



Conference on Latin American History

Spring 2021 Newsletter
Vol. 57 No. 1



IN THIS ISSUE:

I.	Message from CLAH President Ben Vinson, III	4-6
II.	Message from Co-Executive Directors Jurgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards	7-8
III.	Minutes of the 2020 General Committee Meeting	9-12
IV.	Officers and Committee Members Elected and Appointed	13
V.	CLAH Section Session Reports	14-31
VI.	CLAH 2020 Award and Prize Recipients	32-38
VII.	In Appreciation: CLAH Endowment and Fund Contributors	39
VIII.	List of Lifetime Members	40-41

2021 CLAH OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Executive Committee:

President: Ben Vinson III
Vice President: Celso Castilho
Past President: Bianca Premo
Executive Directors: Jürgen Buchenau & Erika Edwards

Elected Council Members:

Danielle Terrazas Williams
Tamara Walker
Maria Barreiros Almeida Reis

Ex-Officio Council Members:

HAHR Co-Editor: Zachary Morgan
The Americas Editor: John F. Schwaller
H-LatAm Editor: Marc Becker

Standing Committees:

Nominating Committee:

Jorell Melendez-Badillo
Ana Lucia Araujo
Jocelyn Olcott

Program Committee:

Thomas Rogers (2021)
Sharika Crawford (2022)
Jesse Zarley

Regional & Thematical Sections

Andean Studies:

Nicol Pacino, Chair
Sarah Hines, Secretary

Atlantic World Studies:

Norah Gharala, Chair
Juan José Ponce Vázquez, Secretary

Borderlands/Frontiers:

Natalie Mendoza, Chair
Jessica Ordaz, Secretary

Brazilian Studies:

Gillian McGillivray, Chair
Yuko Miki, Secretary

Caribbean Studies:

Kaysha Corinealdi, Chair
Reena Goldthree, Secretary

Central American Studies:

Jordana Dym, Chair
Laura Matthew, Secretary

Chile-Rio de la Plata Studies:

Maria de los Angeles Picone, Chair
Debbie Sharnak, Secretary

Colonial Studies:

Adriana Chira, Chair
Mariana Dantas, Secretary

Gran Colombia Studies:

Shawn van Ausdal, Chair
Ana Maria Otero, Secretary

Mexican Studies:

Gladys McCormick, Chair
Mónica Díaz, Secretary

Teaching and Teaching Materials

Casey Lurtz, Chair
Carlos Dimas, Secretary

I. MESSAGE FROM CLAH PRESIDENT BEN VINSON, III



Why Latin American History Now

Dear Colleagues:

One year ago our society and intellectual community were rapt in the throes of the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic. The ensuing year brought unprecedented dislocations, intersecting socio-political crises, and ruptures in our personal and professional lives. Today, by contrast, we have much to be hopeful for. We are gradually returning to a sense of normal. Much about our “new normal” will inevitably involve change, defined by what we’ve learned during these trying times about ourselves, our priorities, and our sense of purpose.

The pandemic is equally bringing about a vigorous sense of renewal and clarity for for the profession of Latin American History. Despite declines in humanities majors and efforts to bolster the field (<https://www.amacad.org/news/humanities-indicators-tracking-field>; *and to save the humanities*— <https://www.studythehumanities.org/>); despite both the public’s call for more preparation in STEM and open assaults on the humanities fields themselves, it seems to me there is an urgent need and place for Latin American History. Call me biased for holding this view, but I don’t think so.

For Latin Americanists who are working in the United States—as this nation looks to the road ahead, the circumstances confronting us now seemingly point to more permanence for our field. We face new geopolitical challenges, new social and racial alignments, new environmental pressures, and the need to act more cooperatively as a global community. At least from my point of view, Latin American historians have rich gifts to give our students and our publics on these matters. Here’s a loose sketch, admittedly incomplete, as to why.

Latin American Cosmopolitanism: Building Better Global Citizens

Looking at Latin American history is akin to both looking in mirrors and gazing out of windows. This is because we gain a sharp reflection of ourselves while also viewing the wider world in which we live—better enabling us to understand both. In Latin America and the Caribbean there are thirty-three living examples of statehood, combined with countless regional and sub-regional cultures. Studying their variegated history inevitably makes our minds (and those of our students) more cosmopolitan. We come to better appreciate the nuances and differences of human social experiences, thereby compelling us to be more acutely aware of belonging to a broader human community. And we are equipped with a vocabulary to do so. *Allyu, casta, macehual, mamehuco, ejido, bogotazo*...the terms are virtually endless. As our minds settle into this more cosmopolitan state, we become more reflective on the U.S. at the same time. Our nation’s catalogue of various activities in the region chart the course of our nationalism and its foreign impact. Through the lenses of security, trade, cultural power, sovereignty, politics and democracy, Latin America allows us to take stock of what our own republic has become, how we got here, and what hurdles remain as we journey towards a greater self-healing in our current troubled times. And when we take a second look to compare our journey to those of our Latin American neighbors, we can also learn immeasurably from their experiences in governance, protest, and revolution.

Environment

I won’t linger here, but I will say that our planet faces considerable challenges and Latin America is essential to addressing our common fate. We can learn much from how Latin America has addressed issues of the environment; how since pre-colonial times, it has thought about the relationship between man and nature, and how individual countries have responded to their unique developmental challenges by extracting and managing resources. Embedded in the history are perspectives on power and justice that may just well illuminate our path to a better future.

A Hemispheric Context for the Migration Conversation

As the demography of the U.S. continues to change, and as Latin America plays a larger role in our transformation, it becomes ever more necessary to know not just the stories and legacies of our Latinx population, but also more about their countries of origin. Not unlike other histories of global Diasporas, where carefully studying home countries, host countries, migration, transnational linkages, processes of assimilation, and cultural survivals constitute a methodology, the Latinx experience can be equally textured. In some ways, therefore, Latin American history is indirectly an oblique history of ourselves, as we are becoming ever more intertwined demographically through the flows of migration.

A Racial Window

I'll close with race. Looked at for so long as a beacon of race, Latin America is loaded with lessons, large and small, about race relations. Beginning with a richly varied history of slavery, remarkable expressions of freedom, dynamic interracial relations, and permeable class boundaries, the region comprises a veritable textbook, packed with case-studies, on how racial systems can mature. As the U.S. has flirted with being a "post-racial" society, and then slipped back into an era of deep racial reckoning, the experiences of Latin America can be illuminating. They've been there before. To what extent are moments of racial reconciliation both redemptive and enduring? What can a national salve look like? How does it reshape a racial and national order, and ultimately, how can progress be measured and by whom?

II. MESSAGE FROM CO-EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS JÜRGEN BUCHENAU AND ERIKA EDWARDS



Greetings from Charlotte, NC, where springtime has sprung, and we are all hoping for improvements on the public health front--not just here, where vaccines are now abundant, but also in Latin America and elsewhere in the Global South, where they are not. At a time of continued COVID infections, white nationalism, racially motivated violence, and mounting social inequality, our work as historians of Latin America and the Caribbean has never been more important.

Thank you to all of those who participated in our first virtual meeting in January. It was a tremendous success. There were a total of 41 panels, 11 of which were section meetings. We want to thank everyone for your flexibility and patience as I (Erika) rebuilt the program from an in-person to virtual format. We received great feedback and were happy to know so many international scholars benefited from the virtual format. We have been and will continue to incorporate virtual sessions in the future.

We want to thank our program committee consisting of Carmen Soliz (chair 2020), Tom Rogers (chair 2021), and Frances Ramos. We especially want to thank our four graduate students who hosted the Zoom sessions: Susanny Acosta, Paul Telljohann, Julia Poppell, and our CLAH graduate assistant, Rossmery Palacio Pérez. I (Jürgen) also appreciate the help of the MaestroMeetings staff, and particularly Mildred Cabrera, Milagros Pereyra, Lazaros Amanatidis, and especially John Meyers.

The turnout was excellent for our 41 sessions, especially for the three Friday events (two presidential panels and the prize/award ceremony). The first presidential panel, on anti-Blackness in Latin American history, had 70 people in the virtual audience and was one of the best-attended panels in recent CLAH history.

As every year, the conference also marked the occasion of transition of officers, and, in odd years, there is a new CLAH president. We congratulate our new president, Dr. Ben Vinson, III, on his new post and thank the outgoing president, Dr. Bianca Premo, for her excellent service to our organization. Bianca will remain on our Executive Committee for two more years. The CLAH membership also chose a new Vice President and President-Elect, Dr. Celso Castillo, as well as a full slate of Council members and Section secretaries. We appreciate the great interest in these elections, both in terms of the number of candidates and the turnout, and wish to recognize particularly María Barreiros Almeida Reis, the first graduate student on our Council, a position created in the recent reform of the Constitution. This year's election will add another non-tenure-track historian to the Council, bringing its total elected membership to six.

June 2022 will mark the end of the current CLAH office quinquennium, and as we do every five years, we invite submissions to host. The call for proposals is available on our website at <http://clah.h-net.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/CALL-FOR-PROPOSALS-TO-HOST-THE-CLAH-OFFICE.pdf>. Both of us, as well as Ben, will be very happy to answer questions about the process as well as about the benefits and responsibilities associated with hosting the CLAH office.

We are looking forward to planning the 2022 CLAH/AHA meeting in New Orleans. It appears at this time that the meeting will be face-to-face, and we look forward to seeing many of you in person once again. At the same time, we are looking forward to using the knowledge that we have gained during this pandemic about the benefits of the virtual environment. We are considering sponsoring online workshops, or *talleres*, throughout the year open to all CLAH members. These virtual events will allow us to reach many more Latin Americanists than before--especially those living in other countries or unable to attend our annual meeting for a variety of reasons, helping us build the CLAH into an even larger and more inclusive community. We look forward to working with all of you on this task.

Finally, we wish to appreciate our deep appreciation for your support of our organization over the past year. At a time when new academic jobs are few and far between and many of our communities and colleagues face numerous health and financial challenges, you continue to support the CLAH through your membership payments and donations. Throughout the pandemic, the CLAH has remained strong and financially sound, and we have you to thank for that!

III. APPROVED CLAH GENERAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES (2020)

January 3, 2020, Sheraton New York

Bianca Premo, President

Ben Vinson, Vice President and President-elect

Jurgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards, Co-Executive Secretaries

1. Call to order and roll call of voting members of the General Committee

Present: Bianca Premo (president), Ben Vinson (vice president and president-elect), Lara Putnam (past president), Jurgen Buchenau (co-Executive Secretary), Sarah Cline, Tatiana Seijas, Celso Castilho, Gabriela Ramos (elected members of the General Committee), Zach Morgan (*HAHR* representative), John F. Schwaller (*The Americas* representative).

Absent: Erika Edwards (co-Executive Secretary), Marc Becker (H-LATAM representative).

CLAH members present: Julia Sarreal, Rachel O'Toole, Carmen Soliz, Juan José Pérez Meléndez, Leah Walton, Julia Poppell, and Rossmery Palacio Pérez.

2. Approval of minutes of the 2019 meeting in Chicago, IL

Tatiana Seijas moved that the minutes be approved, and Sarah Cline seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Fall 2019 Election results and prize committee appointments

All of the Regional and Thematic Committees had slates of candidates (rather than a single candidate) for secretary for the first time ever, thanks to the efforts of co-Executive Secretary Erika Edwards to democratize the elections.

