



**CONFERENCE ON LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY  
SPRING 2019 NEWSLETTER  
Volume 55, Number 1**

**IN THIS ISSUE:**

<b>I. Message from President Bianca Premo .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Message from Executive Secretary Jürgen Buchenau .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. Approved Minutes of the 2018 General Committee Meeting ..</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. Officers and Committee Members Elected or Appointed.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>V. CLAH Regional and Topical Committee Session Reports.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VI. CLAH 2018 Prize and Award Recipients and Citations .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>VII. In Appreciation: CLAH Endowment and Fund Contributors ....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>XIII. Welcome to Lifetime Membership Status .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>IX. Lifetime Members.....</b>	<b>43</b>

## **2019 CLAH OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES**

### **General Committee**

#### **Executive Committee:**

President: Bianca Premo  
Vice President: Ben Vinson III  
Past President: Lara Putman  
Executive Secretaries:  
Jürgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards

#### **Elected Members:**

Lillian Guerra (2017-2018)  
Matthew O'Hara (2017-2018)  
Sarah Cline (2018-2019)  
Tatiana Seijas (2018-2019)

#### **Ex-Officio Members:**

HAHR Editor: Martha Few (2018)  
The Americas Editor: Ben Vinson III  
H-LatAm Editor: John F. Schwaller

### **Standing Committees**

**Nominating Committee:** Karin  
Roseblatt (chair), Pete Sigal,  
Heather Vrana

**Program Committee:** Rachel  
O'Toole (2019 chair), Carmen Soliz  
(2020 chair), Louis Pérez

#### **Nominating Committee:**

Pablo Piccato, Chair  
Nancy van Deusen  
Erick Langer

### **Regional and Topical Committees**

#### **Andean Studies:**

Kathryn Santner, Chair  
Elena McGrath, Secretary

#### **Atlantic World Studies:**

Jesse Cromwell, Chair  
Erin Stone, Secretary

#### **Borderlands/Frontiers:**

Raúl Ramos, Chair and Secretary

#### **Brazilian Studies:**

Okezi Otovo, Chair  
Heather F. Roller, Secretary

#### **Caribbean Studies:**

Quito Swan, Chair  
Devyn Spence Benson, Secretary

#### **Central American Studies:**

Kevin Coleman, Chair  
David Díaz Arias, Secretary

#### **Chile-Rio de la Plata Studies:**

Julia Sarreal, Chair  
Marian Schlotterbeck, Secretary

#### **Colonial Studies:**

Alex Hidalgo, Chair  
Alcira Dueñas, Secretary

#### **Gran Colombia Studies:**

Pablo F. Gómez, Chair  
Stefan Pohl, Secretary

#### **Mexican Studies**

Peter Villella, Chair  
Pablo M. Sierra Silva, Secretary

#### **Teaching and Teaching Materials:**

Jethro Hernández Berrones, Chair  
Corinna Zeltsman, Secretary

## I. MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT BIANCA PREMO



It's only the polite thing to do, to begin my time as the president of CLAH with a comment about what big shoes I have to fill. But those of you who read outgoing president Lara Putnam's last "Message from the President" in the Newsletter from Fall 2018 (vol. 50, no. 2) will know that my expression of admiration for her is more than a perfunctory courtesy. In that message, Lara relayed a heart-wrenching series of snapshots that revealed where we are now, the context in which many of us work. Nativism and misplaced fears— particularly of MS-13, but more generally of migrants fleeing untenable situations in their home countries— are dislocated from any real threat. But fear manifests in very real ways, touching lives, taking lives, including those of eleven friends at her synagogue in Pittsburgh. She ended her message by asking us, "What now?" I don't want her challenge to us, as scholars of Latin America and the Caribbean, as historians, as humans, to be lost in the transition.

"Now" is certainly in flux, politically and professionally. We are historians, and as historians we search to draw analogies or linkages to the past to stabilize ourselves in the rocky present. Nationalism and nativism, populist wizardry with new media, political violence, border-crossing: these are not new phenomena in the hemisphere, and we historians are in a privileged position to mine lessons out of time to remind us of that.

Yet the privileged vantage point of our positions is also receding. In part, this is because the profession is changing. I don't need to tell you that the job market for academic positions on the tenure track has dramatically dried up, that undergraduate students are not enrolling in the numbers they did only a decade ago, that the pressure to either

promote oneself or school the haters on Twitter has reshaped the terrain on which we produce history. Some might actually view these developments as the tyranny of now imposed upon us, provoking nostalgia for another time.

But some might see its promise. We are called upon to make our work meaningful, to make the morals of our stories clearer still. to connect to the public (which, I insist, includes our undergraduate students.) If our professional expertise is under attack, it can shake us out of any complacency or unchecked patterns, perhaps even making space for new expertise and redistributions of privilege. There have been other moments when expertise was questioned, when the map shifted, when change was coming fast. I am presently visiting the early twentieth century in my research, and as a newcomer from the colonial period, I am struck by the similarities between our own times and that era of dislocation, revolutionary nationalism, and technological vertigo. It is particularly at such moments that history by analogy or the invocation of tradition helps people get their bearings.

In seven years, CLAH will be 100. In its nine decades, it has distinguished itself in many respects, above all as a steadfast organization. CLAH is known for its professional constancy and, for some time now, it has executed the kind of clear-eyed yet creative financial decisions that not only stretch a dollar but also to use it to buy as many professional historians entry to sit at the (conference) table as possible. This same steadfastness has kept it on course through multiple political eras, through shifting approaches to the past, with a steady growth in number of members. But, given the “now” we live in, we are undoubtedly approaching a critical moment. We can continue on our path or we can do something new.

Recognizing this, CLAH has proceeded with plans to take stock as we move toward a full century. We now have the support and guidance of our incoming Vice President and future President, Ben Vinson, who will sit in various combinations with me, Lara, Jürgen and Erika on new and continuing ad hoc committees. Those committees intentionally extend beyond the vision of the Executive Committee, which we comprise as presidents, past, present and future, and Executive Secretaries. With the valued labor of and input from the four elected members of the General Committee and the ex-officio members drawn from our profession’s journals, and with the appointments of other regular members to serve, we are throwing the decision-making about our future open wider still. A Constitutional Committee and a Stewardship Committee aims to revisit the foundational charter of the organization and to make finances as robust and transparent as possible, and a Centennial Committee is charged with finding out what you wish for the organization to do and become. I hope you noticed the call for graduate student or early career volunteers for these committees. This is so that CLAH will respond intentionally to massive generational changes in the job market, transformations in methodological approaches and the profession itself, and the urgency of history now.

Under the direction of recently elected General Committee member Tatiana Seijas, the

Centennial Committee will circulate a survey in the late summer or early fall designed to elicit every member's input on what comes next. Whether we decide to stay the course or to radically reorient, this will be a collective choice. The beauty of Lara's final presidential message was that she left it open. Whatever our response to the challenge, now will not become history without us, one way or another.

## II. MESSAGE FROM CO-EXECUTIVE SECRETARY JÜRGEN BUCHENAU



Colegas: Greetings from the CLAH Secretariat from Charlotte, also on behalf of our co-Executive Secretary, Erika Edwards, and our graduate assistant, Lucinda (Lucy) Stroud! Beginning with this Newsletter, Erika and I will alternate remarks in the Newsletter, so it is my turn this time around.

First of all, a word of thanks to all those who made our meeting in Chicago a success. The Program Committee, chaired by Monica Rankin and also including Rachel O'Toole (the 2020 chair) and Michael Huner put together a sizable and high-quality program. The CLAH meeting also marked the final days of Lara Putnam's two-year presidency, and, as our new president, Bianca Premo, has remarked above, she leaves big shoes to fill. We all know, however, that Bianca is more than up to the task. Finally, Lucy was a steadfast help around the office and kept her good cheer last year even as our banking software crashed and we needed to hunt for a quick alternative. She graduates this semester, and we appreciate her help over the last two years. We will appoint a new CLAH graduate assistant in the next few weeks. We also welcome Vice President and President-Elect Ben Vinson III to the Executive Committee. Ben has worked with the CLAH for years in his capacity as *The Americas* editor, and his expertise and enthusiasm is a most welcome addition.

As I conclude my seventh year of involvement with the CLAH Secretariat, I am very

proud of our organization and the field of Latin American history as a whole. CLAH members play a very important role in the profession and our ranks include former AHA presidents (most recently, Barbara Weinstein), members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (most recently, Asunción Lavrín), not to mention current and former university presidents, provosts, deans, and a large number of department chairs. Latin American history matters, and perhaps never more than today. Our CLAH meetings are very well attended, and each year, our panels make up anywhere between 15 and 22 percent of the total number of panels at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.

As we look ahead to our centennial in 2026, the CLAH is going strong, and we look forward to undertaking the next part of our journey with you. As Bianca mentioned, two separate committees will be crafting a visioning statement and a new constitution over the coming months, and we will be in communication with both the membership and the General Committee about next steps. The historical profession is undergoing rapid changes, and we want to be involved in those changes rather than just following them. We look forward to making the CLAH even better than it already is, and we look forward to your input in the process.

Let me close with a quick “housekeeping” item. Beginning with this Newsletter, the Spring Newsletter will include the approved and final minutes of LAST YEAR’S CLAH meeting, including any business transacted between that meeting and the following meeting. That means that we will publish the minutes from last year (which were provisional) for a second time, this time with the requisite additions and amendments. We will still include a complete list of the officers and prize committee members elected and appointed at the most recent meeting. We believe that this new practice better reflects the business of the General Committee, including the discussions that we are conducting between our annual meetings.

### **III. APPROVED CLAH GENERAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Lara Putnam, President

Bianca Premo, Vice-President and President-elect

Jurgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards, Co-Executive Secretaries

January 4, 2018, Marriott Wardman Park, Washington, D.C.

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

President Lara Putnam called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm. Present: President Lara Putnam, Vice President Bianca Premo, Co-Executive Secretary Jurgen Buchenau, Co-Executive Secretary Erika Edwards, General Committee members Peter Guardino, Barbara Weinstein, Lillian Guerra, and Matt O[Hara, Americas editor Ben Vinson, H-Latam representative John F. Schwaller, CLAH graduate assistant Lucinda Stroud, CLAH members Steven Hyland, Barbara Tenenbaum, and

Jennifer Adair, graduate student guests Leah Walton, Caitlin Lemon, Brenda Paredes, Nashaly Ruiz-González, and Jim Smith.

## **2. Approval of minutes of the 2017 meeting in Denver (attachment 1)**

Barbara Weinstein moved approval of the minutes, and Lillian Guerra seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## **3. Approval of Fall 2017 Election results and committee appointments (attachment 2)**

Ben Vinson moved approval of the election results, and Barbara Weinstein seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Matt O'Hara moved approval of the committee appointments, and Lillian Guerra seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## **4. Report of the Program Committee**

Outgoing Program Committee Chair Erika Edwards presented a brief report on the committee's activities for the year. In Washington, D.C., the CLAH received enough space to accommodate all of the panels submitted. This year, CLAH members submitted 42 panels. 12 of these panels were accepted by the AHA Program Committee, leaving 30 with sole CLAH sponsorship. The other two committee members included Monica Rankin (the 2019 chair) and Roger Kittleson.

Lara Putnam thanked Erika Edwards and the other two committee members for their valuable service in building the program. A brief discussion focused on number of panels submitted overall within the context of trends over the last five to ten years. The size of the CLAH program increased dramatically between 2008 and 2013 and has decreased somewhat over the past three years; it is now back where it was in 2010- 2011. In a larger historical context, our numbers are healthy, and the CLAH is the largest affiliate of the AHA with co-sponsored sessions at the AHA annual meeting.

