trade relations with every other country of the world have not substituted for the capital and markets of Cuba’s closest neighbor.

Ten American presidents beginning with Dwight D. Eisenhower have maintained the

“Our relationship with the Universidad de La Habana will ensure that our faculty researchers and graduate students will have access to the materials they need to conduct their research,” says Vice Provost Givens, “but we can also hope that intellectual exchange will lead to better understanding and a chipping away of misconceptions on both sides.”
boycott in an attempt to undermine Fidel’s regime. It has failed to do so. Fidel did not step down until surgery for an intestinal blockage prompted him to cede power to brother Raúl in August of 2006. I was in Cuba for the first time when Fidel fell ill (see the College of Liberal Arts Life & Letters, Winter 2007–2008). I then returned in October 2007 to negotiate the terms of the convenio with Vice Rector Díaz López. On that second trip, I met Ramón Castro for the first time—at another luncheon arranged by John Parke Wright. My friend from Florida also introduced me to the Cuba he loves. We went to Mass at the seventeenth-century La Iglesia Catedral (which had been visited by Pope John Paul II and former president Jimmy Carter) in historic Old Havana. We played “Guantanamera” with a street band, Wright on harmonica and I on the bongos.

Later, Wright took me horseback riding at the farm of Sierra Maestra veteran Miguel Ginarte. We rode with Ginarte and a dozen guajiros (country folk) flying the flags of Cuba and Texas, which are strikingly similar. A photographer from the New York Times showed up to record the event as part of the newspaper’s coverage of the Havana Trade Fair, which Wright was attending. I turned my horse around each time the photographer pointed the camera in my direction; wary of political backlash back home, I was not eager for publicity before the convenio was signed. My worries were unfounded. (Texas Agricultural Commissioner Todd Staples was soon to lead a delegation of state officials and exporters on a much-publicized visit to Havana, which Wright also helped to organize following his speech at UT, “Doing Business with Fidel,” in March 2007.) The mission of Staples’s visit: to increase Texas’s share of rice, grain, and cattle sales. Therefore, I missed an opportunity for fleeting fame. My image did not appear in the equine photo of Ginarte and Wright that appeared in the New York Times on November 12, 2007.

With these developments as a backdrop, Ramón Castro thanked Dr. Givens for anything she could do for the Cuban people. But exactly what can the Universidad de La Habana receive in its partnership with the University of Texas? What can UT achieve? The historian in me cannot but take the long view.

Fifty years ago, the Universidad de La Habana traditionally served the middle and upper classes of this nation of an estimated seven million people. The youth of privileged birth cut their political teeth there. Student leaders at Cuba’s flagship university expected to win future elections as members of congress, fill high government positions, and compete for the presidency. Founded in 1728, the university became the site of patriotic struggle for independence from Spain, achieved after U.S. occupation from 1898 to 1902. In the midst of a depression of the sugar industry, university students in 1933 used violence to help unseat unpopular President Gerardo Machado. Fidel Castro followed in this university’s political traditions. In the 1940s, he attended the university’s prestigious law school and directed the youth wing of an opposition party. He was campaigning for a congressional seat in the 1952 elections when former president and general Fulgencio Batista staged a golpe de estado and installed himself in power. Within days of the coup, Universidad de La Habana students launched the first protest marches against Batista. Raúl Castro enrolled briefly in university studies and participated in a few protests. Fidel suggested he join the Cuban communist party, which Raúl did. In the next few years, student protests became more violent. They met vicious repression from the police, but failed to dislodge Batista from power.

Fidel was practicing law at this time and did not participate in university agitation. Nonetheless, he resolved to raise the protests to the level of armed confrontation. When he organized and led the attack on the Moncada army barracks, located in the eastern city of Santiago, on July 26, 1953, few of his armed followers had attended the University of Havana. The soldiers repulsed the attackers and captured and executed half of their number. Fidel and Raúl escaped with their lives, to be captured later and incarcerated at Modelo Prison on the Isle of Pines. In 1954, Batista’s presidential pardon freed the Castro brothers and other political prisoners. They left Cuba and reunited in Mexico City, where Fidel trained another group of Cuban revolutionary commandos. There Raúl befriended the Argentinean Ernesto “Che” Guevara. He introduced Che to Fidel, who invited him along as the troop’s only foreign combatant.

In the meantime, some members of the student movement decided to separate from the Universidad de La Habana and form an urban guerrilla group, the Revolutionary Directorate. “Strike at the top” became their strategy. Within months of Fidel’s return to the island to set up a guerrilla base in the sierras of eastern Cuba, the ex-students decided to attack in Havana. In March 1957, they staged an armed assault on Batista at his residence in the Presidential Palace. These youthful militants

Left to right: 1) John Parke Wright on harmonica and the author on bongos join a Cuban street band after Sunday Mass in the historic Habana Vieja section of Havana. 2) The author checks out one of the many picture books about Ernesto “Che” Guevara that are on sale at the Plaza de Armas in Habana Vieja. 3) Miguel Ginarte greets Vice Provost Terri Givens at a finca outside Havana. A veteran of the revolutionary battles of the late 1950s, Ginarte raises horses and cattle.
met stiff resistance from the palace guards, and many were killed and captured. The defeat marked the end of student militancy, except for periodic bombings and sabotage of Havana’s power grid. Survivors of the Revolutionary Directorate fled to the countryside, later to unite with Fidel’s guerrilla forces led by Che Guevara. Together they marched into Havana when Batista fled the island in the early morning hours of New Year’s Day 1959. The point is: university students contributed to the overthrow of Batista.

The first year of the Revolution initiated great changes at Cuba’s venerable Universidad de La Habana. The Castro government decided to deemphasize traditional studies of philosophy, religion, and law. Resources flowed into more practical studies in industrial management, economics, agronomy, engineering, and the sciences, often with the support of Soviet and East European educators. The revolutionary army under the command of Comandante Raúl Castro initiated a student militia at the university in order to defend the Revolution. Fidel’s government established scholarships for the sons and daughters of peasants and workers. Students volunteered to work in vegetable gardens and cane harvests. From 1959 to 1963, some students of the middle and upper classes left the Universidad de La Habana as their families fled into exile. Cuban universities thereafter concentrated on developing its higher educational goals of providing socially relevant training and nurturing development of a socialist society.

Then crisis struck in 1991. The Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc governments collapsed, and their trade and educational exchanges to Cuba abruptly ended. Deep budget cuts prevented the upgrade of science labs, technical facilities, and research collections. Now, nearly twenty years later, a recovering Universidad de La Habana again reaches out to the world. Vice Provost Givens, businessman John Parke Wright, and I witnessed evidence of this outreach.

Vice Rector Díaz López had invited us in February not only to sign the convenio but also to attend the convocation celebrating the 280th anniversary of the founding of the Universidad de La Habana. It was held two days after our luncheon with Ramón Castro. We comprised one of several delegations attending from abroad. Others represented Peking University and universities in Colombia, Peru, England, Spain, France, Germany, and Canada. UNAM and the Universidad Politécnica attended from Mexico. Already, hundreds of Cubans have obtained Ph.D.s from Spain, Mexico, and Canada. Cuba’s closest collaborator, Venezuela, sent a total of 750 delegates! As for the United States, officials arrived from American University, the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Science, Tulane University, and the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill. “Thank you for coming to help us celebrate our anniversary,” said Rector Rubén Zardoya Loureda at the end of his speech during the plenary session. “Cuba is your home. [The Universidad de La Habana is your home.] Viva la universalización de la universidad.”

What is this “universalization” of which the Cubans speak? Additional explanation came from the speech of Carlos Rodríguez Castellanos, Director of the School for the Science of Materials, with which UT’s Chip Groat has now established linkages. The concept of universalization involves international collaboration. “Universities have become important agents of innovation, and continued collaboration with Latin American universities has already proved crucial in the development of pharmaceuticals and vaccines to the benefit of all children of the world,” he concluded. Cuban institutions of education strive to provide scientific advice to manufacturing and service sectors of the economy. They also have a mission to serve society. The decentralization of higher learning to urban and national subcampuses aids in delivery of knowledge.

Officials later informed us that the Universidad de La Habana trains 36,000 students in extensions throughout the nation’s capital city. It also extends its educational benefits to 1,500 foreign students at the undergraduate level and nearly 200 at the graduate level—free of cost. Moreover, the government sends its trained educators and medical personnel to work in Africa and Latin America as a Cuban equivalent of the U.S. Peace Corps. Finally, the university seeks to serve the city’s retired workers with enrichment classes in cultural subjects. One administrator described his institution as “una universidad para toda la gente, y para toda la vida [a university for all the people and for all their lives].” Therefore, Cuban faculty members seek to learn from the experiences of others and to share their achievements with foreign colleagues.

The convenio signed by Vice Provost Givens and Vice Rector Díaz López recognizes that the goals of our universities are complementary in many ways. With this acknowledgment in mind, the University of Texas at Austin and the Universidad de La Habana already have begun exchanges. History Ph.D. candidate Benjamin Narvaez spent the spring 2008 semester in Cuba completing research for his dissertation on Chinese contract workers in nineteenth-century Cuba. The Cubans too are coming to UT. Dr. Rafael Hernández, editor of Cuba’s leading intellectual journal, Temas, arrived in fall 2007 to teach UT students about the Cuban perspective in its relationship with the United States. A student in psychology, Daybel Panellas, is utilizing her fall appointment as visiting researcher to complete her Universidad de La Habana doctoral studies. If U.S. visa restrictions end, more Cubans will be able to attend UT’s academic conferences. In return, UT faculty members will be handing out UT baseball caps and exchanging ideas in research colloquia in Havana.

Perhaps we should be thanking Ramón Castro and the Cuban people for anything they can do for the University of Texas.

Jonathan Brown is Associate Director of LLILAS and Professor of History at the University of Texas at Austin.

“We Cubans know that the fate of our nation and humankind depends on our ideas, and the universalization of education is the only way to advance our social and scientific development. We cannot ignore our colleagues abroad as they too strive to solve common problems. We come here to share with you our ideas as well.”

—Dr. Rubén Zardoya Loureda
Rector of the Universidad de La Habana
February 11, 2008
"RACE IN THE OTHER AMERICA" IS AN ALLUSSION TO A SERIES OF ARTICLES TITLED *DA OUTRA AMÉRICA* THAT BRAZILIAN SOCIOLOGIST GILBERTO FREYRE WROTE DURING HIS STAY IN THE UNITED STATES. IN THESE ARTICLES, FREYRE OFTEN REFLECTED ON THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES. IN SOME RESPECTS, I AM DOING THE INVERSE IN THIS ARTICLE. RATHER THAN A WHITE BRAZILIAN MUSING OVER HIS SOJOURN IN THE UNITED STATES, I, AN AFRICAN AMERICAN, AM RECOUNTING MY EXPERIENCES IN BRAZIL. HOWEVER, FREYRE AND I CONVERGE ON AT LEAST ONE POINT—WHETHER IN BRAZIL OR IN THE UNITED STATES, RACE IS NEVER A SIMPLE MATTER.

My undergraduate coursework on the racial dynamics in the Atlantic world greatly shaped my interest in Brazil and the African diaspora. I entered the Latin American Studies program with the intention of studying race and slavery in Brazil, and my coursework at the University of Texas has greatly expanded my knowledge of Brazil's racial dynamics. According to 2006 census data collected by the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE), the Brazilian census bureau, 6.9 percent of the Brazil's populace self-identifies as black. However, if you consider pardos, a formal racial category for multiracial peoples, as Afro-Brazilians, as does IBGE, then Brazil is home to more than 92 million people of at least partial black ancestry—the largest Afro-descended population outside of Africa. As a graduate student in the Latin American Studies program at UT, I have focused my studies on the history and current politics regarding this segment of Brazilian society, which continues to constitute the bulk of the country's population.

I, however, learned the most about Brazil's complex and tumultuous history of race relations during the semester that I spent as an exchange student at the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP). UNICAMP, along with the Universidade de São Paulo, is one of the most renowned institutions of higher learning in Brazil and, by far, the best university if you, like me, study Brazilian social history. The Center for Research in Cultural and Social History (CECULT) at UNICAMP is home to several esteemed social historians, including Sidney Chalhoub, Robert Slenes, and Silvia Lara, with whom I studied. Yet, UNICAMP has not been a popular destination for American students studying.
in Brazil; I was the only American studying there at the time! Despite its renown among Brazilian undergraduate and graduate students alike, I suspect most American students prefer the sun-soaked beaches of Rio de Janeiro and Salvador or the fast-paced urban life of São Paulo to the more subdued Campinas, which is located in the interior of São Paulo state—one of the most prosperous regions of Brazil, yet lacking the excitement of Brazil’s more popular destinations. I, however, chose to study in Campinas for the academic experience. Studying at UNICAMP gave me the opportunity to interact with scholars at one of the most respected institutions of higher education in Brazil and Latin America, strengthen my command of Portuguese, enrich my thesis research, and expand my general knowledge of race relations in Brazil.

While UNICAMP provided a rigorous academic environment, I learned more about race in Brazil off-campus than on-campus. Many friends and colleagues, many of whom are involved in the movimento negro, shared their firsthand experiences of living in a country plagued by an unspoken racism. Our frequent discussions regarding racial quotas in university admissions, financial and structural barriers to social ascension, and day-to-day racial discrimination provided me a deeper, more personal understanding of how race functions in Brazilian society.

My participation in the fourth annual Dia da Consciência Negra march in São Paulo gave me an even greater insight into the struggle of Afro-descendants in Brazil. The march has been held every November 20 since 2004, which coincides with the anniversary of the death of Zumbi dos Palmares in 1695. Zumbi was the last leader of Palmares, the largest and longest lasting documented maroon community (or quilombo) in the Americas and a perennial icon of the movimento negro in Brazil. Today, November 20, which is an official holiday in some states and municipalities, honors the integral role that afrodescendentes have played in the construction of the Brazilian nation and highlights their continued struggle for full inclusion into the national body.

Afro-Brazilians’ continued efforts to gain a greater voice in the national political system are, in many ways, reflective of the quilombos’ current struggles to gain legal ownership of the lands they historically have occupied. When I returned to UT in the spring, I had the opportunity to deepen my knowledge of the history of quilombos and current racial politics in Brazil. I took part in a delegation organized by the UT Law School’s Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice that spent the semester studying the obstacles to the full implementation of a provision in the 1988 Brazilian constitution that guarantees the cultural and collective land rights of communities who self-identify as descendants of quilombolas (maroons). During spring break, the group traveled to Brazil and interviewed academics, governmental officials, NGOs, and activists with the ultimate goal of using the information gathered during the trip to draft a human rights report.

The most important part of the trip, however, was our visits to actual quilombos. First, we visited Sacopã, an urban quilombo that defies popularly held notions of what constitutes a maroon community. Sacopã is situated on one of the last forested tracts of Lagoa Rodrigo de Freitas, one of the priciest neighborhoods in Rio de Janeiro. The second community that we visited was Gamboa de Baixo—whose residents do not classify their community as a quilombo, but rather as a black fishing community—in Salvador, Bahia. The neighborhood was literally chopped in half in 1961 when the Avenida do Contorno was opened as part of a municipal modernization project. Since then, the communities have been fighting for basic amenities and a better public perception. The last quilombo that we visited was São Francisco do Paraguaçu, which is located in the Bahian Recôncavo. The community recently has been the target of attacks by the conservative media who accused the community of fraud in their titling procedures and falsely identifying as a quilombo.

In many ways, the visit to São Francisco do Paraguaçu, which fell on my twenty-fifth birthday, was the pinnacle of my experiences in Brazil. After several of the community members performed a quick samba de roda, much to my surprise, one of the community elders pulled me into the circle and nearly fifty of the community’s residents sang “Feliz Aniversário” to me. Despite my shock, I was touched that they made an effort to commemorate my—a stranger’s—birthday. There, in that community, I felt the sensation of being part of something greater, of being part of the African diaspora. We may not share the same language or culture, but we have a common heritage.

Jonathan Michael Square is a second-year master’s student in the Latin American Studies program. He received the Lozano Long Study Abroad Travel Grant to study at UNICAMP. Jonathan’s master’s thesis examines how Gilberto Freyre’s experiences and education in the United States influenced his vision of race in Brazil.

Left to right: 1) A message written outside the home of a São Francisco do Paraguaçu resident; it reads “We are quilombolas with much pride.” 2) A group of student protestors at the Dia da Consciência Negra march. 3) Jonathan standing in front of one of many waterfalls at Iguaçu Falls.
What Does the Left Do Right?
AN INTERVIEW WITH
RICARDO LAGOS
by Alvaro Quezada-Hofflinger

RICARDO LAGOS, ELECTED PRESIDENT OF Chile in 2000, was the first Socialist to hold the presidency since Salvador Allende. During his term, his popularity was bolstered by Chile’s impressive economic growth and by the adoption of democratic reforms. He left office in 2006 with approval ratings exceeding 70 percent. On March 6, 2008, President Lagos delivered the Lozano Long Lecture as the keynote address at the LLILAS-cosponsored conference The Performance of Leftist Governments in Latin America at the University of Texas at Austin. Alvaro Quezada-Hofflinger, a master’s candidate in Latin American Studies, interviewed President Lagos during that visit.

AQH: A new political left has emerged in the last decade in Latin America, and it has been very successful in capturing the presidency in many of the region’s countries. Rather than talking about the causes of Latin America’s shift to the left, I would like to discuss with you the main achievements of the leftist movements. So, my first question is: What does the left do right?

RL: First of all, I would like to say that in many cases more than a shift to the left, it is a shift against the actual system—which is different. In some cases, when the left has been a coalition for a long time, this means that it has been able to deliver, and that is why it is still in power. I mean when you have four successive presidents in Chile from the same coalition, it means that the coalition has been able to deliver and is performing as it is supposed to.

Now, I would say that during the nineties, quite a number of Latin American countries were very close to the so-called Washington Consensus, and they forgot that public social policy can increase economic inequality or poverty. Now, in many countries—you think Bolivia, you think Ecuador—well, in those countries, what happened was that the people were tired of the political ruling class. To some extent, that happened in Argentina in 2001 when “De la Rua” had to resign. I mean, what you have had in Latin America is many people protesting with their feet, marching in the streets and then preaching government, but it’s a good point to remember that in most places the legal process has been respected.

In short, the left has been able to deliver, and normally when it remains in power, it has done that. Second, in many cases the left gets the power precisely because it was against the existent “status quo,” and there has been opposition to the status quo. Third, there is no question that you have to have growth when you are an underdeveloped or developing country and a plan for distributing that growth. And I will say that, until now, the left has been able to do that job in a rather subtle way.

AQH: And what does the left do poorly, and how can it improve?

RL: I think they do wrong when they don’t realize that it’s necessary to have a substantial majority to introduce these reforms, because in dealing with these majorities, there needs to be a discussion. . . . If you want to have deep, deep changes, then very broad coalitions are going to be essential . . . to capture a national project.

AQH: In general, we can distinguish between two main tendencies of the left in South America: the radicalism of Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez versus the moderation of Chile’s Michelle Bachelet and Brazil’s Luiz Inácio Lula da
Silva. Which do you think is the more appropriate road for Latin America to take and why?

RL: I think that those two roads represent two different economic situations in each particular country. Chile, Brazil, and some others, of course you need to have growth before being able to have social policies that ensure growth is going to be with equity. If you don’t have growth, then you only have a few things to share, and therefore equity is essential. Now, it’s different when you are in a situation like Venezuela where in addition to growth what you have is a tremendous amount of external revenue coming from the price of oil. Therefore, President Chávez can go straight to public social policies because he has the money, he has the account balance that is necessary. What is the account balance in Chile or Brazil? You have to build that up, and of course, in some cases, like Chile and Brazil, we are having a very good time with the price of commodities. Now, if you look at the long term, what you are trying to do is to keep part of that revenue coming from the extra price of copper in order to transform that revenue into research and development for the future. In other words, how are we going to add value to our exports, for instance? How are we going to add value to our exports in copper, fruit, salmon, or whatever it is? We need more research, more development. Otherwise, we are going to be buying patents from the developed world, and this is not the way to do things.