Ben Vinson moved that the results and appointments be ratified, and Zachary Morgan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Report of the Program Committee

Rachel O'Toole, Chair of the CLAH Program Committee, provided a brief report. She thanked fellow committee members Carmen Soliz and Louis Pérez for their service on this important committee. Rachel also informed the General Committee that the PC was able to accommodate all of the fifty-six proposed panels, plus two panels that it composed out of eight individual paper submissions. Of the fifty-six panels, the AHA Program Committee had already accepted twenty-four by the time the CLAH PC did its work. Trends in submissions included panels on anniversaries as well as multi-session panels; in some instances, the AHA PC accepted one but not all of the component panels. There was also a larger number of transnational and transregional panels. Bianca Premo thanked the Program Committee for its hard work.

5. Report on the Secretariat

Jurgen Buchenau gave a brief report on the secretariat. Things are running smoothly in Charlotte. Our former graduate assistant, Lucy Stroud, has graduated and has been replaced by new student Rossmery Palacio Pérez, who was present at the meeting. Jürgen also informed the General Committee of the recent birth of a child, Walker Beau Jackson, to our other co-Executive Secretary, Erika Edwards, who missed the CLAH meeting for that wonderful reason.

6. Review of Executive Secretary's 2019 Annual Report, discussion and vote on Proposed FY 2020 Budget (attachments 3a-c)

Jurgen Buchenau gave a presentation on the financial report and general budget. We have had a good year in terms of membership dues, as many members are signing up for the 2- and 3-year memberships. Our endowment also keeps growing. On the minus side, we did not have as many donations as in years past, and more importantly, the New York meeting is very expensive for the CLAH, weighing upon the FY 2020 budget. Although the Secretariat has held back funds in order to pay for the expensive luncheon and cocktail reception at the New York City CLAH and was able stay within budget, future meetings in New York will be even more expensive. Looking ahead, Seattle will be much less expensive for the organization but present a challenge of its own: fewer panels, as the Seattle AHA meetings are always small due to the cost of travel for most attendees. As a result, our membership numbers will likely be somewhat smaller as well in 2020. A brief discussion ensued about the advisability of informing the AHA leadership about the difficulties involved in organizing catered activities at the New York City meetings, especially as costs continue to increase faster than the CPI.

7. Old Business

a) Constitution/Bylaws Revisions (attachments 4 a-c)

The General Committee first discussed the draft of the revised Constitution moved by the ad-hoc Constitution Committee (Jurgen Buchenau, chair, Bianca Premo, Ben Vinson, and Jennifer Schaefer), beginning with a brief overview presented by Jurgen Buchenau. Sarah Cline inquired whether the CLAH would pay the travel of the non-tenured/graduate student member of the General Committee (in the future, the Council). She also presented two friendly amendments: a sentence to explain H-LATAM and to replace the word “must” with the word “shall” in Article VIII, Section 1. Zachary Morgan asked what would happen to the non-tenured/graduate student member if they attained a tenure-track faculty position; Jurgen Buchenau replied that the status of a committee member was based on their status at the beginning of the term, so that the individual would not need to give up their seat in that event.

Ben Vinson moved that the General Committee approve the Constitution to be sent to the entire membership for ratification, and Tatiana Seijas seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Tatiana Seijas requested that the changes in the new Constitution be clearly explained to the membership via a cover memo.

The General Committee then turned to the second document, the endowment and prize policy, which was explained briefly to the group. This document was crafted by the Policies and Procedures subcommittee of the Constitution Committee (Jurgen Buchenau, chair, Lara Putnam, and John F. Schwaller). With reference to the comingling of past prize funds in the general endowment, Sarah Cline asked that the solicitation for donations be transparent and expressed that she was uncomfortable with money going to general endowment. Lara Putnam and Bianca Premo replied that the new policy provides much-needed transparency with specific language. Jurgen Buchenau pointed out that the prize policy also contains a new feature, the sinking fund, which will allow CLAH members to make a contribution for a specific non-endowed purpose; Sarah Cline expressed her satisfaction with this new feature. Bianca Premo also explains that the combined funds help the financial viability of the CLAH.

Sarah Cline moved that the General Committee adopt the policy, and Zachary Morgan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

b) Centennial Committee CLAH survey report (attachment 5a-b)

Tatiana Seijas, the chair of the ad-hoc Centennial Committee in charge of visioning in advance of the 2026 centennial of the CLAH, presented the work on her committee, and particularly the report based on the survey of the membership. Other members of the committee included Sarah Cline, Celso Castilho, and Gabriela Ramos as General Committee representatives, as well as Raquel Otheguy, Julia Sarreal, Farren Yerro, James Woodard, and Juan José Pérez Meléndez. She expressed her pleasure of working with the committee and thanked James Woodard for putting the survey together, as well as the other committee members for their suggestions and line editing. The committee report in the attachment informs the General Committee of what the CLAH does well, and where improvements are needed. Tatiana asked whether perhaps junior members responded less than senior people [Executive Secretary's editorial comment: it is not possible to ascertain based on an anonymous survey]

A lively discussion ensued about the committee report. On this agenda item, the General Committee allowed the other CLAH members present to speak as well. Bianca Premo thanked the committee on behalf of the CLAH and expressed her delight at the fact that the Centennial and Constitution ad hoc committees arrived at similar recommendations regarding the structure of the General Committee and were able to collaborate in the final results. She inquired whether the Centennial Committee had concrete recommendations or a concise statement of where the organization stands right now.

Tatiana Seijas expressed her surprise at the fact that members were not interested in changing the governance of the organization, nor in the issue of childcare. Julia Sarreal commented that only 65% of CLAH members stated that they subscribe to H-LATAM. Sarah Cline reiterated the survey's finding that most members join as graduate students. Current graduate mentors should therefore tell their students that belonging to the CLAH is a professional expectation. Zachary Morgan inquired if lowering graduate student dues might increase participation, and John F. Schwaller agreed that the organization should not look toward graduate student dues as significant revenue. Rachel O'Toole stated the importance of identifying the mission of the CLAH; Leah

Walton suggested that the General Committee (in the future: Council) include students; and Julia Sarreal asked how the CLAH can attract more contingent faculty. The discussion then focused on the changing job market and its impact on the identities of students (Tatiana Seijas).

The following concrete ideas were proposed:

- Bianca Premo suggested a mission statement to recruit graduate students and young scholars
- Lara Putnam presented the idea of a letter to faculty that discusses ways of subsidizing students via departmental funds, for example via the option of sending a student with a faculty member (cost: \$15) or via the AHA travel fund (Leah Walton).
- The committee discussed a networking reception for graduate students. Sarah Cline pledged the amount of \$500 for a new sinking fund (as per the new prize and endowment policy) to fund such a reception in Seattle.
- An initiative to ensure that Regional and Thematic Committees reach out to their membership about annual sessions and seek their input
- An ad-hoc committee to look at existing RegComs and the possibility of creating new ones
- At the Seattle meeting and possibly beyond, presidential sessions about the future of the professions: teaching and scholarship of teaching; future of the profession, public history, publishing
- Sarah Cline suggested looking at Public History as a possible future CLAH focus
- Rachel O'Toole suggested asking the question: "what do I get from joining the CLAH?" She suggested more attention to nuts-and-bolts issues; jobs; visas and undocumented status, and post-docs.
- Tatiana Seijas proposed that the CLAH move beyond just research presentations toward testimonials of the work of the CLAH.
- José Juan Pérez Meléndez enjoined the CLAH to engage more with contemporary issues and taking stands on the manipulation of history. On that point, Rachel O'Toole suggested that the Regional and Thematic Committees can speak on issues.

8. New Business

Language for Susan Socolow-Lyman Johnson Prize (attachment 6)

The committee briefly discussed the guidelines for this new biennial prize for books on the history of the Chile-Río de la Plata region, which match those of the CLAH's other book prizes. Julia Sarreal inquired how the CLAH will make publishers aware of the new prize. It will be a good idea to alert publishers of all of our prizes including this new one.

Sarah Cline moved that the CLAH adopt the new prize guidelines, and Lara Putnam seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37pm.

IV. CLAH OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS ELECTED AND APPOINTED

On December 9, 2020, Co-Executive Director Jürgen Buchenau presented the results of balloting to President Bianca Premo and Vice President Ben Vinson for their verification as per the CLAH Constitution. The verified members-elect are:

Vice President and President Elect: Celso Castilho, Vanderbilt University

Council (two-year term):

Danielle Terrazas Williams

Tamara Walker

María Barreiros Almeida Reis (non-TT position)

Section Secretaries: (elected to two-year terms, first year as secretary, second as chair)

Andean Studies Committee: Sarah Hines, University of Oklahoma

Atlantic World Studies Committee: Juan José Ponce Vázquez, University of Alabama

Borderlands/Frontiers Committee: Jessica Ordaz, University of Colorado

Brazilian Studies Committee: Yuko Miki, Fordham University

Caribbean Studies Committee: Reena Goldthree, Princeton University

Central American Studies Committee: Laura Matthew, Marquette University

Colonial Studies Committee: Mariana Dantas, Ohio University

Chile/Río de la Plata Studies Committee: Debbie Sharnak, Rowan University

Gran Colombian Studies Committee: Ana María Otero, Universidad de los Andes

Mexican Studies Committee: Mónica Díaz, University of Kentucky

Teaching and Teaching Materials Committee: Carlos Dimas, UNLV

The Council also approved the President's and Vice President's nominations for the following committees:

2021 Standing Committees:

Nominating Committee: Jorell Meléndez-Badillo, Ana Lucia Araujo, Jocelyn Olcott

Program Committee: Thomas Rogers (2021 chair), Sharika Crawford (2022 chair), Jesse Zarley

2021 Prize Committees:

Distinguished Service Award: Reid Andrews (chair), Daryle Williams, Gabriela Ramos

Bolton-Johnson Memorial Prize: David Sartorius (chair), Angela Vergara, Sonya Lipsett-Rivera

Howard F. Cline Prize: Kevin Terraciano (chair), Barbara Sommer, Miguel León.

James R. Scobie Memorial Awards: Hal Langfur (chair), Fernanda Bretones, Sarah Foss

Paul Vanderwood Prize: Leslie Offutt (chair), Bill van Norman, Erin Stone

Antonine Tibesar Prize: James Krippner (chair), Tom Rogers, Karen Racine

James A. Robertson Memorial Prize: Ida Altman (chair), Seth Garfield, Edward Wright-Ríos

Lydia Cabrera Awards: Matt Childs (chair), Takkara Brunson, Aisha Finch

Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award: Sylvia Sellers García (chair), Heidi Scott, Javier Puente

Warren Dean Memorial Prize in Brazilian History: Gabriel Paquette (chair), Alexandre Fortes, Mary Hicks

María Elena Martínez Prize: Alexander Aviña (chair), Susana Sosenski, Diana Montañó

Elinor Melville Prize: Myrna Santiago (chair), Jaime Rodríguez, Oscar de la Torre.

V. CLAH SECTION SESSION REPORTS

ANDEAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Nicole Pacino

Secretary: Sarah Hines

Long Horizons of Revolution and Reaction in Bolivia

Nicole Pacino, of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, chaired the panel, which convened on the morning of Saturday, January 9, 2021. Organized as a roundtable, the panel brought together specialists in Bolivian history who evaluated the October 2019 election, the subsequent ouster of Evo Morales, and the events since that fateful moment. Each panelist spoke for about five minutes and then had the opportunity to respond to each other before opening the session up to audience questions and conversation.