## **5. Report on the Secretariat**

Jurgen Buchenau reported on the beginning of the CLAH's third quinquennium at UNC Charlotte, now under joint leadership with Erika Edwards, who will take charge of the annual program as well as visioning and membership recruitment in the organization. Jurgen Buchenau will remain in charge of the budget and the day-to-day operations of the CLAH, including most communications with existing members not handled by the graduate assistant. He began by thanking former graduate assistant Nicole Hanna, who graduated last year, and former Meeting Director Marissa Nichols, whose functions have been subsumed under Erika Edwards's portfolio as co-Executive Secretary. Jurgen Buchenau also thanked the Dean of the UNC Charlotte College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Nancy Gutierrez, for her support of UNC Charlotte's bid to host the CLAH for a further five years and introduced the General Committee to the new CLAH graduate assistant, Lucinda Stroud, who will be assisting the organization through the 2018-2019 academic year.

## **6. Review of Executive Secretary's 2017 Annual Report, discussion and vote on Proposed FY 2018 Budget (attachments 3a-c)**

Jurgen Buchenau reported on FY 2017 and presented the proposed FY 2018 budget. After a tough FY 2016, 2017 was very kind to the organization, in part because the Denver meeting was relatively inexpensive, and in part because the organization gained seven new life memberships in 2017. Therefore, the organization made a surplus of more than \$9,000 this year, even after accounting for an unexpected expense in conjunction with the annual meeting in Denver. The CLAH still experiences difficulties in making panelists at the annual meeting pay up, but the Secretariat has put a new mechanism in place that will encourage membership payment up front, before the CLAH Program Committee will consider a panel proposal.

For 2018, the Secretariat expects a good turnout at the Washington meeting and average membership payments. The luncheon in Washington will be more expensive than in Denver, but less than what would have been projected at the Omni, our old venue in the city.

As a result of the windfall in 2017, the Executive Secretaries will keep a special cash reserve in its Bank of America account to defray the costs of the luncheon in New York City (2020), which will be extraordinarily expensive. Next year, CLAH will also hold \$5,000 in reserve for much-needed website improvements.

The CLAH endowment is growing, thanks in large part to good years on Wall Street. However, because of a relatively conservative investment strategy, the gains have not kept pace with the gains in the S&P 500 or other widely used stock price indices. Conversely, in the Great Recession of 2008-2009, the CLAH endowment also did not drop as much as other equity-based endowments. Approval of the annual report and budget was moved and seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## **7. Old Business:**

### **a. Report on Cooperation with AHILA (Asociación de Historiadores Latinoamericanistas Europeos)**

On behalf of our AHILA liaison, Jerry Dávila, who was absent from the meeting, Jurgen Buchenau gave a report of the meeting of the AHILA meeting in Valencia in September 2017, and particularly the meeting with the AHILA Consejo Ejecutivo. AHILA and CLAH agreed to organize one panel at each of the other's forthcoming meetings: CLAH will organize a session at the AHILA meeting in Paris (2020), and AHILA will organize a panel at the AHA/CLAH meeting in Chicago (2019), as well as possibly one at the next meeting in New York City (2020). This works well because AHILA sessions, or *simposios*, are two to three panels long. Jurgen Buchenau and Jerry Dávila will work with CLAH President Lara Putnam and AHILA President Natalia Sobrevilla in organizing both sessions and facilitating communication.



John Schwaller pointed out that the AHILA model appears quirky to many on this side of the Atlantic, since the submission process involves two phases: one call for *simposios*, and then another call to fill the accepted *simposios* with papers. The CLAH will need to be diligent in organizing its official *simposio* in Paris, and should also recruit additional papers from CLAH members on other symposia as appropriate.

### **b. Comprehensive Campaign/Endowment Building**

Lara Putnam and John Schwaller took the lead in following up on the goal of the CLAH to launch a Comprehensive Campaign in order to increase our endowment leading up to the centennial of the CLAH in 2026. To begin this task, John Schwaller focused on two immediate goals: the creation of a Stewardship Committee, and the creation of Visioning Committee that would oversee the formulation of a Needs Statement, a process that will include a survey of the membership.

John Schwaller volunteered for the Stewardship Committee. Those present agreed that John Schwaller would follow up with a Skype call including Lara Putnam, Bianca Premo, and Jurgen Buchenau, to constitute the Stewardship Committee.

The creation of the needs statement and the surveying of the membership will be in the hands of a task force that will include Lillian Guerra, Barbara Tenenbaum, and Jurgen Buchenau. It was agreed that Jurgen Buchenau would recruit two additional members to the task force: a recent Assistant Professor and a graduate student.

## **8. New Business**

### **a) Discussion of Viability of 2- and 3-year Memberships**

Jurgen Buchenau presented a proposal to allow members to pay memberships for two or three years, in order to minimize the frequency of dues payment and also offer members some cost savings.

Discussion focused on the viability of also allowing members to pay life memberships in three equal installments, which would make life membership more affordable for members. One possible drawback of such a plan is the possibility of a member failing to fulfill the installment plan after the initial payment (or even the first two). It was agreed that the General Committee will reassess this plan in three years and take appropriate action.

John Schwaller moved to allow CLAH members to purchase life memberships in three equal annual installments of \$250, for a total of \$750. That is \$50 more than a life membership purchased at once. Barbara Weinstein seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The discussion then returned to the original proposal, and the possible impact on journal subscriptions, which benefit from regular yearly payment. However, Ben Vinson pointed out

that the journal subscriptions are only a small number now, and minor fluctuations in CLAH journal subscriptions will not affect the overall health of the journals.

Finally, the committee set about fixing the rates for the two- and three-year memberships. After discussion, Lillian Guerra moved the following amounts:

Professional (one year \$50):

2 years \$90

3 years \$130

Emeriti (one year \$40):

2 years \$70

3 years \$100

Students (one year \$25):

2 years \$45

3 years \$65

Contingent faculty (one year \$30)

2 years \$55

3 years \$80

Ben Vinson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

#### **b) Discussion of a Chile-Río de la Plata Book Prize**

Erika Edwards and Jennifer Adair, in their function as Chair and Secretary of the Chile-Río de la Plata Studies section of the CLAH, updated the General Committee on their plan (shared electronically with the GC earlier in 2017) to raise money for a biennial prize honoring books on the history of the region covered by the section. Pledges worth \$6,000 are needed to establish a biennial prize paying out \$500. So far, they have received 21 pledges totaling \$3,550.

The discussion focused on the impact on the CLAH luncheon (which already has a long agenda); however, the impact would be negligible, particularly if the book prize were offered opposite the also biennial Cline Prize.

Lillian Guerra moved to endorse the creation of the Chile-Río de la Plata Book Prize, subject to collection of funds that meet the \$6,000 threshold. Because the creation of the prize requires a change to the CLAH Constitution, the GC approval is also contingent on confirmation of that change by the CLAH membership via electronic ballot. Barbara Weinstein seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The General Committee also unanimously voted to authorize the General Secretaries to ask that honorable mentions not have a citation read at the luncheon other than the author's name as well as the title of the publication and the publisher.

#### **c) Discussion of new H-LATAM Syllabus Prize**

John Schwaller explained the background of this prize, which falls under the auspices of the Teaching and Teaching Materials Committee and hence does not require a constitutional change. The idea behind the prize is the development of strong syllabi and their dissemination on H-LATAM. The prize will be \$100 and will be given annually for five years, thanks to a donation from John Schwaller. After that time, the committee will discuss whether to make the prize permanent. Those present expressed their appreciation for John's generosity.

Lara Putnam adjourned the meeting at 7:47 pm.

#### **9) CLAH Business Conducted Since Meeting:**

On March 25, 2018, General Committee members Lara Putnam, Bianca Premo, Jerry Dávila, Jurgen Buchenau, Erika Edwards and Sarah Cline, as well as Chile-Río de la Plata Studies Committee chair Jennifer Adair conferred via Skype to consider the offer of a major donation of \$20,000 by Dan Socolow that would fully endow the new prize proposed by the Chile-Río de la Plata Studies Committee at the preceding General Committee meeting. Acceptance of this offer was contingent on naming the prize the Susan Socolow-Lyman L. Johnson Prize. Following this discussion, which produced a unanimous endorsement of this most generous offer, the full General Committee unanimously voted via email to accept Dan Socolow's offer and thus create the new biennial prize, which will first be awarded at the 2020 CLAH meeting in New York City, considering books published in 2018 and 2019. The General Committee conveyed our profound gratitude to Dan Socolow for this generous offer.

#### **IV. OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS ELECTED OR APPOINTED**

On December 10, 2018, Co-Executive Secretary Jürgen Buchenau presented the results of balloting by CLAH members for a Vice President/President Elect and two new members of the General Committee, as well as new secretaries of the Regional and Thematic Committees to President Lara Putnam and Vice President Bianca Premo for their verification as per the CLAH Constitution. The verified members-elect are:

**Vice President and President-Elect** (two-year term, to be followed by two years as President and two as Past President):

Ben Vinson, Case Western Reserve University

**General Committee** (two-year term):

Gabriela Ramos, University of Cambridge

Celso Castilho, Vanderbilt University

**Regional/Thematic Committee:** (elected to two-year terms, first year as secretary, second as chair)

Andean Studies Committee: Elena McGrath, Carleton College

Atlantic World Studies Committee: Erin Stone, University of West Florida  
 Borderlands/Frontiers Committee: Raúl Ramos, University of Houston  
 Brazilian Studies Committee: Heather F. Roller, Colgate University  
 Caribbean Studies Committee: Devyn Spence Benson, Davidson College  
 Central American Studies Committee: David Díaz Arias, Universidad de Costa Rica  
 Colonial Studies Committee: Alcira Dueñas, The Ohio State University  
 Chile/Río de la Plata Studies Committee: Marian Schlotterbeck, University of California-Davis  
 Gran Colombian Studies Committee: Stefan Pohl, Universidad de Rosario  
 Mexican Studies Committee: Pablo M. Sierra Silva, University of Rochester  
 Teaching and Teaching Materials Committee: Corinna Zeltsman, Georgia Southern University

As required by the CLAH Constitution, Co-Executive Secretary Jürgen Buchenau forwarded these names to the CLAH General Committee, and the committee certified the election results at its meeting on January 4, 2019, in Chicago.

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

#### **2019 Standing Committees:**

**Nominating Committee:** Karin Roseblatt (chair), Pete Sigal, Heather Vrana

**Program Committee:** Rachel O'Toole (2019 chair), Carmen Soliz (2020 chair), Louis Pérez

#### **2019 Prize Committees:**

**Distinguished Service Award:** Margaret Chowning (chair), Kevin Terraciano, Brodwyn Fischer

**Bolton-Johnson Memorial Prize:** Camilla Townsend (chair), Pablo Gómez, Keila Grinberg

**James R. Scobie Memorial Awards:** Juan Ponce Vasquez (chair), Chloe Ireton, Yesenia Barragán

**Paul Vanderwood Prize:** Catalina Muñoz (chair), Natasha Lightfoot, David Carey

**Antonine Tibesar Prize:** Ben Bryce (chair), Pamela Murray, Jessica Delgado

**Howard F. Cline Prize:** Alex Hidalgo (chair), Ignacio Díaz Gallup, Alejandra Boza Villareal

**James A. Robertson Memorial Prize:** Jessica Stites-Mor (chair), Chad Black, M. Ivonne Wallace-Fuentes

**Lydia Cabrera Awards:** Camillia Cowling (chair 2019), Matt Childs (chair 2020), Mariola Espinosa

**Elinor Kerr Melville Prize:** Mark Healey (chair), Stefania Gallini, Wilson Picado Umaña

**Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award:** Adam Warren (chair), Karen Racine, Justin Castro

**Warren Dean Memorial Prize in Brazilian History:** Okezi Otovo (chair), Celso Castilho, Eve Buckley

**María Elena Martínez Prize:** Kevin Gosner (chair), Nichole Sanders, Christina Bueno

## V. CLAH 2019 REGIONAL AND TOPICAL COMMITTEE SESSION REPORTS

### 1. ANDEAN STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

#### Loyalties and Political Culture in the Andes

Chair: Kathryn Santner

Secretary : Elena McGrath

Papers presented by Mónica Ricketts (Temple University), G. Antonio Espinoza (Virginia Commonwealth University)

Reflecting on the AHA's annual theme of Loyalty, this panel discussed questions of loyalty in the Andes during the late colonial and early republican eras in various corporate bodies in Peru: the military and schools.

