



Conference on Latin American History

Spring 2023 Newsletter

Vol. 59 No. 1



CONFERENCE ON LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Spring 2023 NEWSLETTER

Volume 59, Number 1

IN THIS ISSUE:

I.	Message from President Celso Castilho	3
II.	Message from Co-Executive Director Jurgen Buchenau	5
III.	Minutes of the CLAH Council 2022 Meeting	8
IV.	Officers and Committee Members Elected and Appointed	14
V.	CLAH Section Meeting Reports	15
VI.	CLAH Award and Prize Recipients	30
VII.	In Appreciation: CLAH Endowment and Fund Contributors	37
VIII.	List of Lifetime Members	39

2023 CLAH OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Executive Committee:

President: Celso Castilho
Vice President & President-Elect:
Alejandra Bronfman
Past President: Ben Vinson, III
Executive Directors: Jurgen Buchenau &
Oscar de la Torre

Elected Council Members:

Luisa Fernanda Arrieta (2022-2023)
Brandon Byrd (2022-2023)
Orlando Deavila Pertuz (2022-2023)
Elizabeth Schwall (2023-2024)
Fabricio Prado (2023-2024)
Marissa Nichols (2023-2024)

Ex-Officio Council Members:

HARR Editors: William Summerhill
The Americas Editor: John F. Schwaller
H-LatAm Editor: Marc Becker

Standing Committees:

Nominating Committee:

Camilo Trumper (chair)
Elena Schneider
Javier Puente

Program Committee:

Robert Franco (2023 chair)
Sarah Sarzynski (2024 chair)
Viviana Grieco

Regional & Thematic Sections

Andean Studies:

Javier Puente, Chair
Renzo Aroni, Secretary

Atlantic World Studies:

Anne Eller, Chair

Emmanuel Lachaud, Secretary

Borderlands/Frontiers:

Nick Villanueva, Chair
Erik Langer, Secretary

Brazilian Studies:

Benjamin A. Cowan, Chair
Sarah Sarzynski, Secretary

Caribbean Studies:

Takkara Brunson, Chair
Jorell Meléndez-Badillo, Secretary

Central American Studies:

Brianna Leavitt-Alcántara, Chair
Sylvia Sellers-García, Secretary

Chile-Rio de la Plata Studies:

Denisa Jashari, Chair
Romina Akemi Green, Secretary

Colonial Studies:

Mónica Ricketts, Chair
Guadalupe García, Secretary

Gran Colombia Studies:

María José Afanador, Chair
Constanza Castro, Secretary

Mexican Studies:

Mónica Díaz, Chair
Xóchitl M. Flores-Marcial, Secretary

Teaching and Teaching Materials

María de los Ángeles Picone, Chair
Pilar Maria Herr, Secretary

I. MESSAGE FROM CLAH PRESIDENT Celso Castilho



Greetings from Nashville, where I work at Vanderbilt University as an associate professor of history and direct the Center for Latin American, Caribbean, and Latinx Studies. It is an honor to step in as president of CLAH, and to welcome aboard Dr. Alejandra Bronfman as the new vice president. We'll be teaming up on several fronts over the next years, exploring questions about the state and boundaries of the Latin American and Caribbean fields, enhancing opportunities for professional development and mentorship at the annual conference, and more broadly, deepening the cumulative efforts of years past that have made the CLAH a meaningful professional space.

This newsletter provides detailed round-ups from the meeting in Philadelphia, including the list of recent prize winners as well as of the nearly forty people who served on the respective prize and award committees. It also features detailed reviews of the section meetings. From the two that I personally attended, and from the feedback gathered on others, it's safe to say that these are again a happening part of the program. On that front, I want to acknowledge the program committee's efforts in organizing a formidable array of panels and workshops: thank you Dr. Sharika Crawford (chair), Dr. Jesse Cromwell, and Dr. Robert Franco.

It is a pleasure to share that the CLAH executive office is moving from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte to the University of Texas, El Paso (UTEP). Beginning in Fall '23, Dr. Erika Edwards and Dr. Christina Villarreal will oversee the management of our association. The following year (2024-25), Villarreal will partner with Dr. Larisa Veloz, with Edwards rotating off. This connection to an R1, Hispanic-Serving-Institution (HSI) is of great interest to me. I hope we can draw on this relationship to, among other things, think more critically and perhaps expansively about the intersections and connections between Latin American and Latinx histories. It is along these lines, and in terms of the relationship between the fields, that I am organizing a presidential session for the upcoming meeting in San Francisco.

With important changes afoot, I want to also express my deepest appreciation to the numerous leadership teams from UNC Charlotte who have charted the course of our organization since 2007. As a late 2000s PhD, I have only known the CLAH in its affiliation with UNC Charlotte, and as such, may have admittedly taken the organization's stability for granted. But having recently re-read newsletters from 5 and 10 years ago, it is clear to me that the UNC Charlotte faculty and master's students have had a decisive impact in our growth. Executive directors Jerry Dávila (2007-12), Jurgen Buchenau (2012-17), Jurgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards (2017-22), and Jurgen Buchenau and Oscar de la Torre (2023) have in ways big and small turned us into the most robust of the AHA's affiliated societies. It is commonplace to read in reports from the mid-2010s of the CLAH routinely breaking its own participation records. In fact, as early as 2011, we were already accounting for 25% of the AHA's conference program. However, the kind of growth the UNC Charlotte leadership enabled goes far beyond just an increase in numbers. I'm talking of fostering a culture that welcomed graduate students; that encouraged innovation in how we added sections/fields (Atlantic) and new prizes (Mexican; Río de la Plata); and certainly, the pushing for more inclusive processes in the selection of section leaders.

I close with a personal *¡mil gracias!* to this dedicated group of colleagues who have so fundamentally enriched what it means to belong to the field of Latin American history.

II. MESSAGE FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR JURGEN BUCHENAU



Colegas:

It is bittersweet to write this final column as co-Executive Director of the CLAH after thirteen years of administering the membership, prizes, and finances of the organization. Helping lead this organization has truly been a magnificent, rewarding experience, and I am much enriched by the opportunity of working with all of you over such a long period of time.

We could not have done this without the help of a lot of people. First of all, let me recognize the folks from UNC Charlotte. Jerry Dávila (now at the University of Illinois) got us going in 2007 by bidding for the CLAH office after a very successful stint at UC-Davis. After Jerry's five-year tenure, in which he was able to take advantage of a course release to manage the entirety of the CLAH operations (probably while never sleeping), the CLAH office moved to a collaborative model, when the idea of a course release was no longer viable. In 2012, we established the position of an Annual Meeting Director, first held by Audrey Henderson and then by Marissa Nichols, both alumnae of our M.A. programs at UNC Charlotte and, then, doctoral students at Emory University. In 2017, Erika Edwards and I pioneered a two-person executive team running the CLAH operations, with great results. Erika assumed the responsibilities of the Annual

Meeting Director for the conference program and managed the relationships with the regional and topical committees (now Sections). I remained responsible for the financial management of the CLAH, our prize and awards program, as well as the oversight of the graduate assistant in membership management, the CLAH Newsletter, and the website. Erika served as co-director with me from fall 2017 to fall 2022, and I fondly remember our excellent collaboration during almost five years. Oscar de la Torre has served as co-director this spring and is currently helping finalize the 2024 CLAH program. Eight graduate assistants have helped us during the sixteen years in Charlotte: Gloria Lawing, who started in 2007, Sarah Levy (2008), Audrey Henderson (2010), Candie Almengor (2013), Nicole Hanna (2015), Lucy Stroud (2017), Rossmery Palacios (2019), and Madison Green (2021). Another graduate student, Megan White, is helping to manage the transition to UTEP.

I would also like to recognize a long string of impressive and dedicated CLAH presidents who made working for the organization a true pleasure: Jeff Lesser (2007-08), Mary Kay Vaughan (2009-10), Cynthia Radding (2011-12), Jane Landers (2013-14), Jerry Dávila (2015-16), Lara Putnam (2017-18), Bianca Premo (2019-20), Ben Vinson III (2021-22), and now Celso Castilho (2023-24). All of these leaders were unceasing champions of our organization, and each put in six years on our Executive Committee: two as vice president and president-elect, two as president, and two as past president. At a time when the neoliberal technocratic university claims so much of our energy, and when the humanities are under relentless attack, it is amazing to see such dedication to our organization.

We have also benefited from the hard work of the members of the Council (formerly the General Committee) and the officers of the eleven Sections. I can't name them all, because there are too many—37 elected Council members and 168 Section leaders, considering the expansion of the Council in 2020 and the addition of the Atlantic Studies Section in 2016. In addition, the *HAHR*, *The Americas*, and H-LATAM have contributed to the Council via *ex officio* members. Collectively and individually, the Council and Section leaders have done amazing work.