Elizabeth Shesko, from Oakland University, discussed the historical role of the military in Bolivia, drawing particularly from her research on the early twentieth-century and the Chaco War. She noted that, while outsiders tend to consider military coups as reactionary, the Bolivian military has not always been a right-wing force. She explained that Morales was fairly pro-military and gave them a significant role in national politics, which helps contextualize their call for his resignation. She concluded that ultimately the military as an institution will defend itself above all else.

Ben Nobbs-Thiessen, from the University of Winnipeg, explained the importance of Santa Cruz in history and contemporary politics. The Comité pro-Santa Cruz played a significant role in 2019 and the rise of Añez to interim president, but as he explained, Morales had also made significant concessions to lowland power brokers. The main themes explored in his comments were the history of oil, food production, and autonomous sentiments in the region, helping to contextualize both the political and environmental events (the massive wildfires) of 2019 and 2020.

Carmen Soliz, from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, spoke about remembering Morales holistically, from his promises in 2006 to his downfall in 2019. She noted that, for Pink Tide leaders, Morales was remarkably good at keeping his leftist and anti-colonial credibility with the international community while internally engaging in compromises on his initial promises that resulted in consistent economic growth. She pointed out that this tendency was unique for Bolivia, and quite the opposite of a previous “leftist” government, the MNR. She concluded that Morales has a mixed legacy that can only be evaluated in the long perspective.

Elena McGrath, from Union College, honed in on the narrative of a “Lithium coup” that was popular outside Bolivia, but pointed out that it obscures how open the Morales government was to public-private partnerships with multinational corporations, and how resistance from mining strongholds, like Oruro and Potosí, grew in response. In fact, discontent grew between Morales and cooperative miners in the 2010s, and both the COB and FSTMB called for Morales’ resignation in 2019 in the name of national unity. This builds on a long tradition of the labor movement seeing its role in the nation as one of defending democracy rather than defending a particular party line.

Nicole Pacino then added that we have to think about the 2020 election in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. She explained that epidemics are moments of crisis as well as opportunity for governments because they can contribute to or undermine state legitimacy. Whereas the MNR gained a lot of legitimacy through its ability to manage outbreaks and extend health care to rural areas, the Añez government did not manage the Covid-19 situation effectively and thereby undermined her regime's already tenuous legitimacy. Protests against the regime's oppressive measures started to include critiques of mismanaging the pandemic. In short, Covid-19 probably helped Arce and MAS in the 2020 election.

ATLANTIC WORLD STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Erin Stone

Secretary: Norah Gharala

For the online meeting of the Conference on Latin American History and the American Historical Association in 2021, the Atlantic World Studies Committee met on January 7 as one of the first sessions on the CLAH program. Chair Erin Stone and Secretary Norah Gharala had invited scholars whose work bridged the Atlantic and Pacific histories of Spanish America. The uncertainties of COVID as well as family emergencies at the time of the conference changed the panel, which consisted of presentations by Diego Luis and Norah Gharala. Although the conveners regretted not being able to include all the original panelists, the discussion was rich and extensive. The panel ran from 11:00 am to 12:15 pm and was attended by 17 people.

Diego Javier Luis (Visiting Assistant Professor of Humanities at Davidson College) presented "The Pacific Meets the Atlantic: Blurred Boundaries and Oceanic Continuum." This paper argued that a global approach is key to understanding conflict and development in the Spanish Empire. In particular, Luis argues that the evolution of discourses of racial control and hierarchy can only be fully understood by examining relations across the empire, going beyond bounded systems or geographic boundaries. He explained that ideas of race and hierarchy spread from Spain (at a time when the monarchs were expelling Moriscos from Iberia) out into the world all the while influencing racialized rhetoric in places as disparate as the Philippines. For example, ideas of a segregated government spread from Spain across the empire creating one system, though with differences between colonies or regions, and one global structure. In Manila ideas/structures like "república de indios" ethnic division, the need to protect Indians, and the Inquisition were set up/attempted, but in large part failed not least of which because of influence from China and its competing cultures and structures (from religion to gender roles and sexuality). Nevertheless, all this proves one of Luis's larger points that race/racism developed in the Early Modern World of the 16th century Spanish Empire.

Norah Gharala (Assistant Professor of History at University of Houston) presented "Connecting the Lives of East Africans in Iberian Worlds." This paper focused on the forced migrations of people from East Africa and the Indian Ocean world to central New Spain. Gharala highlighted the connections people formed in South and Southeast Asia and how these relationships and identities bolstered petitions to achieve goals like marriage or freedom. Other Mozambique's in Mexico maintained strong ties to Lisbon and Seville. These varied forced journeys meant that

people trafficked out of Mozambique Island could have arrived in Mexico via an Atlantic or an Indo-Pacific route. People labeled “Mozambique” or “cafre” in the New World experienced processes of creolization that were informed by time spent in South Asia, the Pacific, and Europe. East Africans strategically included elements of their global journeys across their documentary footprint. Though fleeting and fragmented, these references would have distinguished these individuals and provided them with a distinctive set of legal arguments and networks in the Spanish Americas.

The question-and-answer session benefited from the expertise of a variety of scholars, and specialists in early modern Peru and the South Pacific made extensive contributions to the panel. General questions addressed the development of colonial categories in relation to one another; the racialization of populations in Mexico and the Philippines; and the continued relevance of Atlantic, Pacific, or global frameworks. Audience members posed questions for Diego Luis with regard to taxation and tribute from *chinos* in the Philippines and seventeenth-century projects to deport free Black people from Manila. Audience questions and comments for Norah Gharala included specific questions about one of the lives discussed in the paper and a helpful suggestion to emphasize the port city as a uniting theme for structuring the larger project. Overall, the questions offered insightful takes on the papers and reinforced the connections between Pacific and Atlantic frameworks.

BORDERLANDS AND FRONTIER STUDIES SECTION

Chair: Raúl A. Ramos, University of Houston

Secretary: Natalie Mendoza, University of Colorado Boulder

The Borderlands and Frontiers Section met virtually at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association on January 7, 2021, hosting a session titled, “Constructing the Story of the Present: An Assignment for Teaching Immigration at the US-Mexico Border.” Natalie Mendoza (CU-Boulder) chaired the session, which included three panelists: Adam Goodman from University of Illinois at Chicago, S. Deborah Kang from University of Texas at Dallas, and Maddalena Marinari from Gustavus Adolphus College.

“Constructing the Story of the Present” used the #ImmigrationSyllabus to consider pedagogical questions for teaching the history of immigration on the US-Mexico border. Historians created the #ImmigrationSyllabus following the 2016 US presidential election year in an effort to provide what they viewed to be an essential historical context for understanding and engaging current debates about “immigration reform, integration, and citizenship” in the United States. The syllabus includes 15 weeks’ worth of reading material (of both primary and secondary sources) organized by thematic questions aimed at deepening the American public’s knowledge of immigration in the past and present. Two of the panelists—Goodman and Marinari—had directly contributed to the creation of the syllabus.

The session built upon the #ImmigrationSyllabus in two pedagogical ways. The first way was to think about how to update the #ImmigrationSyllabus to reflect immigration issues these last four years: If we added a sixteenth week to the #ImmigrationSyllabus focused on the Trump presidency (2017-2020) and how it has affected immigration on the US-Mexico border, what themes and

questions would emerge? Ahead of the session the panelists—Goodman, Kang, and Marinari—had selected contemporary sources (primary sources of the present) they would add to the sixteenth week in response to this question. The second way was to think about teaching practices; specifically, how to get students to think about the present in a historical way. The panelists each shared their reasons for selecting their sources, modeling for the audience what it means to think about the present as a historical moment. The panelists had used an assignment that Mendoza and Marinari created for teaching students how to identify primary (contemporary) sources on an important topic or event in their lifetime. Both the panelists' chosen sources and the assignment instruction sheet were shared with the audience in a Google Folder.

The panelists had selected sources for week 16 that touched upon several themes and questions that reflected both a continuity and departure from the previous weeks in the #ImmigrationSyllabus. These included: the impact of the pandemic on migration, asylum, public health, and activism; scapegoating as a means for deflecting attention from other pressing issues; how and where federal immigration policy is created and implemented; and migration in a global perspective. In terms of the history-specific habits of mind students could learn and practice with this topic and assignment, the panelists all identified common skills and concepts, such as change over time and developing context. Most importantly, the panelists emphasized building student skill in critiquing and questioning sources—understanding who creates them, for what purpose/audience, and whose voice is or is not present—to help students become better users of the information they receive in both the past and present. The Q&A discussion with the audience was especially robust, significantly enhancing the panelists' remarks in the first portion of the session. Topics ranged from how to humanize migrants in our teaching to the role of race in understanding immigration and citizenship to interrogating the sources we use to study immigration history.

BRAZILIAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

NB The Brazilian Studies Section opted not to gather at our virtual meeting

CARIBBEAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Devyn Benson

Secretary: Kaysha Corinealdi

Topic: New Directions in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies in Caribbean History

For this meeting, Sandy Plácido (Queens College, CUNY) and Devyn Benson (Davidson College) served as panelist. Kaysha Corinealdi (Emerson College) served as commentator and moderator. We had an audience of 20-25 people.

For her presentation, Plácido focused on teaching a Caribbean Women's History course for the first time in Spring of 2020 and reflected on her decisions regarding which sources to assign, what regions to cover, and what the course made her recognize regarding new approaches in the field. The course spanned the colonial period to the present and included the Spanish, French, English,

Dutch, Danish and circum-Caribbean. Two books that proved extremely useful as course readings were edited collections from the 1990s, *Women in Caribbean History*, edited by Verene Sheperd and *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective*, edited by Verene Shepherd, Bridget Brereton, and Barbara Bailey. This first edition was a result of secondary school teachers engaging women and gender studies scholars regarding creating accessible scholarship on the topic. Plácido found that her students, especially Master of Library Sciences Studies, appreciated the structure of this edition. Another edited collection that formed part of the course was *100 Years of Dominican Feminism*, a collaboration between Dominican Studies scholars in the Dominican Republic and the United States (including scholars like April Mayes) which provided a bilingual edition of primary sources covering the colonial to modern eras in the Dominican Republic. In terms of the book that most of her students loved, it was Maria Fuentes' *Dispossessed Lives*. Fuentes' focus on spatial analysis and close readings inspired a number of research papers for the class. One key reflection from teaching the course included the need for further collaborations. Attention must be given to not only training and pedagogy but also to archive production. Plácido's own work on creating an archive for the work of Ana Lidia Cordero, in collaboration with Cordero's family, was a reminder of the heavy lifting needed in expanding archival sources. Plácido also pointed for the need to expand where we find archival collections. So many people throughout the Caribbean, she noted, have amazing home libraries, and digitizing these libraries would prove invaluable for future generations. She proposed institutions across the region and in the United States, helping to facilitate this digitization project. She called for a Pan-Caribbean approach to navigating these questions of archives and access.