Mónica Ricketts discussed strategies employed by the Bourbon monarchs to cultivate loyalty among subjects, thereby facilitating colonial governance. Much of this was achieved through military reform enacted in the wake of the British capture of Havana in 1762, during the Seven Years' War. In response to this crisis, armies were placed under royal control and were restructured following a centralized model. In Peru, the primary case study for Rickett's paper, standing armies were recruited from creoles, *castas*, and *indios* who used their enlistment to leverage the social capital afforded by military positions. Other strategies to foster loyalty among the colonial armed forces included privileges like the right to trial by one's peers and units of land known as *topos*. Systems of patronage enacted by successive military leaders of both those loyal to the crown and insurgent forces used these strategies, particularly by appealing to *metizos* and others who had the most to gain from them. Ultimately, the leaders of Peru's nascent republic were all military officers who had first attained power in roles loyal to the King of Spain.

G. Antonio Espinoza examined the question of oratory and political loyalty during the early Republican Era of Peru (1821-1879). During the Republican era, new loyalties were forged through strategies like school curriculum and textbooks. Student speeches delivered at the end of school years, give insight into these political loyalties, the rhetoric employed and the importance of eloquence in political discourse. Using Mayer's notion that rhetoric is a negotiation between individuals, Espinoza began with the matter of eloquence and its use as a rhetorical strategy during the colonial period to both indicate speakers' loyalty to the viceroy and also specify their expectations of him. School speeches, delivered by elementary and intermediate students, though far removed from the intellectual elite of Peru, were nevertheless recorded in pamphlets or newspapers for circulation to a broader public. Speeches could be explicitly political or military or merely exhortatory or celebratory. Espinoza argues that students were meant to use these exercises to demonstrate their continuing advancement and also to emulate their more polished peers; the oral strategies they developed

were intended to help them in their future careers. Speeches were intended to create or enhance the patronage relationships between teachers and government officials, or to indicate expectations held by the students of the officials and their duty to their communities.

The discussion centered around comparisons to the armed forces in other parts of the Spanish Empire, including in Mexico where *indios* were explicitly refused entry into the military. There was also discussion of the War of Independence as a resource war and its impact on the troops. Other comments touched on the problem of researching the Republican period due to the difficulty of accessing 19<sup>th</sup> century archives.

## 2. ATLANTIC WORLD STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Chair: Jesse Cromwell

Secretary: Erin Stone

The Atlantic World Studies Committee met on Friday, January 4, 2018 in Chicago, Illinois as part of the annual meeting of the Conference on Latin American History and the American Historical Association. In their roles as chair and secretary of the session, Fabricio Prado and Jesse Cromwell convened a panel of young scholars who presented research emphasizing new thematic directions in the Atlantic history of Latin America and the Caribbean. These papers covered multiple empires in the Americas during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Erika Edwards (UNC Charlotte) presented on how two Atlantic developments in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century history of Argentina contributed to the perceptual disappearance of Afro-Argentines in that nation's racial self-identification. Inaccurate popular understandings of how Argentina came to be a "white" nation abound. Among these tropes, popular myths argued that black Argentines all perished in the independence wars, that yellow fever wiped them out, that miscegenation blended them into the populace, or that Afro-Argentines simply moved away to Uruguay. First, Edwards demonstrated how the myth of black disappearance in Argentina drew upon late nineteenth century processes of whitening the interior of the country through government-sponsored European immigration. Concurrent with this migration was the murder and displacement of indigenous groups under General Julio Argentino Roca's Conquest of the Desert. Implicit in both of these projects were transatlantic precepts of Social Darwinism. Edwards identified a second propagator of the black disappearance myth in the Atlantic rise of public education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Modernizers like the Marques de Sobremonte, a late eighteenth-century Viceroy of Río de la Plata, built public education into a tool to shame and reeducate people of color about their moral deficiencies. Ultimately, Edwards illustrated how transatlantic intellectual phenomena adapted to the Argentinean national context in order to further racially discriminatory attitudes.

Pablo Sierra Silva (University of Rochester) discussed the history of seventeenth-century Afro-Mexicans kidnapped in French buccaneer raids. In total, French *flibustiers* took over one

thousand black captives, the overwhelming majority of whom were women, from Veracruz to French Saint-Domingue in 1683. Sierra Silva sought to understand the experiences of these *Veracruzanas* as not simply stolen property, but also as wives, mothers, and grandmothers in their new surroundings. He argued that imperial histories focusing on the violence and geopolitical consequences of buccaneering has obscured the fate of these captives. An Atlantic, multi-site approach canvassing parish and marriage records in Veracruz and Saint-Domingue allows for the reconstruction of elements of their lives and lineages. In particular, Sierra Silva concentrated on how Article Nine of the Code Noir (1687) governing slavery in Saint Domingue shaped the fortunes of captives by allowing the manumission of enslaved women who married white men. Baptismal records registered many of their children as free people. Despite the violent and coercive nature of marriages between buccaneers and kidnapped Afro-Veracruzanas, Sierra Silva suggests that these unions played a key part in the formation of Saint-Domingue's *gens de couleur*. Thus, a key population in the history of Saint-Domingue and the Haitian Revolution might, in part, trace its origins back to inter-imperial raiding and sexual exploitation in the late seventeenth century.

Cristina Soriano (Villanova University) offered a revisionist history of print culture and revolution in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Venezuela. Venezuela was one of the last colonies in the Spanish Atlantic to receive a printing press. Traditional historiographical interpretations have stressed that this delay was a result of Venezuela's vulnerability to foreign penetration and its internal volatility and that it retarded revolutionary political discourse in the colony. Soriano argued that late colonial and early revolutionary Venezuela is, in fact, critical to the question of whether the printing press was necessary for the formation of political communities. She pointed to substantial evidence that political groups throughout the colony met to gossip and to discuss revolutionary texts, as well as to interact with and to reproduce these texts by hand. The lack of a printing press or formal intellectual societies in Venezuela actually allowed subversive materials to circulate without arousing the attention of authorities in the same way that these conduits would. The Venezuelan public sphere remained less homogenized and contained greater space for contestation as well. Soriano's paper sought to revise an accepted Atlanticist interpretation that printing presses were obligatory for revolutionary discourse by offering a colonial context in which their importance had been blunted.

Finally, Farren Yero (Duke University) proposed a reexamination of our assumptions about the archive through several nineteenth-century circum-Caribbean cases of vaccine development. She began with the story of Maria Bustamonte, who in 1804 sailed to Cuba with two children carrying the smallpox vaccine in their bloodstream in order to collect a five-hundred-peso prize. The girls remained obscure to the history of medicine, but they, like enslaved Africans and other subaltern participants, enabled decades of colonial experimentation as coerced research subjects. Medical trials of this sort took place across the Atlantic world and knowledge of them fluidly crossed imperial and national boundaries. Yero explored who scientific and governmental authorities deemed irrelevant in accounts of vaccination. The recent history of science has revealed the role of the enslaved as non-consenting participants in studies. Yet, this line of thought only reinforced that medical experts of the nineteenth century considered

vaccine experimentation to be a relatively safe endeavor for they would not have undertaken risky research on valuable property (enslaved Africans). By elaborating on the advancement of smallpox vaccination from the perspective of unseen and often unwilling individuals, Yero asked historians to embrace archival fragmentation over absolute archival veracity and to acknowledge that the intentional omission of the dispossessed from documentary records of discovery was an truly Atlantic phenomenon.

At the conclusion of the papers presented by Edwards, Sierra Silva, Soriano, and Yero, a lively question and answer session ensued. The panel wrapped up at 7:00 PM.

### **3. BORDERLANDS AND FRONTIERS STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Chair: Sonia Hernández, Texas A&M University

Secretary: Raúl A. Ramos, University of Houston

The Borderlands and Frontiers Committee convened at the AHA in Chicago on January 4, 2019 hosting a roundtable discussion titled, “The Labors of Latinas across Borders, Region, and Time.” Sonia Hernandez (Texas A&M University) chaired the session, which included three panelists, Sarah McNamara, from Texas A&M University, Lori Flores, from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and Michelle Tellez, from the University of Arizona. Hernandez led the roundtable discussion around a set of questions, asking the panelists to explore the direction of recent scholarship and interrogate the analytical power of research on the intersection of gender, labor, race and nation. In essence, Hernandez set up a *platica* between panelists and the enthusiastic audience.

After introducing the panelists, Hernandez started the discussion by asking each how they define “Latina labor.” Flores used her recent research into Latina and Latino labor in the US northeast to underscore the integrated ways gender is weaved through food production, from food trucks to restaurant ownership. The discussion continued along regional lines as McNamara by noting Latina firsts in the US south. Tellez located labor activism across the border identifying, “transfronteriza activism as a way to oppose the narrative that the border separates, rather the border unites.” Hernandez followed up by raising the border and asking panelists whether the term is more theoretical than material. The panel expanded the question, from Tellez’s real impact of crossing the border, to McNamara noting new points of entry across the nation and Flores highlighting the physical toll of the journey, on that requires a readjustment at almost every state border.

Hernandez turned the conversation to more methodological questions regarding several subjects such as the use of the term Latinx, the engagement and connection with primary sources for research on Latina labor, and the challenges of teaching Mexican American Studies in the current political climate. A couple of the panelists observed a generation gap in the use of Latinx, particularly in the college classroom. Flores felt students appreciated the inclusivity imbedded in the term. On the subject of sources, Tellez connected the power of interviews and



research into trauma on the migrant journey to the ability for scholars to impact policy. McNamara's research similarly entered into migrant spaces in through the position of the *lector* in factories, where orality combined with the global reach of newspapers on the shop floor. In regards to teaching Mexican American Studies, Flores urged the audience to resist collapsing and homogenizing Latina history. She pointed to the media attempts to frame Representative Ocasio-Cortez in traditional Latina tropes as an example of the limitations of past discourse and the promise of new perspectives.

A lively exchange developed between the panelists and the audience. Comments and questions ranged from observations on the composition of panels at the AHA to the importance of mentorship to scholarship. On a final note, one graduate student in the audience commented they were attending their first AHA, finding a sense of belonging from this panel.

#### **4. BRAZILIAN STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Chair: Okezi Otovo

Secretary: Heather F. Roller

On Friday, January 5, 2019, the Brazilian Studies Committee met in Chicago, IL at the joint CLAH and AHA annual meetings. Chair of the committee, M. Kittiya Lee (California State University, Los Angeles) opened the session at 6:00pm and introduced the panelists who spoke to the topic, "New Perspectives on Indigenous Peoples and Modernity."

In "Argumentos jurídicos e políticos apropriados pelos índios da América portuguesa," Carmen Alveal (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte-Natal) examined indigenous land claims in the northern captaincies of Pernambuco, Paraíba, Rio Grande and Ceará from the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries. Analyzing a set of sesmarias granted to indigenous peoples, Alveal found that indigenous grantees were strategic in the range of arguments and claims used to help secure their lands. Astutely wielding their juridical and political knowledge, indigenous sesmeiros utilized arguments common to European sesmaria claimants—such as discovery or defense—along with ones specific to indigenous communities such as the need for land to maintain separation from white society in order to prevent integration into colonial society or to end altercations. Alveal's research into indigenous people who recognized themselves as modern vassals of the crown demonstrates their "making the system" by helping to craft the legalities of colonial land tenure.