Finally, we have a generous membership that keeps us going. Your donations allowed us to establish two new book prizes in Mexican and Río de la Plata history, and an effort to establish a teaching prize is just \$4,000 short of completion. Let me use this space for one final ask: your help in getting across the finish line—you can donate online to “CLAH Prizes and Awards” by using our membership renewal link: https://clah.h-net.org/?page_id=40. As I approach my last nine weeks as co-Executive Director, nothing would make me happier than seeing this prize fully funded, which recognizes our commitment to teaching and mentorship in addition to our long-standing support of cutting-edge scholarship.

Your generosity in terms of your time has been even more impressive than your financial support. Your unflinching willingness to serve on our committees has allowed us to keep our program of prizes and awards going year after year, and we are most grateful about the enthusiasm with which you have helped our field, especially during a challenging time.

Hosting the CLAH has been a truly wonderful experience for UNC Charlotte—and not just the faculty and students working with the CLAH office, but the History Department and Latin American Studies program in general. Being the CLAH host advertised our strength in and commitment to Latin American history and Latin American Studies on and off campus. It put UNC Charlotte “on the map,” an R2 institution previously not known for Latin American Studies beyond Lyman Johnson’s great stature in colonial Latin American history. It made it easier for us to recruit top-notch faculty and graduate students, and it contributed significantly to the Latin American Studies program receiving recognition as part of a research cluster in “Migration and Diaspora” that will receive extra resources to keep the great research collaborations going that have included our work in Latin American history. And finally, it’s just been a lot of fun, and has given us the chance to work with and get to know so many colleagues whom we would have otherwise never had a chance to meet!

Since 2007, the CLAH has changed as much as the world around it. We welcomed another generation of Latin American historians and held fifteen in-person annual meetings with sizes between 65 and 400 Latin Americanists, as well as one virtual meeting in 2021 when the world had shut down. We conducted a comprehensive survey of our organization and rewrote our Constitution and Bylaws to adapt to new circumstances. For example, rather than four elected members on our old General Committee, we now have six on our Council, including two not on the tenure track. Our secretarial elections for the eleven Sections—once largely rubber stamp affairs with a single candidate—are now highly competitive, with bios of three candidates published for the membership. Aside from our two new book prizes, we set up a new Section (Atlantic World). Perhaps most impressively, we have become far more diverse, both in our leadership and in our membership. We also have a growing number of members from Latin America and the Caribbean. And thanks to your support, we survived the COVID pandemic relatively unscathed, even as the first two meetings after the shutdown have been smaller than the ones preceding it. While attendance has gone down, lifetime and long-term memberships have increased, a sign that the CLAH enjoys solid support from its members.

Together, we stand ready to face an uncertain future where the status of our profession is highly uncertain due to financial precarity and unceasing, politically motivated attacks on History in general, and our commitment to write histories from below in particular. Our young colleagues have found a brutal job market in which tenure-track positions (and even non-tenure lectureships) are few and far between. These difficulties only highlight the significance of the CLAH, a committed and congenial bunch of Latin American history teacher/scholars. I have never been prouder to be a CLAH member than I am now!

I want to close with a note of appreciation for our new host, the University of Texas at El Paso, under the leadership of Erika Edwards and Christina Villarreal (2023-24) and then Christina Villarreal and Larisa Veloz (2024-2028). I thank the team for taking over the reins in July! The CLAH will thrive on the Mexican border, and the new team will bring fresh energy and ideas to our collective enterprise, especially as we approach our centennial in 2026. After three

iterations in which UNC Charlotte presented the only bid to be considered, I would also like to thank the University of Alabama for submitting a bid. While that bid was ultimately not successful, the fact that we had two R1 universities bidding for the CLAH office is the ultimate compliment for our organization. I am very excited about our collective future!

III. APPROVED CLAH COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (2022)

**Ben Vinson III, President
Celso Castilho, Vice President and President-elect
Jurgen Buchenau and Erika Edwards, Co-Executive Directors**

January 6, 2022, cyberspace, 5-7 pm CST

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

Ben Vinson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm CST.

Council members present: Ben Vinson (president), Celso Castilho (vice president and president elect), Bianca Premo (past president), Erika Edwards, Jurgen Buchenau (co-Executive Directors), Danielle Terrazas Williams, David Carey, Jr., Tamara Walker, Maria Reis (elected Council members), Zach Morgan (HAHR representative), Marc Becker (H-LATAM representative)

Other CLAH members present: Casey Lurtz, Madison Green, Luisa Arrieta (Council 2023); Orlando DeAvila Pertuz(Council 2023), Monica Ricketts; Sarah Kozameh, Herman Bennett

2. Approval of minutes of the 2021 meeting (attachment 1)

Ben Vinson called for consideration of the 2021 Council minutes. Zachary Morgan moved approval, and David Carey seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of 2021 Election results and committee appointments (attachment 2)

Ben Vinson calls for certification of the 2021 election results and prize committee appointments. David moved approval, and Luisa Arrieta seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Report of the Program Committee

Ben Vinson opened this section asking who will be completing the report of the Program Committee in the absence of Program Committee chair Tom Rogers. Erika Edwards gave the report. The AHA has been generous in adopting panels, especially diverse ones. Some of the panels that were more focused on the Americas were more accepted by the AHA whereas if the panel was more focused on specific areas and timelines, those panels were not as easily cosponsored by the AHA but ended up with the CLAH.

The Program Committee received 56 panel and 17 individual paper proposals; in the end the program featured 60 panels total along with 11 section meetings. After covid hit, 33 panels were listed in person including the section meetings; 40 panels were converted to online.

Erika Edwards spoke on the relationship between the CLAH and the AHA. The AHA has been very accommodating because of COVID and allowed an increasing number of panels to move online at the last minute. The AHA has been very generous with the CLAH. Jurgen also discussed potential assistance to the AHA, as the organization took a serious financial hit because of COVID, by not being able to meet hotel room minimums. Though the CLAH cannot make donations directly to the AHA, the CLAH office could encourage members to give to the AHA.

Ben Vinson echoed Jurgen and Erika's remarks in appreciating the CLAH's relationship with the AHA, and supporting efforts to soften the financial hardship suffered by the AHA because of the sudden changes made for the 2022 conference because of COVID. He also opened the floor to hear about the hardships experienced during the past two years under the pandemic and suggested that the CLAH release a statement about how the pandemic has impacted the careers of academics. Luisa Arrieta and Maria Reis related their difficulties in accessing archives as graduate students and worries about the implications of a longer time to degree. Bianca Premo suggested considering emergency Scobies or Hankes to help graduate students and junior scholars finish their dissertations and books in what will hopefully be the wake of the pandemic. Jurgen Buchenau supported drafting a statement from the CLAH and mentioned that the CLAH does have some extra funds available as one of the research awards did not have any applicants in 2020. Danielle Terrazas Williams suggested approaching foundations targeted towards Latin American Studies to extend the time period past three years and using the CLAH's network and standing to try and help students gain extra time to finish dissertations under the pandemic and obtain funding.

Celso Castilho suggested subsidizing student participation of students at the conference. Can we leverage from the leftover funds to assist professors? Jurgen explained that the funds should be used for research support as that is their intended use.

The new Program Committee will be Sharika Crawford (2023 chair), Robert Franco (2024 chair), and Jesse Cromwell.

5. Report on the CLAH Office

Erika Edwards began discussion of this agenda item by talking about the successful relationship working with Jurgen in a demanding year that required a lot of flexibility in the planning of the annual meeting. She suggested more adherence to program policies in the future, especially the one restricting any one person to two program appearances. This year, some names appeared more than twice. She thanked the candidates for Section secretary for their willingness to serve and send in biographies this year, and Corinna Zeltsman for the idea of adding these biographies, which were very helpful in assisting members in making informed choices while voting. Jurgen Buchenau added to Erika's remarks and thanked her for the work on an ever-changing conference program, as well as Madison Green for her work as a graduate student since assuming the position this past fall. Jurgen mentioned the hardships that COVID brought to the previous graduate assistant but looks forward to updating the website in the future with Madison Green.

6. Review of Executive Director's 2021 Annual Report, discussion and vote on Proposed FY 2022 Budget (attachments 3a-c)

Jurgen Buchenau presented the report on the budget, which consists of three parts: the past budget, the projection for the coming year, and the endowment. The endowment has been increasing in value along with equities in general. It is conservatively invested, so we may want to consider a more aggressive allocation during the next bear market. Jurgen discussed some unexpected variability in the Scobie and Cabrera awards due to COVID: the 2020 Scobie awards were not used until 2021, and there was no applicant for the 2020 Cabrera Award. Membership renewals have exceeded expectations. Many people are now renewing for longer periods instead of just for one year. Because of this windfall, we are now creating a cash reserve consisting of lifetime membership payments, since those members becoming lifetime members will not be making payments in the future. The December dividends doubled from 2020 to 2021 for reasons we do not know, providing another benefit to the budget. As a result of good years, we have not needed to actually make withdrawals to the endowment in the last three years, since dividends plus extra reserves exceeded the money slated for withdrawal.