AQH: Many countries in Latin America have modeled their economic and social policies on those in Chile. Do you think the Chilean model is the ideal for Latin America?

RL: Each country is different. In our case, we decided to open up our economy and compete in the world because we are a small country—15 million people, the size of the market is very small. When you are talking about Brazil—a huge country, tremendous internal market. So the way that they are going to open up the economy will have to be different from the way we open up ours.

Therefore, to talk of some ideal Chilean model is not fair because each country is different. Now, it’s true what I would say as a general principle: We need to have a democracy, number one. Number two, I think that we need some sound economic policies from the macro point of view, which means a balanced budget, an autonomous monetary policy, etc. But at the same time, I think it is essential to have public social policies that address economic inequalities in our society, particularly in Latin America, which is one of the most uneven societies. I remember once somebody asked Presidente Cardoso, “Is Brazil a rich or poor country?” And he said, “Brazil is an unjust country.”

AQH: You mentioned that Latin America is one of the most unequal regions in the world. So, is reducing the huge differences between the poorest and richest people in Latin America possible?

RL: Yes, yes, of course it is. First of all, I would like to make a distinction: You can fight poverty and decrease poverty in a particular country, but inequality remains very much the same. In many cases, this is simply because the upper, upper, upper income groups—not the highest 20 percent, the 10, the 1 percent, but the 0.5 percent—are so rich, so wealthy, that when you take that small group out of the picture, the distribution of income is much more fair, you know. Nevertheless, you can reduce poverty, there is no question of that, and in so many countries it is impossible to think that way, but today Latin America has a tremendous responsibility. During the last five years, per capita income in the region has grown 20 percent—20 percent in five years, simply because of the rise in our raw materials.

AQH: One of your slogans during your 1999 campaign was “Growth with equity.” What did your government do in order to reduce income inequality in Chile?

RL: Well, when I came to power in 2000, poverty in Chile was about 22.1 percent, something like that. And after six years, it was reduced to around 13.2 percent, so more than 1 point per year. And what is more important, the level of indigent people had been about 5.7 percent, and it was reduced to 3 point something. So I think from that point of view, it certainly was successful. Nevertheless, and much more important I think, is the increased enrollment in education, which means that in the long run the distribution of income is
A Q H: Michelle Bachelet was elected president in January 2006 with 53.5 percent of the votes. As you know, she is the first woman to hold this position in Chile’s history, and in 2007, Forbes Magazine ranked her the twenty-seventh most powerful woman in the world. Despite her high popularity in 2006, public approval of her government has consistently declined since she was elected. What is Michele Bachelet done wrong? What has she done right?

R L: Well, first of all, I will say that the president cannot be defined by looking at statistics for approval rating, because on many occasions, I had a very poor approval rating. But it’s due to several circumstances. Sometimes you have to pursue a particular policy until the moment when people will understand that policy; until then you are going to suffer.

I think that the student protests in 2006 and those about the new transport system in Santiago were two areas where there was some criticism. Nevertheless, I think that if you have students going to the streets asking for more quality in education, my only response was: “I’m so happy that students can protest to express their opinions because they are a by-product of democracy in Chile.” They were students of 15 and 16 years old, so they were born in 1990, and therefore because they are the sons of democracy, they are asking for more quality, and they deserve a response. Now, it’s not very easy to respond how you will improve the quality of education—that will take a long time.

With regard to the transport system, after a year it improved a lot, and I’m sure that later people will realize how important it was to have this new model of transport. If we want to have a cleaner city with less pollution, from the point of view of industry in the street . . . and let me just say . . . that the situation in Santiago is awful. So, it seems to me that whenever you have a new system, it will take some time to adjust to that. Which it is not to say that we didn’t make some mistakes as in any work done by humans. But I am rather confident that in the end, Michelle Bachelet will be a very good president of Chile. And it seems to me that people recognize her, how do you say now, “inteligencia emocional.”

A Q H: But what do you think she has done right, in view of all the criticism?

R L: First of all, I think the fact that she has been able to introduce a major reform in our social security system is going to be a tremendous legacy of her government. Second, I think that what they are trying to do to expand the preschool is also another very important goal in her administration. Finally, also very important is the reform of labor legislation that started during her administration. So, I think that in those three areas, there has been tremendous improvement in our society.

A Q H: There is a lot criticism about “concertación,” the coalition that took power in 1990 and remains after almost twenty years. Some people say that this is the last government of the Concertación de Partidos por la Democracia. What do you think about that?

R L: Well, I heard that early in my own administration (laughs). And the other day I was told that it was announced in the press that in a cabinet meeting Michelle Bachlet said that she expected that somebody from her own coalition would be in power after her. Well, I think that twenty years is a long time, and Chile today is a different society. And probably the most difficult issue is that because your agenda has been successful, you change the country, you change society, and therefore because you have achieved that, the time has come to have a new agenda for this newborn society that has resulted. . . . Now the time
has come to say what the new frontiers are that we are planning to reach in the next ten, fifteen, or twenty years.

**AQH:** And what do you think these new frontiers are?

**RL:** I think Chile will have to decide what kind of society we are going to have, a society that is free of the risk caused by being sick, free of the uncertainty about what you are going to do when you are old, free of the risk of being unable to educate your children because you have no money, free of the lack of choice of where to live. . . . In Asia you have a private sector, as in the U.S., [but] it’s my impression that Chile has to be able to work more along European lines. In some ways, we are not like the Europeans because we have some areas of privatization and we have some private education, and I don’t see any reason not to keep those things. But what I do think is necessary is to greatly increase resources . . . public resources to the public sector of those areas. . . . I was in Australia, and my finance minister came to see me and said, “It’s amazing.” The subsidy that goes into education from the public sector is much more equal to the cost of education being paid by the private sector. In Chile, the private sector pays five times more than the public sector for the public schools. Therefore, there is a tremendous challenge to reduce the private sector aspect, so now we are beginning to increase our subsidies, especially those that target neighborhoods where people lack advantages and adequate incomes. And I think that this is the new challenge that we have for the future.

**AQH:** On September 27, 2002, Chile was elected by the United Nations General Assembly to chair the Security Council. At this time, your government needed to make a very important decision about whether to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Your government voted against the U.S. proposal, and as a result, the UN did not support the U.S. invasion of Iraq. What was the outcome of this decision in terms of the relationship between Chile and the United States?

**RL:** Well, we have a very good relationship with the United States. And at that time, I said to President Bush—when you are friends, real friends, then you have to be very open and very frank, very honest with your answer—and I said, look, first we need more time for the United Nations inspector Hans Blitz to finish his job and make sure whether there are weapons of mass destruction. President Bush told me that the time for inspection was over and it was necessary for the Security Council to make a decision now. And I said, in that case, Mr. President, I cannot give Chile’s vote because I think that more time is needed.

Second, the United States told me that the president was going to form a coalition of the willing, those who wanted to proceed despite the decision of the Security Council. And he invited me to be part of that, and I told him very clearly that outside the United Nations we cannot do anything. Look, we are a small country. We are going to work on the global stage. We want to have some rules. . . . Globalization without rules creates a world where some people make the rules, as the globalizers, and some people accept the rules, as the globalized. I don’t want the world to have that division. Therefore, I think it is essential to have some kind of multilateral institution that is strong enough to tackle those problems that have a global dimension. When we are talking about climate change, there is no discussion anymore, because it is the main problem of human beings, one that we have influenced in only the last two hundred years. Therefore, it’s up to us to have a global answer. You know, I am special secretary with Yan Ki Moon, and we have been working on that. I’m rather optimistic that in the year 2009, we will be able to have the second Kyoto Agreement precisely to reduce emissions that are producing this climate change. But this is the kind of problem that is global, and the response has to be global. No single country can give the answer. Therefore, when we said no within the United Nations about going to war without the agreement of the Security Council, we were trying to strengthen that institution that exists for us. It’s really important.

**AQH:** In November of this year, the U.S. presidential election will take place. In your opinion, who is the best candidate for Latin America and why?

**RL:** It’s interesting because you have people who understand that Latin America is different countries. Quite a number of our countries are middle-income countries, and our problem is not to discuss aid. Our problem is to discuss the real things that matter to us, like international negotiations, financial protection, etc. Those areas will be so important to discuss with the United States to discover what are the areas of coincidence and the areas of disagreement, and then to work as nations on how to resolve those areas of disagreement. . . . Forty years ago, I was here in the states when John F. Kennedy designed the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance was a way for the U.S. to do what it thought best for Latin America, and Latin America accepted that. Now things are so different. Now the time has come to have Latin American countries and the U.S., if we want to have a better relationship, it is essential to understand each other’s problems. And I think that to understand each other’s problems is also to see our own problems in society. . . .

The issue of migration is not just the U.S.’s alone. In Chile, we have a lot of immigrants coming from Bolivia, from Ecuador, from Peru, and this will remain the case for many, many years to come. As long as economic conditions are a little bit different in Chile from other countries and people go to Chile, then they start sending remittances to the other countries. Do you think that the answer is to build a wall? Of course not. . . .

**AQH:** This is my last question. Fidel Castro, Cuba’s fiery revolutionary patriarch and an international icon of rebellion, announced he is stepping down as president, and his brother Raúl Castro is replacing him. My question is, does this bring implications for change, or does it really not matter?

**RL:** Well, I think that this is something our Cuban friends have to decide. I think it is important to be very careful about what is going on in Cuba, and to understand that it is up to the Cubans to define what kind of society they would like to have. And my only advice—if I can give some advice—is to say, please, why don’t we follow very closely what is going on and help Cubans to define for themselves what is better for their own country. I am really afraid sometimes when people would like to jump in there to “help” with some preconceived ideas of what has to be done because that’s better for the Cubans. No. I think that the Cubans know what is better for them. Let’s be cautious, and at the same time, let’s stand together to help them make the right decisions. That’s all.
In much of Latin America, the left is resurgent. During the 1990s, conservative policies held sway in much of the region, as even traditionally populist parties came to embrace the market-oriented paradigm. The new millennium, however, saw the region move in a different direction, driven in part by disenchantment with the traditional parties and their record of governance. By early 2008, left-of-center parties or movements had come to power in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela, and, nearly, Mexico and Peru as well.

The new left-of-center governments are often said to represent a wide variety of tendencies, yet we still have relatively little systematic and comparative information on their policy programs. To help fill this gap, the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies brought together distinguished academics from Latin America and the United States for a two-day conference entitled The Performance of Leftist Governments in Latin America: What Does the Left Do Right? This conference focused on four countries—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela—and covered a wide range of policy areas from economic and social policy to the reform of political institutions. The conference organizers, Wendy Hunter, Raúl Madrid, and Kurt Weyland of the Dept. of Government at the University of Texas at Austin, hope to publish the proceedings of this conference in a forthcoming volume.

The former president of Chile, Ricardo Lagos, kicked off the conference by delivering the 2008 Lozano Long lecture entitled: “Democracy, Equity, and Growth: 18 years of Democratic Coalition Government in Chile.” In his speech, Lagos linked the left to social justice and to the idea of giving “more power to the citizens.” He argued that the left could be distinguished from the right in part based on beliefs about whether society should be fundamentally shaped by citizens or consumers. Lagos acknowledged the benefits of a market economy, but he argued that if society is shaped only by consumers, then it will reproduce the inequities that exist in markets. Citizens, he argued, are equal in rights and duties, while consumers are unequal because their rights and influence “depend on the size of their pockets.”

Although there may be widespread agreement on the left about the need for greater social justice and citizen participation, there has been a great deal of variation in how leftist governments have chosen to achieve these aims. Venezuela has carried out the most far-reaching changes to date. The administration of Hugo Chávez has dramatically overhauled the country's existing political institutions, expanded state intervention in the economy, and boosted social spending significantly. Left-of-center governments in Brazil and Chile, by contrast, have largely worked within the existing policy institutions and have embraced the existing market-oriented economic policy model. Finally, the government of Evo Morales in Bolivia represents an intermediate point between...
these two poles, although it leans more in the direction of Chávez. The Morales administration has sought to dramatically reform the constitution and has expanded the role of the state in the economy, but so far it has employed rather cautious fiscal and wage policies.

The differences between the four countries have been sharpest with regard to political reforms and rhetoric. Whereas center-left governments in Brazil and Chile have largely maintained the existing constitutions, sought out common ground with the opposition, and avoided polarizing rhetoric, populist left governments in Bolivia and Venezuela have created new constitutions, swept away existing political institutions, and maintained hostile relations with the opposition.

Notable differences among the leftist governments also have emerged with regard to economic policy. Left-of-center governments in Brazil and Chile largely have maintained the market-oriented model bequeathed to them by their predecessors, but Bolivia and, especially, Venezuela have increased state intervention in their economies. Nevertheless, neither of the latter two countries has moved to nationalize the economy, run up huge fiscal deficits, dramatically reduced their foreign trade with the United States, or carried out other sweeping reforms associated with left-wing governments in previous eras. Thus, the differences between the leftist governments in this policy area, while significant, are not vast.

The smallest differences have emerged in the area of social policy. Left-of-center governments in all four countries have introduced new social policy initiatives and have expanded social spending. Given the limited resources available, they have adopted many programs that target the poorest sectors of the population, an approach in line with recent prescriptions by the World Bank and other international development organizations. Nevertheless, they have implemented some universalistic programs as well. The left-of-center governments in all four countries also have focused on state-directed social policy initiatives, rather than the privately managed social programs embraced by some of their successors.

Jennifer Pribble, and John Stephens points out, the Lagos administration enacted reforms in 2005 that eliminated the appointed senators, gave the president the power to remove the heads of the armed services, and reduced the authority of the National Security Council. Nevertheless, by and large, the Concertación has respected existing political institutions and those institutional reforms that it has enacted have been undertaken with the support of significant sectors of the opposition.

The Concertación also has employed relatively conservative economic policies, opting to maintain the market-oriented economic strategy initiated under Pinochet. As Huber, Pribble, and Stephens discuss, the Concertación government has kept the economy relatively open to foreign trade and investment, and it has generally refrained from intervening in the economy. The Concertación also has practiced fiscal conservatism and wage restraint, although it has regularly boosted the minimum wage and it initially raised taxes to finance increased social spending. These policies have kept inflation low and have generated steady economic growth. Indeed, as the conference paper by Ricardo Ffrench-Davis points out, the macro-economic performance of the Concertación government has been considerably better than that of the military regime that preceded it. Whereas annual GDP growth averaged 2.9 percent between 1974 and 1989, it averaged 5.4 percent between 1990 and 2007. The inflation and unemployment rate, meanwhile, has been significantly lower under the Concertación than during the Pinochet regime.

Although there may be widespread agreement on the need for greater social justice and citizen participation, there has been a great deal of variation in how leftist governments have chosen to achieve these aims.
According to Cardoso, the Concertación has departed importantly from the previous regime in terms of its social and labor policies. The Lagos administration, for example, introduced unemployment insurance, legalized divorce, initiated universal health care coverage for certain common illnesses (Plan AUGE), and created a welfare program for the poorest sectors of the population that involves cash transfers as well as counseling (Chile Solidario). The Bachelet administration, meanwhile, has expanded the provision of public daycare and created two new state-funded pensions for people who either have not contributed to the private pension system or have not contributed enough to earn a decent pension. These reforms, taken as a whole, represent significant social policy changes.

The Lula administration in Brazil has resembled the Concertación governments in Chile in terms of its moderate policies. Indeed, there has been a great deal of continuity in policies between the Lula administration, which took power in 2003, and its predecessor, the centrist government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso. The Lula administration has not sought to carry out major constitutional reforms, and it has been relatively pragmatic in terms of reaching across the political spectrum in order to get legislation approved. In the 2002 and 2006 elections, it even ran in alliance with more conservative parties.

As the conference paper by Pedro Luiz Barros Silva, José Carlos de Souza Braga, and Vera Lúcia Cabral Costa argues, this combination of pro-market economic policies and pro-poor social policies has helped Lula win widespread support from both poor and well-off sectors of the population.

The Contestatory Left

The contestatory left, by contrast, has broken much more dramatically with past policies and institutions. Nowhere is this clearer than with the Chávez administration in Venezuela, which took power in 1999. As Steve Ellner discussed in his conference paper, Chávez has moved to overhaul existing political institutions and consolidate control of the Venezuelan government. Shortly after taking office, Chávez convened a constituent assembly dominated by his supporters, which dissolved the existing legislature and the supreme court, extended the president’s term, and allowed for immediate presidential re-election. Chávez also stacked his supporters in institutions that were traditionally nonpartisan, such as the Attorney General’s Office, the Comptroller’s Office, and the National Electoral Council, by lowering the size of the senate, creating direct elections to fill the Supreme Court, and allowing elected officials to be subject to recall elections. Finally, the new constitution, which still needs to be approved in a referendum, would allow presidents to serve two consecutive five year terms, allowing Morales to stay on for another ten years. It also seeks to weaken the opposition’s control of the senate, the prefects, and the judiciary by expanding the size of the senate, creating direct elections to fill the Supreme Court, and allowing elected officials to be subject to recall elections. Finally, the new constitution would increase the government’s control of other institutions such as the Human Rights Ombudsman, the Comptroller General’s Office, and the National Electoral Court, by lowering...
the amount of congressional support necessary to confirm governmental appointees to these posts. The new constitution has been vigorously opposed by the opposition, leading to growing political polarization in Bolivia.

In economic policy, the Morales administration also has followed the Chávez model to some degree, moving Bolivia in a more statist direction. The Morales government has refused to negotiate a free trade agreement with the United States, and it has exerted more state control over the economy, particularly in the natural resource sector. As the paper by Benjamin Kohl and Linda Farthing argues, however, the government’s economic policy has been moderate and reformist, rather than radical. The Morales administration, for example, has limited wage and spending increases, it has built up its international reserves to record levels, and it has worked hard to maintain its existing trade arrangements with the United States. Even the country’s vaunted gas industry “nationalization” plan was hardly radical in that it has emphasized renegotiation of contracts rather than expropriation, for the most part. As the paper by George Gray Molina points out, the Morales administration has forced the foreign-owned gas companies to pay a larger share of their revenue to the Bolivian government, threatening them with expropriation if they fail to comply. Although Morales’s economic policies represent a departure from the market-oriented policies of the last two decades, they are not inconsistent with the state-capitalist policies pursued in Bolivia prior to 1985.

Nor has the social policy of the Morales administration represented a dramatic break with the past. The Morales government, like its counterparts in Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela, has expanded social spending and introduced some new social policy initiatives. These initiatives, however, have built on existing policies, as Gray Molina discusses. The Morales administration’s new pension program, Renta Dignidad, simply expands the non-contributory pension system introduced during the first administration of President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada. Morales’s major new conditional cash transfer program, the Bono Juancito Pinto, was modeled on programs introduced earlier in the municipality of El Alto, Bolivia, as well as in other Latin American nations. Even the agrarian reform plan, according to Kohl and Farthing, did not depart from existing land tenure principles. Moreover, the Morales administration has moved cautiously in the implementation of this reform because of the potential for violence. Thus, the Morales administration’s social policies do not significantly differentiate the government from its more moderate neighbors in Brazil and Chile.

Conclusion
Left-wing governments have brought change to Latin America, but the extent of these changes has varied considerably across countries and policy areas. In Brazil and Chile, left-of-center governments have been more aggressive than their predecessors in using social policies to address poverty and inequality, but they have largely embraced the political institutions and economic policies they inherited from previous regimes. In Bolivia and Venezuela, populist leaders have engaged in fiery rhetoric and sought to radically overhaul their countries’ political institutions. Nevertheless, even in these countries, the economic and social policies of left-wing governments have been a far cry from the socialist policies of Fidel Castro in Cuba or Salvador Allende in Chile.

The performance of these left governments has also varied. Chile is the clearest success story with an impressive record of growth, stability, and social progress. In Brazil too, the left has presided over economic growth and stability, but the left has been in power for a much shorter time in Brazil than Chile, and its accomplishments have been more modest. In Bolivia and Venezuela, the record of left government is decidedly mixed. The Venezuelan economy has experienced considerable volatility during the Chávez years, although it is currently in the midst of an oil-driven boom. The Bolivian economy, meanwhile, has generated strong growth so far under the Morales administration, but there are some worrisome signs of inflation. Traditionally marginalized sectors of the population have acquired more influence in Bolivia and Venezuela in recent years, but both countries have become more polarized and less democratic. It may be too soon to conclude that the moderate left is more successful than the counterstausory left, but the trend certainly points in that direction.