Ananya Chakravarti (Georgetown University) shared a piece of her comparative research on indigenous global history. In her broader work, Chakravarti investigates indigenous production and practices of knowledge across time and space. She traces the ongoing tendency of European traditions of thought, including those embedded in global history, to exclude indigenous peoples from a connection to and awareness of the wider world. In her presentation, she asked what it would look like for scholars to carve out space for indigenous people as actors in global history, without flattening indigenous politics. Developing

contemporary and 16<sup>th</sup> century Brazilian examples, Chakravarti argued that indigenous politics and cross-cultural interactions became obscured in grand, elite narratives but, with the appropriate methodologies, scholars can properly recognize the place of indigenous peoples in global history.

In “How Guaraná Became Brazil’s “National” Soda: A Story of Race and Gender,” Seth Garfield (University of Texas at Austin) traced the history of Brazil’s most famous beverage. His exploration of guaraná’s rise to fame from the 1920s forward revealed shifting narratives about modernity and self-fashioning in 20<sup>th</sup> century Brazil. Garfield argued that the study of guaraná evidences changing culinary and social habits but also creative story-telling, urban consumption, and myth-making over time, for example, the myth of fusing indigenous flavor with European tastes. Erased from those myths in 1930s-1940s guaraná advertisements was a history of violence in favor of an apolitical, bourgeois narrative of industrial modernization, popular consumption, nationalism, and economic development. As guaraná advertisements moved away from depictions of health and vitality, freedom, and the sexual availability of indigenous women and more to depictions of leisure, the use of Indian caricatures decreased. Guaraná became a marker of a Brazilian lifestyle. Ultimately, Garfield demonstrated that the story of guaraná and its changing narratives over time illustrates a complex history of the naturalizing of social hierarchies.

Mary Karasch (Professor Emerita, Oakland University) provided comments, praising the panelists for bringing to light crucial reflections on indigenous people’s history particularly in the current political climate where indigenous rights and land security are under serious threat. Following the presentations and commentary, the audience provided additional comments, questions, and discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

## 5. CARIBBEAN STUDIES MEETING

Chair: Quito Swan

Secretary: Devyn Spence Benson

The Caribbean Studies Committee met on Friday, January 4, 2019 at the American Historical Association (AHA)’s annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois. The title of the session was *Forward Ever, Backward Never: Caribbean Migration and Its Impact on Global African Diasporic Movements*. Papers were prepared by Glenn Anthony Chambers (MSU), Janelle Edwards (Penn State University), Delia Fernandez (Michigan State University), and Quito Swan (HU).

Professor Chambers discussed the iconic Latin Jazz saxophonist, bass clarinetist, and flautist Eric Dolphy. Born in 1928 in Los Angeles, California, Dolphy was a contemporary of Jazz greats like John Coltrane. His father was Afro-Panamanian of Jamaican descent and his mother was Costa Rican of Afro-Panamanian descent. Yet, in the popular imagination, Dolphy is remembered as being African-American. Growing up in a bilingual household, his music was replete with

African, Asian, and Caribbean influences. Chambers's paper addressed how Dolphy's embracement of nontraditional musical patterns was related to his own cultural roots that stretched deep into the Caribbean and Central America.

Professor Fernandez's talk focused on Latino labor migration to Michigan in the 1950s. Largely centered on Afro-Puerto Ricans, the paper was centered in the aftermath of the 1947 industrial Act known as Operation Bootstrap. In 1951, the Puerto Rican Agency sent numbers of Puerto Rican laborers to the Grand Rapids. Fernandez detailed the impact of racism and segregation on Michigan's Afro-Puerto Rican communities in the Grand Rapids. Her paper also described how religious and racial identities often helped to craft a sense of Puerto Rican identity beyond *mestizaje*. This also was influenced by an intentional push for "consciousness raising" about Puerto Rican nationhood in the 1970s. In 2022, the release of census records from the era will detail more about how the state described this community.

Professor Swan's paper detailed West Indian migration to Bermuda around the turn of the twentieth century. West Indians laborers came to the island in significant numbers to work on the construction of the British Government's military dockyard. By far the largest community was from St. Kitts. For Bermuda's white Government, the presence of these "colored West Indians" was both "undesirable" and also a "necessary evil." The paper demonstrated how the experiences of this West Indian community greatly informed the intersecting complexities of race, whiteness, pan-Africanism, black protest, colonialism, labor and immigration in Bermuda.

Professor Edwards was not able to attend. Chambers, as chair of the session, read her paper. Her paper focused on West Indian immigrants in New Bedford, Massachusetts.

By exploring a less-studied Caribbean migration pattern, the paper explored the informal familial and kinship networks of the city's West Indian enclave. Her paper aimed to disrupt a lingering historiography of Caribbean migration to cities such as New York, and presented relatively unexplored strategies of integration, alternate community organizing strategies and assimilation for West Indians in the United States.

This was followed by an engaging question and answer period with the audience.

## **6. CENTRAL AMERICAN STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Chair: Kevin Coleman

Secretary: David Díaz Arias

"Archives: Lies, Obstruction, and Possibility" was the theme for this year's meeting of the Central America Section. Our Chair, Heather Vrana, opened the meeting by inviting us to think about transcription and translation within the broader context of advocacy for unaccompanied minors from Central America. Vrana noted that for 2019, the Central America Section will have Kevin Coleman serving as Chair and David Díaz Arias as Secretary. She then turned it over to our invited panelists: Dain Borges, David Díaz Arias, Suyapa Portillo, Lara Putnam, and Kirsten Weld.

“It is hard to use the word ‘archive’ in a conversation with an academic,” noted Dain Borges of the University of Chicago. For some, Borges continued, the word “archive” is a metaphor, for others it’s a discursive apparatus that conditions what can be said. But for historians, archives have always been things that actually exist and which are, at least in the region of the world where most of us do research, precarious. The fire in the Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro in 2018 was no fluke. Other archives, such as those of notaries or the Catholic Church, were set up to serve non-scholarly constituencies and remain difficult to access. “To get access to the archdiocesan archive in Salvador Bahia,” Borges recounted, “I had to wait until Padre Pithon died!” He added, “when it was opened to historians, the new archivist was a benevolent Catholic historian, there was a reading table with a velvet table cloth, and the rich matrimonial case files, with love letters sewn into the petitions, available for consultation.” Borges views the political upheavals that surround our archival adventures as constitutive of new moments of opening. Rather than wait for some perfect, orderly, peaceable society and its archive, Borges reminds us that saving records is an institutional mechanism for the impossible task of defeating “entropy and chaos.”

From there, David Díaz Arias of the Universidad de Costa Rica shifted the conversation to a consideration of the relationship between judicial systems and archival collections. Costa Rica’s long tradition of democratic stability has attracted researchers who come to the National Archives and the National Library, often with the aim of explaining why the country is comparatively exceptional. But Díaz Arias suggests, the archives themselves have been set up to reinforce this narrative of exceptionality, social inclusivity, and political peace. For example, the Civil War of 1948 was characterized by repression of the defeated groups by the victors, the followers of José Figueres. The persecution marked those who experienced it as well as their children, and was institutionally sanctioned through the creation of special courtrooms to try their political enemies. Or, consider the case of Vivian Gallardo, accused by the state of “terrorism” and held in a small, cold prison cell. In July 1981, Corporal José Manuel Bolaños Quesada opened fire on her while she was imprisoned, shocking the public. But despite how well known this case is, the files on it were lost in the archives until a researcher accidentally discovered them with papers on the nineteenth century, among documents catalogued as “national celebrations.” “How do you do research in an embattled country that has not seen real peace or participatory democracy?”

This was the question that Suyapa Portillo of Pitzer College used to organize her reflections on conducting research in Honduras. Her own family lived under dictatorship in Honduras and fled political persecution. In the wake of the 2009 coup d’état that unleashed a period of extraordinary violence against ordinary Hondurans and now in solidarity with the migrants fleeing the country in caravans, Portillo has repeatedly asked herself: “How do I not engage as a queer feminist, as a Honduran?” If these two aspects of her identity compel a commitment to political organizing, they have also made Portillo vulnerable as a researcher in Honduras. As a cultural insider, she enjoys a degree of privilege, including historical family links to the Liberal Party and Ramón Villeda Morales. But as a woman and an outsider, she has been the target of

sexual harassment in the archives and has been denied access to archives that her male and/or white colleagues have been granted access.

Lara Putnam of the University of Pittsburgh further expanded upon this theme of the embodied historian, turning it into a broader reflection on the methodological advantages of historical research. In her words: I was interested in attending to the history of Limón, and was arriving as someone who was married to a Costa Rican man and as a newly minted mother. My research was dictated from the start by the location of the grandmothers in question: Cambridge, Massachusetts and San José, Costa Rica. If you think about the locations of these grandmothers, of course I ended up studying the United Fruit Company! There's a Venn diagram of information capture that says something meaningful about turn-of-the-century Central America, because there was the United Fruit Company collecting documents that ended up in the Baker Library at Harvard, the excavation of banana plantations created these dense networks around archaeology that also tied Harvard archaeologists to Costa Rica in particular. My dissertation research about reproductive labor was shaped both by tracing these arcs of information and my own reproductive labor. Putnam described the historian's work within the archive as that of producing historical ethnographies of institutional formation that are at once necessary for our research and rarely explicitly discussed. As we navigate the finding aids and systems of cataloguing, "we routinely reconstruct whole histories of state formation (of state unformation? deformation?)." But because this artisanal practice often goes uncommented on, historians lay ourselves open to the complaint that emplaced archival research is not efficient. We need to be able to articulate just how valuable the classic archival practice of historians is. Putnam was able to write an innovative history of prostitution because of the Boston-San José link, the mother-in-law and the toddlers at home, and the time to go back to the archive every day for hours at a time. Only then could she use the police department's original *fichero* to gain disproportionate insight into the lives of working women in Limón, which came to her not primarily through the state's interest in their sex lives, but through the policing of public spaces and these women's own interest in having the state occasionally adjudicate over their economic lives. In an important way, her own reproductive history enabled her to generate new knowledge about the past through the slow and steady application of our discipline's foundational method.

From a discussion of the indispensable nature of institutional archives, Kirsten Weld of Harvard University pivoted to contemplate their future. She noted that "doing research in Central America has to structurally depend much less on national archival institutions than doing research in say, France or England or the United States." She traced the origins of the national archive back to the French Revolution and the ideal of an institution that could render the affairs of state transparent to a democratic public. But, she noted, "if we index the health and vitality of a national archival institution to the functionality of a nation state, then you have to look at Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras right now and consider the functionality of those nation states, and ask what about the future of these national archival institutions that are murderously underfunded and brutally neglected?" She noted that in Guatemala, for example, the Archivo Nacional has not taken in a new document since the late 1960s, and that its budget line from the National Congress has been zero. With a parting question, Weld turned it over the

audience: “Does this change the way a Central Americanist does research, as opposed to an Other-Part-of-the-Worldist?”

## 7. CHILE-RÍO DE LA PLATA STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Chair: Julia Sarreal

Secretary: Marian Schlotterbeck

The Chile-Río de la Plata Section of the Conference on Latin American History held a roundtable at the American Historical Association Annual meeting in Chicago and discussed ongoing issues for the section. The organizers of the roundtable, Dr. Jennifer Adair, the chair of the section, and Dr. Julia Sarreal, the secretary, called the roundtable “New Environmental Histories of Chile-Río de la Plata.” Through the roundtable, panelists sought to recognize the insights of previous scholarship on this theme, while simultaneously seeking to discover new and emerging avenues of scholarship. As indicated in the abstract for the session, the roundtable brought together scholars working on Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, and Chile from the late colonial period up through the end of the twentieth century. The presentations reflected an expanding range of concerns and methodologies in the growing field of environmental history. The presenters called attention to topics as varied as ecological change driven by population growth and resource extraction, water disputes along border regions, animals and trade, and disaster development. By emphasizing similarities while remaining attentive to local historical particularities, the presentations illuminated the possibilities of new historical studies of nature, the environment, and climate change throughout the region.