There will be some changes in the budget. Since the pandemic caused acute labor shortages at Duke and Cambridge University Press, the CLAH office is no longer handling journal subscriptions. Jurgen also highlighted a possible end to the fortunate circumstance that the CLAH graduate assistantship has been funded by the university since 2007. This graduate assistantship position is in jeopardy because of the secretarial nature of some of the responsibilities, which makes them incompatible with new guidelines about graduate funding based on changes to the federal Fair Labor Standards Act. As these changes affect all universities, the CLAH may have to pick up more of the expense of maintaining the secretarial duties of the GA position. Ben

Vinson commented on the presentation of the budget cautioning members of the state of the finances in previous decades. He congratulated everyone for the great financial standing the CLAH has now and reminded the group that things can change quickly.

David Carey Jr. asked if it is possible to give money to the AHA because of the current financial hardship due to the 2022 conference. He also asked if we could create an emergency COVID fund for graduate students and professionals and if donations could be made to said fund. Jurgen Buchenau suggested the possibility of giving some of the money saved from canceled events during the conference such as the cocktail party to the AHA to help soften the financial blow to the AHA. He also suggested possibly matching donations made by members to give to the AHA. Bianca Premo reminded the group that any aid should come within the parameters of existing structures, such as the Scobie or Hanke award, to stay within our published guidelines. Designated to help students and junior faculty, these programs could be temporarily expanded.

David Carey Jr. moves to approve the budget, and Maria Reis seconded the 2022 budget. The budget is approved.

7. Old Business

a. Call to host CLAH Office for the quinquennium 2023-28 and request for a one-year extension on the quinquennium 2017-2022 (attachment 4)

Jurgen Buchenau spoke on the subject of the CLAH Office, which is up for bids every five years. UNC Charlotte has hosted the CLAH office through three quinquennia and each time, sent in the only bid. This year, we did not get any proposals, and UNC Charlotte was unable to submit a new five-year bid because of uncertainties regarding staffing and the graduate assistant support. But UNC Charlotte is prepared to host the office once again in 2022-23 to allow a fresh bidding process. Jurgen Buchenau and Ben Vinson asked for a one year extension for UNC Charlotte so the CLAH can continue under the same staff and graduate assistant until a new bid can be approved to support the CLAH for the quinquennium 2023-2028. As part of this extension, the CLAH would commit to stop gap funding in the amount of \$14,000 in case the university cannot support a graduate assistantship next year. So that the Council could discuss this idea, Jurgen, Erika, and Madison temporarily left the Council meeting due to conflict of interest considerations.

In their absence, the Council discussed the changing finances of universities, and how this may impact a potential bid for the Secretariat. Given this, we felt that in a future bid we may want to spend some time thinking about 1) should we allow for the Secretariat be split over multiple institutions 2) should we contemplate more financial support from CLAH 3) are there other options we can consider that might make a bid more attractive to a suitor. The request for the one-year extension and \$14,000 stop gap were both approved.

Upon return of the UNC Charlotte team to the meeting, Ben Vinson asked what

modifications we can envision to modernize the secretariat in order to make the position more attractive. Zachary Morgan asked if Jurgen can explain the legal challenges with using a graduate assistant in the future. Jurgen explains that there are three different kinds of graduate assistantships at UNC Charlotte, and only two of them—teaching and research assistantships—can hold stipended lines. Pursuant to the amendments to the FLSA referenced above, the university now states that such stipended graduate assistants cannot do office/secretarial work as part of their duties. According to our administration, the graduate assistant should be paid hourly and eligible for overtime pay. We could figure out how much time it takes the assistant to complete the secretarial tasks associated with the position, what the compensation for these tasks should be, and whether some of the position can be redefined as a “research position” which is eligible for graduate assistantship funding.

Ben Vinson suggests thinking about distributing the work of the CLAH among two or more institutions. Perhaps we should consider a twin campus approach to assigning CLAH duties. Danielle Terrazas Williams asks what the financial cost would be for hiring someone to fill the position and not relying on the university. Jurgen stated that the cost of a fully salaried position might be \$70,000 including benefits. That might work if we teamed up with two other organizations or journals.

8. New Business

a. Teaching Prize (Casey Lurtz, 2021 Chair, Teaching and Teaching Materials Section)

Casey Lurtz gave an update on the status of the teaching prize. This year, the section’s Syllabus Prize had lower submission rates. Casey Lurtz explained that the section had developed a proposal to fully fund an endowed teaching prize:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bGBM9ak6lq0oK0r25ZeWMnpoMpbxfXqwjEN-4k6HBlg/edit?usp=sharing>

Casey Lurtz explained that the section had already received pledges received from one call over the span of a month and asked the council for feedback and support. Is this the moment to start trying to endow an award like this is or should we wait?

David Carey Jr. supported the timing of the new prize especially under the pandemic when classrooms have moved to zoom. Tamara Walker suggests emphasizing the innovative aspect of learning and the teaching of history during the pandemic. Tamara also suggested considering who would write the letters of recommendation – students or staff? Jurgen Buchenau expressed full support of the award and its timing but suggests the name be only Teaching Award and not also include teaching materials. Bianca Premo also supported the award, especially since it includes all professional historians and not just the top publishing scholars. Zachary Morgan supported leaving the authorship of the letters of support open so that applicants can chose between sending two letters from students or also incorporating one from staff. Ben Vinson expressed his support for the teaching prize and asked what would need to happen next

for Casey and the committee to move ahead? Jurgen explained that the money has to be in place to move forward. To secure the pledges, we could use the "CLAH Prizes" button on the website to collect donations. Alternatively, you can collect checks from donors and present them to the council once \$12,000 is raised. Erika Edwards encouraged using the website and CLAH Prizes donations to collect pledges. She suggested stating the goal of the prize, timeline of how often the prize will be awarded, and identifying those dedicated to seeing the award come to fruition. She also raised the question of whether this should be a biennial or annual award. Casey replied that a biennial award might initially be more viable.

David Carey Jr. suggested that Casey continue her fundraising with a view of presenting a finalized proposal to the board. Bianca asked when we are planning on rolling out the centennial campaign in earnest. How will this teaching award and its campaign affect the campaign for the centennial? Casey's goal is to have the campaign for the prize done in a year. Jurgen approved sending a call for donations via CLAH-LISTA for the award.

The council approved the campaign.

b. Amendment to Hanke Award procedures (attachment 5)

Jurgen explained that the Hanke Award Committee approached the office about confusion in the guidelines for the award regarding the requirement of two letters. To clear up the confusion, Jurgen submitted amended guidelines. He also asked if the CLAH should raise the award from \$1,000 to \$1,500, as an award of \$1,000 is no longer useful for international travel. There are two motions on the floor: to increase the prize to \$1500 annually and to revise the language to clarify that two letters of support need to be provided

David Carey, Jr. moved to increase the Hanke Award to \$1,500 and Danielle Terrazas Williams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Maria Reis moved and Celso Castilho seconded the original motion to clarify the language; the motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:57 CST.

IV. CLAH OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS ELECTED AND APPOINTED

On December 2, 2022, Co-Executive Director Jürgen Buchenau presented the results of balloting by CLAH members for a vice president and president-elect, three new members of the Council, and new secretaries of the eleven CLAH Sections to President Ben Vinson and Vice President Celso Castilho for their verification as per the CLAH Constitution. The verified members-elect are:

Vice-President/President-Elect (two-year term)

Alejandra Bronfman, University at Albany—State University of New York

Council (two-year term):

Fabricio Prado, College of William and Mary

Elizabeth Schwall, Northern Arizona University

Marissa Nichols, Emory University (non-TT position)

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

Andean Studies Committee: Renzo Aroni, Columbia University

Atlantic World Studies Committee: Emmanuel Lachaud, City College of New York

Borderlands/Frontiers Committee: Erick Langer, Georgetown University

Brazilian Studies Committee: Sarah Sarzynski, Claremont-McKenna College

Caribbean Studies Committee: Jorell Meléndez-Badillo, University of Wisconsin

Central American Studies Committee: Sylvia Sellers-García, Boston College

Chile/Río de la Plata Studies Committee: Romina Akemi Green, Washington and Lee University

Colonial Studies Committee: Guadalupe García, Tulane University

Gran Colombian Studies Committee: Constanza Castro, Universidad de los Andes.

Mexican Studies Committee: Xóchitl M. Flores-Marcial, UNAM-Oaxaca

Teaching and Teaching Materials Committee: Pilar Maria Herr, University of Pittsburgh-Greenburg

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

2023 Standing Committees:

Nominating Committee: Brenda Elsey (chair), Camilo Trumper, Corinna Zeltsman

Program Committee: Robert Franco (2023 chair), Sarah Sarzynski (2024 chair), Viviana Grieco.