For her presentation Devyn Benson discussed the collaborative work that went into the recent translation of *Afrocubanas: historia, pensamiento y prácticas culturales* (2001)/*Afrocubanas: History, Thought, and Cultural Practices* (2020). Benson provided a history of the AfroCubanas group as well as the friendship and intellectual exchange that formed part of her relationship with members of the group, and the eventual editors of the collection, Daisy Rubiera Castillo and Inés María Martiatu Terry. Benson also discussed three ways in which the edited volume undertakes a black radical feminist approach - by recovering history as politics and centering black women in this history, by introducing new gendered and racialized language into Cuba, and by centering lived experience and culture in historiographic work. For both Rubiera and Martiatu, the idea of black women being seen and recognized for their work and ideas throughout time was vitally important. As noted by Benson, most discussions of black women in Cuba have centered around the tropes of the jinetera (sex worker) or the tragic mulata. Moreover, in thinking about Cuban history, the focus still remains on white male figures: Fidel Castro, Martí, etc. For the editors of *Afrocubanas*, challenging this dominant narrative was imperative. Using the term AfroCubanas, also challenged historical and national narratives focused on a raceless Cuba. Rubiera and Martiatu felt that this term best encapsulated the life experiences of the women in their group, as well as the history and politics at the center of the edited collection. AfroCubanas made history by being the first book published in Cuba to use this term, in this way challenging previous understandings of race and gender on the island. The book, by bringing together the work of scholars, activists, artists, and a wide range of other Afro-Cuban identifying women, also highlighted the importance of understanding history making in an interdisciplinary way. The group AfroCubanas, Benson noted, disbanded in 2019 largely due to the leadership aging out. When Benson asked Martiatu and Ribiera about this, they both responded that the work of the organization would continue, because no true feminist work could be undertaken that did not center AfroCubanas and that being

Afrocubanas was not just the name of an organization, but “an attitude towards life.” The name and work of Afrocubanas nonetheless lives on. A second edition of the book was published in Cuba in 2016 and there is presently a digital Afrucubanas magazine.

Corinealdi commented on how both panelists emphasized the importance of collaboration both in the classroom and in research as it pertains to navigating new lines of inquiry on the topic of women, gender, and sexuality in the Caribbean. Her questions for Plácido included: (1) What does engaging in a Pan-Caribbean framework for women, gender, and sexuality studies look like within the classroom? How do we with equity engage the full reach of a Caribbean Studies approach that includes the Spanish, French, Dutch, Danish and circum Caribbean? To what degree does the preponderance of available research or archives in particular areas, or the availability or lack of translations, dominate what we can assign our students? (2) Did some of the discussions or sources that you assign as part of this course directly shape your own thinking as it pertains to her research on women in the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico? (3) Based on the sources assigned in the course, in what ways do you see an interdisciplinary perspective, one that combines archeology, literature, theory, etc., as being crucial to the work of women, gender and sexuality studies in the Caribbean? (4) How is a transnational black feminist framework informing you scholarly, pedagogical and collaborative approaches? How do you grapple with both the specific and the points of connection across space and time?

In responding to these questions, Plácido made note of how her own scholarly trajectory had allowed her to consider a Pan-Caribbean connection through the fields of the history of medicine, political economy, anti-imperialism, and transnational studies. Slavery, she noted, has been one way in which talking about multiple regions has been undertaken in the past, but she is especially interested in how returning to some of the social history and political economy work undertaken by scholars in the Caribbean in the 1990s, could help re-chart twenty-first century conversations. Regarding the availability of sources and issues of access and translation, she noted the work of the CUNY Dominican Studies Institute, in making available primary sources. This kind of availability is crucial, particular in our current pandemic-related online system of instruction and collaboration. She likewise noted a recent English-language translation of the one of Juan Bosch’s works as an example of ongoing inroads in the realm of translations. As for the sources and/or discussions that especially shaped her research interests, she pointed to the work of Kathleen Deagan. Deagan combines archeology and gender studies to paint a picture of Taino social dynamics in the Haitian side of Hispaniola during the 1500s-1600s. This Plácido noted, was one of the most exciting reads for her from the course. Regarding an interdisciplinary framework, Plácido pointed to the degree to which almost all of the texts she assigned pursued such an approach. She also made a point to assign a young adult novel by Edwidge Danticat as a way to tap into the imaginative/speculative dimensions of historical writing. On the topic of transnational black feminism, she pointed to how such an approach further highlights the failure of the state. In the case of the Dominican Republic, the state has failed poor black women during this pandemic. The state also continues to decimate these communities through mining ventures. A black transnational feminist approach involves calling out this inequity and point out what is both specific but also transnational about these examples of state failure.

Corinealdi’s questions for Benson included: (1) Following up on the question of the importance of translating the work of black women, is it also important who is doing the translating? I’m

thinking here of the recent translations of the work of Lélia Gonzalez in Brazil and the work of black feminist scholars who have been crucial to this process. I am also thinking of the work of people like Melva Lowe de Goodin in Panama who have made a point to translate their works themselves. (2) I would love to hear more about generational agendas, attention, and participation. Did the women who form part of *Afrocubanas* see themselves as sharing part of a longer genealogy that included women from the independence period to their moment? Are there particular calls for action or markers that have remained through this time? I am thinking of the work of Takkara Brunson, for example and some of the agendas during the early independence period. (3) How is a transnational black feminist framework informing your scholarly, pedagogical and collaborative approaches? How do you grapple with both the specific and the points of connection across space and time?

In answering these questions Benson clarified that she herself did not do the translation and that in fact a Chicana scholar was contracted for this work. She nevertheless noted the importance of context for translations. She, for example, offered guidance on particular Cuba-specific terms within the text and also made a point to reach out to scholars of colonial Cuban history for terms that she did not understand. Connected to the point of who does the translations is also recognizing the challenges of pursuing translation work. It took many years to secure a publisher for the English language version, and once the book became available, the price (over \$100), made it inaccessible to most. Who does the work of translation and who pays for it, are important questions. Benson also welcomed the idea of assigning more texts about black women translated by black women. Regarding the genealogies present within *Afrocubanas*, Benson noted the emphasis of the editors regarding the need to talk about black women as actors and intellectuals. They were there from the independence struggles to the present moment and their collection ensures that people don't forget this. As for transnational black feminist frameworks, and balancing specificity and connections, Benson used as an example black hair politics across the Americas. What is available in a given space, shapes what black hair can look like. Yet, there is a hemispheric discussion of black hair possibilities.

Questions posed by the general audience included those asking for a discussion of rural and urban divides and the experiences of women, the possibilities of videoconferencing in connecting spaces that have otherwise been divided (e.g. U.S. and Cuba), the kinds of initiatives needed to generate Pan-Caribbean collaboration, engaging with questions of political economy in ways that do not further denigrate or exploit black women, and looking at the political economies practiced by black women. Plácido pointed to the work of people like Jorge Ulloa who in the context of Dominican history has highlighted the importance of connecting oral histories with archive building, especially in regions of the country that receive less scholarly focus. Benson reflected on the fact that she has never had an opportunity to present with Rubiera because Rubiera does not have access to a reliable internet connection. Plácido reiterated her focus on greater institutional collaborations, with scholars looking beyond big capitals and paying attention to rural areas. On the topic of political economy, the work of Mamyrah Douge-Prosper and Helen Safa were presented as two great examples of historicizing black women's political economies. Attention was also given to engaging with micro economies and micro histories. For example, the work of washerwomen, seamstresses, and servants proved crucial to building communal economies. Similarly, *cofradías* and *sou-sou* systems highlight how women have created their own economic security amidst nation-states that either denigrate or ignore their existence.

CHILE-RIO DE LA PLATA STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Marian Schlotterbeck

Secretary: María de los Ángeles Picone

The Chile-Río de la Plata Committee convened online on Saturday, January 9, 2021, at 4:30 pm EST. This year's discussion focused on writing, thinking, and teaching the Southern Cone. The panel's original iteration asked discussants to share how social, economic, and political events in the Southern Cone inform our research and shape our teaching. As the pandemic took over our lives, we also invited panelists to share teaching strategies on remote learning. The panelists represented a diverse group of scholars in different stages of their careers: Lily Pearl Balloffet, Alyssa Bowen, Carlos S. Dimas, Brenda Elsey, Romina Green-Rioja, Hannah Greenwald, Michael Huner, Craig Johnson (who could not join us), and Jennifer Schaefer.

Brenda Elsey reminded us that the pandemic forced changes on three fundamental aspects of our teaching: goals, content, and form of feedback. Everyone with their cameras on nodded at this point. We all recognized 'sacrificing' an aspect of our courses for the sake of navigating the pandemic. For example, we might not be teaching much writing this semester. Teaching, commented Jennifer Schaefer, involves a lot of "poner el cuerpo." How would that look like in an online setting? With two examples, she boiled down how she transitioned online. First, Schaefer transferred the embodying technique of students moving around the classroom talking to each other to Google Docs. While the benefits of moving disappeared, conversations still occurred. Second, she used the annotation featured on Zoom for interactive learning. Students used this tool to answer simple questions that would prompt discussion. Hannah Greenwald underscored the importance of seeking intentional collaborations with our peers in Latin America and designing syllabi highlighting the agency of indigenous people and people of African descent, especially in the Southern Cone. Carlos Dimas shared his experience in breaking the classroom barriers to facilitate learning. While we might have heard of learning outside the classroom experiences, Dimas stressed the relevance of open-ended assignments, such as journaling. Creativity and transparency sit at the center of course design.

Lily Pearl Balloffet shared the experience of teaching California, where wildfires and strikes were already pushing learning to online environments. However, at its core, transitioning online challenged how we could re-design in-classroom activities to have the same impact in digital learning spaces. Balloffet provided the example of Marian Schlotterbeck visiting her course to talk about the estallido in Chile in 2019 and the artistic archive generated from it. Utilizing digital repositories, transitioning online meant students could examine them at their own pace. Hence, Balloffet shared a new course she is designing for Summer 2021 with a thematic focus on Latin America through the lens of hip hop to study anti-imperialism and social resistance. Balloffet reminded us of a critical question at the center of these designs: What do we want students to experience in this course?

Michael Huner shared an insightful answer to this question. On the first day, he "shocks" students with present-day events, such as the 2019 coup in Bolivia or the Itaipu Dam's impact on Paraguay and Brazil. While the class then follows a more traditional chronology, students are aware of the events at the end. Discussions, in this case focusing on sovereignty and violence, come full circle

when half the class reads *The government of Beans* (2020) and the other half reads *The Anti-Black City* (2018).

Additionally, the discussants shared assignments that others might find adaptable. Romina Green-Rioja shared a project on gender law. Students examine laws in different countries, such as Cuba Family Law, Jamaica Equal Pay Law, the 1993 Zapatista Women’s Revolutionary Law, the Argentine 1991 Gender Quota Law, and the 2012 Gender Identity Law from Argentina. As they researched these regulations and put them in a historical context, students then create their gender code. Alyssa Bowen shared a lesson plan for 1968, where groups of students focused on one country (Mexico, Chile, or Brazil). Using non-traditional primary sources, they examined the year 1968 in each country. To conclude the unit, students created their own art reflecting the aspirations of the 1968 movements. Brenda Elsey worked on a Wikipedia Project, where students completed Wikipedia entries. While the project focused on understanding civil and political rights, the distance from US politics helped tackle questions on gender, race, and violence.