We organized the roundtable to have seven participants, including Dr. Adair and Dr. Sarreal. The other participants included: Dr. Alison Bruey (University of North Florida); Rob Christensen, (ABD, Georgetown University); Dr. Federico Freitas (North Carolina State University); Dr. Thomas Miller Klubock (University of Virginia); and Dr. John Soluri (Carnegie Mellon University). Unfortunately, two of the participants were unable to come to the roundtable: Dr. Adair was on maternity leave and unable to travel. Dr. Bruey was on sabbatical leave in Chile and unable to make the trip to Chicago. Despite the absences, we held the roundtable, with an audience attendance of approximately 20 people. The audience included a range of academics at very different points in their careers, from graduate students to senior scholars. Dr. Sarreal chaired the session and moderated the discussion afterward.

Dr. Freitas presented his research on how Argentina and Brazil pioneered the use of national parks as tools of frontier development and border control. His comments were based on his current book project, which tracks almost one hundred years of national park history, and outlines the changes in environmental and territorial policies in Latin America’s two largest countries—from early twentieth-century bids to project power over contested borderlands to the adoption of an international conservation paradigm in the post-war era. Dr. Klubock discussed research for his new book project on the history of rivers, water, and water wars in Chile. His comments focused on one chapter, which describes the ecological crises caused by copper mining in Chile’s Cachapoal Valley, one of central Chile’s most fertile agricultural regions

and a primary source of agricultural goods for the capital city of Santiago. Rob Christensen's presentation was entitled, "Written in the Sand: Foundations for Climate History in Chile and the Río de la Plata." His comments focused on his current research on indigenous people and the changing environments of 19<sup>th</sup> century Argentina, centering on climate change, historical epidemiology, and stock raising. Dr. Soluri's presentation was entitled "Guanacos, Sheep and the Politics of Animals." His comments focused on his current project, which is centered on animals, markets, borders, and environmental change in southern Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego from 1800-2000.

Following the presentations, the participants fielded a series of comments and questions from the audience. Dr. Sarreal moderated the discussion. Dr. Sarreal also posed several questions to the panelists, including: How does the environmental history of Chile and the Río de la Plata region fit with what is happening more broadly in the field beyond our geographic region? What is innovative about our approach? What have we not yet taken on? Are there unique challenges or special opportunities facing environmental historians of our particular region? Panelists and audience members responded to these questions noting the range of diversity among Latin American environmental historians, who have also brought a welcome social history approach to the field. Other participants noted how environmental history is much stronger in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico, as compared to Chile and Argentina. One audience member also mentioned the importance of gendered histories of the environment and also took note of the gender imbalance of the panel, a regrettable occurrence due to the absence of Dr. Adair and Dr. Bruey. Nonetheless, the panel topic sparked a lively and productive discussion among the presenters and between the audience, which carried over into the hall.

## **8. COLONIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Chair: Alex Hidalgo

Secretary: Alcira Dueñas

### **"Tuning the Colonial Survey"**

The survey of colonial Latin America represents the most important point of contact between colonial Latin Americanists and a wide range of history and non-history students. As a sub-discipline, however, we seldom talk about the challenges and opportunities teaching this introductory course brings us as scholars and teachers. The ongoing attack on the humanities, the rise of fake news and "alternative facts," and the continued targeting of immigrants, women, and religious minorities makes all the more urgent to discuss what can we do and say about the way the past shapes our present, about the tools we hone to read sources, and how we should connect the colonial survey with the nature of patriarchy, race, religion, and power.

The three panelists participating in the round table were: Anna Schapochnik (Associate Professor, DePaul University), Alcira Dueñas (Associate Professor, Ohio State University Newark), and Adam Warren (Associate Professor, University of Washington). Due to

extenuating circumstances, the coordinator Alex Hidalgo was not able to attend the meeting. After the introduction (paragraph above prepared by Alex, along with the specific points to be discussed next), the panelists offered various perspectives about how the colonial survey could tackle the pressing contemporary issues mentioned through alternative uses of sources and methods, how to incorporate research in this survey, themes, and new pedagogy, including rethinking exams and other forms of evaluation.

Regarding teaching, there was an agreement that the traditional lecture-based survey with a weekly discussion session should be rethought. More time for discussion and less time for lecture seems to be the suggestion based on the question: what are the skills we want the students to acquire. Critical thinking and making the connections between the past and the present are more easily developed during discussions. We need to be creative and rigorous at the same time about the reading assignments prior to discussions. The question remains, how to make sure the students complete the readings?

About Sources: To relativize the traditional categories of conqueror and conquered, perpetrator and victim, Native Conquistador: Alva Ixtlilxochitl's Account of the Conquest of New Spain, by Alva Ixtlilxochitl. This source is also useful to learn the construction and complexity of native identity in Mesoamérica during the years of early contact. Mathew Restall and Kris Lane's textbook was also recommended. Short primary sources were also suggested.

About method: A key question helpful to use throughout the course is: how do we know what we know? This always points to critical analysis of sources, thorough contexts of the past events and contexts of present events connected. This is an excellent opportunity to teach the students meaningful aspects of how historians do their craft, and how what they do are also narratives of the past. This exercise would greatly help to connect to the present issue of how the information in the news is also produced, how it is distributed, how it does circulate, and how rumors can turn into real history. This practice tackles directly the issue of fake news today.

Suggestions: always emphasize that the role of history is to challenge the simplification of reality past and present; to explore the construction of reality; and to destabilize the assumptions we have about the world. A more critical question to ask the students at the end of each class could be: To what extent colonialism has come to an end? Assess the colonial legacy at the end of the course with theories of colonialism such as Anibal Quijano on Coloniality of power and Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui on internal colonialism. Perhaps juxtapose with Patrick Wolfe.

About incorporating research in this survey: The students that usually take the colonial survey course are primarily first year students who may or may not have good research skills. There are online interactive platforms where students at every level can engage in small research projects, which are part of larger projects. Zooniverse and Wikipedia were mentioned as examples. The lack of language skills in Spanish was mentioned as a hindrance to incorporate research exercises in the colonial survey.



To help connect the colonial past with the present, suggestions were also given such as start the class with an image and ask the students directly what is familiar and what is unfamiliar about the image and take up the class from there. To hone critical analysis, for each theme of the survey, always ask the question, is this order natural? What is the place of this theme in the present?

Themes and sources to discuss diversity and racism: Talk about indigenous peoples today and, for example, find examples of indigenous intellectuals past and present and compare constraints and agency over time.

Key themes to discuss racist stereotypes in historiography and in the contemporary discourses: cannibalism; human sacrifice; pureza de sangre; and others. Sources were suggested such as Neil Whitehead's *Of Cannibals and Kings: Primal Anthropology in the America's* for sources on indigenous Caribbean populations (Aruaca and Caribe) during early contact. These are key readings to learn the views of each other by Spaniards and Indigenous peoples.

Neil Whitehead, *The Conquest on Trial*, Michael Graulich's "Aztec human sacrifice as expiation" as well as David Carrasco's chapter on Human Sacrifice in *The Daily Life of the Aztecs* were also recommended as sources showing the complexity of the intercultural experience and also useful to deconstruct the most common stereotypes Europeans created about indigenous peoples.

## 9. GRAN COLOMBIA STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Chair: Pablo F. Gomez

Secretary: Stefan Pohl

### **"Historians Facing a Contentious Present in Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Panama"**

Moderator: Kevin Coleman, University of Toronto

The Gran Colombia Studies Committee met on Saturday, January 5, 2019, at the joint CLAH and AHA annual meeting. The chair of the Committee, Catalina Muñoz, invited a group of historians to reflect on the recent political and social histories of Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, and the types of engagements historians have with human rights advocates, and community activists and organizations in these countries. Rather than formal papers, the session was structured as a roundtable with animated exchanges between the panelists and the audience.

Kevin Coleman, the moderator, opened up the roundtable with short introductions of the presenters and explained that Marixa Lasso (one of the panelists) could not attend the AHA/CLAH meeting. Catalina Muñoz followed with welcoming remarks. She framed the ensuing conversation around the themes described above and exhorted the presenters to

reflect on how their work as historians engages with the turbulent social and political conditions appearing during the last decades in the region. Catalina also invited the panelists to elaborate on the importance that the public-facing aspects of their work have for their intellectual projects.

Miguel Tinker Salas began his remarks by discussing the history of oil production in Venezuela and the relationship of this history to the structural conditions that have conditioned its current political and social crisis. He pointed out that Venezuela, in spite of the abundant mediatic attention that the country has received from US media during the past few years, remains, paradoxically, a mostly understudied country within US academia with very few faculty devoted explicitly to the study of Venezuelan history. Partially because of this, Venezuela and Venezuelans frequently appear in the public (and scholarly) discourse as tropes to reflect on the possibilities and failures of political reform in the region. With the arrival of Hugo Chavez, for example, the Venezuelan case was promoted by many scholars in Latin America and the United States as a model of exceptionalism and as a model of the imagination of left-leaning social-democracies in the continent. Yet, after the collapse of the Venezuelan economy and the rise of violence and political instability in the wake of Chavez's death, Venezuela has appeared in the hemispheric public discourse as an example the perils of economies and societies built on the riches, and hubris, of oil-dependent economies.

In his presentation, Marc Becker discussed his experiences working with Ecuadorian indigenous communities in the early 1990s, and the complex political and ethical positionality of US researchers studying and working with indigenous movements in Latin American countries. Many of the indigenous activists with whom Marc worked back in the 90s have made political choices that seemed to contravene what US academics believe is "best" for their communities both in political and economic terms. Indigenous movements, Marc reminded us, are multivocal. And it is a mistake to make any assumptions about the types of political and social choices that Indigenous communities and activists make when dealing with the challenges of Neoliberalism and globalization.

Luis Van Isschot shared with the group his experience first as a Human-Rights advocate and later as a historian studying political activism and violence in the oil-producing region around the Magdalena river in central Colombia. During his presentation, Luis made emphasis on the long tradition of socially-engaged scholarship in Colombia, and on the importance of projects of historical memory carried out not only by historians, but also, crucially, by social activists in some of the communities affected by the decades-long civil war from which the country has (only apparently) been emerging in the past few years. The continuous factiousness that characterizes Colombian society, Luis explained, and the unfinished nature of the peace accord between the FARC and the Colombian government is made evident by the continued assassination of labor activists in the country, the persistent inequality and concentration of wealth and land (unaddressed in the peace process), and the stigmatization of large segments of the population by right-wing politicians that have equated social activism with insurgency. Luis talked about how Colombian scholar and activist responses to these politically-driven strategies of disruption and division have focused on the recuperation of specific, and oft-

forgotten, material and documentary histories related to the war. The so-called “violentología” literature for example, already includes more than one hundred monographs. Luis reminded the group that this scholarly academic production is only the best-known type of intellectual engagement with the complex history of the civil war that has engulfed the country during the past five decades. Far less recognized has been the work performed by a multitude of Human Right activists and organizations of which the most prominent example is the Centro de Investigación y Educación Popular Programa Por la Paz (CINEP). The CINEP has been developing several projects of recovery and preservation of the historical memory of the war in a remarkable example of the crucial historical labor carried out by what Luis calls “counter-hegemonic” civil society organizations.

Catalina Muñoz finished the opening round of panelists’ remarks by emphasizing the “ahistorical” nature of the public discussion about the Colombian peaceaccord process and the referendum that sought to give popular legitimacy to it in 2016. Historians and their work, Catalina underscored, were mostly absent in the public debate about the historical conditions and circumstances shaping this historical event, and possible avenues for shaping negotiations for the demobilization of the FARC, their return to civil society, and the reckoning with decades of political violence against political activists and communities across the country. Catalina explained how, together with a group of colleagues and students from Los Andes, she has sought to start readdressing the absences of historians’ voices (and historical work) in conversations about the remaking of the social and political fabric of the country in the aftermath of the peace agreement, by establishing “conversatorios” in public libraries in Bogotá and other municipalities in Colombia.