2023 Prize Committees:

Distinguished Service Award: Joaquín Chávez (chair), Sara Kozameh, Rob Alegre

Bolton-Johnson Memorial Prize: Gabe Paquette (chair), Mark Healey, Yuko Miki

Howard F. Cline Prize: Bradley Benton (chair), Amara Solari, Carmen Soliz

Elinor Melville Prize: Barbara Mundy (chair), Eric Carter, Rocío Gómez

James R. Scobie Memorial Awards: Julia Rodriguez (chair), Rebekah Pite, William Acree

Paul Vanderwood Prize: Marjoleine Kars (chair), Steven Hyland, Mary Hicks

Antonine Tibesar Prize: Erik Ching (chair), Jaime Pensado, Anadelia Romo

James A. Robertson Memorial Prize: Rachel Sarah O'Toole (chair), Keila Grinberg, Josh Savala

Lydia Cabrera Awards: Takkara Brunson (chair), Aisha Finch, Fernanda Bretones Lane

Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award: Sarah Hines (chair), Lance Ingwersen, Ignacio Martinez

Warren Dean Memorial Prize: Heather Roller (chair), Colin Snider, Rodrigo Camargo de Godoi

María Elena Martínez Prize: John Tutino (chair), Peter Guardino, Elizabeth O'Brien

V. CLAH SECTION MEETING REPORTS

ANDEAN STUDIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Chair: Javier Puente

Secretary: Renzo Aroni

The Andean Studies Section Panel “Social Movements and Governments in the Andes, Past and Present” was a provocative discussion. Since two original panelists could not attend in person, it changed a bit in some way. Additionally, the AHA does not provide AV support for CLAH-only sessions so we couldn't turn it into a hybrid event. Given these challenges, the incoming chair and secretary of the section reoriented the panel into a more Peru-centered conversation, which was timely and urgent due to ongoing social and political upheaval in this Andean nation. The panelists included Victor Maqque (University of Oklahoma), Gabriela Ramos (University of Cambridge), and Javier Puente (Smith College). Renzo Aroni moderated the panel.

The panelists discussed the ethnic and historical roots of the social movement, Indigenous resistance, and the current so-called “Estallido Social” in Peru. Victor Maqque examined the participation of Indigenous communities in the Southern highlands during the transition from colonial to the new state-nation building. Maqque

challenged the leading academic vision that the colonial policy of erasing the Caciques' traditional community authorities also eliminated the Indigenous community political agency in the aftermath of the Andean insurrections. Nevertheless, Maque argued that removing the Caciques rather than truncating the community politics produced an internal process of consciousness and political transformations that partly explains their continuous struggles after independence from below and the state margins.

Next, in her intervention, Gabriela Ramos discussed what impedes or limits progressive democracy. She mentioned two factors. First, radical and conservative ideologies such as Catholicism and the rise of evangelicalism. The other one is the correlated nationalism and nation-identity building. She criticized the obsession with the one-single identity, including radical Indigenismo and nationalism. As a construction process, identity at the local and organizational levels takes multiple changing strategic trajectories and challenges the homogenizing estate-nation obsession.

Finally, Javier Puente examined the anti-system pulsion in Peruvian politics across the twentieth century, particularly in the last three decades from the 1990s to the present. Comparing two *autogolpes* (self-coups), one successful and authoritarian by Alberto Fujimori in 1992 and the other failed and attempted by Pedro Castillo in 2022, Puente argues that those empowered by the claim of the excluded sectors, many who questioned the status quo ended up, almost unavoidably, reproducing the establishment and betraying what they once claimed to represent. Additionally, unable to be routed through institutional means, the antisystem pulsion has historically found other forms of representation and mobilization platforms, from populist movements to armed insurgencies.

Toward the end, the questions from the audience expanded the above interventions to deepen the arguments of each panelist, centering on issues of democracy, religion, identity, and the possibility of state-community relationship improvement.

ATLANTIC WORLD STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Juan José Ponce Vázquez

Secretary: Anne Eller

This year's Atlantic Section panel was entitled "New Currents and Old Contests—Extending the Black Atlantic into the 19th Century." The panelists were invited to reflect on the promise or perils of extending the Black Atlantic forward temporally, to consider some other boundary expansion, or simply offer several trenchant and nagging questions about the Atlantic framework.

The first presenter, Beau Gaitors, offered his insights from the perspective of his research on 19th-century port towns and cities, focusing on the port city of Veracruz. Gaitor's work considers the movement of free and enslaved African descendants throughout the Atlantic world. Through this lens he engages the shifting statuses and

subjectivities of African descendants in the Atlantic world during the nineteenth century as people moved back and forth between slavery and freedom, colonial subjects and national citizens, and from welcome inhabitants to forcefully removed. He asked the audience to ponder: how does the Black Atlantic framework engage with shifts in subjectivities of African descendants? What does the Black Atlantic mean when slavery is abolished? How do the concerns of localized populations extend to the Atlantic and in what ways do Atlantic concerns impact local populations in nation building projects? In his reflections, Gaitor observed that port towns are deeply linked to hinterlands (in this case, sugar and coffee) and riverine interiors. He also encouraged the audience to consider the continuity of post emancipation questions about citizenship and belonging in the writings and policies of politicians and the daily circumstances of black populations.

The next presenter, Arielle Alterwaite, invited the audience to think from her own research about the indemnity that French King Charles X extorted from Haitian President Jean-Pierre Boyer in exchange for recognition in 1825. She argues that the Black Atlantic facilitates us to begin to write new narratives about Haitian debt in three main ways. Firstly, the Black Atlantic framework expands the international theater of the Haitian Indemnity to include not just France and Haiti, but the British Empire, Greece, nascent nation-states in the Americas and Europe, and sovereign entities like the Holy See. Second, the Framework encourages scholars to trace the long wake of this debt burden from conflict in the eighteenth century into the nineteenth and emphasizes the indemnity's long-term conditions of possibility. Finally, she established how thinking with the method of Black Atlantic provides a way for scholars to break through the more traditional disciplinary boundaries of, for example, social, political, intellectual, and economic history and center Haiti as a locus that connects disparate places; its actors and political economy emerge as central to the development of capitalism, nationalism, and imperialism in world history, not just a synchronic frame in the sideshow of the history of the West.

Following Arielle was Emmanuel Lachaud, who continued the panel's consideration of Haitian independence. His work places Haiti's second imperial moment (1849-1859) within a portrait of vast shifts in the overlapping African Atlantic, Latin American, and Euro-American spheres. Lachaud's analysis challenges the creeping teleologies of secularism that are sometimes folded into Atlantic or "Age of Revolution" frameworks. As he argues, the second Haitian empire was not a by-product of archaic ideology but rather was an extension of multiple worldviews within a non-monolithic Black Atlantic. He described a complex cosmology of "Vodou-Catholic ethos," freemasonry, and alternative rural authority in the context of extremely limited liberal republicanism and small state reach. He asked: What did it mean to be politically legitimate in the landscape of Caribbean post-slavery cultures in the nineteenth-century Black Atlantic world? What is at stake when we use the conceptual frameworks of "Atlantic" with regards Afro-descendants and their lived experiences of post-emancipation struggles? His research evokes a deeply uneven landscape of slavery and abolition, transcends

the typical parameters of any single Black Atlantic and demonstrates just how flexible, fluctuating, and interlocking these networks and numerous 'Atlantics' were. He located his scholarship within generative work that contemplates many hemispheric 'Atlantics' and invited the audience to think about what remains excluded and what becomes legible. Finally, he meditated on how to excavate nuanced stories of the many ideas of freedoms that existed, even at odds with one another.

Finally, Adriana Chira invited the audience to consider some limitations and biases of Atlantic history, despite its enormous growth over the previous two decades. She highlighted its intrinsic tension between grounding and mobility (the Atlantic frame favoring as it does the visible record of its most mobile actors) and the framework's limited reach into areas beyond profit (and documentation) centers. Thinking from the history of the putative periphery of eastern Cuba, she highlighted how scholars must consider slower, less spectacular, less documented regions and very particularly the tremendous gains that communities in these territories won by custom. She critiqued the sometimes-vampiric relationship of grand narrative-style histories to careful social histories and invited the audience to consider, even center, societies such as the remarkable smallholding communities that she considers and their complex negotiations. The deep impact of these liberation struggles extend from the period of slavery into contests that precede the Cuban Revolution; in other words, deep into histories often combined with capital narratives, cleaved from their very deep context.

The audience asked spirited and interesting questions about identity, terminology, and quandaries about sparse and hostile sources. A fine meal off-site was had as discussion continued.