Raúl Madrid is Associate Professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin. 

IN MEMORIAM

John W. F. Dulles, who taught at the University of Texas for more than forty-five years and was a familiar face at LLILAS, died June 23, 2008, in San Antonio at the age of 95. His wife of sixty-eight years, Eleanor Ritter Dulles, preceded him in death four days earlier, on June 19.

Born in Auburn, New York, in 1913, Professor Dulles was the eldest son of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. His early career was in mining, beginning at the Duquesne mine in Patagonia, Arizona, followed by work as assistant general manager at Cia. Minera de Peñoles in Monterrey, Mexico. His interest in Mexico led to his first book, Yesterday in Mexico: A Chronicle of the Revolution 1919–1936. Following his job at Peñoles, he became executive vice president of Cia. Mineraço Novalimens in Belo Horizonte, which in turn led to his lifelong interest in Brazil and more than twelve books on its history.

Professor Dulles had just finished his forty-fifth year of teaching at UT and was preparing his fall course material at the time of his death. Among his numerous publications was his most recent book, the second of a two-volume biography, Resisting Brazil’s Military Regime: An Account of the Battles of Sobral Pinto, published by the University of Texas Press in 2007.

Professor Dulles will be remembered as a dedicated scholar and will be greatly missed by his many friends and colleagues at the University of Texas and throughout Latin America.
In Fall 2007, the Blanton Museum of Art cosponsored an artist residency with the Iberê Camargo Foundation, based in Porto Alegre, Brazil. Former Blanton Curator of Latin American Art Gabriel Pérez-Barreiro explains how the relationship with the Blanton Museum developed: “I came to know the Camargo Foundation around three years ago when the then director, Fernando Schuler, came to Austin on a fact-finding mission, to discover that we are probably the only U.S. museum with a major Iberê Camargo work in the collection. He then invited me to Porto Alegre to speak at a symposium on museums. This was my first contact with Porto Alegre. At the time, they were sponsoring an artist-in-residence at the Art Institute of Chicago, and I proposed that they refocus to UT, given our connections to Latin America. They agreed, and this was the first year we tried. Last year the Foundation offered a scholarship in Austin and one in France. I was pleased to see that more people applied for Austin.”

Erin Aldana, a doctoral candidate specializing in contemporary Brazilian art, recently had the opportunity to speak with Matheus Rocha-Pitta, the artist chosen for the residency in Austin. He was born in 1980 in Minas Gerais, and studied history at the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais and philosophy at the Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro. Over the years, his work has focused on the displacement and discontinuity of contemporary life. His residency project, Drive Thru, was recently awarded the first edition of the Illy Sustainart and ARCO prize in Spain, an award given to young artists to support the development of their careers.

EA: Maybe you could start by talking about how you became interested in art. Where did you go to school? Did you make art as a child, or was it something that happened later?

MRP: My father was an artist, so I grew up in his studio. It was part of my formation, reading all of the books in his library. But I never had manual skills, so I never thought of myself as an artist because of that. I drew, but not well.

EA: What kind of art did your father do?

MRP: He was a very good painter, so the idea of art for me was associated with these manual skills, so when I was a child, I always thought I would become a writer (laughing). When I moved to Rio to go to school, I already had a camera and had taken some photographs that I really liked. I started working in an advertising studio and I really became involved with photography. It was not a conscious decision; it was more conscious afterward when I realized that that was what I wanted to do. I have many divergent interests and being an artist allows me to bring everything together.

EA: So you started out doing photography, and then worked in advertising?

MRP: Yes, I was an assistant to an advertising photographer for a year, and then I became the assistant for Miguel Rio Branco.
EA: Wow, he is really famous, isn’t he?

MRP: Yes, I knew someone who had his number and I just called him and said, “I want to be your assistant.” With Miguel, I did not learn technique, but learned how to edit and how to produce a discourse through photographs. It is not just about taking good pictures; it is also about focusing on something that was very important to me.

EA: Like telling a story?

MRP: Yes, maybe, but it is more about what you want to say. When you are a photographer, you can take really good pictures of almost anything, so it is really important to know how to edit. To edit your own work is as important as being a good photographer. That was the most important thing that I learned from him.

EA: So now you are working in video?

MRP: Yes, I started to make video about three years ago, and now it has become very important for me, more than photography.

EA: And did you work with anyone, or just teach yourself?

MRP: I am very self-taught. A video camera is completely automatic.

EA: So you never really formally studied art at school or anything like that? (He shakes his head.) So why don’t you believe in that?

MRP: First, I think that you do not teach anyone to be an artist, and second, for me it is more important to learn philosophy and history. I studied other artists and worked with other artists and that is how I learned.

EA: So who or what are some of your artistic influences?

MRP: I am really receptive, so the range of material that has influenced me is really huge. There are some artists who are really important for me, like Hélio Oiticica and Robert Smithson. I like artists who write; Smithson’s writings are really important for me. For me, they just opened a new ground. I like the unfinished character of their work. I admire that because, those artists, you can work with them, their heritage is open. I like this idea of works that are not directed.

EA: Yes, I am thinking about the project in which Smithson buried a shed at a university.

MRP: Yes, my project is very related to this. Also the project by Hélio Oiticica, Giving Back the Earth to the Earth

EA: The one where he poured some dirt on the ground in the middle of a box and it left a square shape behind?

MRP: Yes, these two projects were really important for me. I like them because you can respond to them and establish a dialogue; their work is not like something finished, hanging on a wall.

EA: Could you tell me a little more about the residency program at UT and how you became involved with it?

MRP: The program is a partnership with the Iberê Camargo Foundation and the Blanton Museum. There was an open call in Brazil, so I applied for it. The Iberê Camargo Foundation does it every year, and it is always in a different country.

EA: What are some of the other places where they have done it?

MRP: Every year there are two residencies; this year it was in Austin and Rennes, in France, last year it was in Chicago and Buenos Aires, the year before that it was in Chicago and Mexico, the first year it was in London and Paris. So each year they make different connections. You must apply with your work and a specific project as well. The idea of travel is really important, but it is not a vacation.

EA: I know what you mean.

MRP: For me the most important thing here is to be working in a completely hostile environment. In my city, I know how everything works and here it is completely different and that is really challenging, which is nice.

EA: Could you give me an example?

MRP: For instance, I had to find a place to make my video. This in Brazil would be very easy. You just go there and do it. The idea of public space in Brazil is completely different from here. I have the impression that public space here is negative, it is where you cannot smoke, you cannot drink. It is actually almost private since it belongs to the state. With my
first attempt to find a place that was very movie-friendly, I called them and they asked me if I had insurance. When I said no, they said they could not help me, because if anything happens, they are liable.

EA: Everyone is afraid of a lawsuit; that is how it is here.

MRP: In Brazil, you are liable for yourself, so this is one aspect that I really started to perceive. Also, the working relations are very different here. In Brazil, the basis is more informal, so for an artist it is very nice because you have more freedom to experiment, there are not so many rules. That is good, especially for me, because I like to work outside of the studio. I could not imagine how things would be here, how this would affect the work. It was very important for the project as well, so it was really nice to know how social space is organized, and the importance of cars.

EA: Yes, cars are very important here. If you live in a city where the public transportation is not that great, you really need to have a car.

MRP: When you are working in your home [country], you take so much for granted, so here you are conscious of almost every aspect of the work. It also makes me reread my former works. It is not exactly the work; it is also the way [working in another country] can give you a different perspective about your work.

EA: Could you give examples of some of the projects that you did before the residency?

MRP: I did a project in 2005 called Drive In for which I also used a car. I had a gallery show in a small shopping center that had an underground parking lot, so I used the parking lot as an exhibition space. I was thinking of the gallery as a sort of cave, so I made a circuit between the gallery and the parking lot and disrupted the circuit. I made a replica of the gallery inside the car. The project was about the gallery and the parking lot and changing one for another. A friend told me it was like the two sides of a coin, in which the two sides do not meet. It is related to this project here because it is also involves questions of cinema and movement. When you go to the cinema, you sit, you do not move and everything comes to you. So instead of the car going somewhere, I made the piece go through the car. So instead of the car crossing the landscape or crossing the border, I made everything cross the car. The car becomes a sort of “screen” or container for the movement and not the movement itself.

EA: Usually when you think of a car, you think of a car moving; it is one of the crucial aspects of experiencing being inside a car. In your case, you have a car that is not moving at all. Could you describe this work for someone who has not seen it?

MRP: My first inspiration was police procedures. In Rio, the police confiscate everything: drugs, money, guns, contraband. Sometimes the police build huge displays and call the press. It is a form of self-advertisement. In these operations they use the car as a support for the display; they place the objects on the hood and photograph them. What strikes me in this procedure is that there is a circuit of circulation of goods that is related to the market and when the police apprehend it, they take it out of one circuit and put it into another, which is the media circuit. There is a sort of destruction between image and object, because the object is taken out of circulation, but its image is widespread. And no one really knows what happens to the drugs after that. Also the word “apprehension” has the sense of a sort of capture, an aesthetic procedure of appropriation, and I like to think of this capture as something related.

The project was inspired by this police procedure. When I applied for the residency, my project was very broad. And when I knew that I was coming to Texas, I started to do research.

EA: Did you know already that you were going to use a car?

MRP: Yes, I knew that I would use the car as a display for the objects, but I was not sure what objects I would use: fake guns, or fake money. Eventually, I decided to do a “land apprehension” which is very contradictory, because the land is not an object. I liked this kind of challenge because it made the project broader, and called into question what an object is.

EA: Maybe what you can own?

MRP: The border issue came up, because whenever you put a fence around the land, you are saying you cannot consume this land.

EA: Well, also, Texas used to be part of Mexico; that is an interesting fact in relation to your project.

MRP: It also speaks to the arbitrariness of the border. Of course it has a physical location, but the border is not about being specific. Basically, there is a car with a fence inside it, and the landscape, which is dirt, crosses the car. In order to make the landscape into an object, I packed it with transparent tape, which added another layer, because the packs of dirt look like drugs. In the beginning, you might think that they are drugs, but you realize that it is just dirt. It makes the dirt into a commodity. As the packs go through the car, passing through the fence, they are unpacked, so the dirt returns to its natural state.

EA: So is that what the video consists of, having the dirt move through the car?

MRP: Yes, the dirt and the fence move through the car, so the car “crosses” them without moving. The project is basically the video and the car itself as a form of sculpture.

This program is organized by the Blanton Museum of Art, supported by the Barbara Duncan Centennial Endowed Lectureship. Additional support has been provided by the Creative Research Lab in the Department of Art and Art History, and the Brazil Center at the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas at Austin.
In 1985 I published an article titled “El movimiento indígena en Guatemala: 1970–1983” in which I problematized the conditions that led to the insurrection by the Maya population in the Guatemalan highlands from 1979 to 1983. I quoted the Documento de Marzo 1967, an evaluation made by Ricardo Ramírez, future commander-in-chief of the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP) under the pseudonym of Rolando Morán, of the state of guerrilla warfare after the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR) were defeated in the mid-1960s. He argued that one of the main reasons for their defeat was the FAR’s incapacity to mobilize the Maya population. With this statement he launched a foundational critique of the revolutionary/indigenous paradigm that pointed the way to Guatemala’s civil war. Morán proposed a political-military structure whereby Mayas would be incorporated as the base of support for a guerrilla column that centralized all political and military decision-making.

Prior to the mid-1960s, the Mayas had not been on the Guatemalan left’s radar. The pre-1968 belief among Guatemala’s Communist leftists was that Mayas were “feudal leftovers” and, by extension, “a reserve for reactionary landlords.” According to this logic, Communist cadres in the 1960s fully embraced the classical Mexican anthropological notions of mestizaje and indigenismo as originally developed by Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán—and, by extension, justified mestizaje and forced acculturation. Such thinking ultimately re-wove the threads of colonialism and racism into the seemingly radical Communist narrative regarding the nation.

During the 1960s, the state simultaneously tried to fulfill the role of agent for development while still repressing the population to keep those modernizing features from bringing about changes in the Ladino power structure. Those attempts at modernization, nevertheless, generated expectations among Mayas, unsettled the traditional order by generating rapid changes, and made for a combustible mix when combined with the work that Catholic missionaries following the tenets of Liberation Theology were doing with Guatemala’s indigenous poor.

These issues generated a full-fledged academic debate at the University of San Carlos in the early 1970s, in which major Guatemalan figures such as Carlos Guzmán Böckler, Mario Solórzano Foppa, and Severo Martínez participated. Their efforts produced an initial theorization about ethnicity on the part of Ladino intellectuals. This theorization, however limited and partial, was the first to configure Maya subjectivity from a Ladino point of view. It thus became a foundational source for two political-military organizations launched in the early 1970s, the EGP and the Organization of People in Arms (ORPA).

The traditional Ladino-led revolutionary leftists saw themselves as the intellectual architects of the revolution. Within the scope of what Rama defined as “the lettered city,” they monopolized leadership posts and power/knowledge relations while Mayas provided most of the cannon-fodder as combatants and logistical support. The Mayas saw it differently. They kept their ethnic goals a secret. They called this la...
conspiración dentro de la conspiración (the conspiracy within the conspiracy). As verbalized by Maya Ixil leader Pablo Ceto in 1981, it consisted of trying to move up the revolutionary ladder as far as possible, but not to further the revolutionaries’ goals as a whole; rather, they sought to further the Mayas’ own secret goals of agency. Because of their grassroots organizational efforts, they called themselves “Maya populares.” Other Maya cadres, however, agreed on agency and empowerment but disagreed on the need to violently confront the Ladino state. Most of the latter were studying in Europe and the U.S. They were later labeled by their rivals “Maya culturales.” The Ladino-led revolutionary process became, from a Maya point of view, a mere vehicle for the defense of Maya identity, for gaining agency, and for the future configuration of their enfranchisement, regardless of whether they were members of one tendency or the other. Ladino members of the revolutionary left, however, were blind to this outcome. Their conception remained rooted in the pre-1968 foco-theory as developed by Guevara in the aftermath of the Cuban Revolution. Their ideas about ethnicity were not much more developed than those espoused by Stalin when granting the right of self-determination to the various nationalities within Russia as Commissar of Nationalities in 1917.

According to the Ladino history of the Guatemalan civil war, there was from 1979 to 1982 a spontaneous insurrection in the Maya highlands, within a broader revolutionary effort begun in 1974 when EGP was founded. The Ladino revolutionary organizations were unable to bring the “undisciplined” masses under their centralized control. The revolutionary movement as a whole was neutralized politically by 1982, defeated militarily the following year, and, after lingering in the jungle for more than a dozen more years as a power factor, they signed a peace treaty in December 1996 that enabled them to become a legal political party. In this narrative of events, it is clear that the revolutionaries lost the war. It was a narrative that I myself had embraced in my aforementioned article nearly eighteen years ago, but it contains significant errors. For one, it soft pedaled the guerrillas’ paternalistic behavior, instead of problematizing authoritarian manipulations and the inevitable militaristic normativity weighing down political-revolutionary organizations from their very beginnings. Nor does it address their own exercise of violence when they forced people to join their effort in liberated areas or zones, and when they tried to hegemonize the heterogeneous and fractured leftist movement. The categorical separation between “Maya populares” as peasants, and “Maya culturales” as bourgeois or elite, should also be nuanced, given the two groups’ similar goals. Finally, in the official history of the Guatemalan left, the Liberation Theology priests and the organized left considered themselves to be the engine of history. The Maya population remained primarily a reactive object of history, and their struggle for agency was ignored.

Rethinking the Maya narrative from the Maya perspective, we observe decentralized sites of struggle where subjugated peoples contest hegemony, recovering local voices; we discover alternative struggles for agency and self-empowerment. This is as it should be: Mayas remain, in statistical terms, the war’s greatest victims. Among the quarter of a million war dead and the hundreds of thousands of refugees, most were Mayas, and the army was officially accused in Guatemala: Memory of Silence (Commission for Historical Clarification, 1998) of wiping out more than six hundred Maya villages. But, more important, the apparently absolute division between the group favored by Ladino leftist ideology, the “Maya populares,” and their supposed rivals or class oppressors, the “Maya culturales,” is greatly attenuated if we read the story from the Maya viewpoint. “Maya populares” were, in general, poorer, illiterate, rural Mayas, such as Rigoberta Menchú and her family, whereas “Maya culturales” were, for the most part, members of Maya elites with high school diplomas from the towns of Quezaltenango or Santa Cruz del Quiché, many of whom had gone on to enroll at the University of San Carlos and, in some instances, had won scholarships to study abroad. Nevertheless, some members of the Maya elite, such as the Alvarez family of Santa Cruz del Quiché, joined the EGP while many of the sons and daughters of the so-called Maya bourgeoisie in Quezaltenango joined ORPA. Thus, class is not the central issue in this division, which is more conceptual and cultural, one of means, not ends.

In the earlier part of the struggle, from the semi-insurrection of 1979 to the summer of 1983, “Maya populares” linked to revolutionary organizations had more visibility, but this was because they accepted a subservient role within the ranks of Ladino-led revolutionary organizations. This self-disciplining process often implied a renunciation of their ethnic demands. When the revolutionary war effort stalled, “Maya culturales” poured their energy into reviving their cultural heritage through peaceful, and often institutional, means.

During the years leading to the peace signing in 1996, the tension between “Maya populares” and “Maya culturales” continued to flip-flop as both groups struggled to gain the upper hand. This was most evident in October 1991, when the latter tried to keep the former from participating, or having any say, in the celebration of the Second Continental Meeting of Indigenous Peoples to commemorate five hundred years of indigenous resistance. At this juncture, the “Maya populares,” having lost their base of support, which now lay scattered either in refugee camps in Mexico or in the jungle, had become virtual intellectual prisoners of the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG), which kept a tight party discipline in typical Leninist vertical fashion. “Maya culturales” complained that they either were not allowed to participate in the event or were placed in marginal positions within it, so that “Maya populares,” and especially Rigoberta Menchú, could play a preferential role, since she was already a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize. Nevertheless, it became the first time that both groups participated jointly in an event. Within a year Menchú won the Nobel Peace Prize, and her initial gesture was to break with the URNG, the Ladino-led Guatemalan revolutionary unity, and to build a bridge to the “Maya culturales” in the hopes of forming a single and unified Maya movement free from any Ladino/revolutionary/Marxist-Leninist tutorial role.

The Maya movement emerged as the one distinctive, rising social movement during the peace accords:

Mayan organizations in the ASC fought vigorously for the Accord on Indigenous Rights and Identity (AIDPI), and grew in strength and stature during the negotiations. Forming COPMAGUA (Coordinating Committee of the Maya Peoples of Guatemala), the largest umbrella group of Mayan organizations, was considered a crucial step for Mayan unity. The peace accords recognized COPMAGUA as an official counterpart of the government in peace implementation. These developments
made many feel that the time of the Maya had finally arrived (Who Governs? Guatemala Five Years after the Peace Accords, R. Sieder et al. 2001:21).

The problem with COPMAGUA was that it was still controlled by the URNG, which, rather than allowing free-flowing horizontal relations among indigenous groups, imposed a verticalist discipline through the “Maya populares” they still controlled. “Maya culturales” negotiated bilaterally with Menchú, who had become a third force and a bridge between “Maya populares” and “Maya culturales.” Politically, though, COPMAGUA’s verticalism prevented the emergence of a genuinely autonomous cultural citizenship. This lack meant that public processes to generate support for Maya issues in the public arena never took place. It sufficed that military officers and guerrilla commanders negotiating the peace process behind closed doors agreed. The result was that, whereas the Peace Accords of 1996 established bilingual education for the entire Maya population, and a plethora of rights—such as a land fund, a right to judge and be judged in their own language, or even to implement Maya law at the local level—as well as recognition of their subjectivity, Maya organizations still were absent from the national scene. Very few believed in COPMAGUA because it was perceived as a front for the URNG, even if this was only partially true. Thus, even though in 1996 it appeared that Mayas were ultimately the victors in this war—despite the high cost they had paid in terms of dead, disappeared, and immeasurable psychological trauma for hundreds of thousands—once the euphoria of the peace signing faded, most social trends returned to business as usual.