An animated conversation ensued between the audience and the panelists after the presentations. During it, participants remarked on the challenges that historians interested in actively participating in public debates about politics both in the United States and in Latin America face. Members of the panel and the audience also shared strategies they have used to effectively partake in the broader political conversation through different types of media outlets.



## 10. MEXICAN STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Chair: Peter B. Villella

Secretary: Pablo M. Sierra Silva

### “Gender in Mexican History: How Are We Doing?”

The Mexican Studies Committee convened in Chicago to reflect upon the current state and trajectory of professional historical scholarship and pedagogy on women in Mexico. The chair, Dana Velasco Murillo, opened the discussion with several simple, yet profound questions: with regards to Mexican women’s history, what are we doing well, what are we doing poorly, what are we talking about, and what do we need to talk about (but aren’t)? Each panelist offered informal commentary punctuated with audience feedback and questions. The conversation that ensued was lively and productive. Overall, it celebrated the maturation of the contemporary field of Mexican women’s history, now several decades old, while acknowledging its continued relevance amid challenges both old and new. Panelists and attendees cited the widespread persistence of hoary falsehoods about Mexican women among peers, students, and the broader public, and acknowledged the need, moving forward, for the field to respond to and integrate new scholarly approaches arising from queer and gender studies.

Silvia Arrom opened the discussion with an overview of the field since the publication of Asunción Lavrin’s seminal *Latin American Women* in 1978. Arrom hailed the great progress and increasing sophistication that has occurred in the ensuing decades, yet

also highlighted the problem of “zombie theories” that continue to haunt professional scholarship: stereotypes about Latin American and Mexican women that, despite forty years of accumulating evidence to the contrary, simply refuse to die. Arrom specified several zombie theories and openly wondered at the reasons for the longevity of each one. Some are simple factual misconceptions; sor Juana de la Cruz, for example, was not silenced by the Church, nor did colonial women have the legal status of children. Other zombie theories seem to be perpetuated less by factual errors than from entrenched historiographical habits. For example, women in colonial Mexico were hardly passive, and it is misleading to regard women who engaged in commerce, labor, and public discourse as necessarily “exceptional” or indicative of some newly emerging phenomenon. Arrom openly wondered if, on some subconscious level, we want such stereotypes to be true, which would explain their imperviousness to contrary data. She suggested that the subtle but tenacious legacies of the Black Legend, nineteenth-century liberal historiography, and US chauvinism *vis à vis* Mexico likely play a role here, as does the tendency to structure historical narratives according to overly simple calculations of “progress” or “regress” regarding the condition of women over time. Arrom concluded by noting that, after forty years of superb scholarship, we are nonetheless “still fighting zombies.”

Next, Mónica Díaz addressed contemporary research into religious women during Mexico’s colonial period. She likewise placed the origins of the contemporary field in the 1980s with the pathbreaking works of Lavrin as well as those of fellow panelists Patricia Seed and Silvia Arrom. Díaz noted how they were among the first historians to address Mexican women systematically and rigorously at a time when writing about women was, by definition, a politically substantial act of resistance. The field has flourished ever since, paralleling developments in the history of women elsewhere by encompassing ever more issues, such as family, sexuality, convents, witchcraft, healing, and ethnicity and race. Díaz also echoed Arrom’s concern with zombie theories, highlighting one such misperception from her own subfield that regards religious women in the colonial period as necessarily elite or otherwise exceptional. Not true, she argued, as beyond the most visible population of veiled, convent-based nuns were diverse women—*beatas* and laywomen, rich and poor, native, Afro-Mexican, and mestiza—whose crucial formal and informal contributions enabled the day-to-day functioning of Mexican religious and civic life. Highlighting the work of Margaret Chowning and Kathryn Burns as exemplars, Díaz called on religious historians to de-isolate the convent to acknowledge and address its extensive links to the broader lay society, including non-elite women, to which it belonged. Díaz also lauded ongoing efforts to problematize and historicize the archive itself, arguing that such methodological innovations are essential to illuminating the historical lives of women that are otherwise systematically obscured by archives.

Next, Nicole von Germeten considered the state of the field holistically, and identified several trends, some positive and others less so. Likewise pointing to Seed and Arrom’s work from the 1980s as establishing the methodological and conceptual foundations for the field, she noted that one of its primary objectives has always been to reveal the

choices and actions of Mexican women through time, thereby dispelling negative stereotypes of female passivity and silence. Tracing the subsequent development of the field, she noted that new theories emerging from gender and queer studies have benefitted women's history by enabling scholars to perceive and describe more profound dimensions of women's experiences, such as sexual thoughts and desires. Nonetheless, von Germeten also lamented the persistence of an unbalanced discourse that, in stressing the pervasiveness of patriarchy, can sometimes disregard women's volition, thereby rendering invisible the role of women in the unfolding of history. She cited Karen Vieira Powers, who in 2002 critically examined the language scholars use to address women, revealing how seemingly gender-neutral analyses can unintentionally reproduce anti-women discourses of victimhood and shame, representing them either as the passive objects of male actions or as opportunistic and wanton *malinchistas*. Von Germeten concluded by declaring the necessity of constructive criticism—from both peers and self—in striking the right balance between the need to account for both oppression and agency, and offered examples of some “vulnerable moments” from her own work.

Margarita Ochoa spoke next, and began by citing recent events in US politics that illustrate the ongoing critical need for women's history. She also called on the audience to consider the cultural and educational roots of our culture's attachment to Arrom's “zombie theories.” She noted that Bartolomé de Las Casas and the Black Legend form the core of how many high school students in the US are introduced to Latin American history; this can result in a sophomoric and self-congratulatory cynicism toward the region in which the trope of female powerlessness becomes a deeply rooted assumption difficult to dislodge. Ochoa then considered the state of the field in light of a misleadingly simple question posed to her by a student: “what were the dominant gender norms of colonial Mexico?” Ochoa used this unanswerable question to call attention to the breadth of the range of women's experiences in Mexico and to consider the parameters by which we distinguish them from one another, from class and ethnicity to region and the role of law. In doing so, she reminded the audience that there is no one single “Mexican women's history.” Rather, there is a rich, complicated, and varied array of histories as diverse as Mexico itself.

Patricia Seed gave the final *charla*, one more personal and introspective. To highlight the broader cultural and political conditions that helped inspire the emergence of women's history as a major subfield in the discipline, she spoke frankly about her own family background and how it influenced her to become academically interested in women's lives as “a definitively feminist approach to history.” In this spirit, she reflected on her current work on the history of cartography and noted that her research is increasingly drawn toward women, great minds and achievers, who were prevented on gendered grounds from fully realizing their genius or whose contributions to science have gone largely unheralded until now.

During the session, the audience enjoyed wine generously provided by Velasco and took

opportunities to reflect on the panelists' observations and pose questions of their own. Several topics were salient. First was the issue of the precise contours and links between "women's history" and "gender history." There was a broad consensus that, while linked, these two fields are not the same; indeed, Silvia Arrom described a Venn diagram in which women's history and gender history overlap substantially but are by no means equivalent. The panelists agreed that the insights of gender history—such as efforts to "queer the archive"—can enrich women's history, especially with regards to studies of sexuality. At the same time, they wondered if the theoretical innovations of gender history have sometimes outstripped the conventionally understood parameters of "women's history." This may lead some scholars to overlook the fact that, despite forty years of advances, much empirical work remains to be done to uncover and detail the lived experiences of those perceived as women in Mexican history: where they lived, where they worked, and the extent of their freedom and what they did with it.

The attendees also discussed strategies for dealing with zombie theories and other antiquated notions regarding women in Mexican history, in both scholarship and undergraduate education. It was suggested that changing times call for changing pedagogy; whereas in the past students were frequently underinformed about historical injustices against women, undergraduates today are typically quite attuned to and familiar with feminist criticisms of patriarchy, often keenly so. The danger, therefore, is less a blindness to patriarchy than the opposite, the inclination to define historical women precisely in terms of passivity and abject victimhood—one of the most pervasive and disempowering tropes that women's history works to dispel. Arrom in particular called on scholars to avoid singular narratives of progress and regress—the temptation to cleanly state whether "things got better" or "things got worse" during a particular historical period—as such narratives can easily become essentializing and misleading. The panel was a success; while we are "still fighting zombies," the field of women's history in Mexico, mature and thriving, stands on solid intellectual and methodological ground and is well-situated to continue its work into the future.

## **11. TEACHING AND TEACHING MATERIALS COMMITTEE MEETING**

Chair: Jethro Hernández Berrones

Secretary: Corinna Zeltsmann

This year the meeting examined the promises, challenges, and perils of introducing social media and other digital platforms in the Latin American History classroom. Digital technologies have reduced the time and distance academics and students of history invest in accessing, sharing, and delivering information. At the same time, the public has traditionally identified historians and their practice with orthodox sources from which they gather information to discover and interpret the past. These sources usually include documents, books, and—more recently—media, generally secluded in obscure and sometimes hidden archives. The digital era, however, has changed the way historians work and engage with their audiences, including their

immediate ones, students. For this reason, the committee invited two historians who have incorporated digital technologies in their courses to share their experiences using social media, Wikipedia, and other digital tools in the classroom. Dr. Brandon Morgan, from Central New Mexico Community College and Western New Mexico University, presented a talk titled “We’re using Twitter in this class!?!” and Dr. Corina Zeltsmann, from Georgia Southern University, gave a presentation for “Engaging Digital Communities of Practice and Public History through Wikipedia”.

Amanda M. López opened the session announcing this year’s CLAH Syllabus Prize. Aiala Levy, from University of Scranton, received the prize for the best syllabus in Colonial Latin American History submitted to H-LATAM. Dr. Levy’s syllabus balances coverage of historical content with innovative pedagogical approaches. In line with this year’s meeting theme, the syllabus uses traditional sources and modern digital technologies for reading and writing assignments. The committee was impressed with activities and assignments that encouraged self-reflection, collaborative, and innovative learning. These included workshops on Google Docs, carrying out interviews, and cultural competency, which prepared them for assignments such as group reading notes and an oral history project. Congratulations Dr. Levy! The committee encourages CLAH members to participate on next year’s prize. Submit your 20<sup>th</sup>-century-Latin-America syllabi to H-LATAM on any theme during 2019 to participate!!!

Next, Dr. López introduced the session highlighting the relevance of digital humanities for the profession and the American Historical Association’s efforts to support the digital turn in history. The world has changed, she commented, and in this world, students who populate history courses are, for the most part, not history majors. How can historians engage tools that allow students be critical of the wealth of information they have at the tip of their fingers? How can digital technologies be a tool to engage with skills students have developed formally or informally? How can historians use these technologies to enhance students’ appreciation of history as a discipline and as a set of toolbox of critical skills? Dr. López delineated four major issues instructors should consider when adopting digital pedagogies in the classroom. Digital tools are an opportunity to make students digitally literate. They add to the repertoire of skills going into the job market—not necessarily as history majors. Access to digital tools differ and their incorporation in the classroom should not reinforce or increase equity disparities. And digital tools should make Latin America more accessible and relevant to students in the US. These issues guided the questions and discussion that followed up the presentations.

Dr. Morgan shared his experiences creating an online course. Moving online came as an institutional opportunity to deal with lower enrollments. The guiding principle he followed in adapting his traditional course was keeping online interactions similar to the ones in the classroom. Since his courses are based on the Critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire, he uses digital tools to promote and enhance this particular pedagogical approach. In this sense, Dr. Morgan emphasized that using digital platforms in the classroom is like any other teaching technology. Instructors should introduce them framing what platforms are being used, how, and why. Technology should not be used for the sake of it. Therefore, Dr. Morgan emphasized the need to make expectations clear. Expectations such as the ability to use digital tools, the different



learning curves of different digital platforms, and the challenges and potential consequences of using completely public forums such as twitter. Dr. Morgan offered some examples such as creating a hashtag for the class, using reading tweets instead of reading quizzes, and creating timelines with Tiki-taki. If you want to look at the design and outcomes of some of his course assignments that include digital tools, go to <https://bit.ly/2Q8MWXb>.