BORDERLANDS AND FRONTIERS SECTION MEETING

no report received

BRAZIL SECTION SECTION MEETING

Chair: Benjamin A. Cowan
Secretary: Sarah Sarzynski

The AHA Brazilian Studies Section gathered in Philadelphia at 7:15PM on Friday, January 6, 2023. Despite the lateness of the hour, the partitioned section of the Grand Ballroom was simply packed. More than one hundred attendees convened for a panel envisioned and created by section Chair Yuko Miki (Fordham University). Fittingly entitled "A Celebration of Barbara Weinstein," the panel sought to catalog and honor the scholarship and legacy of this eminent historian of Brazil (and, by the by, former president of the American Historical Association). The panelists facing this formidable challenge included Keila Grinberg of the University of Pittsburgh; Daryle Williams of the University of California at Riverside; Kirsten Schultz of Seton Hall University; and Marc Hertzman of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

As the animated question period would subsequently demonstrate, no panel could do justice to the feelings of gratitude and admiration in the room. Nevertheless, each panelist wove an informative and moving tapestry of personal memories and professional appreciation. Dr. Grinberg, the sole Brazilian on the panel, began the session with “Barbara Weinstein’s Enduring Analysis of Race and Nation in Contemporary Brazil.” This presentation not only traced Weinstein’s contributions across the decades, from her landmark work on the Amazon rubber boom (1983), to each of her other monographs and even her signal 2016 article “Ainda sou uma Brazilianist?” Grinberg demonstrated the immense breadth of Weinstein’s oeuvre, but more critically showed how her work has shaped more than one generation of scholarship on race, class, gender, and local and regional identity in Brazil. Dr. Williams’s intervention, “Journeys: The North American Academic in Brazilian History,” picked up the thread with a meditation on being a brasilianista alongside Weinstein. Williams recalled his time with Weinstein at the University of Maryland, discussed the many ways he had witnessed her prowess as a scholar, mentor, and administrator, and mused fondly on the sheer warmth of memories Weinstein had created with him and other scholars inside and outside of Brazil. His recollections of dinner parties and beach visits with Weinstein in Rio de Janeiro drew chuckles and nostalgic sighs from the audience; he concluded with a resounding paean to Weinstein’s wisdom and munificence as a senior colleague and her contributions not just to the discipline but to higher education more generally.

Dr. Schultz followed with her own account of Weinstein as a doctoral advisor in “Reflecting on Barbara Weinstein: Scholar/Mentor.” Schultz’s delight in paying homage to Weinstein seemed to strike a chord with others in the room whom Weinstein had advised formally or informally, and gave voice to the dozens upon dozens of scholars who have looked to Weinstein as an example and a font of generosity in the profession. Finally, Dr. Hertzman offered a much broader appreciation of Weinstein’s career in “A Brazilianist in Dialogue with the World.” Hertzman articulated what many in the room, of course, find to be a hallmark of Weinstein’s—her dexterity and ability to engage with historians and other scholars across regions and disciplines. He further underscored Weinstein’s importance as a public-facing scholar, whose writing and speaking—even before her tenure as AHA president—made her (and others’) work extraordinarily relevant.

When these excellent contributions had concluded, Dr. Miki opened the floor to questions and comments, inaugurating a stirring series of memories, appreciations, and expressions of thanks. Several attendees attested to Weinstein’s personal import for them, in their careers or their lives, and more than one spoke of how deeply she has impacted the academy itself, in the United States as well as in Brazil. Notably, the comments confirmed how trailblazing has been Weinstein’s path, as audience members spoke to the barriers she has broken and the space she has created for others. These

comments came from people who know Weinstein well and from some who described a more distant relationship of admiration and/or inspiration. The latter, perhaps more than anything, traced an arc of generous contributions and benevolent influence that seemed the theme of the evening.

After the panel, many attendees joined the panel in adjourning to a local restaurant for drinks and further celebration.

CARIBBEAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Reena Goldthree

Secretary: Takkara Brunson

The Caribbean Studies Section convened on Friday, January 6, 2023 from 4:30-6:00pm EST, hosting a section titled, "New Approaches to Caribbean Labor and Working-Class History." The session explored social dynamics within twentieth century labor movements. The session highlighted approaches for studying the histories of worker resistance in Haiti and British Guyana. Two invited presenters were unable to attend. The session featured presentations by Matthew Casey (University of Southern Mississippi) and Nicole Burrowes (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey). Reena Goldthree (Princeton University) served as the commentator.

In his paper, "'Informal Urban Labor during the US Occupation of Haiti (1915-1934): Political Exclusions, Historiographical Invisibility, and the Roots of Urban Protest in Port-au-Prince," Matthew Casey examined labor activism in Haiti during the U.S. Occupation. Casey centered the life of Haitian journalist, Joseph Jolibois Fils. Jolibois has been an understudied, complex figure who, on the one hand, emerged as a hero of the working class who critiqued U.S. imperialism and, on the other hand, was jailed and mocked by elites. Casey reconstructed the world in which he emerged to focus on the lives of workers. He argued that the same forces shaping life in rural communities also sent individuals to the cities. There they became part of the informal sector, and the resistance of such workers emerged in the journalism of Jolibois. Casey's analysis sought to grapple with portrayals of urban workers as part of Jolibois' political critique that also offered fragmented accounts of labor resistance.

Following Casey's presentation, Nicole Burrowes gave a paper titled, "Seeds of Solidarity: Revisiting the 1930s Caribbean." The presentation focused on social dynamics among Black and Indian laborers in British Guiana. Burrowes began by reflecting on the racial violence of 1964, which led to the killing of an estimated 700 individuals. The violence highlighted divisions between Black and Indian workers that permeated daily life in British Guiana. Burrowes argued that the tensions that led to such violence demonstrated how plantation logics lived on in the organizational structure of labor, as well as social networks. Workers from both populations had organized in separated labor unions and supported different political leaders. She emphasized that, as colonial populations, Black and Indian workers were positioned

against each other. Importantly, these divisions were not inevitable. Burrowes also presented the question: “How do we build on the established work and look at joy?” Her presentation suggested new approaches for understanding the complexities of social relationships in British Guiana.

In her comments following the presentations, Reena Goldthree identified key themes that emerged. One theme involved the nature of day-to-day governance in the British and U.S. empires. Second, she asked each presenter to speak more about their interpretation of source material, especially in cases where the sources provided limited evidence about the perspectives of workers themselves. Following Goldthree’s remarks, the panel concluded with questions from audience members. Audience members were particularly interested in Casey’s interpretation of Jolibois’ account of labor resistance. Finally, audience members asked Burrowes about how she identified moments of solidarity between Black and Indian workers.

CENTRAL AMERICAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Laura Matthew

Secretary: Brianna Leavitt-Alcántara

The Central American Studies Section held its annual meeting on Friday, January 6, in Philadelphia, as part of the meeting of the Conference on Latin American History and the American Historical Association. In her role as session chair, Laura Matthew convened a roundtable entitled “Transnational Scholarship, Transnational Lives – Early Career Historians of/from Central America.” The roundtable participants included Jennifer Cárcamo (University of California, Los Angeles), Stephanie M. Huevo (Fordham University), Mateo Jarquín (Chapman University), and Yaser Robles (Choate Rosemary Hall). Edward Anthony Polanco (Virginia Tech) served as commenter for the roundtable. Iyaxel Cojti Ren (University of Texas, Austin) intended to participate but was unable to attend due to unforeseen circumstances.

Laura Matthew presented opening comments, which included the announcement that Sylvia Sellers-García was elected as incoming Committee Secretary. Matthew welcomed the audience and explained that this roundtable discussion would feature a conversation among early career historians of Central American descent about how their transnational family and community ties have framed their scholarship and approach to the field of Central American history

Polanco opened the roundtable discussion by asking the panelists why they chose to study Central American history. Cárcamo, Huevo, Jarquín, and Robles shared how their experiences as immigrants or children of immigrants from El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras shaped their interest in the study of Central American history. Jarquín grew up spending extended periods of time in both Nicaragua and the United States. By contrast, Cárcamo, Huevo, and Robles grew up in the United States without regular opportunities to visit El Salvador and Honduras. Furthermore, their families preferred

not to talk about their home countries nor what motivated them to immigrate. For Huezo and Robles, growing up in areas of New York City without large Central American communities further limited their early exposure to Central American and diaspora histories. Several noted that their first substantive encounters with Central American history came in college courses and student organizing groups. Studying Central American history provided opportunities to make sense of personal and familial histories of migration and connect to Central American communities both in Central America and in the diaspora.

Polanco then asked the panelists how being Central American or of Central American descent has shaped the way they think about Central America and its past. The panelists discussed how their backgrounds shaped their interests in approaching the history of Central America and the Central American diaspora within transnational contexts. Jarquín's work, for example, considers how Nicaragua's Sandinista Revolution affected global debates about economic development and international relations. Robles' research examines how U.S. foreign policy and Central American civil war shaped Honduras and the experiences of Hondurans in the 1970s and 1980s. Huezo examines Salvadoran community organizers and movements for popular education in both El Salvador and the diaspora. Cárcamo has explored transnational Central Americans experiences and social movements through two original documentaries, *Children of the Diaspora: For Peace and Democracy* (2013) and *Eternos Indocumentados: Central American Refugees in the United States* (2018).

The roundtable then discussed the biggest challenges they have experienced in their academic and career journey. Panelists spoke about the lack of diversity in some academic institutions and the struggles involved with being one of the few Central American or Latinx graduate students or faculty members. The panelists also shared common experiences regarding the complex and sometimes painful dynamics involved in conducting research in their families' home countries. Given the recent history of war and trauma and on-going legacies of violence, some experienced intense familial opposition to their research plans. Robles spoke about the dilemma of doing oral histories with living subjects and worrying about the real-world ramifications of publishing his findings. Jarquín described how Nicaragua's current authoritarian government has made historical research increasingly difficult and dangerous. Huezo and Cárcamo expressed similar concerns about El Salvador's dramatic shift towards authoritarianism and the implications for social movements, human rights, and intellectual activity and research. Panelists also discussed how they have wrestled with the painful proximity of recent and longer-term traumatic histories to their own families' experiences. The roundtable concluded with a discussion of what questions Central Americanists should be thinking about today, as researchers and as teachers. All the panelists expressed a desire to see Central Americanists better incorporate the Central American diaspora into the field of study. Several pointed to the University of California, Los Angeles' new program in Central American Studies as a model for other institutions to follow.