For these reasons, I argue that the verticalist imposition of Maya rights by “Maya Populares” acting on behalf of the URNG was a pyrrhic victory. At a time when Mayas could have generated a movement similar to the one that led to Evo Morales’s presidency in Bolivia, the URNG’s traditional understanding of politics as an agreement exercised exclusively among top leaders behind closed doors caused this moment to dissipate. Instead, Guatemala slid into an era that Charles R. Hale has labeled “indio permitido,” one controlled by Ladino forces across the political spectrum (Más que un indio, 2006:298). Hale states: “It is more accurate to view the COPMAGUA debacle as a punctuating episode in the long-term cycle of alliance-estrangement between Mayas and the ladino-controlled left” (296). The split between “Maya populares” and “Maya culturales” was part of the heritage of 1968. In other words, it is emblematic of the differing political views for which 1968 stands as a divide. “Maya populares,” though providing the backbone of revolutionary resistance and insurrection in the late 1970s and early 1980s, were tied to a pre-1968 vision of politics. This was a modern, verticalist, ultimately Eurocentric vision, whereby Mayas were the masses behind an avant-garde party that thought and decided in their name, but which also instrumentalized them, deploying ethnic animosity as a driving force behind revolutionary violence. In other words, the political-military structure of guerrilla organizations politicized ethnicity, without ever reflecting on the implications of the colonial nature of power within their very own organizations. Indeed, to a large extent, we could go so far as to claim that the manipulation of Maya populations by political military organizations could very well have had a basis in colonial attitudes and practices.

“Maya culturales” on the other hand, who were originally elitist and nonbelligerent in their approach, slid more comfortably into the spaces of the local and into the articulation of indigenous identity as a site of contestation, even when they were participating in the process that would conform to the era of the “indio permitido,” when, in Hale’s words, “Maya culture lost its claim to being a singular, or even predominant, political valence and became the site of constant, profound contestation” (296). By virtue of their affirmation of Maya rights and identity in the context of a Maya cultural struggle, they had a better basis for redefining their terms of engagement with the state and with Ladino political forces. Thus, without ever conceptualizing themselves as a post-1968 model of multicentric networks, they de facto ended up behaving as just such a network, a loose affiliation of the type that has emerged in the context of the World Social Forum (The Historical Evolution of World-Systems, Chase-Dunn et al. 2007). By returning to the local to reanchor their identity within a valued identity horizon that spelled “roots” from within an imaginary or ideational space that bolstered the legitimacy and the self-worth of the community, they became better equipped to reposition their locality within newer global designs that have emerged since 1968. After all, in Latin America today, indigeneity (from the Zapatista to the Mapuche) “is a historical formation characterized by its eloquent embrace of modern and non-modern institutions” (LASA Forum, de la Cadena, Fall 2007:9). According to this logic, an indigenous neo-developmentism could very well point the way toward a new left, one very different from the outdated, verticalist authoritarian model inherited from the Jacobins. This more radical possibility, still to be named, combines features of postcapitalist, postliberal, and poststatist society, which some Maya thinkers linked to grassroots efforts embody and are beginning to theorize, albeit in a tentative way. What these communities might be producing is un modo de futuro (a model of the future; prologue to Dispersar el poder, Raquel Gutiérrez and Luis Gomez 2006:17). We can, of course, wonder if the communal system can achieve a stable expansion of their noncapitalist practices and nonstate forms of power. Can these practices of economic, ecological, and cultural difference be institutionalized in some fashion, without falling back into dominant modernist forms? Can communitarian models ever be the basis for an alternative, and effective, institutionalization of the social? Can the new worlds envisioned by the Zapatistas, the World Social Forum, and many other social movements, be reached through the construction of nonstatist, postcapitalist, and postliberal local and regional autonomies? And can these alternatives find a way to coexist, in mutual respect and tolerance, with what until now have been dominant, and allegedly universal, modern forms of life?

Arturo Arias is a Professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Texas at Austin.

NOTES: 1) The best known books that came out of this debate are La patria del criollo by Martínez Peláez, and Guatemala: Una interpretación histórico-social by Guzmán Böckler and Jean-Loup Herbert, but it also produced seminal articles such as “El nacionalismo indígena: Una ideología burguesa” by Mario Solórzano Poppa. 2) Personal communication. Mexico City, Spring 1981.
LIKE OIL AND WATER, ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT do not always mix, at least not in public, where advocates for the two issues often hunker down into entrenched political camps. In an effort to bridge the divide—and unite two regions that have their own share of political history—the University of Texas at Austin’s Jackson School of Geosciences launched the Latin American Forum on Energy and the Environment. The initiative was designed to revitalize the university’s ties to the energy and geoscience sectors of Latin America while creating a space for stakeholders to explore balanced stewardship of energy and environmental resources.

Charles Groat, a professor of energy and mineral resources at the Jackson School, where he currently serves as interim dean, sees the value of organizations like the forum that can bring together diverse players. “Energy and mineral producers commonly play up the economic value of a commodity and downplay environmental concerns, and as a result, their credibility with the public is not always strong,” noted Groat. “Environmental groups emphasize negative landscape impacts,” he added, “and tend to downplay economic benefits.” In between, Groat said, there need to be organizations perceived as honest brokers.

Few academic institutions can unite as many Latin American geoscience leaders as the University of Texas at Austin. Within a two-year span the university hosted three meetings, in Austin (Sept. 18–20, 2005), Rio de Janeiro (July 9–11, 2006), and Huatulco, Mexico (Sept. 30–Oct. 2, 2007), convening government ministers, energy executives, and international funding representatives from fourteen countries. Guests included twenty-four ministers and directors of national energy and environmental agencies.

Two major joint projects have resulted—a commitment of $7.5 million from Brazil’s national oil company, Petrobras, to pursue collaborative education and research with the university, and a conference on transnational water issues. A third conference is on the table uniting Cuban, Mexican, and U.S. representatives to discuss transnational energy issues in the Gulf of Mexico. Additional projects in Venezuela and Ecuador are under consideration.

Seeking Advice
At the Rio meeting, cohosted with the Brazilian Institute of Oil, Gas, and Biofuels, the need to balance energy and environmental concerns was very much on the mind of John Briceño (UT BBA 1985), at the time
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Belize's deputy prime minister and minister of natural resources and the environment. (Following a change in government, Briceno is now a member of the Belizean parliament.) “I want advice— that’s why I’m here,” Briceno told the assembly. After five decades of failed oil and gas exploration in Belize, oil was finally discovered there in 2005 at a site called Spanish Lookout. The size of the discovery—10 million barrels of high quality light crude—was modest by most countries’ standards. But for a nation of fewer than 300,000 inhabitants, 30 percent of whom live below the poverty line, it was a windfall. The discovery prompted national celebrations, and also, said Briceno, major questions: “What are the impacts? Benefits? How will we manage the industry and ensure profits help as many Belizeans as possible?”

Complicating matters, Belize relies heavily on eco-tourism for revenue. The country is home to the world’s first national jaguar preserve and second longest barrier reef. “Because so much of what we have here is fragile, we take the concerns of our friends in the environmental sector very seriously,” said Briceno. “At the same time, in our context, leaving such a valuable commodity in the ground is not an option.”

Neutral Parties
Each of the first three forum meetings included a mix of joint presentations followed by breakout groups dedicated to energy and environment. Ample time was reserved for networking. The school invited forum members to bring partners and spouses, to give the event a personal touch and cultivate trust across national boundaries.

Presenters have included Armando Zamora, director of the National Hydrocarbons Agency of Colombia, discussing new models for expanding foreign investment in Columbia’s hydrocarbon sector; Allan Flores Moya, former vice minister of energy and environment for Costa Rica, discussing Costa Rica’s alternative energy programs; and Gordon Weynand, energy team leader of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), talking about USAID’s priorities in Latin America.

Given the range of energy economies represented at each forum—from deregulated to nationalized and all trends in between—attendees have found interesting subjects for comparison. Energy regulations emerged as one hot topic, with representatives curious to share best practices. Marilda Rosado de Sá Ribeiro, former director of legal affairs for Brazil’s National Petroleum, Natural Gas, and Biofuels Agency (ANP), began to assemble a matrix of energy sector regulations across Latin America and North America. Working with Scott Tinker, director of the university’s Bureau of Economic Geology, she carried the work into the second forum in Rio, where regulatory practices became a major topic.

Economic valuation of environmental assets was popular at the Huatulco meeting. Eugenio Figueroa, director of the National Center for the Environment and the Center of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics at the University of Chile, demonstrated a method adopted by Chile to value the country’s protected areas. By showing the positive impact of protected areas on the Chilean economy, the method helped the government reject lobbying efforts to open up sensitive areas to development.

Southern Model
Part of the Rio meeting highlighted Brazil’s success in oil and gas exploration over the past three decades, when the country moved from being a net importer to a net exporter of energy. Oil and gas have been critical to the shift, but so have biofuels. Following the 1973 international energy crisis, Brazil began a series of policies to provide incentives for production and consumption of sugar-based ethanol. The program experienced dramatic ups and downs, and nearly crashed with the low price of oil and high price of sugar in the late 1980s. Today, however, it is considered a major economic and environmental success. Biofuels and other renewable sources classed as biomass account for 29 percent of Brazil’s energy consumption.

Maria Antonieta de Souza of Brazil’s energy agency offered an overview of the biofuels program, of particular relevance to countries like Mexico interested in expanding ethanol production. Ethanol works in Brazil because of the low cost of domestic sugar, government policies requiring its use, and most recently, the automobile industry’s embrace of flex-fuel passenger vehicles. Flex-fuel cars are far and away the most popular passenger vehicles in Brazil.

Double Vision
Even Brazil’s much vaunted biofuels program draws fire from environmentalists who criticize farming practices and the use of land for fuel instead of food. From Belize to Brazil, all countries seek to obtain maximum benefits from their natural resources, but development of energy resources, noted Groat, is often perceived to be in conflict with stewardship of the environment.

Can countries have it both ways? “Yes, but it isn’t easy,” said Groat. In his presentation in Rio on “Resource Development and Environmental Integrity: The Quest for Balanced Policies,” Groat offered examples of win-win situations where industry adopted environmental practices that had economic benefits. In one case, Texas Utilities reclaimed land in advance of regulations, to increase the value as real estate. In another, depleted quarries were reshaped for houses, commercial structures, and recreation.

Groat described the potential for fostering such situations but cautioned that education and public discourse need to look more deeply at energy and environmental issues. “We do not present in education or outreach a balanced view,” said Groat. “It tends to be an all-resource perspective from the companies or all-environment in the popular view. Companies’ primary interest is in the value of the resource. Environmental groups sometimes leap to an ‘It’s evil’ point of view and in extreme cases minimize resource value. Our education system needs to give a balanced view.”

The University of Texas at Austin has long been a top destination for Latin American geoscientists, whether they are seeking degrees or working with the Bureau of Economic Geology and other units on collaborative research. With Groat’s new center focusing on energy and environmental issues, plus a confluence of strengths in regulatory law, energy management, and policy, the university is well positioned to offer a full spectrum of education for Latin American energy and environmental specialists.

Now with the Latin American Forum on Energy and the Environment, the university has a new leadership role—and perhaps a way to help Belize keeps its pristine beaches while developing its oil wealth. (See sidebar p. 29.)

J. B. Bird is the Communications Director for the Jackson School for Geosciences and received his master’s in Latin American Studies in 1993.
AS GRADUATE STUDENTS DEDICATED TO international planning and development, we look for opportunities to apply what we are learning in the classroom to the real world. It is rare, however, to have the chance to conduct fieldwork that will be useful for—and utilized by—local communities and governments, particularly in one semester. But this is exactly what eleven graduate students did in Dr. Bjørn Sletto’s course, Applied Geographic Information Systems: Participatory Approaches to Environmental Justice, in spring 2008.

The class grew out of a new, collaborative agreement between the UT School of Architecture and the Municipality of Santo Domingo Norte in the Dominican Republic. The original objective of this collaboration was to provide technical assistance to the municipal planning office, and to develop graduate-level, practical student research and learning opportunities. In this course, however, Dr. Sletto and his students took this fledgling partnership a step further. We developed a multimethod, participatory, social justice approach to investigate issues of risk and vulnerability in the informal settlement of “Los Platanitos,” and, in the process, we aimed to provide project partners with conceptual and technical tools to address the challenges facing this community. We based the project on principles of service learning, which meant we had to work closely with community members while also incorporating the perspectives and experiences of Dominican NGOs and scholars. As a result, the project culminated in a much broader international collaboration than what was originally proposed.

Santo Domingo Norte was established in 2001 after the capital city was disaggregated into five municipalities in order to decentralize regional development and policymaking. It is the largest of the new municipalities and is facing the most rapid urban expansion and greatest development challenges, including a proliferation of more than thirty informal settlements. As in the case of Los Platanitos, these informal settlements tend to be located in low-lying floodplains and other ecologically vulnerable areas, and many of these are at risk from flooding, mudslides, and water-borne diseases. This is exacerbated by social vulnerability, which stems from poverty, inequality, and institutional weakness. While policy response to natural disasters and other ecological risk is dominated by physical and infrastructure interventions, in this project, students conducted an analysis that incorporated the fundamental influence of social structures that limit access to resources and increases residents’ vulnerability to natural disasters.

The goal of the project was to conduct a community needs assessment in Los Platanitos, focusing on risk and vulnerability associated with flooding, garbage accumulation, and the lack of a proper sewage system. We developed various collaborative methods, including participatory mapping, community surveys, focus groups, and workshops, to document local knowledge of environmental and social conditions, which is often overlooked in development projects that focus exclusively on infrastructure improvements. The project drew on the principles of Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), in part because of the limited time available to spend in the field, but also to enable residents to claim ownership of the project and the data, which in turn would allow them to plan and act on community-based initiatives. Ultimately, the intention was to initiate a partnership with community members and key organizations working in informal settlements, in particular Ciudad Alternativa and COPADEBA (Comité para la Defensa de los Derechos Barrales), to allow researchers, activists, and residents to act as equal partners to improve the quality of life in the community.

The project exposed us to the many challenges and opportunities of such participatory projects. We were confronted by limitations imposed by the academic calendar, restrictions on funding and time, and the necessity of building and maintaining relationships with Dominican partners with different political philosophies and goals. We came from various disciplinary backgrounds, including public policy, planning, geography, and anthropology, which in itself presented challenges. We were expected to take an active role in the development of the project,
which led to dynamic discussions regarding the objectives, the relationships with our various partners, the data being collected, and the collaboration between the class teams and their responsibilities. Although this often meant spending a lot of time negotiating our ideas and concerns, it led to a much more thoughtful and sophisticated awareness of the social relations and environmental aspects of our work.

Despite the time we spent developing the project before our first trip to the Dominican Republic, none of us felt fully prepared when we arrived in Santo Domingo in January to begin our fieldwork. This general sense of bewilderment only increased the first couple of days we were working in Los Platanitos. The problems faced by the community seemed overwhelming and much more severe than we had originally imagined. Garbage was everywhere. The streets were muddy and full of potholes and black water. When it rained on the second day, residents brought us to the bottom of the ravine where the flood problem is the worst. They showed us houses filled with black, murky water. Residents were standing outside in the rain or in the shade of a neighbor’s house, waiting for the rain to stop and the flood water to slowly drain down the garbage-filled creek. Children jumped into the creek to pull out the garbage so the water could continue to move. This was the first time we saw people throwing their trash into Los Platanitos from higher elevations. We soon realized that the lower area of this community serves as a garbage dump for residents living in surrounding neighborhoods, a situation exacerbated by the fact that Los Platanitos is literally built on what was once the garbage dump for the city of Santo Domingo. In other words, the inhabitants of Los Platanitos are forced to constantly live among garbage.

The participatory approaches we used were crucial for understanding such social and environmental realities, but this research strategy also presented us with unexpected challenges. In many ways it was quite easy to work with community members. They knew we would be arriving in January, and many residents had committed to working fulltime with us for the two weeks we would spend there. Women, men, and children alike were welcoming, enthusiastic about the project, and ready to participate in different capacities. “Bodyguards” accompanied us in the field for safety reasons, elder men participated in a physical survey of the bottom of the ravine, women worked with us to develop and conduct a community survey, and children participated in workshops and showed us around to help us see the community from their perspective. But even though students and community members were eager to work together, language and cultural differences sometimes made these interactions difficult. As Americanos, our more formal and reserved way of interacting contrasted drastically with the friendly, vivacious, and informal mannerisms of Dominicans. We quickly learned to give lots of hugs, touch each other’s arms, hands or shoulders, look directly into each other’s eyes, and share jokes and personal observations.

Despite these challenges, and although we don’t know how our work ultimately will help the community, the course was a success measured by the quality of the research we conducted, and perhaps more important, in terms of the relationships that we developed with community members and the critical perspectives we developed about participatory planning in marginal neighborhoods. Throughout the course, we were always reminded of the numerous opportunities, challenges, and potential problems with doing international development work: how our maps and data might adversely affect the people of Los Platanitos despite our good intentions; how our interventions in the neighborhood might change or reify social inequalities; how, as researchers from the United States, our epistemological perspectives might perpetuate uneven North-South power relations. By continually discussing such social, ethical, and methodological challenges, we learned to think about the consequences of our work as we developed this project, and also when we were carrying it out.

Ultimately, this project has offered us important experiences in international participatory work, which will be invaluable for our future work in academia, in development organizations, or in government agencies. The course has made us better scholars and better professionals—not only because of the technical and conceptual skills we developed, but also because we learned to see the complexity and beauty of such “underdeveloped” places. For Los Platanitos is not simply a place plagued by garbage, flooding, poverty, and injustice, but a diverse, close-knit, and humane community, where multicolored houses and winding walkways climb the hills, where children play baseball in the streets and men play dominos in family-run shops, and where palm trees stand out next to a clear, bright blue sky.

Solange Muñoz is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Geography and the Environment, and Shawn M. Strange is a master’s candidate in the Program in Community and Regional Planning of the School of Architecture, both at the University of Texas at Austin.
“WE WOULD LIKE TO introduce Hemispheres, the international area studies outreach consortium at the University of Texas at Austin. Our mission is to help educators incorporate world studies content into their classrooms and existing curricula.” In summer 2003, we sent out this introduction and our first calendar—with images from Latin America; the Middle East; Russia, East Europe, and Eurasia; and South Asia—to social studies curriculum coordinators throughout the state of Texas. Hemispheres was ready to go statewide, and this was our first step in that direction.

Hemispheres began in 1995 as an informal consortium of the four National Resource Centers (NRCs) at UT, with a two-day “how to use the Internet” workshop for teachers. In 1998, Hemispheres started to offer week-long, on-campus workshops on thematic world studies topics and to provide content, rather than skills training, for educators. When I arrived at LLILAS in 2001, Hemispheres activities included the annual summer institute and a newsletter for teachers. However, we had the resources to build a more engaging and proactive program of activities. I believed that Hemispheres needed to take an active role in creating materials and providing training to a wide array and great number of educators. Christopher Rose, the Assistant Director of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies and the most senior member of Hemispheres, recalls, “When I started, the group seemed satisfied with the work we were already doing and, because of individual interests, didn’t want to expand our joint work. But then Natalie came on and said ‘we should be doing more’ and it clicked. I thought to myself, ‘Yes. Finally.’ We took off from there.”

We began with a calendar: sixteen culturally significant photographs, taken by our graduate students and faculty, accompanied by captions that could serve as a stimulus for discussion of our four world regions. The calendar was designed to promote our services, in the hopes of working more closely with classroom teachers. It worked. In January 2004, Arlington Independent School District, in the Dallas–Fort Worth area, asked us to present to their social studies teachers at a district-wide training program. We were thrilled but, unsure of what to present, we asked for a list of standards-related topics with which their teachers were struggling. We then discussed their suggested topics in terms of which ones had been mentioned by other teachers, what kinds of university resources we could access to address them, and how to format the materials for teachers. Based on our experience with our summer teachers’ institutes, we knew that supplemental materials were in high demand by educators frustrated with minimal textbook coverage of important state-mandated standards.