Dr. Zeltsman shared with the audience a Wikipedia assignment for her Modern Latin American History course. This assignment provides an opportunity to create “communities of practice” where students learn useful skills for a major in the humanities, such as defining a research topic, finding sources, and writing for an audience that is not the professor. The Wikipedia platform offers a concentric network of participants to which students integrate slowly, increasing their participation level. The platform offers professors a model they may use to structure the assignment. They and their students take advantage of resources, such as tables that prioritize reliable sources and content and style editors, available to facilitate the adequate completion of the assignment. Dr. Zeltsman values this platform because it engages students in the dynamic of knowledge production, allowing them to have exchanges with members of the community and gain an audience in time. Instructionally, the platform offers assignment adaptability, according to students’ or the professor’s needs. She also identified some challenges such as the variety of students’ skill backgrounds, which require more or less mentoring, the identification of plagiarism, which is less fatal to students, and the overwhelmed Wikipedia’s education section, which takes too long to get back to professors’ inquiries. You may find her presentation slides in at <https://bit.ly/2CF7AKW>.

The session concluded with Q&A. Attendants asked specifics about particular assignments and shared some additional tools such as Timelinemaps.org and the Adobe Spark Project. Discussion and debate progressed towards the challenges of using social media that spread misconceptions about Latinx communities. The well-attended session concluded with an invitation to join us in next years’ meeting.

## VI. CLAH 2018 PRIZE AND AWARD RECIPIENTS AND CITATIONS

**NOTE: The 2018 Distinguished Service Award winner and James R. Scobie Prize recipients were announced and honored in the Fall 2018 Newsletter**

For the 2019 Calls for Prizes, please see [http://clah.h-net.org/?page\\_id=60](http://clah.h-net.org/?page_id=60)

### BOLTON-JOHNSON MEMORIAL PRIZE

The Bolton prize was established in 1956. It was enhanced in 2000 by a generous donation from Dr. John J. Johnson and is now the Bolton-Johnson Prize. It carries a stipend of \$1,000. The Bolton-Johnson Prize is awarded for the best book in English on any significant aspect of Latin American History that is published anywhere during the imprint year previous to the year of the award. Sound scholarship, grace of style, and importance of the scholarly contribution are among the criteria for the award. Normally not considered for the award are translations, anthologies of selections by several authors, reprints or re-editions or works published previously, and works not primarily historiographical in aim or content. An Honorable Mention Award may be made for an additional distinguished work deemed worthy by the Bolton-Johnson Prize Committee. It carries a stipend of \$200.

2018 Committee:

Shawn Miller (chair)

Edward Murphy

Marcela Echeverri

**2018 Winner:**

**Peter Guardino, *The Dead March: A History of the Mexican-American War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.**

In this ambitious book, Guardino revisits themes of major importance to the national historiographies of the US and Mexico and criticizes enduring misconceptions about the war. Breaking away from military history's standard battle narratives, Guardino deploys a sophisticated social history approach to the war, based on magisterial research. He uses new material to study Mexican and American nationalisms in the mid-nineteenth century through multiple actors and offers a brilliant analysis to characterize the common soldiers on both sides of the battle lines; who these men were and what motivated them. In considering issues of religion, gender and race, he offers an original interpretation of the war's meaning and its outcome.

Well written, balanced, and intimate, *The Dead March* is a pleasure to read and often fascinating. Not only does Guardino develop a social and cultural history of the war's international dimensions; he reperiodizes the history of Mexican nationalism, showing its pre-revolutionary potency. At the same time, he challenges common ideas about US

exceptionalism – specifically the notion that the US won the war as a result of its superior political institutional foundations.

*The Dead March* is an authoritative, multifaceted work that changes the field of US-Mexican relations, a book that everyone should read.

### **Honorable Mention**

Pablo F. Gómez, *The Experiential Caribbean: Creating Knowledge and Healing in the Early Modern Atlantic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.

The *Experiential Caribbean* tells a deeply human story bound in early-modern anxieties about nature and sickness. Pablo Gómez argues provocatively that Afro-Caribbean medical practitioners were not just potent competitors to an emerging medical science but were also unacknowledged contributors. Unbound by authoritative texts, healers, he suggests, engaged in empirical practices that presented visible cures to the region's formidable diseases, pointing to the universality of the human body in all races and spaces. The book's conceptual breadth pioneers new approaches to the histories of medicine, to conceptions of race, and to the movements of ideas across imperial boundaries.

### **WARREN DEAN MEMORIAL PRIZE IN BRAZILIAN HISTORY**

The Warren Dean Memorial Prize was established in 1995 and carries a stipend of \$500. It recognizes the book or article judged to be the most significant work on the history of Brazil published in English during the year prior to the award year. Publications by scholars other than historians will be considered as long as the work has substantial historical content. Comparative works (e. g. on Brazil and another country) will be eligible as long as they include a substantial amount of material on Brazil.

### **2018 Committee:**

Ben Cowan (chair)

Teresa Cribelli

Mieko Nishida

**Winner: Patricia Acerbi. *Street Occupations: Urban Vending in Rio de Janeiro, 1850-1925*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2017.**

Amid a very impressive field of submissions, Patrícia Acerbi's brilliant *Street Occupations: Urban Vending in Rio de Janeiro, 1850–1925* stood out to the committee for its contributions to several critical areas, including the histories of Brazil, of race, of labor, and of slavery and emancipation in the Americas. Acerbi's book uses a wide-ranging source base (from vendor licenses to police records and from journalism to patent applications) to expand our understanding of what happened to particular populations and forms of work in the aftermath

of emancipation. *Street Occupations* demonstrates how immigrant street vendors actively participated in the construction of employment, rights, freedom, and citizenship in late imperial and early Republican Brazil. Acerbi's arguments resonate not only as a re-thinking of the dynamics of emancipation and citizenship in Brazil, but as an illuminating history of the development of informal labor (and its interconnections with race, class, marginalization, and policing)—which remains central to, and contentious within, Brazilian and Latin American economies and societies.

### **HOWARD F. CLINE MEMORIAL PRIZE**

The Howard F. Cline Prize was established in 1976. It carries a stipend of \$500. The Howard F. Cline Memorial Prize is awarded biennially to the book or article in English, German, or a Romance language judged to make the most significant contribution to the history of Indians in Latin America, referring to any time before the immediate present. Items appearing in the two calendar years just preceding may be considered for a given year's award. Hence, items published in 2017 and 2018 will be considered for the award year 2019 (awarded at the meeting in January 2020).

### **Next award made 2019**

### **MARIA ELENA MARTINEZ PRIZE IN MEXICAN HISTORY**

\$500 is awarded annually for the book judged to be the most significant work on the history of Mexico published during the previous year. The prize was established in 2009. Formerly the Mexican History Prize, the prize was renamed in 2015 in memoriam of María Elena Martínez.

### **2018 Committee:**

Tanalís Padilla (chair)

Peter Villella

William Taylor

**Winner: Pablo Piccato. *A History of Infamy: Crime, Truth, and Justice in Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017.**

Pablo Piccato's *A History of Infamy* is an impressively conceptualized and innovative work. Through the lens of crime and justice, the author examines how journalism, the *nota roja*, and crime fiction shaped the urban public's perception of truth and violence in twentieth-century Mexico. The complex but artfully drawn picture that emerges shows how intersecting institutions, practices, rumors, media and a broad cast of characters affected the perception of crimes and contributed to the decline of truth. Piccato's extensive research and careful, integrative thinking provides a vivid and evocative story, one that illuminates not only the

condition of violence in Mexico, but much about the human existence.”

### **ELINOR KERR MELVILLE PRIZE**

The Elinor Kerr Melville Prize was established in 2007 through a bequest from Elinor Melville. It carries a stipend of \$500. The Melville prize is awarded for the best book in English, French, Spanish or Portuguese on Latin American Environmental History that is published anywhere during the imprint year previous to the year of the award. Melville defined environmental history as “the study of the mutual influences of social and natural processes.” The prize will go to the book that best fits that definition, while also considering sound scholarship, grace of style, and importance of the scholarly contribution as criteria for the award. Normally not considered for the award are reprints or re-editions of works published previously, and works not primarily historical in aim or content. More general works of environmental history with significant Latin American content may also be considered.

#### **2018 committee:**

Sharika Crawford (chair)

Mark Healey

Kristin Wintersteen

**Winner: Mikael Wolfe. *Watering the Revolution, An Environmental and Technological History of Agrarian Reform in Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.**

*Watering the Revolution* examines the history of water management in Mexico’s dry but fertile Comarca Lagunera since the late nineteenth century, emphasizing how it shaped the Revolution’s agrarian politics from the 1930s through the 1970s. It skillfully weaves together technology and environment, and manages a nuanced explanation of the interests at play and the environmental consequences of the choices made. It convincingly shows, for example, how the *aniego* irrigation system was sustainable but socially inequitable, and how a questionable dam came to be a centerpiece of campesino demands and government promises of social justice. Wolfe establishes water as a key theme for Latin American environmental history, a much-awaited development.

By showing the crucial and misunderstood importance of water to agrarian reform in a heartland of the Mexican Revolution, Mikael Wolfe’s book also underscores how environmental history transforms our understanding of major themes in Latin American history, like revolution, development, and state-building.

### **LEWIS HANKE POST-DOCTORAL AWARD**

The Lewis Hanke Award carries a stipend of up to \$1,000, to be used only for international travel. This award was created through generous donations from students, colleagues, and family members of the late Lewis Hanke. It will be given annually to a recent Ph.D. recipient in

order to conduct field research that will allow transformation of the dissertation into a book. Applicants must have completed their Ph.D. degrees in the field of Latin American history no more than four years prior to the closing date of the application. The award will be made by a committee appointed by the CLAH president and confirmed by the CLAH General Committee.

### **2018 Prize Committee**

Yuko Miki (chair)

Casey Lurtz

Ernesto Bassi

### **Winner, Joseph M. H. Clark, "Veracruz and the Caribbean in the Seventeenth Century."**

The Lewis Hanke Award Committee congratulates Dr. Joseph M.H. Clark of the University of Kentucky for his project, "Veracruz and the Caribbean in the Seventeenth Century." We believe Dr. Clark's project, which imagines the Caribbean beyond the islands and the Plantation, and effectively inserts Mexico into the geographic space some Caribbeanists have recently interpreted as a Greater Caribbean, is an important contribution to early modern Latin American, Caribbean, and Atlantic history. By positioning Mexico in the Caribbean context to which the viceroyalty of New Spain clearly belonged throughout the colonial period, Dr. Clark's project also promises a reconceptualization of Mexico's place in the world. We wish him a fruitful research trip to the Archivo General de la Nación (Mexico) and look forward to reading the book to which this research trip will contribute.

### **LYDIA CABRERA AWARDS**

Lydia Cabrera Awards are available to support the study of Cuba between 1492 and 1868. Awards are designed specifically to support:

- 1) original research on Cuban history in Spanish, Mexican, and U. S. archives;
- 2) the publication of meritorious books on Cuba currently out of print; and
- 3) the publication of historical statistics, historical documents, and guides to Spanish archives relating to Cuban history between 1492 and 1868.

A limited number of awards will be made annually up to a maximum of \$5,000.