CHILE-RIO DE LA PLATA SECTION MEETING

Chair: Debbie Sharnak

Secretary: Denisa Jashari

The Chile/Rio de la Plata Studies Section roundtable, “New Approaches to Dictatorships and Human Rights,” convened on Saturday, January 7, 2023, in Philadelphia. Debbie Sharnak (Rowan University) chaired the roundtable and Denisa Jashari (UNC-Greensboro) served as the commentator. This panel brought together six scholars at different stages of their academic careers and based in Argentina, the US, and the UK: Edward Brudney (University of Tennessee Chattanooga); Alison Bruey (University of North Florida, in absentia); Sebastián Carassai (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina); Constanza Dalla Porta (Princeton University); Joshua Stern (Temple University); and Luciana Zarzoli (Cardiff University).

Edward Brudney reflected on the ways in which certain dates, such as March 24, 1976, in Argentina, or September 11, 1973, in Chile, acquire definitional status and mark a before and after in the histories of these countries. Brudney suggested that we move beyond rupture to trace continuities in political culture across the schism of different administrations. Doing so, he argued, demonstrates that dictatorships were less cohesive and effective than previously thought. He was careful not to overlook the state-sanctioned forms of violence unleashed by military regimes. But Brudney also pointed to the gap between *de jure* and *de facto* rights; intended authoritarian decrees and laws did not always produce desired effects. Resistance to authoritarian regimes, and by extension to the application of their laws, stemmed not only from trade unions and leftist militants, but also as a “product of the systemic inertia that defines everyday life.” Brudney ultimately encouraged the audience to consider the persistence of routines and political cultures *despite* state repression and regime change.

Alison Bruey, who could not attend in person but whose written remarks Debbie Sharnak read out loud, similarly questioned the Chilean transition to democratic rule. In analyzing an armed robbery by the Lautaro Youth Movement (MJL) in the early 1990s, the ensuing police chase and massacre, and public discourses on crime and security, Bruey pointed to continuities both in radical left activity and the logic of state repression. By branding MJL participants solely as “delinquents” and divorcing their actions from the group’s larger *political* goals, Bruey argues that the democratic administration of Patricio Aylwin ignored the group’s human rights. Ultimately for Bruey, this incident reveals “unvarnished power dynamics and differential assignments of humanity that co-existed with positive human rights rhetoric and initiatives” during that period. Bruey challenges us to reconsider the narratives and periodizations of the larger Cold War and to critically examine how human rights discourse is mobilized, and just as importantly, whom it excludes and why.

Constanza Dalla Porta ended her presentation with a haunting question: “Are dead bodies and bones subjects of human rights?” Like Bruey, Dalla Porta considered who

has access to human rights and the complex power struggles around the recognition of rights. Dalla Porta's presentation centered on the work of the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team in identifying human remains, crucial work for the families of the disappeared and for ongoing legal claims and investigations. Dalla Porta made two main interventions. First, in following the emergence and trajectory of the Argentine Forensic team across Latin America, Europe, and Africa, she highlighted the transnational circulation of medical and scientific knowledge. Secondly, human remains and their subsequent identification have consequences for state-sanctioned disappearances and the law. When disappeared actors "reappear" as their bones are studied and identified, she asked, what should human rights advocates call them? In focusing on a largely understudied topic by historians, Dalla Porta's work on forensic anthropology has immense potential for the fields of human rights, international solidarity, the transnational circulation of medical expertise, and memory studies.

Sebastián Carassai began his remarks by referencing the lyrics of the song "Muchachos," which became the anthem of millions of Argentine soccer fans during the World Cup. The first lyrics of the song equate Argentina with the production of soccer stars and national heroes. The song states: "I was born in Argentina, land of Diego and Lionel, of the boys of the Malvinas that I will never forget." For Carassai, these lines embody the tension of Argentine national identity. He argued that before and after the Malvinas war with England in 1982, the question of Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands unified disparate social sectors. Perhaps the only common unifying thread across class and political ideology was the shared sentiment that the Malvinas were and would always be Argentine. The "Malvinas Paradox" as Carassai called it, manifested a central tension of Argentine identity: the celebrated Malvinas "heroes" were also the perpetrators of human right violations during the dictatorship. In identifying and calling out this tension between human rights on the one hand, and national patriotism on the other, Carassai's interventions prompted important questions on democracy and identity.

Luciana Zarzoli likewise provided a nuanced view of the Argentine dictatorship. She agreed with Brudney that dictatorships are not as cohesive as previously thought. Zarzoli showed that the only thing regime actors agreed on when it came to labor policy was the use of repression. Zarzoli and **Joshua Stern** brought labor studies squarely within discussions of dictatorships and human rights. Moving away from the commonly analyzed dimensions of authoritarianism, such as disappearances, detentions, and tortures, Zarzoli pushed for a critical examination of what she called the "productive character of the Proceso" in Argentina. In doing so, she argued that we must consider the capital-class conflict in comprehending workers' varied experiences. She argued that the Argentine dictatorship sought to sever what had once been a cohesive working-class political culture intimately tied to work and wage labor. For Zarzoli, and in close conversation with Carassai, the song "Muchachos" and its unifying dimensions can perhaps be seen as a response to the collective anxiety produced by the dictatorship's fragmentation of political culture.

In summary, the roundtable generated a productive discussion over the importance of dates and periodizations, the need to consider previously overlooked dimensions of authoritarian rule, and to unpack the complex links between national identity and human rights discourse. These scholars likewise traced continuities across time and national borders.

COLONIAL STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Mónica Ricketts

Secretary: Guadalupe García

“The Global and the Local – A Colonialist’s Conundrum.” The Colonial Studies Section of CLAH held its annual roundtable at the 2023 AHA/CLAH meeting in Philadelphia, on Friday, January 6, from 5:30 – 7:30 PM EST

Our roundtable counted with three out of the four announced speakers, Amílcar Challú (Professor of History and chair, Bowling Green State University), Kris E. Lane (Professor of History, Tulane University), Cristina Soriano (Associate Professor of History, University of Texas at Austin). Sadly, due to a family emergency, Martha Few (Professor of History, Penn State) could not join us.

The goal of the panel was to discuss how specialists of colonial Latin America have embraced the new trends affecting the historiography leading us to write within broader geographical and methodological frameworks: imperial, Atlantic, global, comparative. In the past decades, we have seen the publication of books and articles focusing on transatlantic networks and connections, and circulation of ideas, commodities, and peoples. There has also been an effort at examining specific cities and developments from broader perspectives. And while opening up, and comparing and connecting have consolidated as vibrant methodologies, local histories remain strong and crucial. This panel gathered specialists who have been able to successfully work along both lines of historical inquiry: the global and the local. They discussed the decision-making process in choosing their topics and angles of research and their methods when conducting archival research. More broadly, the aim of the panel was to reflect on the field of colonial Latin American from these methodological challenges.

Amílcar Challú shared his experience of working on living standards in colonial Mexico. He presented his rich and meticulously-gathered data for the late eighteenth century, which – as he explained – can only be fully understood when contrasted with comparable data from other parts of the world. In this light, Mexico appears wealthier and with better standards of living than we commonly assume. Next, Kris Lane presented an illuminating reflection of his coming-of-age as a historian of the colonial era and the challenges faced along the way, from working on mines to cities, to piracy, Colombian emeralds, to arrive back at Potosí’s mines and corruption scandals. Cristina Soriano closed by sharing her fascinating research on the circulation of ideas and

reform programs seen from the island of Trinidad, a place at the crossroads of multiple kinds of trade and connections, which would become – in her view – a true laboratory of reform. These three rich presentations offered provoking ideas and a discussion with the public followed that circled around the methodological challenges we all face not only when working along these lines, but also when writing about colonial Latin American in the United States for a mostly American public. A member of the audience urged us to be mindful of the differences that still exist in approaching topics in the United States and Latin America, a concern the panelists shared and work hard to bridge.

GRAN COLOMBIA STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Ana María Otero-Cleves

Panel: Yesenia Barragán, Catalina Muñoz, Franz Hensel, Blake C. Scott

Telling stories from and about Gran Colombia: Historical narratives, fragmentary subjects, and the archive (Roundtable)

Historians are well aware that the archive not only contains documents but is itself a contentious space. In the last three decades, scholars have recognized that far from being neutral, archival practices both shape and mirror power relations. By digging deep into the histories of the archives in which they work, historians have unearthed how power struggles, social epistemologies, cultural forces, ideological underpinnings, and collective interests have shaped the raw material available to scholars to explore the past.