Arlington may have expected a simple presentation, but we delivered a complete, ready-to-use curriculum unit with both middle and high school activities: “Understanding Migration: Curriculum Resources for the Classroom.” The unit, written by outreach staff in each of the four NRCs, includes a historical and theoretical overview about human migration through history and regional case studies that allow students to examine topics such as the deteriorating quality of life in lower-class urban areas in Brazil, the partition of India, the debate...
over the Palestinian right of return, and the repatriation of ethnic Russians from the Newly Independent States.

The curriculum unit was an instant success, and the Arlington teachers appreciated our presentation style, which focused on content rather than pedagogy. One teacher commented on the evaluation, “I appreciated the way this particular workshop was presented. I felt that I was back in a college classroom setting. . . .” This remains our highest compliment, and one that we receive regularly: our training sessions bring educators back to their college days and offer them a peek into current research and thinking about world studies.

“Understanding Migration” has now been presented 22 times, to 650 educators, at school districts, regional education service centers, and state and national conferences. If a mere 10 percent of those teachers use the unit at least once, approximately 7,800 students will have used our materials to study migration. In addition to our training sessions, “Understanding Migration” is available on the Hemispheres Web site, and has received national attention through its inclusion on Outreach World, a national online clearinghouse of resources for teaching international studies. Since its debut on Outreach World, it has been a top download.

Based on the success of “Understanding Migration,” Hemispheres continues to create curriculum units written with an eye to state and national teaching standards, and in response to needs identified at various educator events. The success of the units is due, in large part, to input from the teachers with whom we work: we listen to their needs and try to address the gaps in their knowledge and in their textbooks. To date, we have written three more units:

“People and Place: Human-Environmental Interactions,” with fourteen case studies that address global issues, such as water management and pollution, and region-specific phenomena, such as the challenges of living in the coldest part of Siberia and conservation in a highly biodiverse Ecuador.

“Africa Enslaved: Comparative Slave Systems outside the United States,” which uses primary source documents to compare and contrast historical slave systems in Brazil, Ottoman Egypt, Haiti, and the Swahili Emirates of East Africa.

“Explorers, Traders, and Immigrants: Tracking the Social and Cultural Impact of the Global Commodity Trade,” which examines eight global commodities—including chocolate, rice, and indigo, among others—from their points of origin through the social, cultural, political, and economic changes they wrought along their journeys.

Along with our supply of Hemispheres-created curriculum, our educator training program has expanded significantly and now includes 8–10 professional development sessions, plus conference presentations, each year. Most sessions, which last a full day, include a combination of content presentations (e.g., Contemporary Brazil, Geography of the Middle East) and activities from our curriculum units. Attendance numbers at Hemispheres professional development presentations have been increasing steadily, especially in locations where we have presented previously. Thus far, we have presented to more than 1,750 educators.

Today, Hemispheres continues its active program of curriculum development and related professional development workshops throughout Texas. The off-campus workshops reach teachers who do not have the opportunity to attend campus-based events and, because of grant support, the workshops are free, enabling low-income school districts to host Hemispheres. Although we are far from covering all of Texas, we have traveled from Brownsville to El Paso, Houston to Lubbock, and to cities large and small in between. We believe that this pairing of curriculum and training is one of the best ways to fulfill our outreach mission. Feedback from our districts—including our first host, Arlington Independent School District, which brings us back regularly—indicates that we are filling an important need in world studies. After a recent presentation, Kathy Riggle, a Social Studies Instructional Specialist, wrote, “I wanted to let you know how much we appreciate you coming to Arlington again to share your wealth of information and insight . . . I had a teacher, who attended your [last] session, who wants us to have you back every month!” As long as educators respond this way, Hemispheres will continue to trek across Texas—and, we hope, other states—to deliver solid world studies content to those who need it.

Natalie Arsenault is LLILAS Outreach Director.
The form of the thesis seems like a bizarre tool for rendering the lives of the peoples of FDOMEZ, an organization in the Huasteca region of Mexico. The academic tools I carried with me on my first few trips to the Frente Democrático Oriental de México Emiliano Zapata soon proved dull. There is almost nothing more anathema to a student of indigenous identity politics than hearing 600 indigenous peoples shouting “Por la liberación proletaria del campesino venceremos!” or singing “L’Internationale” in Spanish at 5 a.m. (Originally written in French, this song has been translated into many languages and is recognized as the anthem of international socialism.) This group challenged not only what I learned as an anthropology student, but also my very role as a student researcher.

Part of the problem was a scientific mindset that predisposed me to read about a place and struggle that I had never gotten to know in person and to interpret it using academic paradigms. Theodor Adorno approaches this matter in his analysis of Descartes’s Discourse on Method, a treatise that laid the groundwork for positivism and modern Western science. He critiques Descartes’s method for producing knowledge in the form of simplifying models that create the “illusion of a simple, basically logical world.” This tendency in scientific approaches encompasses most of what I have been taught since kindergarten.

As a graduate student, I was poised to stand very close to the pinnacle of that ivory tower, prepared to theorize on objects of study. Oftentimes I feel pushed to theorize in a way that is tied to the spirit of simplicity and logic. Does not the question “What is your argument?”—so basic to any conversation about theses—epitomize this tendency? In the praxis of both researching and writing, we are left to battle the thorny feelings that arise from trying to make coherent pictures out of the vast and oftentimes cacophonous sets of stories, processes, personalities, settings, and emotions that are exchanged during research. How much of this do we leave out of our final accounts?

Upon rereading Adorno—who champions the form of the essay, with its open and wandering path of inquiry, as an alternative form of writing and thinking philosophy—I found that my interaction with the peoples of the Huasteca has meandered along like an essay. By that I mean that in the course of my journey I had to give up a preconceived endpoint and a predetermined set of criteria with which to approach my research question. My shifting relationship with the organization led me to substitute my conception of scientific research with a commitment to friendship and solidarity with FDOMEZ as the criteria driving my research.

When I carried out my first interviews, I made some people uncomfortable by asking them point blank what socialism, the platform of the organization, meant to them specifically as indigenous peoples. Having learned about certain kinds of identity politics, I assumed this indigenous group would have a ready answer because, of course, they all identify as indigenous and would have had to give that precise question some thought. However, many people responded with a puzzled look or, what is worse, an irritated expression. Some might have felt I was placing them in the “savage” category, and others might not have fathomed what being specifically Nahuat had to do with being socialist. Initially, this was very disconcerting because it made me wonder whether my driving question—why socialism is the platform of an indigenous peasant organization in the age of identity politics—might be at some basic level misguided.

It was probably my third interview that embarrassed me the most. I had finished grilling the friendly president of the Unión de Mujeres...
(the women’s group within FDOMEZ) and, satisfied after an hour of personal and political questions, I turned off my recorder and thanked her for her time. In Nahuatl, she spoke smilingly to a friend sitting next to her, and I knew something was wrong. She looked straight at me and in a measured tone said, “We’re not done, I have some questions for you.” It took me a few moments to recover from that sinking feeling of shame at not having given her an equal chance at interviewing me. Her questions made me realize that my presence and profession were not being taken for granted. I, too, had to reveal my history, general demise of socialism as a utopian project post-1990. However, their time-tested antidotes of solidarity and collectivism are what made my association with the organization as a fellow human being possible. At the end of an interview with a veteran member of the organization, I addressed the friction I thought was caused by my perceived privileged position as a U.S.-grown, better-off mestiza researcher. After a reflective pause he said, “That may be the case, but you have the heart of a proletarian. Is that not why you have come from so far to the land of your parents?” This shocked me because I realized that all this time I was being analyzed down to my bare emotions and origins.

As a result of these experiences, I switched my method to asking broad questions while opening up myself for interrogation. I found that listening to what people had on their minds indirectly answered some of my questions and concerns and, what’s more, it opened the Pandora’s box to the flipside of that simple and logical world that positivist anxieties anticipate. In bits and pieces, the organization’s problems, concerns, and anxieties, as well as its deep commitment to solidarity, equality, and collectivism began to surface, all of which previously had been completely off my radar.

Becoming an object of study myself reformulated my sense of purpose within the organization. Central to FDOMEZ’s experience are the collective feelings of solitude and isolation due to repression and the political agenda, and even establish my own sense of humor in more depth than could be revealed in a cursory introduction.

As a result of these experiences, I switched my method to asking broad questions while opening up myself for interrogation. I found that listening to what people had on their minds indirectly answered some of my questions and concerns and, what’s more, it opened the Pandora’s box to the flipside of that simple and logical world that positivist anxieties anticipate. In bits and pieces, the organization’s problems, concerns, and anxieties, as well as its deep commitment to solidarity, equality, and collectivism began to surface, all of which previously had been completely off my radar.

Becoming an object of study myself reformulated my sense of purpose within the organization. Central to FDOMEZ’s experience are the collective feelings of solitude and isolation due to repression and the being analyzed down to my bare emotions and origins.

A married couple I came to know found a way to transform my unusual status as a young foreign unmarried female who always arrived alone whether in the city or in rural communities. In one of our interviews in Mexico City, when the three of us were disclosing our ages, I commented that the husband was old enough to be my father. The next time I attended an FDOMEZ event in a rural community, the couple and many other members of the organization began to teasingly and sometimes seriously identify me as the couple’s daughter. In retrospect, I could venture a hypothesis that my initial comment had been an unconscious expression of a sense of budding closeness.

After much joking, washing clothes together, sitting down at meals, riding pre-dawn buses, and occasionally discussing politics, I have come to be more than a researcher in the eyes of the community; I am Porfirio and Mari’s daughter, a proletarian, a Mexican rather than just a Chicana, a died-again Christian who is no threat to their political Catholicism, and many other things I did not intend. Although I have yet to apply the spirit of the essay to the writing of my thesis, careful not to impose a simplified and logical model over this vivid experience, I look forward to writing and presenting it to them as more than just a researcher.

Rachel Pacheco is in the LLILAS master’s program, with a concentration in anthropology.
surrounded by people who thought my going
for some shady cocaine-related operation—
which I’m not or (2) if this is just a coverup
for similar reasons, or else they are trying to
lose touch with reality. Why leave? And
for that answer. On a personal level, I
away was a great idea, and I have been
How do you have to go
away to study your own country? According
to the extremists, I was on my way to being brainwashed; others were concerned that I
would lose touch with reality. Why leave? And
to the U.S., of all places? When I get the ques-
tion here, people are sometimes surprised,
for similar reasons, or else they are trying to
gauge two things: (1) whether I am after the
American dream and an American husband—
which I’m not or (2) if this is just a coverup
for some shady cocaine-related operation—
not the case either. (I am dead serious; I have
actually been asked the last question.)
I don’t want to exaggerate. I was mostly
surrounded by people who thought my going
2006, when I flew in to the United States from
Colombia, where I originally come from, the
U.S. immigrations officer at the airport asked
me the following question:
Why would a person FROM Latin Amer-
ica come to the United States to study Latin
America?
He said this with a sigh, perplexed; this
wasn’t an officer trying to figure out whether I
would be attempting to switch my visa status
anytime soon. He was Latin American himself,
and he seemed somewhat annoyed and sad at
the thought of my leaving the region to study
it. To him, this was somehow backwards. He
was not alone in this feeling. I had heard that
question before, and I would hear it again in
the coming months. In Bogotá, before my trip,
some people expressed similar concerns. They
sighed, frustrated: Why do you have to go
to the extremists, I was on my way to being brainwashed; others were concerned that I
would lose touch with reality. Why leave? And
to the U.S., of all places? When I get the ques-
tion here, people are sometimes surprised,
for similar reasons, or else they are trying to
gauge two things: (1) whether I am after the
American dream and an American husband—
which I’m not or (2) if this is just a coverup
for some shady cocaine-related operation—
not the case either. (I am dead serious; I have
actually been asked the last question.)
I don’t want to exaggerate. I was mostly
surrounded by people who thought my going
away was a great idea, and I have been
received here by people who also agree—or
who simply think it’s a good thing to have a
Colombian in the room who can dance salsa.
But I have to say that the question keeps com-
ing back, from strangers and friends alike. I
keep asking it myself. I thought I would try to
answer that question this afternoon.
The way I see it, there are two dimen-
sions to that answer. On a personal level, I
went away for the sake of just going away. These two years have been quite an expe-
rience; I have taught people how to dance
and have seen my pupils surpass me in skill
and certainly in enthusiasm. As a “cultural
exchange thing” I have tried to figure out foot-
ball (unsuccessfully); I have also cried on the
phone out of sheer desperation and fury at my
poor listening comprehension of the English
language. The story might be familiar to you:
how living in another country can change you.
Completely.
On another level, which is no less per-
sonal, the answer I can give you has caught
me completely by surprise. I suspect what I
am about to say may seem obvious to a lot of
people, especially to my comparative politics
professors; all I know is it has changed me pro-
doundly. My sense is that the people from Latin
America who come to the U.S. to study Latin
America are given an amazing gift: it’s called
perspective. Looking at my country from this
particular vantage point has challenged every
assumption I had about its history, its conflict,
its politics, its culture; it has also completely
transformed the questions I now carry in my
head. I still find what happens in my country
incredibly interesting, but for reasons I didn’t
even know. Colombia doesn’t seem so unique
anymore, so utterly important: in that sense,
I have lost my innocence. I understand it a
little bit better, and when I watch the news,
that actually makes it worse. (I should prob-
ably say I am interested in politics so, yes, I do
lose sleep over these issues.) More important
perhaps, being here has forced me and encour-
gaged me to really look at Latin America as a
whole, and to try and understand how other
people see us. It is as if I stepped outside the
eye of the storm, and suddenly BAM!—the
continent in all its size and complexity was
before me. Every day I study Latin America
here, I walk down paths I am familiar with,
because I grew up with them. But my famil-
arity is no longer the catchall answer. I get
to make new questions of my old questions
eye. I have to.
I have been struggling with this speech for
a couple of days now. At some ungodly hour
last night, I was offered all sorts of advice,
two pieces of which I found especially use-
ful. A friend said, be funny. It’s easy for him,
he’s a natural. So for laughs, I suggest you
look for the Chilean guy hovering around the
beautiful pregnant Chilean lady; he will crack
you up. Another wise Brazilian friend said:
keep it simple. Simplicity and clarity come
more easily to me in Spanish, so I will end
this the only way I possibly can: en español.
Ha sido un placer compartir los últimos dos
años con ustedes, de verdad que sí. Les deseo
la mejor de las suertes. Buen viento y buena
mar. Muchas gracias.
Sandra Botero graduated with an M.A. in Latin
American Studies in spring 2008 and is start-
ing her Ph.D. in government at the University
of Texas this fall.
PLANNING, ORGANIZING, AND FUNDRAISING
for the annual ILASSA Student Conference is no small task, and it keeps the students of ILASSA extremely busy. Nevertheless, students in the institute find time for other activities as well.

For starters, each summer ILASSA students work to plan new student orientation for the incoming class of Latin American Studies graduate students. The event is a chance for incoming students to learn about their academic options at the institute, meet fellow students and faculty, and familiarize themselves with Austin.

Throughout the year, ILASSA hosts “Brown Bag” events, where distinguished faculty and guests give brief talks on current events, new research, and other topics of interest to students. Last year, ILASSA enjoyed lunchtime discussions with Juan Haro, a leader of Movement for Justice in El Barrio, an organization that advocates for immigrant and African American housing rights in Harlem; Carlos Gaviria, a 1991 Colombian presidential candidate in 2006 from the Polo Democrático Alternativo and featured speaker at the ILASSA Student Conference; and Daniel Bonilla, Professor at Universidad de los Andes School of Law in Bogotá, Colombia, and director of the Public Interest Law Group of Universidad de los Andes.

The ILASSA Cultural Committee and the Spanish and Portuguese Department also cosponsor movie nights. Last year, Quien Mato a La llamita Blanca, Terra em Transe, Memória Del Saqueo, Diarios de Motocicleta, The Revolution Will Not Be Televised, and Kamchatka, among others, were shown.

The ILASSA soccer team, the Chupacabras, is another activity enjoyed by many ILASSA students. The Chupacabras field coed and men’s teams during the intramural seasons. Spring 2008 marked an important chapter in Chupacabra sports history, as the team won the indoor intramural championship for the first time! The Chupacabras also play an annual game against the LBJ School of Public Affairs “Great Society” team. The game, known as the Sid Richardson Hall Superclásico after the building that both departments share, always draws the best, or at least most enthusiastic, soccer players from each department, as well as a good number of spectators and “hinchas” on each side. In the spring 2008 game, ILASSA’s Chupacabras beat LBJ 6–2. After the game, the Chupacabras were awarded the Superclásico Trophy, and both teams celebrated a well-played game with caparinas at São Paulo restaurant, the Chupacabra team sponsor. For the latest Chupacabra updates and scores, you can check out http://soccerlover.org/chupacabras/.

For the past two seasons, ILASSA also has fielded an intramural softball team. Although the Chupacabra softball team doesn’t have the same collection of trophies as does the soccer team, they are equal in spirit and dedication.

ILASSA also administers the “Chupacabra Listserv,” an online community of Latin American scholars, enthusiasts, and professionals in the Austin area as well as around the country and around the world. It’s a place where students, alumni, and community members can post interesting articles on Latin America, get advice for summer
travel plans to Latin America, find a summer internship or job after graduation, or discuss current events affecting the region. An ILASSA member is always on hand to moderate listserve content and help sign up new members. For more information on how to join the Chupacabra listserve, visit http://www.utexas.edu/cola/insts/lilas/studentgroups/ilassa/.

To unwind after a hard week of classes, thesis research, and soccer games, ILASSA also organizes a weekly Friday happy-hour event. The venue of the week is announced over the Chupacabra listserve, and ILASSA students congregate at the Crown and Anchor, Hole in the Wall, Showdown, Dog and Duck, or wherever there are good music and drink specials to relax, catch up with friends, and meet new colleagues. Last year, ILASSA also organized several happy hours in coordination with other departments, such as the European Student Association, School of Social Work, Community and Regional Planning, and the LBJ School of Public Affairs.

At the end of the school year, ILASSA students have multiple reasons to celebrate. Many second-year students have just turned in their thesis or professional reports. Others are preparing to head home for the summer or travel to Latin America to conduct fieldwork. ILASSA organizes several events to celebrate a successful year and ring in the summer. At the ILASSA Potluck, students are treated (or subjected) to the culinary skills of their classmates. Superlative awards are also given out to deserving students—such as “Most Likely to Wear a Cowboy Hat,” “Most Likely to Teach at LLILAS,” and the prestigious “Best Male Dancer” and “Best Female Dancer” awards.

The last ILASSA-organized event every year is the graduation dinner. Put together by first-year students with the help of the faculty and staff of the institute, the dinner is a chance for graduating students and their families to celebrate their time spent in LLILAS, and with ILASSA. Last year’s dinner was graciously hosted at the beautiful home of LLILAS Director Bryan Roberts. Students and their families, faculty, and staff were treated to gorgeous weather, delicious food catered by Las Manitas, music, and of course Latin dancing.

ILASSA’s varied activities and events, the crown jewel of which is the ILASSA Student Conference, ensure that graduate students in the institute have plenty to keep them busy. Whether with sports, guest lecturers, or happy hours, ILASSA guarantees that the life of a Latin Americanist at the University of Texas at Austin is filled with more than classes and research. If you’d like to join us at a happy hour, enter into a debate on the Chupacabra listserve, attend a “Brown Bag” session, or play some fútbol, you’re more than welcome!

Michael Gale is a master’s candidate in the Latin American Studies program.