The audience engaged with questions about specific assignments for the discussants. Also, three main themes underpinned the conversation. Jesse Zarley shared the Puerto Rico Syllabus, an example of collaborative design to understand present-day issues from a historical perspective. The audience also commented on their anti-exam design experiences, where courses gravitated towards more meaningful projects. Assessments are learning opportunities. Finally, Raymond Craib picked up the question of transparent teaching and asked to continue this conversation beyond the meeting.

COLONIAL STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Alcira Dueñas

Secretary: Adriana Chira

The Colonial Studies Committee convened virtually on January 10 to reflect on notions of freedom before the Age of Emancipation.

The chair opened the discussion by reflecting broadly on the theme, especially in light of recent protests for racial justice and of the CLAH presidential panel, “Conversations on Anti-Blackness and History.” The theme for the roundtable was proposed before the summer of 2020. However, the protests for racial justice that occurred during that summer gave this roundtable a novel impetus. Prison abolition and police reform were two issues at the heart of the protests, placing into spotlight freedom as a liberal concept and the messy realities associated with it. Activists, intellectuals, academics questioned the limits of this liberal model, one that still assumes individual and collective progress as a fundamental aspect of freedom-making. In its variegated forms, liberalism tends to approach freedom as a state of becoming, thereby excluding those deemed unready. But if we distance ourselves from the liberal notion of freedom, what are we left with? Recuperating ideologies and practices of emancipation that predated the nineteenth century could help us rethink liberalism’s seeming inevitability and primordial emancipatory power. A second rationale for the roundtable has been freedom-making as an entry point into the meaning of Blackness in Latin America, one that is not fully subsumable to violence, dispossession, marginalization, and enslavement. The archives of Black freedom-making are especially rich within Latin America—there are rich paper trails associated with manumission’s legalities, with maroon communities that had proximity to state, with the Catholic Church. Do these enable us to

tell a distinctive story about Black freedom and through it about Blackness? This is not a new question, but we thought it might be worth considering it anew in light of the recent archival turn in studies of slavery especially in the British Caribbean.

Fernanda Bretones Lane opened the roundtable with a question: what happens when we de-center the Age of Revolutions as a watershed for thinking about freedom? She pointed out that it is common to refer to the nineteenth century—the century birthed by the Age of Revolutions and its central tenets (the individual enlightened by reason and motivated by liberty, progress, toleration, etc)—as the “century of freedom,” when slavery was finally abolished in the “West.” Except, the Age of Revolutions also created the conditions for the expansion of slavery on unprecedented levels in Brazil, Cuba, and the United States (something the historiography on second slavery shows). So, while it is true that, by the end of the nineteenth century, the institution of slavery would disappear from the Americas, the timing in which that happened matters, and in Brazil, Cuba, and the US South, that did not correspond to the traditional periodization of the Age of Revolutions. Therefore, to speak of “Freedom before the Age of Revolutions” is to remind ourselves that there existed freedom before this moment, even in the colonial slave societies of Latin America and the broader Atlantic world. Bretones offered insights from her own research, in particular the ways in which thinking about freedom before the Age of Revolutions allows us to expand the very concept of freedom to include, among other things, serving new “masters” under different imperial regimes. This is an exercise that requires engagement with a multitude of historical realities and cultural and social understandings of what freedom might have signified to different groups of Black people in the Americas.

Mariana Dantas connected our conversation to points raised during the Presidential Panel discussion on Anti-Blackness and History. In particular, she reiterated the point Herman Bennett made about the burden that is put on historians of the Black experience in Latin America to justify and repeatedly explain the relevance of their topic of research and representativeness of their findings and case studies. This burden keeps us stuck in a cycle of producing more examples, generating more evidence for our claims, and it prevents us from theorizing the past in ways that change and redirect dominant historical narratives. The issue of freedom is a case in point. Referencing the recently published volume *As If She Were Free*, edited by Erica Ball, Tatiana Seijas, and Terri Snyder, Dantas noted the book’s focus on Black women’s experiences in the Americas, from the colonial period to the twentieth century, and the ways these women articulated what freedom could and should mean. Their understandings, practices, and pursuits of economic autonomy, social respectability, motherhood, property holding, and a dignified death, this work shows, place Black women at the center of a hemispheric process of freedom-making. Their experiences, anxieties, and expectations resonate with modern-day audiences (as Dantas was able to witness when using the book in an undergraduate seminar), reminding us that our prevailing understandings, practices, and pursuits of freedom were informed and indeed crafted by these women and their lived experiences. As historians of the Black experience, we need to present these stories not as alternative or marginal examples to dominant processes, nor as the other half of a dialectic process that reframed relationships of power in Latin America. We need to present them as THE plural and diverse process that produced freedom as a concept in the early modern world. We can, moreover, reinforce that argument with a discussion of what became dominant notions of freedom of access to socio-economic spaces, of enjoyment of everyday practices, and of

understandings of the possible in the societies we are studying. Finally, it might be worth noting that these notions were often more widespread and relevant to everyday life than ideas about political freedom white male revolutionaries were concocting at the time.

Mary Hicks opened her remarks with a provocative question: Why has freedom ascended as THE paradigmatic analytical category to study Afro-Diasporic populations in the last 60 years? If, “freedom” is indeed one of the “North Atlantic fictions” as Michel-Rolph Trouillot has suggested, what use does it have for analyzing the history of enslaved and formerly enslaved people in the early modern South Atlantic- particularly colonial Brazil, the area that Hicks studies? Is the quest for a meta-narrative of the acquisition of ever greater freedom simply another example of what Trouillot claims is the “the projection of the North Atlantic as the sole legitimate site for the universal, the default category, the unmarked, so to speak, of all human possibilities”? Viewed critically this way, does the idea of “freedom” limit scholars just as much as it enables us to understand the experiences and consciousness of our historical actors? As part of the reorienting of our historical imaginations, should we jettison the term all together, or replace it with other terms? What could the alternatives be? Hicks suggested two alternatives: security, simultaneously in a bodily, social and spiritual register, and wholeness of self-hood—premised on the recreation or restoration of social and kinship ties. Enslaved mariners in the turbulent and dynamic world of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century South Atlantic, the subjects of Hicks’ book, emerged from a context in which they had been violently enslaved, dislocated from their communities (mostly in West Africa) and forcibly migrated to Brazil. They eventually became, in the maritime milieus of the south Atlantic, worldly, cosmopolitan, multilingual and at times multi-religious subjects. The flood of enslaved mariners seeking manumission via the free soil *Alvará* of September 19th, 1761 (a measure which liberated any enslaved person who stepped foot on Portuguese soil) sparked a crisis in maritime slavery before it was amended in 1776. Mariners drew on socio-religious networks of Black catholic brothers to achieve their objective, indicating the communal aspects of their pursuits, and the ephemeral forms of transatlantic Black solidarity and monetary aid that existed in the pre-revolutionary Atlantic. Despite their strategic emphasis on individual, as opposed to categorical, forms of liberation, they did frequently employ definitions of “liberdade”—liberty, the term they preferred—which were more expansive than what colonial officials intended. Liberty then, in the epoch of free soil petitions, was enabled by and further facilitated forms of Black sociality.

Alexandre Pelegrino’s presentation explored the interconnected histories of Indigenous and African slavery. He opened his remarks with a question: what were the impacts of Indigenous enslavement and their struggle for freedom in slave systems writ-large? Pelegrino used manumission letters and notarial records as analytical tools to understand the transformations of slavery in one region, Maranhão. Between the 1740s and 1770s, Maranhão, a peripheral area in Northern Brazil, transitioned from a frontier economy based on the exploitation of indigenous slaves to a plantation economy exporting cotton and rice cultivated by African slaves. In this period, the Portuguese crown abolished the enslavement of indigenous people (1755) and created a trading company to transport African slaves. Manumission letters from the 1740s to the 1780s not only reveal the demographic profile of manumitted slaves but they also show us how notarial practices reinforced slavery. Following manumission letters before and after the 1755 law, we can see the emergence of a sentence that stressed the legitimate origin of settlers’ slaves, “a legitimate descendant of a black slave” (*legítimo descendente de preta*). Notaries purposely included the

sentence within the notarial formula to legitimize slavery. In a moment of structural economic changes and when several litigants were seeking freedom by asserting their indigeneity in local courts, Pelegrino showed that notarial practice entrenched the racial lines of slavery by associating the juridical condition of slaves with blackness and hindering future legal actions of subjugated people.

The audience was very engaged. The dialogue that followed the presentations was intense and generative. We look forward to a reprise in New Orleans.

GRAN COLOMBIA STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Stefan Pohl-Valero, Universidad del Rosario

Secretary: Shawn Van Ausdal, Universidad de los Andes

“Historical Trajectories of Capitalism and Development in the Gran Colombia – Local and Global Perspectives”

Participants:

Constanza Castro-Benavides, Universidad de los Andes

Margarita Fajardo, Sarah Lawrence College

Aaron Kappeler, University of Edinburgh

Ricardo López-Pedrerros, Western Washington University

Ana María Otero-Cleves, Universidad de los Andes.

Stefan Pohl-Valero, Universidad del Rosario

Moderator:

Shawn Van Ausdal, Universidad de los Andes

The Gran Colombia Studies Section met on Saturday, January 9, 2021, in the annual meeting of the Conference on Latin American History in association with the American Historical Association. Originally scheduled to meet in Seattle, the conference was held virtually due to the pandemic. The historian of science, Stefan Pohl-Valero, chaired the Gran Colombia Studies Section for 2020. He invited a group of scholars, whose exciting work examines varied aspects related to the history of capitalist development in Gran Colombia (Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador), to present some of their findings and participate in a roundtable discussion. The aim of the session was to share thoughts about how to rethink narratives of capitalism and development in northern South America.

Constanza Castro initiated the panel by outlining her work on popular citizenship and the consolidation of private property rights in Bogotá during the mid-nineteenth century. The privatization of Church lands and city commons represented one of the final blows to the *ancien régime* and situated Latin America at the heart of the liberal revolutions that were transforming the

Atlantic world. While often conceptualized as a predominantly rural affair, which helped to jumpstart the export economy, Castro pointed out that the privatization process also deeply affected urban Latin America. In the case of Bogotá, for instance, much of the population lived or earned their livelihoods on communal or corporate lands. Rather than just buffeted by the winds of change, popular groups actively participated in this process. Employing the language of rights to protect or obtain access to land, the urban poor helped define the pace of privatization, shape urban property markets, and reformulate notions of democracy, equality, and citizenship. In other words, to better understand the transition to capitalism at the local level, Castro emphasized the importance of paying attention to the agency and politics of subaltern groups.

Ana María Otero next described her project on popular consumption and citizenship in Colombia during the second half of the nineteenth century. She began by stressing how popular groups, such as peasants, artisans, and small property owners, were the largest consumers of imported goods in Colombia. What's more, this market was not just an afterthought for English and American manufacturers; they took the time to redesign their products and packaging according to consumer taste as far down as the regional level. Rather than marginal or passive, popular consumers thus played an active role in the global circulation of merchandise and the "domestication" of foreign goods. Otero also discussed how popular participation in the marketplace as consumers, in contrast to the traditional emphasis on producers, contributed to notions of citizenship. Elites encouraged popular consumption – along with education, hygiene, and racial mixing – both as a means of material improvement and as a visible sign of social progress. Such views, and the relationships forged in stores and local markets, nourished notions of community, rights, and the place of popular groups within the nation.