In the roundtable of this year AHA titled *Telling stories from and about Gran Colombia: Historical narratives, fragmentary subjects, and the archive*, Catalina Muñoz (University de los Andes), Franz Hensel (Universidad Autónoma de Bucaramanga), Blake C. Scott (College of Charleston) and Ana María Otero-Cleves (Universidad de los Andes), engaged in a lively conversation about how “the archive” —broadly understood— has marked their understanding of men’s and women’s lives, and how it challenges the ways historians write histories of vulnerable and often invisibilized subjects for historians of Latin America. Yesenia Barragán (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey), who was unable to attend the panel in person, sent her comments in advance to be read in the session and discussed by the attendees.

In the session members of the panel critically discuss the challenges and limitations of the archive exploring how has the “archival turn” challenge the way they engage with and narrate stories of Gran Colombia’s men and women. Muñoz, Scott, Hensel, and Otero-Cleves shared the challenges they have faced in their own research, from engaging in “traditional” research to the oral history and public history projects. They also noted how questioning “the archive” in the current situation in the region should be

a priority among historians, particularly due to the physical state of the archives, the restrictions on access to many of them, and the possibility of their disappearance due to political pressure. Muñoz, Scott, and Hensel also highlighted the importance of continuing the conversation and of exploring different methodologies to narrate the stories of the least represented groups in Panama and Colombia. Finally, a space for discussion was given to the attendees who underlined the relevance of these discussions for both higher education and primary education.

MEXICAN STUDIES SECTION MEETING

Chair: Mónica Díaz

Secretary: Edward Wright-Ríos

Presenters: Robert Alegre, Bradley Benton, Ulices Piña

(Aside: Our fourth presenter, Karen Melvin, was unable to attend)

Title: Writing Mexican History – Issues and Solutions

Date: January 6, 2023

For this year's meeting we decided to open a discussion of the various challenges we face in writing history and how we find creative ways to surmount obstacles. We invited four scholars to attend, however one of our colleagues was unable to attend at the last minute. The chair and secretary sought scholars working on different time periods and doing different kinds of history so that we could spark a wide-ranging discussion. Fifteen additional colleagues attended the session and made up the audience. We asked each discussant to present a "problem" they encountered in their recent work.

Prof. Robert Alegre (Associate Professor, University of New England) presented first. Alegre's first book focused on railroad workers and their struggles to organize an independent union at a time when the Mexican government imposed *charro* (corrupt, state-selected interlopers) to run unions and block efforts to mobilize for better wages and conditions. It emerged from a very close focus on Mexican workers, a particular sector of the economy, and repressive state actors. The problem that he placed before us in his current book project relates to narrative and analytical cohesion when writing on a much broader topic. Alegre's new study offers a Latin America wide grassroots history of the Cold War. In other words, he needed an organizing theme or device to bring multiple social movement in different countries (and distinct national histories) into the same frame of analysis. He is working to resolve this challenge by focusing on how different movements understood the importance of self-determination in their respective political context and structured their strategies in hopes of achieving it.

Bradley Benton (Associate Professor, North Dakota State University) was the second presenter. He offered us a discussion of his research on early colonial mestizo children and a campaign to place them in colegios and apprenticeships. In other words, he

examines a handful of decades when post-conquest Spanish authorities discussed how to best support the rapidly emerging population of mixed-race children, the often-orphaned sons and daughters of Spaniards. Thus, his work analyses the debates that appear in the archives documenting this issue. However, he hoped to include a discussion of actual individual mestizo children impacted by these ideas. Benton described his frustration at not being able to identify any individual beneficiaries in the initial research. Much of what he worked with were notarial records. He drafted and submitted the article for publication with the question still nagging at him. After peer review and when beginning revisions, he realized that he had overlooked a particular subset of notarial records. There he was eventually able to locate two beneficiaries, a boy who was apprenticed to a silk weaver and another assigned to a Basque tailor. He also located an orphaned woman from the girl's colegio who secured a dowry from the school. (However, it isn't certain that she was a mestiza.) In any case, as he shared with the other panelists and audience, sometimes we need to be engaged in the act of writing to develop ideas and make connections, especially when working with the very fragmentary records.

Prof. Ulices Piña (Assistant Professor, California State University Long Beach) was the final panelist. Piña is in the process of turning his dissertation into a book. His research focuses on the complex political dynamics within the state of Jalisco during the decades immediately following the Mexican Revolution. He is also seeking to inspire new ways of thinking about state formation, essentially moving in new directions after the surge of state formation studies in the mid 1990s. What he shared in the presentation was his attempts to understand how the nascent post-Revolutionary state began to surveil its imagined opponents and conspiring rivals in Jalisco during the mid-1920s. Here the challenge was for Piña was how to organize his analysis in a readable manner after examining the dossiers of the state's early effort to establish a domestic intelligence unit. What Piña realized amid revisions was that he was able to learn an extensive amount about one agent in particular, an agent who also produced thoughtful detailed reports. Therefore, he has built his discussion of this moment around the "vision" and institutional biography of a specific historical actor. In essence, readers get a sense for "seeing like a state" via their immersion in this individual's perspective.

Following the panelists presentations, we proceeded to have forty minutes of active discussion, moving from direct questions about individuals' work and analysis to broader debates about writing strategies.

TEACHING & TEACHING MATERIALS SECTION MEETING

Carlos Dimas, Chair

Ángeles Picone, Secretary

The Teaching and Teaching Materials Section met on Saturday January 7, 2023 at 6pm. We began the meeting by reiterating fundraising efforts for the Syllabus Prize and congratulating this year's winner, Dr. Luis Herrán Ávila (University of New Mexico). This year's theme was "Revisiting the Survey." The committee, composed of Ximena Sevilla (University of Rhode Island), Edward Brudney (University of Tennessee - Chattanooga), and Ulices Piña (University of California - Long Beach) was impressed by Dr. Herrán Ávila's emphasis on where the "learning will happen." They appreciated his well-structured survey that challenged narratives that portrayed Latin Americans as victims and appreciated the breadth of assignments, topics, and voices.

We then moved on to the roundtable, which comprised of a thought-provoking, engaging conversation around the Latin American survey as well. Because of some last minute changes, the panel differed a little bit from the program. Then-secretary Ángeles Picone chaired the session. Panelists were Sephanie Huezo (Fordham University), Elizabeth Schwall (University of Northern Arizona), and Kyle Harvey (Western Carolina University) in lieu of Javier Cikota (Bowdoin College). Panelists situated their courses within their institutions, describing a bit more in depth the student body they serve and how they adapt the survey to those demographics. For example, Dr. Huezo stressed the importance of the concept of *mestizaje* to engage students. Dr. Schwall brought out attention to the distinction between importance and significance to ask what stories matter. Dr. Harvey observed the challenges that Latin American History poses for US students, such as the complex hierarchies and actors.

The audience was so engaged it was hard to keep up taking notes. An audience member stressed the importance of discussing the meaning of Latin America and of acknowledging that we do not have a clear answer. This lack of clarity, more than a hindrance, offers a world of possibilities for understanding the history of the region. Another attendee also pushed for class discussions on students' assumptions about Latin America to challenge their stereotypes. In turn, such conversations, argued the audience, could result in examinations of the relationship between the US and Latin America. At this point, interventions revolved around the changing nature of "Latin America" both as a label, as a region, and as a unit of analysis. Finally, panelists and audience members exchanged thoughts about textbooks (most leaned towards getting rid of them), difficult concepts for students (like liberalism or even class), and the centrality of historical skills.

Perhaps the most significant takeaway from this meeting was the interest in teaching-focused events in the context of CLAH to reflect on our teaching of Latin American History.

VI. CLAH AWARD AND PRIZE RECIPIENTS AND CITATIONS

1. James Alexander Robertson Prize

Committee: Catherine Komisaruk (chair), Ray Craib, Paul Lokken

Winner: Guillermo Wilde and Kazuhisa Takeda, “Tecnologías de la memoria: Mapas y padrones en la configuración del territorio guaraní de las misiones” *Hispanic American Historical Review* (2021) 101.4: 597–627.

The committee was unanimous in selecting “Tecnologías de la memoria: Mapas y padrones en la configuración del territorio guaraní de las misiones” by Guillermo Wilde and Kazuhisa Takeda, among a very impressive pool of articles, for the Robertson Prize. With their innovative approach to sources and their expert interpretation, Wilde and Takeda have offered new perspectives on the history of the Guaraní communities that came to be settled in reducciones in the region of the Paraná and Uruguay Rivers (this is what is today the border between Brazil, Paraguay, and Argentina). Their analysis is based on maps and padrones (census records) of these communities, as well as narrative histories written by Jesuit missionaries. As they describe the nature of their sources, Wilde and Takeda give evidence of indigenous cartographers, artists, and writers in the production of the maps in particular. They demonstrate the richness of these maps as sources for the history of Guaraní communities: In their skilled analysis, we see that the maps document particular cacicazgos (native rulerships) that persisted—or were reconstituted—through the process of reducción and Jesuit intervention, and even into the decades beyond the Jesuit expulsion of the late eighteenth century.