LLILAS CONFERENCES

Fall 2007

Asia in Latin America: Across Four Continents

Congreso de Idiomas Indígenas de Latinoamérica / Conference on Indigenous Languages of Latin America–III (See article p. 37)

Spring 2008

XXVIII Annual ILASSA Student Conference (See article p. 35)

Urban Segregation and Labor in the Americas

Transitions in the Cuban Revolution (See article p. 4)

Abriendo Brecha V: Activist Scholarship at the Tejas Global Crossroads

North America and the Dilemma of Integration: Perspectives on the Future of the Region (See article p. 43)

The 32nd Maya Meetings—Copán Archaeology and History: New Finds and New Research

The Performance of Leftist Governments in Latin America: What Does the Left Do Right? (See article p. 14)

The Political and Cultural Economies of Water in the 21st Century

Mexico–U.S. Migration: Rural Transformation and Development

Image, Memory, and the Paradox of Peace: Fifteen Years after the El Salvador Peace Accords (See article p. 21)

What’s Left of the Latin American Left?
The ILASSA Conference: TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS SHOWCASING STUDENTS by Michael Meyer

Twenty-eight years. That's how long the Institute of Latin American Studies Student Association's (ILASSA) Annual Student Conference on Latin America has been an important event at the University of Texas at Austin. Twenty-eight years. That makes the conference older than most of the students. Like those students, the conference has grown and matured in ways that would make any parent proud. In fact, how could we not take pride in an event that has become the most prestigious and distinguished of its kind?

Over its history, the ILASSA Conference has brought together hundreds of students from UT and throughout the hemisphere—and thousands of Latin America enthusiasts—to share ideas, present research, and discuss issues at the forefront of Latin American scholarship. In its twenty-eight years the event has evolved from humble beginnings to the prestigious, professional event it is today, with faculty-moderated panels, internationally respected speakers, and a diverse array of student presenters. Alumni of the conference have gone on to be movers-and-shakers in the world of Latin American scholarship, politics, and business. These accomplishments are more than enough to put a glint in any “parent’s” eye.

ILASSA—the conference’s “proud parent”—is excited to report that the 2008 event brought approximately eighty-five undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students from thirteen countries and eleven states to UT, and saw a total attendance exceeding four hundred. No fewer than thirteen students made their very first trip to the U.S. to present at the conference, and more than forty individuals visited UT for the first time in order to attend. Renata Moreno from Colombia was one of these. She said that for her the experience was “extremely enriching” in ways she never thought possible.

But it’s not all berries and roses. As an ILASSA-run conference, the work of planning the event falls on graduate students already stretched thin by their many responsibilities. An estimated two thousand hours of work are required to realize the event, with the bulk of this falling on a core group of fewer than twenty people. After each conference’s cathartic Fiesta de Despedida, attention turns to the next year: How do we convince ourselves that the work is worth it? In the face of our exhaustion we ask, why would we possibly want to do this again?

It’s actually a remarkably easy question to answer, because when the conference happens, everybody “wins.” Through the ILASSA Conference, the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies—already the premier Latin American Studies institute in the country—is made visible to the world of Latin American scholarship in ways otherwise inaccessible. The conference enhances the academic environment within the institute, and marks it with a special source of pride and distinction. The institute can boast an extremely active and engaged student body, which gives it unique angles for recruitment and fund-raising. What’s more, visitors from across the U.S. and the hemisphere go home with powerful experiences and images associated with Latin American Studies at UT.

The conference means just as much, if not more, to the UT students who organize it. Those students benefit from the opportunity to put themselves to work in areas like logistics, finances, hospitality, and abstract evaluation. When they graduate, they leave with honed professional skills and with laudable achievements made not just inside the classroom, but outside it—with a sense that they accomplished something internationally meaningful. All institute students benefit from the conference inasmuch as they begin their worklife as graduates of a distinguished program whose reputation and image are enhanced by the conference, its long history, and its prestige.

As for presenters and attendees, this is where the ILASSA Conference may offer its greatest “payoff.” Through panel discussions, plenary addresses, “brown bag” discussion groups, and other happenings, emerging scholars explore their academic potential and build
their networks in what one presenter called a “friendly and constructive environment.” This has helped launch numerous aspiring academics and professionals into their fields. Kurt Weyland, now the Lozano Long Professor of Latin American Politics in the Department of Government at UT Austin, says:

“My first conference participation ever was at ILASSA in 1986, when I was an M.A. student at LLILAS. Two experiences had a lasting impact on me. First, I read my paper, literally, and my advisor ‘got on my case’ for that—so I’ve never done it again! Second, I met an M.A. student from the University of Florida, Gainesville, who presented a great paper (he did not read it)—Timothy Power. We became friends, ended up sharing an apartment during our doctoral field research in Brazil, and have stayed in close professional and personal contact ever since; for instance, I wrote a chapter for a book that Tim coedited (Democratic Brazil, Pittsburgh 2000), and we regularly get together at conferences. Tim now teaches at the University of Oxford! Thus, ILASSA really made a difference—actually, two differences—for my academic career.”

His sentiments are shared by Felipe Nunes, master’s student at the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil, who has similar praise:

“Participating in the Annual ILASSA Student Conference was a wonderful opportunity… I went twice to the conference—in 2006 and 2007—and I now encourage my colleagues in Brazil to send papers to the event. Everything about the conference earns our congratulations…. After my experience in Austin, I organized the meeting of the Academic Center of Social Science in the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais in 2006, trying to replicate the good things that I saw at the ILASSA Conference… The event brought me academic, professional, and social benefits that I will remember for a very long time.”

Participants in the conference also benefit from the social connections they make. About thirty-five foreign visitors each year stay with UT students and other conference supporters. Presenters have repeatedly praised this practice for making the conference more affordable, and giving them a chance to develop and sustain friendships with people from their own country and others. Lúcio Bittencourt of the Fundação Getulio Vargas said, “It’s so great being here, and meeting all these people. Not just from the U.S., but Brazilians from all over the country!”

All of us—the institute, ILASSA members and conference organizers, and conference participants—profit immeasurably from the chance to interact with the conference’s plenary speakers and to hear their powerful words. Some of the great minds of our time have spoken at the ILASSA Conference, including political and social leaders, authors, and prominent Latin American scholars such as Elena Poniatowska, Carlos Monsivais, and Benedita da Silva. In 2008, Lucas Benítez from the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) delivered the opening address. The CIW is responsible for a historic agreement in the campaign for fair food with the corporate giants Yum Brands and McDonald’s and was honored with Anti-Slavery International’s Anti-Slavery Award in 2007.

The closing address was given by Dr. Carlos Gaviria, the leader of Colombia’s Polo Democrático Alternativo and 2006 presidential candidate. As president and justice of the Colombian Constitutional Court, Dr. Gaviria played a key role in the implementation of legal pluralism in his country. He now heads the coalition of opposition parties in Colombia. Renata Moreno said of his visit: “Getting to know Carlos Gaviria personally was marvelous because even though we’re from the same country, I’d never had the chance get to know him or talk with him. I never imagined how respected he would be in the United States, which is great because he is someone I admire profoundly” (translation by author).

These things are what make the effort worth it. In light of the many benefits the ILASSA Conference brings to its organizers and participants, and to the institute and UT, the seemingly grueling work of putting it together looks more like an easy labor of love. Each year the project of realizing this extraordinary conference—both an impressive feat and a mammoth task—is passed to a new and eager generation of Latin American Studies students. They will continue to grow, professionalize, and improve the event, building support and enthusiasm for this conference that has been so meaningful to so many people, and they will continue to make fellow students, faculty, and alumni proud.

Michael Meyer is a master’s candidate in Latin American Studies.

NOTE: The ILASSA Conference is made possible and successful by the work, support, and financial backing of countless individuals, departments, businesses, and institutions, to whom we are eternally grateful. Papers from previous conferences are available on LANIC (http://lanic.utexas.edu/), and the program for ILASSA 28 can be downloaded at http://www.utexas.edu/cola/insts/llilas/conferences/illilas_08/program/.

1) Joel Perez of the Proyecto Defensa Laboral introduces Lucas Benitez at the opening plenary session of ILASSA 28. 2) Lucas Benitez of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers delivers the conference’s opening address. 3) Zoila Cleaver and other attendees at the opening plenary session. (Photos by Jon Huang)
The Center for Indigenous Languages of Latin America was established at the University of Texas in 2001 in response to several key ideas. First of all, linguists have become increasingly aware of the precarious status of the languages they work on, as rapid language shift threatens the continued existence of a large number (some estimates say up to 90 percent) of the approximately six thousand languages that are spoken in the world. This is certainly true of Latin America, where all of the indigenous languages show signs of language shift and many are no longer spoken at all. Second, language is central to the identity of many indigenous Latin American communities, and is almost universally ignored or relegated to an inferior status as merely “cultural patrimony” or the like in most Latin American states, even those such as Bolivia or Guatemala where a majority of the population speaks one of these languages natively. Only Quechua in Peru has official status, and even there this is a status largely without any real governmental support. Third, the health and future status of a language depend crucially on the community of speakers and the decisions they collectively and individually make about using the language with their children, other family members, neighbors, and friends, in public spaces as well as private ones, with outsiders as well as insiders.

These ideas and observations led the Department of Linguistics, especially then Chair Anthony C. Woodbury, to propose, along with Joel Sherzer of the Department of Anthropology, the creation of the Center for Indigenous Languages of Latin America as a means to address issues regarding language abandonment and consequent disappearance in Latin America. The initial rationale for the center was that it could contribute in a more organized way to the basic documentation of Latin American languages, which collectively comprise around 15 percent of the languages of the world and constitute, especially in the Amazon Basin, one of the areas of greatest language diversity, both genetic and structural, anywhere. The thorough documentation of the languages contributes to our knowledge of how our intellectual capacity—specifically human language—functions, adds to our knowledge about human history, and helps us understand those elements of human society that are grounded in specific linguistic expression. The University of Texas already was known and well regarded for its contributions to language description and documentation through both the Linguistics and Anthropology departments, and of course for its strength in Latin American Studies. As the idea for the center developed, it became clear that two crucial and interconnected principles should be added to the original idea of basic documentation of endangered languages: 1) that projects in documentation should be carried out cooperatively with communities of speakers, and that 2) a focus of graduate education in this area should include native speakers of Latin American languages as well as the more traditional student body of non-speakers.

Carrying out documentation projects in cooperation with communities of speakers implies designing those projects to serve purposes of direct
Language is central to the identity of many indigenous Latin American communities, and is almost universally ignored or relegated to an inferior status as merely “cultural patrimony” or the like in most Latin American states, even those such as Bolivia or Guatemala where a majority of the population speaks one of these languages natively.

interest to the communities. In many cases this means using some of the time and resources that are available to a project in applying linguistic knowledge that is acquired through basic research to such matters as the creation of educational materials, teacher training, linguistic outreach, or the construction of basic language resources for the community. It also implies using Spanish or Portuguese for the “link” language in bilingual and descriptive materials, rather than English. It further implies storing materials in ways such that they are accessible to community members in the future. In this regard, the creation of the Archive of Indigenous Languages of Latin America (directed by Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury and managed by Heidi Johnson) at UT has provided the ideal long-term storage situation, since it is a permanent digital archive that can be consulted by anyone with Internet access (at http://www.ailla.utexas.org). While not all indigenous communities have such access, an increasing number do and many more will in the near future.

Focusing on graduate education for native speakers of Latin American languages starts with the principle that native speaker linguists have a stake in the future of their own languages, have intimate insider knowledge of the dynamics of the community that can contribute substantially to the success of programs in language preservation, and can be leaders in language revitalization in ways in which no outsider can hope to be. In addition, native speakers can work on very difficult problems of linguistic analysis with great sophistication. Furthermore, indigenous Latin Americans have had severely limited access to higher education, a situation we hope to help mitigate in the area of linguistics. Since Latin American indigenous languages lack almost any sort of institutional support where they are spoken, strong graduate education for some of the speakers can begin to bridge that gap by providing academic institutional support and by training leaders who may be able to increase the possibilities for other institutional support at home.

The creation of the Center for Indigenous Languages of Latin America at UT has resulted in three notable achievements. First, we have the largest number of indigenous Latin Americans enrolled in graduate programs in linguistics (including linguistic anthropology) of any U.S. university. They currently include speakers of Mayan languages (Q’anjob’al, Mam, Chol, K’ichee’), Otomanguean languages (Chatino, Zapotec), Chibchan languages (Kuna), and Quechua. We also have on average 20–25 graduate students who are working actively on the analysis of Latin American indigenous languages. Second, we have had three quite different projects, all with major funding, that have involved UT students and faculty in cooperative ventures with each other, with communities of speakers, and with scholars from elsewhere. Each one has been quite different in the specifics of design, but all have created research teams and have been carried out in collaboration with communities of speakers. Third, the center has begun a biennial conference that is unique in the United States. It has been held three times, with Latin American participation ranging between 45 and 60 percent and indigenous Latin American participation steadily increasing from 15 to 25 percent. Conference papers are presented largely in Spanish, and the conference has become known as a major venue where scholars who work on Latin American languages can come together and exchange ideas. It further has provided an unequaled opportunity for speakers of the languages to begin to present their own research in an academic setting and to begin to establish scholarly networks well beyond their home communities and countries.

The three research projects have been designed to meet the research goals of their PIs and research personnel, but they also have been conceived of as constituting new models for research collaboration, not only with other scholars and with a PI’s own graduate students, but also with the communities in which they take place. A brief synopsis of each follows.

1) Iquito Project, Peru

This project was created by anthropology graduate students Chris Beier and Lev Michael in response to a request from the Iquito community to help provide them with materials for language education and revitalization. Iquito is a highly endangered language of the Peruvian Amazon with twenty-five elderly speakers. The project began with minor funding for the four graduate students who participated in its first fieldwork season in 1992, and then secured major funding from the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) of SOAS, University of London (PI Nora England, co-PIs Chris Beier and Lev Michael). It has involved
twelve graduate students (nine from UT and three Peruvians), four native speakers, and two community language specialists and has produced a large text collection, a draft of a dictionary, a draft of a grammar, and various educational materials for the community. One of its most important contributions was in providing fieldwork training for all of the graduate students involved. Six M.A. and three licenciatura theses were produced as a result of student participation in the project, and two doctoral dissertations are currently in progress. The project has been noteworthy in two respects: it was established initially as a direct response to a community request for help, and it has been an entirely graduate student initiative, with faculty playing only a minimal support role.

2) Mayan Project, Guatemala
This was a project in the documentation of four Mayan languages, Uspanteko, Sakapulteko, Teko, and Awakateko, directed by Nora England and supported through an ELDP grant to England for two of the languages and a grant from the Norwegian Embassy to a Guatemalan linguistic research institution, OKMA (Oxla-juuj Keel Maya’ Ajtz’iib’) for the other two. It created a lexical database, a text database, and grammars for each of the languages and resulted in the publication of three grammars and four dictionaries. Subsequent funding also resulted in the creation and publication of pedagogical grammars in three of the languages. Besides England, one UT linguistics graduate student, B’alam Mateo, worked on the project, as did four Mayas who, as linguists, headed the research teams for each language, and eight community members who were trained in linguistics and worked on the materials for their own languages. One of the team leaders, Telma Can, subsequently has begun the graduate program in linguistics at UT. One unique aspect of the project was that the team leaders, all speakers of a Mayan language, wrote grammars of languages they themselves did not speak. B’alam Mateo went on to secure funding for dissertation research on his own language (from ELDP and NSF) and created his own team of research personnel consisting of community members to whom he taught grammatical structure, fieldwork methodology, and transcription techniques. The Mayan project is unusual because it was entirely designed and implemented through collaboration between Maya-speaking linguists and England, and all of the personnel except for England were native speakers of Mayan languages.

3) Chatino Project, Mexico.
This project was begun by Anthony Woodbury and two Chatino graduate students, Emiliana Cruz (Anthropology) and Hilaria Cruz (Linguistics). After several summers of fieldwork on minimal funding, the project has secured major funding from the ELDP. Besides the two Chatino graduate students, four other graduate students are involved with the project, as well as Woodbury’s high school-aged daughter and Emiliana Cruz’s daughter. The project is documenting four different varieties of Chatino and has been very active in teaching literacy and language structure to Chatino teachers. This project has, like the Iquito project, provided field training to graduate students and has as a goal, like the other projects, the comprehensive documentation of the language, with text databases based on video and audio recordings, lexical databases, and grammars of each variety studied. The unique aspect of this project is that it began through the efforts of the two Chatino graduate students, who were committed to promoting literacy, education, and language revitalization in Chatino, and was then shaped by their interactions with Anthony Woodbury, who became committed to the language and the project through his initial role as a graduate supervisor for Emiliana Cruz.

Through these projects and the Conference on Indigenous Languages of Latin America we also have established strong continuing relationships with some of the Latin American institutions that have an interest in indigenous languages, such as the Universidad Mayor de San Marcos in Peru, OKMA in Guatemala, and CIESAS and the Universidad de Sonora in Mexico. The projects also illustrate well our general goals:
1) To contribute to the documentation of Latin American languages.
2) To respond to community interests in their own languages.
3) To contribute to language preservation.
4) To contribute to graduate education for Latin American indigenous students.
5) To design and test new models for cooperative projects that can accomplish these goals.
6) To contribute better linguistic description and analysis, better trained linguists, and more conscientious scholarship in the field of linguistics.

Nora C. England is Dallas TACA Centennial Professor of Linguistics and Director of the Center for Indigenous Languages of Latin America.
In January 2007, the University of Texas Libraries signed a cooperative agreement with Google to digitize no fewer than one million books from its collections over the next six years. By summer 2008, Google had digitized more than 300,000 volumes from the unique holdings of the Benson Latin American Collection and made available online digital copies of many of the photographs, illustrations, maps, graphs, and charts as well as the text of two to three hundred of these books. Titles from the Benson that appeared online include such forgotten classics as Paul Groussac’s *El viaje intelectual* and a rare account by Argentine Navy officer Jose M. Sobral of his exploration of Antarctica, *Dos años entre los hielos*, 1901–1903.

Through the parallel efforts of Google Library Partners in the United States and Europe, Latin Americanists everywhere in the world will soon have online keyword, author, title, publisher, or publication date access to the full text of tens of thousands of rare and out-of-print books from the finest research collections.

One of four large-scale digitization projects under way in the United States, the Google Library Partners now includes twenty-eight research libraries with total holdings in the hundreds of millions of books. The combined holdings from the libraries of the original five Google partners—Harvard, Michigan, New York Public Library, Oxford, and Stanford—have been estimated at 58 million volumes. Of these, 15 million are planned to be digitized and online within ten years. Other mass-digitization initiatives include the Carnegie Mellon University’s Million Book Project, Microsoft’s Live Search Books, and the well-publicized Open Content Alliance.

Google’s Goals: Online Discovery of Book Contents

Google’s main goals are to make the contents of books discoverable by as wide an audience as possible and ultimately help authors and publishers sell more books. Google has the resources, the indexing capacity, the search engine, and so far the incentive to digitize, instantaneously sort through, and disseminate the millions of bytes that the imaged books are taking up on the Google servers. Since many of the books take up an average of 20 megabytes each, the first lot of 15 million will absorb a minimum of 300 terabytes of server space. This is about four times the bytes the Library of Congress estimates the U.S. National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program has processed to date.

Like all other initiatives to digitize and make gargantuan masses of materials available online, Google is restricted by copyright law. A web of international copyright laws protects recently published books as well as many obscure, hard-to-find, and out-of-print books, precluding their dissemination online. To accommodate legal restrictions, Google developed a three-tiered system for delivering desired texts to users as Snippets, in Limited View, or in Full View. That is, when searched in Google Book Search, texts protected by copyright appear as phrases on a fortune cookie, separated from essential bibliographic information including pagination; these are called Snippets. At most, the Snippet returns a few lines of text before and after the keyword or phrase entered by the user. When permission is granted by the copyright owner—often the publisher of a book—Google more liberally displays as much as 50–75 percent of the book. If a book is clearly in the public domain, then the book appears in full text ready for downloading by the user.
Like all other initiatives to digitize and make gargantuan masses of materials available online, Google is restricted by copyright law.

To accommodate legal restrictions, Google developed a three-tiered system for delivering desired texts to users as Snippets, in Limited View, or in Full View.