Aaron Kappeler, an anthropologist who has studied contemporary agrarian struggles in Venezuela, discussed his effort to rethink the genealogies of Latin American liberalism. By tracing agrarian reform efforts back to the mid-nineteenth century, Kappeler emphasized how dependency theory should be placed within the *longue durée* of local perspectives on political economy. Rather than see Venezuelan leaders blindly adopt Ricardian ideas of comparative advantage and free trade, he stressed the importance of "selective adaptation" to concrete problems. Pursing a Foucauldian approach to the genealogy of liberalism, he suggested, can illuminate how twentieth-century dependency theory and visions of sovereignty and biopolitics have roots in the principle of "reason of state" in nineteenth century "arts of government."

Margarita Fajardo also discussed dependency theory, which is central to her forthcoming book, *The World That Latin America Created*. Her story of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America clearly shows the emergence of influential and countervailing theories of capitalist development from the periphery. She also emphasized how the rise of dependency theory was more complex and riven with internal tensions than often realized. And while the *cepalinos*,

as these economists and policy makers were known, criticized the structure of the global economic system, they also demanded more, not less, trade and aid.

Ricardo López then discussed his effort to rethink the historical formation of the Colombian middle class. While he analyzes this class as a social category, a political project, a subjectivity, and a material reality in his book, *Makers of Democracy*, in this session López emphasized the way paying attention to the rise of the middle class can help us rethink broad questions of domination. Rather than consider the middle class to be marginal to the development of capitalism, or see them as a vanguard of democracy, he suggested that they are a productive window onto questions of exploitation and inequality. In the case of Colombia, the middle classes played a key role by helping to legitimate the social order. López also suggested that the category of elites, which are often taken for granted, should also be reexamined.

Finally, Stefan Pohl contributed to the discussion with insights from his project on the assemblage of food and nutrition-related governmentality in Colombia during the first half of the twentieth century. Pohl's work starts out by following the arrival of agricultural experts from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1948, a time a growing unrest following the assassination of the populist political leader, Jorge Eliécer Gaitán. Building on their experience in Mexico, these experts helped to pave the way for the development of the so-called Green Revolution. Yet Pohl suggested that narratives which privilege the agency of actors from the U.S. overlook the critical role played by local institutions and experts. By combining the historiographies of economic and agricultural development with those of health, and science and technology studies – in particular by following how foodstuffs and the bodies that produced and consumed them became objects of knowledge and intervention – he seeks to unravel the complex entanglements of science, politics, and economic development.

Following the initial presentations, the participants elaborated on their case studies and some of their findings in a roundtable discussion. Subsequently there ensued a spirited discussion about the relationship between their new perspectives, which emphasize the politics of capitalist development at different scales, and an older tradition that tended to focus on economic questions at the national level. Some of the key suggestions raised by the discussion include the following. First, it is important to decenter traditional narratives of capitalist development. Rather than emphasize the outward diffusion of a new model of political economy from a North Atlantic core, the participants highlighted the role of the periphery in the construction of a new social (and global) order. Second, the panelists also stressed the importance of paying attention to a wider body of actors than considered by the traditional historiography. In different ways, peasants, artisans, the middle class, and development experts all helped to shape the formation of capitalist societies in Gran Colombia. Last, paying attention to consumption, rather than privileging production, and the circulation of merchandise, people, and ideas can enrich our narratives of capitalist development and help articulate key connections between different scales of analysis.

MEXICAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Pablo Miguel Sierra Silva

Secretary: Gladys McCormick

Topic: “Mexican Numbers: Reconsidering the Quantitative in Times of Violence”

Panelists:

Sabrina Smith (UC-Merced)

Andres Reséndez (UC-Davis)

Camilo Vicente Ovalle (UNAM)

This year the Mexican Studies Committee featured an interactive roundtable session that included brief remarks from scholars of the colonial, early national, and contemporary periods to consider how, why, and when we resort to quantitative sources. Committee Chair **Mr. Sierra Silva** initiated the session by introducing the Committee Secretary, Gladys McCormick. He then offered some quantitative data on the striking homicide rates in Mexico in 2019 which then exploded throughout the year 2020. He drew attention to how often these data on massive homicides and disappearances throughout Mexican history appear in media coverage worldwide. As this coverage often filters into everyday conversation, office exchanges and corner-store small talk, Sierra Silva proposed the question of how we as historians interact with coverage centered on notions of absence and presence. In particular, how do numbers inform our contemporary and historical perception of violence in Mexico? The Committee Chair then introduced the four distinguished panelist speakers, who each had a designated opportunity to address the previous questions, as summarized below.

Sabrina Smith recalled that, in 2015, 1.4 million Afro-Mexicans self-identified as such in the *encuesta intercensal*. Her initial insights focused on the 2020 national census survey that reflected a larger number of Afro-Mexicans than ever reported, and she emphasized the importance of visibility and counting in census surveys to address issues of citizenship, inclusion, and combatting racism. Smith provided an example of how census surveys during Mexican colonial times which only reflected quantitative data were not entirely accurate of the population’s demographic, as older records did not always include women or enslaved persons. From her research, Smith explained her discovery that quantitative census data alone can skew a historian’s perspective, while judicial, notarial, and inquisition records provide better insight regarding populations than broader numbers. She described the dehumanization created by the counting and classifying that results in quantitative data. Smith concludes her portion by discussing the problem of presence and absence with regards to Afro-Mexican history.

Andres Reséndez initiated his discussion by emphasizing the use and role of numbers, especially in his own research. In his work on Indian slavery, he noted that he had to wrestle with this idea of numbers, of which there were not many for his research, as records for Indian slaves were essentially nonexistent. Reséndez mentioned that he estimated the total number of Indian slaves to be between two and a half to five million, which has received some recognition in literature. He reemphasized the role that numbers play beyond the dehumanization effect, to give significant

meaning to horrific phenomena like slavery or mass homicides, as in the Mexican case at discussion.

Camilo Vicente Ovalle began his discussion by commenting that data and numbers are records of social phenomena such as state violence in Mexico. He explained that it is crucial to consider the context in which quantitative data are produced – social, political, historical, etc. Ovalle continued to say how records of numbers of violence in Mexico, for example, are not external information; rather, they go hand-in-hand with the logic and cause behind the violence. He discussed how one of the biggest problems for historians and social scientists studying violence in Mexico is that they do not critically process quantitative data in this context. By focusing solely on the numbers themselves, Ovalle explained how we hide the true logic and insight that drives those numbers to be what they are. He went on to say that data does not only present evidence for a magnitude of violence, but it facilitates an understanding of the phenomena. Citing the data on disappearances in Mexico, Ovalle indicated that these numbers only refer to those disappeared *permanently*, not including those who were once disappeared but later found. He used this example to illustrate how quantitative data are often not entirely reflective of the phenomena that it attempts to encompass. To emphasize the importance of context, Ovalle explained how one cannot compare numbers of disappearances in Mexico and Argentina, for example, as each country had drastically differing political-economic contexts. He concluded by recognizing the weight that numbers carry, but more so with regard to the context in which they were produced.

Mr. Sierra Silva then brought Gladys McCormick into the conversation to weigh in on her position regarding the issues discussed thus far by the panelists.

Gladys McCormick began her discussion by noting the similarities that exist across time periods. She recalled a question from a former mentor that grappled with determining which numerical threshold is significant to establish importance of a given number. McCormick then related her research on torture in Mexico with Ovalle's findings that quantitative data is always existent. She agreed with Smith and Resendez in their points that numerical data gives great weight to historical events that tend to be marginalized. In addressing the transition between historical periods, McCormick grappled with how the disappearances during the Mexican counterinsurgency movement between the 1960s and 1980s then moved into the counternarcotic efforts of the early twenty-first century. Referring again to her research, she emphasized how accurate data on the number of people tortured during the Mexican dirty war is essentially nonexistent because of the nature of the widely accepted phenomenon. McCormick concluded her session by making note of a chapter of her in-progress book on torture in Mexico, which deals with the presence of the family of those tortured during the counterinsurgency movement. She marked the significance of how many people were tortured solely because they were related to someone involved in the revolutionary movement, citing the example of the Cabañas family. McCormick's final note regarded the importance of numerical data and how numbers linger behind this research.

The floor was then opened for questions by the audience, which were posed in the chat box and moderated accordingly by Mr. Silva Sierra. Several participants offered questions to debate the following: How do our different methods, theories, and archives inform our approaches to numerical information? What are the implications of the quantitative to cultural, social, and economic history and to the new digital platforms that expand the reach of our research? What are

the limits and opportunities of engaging more fully such data (or the lack thereof) to understand moments of profound violence across time?

Committee Chair Mr. Silva Sierra concluded this roundtable discussion by thanking the panelists and participants for a fruitful conversation.

TEACHING & TEACHING MATERIALS SECTION MEETING

Chair: Corinna Zeltsman

Secretary: Casey Lurtz

The CLAH Teaching and Teaching Materials Section convened its annual meeting at 2pm ET on January 10, 2021 via Zoom for a session titled “Taking Off the White Gloves: Teaching Latin American History through Rare Books and Special Collections.” Corinna Zeltsman, chair, and Casey Lurtz, secretary, welcomed more than twenty participants to the session.

The session began with some business matters. First, Zeltsman announced the incoming secretary for the section, Carlos Dimas, from University of Nevada Las Vegas. Corinna then thanked the referees for the committee’s syllabus prize, this year called “**Creative Assignments for Latin American History Courses:**” Chad Black, Ángela Vergara, and José Carlos de la Puente. The winner of the prize was Sarah Chambers for her syllabus [Early Latin America to 1825](#). María de los Ángeles Picone ([Borders & Frontiers in Modern Latin America](#)) and Sarah Foss ([Plantation to Plate: Sugar, Bananas, and Coffee in the Americas](#)) both received an honorable mention from the committee.

Lurtz followed with an overview of the Fall 2020 activities organized by the section in response to the move to online teaching necessitated by the coronavirus pandemic. She thanked the colleagues who led five virtual workshops, which drew more than 200 participants. Debbie Sharnak, April Yoder, and Marieke Riethof led the first workshop with a session on tools for student participation; Juliette Levy then introduced ways of thinking about games and teaching; Sharika Crawford and María de los Ángeles Picone talked through digital spatial tools; Alex Borucki presented the Slave Voyages database and attendant projects on Afro-Latin American sources; and finally Christine Hernández and Ana Ramírez Luhrs from Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials presented the digitized archival sources their members have gathered. The chair and secretary expressed their gratitude for the work of mutual aid that these scholars and those who attended the sessions engaged in and announced that they would be looking into continuing them for spring 2021.

Zeltsman then introduced the session itself with her own interests in material culture and her experience that engaging with physical texts encouraged students to reflect on hemispheric power dynamics of why objects have migrated north into US library collections. Primary source sessions, in her experience, also open up opportunities for ongoing collaborations with library staff. Zeltsman acknowledged that we all work in very different kinds of institutions with very different collections, some the result of quirky professors or quirky donations. She then welcomed Alex Hidalgo of Texas Christian University, the author of *Trail of Footprints* (UT Press, 2020) and

Rachel Stein, research and instruction librarian at Latin American library at Tulane, currently working on a book project titled *Global Publishing in Age of Iberian Monarchy*, as our presenters.