### **2018 Committee:**

Reinaldo Román (chair 2018)

Mariola Espinosa

Matt Childs (chair 2020)

**Winner: David C. LaFevor, "The Argüelles Affair and the Slave Ship Cicerón: Cuba, Spain, the United States and the Last Days of the Slave Trade."**

LaFevor's monograph in progress is more than an account of the international scandal and economic and political intrigue surrounding the illegal sale of 1300 enslaved Africans in Cuba in 1863. Focusing tightly on a single episode, one that involved President Lincoln's extra-legal rendition of Cuban slave traders who had escaped to New York City to avoid prosecution, LaFevor tips the event forward and backwards to show larger trends shaping nineteenth-century Cuba and the abolitionist movement across the Atlantic. In LaFevor's hands, this episode becomes the starting point for a multi-faceted exploration of the slave trade and its international legal context during its final years, an intervention that advances distinct historiographies on the trade, abolitionism, and local struggles for emancipation without neglecting the descendants of the 1863 captives, who still live in Matanzas, or the infamous career of Julián Zulueta, arguably "the largest slave owner in the world and the largest single slave trafficker in history."

LaFevor relies on well-chosen archival materials from Cuba, the United States, and Spain, including the under-utilized Archivo General Militar in Segovia, and incorporates descendants' oral testimonies while also considering their unique interests as an audience for historical scholarship. Despite their illegal acquisition and the corrupt practices that their arrival in Cuba revealed, the captives, who were mostly West Africans (Lucumíes), found themselves classified as *emancipados* and exploited by some of the very planters who financed the illicit voyage to Ouidah. Nevertheless, the scandal and its legal repercussions were such that they accelerated the end of the slave trade. After four decades of countenancing contraband, Spain had to relent. In the words of a referee, the Arguelles Affair makes for "an amazing case through which to analyze the failures of abolition and the long life of the international illicit slave trade."

David C. LaFevor is assistant professor of Latin American history and digital humanities at the University of Texas at Arlington. He is the recipient of a major grant from the British Library and the author of a book manuscript titled *Prizefighting and Civilization: Race, Masculinity, and the Public Sphere in Cuba and Mexico, 1840s-1930s*. LaFevor earned his PhD in History at Vanderbilt University (2011).

## **JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON PRIZE**

The James Alexander Robertson Prize is awarded annually for an article appearing (during the year preceding the award) in one of the four consecutive issues of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (August 2017-May 2018) for the 2018 award, awarded at the conference in January, 2019). The article selected for the award is to be one that, in the judgment of the prize committee, makes an outstanding contribution to Latin American historical literature. An Honorable Mention Award (with no cash stipend) may be made for an additional distinguished article deemed worthy of the same by the Robertson Prize Committee.

### **2018 Committee:**

Frances Ramos (chair)

James Sanders

Yanna Yannakakis

**Winner: Elizabeth Schwall, "Coordinating Movements: The Politics of Cuban-Mexican Dance Exchanges, 1959-1983," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 97.4 (2018): 681-712.**

It the pleasure of the Robertson committee, composed of Frances Ramos (chair), Yanna Yannakakis, and James Sanders, to award this year's prize to Elizabeth Schwall for "Coordinating Movements: The Politics of Cuban-Mexican Dance Exchanges, 1959-1983." Dr. Schwall's important article deepens a body of literature focusing on the relationship between Mexico and Cuba during the Cold War. While scholars have focused exclusively on official policy and the world of high-level politicians, showing that while Mexico publicly proclaimed friendship with Cuba, it secretly criticized its revolutionary perspective and aligned itself with the United States, Dr. Schwall illustrates that through "creative diplomacy," dancers and choreographers created concrete ties between both countries.

By focusing on dancers instead of politicians, and by combining diplomatic history with the history of emotion, Dr. Schwall has provided us with a new perspective on how Cuba and Mexico established and maintained their revolutionary relationship. While studying politicians leads one to see a superficial relationship between Cuba and Mexico, Schwall's study of cultural actors reveals a deep, sustained relationship, despite ebbs and flows. Mexican dancers did not merely visit Cuba, and Cuban dancers did not simply perform in Mexico; they took up residence in each other's countries to train, teach, and perform. Her focus on dance also let her bring women into a usually male story of diplomatic history. Schwall adroitly exploits a great variety of source material to create a fascinating cultural and diplomatic history.

#### **ANTONINE TIBESAR PRIZE**

The Conference on Latin American History in cooperation with *The Americas* established the Tibesar Prize in December 1990. It carries a stipend of \$500. A Tibesar Prize Committee, annually named by the president of the Conference on Latin American History, will designate the most distinguished article published by *The Americas* for the volume year, which ends in the year before the award is announced. Hence, for the 2018 Tibesar Prize to be awarded in January of 2019, the Tibesar Prize Committee will review and judge articles in the 2017 volume year.

#### **2018 Committee:**

Adriana Brodsky (chair)  
Kittiya Lee  
Christopher Heaney

**Winner: Scott Cave, "Madalena: The Entangled History of One Indigenous Floridian Woman in the Atlantic World." *The Americas* 74.2 (April 2017): 171-200.**



Scott Cave has written a beautiful article reconstructing the life of Madalena, a sixteenth-century indigenous woman who was forcefully taken from a place named Tocobaga, on the coast of today's Florida, to Havana and then Spain, and then back again to Tocobaga transformed. Once there, she was able to escape the hands of the Spanish and perhaps coordinate her people's killing of her captors. This year's Tibesar Prize is an article entitled, "Madalena: The Entangled History of One Indigenous Floridian Woman in the Atlantic World." It is about what we can and what we cannot know. It is informed by tremendous archival work, spider-like contextualization, and well-earned speculations anchored in Native American and Indigenous Studies methodologies and a generous humanity. In her lifetime, Madalena was made a historiographical thing, a puppet in the sixteenth-century Spanish telling of an attempted conquest and conversion of her people. Yet she managed to escape and disappear into her life. This article about how she did so will speak to students and to scholars, laying open the contingency of Spanish colonialism, the strangeness of its violence, and Native experiences of that strangeness. Most importantly, it attends to the vastness of the non-elite, non-European, non-male perspectives whose outlines might be traced by treating even the most seemingly fleeting actor as that most unfortunately radical thing: a person, one whose ends we—very happily—might never learn."

#### **PAUL VANDERWOOD PRIZE**

This prize was established in 1961 and renamed the Vanderwood Prize, in recognition of Paul Vanderwood, in 2012. It carries a stipend of \$500. The Vanderwood Prize is awarded annually for a distinguished article on any significant aspect of Latin American history by a member of the CLAH, not appearing in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* or *The Americas*. The committee will consider nominated and self-nominated articles in English, Spanish, Portuguese and French. To be eligible for the prize, authors must be members of the CLAH during the year the article is published and the year that it is considered for the award.

#### **2018 Committee:**

Laura Shelton (chair)  
Ryan Kashanipour  
Carlos Dimas

**Winner: Marjoleine Kars, "Dodging Rebellion: Politics and Gender in the Berbice Slave Uprising of 1763," *American Historical Review* 121.1 (2016): 39-69**

Marjoleine Kars beautifully recovers the experiences and voices of enslaved women during the Berbice slave uprising through their heartbreaking testimonies of the devastation they endured. Her analysis reveals the gender politics of slave rebellions, when controlling women became integral to the political power of male rebels. More importantly, she demonstrates that by dodging rebellion and thwarting colonial "justice", enslaved women exercised their own form

of limited resistance and strategic action against their Dutch and new rebel masters.

Honorable Mention: Krisna Ruethe-Oriheula and Cristina Soriano, "Remembering the Slave Rebellion of Coro: Historical Memory and Politics in Venezuela," *Ethnohistory* 63:2 (April 2016): 327-350.

Krisna Ruethe-Oriheula and Cristina Soriano examine the memory of the Coro rebellion, and of José Leonardo Chirino, the man accused of, and brutally executed for leading it. They demonstrate how efforts to silence or memorialize this past "have shaped political identities, contested or reproduced ethnoracial hierarchies, and engraved the past into the landscape." They remind us that historical memory can be used to justify and legitimate political agendas; but also to construct empowered political subjectivities that challenge oppressive state powers.

## VII. IN APPRECIATION: CLAH ENDOWMENT AND FUND CONTRIBUTORS

### CLAH PRIZES AND AWARDS

Casey Lurtz  
James Sanders  
Jurgen Buchenau  
James Woodard

### Bolton Johnson

Eric Van Young

### Scobie

Steve Stern  
Deborah Truhan

### Hanke

Ralph della Cava

### Robertson

James Sanders

### Dean

Anne Hanley  
Robert Wilcox  
Barbara Weinstein  
Yuko Miki  
Bryan McCann

### Melville

Robert Wilcox  
Anne Rubenstein

### Vanderwood

Eric Van Young  
Ryan Edwards

### Cabrera

Reinaldo Roman

### Syllabus Prize

Anonymous

**VIII. WELCOME TO OUR NEW LIFETIME MEMBERS**

Laura Matthew

Anne Eller

**IX. LIST OF LIFETIME MEMBERS**

Dauril ALDEN

Gladys ALEMAN

Rodney ANDERSON

Reid ANDREWS

Nancy APPELBAUM

Silvia ARROM

Stephen BELL

William BEEZLEY

Allison BIGELOW

Dain BORGES

Alex BORUCKI

Christopher BOYER

Steven B. BUNKER

Mark BURKHOLDER

Jurgen BUCHENAU

Elaine CAREY

Donald CASTRO

Sarah CLINE

Michael CONNIFF

William F. CONNELL

Karoline COOK

Jerry COONEY

John COATSWORTH

Don COERVER

Theodore COHEN

Edith COUTURIER

Benjamin COWAN

Raymond CRAIB

Victoria CUMMINS

Light CUMMINS

Thomas DAVIES Jr.

Jerry DAVILA

René DE LA PEDRAJA

Jesús F. DE LA TEJA

Jose DE LA TORRE CURIEL

Roberta DELSON

Alcira DUEÑAS

Marshall EAKIN

Anne ELLER

Phillip FLEMION

Max Paul FRIEDMAN

Paul GANSTER

David GARRETT

Michael GONZALES

Bill GRAM

Karen GRAUBART

Janet GREEVER

Hernan HORNA

Orva ICE

Ivan JAKSIC

Harold JOHNSON

Amelia KIDDLE

Franklin KNIGHT

Catherine KOMISARUK

Erick LANGER

Asunción LAVRIN

Monica Kittiya LEE

Jeff LESSER

Linda LEWIN

John LOMBARDI

Rick LOPEZ

Joseph LOVE

Christopher LUTZ

Colin MACLACHLAN

Florencia MALLON

Laura MATTHEW

Sean MCENROE

Cynthia MILTON

Aaron MOULTON

Alfred MYERS

José Manuel NAVARRO

Matthew D. O'HARA

Rachel Sarah O'TOOLE  
Jocelyn OLCOTT  
Sarah OWENS  
Jadwiga PIEPER MOONEY  
Stafford POOLE  
Susie PORTER  
Bianca PREMO  
Frank (Trey) PROCTOR III  
Lara PUTNAM  
Cynthia RADDING  
Monica RANKIN  
Frances RAMOS  
Jane RAUSCH  
Andrés RESENDEZ  
Mark RICE  
Paul RICH  
Karin ROSEMBLATT  
Louis SADLER  
Frank SAFFORD  
Marian SCHLOTTERBECK  
John SCHWALLER

Ingrid SCOBIE  
Rebecca SCOTT  
Gabriela SOTO LAVEAGA  
Steve STERN  
Donald STEVENS  
James STEWART  
Noel STOWE  
William SUMMERHILL  
David SWEET  
Barbara TENENBAUM  
Kevin TERRACIANO  
Joseph TULCHIN  
Josefina Z. VAZQUEZ  
Ben VINSON, III  
Emily WAKILD  
Louise WALKER  
Richard WARREN  
Edward WRIGHT-RIOS  
Yanna Panayota YANNAKAKIS  
Julia YOUNG  
Lubomir ZYBLIKIEWICZ