On the other hand, anxiety about the likelihood that Google will abandon the Google Library Partnerships before reaching its stated goals peaked in May 2008 when Microsoft announced that it would end similar mass-digitization projects, Live Search Books and Live Search Academic Services. By that date, Microsoft and its partners had digitized three-quarter million books and tens of millions of scholarly journal articles. Microsoft turned over the digital files to Ingram Digital, which already had functioned as the host for the Microsoft Live Search Books files. Presumably, publishers will now have to renegotiate terms with Ingram or opt out of the project.

Less concerned about business practices, some scholars fear that popular mass digitization programs will reduce the motivation of research libraries to preserve the original copies. Others question the rationale for...
imaging millions of printed pages at a time that scholars demand massive data sets they can manipulate. To date, mapping, notation, and data aggregation tools provided by Google have proven inadequate for scholarly use.

Library Partner Goals

Many research libraries, including the Library of Congress, have undertaken ambitious book digitization programs but not on this scale. Given the limited resources and lack of access to the necessary technology, individual research libraries have not been able to digitize more than a few thousand of their books, confirming librarians’ estimates that digitization of their holdings would take generations to complete. Google's proposal to digitize and service the digital archive of their collections at no cost to the research libraries not only accelerated the rate at which the digitization processes can take place, but it promises to quickly multiply the number of printed books to be digitized from the thousands to the millions.

Alliance with Google assures research libraries that their books will be more easily discovered by users worldwide and their collections made known beyond the walls of an institution. These outcomes advance the mission of universities to disseminate knowledge and fulfill the mandate of libraries to expand and diversify access services. Librarians are beginning to accept digital copies as an important means of preserving their collections much as they once did microfilm reproductions of books and manuscripts so that partnering with Google has been repeatedly justified as an affordable long-term preservation strategy. The creation of digital copies for preservation is defensible as a fair use and is sensible as a solution to replacement for lost and fragile items.

Several research libraries, such as those at the University of Michigan and Stanford University, also have leveraged these large-scale projects to develop user-oriented search applications and improve the integration of disparate digital collections. In connection with the Google Library Partnership, the University of Texas Libraries staff is testing the means to link the corresponding digitized texts to the main online catalog author entries.

In addition, research staff began an investigation of copyright laws in various Latin American countries and joined colleagues at the University of Michigan in refining procedures for determining the copyright status of individual works, with the intent of uncovering the maximum number of titles in the public domain. Books in the public domain may be presented online in full view and prepared for downloading by anyone with adequate technology.

Copyright Laws in Latin America

The global distribution of potential readers and authors complicates the determination of the copyright status of individual works disseminated online. Although the language of current copyright laws flows from that of the Berne Convention and is harmonized through multilateral treaties among countries, definitions and duration of copyright protection vary widely from country to country. The laws of individual countries distinguish authored works, anonymous and pseudonymous works, edited works, and translations as well as works-for-hire, among others, while copyright protection terms vary from fifty to one hundred years, sometimes calculated from the date of publication for compiled works or from the year of death for authored works. In the case of multiple authors, copyright protection is calculated from the year of death of the last living author.

The classification of creative works, the identification of authors, the accurate determination of author death, and the correct calculation of the duration of copyright are complex, time-consuming, and painstaking tasks. They are also risky, as errors could prove embarrassing, if not expensive. Consequently, the rules for determining the copyright status of large numbers of books must be extremely conservative. That is the case with Google's algorithms.

According to the U.S. law, books published anywhere before 1923 are no longer protected in the United States and are categorically in the public domain. After that date, a series of conditions related to copyright formalities, trade agreements, treaties, and court decisions must be conjugated in order to arrive at the copyright status of a work. Ironically, at different times U.S. law has provided copyright protection beyond the term the works enjoyed in the country of origin. Many of the books in the Benson Latin American Collection are works that had been in the public domain in the country of origin but were republished with a new foreword, annotations, or similar editorial additions, thus making it difficult to separate the original text for dissemination throughout the digital public domain. Edited and republished works make up a substantial portion of research libraries like the Benson Latin American Collection, which increased book purchases and exchanges during the 1960s. All of the republished work will be protected by copyright law for many more years and will continue to appear to the Google Book Searcher as Snippets.

Creative Uses of Google Book Search

Although small-scale and mass digitization projects have been recognized as a boon to classicists, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern scholars in general, Latin Americanists have not had enough time to use the newly available materials and to publicize their experiences accessing and utilizing mass digital libraries. Recent postings on discussion lists and formal publications by historians, print history, and book culture scholars in general have been mostly negative, creating additional doubt about the value of the endeavor. The more positive comments admit to the usefulness of mechanisms that allow user-chosen searches over millions of books and recognize Google Book Search as an effective finding aid for pinpointing the location of arcane and regional materials currently scattered worldwide without having to consult foreign language union catalogs.

Because the books that are being digitized come off the shelves as raw inventory from dozens of research libraries, few attempts have been made to select or curate subcollections in relation to the interest or research needs of faculty and students. Indeed, the individual researcher must carefully select from a huge mass of digitized titles for their personalized collections. It will be up to researchers to prompt their home institutions to assist in those searches and to provide the tools to restructure the contents within the digitized books so that they can be analyzed and manipulated as a mass—of snippets.

Explore Google Books Search, http://books.google.com/advanced_book_search and have a say on what will be done next!

Maria Elena González Marinas is Assistant Professor in the Library and Information Science Program at Wayne State University. She received her Ph.D. from the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin.
CARLY CASTETTER and I knew that working as LLILAS interns would present us with a number of opportunities, but we never expected the job description to include international travel. Along with Lautaro Millaman-Teruel, Javier Rojas, and Mario Guajardo, we had the privilege of representing the University of Texas at Austin student body and joining a number of UT faculty and staff in March 2008 for a week of panels and discussions as part of the Nortearmérica y el Dilema de la Integración conference. The conference was the culmination of efforts from UT as well as five Mexican universities: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE), Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), Instituto Tecnología de México (ITAM), El Colegio de México (COLMEX), and Instituto Tecnologico de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM). Each day’s events were hosted at one of the participating universities’ campuses, allowing us to see parts of Mexico City that most first-time tourists wouldn’t visit as well as connecting us with university students who gave us a Mexican perspective on college life like our own.

Carly and I joined the UT group, already establishing itself in Mexico, on the third day hosted at ITAM. Though we missed the visit of President Powers, we were welcomed to Mexico City with a formal dinner hosted by Provost Leslie held in the courtyard of Museo Interactive de Economía just blocks from the Zocalo. We spent our second day at COLMEX, where we listened to talks largely on the political atmosphere between Mexico and the U.S. The day ended with a reception hosted on campus in which we met several COLMEX students who told us about their lives in Mexico City. They even started a mini-fan club for UT government professor Sean Theriault. He had been especially well received as the speaker ending the day’s panel, giving his insights on the upcoming U.S. presidential election, which we learned was as interesting to our Mexican peers as to us. The conference’s last day was held at the ITESM–Santa Fe campus, which we found to be extremely modern and colorful. Though the speakers each day were incredibly interesting and diverse in topics, the panels at ITESM were especially compelling. Mexican Secretary of Public Education Josefina Vázquez Mota opened the day with a plea to embrace multinational education. Furthermore, we were privileged to hear Carlos Monsivais—a Mexican writer with whom we weren’t familiar and didn’t realize was famous until we saw a quote of his on a billboard while walking through Chapultepec park the next day. ITESM also presented an opportunity to interact with our Mexican peers, this time in a lunch setting, where we learned about the more business-oriented studies of ITESM students.

Our week spent in Mexico was much more eye-opening than any trip we could have taken on our own. The conference surely achieved its goal of integration through us—we made Mexican friends and ingratiated ourselves with the city as best we could in the little time we had there. The unique opportunity that LLILAS provided us opened our eyes to the great possibilities with our Mexican neighbors and gave more meaning to our desire to major in Latin American Studies.

Courtney Martinez is a first-year Latin American Studies undergraduate major, with a concentration in government.
ONE AUTUMN NIGHT IN MAY, I ARRIVED HOME from my four-hour economics course at the University of Buenos Aires to discover my bathroom mirror shattered in pieces and stacked neatly in the floor of my shower. When confronted, neither my exchange program host mother, María, nor Marta, the woman she paid to clean the house, confessed to having broken it. There we stood in the kitchen, all suspecting each other. As one of the million-plus workers in the growing domestic service sector of urban Argentina and a (likely illegal) Peruvian immigrant, Marta might have feared losing her job enough to blame the incident on me. Though a fully employed member of the Argentine middle class, María relied more than she would like to admit on the income she earned hosting American exchange students and so might have had ample motive to have my program pay for the damage as if it had been my fault.

The invasion of such deceit into the apartment where I had lived as part of the family for five months is a glimpse of the precarious state of society, political discourse, and economic confidence in Argentina less than seven years after the devastating economic crash of 2001. The conflicted national psyche of this moment could not have found a more apt metaphor than a mirror shattered without a culprit and surrounded by a haze of accusations and mistrust.

I spent February–July of 2008 in Argentina. In that time I studied at four universities, was detained in three separate popular highway roadblocks, found myself in the cross-fire of a fútbol-inspired shoot-out, and encountered an untold number of individuals whose experiences as Argentines were as distinct as the dense jungle, rich farmland, and snow-capped mountain peaks that illuminate this country’s diverse terrain. My everyday encounters with the lives and stories of this conflicted but proud people revealed a “national identity” as shattered as my bathroom mirror.

Rising in the distance above the reeds of the Reserva Ecológica where I would spend my Saturdays is a glittering expanse of skyscrapers and construction cranes. This is Puerto Madero, the city’s newest barrio and home to five-star restaurants, loft apartments, and private art galleries. It is a completely post-crash phenomenon. In 2003, as the economy began to grow again, this former port zone became prime real estate, and an extravagant construction boom began that has not slowed since. This is the shining symbol of the great Argentine “recovery” championed by ex-president Nestor Kirchner. However, as the sun would pass behind those sleek towers, another unavoidable sight of post-recovery Buenos Aires emerged. On nearly every street corner every night of the week, passers-by will notice heaps of trash surrounded by people. They are the cartoneros, and if you ask any Buenairens about the differences she’s experienced since the crash, they will be near the top of her list. In a country where nearly a quarter of the population remains in poverty, they eke out a living sifting through the trash of the city salvaging what they can to provide for the needs of their families and collecting recyclables like cardboard, plastic jugs, and copper wiring for exchange for a meagre income. Seventy-two thousand porteños are estimated to engage in this activity as their primary means of existence. Some residents support a plan to incorporate them into a city initiative to increase recycling. Many others, mostly in the wealthier zones of the city, simply see the cartoneros as a public nuisance not
to be encouraged. It is difficult to absorb the harshness of a place where some live in the glass towers of Puerto Madero while others collect glass off the streets just to survive, but once you begin to appreciate the intensity of this disparity, it becomes clear why the Argentine of the twenty-first century must find it difficult to recognize his reflection when he looks in the mirror.

This crisis of identity manifested itself in force in the political arena this year. In March 2008, the tax (retención) on soy, a crop whose exportation has been a key driving force of the post-crisis recovery, was raised to 45 percent. The agricultural sector responded with a “lockout” involving a halt of all exports and roadblocks on most of the nation’s highways. Overnight, we found ourselves in the midst of the largest general strike since “Isabelita” Perón’s time. My twelve-hour return trip from Easter vacation became a twenty-four-hour ordeal as our bus weaved around pickets, parked tractors, and stacks of burning tires. Meat began to run out in the capital, and prices of basic food products like milk and bread rose. A friend’s host mother began hoarding canned foods in panic, and middle-class Argentines took to the streets in protest in numbers not seen since the crisis. It felt like the first time since the devastation of 2001 that people seriously feared things might be headed downward again. What struck me most, though, was the utter lack of popular consensus. The country’s four major agricultural advocacy groups led the lockout in the name of the rural population while the government accused them of representing the interests of the big soy producers. My UBA classmates denounced the conditions of the rural working class, while my host mother accused the government of appeasing multinational investors. In short, everyone was against the situation, but no one could agree on whom to blame, what to do about it, or how to move forward. The lockout went on for two months, was interrupted by an official dialogue for a month, resumed for two more months, and then halted for another month for the Congress to debate and vote on the retenciones plan. At the time of this writing a definitive accord has yet to be reached.

These are not images of the vibrant and optimistic country that saw Nestor Kirchner leave office with unprecedented popularity only last year and welcomed his wife, Cristina Fernández, under the same banner of rebounding prosperity (although she now carries a slim 20 percent popularity rating). The sight of so many struggling for mere existence on the streets every night is not the mark of abundant recovery. A national shutdown over the value of soybeans scarcely signifies the unified political will of an ascendant nation. Nothing summed it up better for me than a political cartoon I saw one day during the lockout. A child is looking up from his cartonero’s wagon at a wall plastered with signs reading “WE ARE ALL THE COUNTRY!” and asks, “Papá, what does all mean?” This is the Argentina I came to know in my semester away from the all-nighters and orange tiles of UT. It is a vision that, as tragically unclear as it is for those who will go on living it once I return, will remain all too clearly in my memory.

Jacob Bintliff is a senior in the Latin American Studies program at the University of Texas at Austin.

Left to right: 1) A rural piquetero in Missiones Province. 2) The towers of Puerto Madero rising along the Rio de la Plata. 3) Grain silos in the Pampa.
WHAT DO THE TRIAL OF former Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori, the construction of a wall on the border between Mexico and the U.S., the situation of rural workers in Guatemala, the declassification of documents related to human rights abuses in Ecuador, the reopening of a criminal investigation for a forced disappearance in Honduras, the design of public institutions to deal with discrimination in Latin America, and the claim for protection of traditional lands brought by an Afro-Brazilian quilombo community all have in common?

Probably one of the few things they share is that they were the seven different projects that a group of eight students worked on in my Advanced Human Rights Advocacy course this semester. The students were from the UT Law School, LLILAS, and the LBJ School. The main goal of the course was to teach human rights from the advocate’s perspective and to develop theoretical and practical human rights skills. Nathaniel, one of the students, better explained the dynamic: “In our class, we [addressed] the contours of human rights law and how individuals can find recourse when they’ve lost everything. As such, we have been given the rare opportunity not only to discuss the contours of this issue but to put them into action to hopefully set a precedent that will help people in the future. Quite frankly, that’s huge.”

In the following paragraphs I would like to explore, through the students’ voices, some of the tensions and dilemmas involved in teaching a course that lies at the intersection between theory and practice, and that seeks to expose students to the ethical, political, professional, and personal accountability questions related to human rights work.

I selected cases and projects because I believed they provided students with the opportunity to gain real-world experience and also forced them to think critically about human rights advocacy. All of the projects involved research, writing, and an opportunity to discuss the strategies used by our organizational and individual partners. They also provided a good platform for considering the tensions, complexities, challenges, and dilemmas of human rights advocacy. The projects contained a
human rights component or, in other words, the issues involved could be addressed from a human rights perspective. In some instances, the work required a creative approach to human rights discourses and an exploration of the alternative meanings of human rights. All the projects that we worked on involved to different degrees local, transnational, and international human rights advocacy, either because of the legal standards being used or the forums selected for the advocacy. The cases and projects provided the students an opportunity to gain practical skills in partnering with other students, institutions, and organizations, thus forming a team of advocates. As I will discuss later, the collaborative work presented an important challenge. Finally, all the projects allowed a multidisciplinary approach.

**Human Rights Advocacy: What We Try to Teach, Why, and How**

In graduate schools there are very few opportunities for students to learn from the perspective of the human rights advocate—that is, to learn by doing and particularly to be confronted with the practical, logistical, ethical, political, and personal dilemmas that a human rights defender confronts in his or her daily work. At the Bernard and Audre Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice we endeavor to provide the right setting so that students can work on real-world projects and get firsthand experience learning how to practice human rights.

We have negotiated arrangements to facilitate international internships with courts, international institutions, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Europe, Africa, and Latin America. The students selected for these posts participate in a range of investigative work, factual development, legal research on both procedural and substantive law, and draft opinions for the cases before the different tribunals. In addition, the Rapoport Center provides stipends for summer internships with nongovernmental and intergovernmental human rights organizations in the United States and abroad. In summer 2008, nine law students headed to destinations as diverse as Beijing, Katmandu, Nairobi, La Paz, and Chiang Mai. Their projects include protecting the rights of indigenous peoples, advocating for the rights of immigrants, working toward democratic and legal reform, and engaging in community legal education efforts.

The Rapoport Center has developed a multiyear project on Afro-descendant and indigenous land rights in Latin America. Each spring break, the center coordinates a weeklong fact-finding mission to a different country to investigate and gather information on the status of collective land claims by Afro-descendant communities. The delegations comprise a multidisciplinary group of students from, among others, the School of Law, Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies, and the LBJ School of Public Affairs. Last year we traveled to Colombia, and this past spring break we went to Brazil. The students use the results of the fact-finding mission to write several academic papers as well as comprehensive reports detailing the findings of the project and making policy recommendations to relevant governmental, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental organizations and policymakers.

The Advanced Human Rights Advocacy course was part of the strategy to devise projects and initiatives that provide students opportunities to learn by doing, while also serving people whose rights were violated. As one of my students, Claudia, said: “It was refreshing to have a project and class in graduate school that had real-life consequences and effects—I was able to work on something that would actually help someone, instead of reading pages and pages on theory and producing a research paper with the sole purpose of receiving academic credit.” For Andrea, the class was a “good opportunity to work on my research skills, work on a team, and coordinate internationally.” Her classmate Chris summarized his experience in this way: “In only three short months everyone in our class has been elevated to the level of ‘semi-expert’ on the issues surrounding their respective projects. I see this as an amazing transformation that should not be taken for granted. As I complete the first half of my master’s program, I realize the distinct possibility that this class will be the closest thing to ‘job training’ that I will receive during my time as a graduate student.”

The projects we undertook exposed students to the complexities in human rights advocacy and research and to the multiple tools available for achieving particular goals. As another student, Nathaniel, said, “In each project, I encountered unique challenges ranging from moral concerns and legal hurdles to just plain physical exhaustion and procrastination.” We prepared documents supporting the use of legislative and judicial—national and international—processes. Through different projects we used different approaches to transnational justice from criminal prosecutions to truth commissions. In sum, we explored the plethora of norms, procedures, and forums available to promote human rights. For instance, in the border fence project, the students’ first task was to analyze what possibilities an international human rights system offers to challenge the construction of a fence on the U.S.-Mexico border. We explored different alternatives with their advantages and limitations, such as a visit by an international body, filing a formal complaint, requesting urgent actions or presenting evidence in a public hearing in front of that international body. For each project, students fully participated in the decision-making process leading to the selection of the best strategy to be pursued. As any human rights advocate, students needed to understand the purpose of their actions as well as the legal and political consequences and limitations of their decisions.

We discussed how to be the type of advocates who are committed to action and yet critical of their own work at the same time. For instance, many of the students in the class were troubled by their involvement in the criminal prosecution of human rights abusers for events that happened twenty or more years ago. Nate was “less proud of reopening” the criminal investigation for the forced disappearance. He felt “that people move on with their lives in spite of the fact that a horrible atrocity has happened,” and he did “not find the argument convincing that an individual, a country, or the international community needs to have every horror spelled out in its gruesome detail especially when the horror is being dealt with through other means.” Nate continued by saying that if “the country seems to be moving in the right direction with regard to following the American Convention and handling the issue of forced disappearances . . . why are we risking our own moral integrity and possibly committing a human rights violation ourselves to further a human rights position that is already being furthered?” His classmate Alice added, “I think prosecution can serve three general purposes: deterrence of future criminal action, retribution (to show that the society thinks an act is wrong and to show justice was done for the victims’ families),
or to set the story straight for the purposes of history and truth.... Regarding the Fujimori trial brief, Andrea said: “I was troubled by what I saw as another manifestation of International Law’s push to prosecute to the detriment of other mechanisms (resources, attention, etc.). I’m not sure that I have completely resolved this issue, but I have also recognized that prosecution is an important role and that the international community can play an important role. Furthermore, if domestic courts begin to prosecute more actively, then it is likely that more human rights violators can be punished and this will ostensibly (and according to one theory of crime) make would-be-violators less likely to engage in human rights violations.”