Rachel Stein gave a presentation entitled “Active Exposure to Special Collections for Latin American History Instruction” that walked the attendees through a special collections class visit from the librarian’s perspective. Often, she said, these visits are “one shot” opportunities to engage with students that must encompass some hands-on orientation to the library alongside a chance for students to flex their critical thinking skills. She emphasized that libraries don’t need to have “treasures” for these visits to be effective; any kind of physical material, including things from circulating collections, can be used to help students get a sense of and get excited about the materiality of primary sources and the kinds of work historical research entails. Stein encouraged faculty and librarians to circulate and help students think through worksheets that asked basic questions about sources – who, what, when, where, how, and why – as a means of building community among students. Clarity in both instructions and in reminders of why the class was visiting the library help make sessions stick. She suggested using GoogleDocs or other online interfaces for the worksheets so that students could easily return to the experience alongside digital resources the library could provide to supplement the session. Overall, Stein encouraged these kinds of visits as opportunities for community building within a class as well as between faculty and librarians.

Alex Hidalgo then presented a talk titled, “A Book is a Foreign Object: Teaching Latin American History with Special Collections.” For Hidalgo, teaching with original sources is essential part of our profession and he makes it a priority in all levels of classes. He sees this kind of experience as placing students squarely in the research lab via access to sources. Instead of doing one shot visits as described by Stein, Hidalgo invests in longer term assignment design that brings primary sources into most of his class sessions. This helps move away from the show and tell model and provides students ways to gain comfort in working with such sources. He encouraged faculty to take stock of their library’s resources by talking with librarians, browsing their catalogs, and wandering the stacks – most libraries have more than one might expect. He also encouraged sending students into the stacks themselves to find materials of interest. He gave the example of a Museums and Collecting class where he had students find materials in the circulating collection with which to create a traveling museum that they then took to local middle schools. Hidalgo also spoke to the potential uses of digital archives and tools that allow us to get beyond our library’s collections. He described in class activities that combined digitized maps and web searches to complete a series of tasks related to the object in question. These activities give students the chance to gain ownership of the skills involved in historical research and introduce the possibilities of what history can do. In what Hidalgo referred to as inclusive pedagogy, this also provides low stakes ways for him to check in on his students’ progress and comprehension.

The conversation that followed focused on additional strategies for collaboration between librarians and faculty, how to build a teaching collection of special materials with minimal budgets (things aren’t as expensive as one might guess and twentieth century materials in particular are quite cheap), and the kinds of skills that engagement with primary materials can teach. The final questions turned discussion towards how working with primary collections can lead students out of the library and into the local community as well.

VI. CLAH 2020 AWARD AND PRIZE RECIPIENTS AND CITATIONS

Susan M. Socolow-Lyman L. Johnson Prize

Committee:

Jody Pavilack (chair), Eduardo Elena, Julia Sarreal

Winner: Elizabeth Penry

The People are King: The Making of an Indigenous Andean Politics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019)

Honorable Mention: Alison J. Bruey

Bread, Justice, and Liberty: Grassroots Activism and Human Rights in Pinochet's Chile (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2018)

The Susan M. Socolow and Lyman L. Johnson Chile-Rio de la Plata Book Prize was established in 2018 to be awarded biennially to the book judged to make the most significant contribution to the history of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay. I am honored to have chaired the inaugural committee awarding this prize, together with Julia Sarreal, of Arizona State University and Eduardo Elena, of the University of Miami. Among the many outstanding books we received, the committee was unanimous in its selection of one prize winner and one honorable mention.

The winner is S. Elizabeth Penry, of Fordham University, for her book *The People Are King: The Making of an Indigenous Andean Politics* (Oxford UP, 2019). The research and writing in this book are exceptional, and we especially appreciate how well it communicates the present-day significance of Andean history for participatory democracy. This book makes a strong contribution to Andean studies, Colonial Latin American history, ethnohistory, and understandings of democratic indigenous movements today.

The Honorable Mention for the 2020 Susan M. Socolow and Lyman L. Johnson Prize is Alison J. Bruey, of the University of North Florida, for her book *Bread, Justice, and Liberty: Grassroots Activism and Human Rights in Pinochet's Chile* (U of Wisconsin P, 2018). The oral histories and archival research in this book are rigorous and creative, bringing into full emotional view the human dimension of political activism in Chile and the consequences for the ongoing struggle for justice and democracy.

Bolton-Johnson Prize

Committee: Fabricio Prado (chair), Peter Guardino, Christina Ramos

Winner: Natalia Milanesio

Destape! Sex Democracy, & Freedom in Postdictatorial Argentina (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2019)

Honorable Mention: Ryan Crewe

The Mexican Mission: Native Survival and Mendicant Enterprise in New Spain, 1521-1600 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

Destape historicizes the transformations in sex, sexuality, gender, and identity during the most recent process of redemocratization in Argentina. This is a book replete with surprising information and vivid anecdotes, the fruit of intense and lengthy research in written sources and oral history. Based on interviews, official documents, printed and digital media sources, and a myriad of materials from private archives, Natália Milanesio reveals the fascinating process of the rediscovery of sex life as part and parcel of the rediscovery of democracy in Argentina. *Destape* chronicles how, after decades of religious repression and government censorship of sex and sexual content, the lid was taken off in the 1980s. Starting in the last years of the *proceso*, Argentine society progressively saw a flood of sexual content on the TV, an explosion of publications about sexual life, pornography, erotic literature, and a boom in sexology and sexual therapy. Milanesio does not claim, however, that the Argentine *Destape* was a sexual revolution. Despite the sexual explosion in media and society, the Argentine *Destape* had limitations and contradictions, hardly including gays, lesbians, and more radical feminist agendas, for example. Even though the *Destape* produced the conditions for the emergence of the LGBTQ movement in Argentina, these agendas did not become mainstream at the time. Milanesio's *Destape* expands our understanding of the process of re-democratization by bridging public and private spheres and shedding light on an important aspect of daily life that young Latin Americans have taken for granted. *Destape* is a vibrant, unique, and outstanding book.

The *Mexican Mission* brings a new perspective to our knowledge of Indigenous peoples and Spaniards in post-conquest Mexico by examining the political and social role of the early missions in Mexico. Focusing on the everyday struggles of the commoners and the material contingencies that shaped religious change in 16th century Mexico, *The Mexican Mission* argues that Indigenous groups found in the missions an arena that allowed them to engage Spanish colonialism while maintaining and reconstructing indigenous communities. Ryan Crewe provides a new assessment on the meaning of conversion, fully revealing a major readaptation of indigenous politics and social dynamics. In this process, Indigenous peoples actively participated and exercised a great deal of agency. *The Mexican Mission* takes full advantage of the many documents produced by indigenous voices preserved in Spanish but also harnesses much of the most interesting work ethnohistorians using native language sources have produced in the last few decades. Moreover, Crewe is often able to bring in the voices of *macehuales* as well as indigenous elites. Ryan Crewe's elegantly written and superbly researched book makes a decisive intervention in a field that has a long tradition of important works, from Ricard and Gibson to ethno-histories based on native language sources.

Warren Dean Prize

Committee: Mariana Dantas (chair), Gregory Childs, Brian Owensby

Winner: Jessica Graham, *Shifting the Meaning of Democracy: Race, Politics, and Culture in the United States and Brazil* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019).

In *Shifting the Meaning of Democracy*, Jessica Lynn Graham offers an ambitious and innovative reading of the notion of racial democracy, making it a relevant tool of analysis that allows her to reinvent the historical comparison between Brazil and the U.S. The book is a timely examination of the discursive uses of race and democracy by dominant political actors and Black activists.

Graham employs a compelling framework of analysis to uncover the meaning of and structure to a “cacophony of racial political ideals” that competed for primacy during the first half of the twentieth century. She identifies the voices and actions of racial realists, who called out the racism in their countries and fought for redress. She examines the views and actions of the racial denialists, who, fearful that the racial debate would legitimize extremist left or right political views, negated the existence of race-based inequality. She reveals the practice of racial dissuasion by those eager to neutralize Black activists and discourage their participation in emerging social movements in order to protect the state from their political criticism and to reaffirm their own supremacy. Finally, she discusses widespread racial obstructionism that sought to impede, sometimes aggressively and sometimes subtilty, efforts to achieve real racial inclusion and justice. Applying her framework to the analysis of racial democracy as rhetoric, policy, and action during the period under examination, she uncovers the underlying views and goals of the Vargas regime in Brazil and Roosevelt administration in the U.S., of different political ideologues of the era, and of prominent cultural and political actors. She ultimately demonstrates that despite the activism that fought for tangible advances in racial equality and justice, this era mostly enshrined the aspiration or illusion of racial democracy.

Lydia Cabrera Award

Committee: Matt Childs (chair), Mariola Espinosa, Lillian Guerra
Not awarded in 2020 for lack of submissions

Scobie Awards

Committee: José Ragas, Rachel Grace Newman, Bonnie Lucero

Winners:

Alexander Chaparro
Marcus Oliver Golding
João Nascimento Gregoire
Aimee Hisey
Manoel Neto

Paul Vanderwood Prize

Committee: Dana Velasco Murillo, Anne Eller, Paul Ramirez

Winner: Roberto Franco

"'Todos/as somos 41:' The Dance of the Forty-One from Homosexual Reappropriation to Transgender Representation in Mexico, 1945–2001," *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 28.1 (2019): 66-95.

Honorable Mention: Andrew Walker

"All Spirits Are Roused," *Slavery and Abolition* 40.3 (2019): 583-605.

The Paul Vanderwood Prize Committee, composed of Dana Velasco Murillo, Anne Eller, and Paul Ramírez, is pleased to announce the recipients of this year’s prizes.

The Paul Vanderwood Prize Committee received an impressive number of submissions for this year’s competition. The committee selected Robert Franco’s "'Todos/as somos 41'": The Dance

of the Forty-One from Homosexual Reappropriation to Transgender Representation in Mexico, 1945-2001” for the prize. Dr. Franco’s article analyzes the legacy of a 1901 social event that ended in the arrest of 41 men, including those in drag, on the construction of homosexual identity formation and alternative sexual practices and forms of desire in postrevolutionary Mexico. Franco traces how distinct historical actors—writers, artists, reporters, gay and lesbian rights groups, the LGBTTTI communities, academics, club owners—reappropriated the memory of the 41 from one of deviance and shame to a vehicle for personal expression, community dialogue, political activism, and scholarly inquiry. The committee was particularly impressed by Franco’s methodology and his innovative approach to sources, including novels, broadsheets, etchings, magazines, newspapers, photographs, day planners, erotica, and performance art. The Committee also recognizes Andrew Walker’s, “All Spirits are Roused: the 1822 Antislavery Revolution in Haitian Santo Domingo,” for Honorable Mention. Dr. Walker’s article considers a critical yet understudied period in the history of Hispaniola: the twenty-two years (1822-1844) when the entire island was united as the Republic of Haiti. It argues that the origins of unification arose from a shared goal of emancipation among Haitian authorities and large numbers of Santo Domingo’s free Afro-descended populations. Unification drove anti-slavery movements that resonated beyond Hispaniola’s shores, including the seizure of slave trading vessels and the promise of freedom to any migrants who reached the island. In stressing mutual connections and goals between Haiti and Santo Domingo, Walker’s article dismantles and corrects outdated paradigms that stressed chronic contention between the two sides, including Trujillo-era narratives deployed to reinforce nationalistic racial rhetoric of Dominican supremacy.