In short, through particular projects, students, as in any regular academic course, were required to think about the different dilemmas presented by a particular issue. The advocates in training perceived that human rights discourse is not unique, that options are numerous, and that interests can be contradictory. It was very clear that there are no truths written in stone. To the contrary, human rights advocacy is an extremely rich field that forces its practitioners to develop creative approaches to advance certain causes. For instance, our project on traditional lands of Afro-Brazilians forced students to think about how the human rights framework, generally understood to protect individual rights, could encompass group or collective rights. The project on the border fence provided students with a debate about whether the issues surrounding the fence’s construction might or might not be framed in human rights terms. Leah explained that she chose this project “because of its relevance to public policy and because of my strong belief that the border fence is political expedience epitomized ... I wasn’t sure that I believed human rights (as I conceived them) were being violated by the building of a border fence in the Texas Rio Grande Valley, but I wanted the chance to stretch my thinking toward this argument.”

These transnational and international projects confronted some students for the first time with a research agenda on a global or regional scale. Alice wrote: “This was my first foray into truly international legal research, meaning outside the scope of LexisNexis and Westlaw. The comparative law cases in the memos would have been virtually impossible for us to find without Ariel’s help. There is no central way, that I am aware of, to search for other countries’ cases. There is probably a way to search cases by country, but I don’t even know of a way to find those websites or how to use case reporters at the library for those tasks.” In the same vein Andrea complained that “once the research began in earnest, I was even more frustrated. I had never done comparative international research before, and I did not know how to read international cases ... All of the cases I had to read were in Spanish, and many of them have multiple opinions as well as a presentation of the case by the prosecution. As someone familiar only with U.S. court cases ... I [didn’t know] how to read the cases.”

While these international projects provided important opportunities for training, Matt reflected on a commonly cited feeling when he questioned himself about “whether one could still be an effective advocate from afar, and how that dynamic changed one’s role as an advocate.” Alice says, “What could have made a huge difference is the energizing force gained from working for someone, someone whose face I know, whose pain and joy I can see. I realize this is utterly impossible in our distance-learning version of international human rights.”

To address this situation, future courses will try to connect the projects with other initiatives such as the summer internships or the spring break projects. By linking both sets of activities, we can provide students with the needed, and so far elusive, personal contact with the clients they are serving. More important, this arrangement also would provide a more permanent and sustained engagement between UT and our partners on the ground.

Of course, the students’ distance from our partners also provided them with an educational opportunity. Dominic commented: “A major lesson I have learned through my involvement in both projects has been the importance of maintaining a high level of communication and coordination with one’s partners and collaborators. The collaborative nature of these projects, with our peers or workmates, our colleagues in Latin America, and our ‘executive director,’ represents a significant shift from the normal solitary work routine of a student.”

Most of the projects required a fair amount of reading, researching, and communication in Spanish and Portuguese. Most of the students have some level of knowledge and fluency in one or both languages. But for many of them, it was the first time that they had worked in this bilingual environment, and it was an important challenge. As Matt put it: “To effectively carry out work with communities, people should be able to—at least to a certain degree or proficiency—speak the language that they hope to work in. It is a vital expression of solidarity—a reflection of caring enough to take the time to learn someone’s language. Equally serious is the fact that it is a tool for communication.”

Ultimately, the main challenge posed by the course was: What is the student’s and the university’s role in doing human rights advocacy? Is there a space? A need? A duty? What are the possibilities and limitations? We did not intend to provide final answers to these questions in our course; however, we spent a significant amount of time discussing them in the framework that Matt provided: “How do you grow as a human rights advocate without sacrificing the quality of advocacy? Is there a problem in using human rights work as a training ground for human rights work? Would I want students representing me? ... Up to only a certain point can community solidarity, personal investment, and seriousness compensate for a lack of technical knowledge and experience.” Chris had the same anxieties when he said: “I’m a student. We’re all students. Is this okay? This tension will probably be prevalent in our class reflections, and I think it is for a good reason. We’ve discussed the parallel between the role we play in our class projects and that played by medical students, which leads to the question: Is it okay for us to learn through trial and error when the stakes are so high?” He concluded, “It may be that our good intentions are not always good enough and that our status as students discredits some of our efforts, but I feel confident that ... university students should and always will have a place in any discussion on human rights.” I hope that at UT we can continue to strengthen this discussion.

Ariel Dulitzky was the Tinker Visiting Professor during fall 2007. He is now Associate Director of the Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice at the UT School of Law, where he teaches courses on human rights.
lous, and always strategically significant stretch of land. With the Yucatán, it was home of the Maya, one of the great pre-Columbian cultures. MacLeod examines the long-term process it underwent of relative prosperity, depression, and then recovery, citing comparative sources on Europe to describe Central America’s great economic, demographic, and social cycles. With an updated historiographical and bibliographic introduction, this fascinating study should appeal to historians, anthropologists, and all who are interested in the colonial experience of Latin America.

Murdo J. MacLeod is Emeritus Professor of History of the University of Florida at Gainesville.

Gabriel García Moreno and Conservative State Formation in the Andes
by Peter V. N. Henderson,
LLILAS New Interpretations of Latin America Series (November 2008)

This book explores the life and times of Ecuador’s most controversial politician within the broader context of the new political history, addressing five major themes of nineteenth-century Latin American history: the creation of political networks, the divisiveness of regionalism, the bitterness of the liberal-conservative ideological divide, the complicating problem of caudillismo, and the quest for progress and modernization.

Two myths traditionally associated with García Moreno’s rule are debunked. The first is that he created a theocracy in Ecuador. Instead, the book argues that he negotiated a concordat with the Papacy giving the national government control over the church’s secular responsibilities, and subordinated the clergy, many of whom were highly critical of García Moreno, to the conservative state. A second, frequently repeated generalization is that he created a conservative dictatorship out of touch with the liberal age in which he lived. Instead, the book argues that moderates held sway during the first nine years of García Moreno’s period of influence, and only during his final term did he achieve the type of conservative state he thought necessary to advance his progressive nation-building agenda.

In sum, this book enriches our understanding of many of the notions of state formation by suggesting that conservatives like García Moreno envisioned a program of material progress and promoting national unity under a very different formula from that of nineteenth-century liberals.

Peter V. N. Henderson is Professor of History at Winona State University in Minnesota. He is author of, most recently, In the Absence of Don Porfirio: Francisco León de la Barra and the Mexican Revolution.

Both books may be ordered through the University of Texas Press. For more information, visit http://www.utexas.edu/utpress/ or contact LLILAS Managing Editor Virginia Hagerty at vhagerty@mail.utexas.edu.
TEACHING IN THE KEY OF LIFE: Our Latin Americanist Music Faculty

From protest music in Cuba to Andean popular music to Mexican mariachi music, the interests of the faculty below, all at UT’s Butler School of Music, are indicative of the diverse areas of musical scholarship available to students in Latin American Studies.

Robin Moore
Robin Moore is Associate Professor of Ethnomusicology at the University of Texas at Austin, where he earned his Ph.D. He teaches courses on the history of ethnomusicology, on music and race in Latin America, and on music in Mexico and the Caribbean, among others. Regarding his professional interests, he says, “I’m very grateful to be teaching at one of the handful of U.S. institutions that takes music from Latin America seriously as a focus of study, and that has such excellent library resources for students and faculty in that area. Latin American music is tremendously important to the future of this country, but most music programs have been very slow to recognize that fact.”

Dr. Moore recently presented a paper on protest music in socialist Cuba at the UT conference What’s Left of the American Left?, which was organized by LLILAS and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Elaborating on this theme, he says, “Cuba of the post-1959 period has produced many excellent musicians. Their compositions are not only musically sophisticated, but demonstrate a keen understanding of social realities within and outside of Cuba. It’s a shame the performers aren’t better known in this country.”

He has received awards and fellowships from the Rockefeller Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, and the National Humanities Center. His primary research interests include music and nationalism, music and race relations, popular music study, and socialist art aesthetics.

Dr. Moore is the current editor of the Latin American Music Review (LAMR), published by the University of Texas Press. He is also author of Nationalizing Blackness: AfroCubanismo and Artistic Revolution in Havana, 1920–1940 and articles on Cuban music in LAMR, Cuban Studies, Ethnomusicology, Encuentro de la cultura cubana, and other journals and book anthologies. His latest book, Music and Revolution Cultural Change in Socialist Cuba, concerns artistic life in Cuba after 1959.

Dr. Moore also has been instrumental in extending offerings in Latin American music performance in recent years, and in creating ties to the Spanish-speaking performance community in the Austin area. Through an agreement funded jointly by the School of Music, the Dean of Fine Arts, and the office of Vice President Gregory Vincent, Moore has helped to hire a local performer, Adolph Ortiz, to direct the UT Mariachi Paredes, and has created a new Conjunto Ensemble under the direction of Grammy-winning artist Joel Guzmán as well as J. J. Barrera. Dr. Moore himself directs a performance ensemble devoted to music of the Spanish-speaking Caribbean and Colombia. All these groups are open to UT students, graduates or undergraduates.
Joshua Tucker
Joshua Tucker is Assistant Professor of Ethnomusicology at the University of Texas, specializing in popular musics of Latin America. He received his Ph.D. in 2005 from the University of Michigan, where he was a founding member of the interdisciplinary Círculo Micaela Bastidas de Estudios Andinos. He held a postdoctoral fellowship in ethnomusicology at the University of Chicago before joining the faculty at UT Austin in 2006, and will spend the 2008–2009 year as a visiting scholar at Brown University’s Center for Latin American Studies.

In the ethnomusicology program, students receive training in a variety of historical, analytical, and cultural issues before specializing in a historical period or geographical area. Professor Tucker regularly offers courses on Andean and Brazilian music. He also teaches music of indigenous peoples of the Americas, gives surveys of world popular music, and directs the University of Texas Andean Music Ensemble.

Since 1999, Dr. Tucker has studied Andean popular music in Peru, both in the highland city of Ayacucho and among migrant groups in Lima. Focusing on media workers, including record producers and radio DJs, his research demonstrates how they create new publics for styles blending traditional forms with international sounds. He is interested in the way that these agents are redrawing the dominant notions of ‘Andean’ and ‘indigenous’ subjectivity subscribed to by other kinds of state and civil actors. “Popular commercial music is not often taken seriously in Peru as a site for redefining social norms, particularly in light of the more tangible political changes in Bolivia and Ecuador,” Dr. Tucker says. “But in contemporary Lima, popular culture is probably the most dynamic force reshaping racial and ethnic ideologies.” Among his publications are a forthcoming article in *Popular Music and Society* entitled “And Then There Was a Public,” and a chapter on Peruvian chicha music for a forthcoming edited collection on cumbia in Latin America. He has regularly contributed reviews to *Latin American Music Review, Social Anthropology*, and *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*. His work has been supported by a number of agencies, including the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

In summer of 2008, Professor Tucker returned to Lima to research Internet radio stations that disseminate Andean music. He also began an investigation into Peru’s recent boom of *teled novelas* based on the lives of Andean migrant superstars, focusing on the way that viewers interpret the narrativizations of migrant experience created by non-Andean producers.

Lorenzo Candelaria
Lorenzo Candelaria, Associate Professor at the Butler School of Music, is a historian of Western European art music in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He received his Ph.D. with distinction from Yale University, where he studied with renowned musicologist Craig Wright. Prior to his work at Yale, he studied classical violin at the prestigious Cleveland Institute of Music under Viktor Danchenko (a pupil of David Oistrakh), and later, at the Oberlin Conservatory. Dr. Candelaria reflects on the Oberlin experience as a transformative one. “My love of music history really began at Oberlin,” he says. “As a violinist, I naturally dreaded the rigorous courses in Medieval and Renaissance music history. The repertory I knew was Mozart and Beethoven, not Machaut and Josquin. But the professors there made early music come alive in ways I never anticipated.”

Deeply impressed by Oberlin’s interdisciplinary approach to music culture, Dr. Candelaria switched majors from his first love, violin performance, to music history and thus started down the path that would lead him through Yale and, ultimately, to the University of Texas, where he has been on faculty since 2001. At UT, he continues to pursue an interdisciplinary approach to music culture. In addition to his affiliation with LLILAS, he is associated with the Center for Mexican American Studies (CMAS) and the Center for Religious Studies, and has worked closely with the Blanton Museum of Art.

Dr. Candelaria has a wide variety of interests ranging from Gregorian chant to Mexican mariachi music. As a violinist with two Grammy-nominated mariachi groups in the 1990s, he has a real insider’s perspective on the latter. Reflecting on the experience, he says that “touring with those guys is about as close as I’ll ever get to being a rock star.” Nevertheless, he much prefers his life as a scholar and teacher. “It was a great experience, but my real passion and calling is here in Austin with my wife, our three children, and our extended family at the University of Texas.”

His mariachi days well behind him, Dr. Candelaria’s work now focuses on Catholic music in sixteenth-century Spain and its subsequent impact on devotional cultures in Latin America and the southwestern United States. His most recent books include *American Music: A Panorama*, a best-selling textbook coauthored with Daniel Kingman, and *The Rosary Cantoral: Ritual and Social Design in a Chantbook from Early Renaissance Toledo*. The latter focuses on a stunningly beautiful chantbook from fifteenth-century Spain that was donated to a prominent religious house by a group of accused heretics. Dr. Candelaria is currently writing a book on music in Mexican Catholicism which includes a chapter on the popular Mariachi Mass—a topic that neatly bridges two seemingly diverse interests.
Visiting Professors for 2007–2008 at LLILAS

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 are brought to UT to teach courses or a set of classes, 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 Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Endowment and supports visiting scholars to teach at UT for one semester. Dr. Antonio Dimas DeMoraes was our Lozano Long Visiting Professor for fall 2007. He holds a Ph.D. from the Universidade de São Paulo and is a respected scholar of Brazilian literature, with a research focus on the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Professor Dimas taught the course Modernização cultural e literária nos anos 20 e 30: Gilberto Freyre, Mário de Andrade e José Lins do Rego.

The Tinker Visiting Professor program dates back to 1973 when it was endowed by the Edward Larocque Tinker Foundation. The goal of the program has been to bring pre-eminent thinkers from Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula to provide an opportunity for U.S. scholars, students, and the general public to discover the contributions made by Latin American and Iberian scholars in a broad range of disciplines. Dr. Ariel Dulitzky was the fall 2007 Tinker Visiting Professor. He holds a law degree from the University of Buenos Aires School of Law and an LL.M. from Harvard. He is now Visiting Professor of Law and Latin American Studies and Associate Director of the Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice at UT. As Tinker Professor, he taught the course Human Rights in Latin America during fall 2007. Dr. Sandra Kuntz Ficker was Tinker Visiting Professor for spring 2008. Dr. Kuntz is Professor of Economic History at El Colegio de México, 1800–1940.

Spring 2008 also brought Dr. Rodolfo Cruz to UT as the Matías Romero Visiting Professor. The Matías Romero Visiting Chair in Mexican Studies was created through an educational and research cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico and UT Austin. Its purpose is to promote the presence and participation of distinguished Mexicans from the public and private sectors, as well as from academia, to foster greater understanding of Mexican culture and society. Dr. Cruz is Director of the Population Studies Department at the Colegio de la Frontera del Norte in Tijuana, Baja California. He has taught numerous courses on demography there and at San Diego State University. He earned his Ph.D. in sociology from UT Austin and a master’s degree from the Colegio de México. During his semester in Austin, Dr. Cruz taught a graduate seminar on international migration, with a focus on Mexican migration to the U.S.

LLILAS Visiting Resource Professors

The LLILAS Visiting Resource Professors (VRP) program allows for scholars to come to UT for shorter periods. Visiting Resource Professors are invited by UT Latin Americanist faculty members to lecture for one to two weeks in either undergraduate or graduate classes. The VRP program addresses three academic goals: 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 the University of Texas; and to allow Latin American scholars access to UT library collections and archives. For the 2007–2008 academic year, LLILAS welcomed the following Visiting Resource Professors.

Fall 2007

Celina Manzoni
Dr. Manzoni is Professor at the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras of the Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina. She specializes in Latin American literature of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, with a focus on Caribbean literature.

Daniel Bonilla
Dr. Bonilla is Associate Professor at the Universidad de los Andes School of Law in Bogotá, Colombia. Dr. Bonilla is Director of the Public Interest Law Group of the Universidad de los Andes. As Director of G-DIP, Dr. Bonilla works with students to bring cases before the Constitutional Court relating to a broad range of issues including racism, discrimination, indigenous rights, and the environment.

Summer 2008

Rachel Meneguello
Dr. Meneguello is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. She specializes in Mexican politics, in particular the presidential and congressional elections in Mexico. She has co-authored a book with Kevin E. O’Rourke and Robert Alford titled The Mexico-U.S. Trade Relationship: Politics, Power, and Policy (2002), and she has contributed to a number of major works including Political Science Quarterly, Comparative Politics, and the Mexican Review.

Eduardo Ríos Neto
Dr. Ríos Neto is Professor of Demography at the Federal University of Minas Gerais. He has served as president of the Brazilian Population Studies Association and has collaborated on several joint projects with the UT Population Research Center. Professor Ríos Neto was the Edward Larocque Tinker Visiting Professor at UT during spring 2006.

Spring 2008

Claudia Agostoni
Dr. Agostoni is a researcher at the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico (UNAM), in Mexico City. Her research interests include the social and cultural history of medicine and public health during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Mexico and in Latin America more generally. In 2005, Dr Agostoni received the Mexican Academy of Science Annual Award for research in the humanities.

Patricia Ravelo Blancas
Patricia Ravelo Blancas is Professor at the Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social and at present a Visiting Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso. Her current research project is “Protestal social y acciones colectivas en torno de la violencia sexual y de género en Ciudad Juárez, Chih./ El Paso, TX.”

Martha de Uhlôa
Professor de Uhlôa, an ethnomusicologist affiliated with the Instituto Villa-Lobos at the Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, is a renowned scholar of Brazilian popular music. She has served on the editorial board of Popular Music, the field’s leading journal, and is currently a Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music.
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Fall 2007

Celina Manzoni
Dr. Manzoni is Professor at the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras of the Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina. She specializes in Latin American literature of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, with a focus on Caribbean literature.

Daniel Bonilla
Dr. Bonilla is Associate Professor at the Universidad de los Andes School of Law in Bogotá, Colombia. Dr. Bonilla is Director of the Public Interest Law Group of the Universidad de los Andes. As Director of G-DIP, Dr. Bonilla works with students to bring cases before the Constitutional Court relating to a broad range of issues including racism, discrimination, indigenous rights, and the environment.

Summer 2008

Rachel Meneguello
Dr. Meneguello is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. She specializes in Mexican politics, in particular the presidential and congressional elections in Mexico. She has co-authored a book with Kevin E. O’Rourke and Robert Alford titled The Mexico-U.S. Trade Relationship: Politics, Power, and Policy (2002), and she has contributed to a number of major works including Political Science Quarterly, Comparative Politics, and the Mexican Review.

Eduardo Ríos Neto
Dr. Ríos Neto is Professor of Demography at the Federal University of Minas Gerais. He has served as president of the Brazilian Population Studies Association and has collaborated on several joint projects with the UT Population Research Center. Professor Ríos Neto was the Edward Larocque Tinker Visiting Professor at UT during spring 2006.

Spring 2008

Claudia Agostoni
Dr. Agostoni is a researcher at the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico (UNAM), in Mexico City. Her research interests include the social and cultural history of medicine and public health during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Mexico and in Latin America more generally. In 2005, Dr Agostoni received the Mexican Academy of Science Annual Award for research in the humanities.

Patricia Ravelo Blancas
Patricia Ravelo Blancas is Professor at the Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social and at present a Visiting Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso. Her current research project is “Protestal social y acciones colectivas en torno de la violencia sexual y de género en Ciudad Juárez, Chih./ El Paso, TX.”

Martha de Uhlôa
Professor de Uhlôa, an ethnomusicologist affiliated with the Instituto Villa-Lobos at the Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, is a renowned scholar of Brazilian popular music. She has served on the editorial board of Popular Music, the field’s leading journal, and is currently a Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music.
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