María Elena Martínez Prize in Mexican History

Committee: Paul Eiss (chair), John Chuchiak, Nora Jaffary

Winner: Sonya Lipsett- Rivera

The Origins of Macho: Men and Masculinity in Colonial Mexico (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2019).

Honorable Mention: Ryan Crewe

The Mexican Mission: Native Survival and Mendicant Enterprise in New Spain, 1521-1600 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

The committee found Sonya Lipsett-Rivera’s *The Origins of Macho: Men and Masculinity in Colonial Mexico* to be an outstanding work—one that makes path-breaking contributions to our understanding of gender and masculinities in colonial Mexico, even as it also offers important comparative insights to the workings of masculinity in other periods and places. Moreover, we found *Origins* to be very engagingly written, offering a well-crafted narrative that delves repeatedly and deeply into rich vignettes from the source material, while never losing sight of how those examples serve to advance the book’s analytical argument. In short: a tour de force. The committee found Ryan Dominic Crewe’s *The Mexican Mission: Native Survival and Mendicant Enterprise in New Spain, 1521-1600* to be an outstanding and novel work of scholarship that deeply explores the emergence and elaboration of the mission system in Mexico, even as it draws surprising connections with far-flung locales like the Canary Islands and the Philippines. We were particularly impressed by how the work recognizes indigenous populations

as important actors with their own interests and strategies, whose actions substantially shaped the way the system took shape.

Antonine Tibesar Prize

Committee: Paula Alonso (chair), Robert Schwaller, Danielle Terrazas Williams

Winner: Aaron Coy Moulton

Counterrevolutionary Friends: Caribbean Basin Dictators and Guatemalan Exiles against the Guatemalan Revolution, 1945-50,” *The Americas* 76.1 (2019): 107-35.

Honorable Mention: Sara Kozameh

“Guerrillas, Peasants, and Communists: Agrarian Reform in Cuba’s 1958 Liberated Territories,” *The Americas* 76.4 (2019): 641-73.

Aaron Coy Moulton’s article “Counterrevolutionary Friends: Caribbean Basin Dictators and Guatemalan Exiles against the Guatemalan Revolution, 1945-50” sheds light on the understudied issue of counterrevolutionary networks of mid-twentieth century Central America and the Caribbean. This research shifts attention from traditional analyses on U.S. policy and nationally focused studies, casting instead a wide net to better understand how a loose coalition of Caribbean Basin dictators participated in a regional network centered around shared anti-communist sentiment. Moulton’s close reading of newly available material reveals the complex considerations that mediated the degree to which participants in this network extended support to Guatemalan counterrevolutionaries. With its clarity of prose, depth of analysis, and innovative arguments, this article will undoubtedly inspire further research into this topic

Sara Kozameh, “Guerrillas, Peasants, and Communists: Agrarian Reform in Cuba’s 1958 Liberated Territories”, offers an innovative account of the participation and impact of guerrilla peasants in agrarian policies in the liberated territories during the revolution. Based on documents from the insurgency, this well-argued and clearly written article offers a new lens to assess the role of guerrilla peasants in experimenting with revolutionary policies.

Alexander Robertson Memorial Prize

Committee: Michele Reid-Vasquez (chair), Cristina Soriano, Juan José Pérez Meléndez

Winner: Pablo Miguel Sierra Silva

“Afro-Mexican Women in Saint-Domingue: Piracy, Captivity, and Community in the 1680s and 1690s,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 100.1 (2020): 3–34

This is a wonderful article that makes an important and original contribution to Afro-Mexican and diasporic history. It eloquently bridges colonial Mexico with Saint-Domingue, enslavement and tenuous freedom, the Spanish and the French Atlantics, and piracy and gender studies. The article goes back and forth between a methodological reflection on “retrospective significance” (Trouillot) and an exercise in reading historical documentation minutely in an effort to make the most of the experiences of a cohort of kidnapped women from Veracruz (many of them already enslaved) after their forced relocation to Saint-Domingue. In doing so, Sierra Silva arrives at insights as varied as the roots of the *gens de couleur* in St. Domingue prior to the sugar boom, the liberties and negotiations enjoyed by black women in terms of their ability to enter formal unions before the Code Noir of 1685, and their comparatively more limited window of

possibilities in Veracruz, where other definitions of racial and inherited slavery predominated. The author relies on documentation from the AGI and baptismal and marriage records digitized from the Archive d’Outre Mer in Aix, thus combining in-person and digital archive research.

Honorable Mentions:

1) Daniel Mendiola

“The Founding and Fracturing of the Mosquito Confederation: Zambos, Tawiras, and New Archival Evidence, 1711–1791” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 99.4 (2019): 619–47.

This is a finely researched article which contends that the breaking up of the Mosquito Confederation after 1766 was *not* due to internal ethnic conflict among Taiwiras and Zambos, or indigenous and African-descent Miskitus. Rather, the author surveys three political generations to trace the process by which the Mosquito solidified alliances among their various chieftains, a feat of negotiation and loyalty that allowed them to exert strong pressure on the port of Matina and as far inland as Cartago in their seasonal expeditions for prisoners and goods along the coast. Mendiola does painstaking work identifying the number and sequence of such visitations, relying on archival material from Archivo Nacional de Costa Rica, the Archivo General de Centroamérica in Guatemala and the National Archives at Kew. Importantly, his findings subvert the consensus among the last handful of specialized scholars in that ethnic tensions undid the Mosquitos. Mendiola demonstrates that this was a retroactive projection from the memories of those who lived or descended from those who lived the civil war of 1791. His contribution illuminates the lesser-studied region of Central America, and is a call for taking seriously, not empires and their working as is customary, but indigenous polities and in their own terms and with equal seriousness.

2. Isadora Moura Mota

“Other Geographies of Struggle: Afro-Brazilians and the American Civil War,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 100.1 (2020): 35–62.

This article aligns with the social history among historians of Brazil of the 1990s and early 2000s often referred to as the Campinas school, though pushing it toward a hemispheric and almost global framework. In this regard, the article is part of and contributes to an emergent cohort of Imperial Brazil scholars trying to expand the frame of analysis beyond the national with thoughtful and rigorous Pan-American and world-history approaches. The article’s main idea is that slaves deployed their own “geopolitical literacy” to act upon incidents—and opportunities—related to the U.S. Civil War. The visitation of Confederate and Union war vessels, as well as whalers in Brazilian ports, allowed enslaved men to flee or to rise up in the name of the purported freedom represented by the arrival of these foreigners, never minding that the Confederates did not bring such news. Focusing on Maranhão and Santa Catarina, on cases stemming primarily from the Arquivo Nacional and a Yale University collection, the article makes a compelling effort move beyond open Brazil’s insularity.

Lewis Hanke Award

Committee: Sherwin Bryant (chair), Justin Wolfe, Karoline Cook

Winner: “The Roots of an Illegal Peasant Crop: Coca in Colombia, 1950s-1990s”

Distinguished Service Award

Committee: Brodwyn Fischer (chair), Eric Zolov, Reid Andrews

Winner: Thomas Holloway

The citation was published in the Fall 2020 *Newsletter*.

VII. IN APPRECIATION: CLAH ENDOWMENT AND FUND CONTRIBUTORS

CLAH Prizes and Awards

Dantas, Mariana
Sanders, James
Schwaller, John F.

Susan M. Socolow and Lyman L. Johnson Prize

Alonso, Paula
Larson, Brooke

The Elinor Melville Prize for Latin American Environmental History

Wilcox, Robert

The James R. Scobie Awards

Chesterton, Bridget
DellaCava, Ralph
Flannery, Kristie
Harvey, Kyle
Meade, Teresa
Rogers, Thomas

The Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award

DellaCava, Ralph

The María Elena Martínez Prize in Mexican History

Chowning, Margaret
DeLay, Brian

The Warren Dean Prize in Brazilian History

DellaCava, Ralph
Weinstein, Barbara
Wilcox, Robert

VIII. LIFETIME MEMBERS (NEW MEMBERS IN BOLD)

Alden, Dauril
Alemán, Gladys
Anderson, Rodney
Andrews, Reid
Appelbaum, Nancy
Arrom, Silvia
Beezley, William
Bell, Stephen
Bennett, Herman L.
Bigelow, Allison
Borges, Dain
Borucki, Alex
Boyer, Christopher
Buchenau, Jurgen
Bunker, Steven B.
Burkholder, Mark
Burns, Kathryn
Cagle, Hugh
Carey, Elaine
Castilho, Celso
Castro, Donald
Cline, Sarah
Coatsworth, John
Coerver, Don
Cohen, Theodore
Connell, William F.
Conniff, Michael
Cook, Karoline
Cooney, Jerry
Couturier, Edith
Covert, Lisa
Cowan, Benjamin
Craib, Raymond
Crawford, Sharika
Cummins, Victoria
Davies Jr., Thomas
Dávila, Jerry
De La Pedraja, René
De La Teja, Jesús F.
De La Torre Curiel, Jose
Delson, Roberta
Demarest, William
Dueñas, Alcira
Eakin, Marshall
Eller, Anne
Flemion, Phillip
Friedman, Max Paul
Ganster, Paul
Gao, Jian
Garrett, David
Goldthree, Reena
Gonzales, Michael
Gram, Bill
Graubart, Karen
Greever, Janet
Grieco, Viviana
Herman, Rebecca
Horna, Hernán
Jaksic, Ivan
Johnson, Harold
Kiddle, Amelia
Knight, Franklin
Komisaruk, Catherine
Langer, Erick
Lavrin, Asunción
Lee, Monica Kittiya
Lesser, Jeff
Lewin, Linda
Logan, Alison
Lombardi, John
Lopez, Rick
Love, Joseph
Lutz Christopher
MacLachlan, Colin
Mallon, Florencia
Mansilla, Judith
Matthew, Laura
McEnroe, Sean
Milton, Cynthia
Moulton, Aaron
Myers, Alfred
Navarro, José Manuel
Nobles, Rex
O'Hara, Matthew D.
O'Toole, Rachel Sarah
Olcott, Jocelyn
Owens, Sarah
Pieper Mooney, Jadwiga

Poole, Stafford
Porter, Susie
Premo, Bianca
Proctor III, Frank (Trey)
Putnam, Lara
Radding, Cynthia
Ramos, Frances
Rankin, Monica
Rausch, Jane
Reséndez, Andrés
Rice, Mark
Rich, Paul
Roch, Gabriel
Roseblatt, Karin
Safford, Frank
Sanders, Nichole
Schlotterbeck, Marian
Schwaller, John
Scobie, Ingrid
Scott, Rebecca
Sierra Silva, Pablo Miguel
Soto Laveaga, Gabriela

Stern, Steve
Stevens, Donald
Stewart, James
Stowe, Noel
Sullivan-Gonzalez, Douglass
Summerhill, William
Sweet, David
Tenenbaum, Barbara
Terraciano, Kevin
Tulchin, Joseph
Vazquez, Josefina Z.
Vinson III, Ben
Wakild, Emily
Walker, Andrew
Walker, Louise
Warren, Richard
Weber, Rebecca
Williams, Daryle
Wright- Rios, Edward
Yannakakis, Yanna Panayota
Young, Julia
Zyblikewics, Lubomir