The article’s interventions play out on several levels: First is the history that the authors reveal of Guaraní communities—a remarkable trajectory of survival of native political, social, and economic structures even under the unfathomable pressures of population loss, forced relocation, and religious conversion. On a second level, the article offers a key methodological intervention in its approach of combining the study of maps with a study of padrones (census records). The authors note that previous scholarship on the Guaraní missions has studied maps, or padrones, but not both. In their comparative analysis of maps and padrones from the same region, Wilde and Takeda demonstrate how not only cacicazgos but also their constituent lineages persisted, and in some cases shifted, through reducción and relocation. Finally, the article has provided a valuable intervention in its introduction to a little-known body of documents—the maps of Guaraní territories in the Jesuit missionary ambit. The authors demonstrate not only the great potential of these maps as sources, but also the historical significance of the maps themselves as documents that were carefully preserved and were, over the decades, often consulted, altered by annotations, and copied. These maps were, in the words of Wilde and Takeda, “technologies of memory” for native communities if not also Jesuit missionaries. Along with padrones and narrative histories, maps served as a

device by which indigenous authorities conserved the memory of their use of territory and of their contributions to community formation.

The article “Tecnologías de la memoria” is outstanding in offering both historical and methodological interventions. The committee further praised the authors for having located a scattered body of published and unpublished sources (created by native as well as colonial authors); for their work with verbal, visual, and quantitative sources; their innovative methodology; their powerful analysis and their compelling findings; and their clear and accessible writing. “Tecnologías de la memoria” exemplifies the best kind of work in our discipline.

2. Antonine Tibesar Prize

Committee: Vanessa Freije (chair), Sarah Sarzynski, Robert Schwaller

Winner: Yesenia Barragán, “Commerce in Children: Slavery, Gradual Emancipation, and the Free Womb Trade in Colombia,” *The Americas* 78.2 (Apr 2021): 229-257.

Winner: Yesenia Barragán’s investigation of the Colombian Free Womb law of 1821 focuses on the consequences that the legal ambiguities had for enslaved mothers and children. Instead of emancipating Free Womb children, the law created even more unstable categories, starting a Free Womb trade and enabling children’s enslavement. Analyzing congressional debates, Barragán reveals how this commerce happened on the ground in the Chocó province. Her archival research goes beyond legal history by illuminating the experiences of enslaved children and showing how enslaved mothers used the legal system to fight against family separation. Her work contributes to a growing body of scholarship that reveals that quotidian experiences did not conform to binary categories of freedom or enslavement.

Honorable Mention: Robert Buffington, “Chin-Chun-Chan: Popular Sinophobia in Early Twentieth-Century Mexico City,” *The Americas*, 78.2 (Apr 2021): 279-318.

Robert Buffington’s work reveals the deep context of a seemingly inconsequential idiom “Chin-Chun-Chan,” and how the idiom offers insights about how Mexicans responded to relatively-low levels of Chinese immigration in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Analyzing popular culture sources such as theatre and penny press publications, Buffington opens up a broader conversation about how Sinophobia became so central to postrevolutionary racial politics and nationalist discourses. The article is particularly impressive for its methodological richness as Buffington draws from feminist and queer theories to examine how racist discourses were sexualized. He shows how such discourses relied on emotions of disgust and fear to describe Chinese bodies and naturalize Sinophobia.

3. Paul Vanderwood Prize

Committee: Gabe Paquette (chair), Lauren MacDonald, Joseph Clark

Winner: Kevan Antonio Aguilar "From Comrades to Subversives: Mexican Secret Police and 'Undesirable' Spanish Exiles, 1939–60," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 53.1 (2021): 1-24.

This well-conceived and well-researched article examines the Mexican State's surveillance in the decades of the 1940s and 1950s of mainly left-wing but also republican Spanish political exiles who fled Spain for Mexico during and in the immediate aftermath of the Spanish Civil War. Displaying both mastery of the robust existing historiography and offering original insights based on previously underutilized archival sources, Aguilar reveals the Mexican state's ambivalent embrace of Spanish political exiles, which balanced ideological affinities and international solidarity with apprehension about the subversive impact of the exiles, what the surveillance apparatus regarded as the exiles' potential threat to the existing order.

Honorable Mention: Ana María Silva Campos, "Fragile Fortunes: Afro-descended Women, Property Seizures, and the Remaking of Urban Cartagena," *Colonial Latin American Review* 30.2 (2021): 197-213.

Silva Campos's methodologically sophisticated article uses confiscation records to examine the urban dynamics of property ownership in seventeenth century Cartagena. Her convincing analysis serves to "reveal the ways in which formerly enslaved women shaped local micro-economies." In particular, she explores Inquisition records related to the property of women accused of witchcraft, whose dispossession not only disrupted the community of free people of African descent but also impacted local economic life as this property was liquidated, auctioned, and redistributed in Cartagena.

4. Lydia Cabrera Awards

Committee: Takkara Brunson (chair), Aisha Finch, UCLA, Fernanda Bretones, University of Florida

Winner 1: Daylín P. López's dissertation on benevolent hospitals examines the gendered, racial assumptions that shaped medical knowledge and practices during the nineteenth century. Such assumptions, López contends, reflect broader confrontations over the nature of colonialism between the urban reforms of the 1840s and slave emancipation during the 1880s. Furthermore, López employs an Atlantic framework in order to analyze "the interaction between Caribbean and Latin American scientific

thought, and the connections between regions traditionally considered “peripheral” to science and medical development.”

Winner 2: Sophia Kitlinski's dissertation project traces the transatlantic circulation of Abakuá objects between the late 1870s and late 1890s. Kitlinski asserts that, even after the Spanish colonial government criminalized the Abakuá, Cubans and Spaniards treated the spiritual objects as powerful while mobilizing them to shape the nature of Spanish imperial policy. Kitlinski “connects three regions linked by the circulation of Abakuá objects—Cuba, Spain, and Spain’s African colonies—that have rarely been studied together in order to understand how spiritual objects intervened in the asymmetrical social and political hierarchies of empire.”

5. Scobie Awards

Committee: Mariola Espinosa, William Van Norman, Chloe Ireton

Winners: (already announced in April 2022)

Javier Etchegaray García

Camila Ordorica Bracamontes

Jeanette Charles

Austin Nelsen

Constance Holden

6. Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award

Committee: Renata Keller (chair), Elizabeth Schwall, Robert Saba

Winner: William Cohoon, “Information Empire: Environmental Social Policy and Resistance in Bourbon Peru.”

Our committee is pleased and honored to present the Lewis Hanke Post-Doctoral Award to William Cohoon for his project “Information Empire: Environmental Social Policy and Resistance in Bourbon Peru.” Cohoon’s research on Bourbon officials’ attempts to transform Peru’s urban and rural environments for the purposes of information gathering and social control promises to provide crucial insight into the processes and challenges of the Spanish imperial project in the Americas. The committee was particularly impressed with the way Cohoon uses a wide variety of sources to examine both the imperial agents’ efforts to control their colonial territories as well as local responses. His research into imperial technologies is on the cutting edge of scholarship on social control and built environments. Cohoon’s plans to use the Hanke award to expand his archival base to a new region of Peru—the province of Arequipa—will help him compare local responses there to what he has already found in

other regions. Cohoon's previous experience researching and publishing in Peru gives us confidence that he will make the most of this opportunity. This additional fieldwork will help Cohoon publish a nuanced, multi-faceted book on Spanish imperialism in Peru that will help diversify and deepen our understanding of a pivotal part of Latin America's colonial past. We applaud William Cohoon for his creative, ambitious work and are excited to help support his ongoing efforts.

7. María Elena Martínez Prize in Mexican History

Committee: Matthew O'Hara (chair), Norah Gharala, Jaime Rodríguez

Winner: Alan Shane Dillingham, *Oaxaca Resurgent: Indigeneity, Development, and Inequality in Twentieth-Century Mexico* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2021)

Oaxaca Resurgent is an expansive history of development policy and indigenismo in the Mexican state of Oaxaca. While it offers a richly-textured case study focused on the Mixteca, the book is notable for the way that it links regional, national, and hemispheric conversations about inequality and political participation. The analysis is thoroughly grounded in the historiography of twentieth-century Mexico and draws on a rich and diverse set of sources, from underutilized archival collections to oral history. Attentive to the interplay between, on the one hand, government officials in Oaxaca and Mexico City, and, on the other, Indigenous leaders, activists, and intellectuals, Oaxaca Resurgent forces us to rethink the evolution of Mexican indigenismo in the second half of the twentieth century.

8. Warren Dean Prize in Brazilian History

Committee: Andy Kirkendall (chair), Patricia Acerbi, Kirsten Schultz

Winner: Frederico Freitas, *Nationalizing Nature: Iguazu Falls and National Parks at the Brazil-Argentina Border* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

The Warren Dean prize goes to a book that demonstrates the importance of borderlands in Brazilian history, as well as the necessity of crossing national borders to answer significant historical questions. Using an array of sources and innovative methodologies, Frederico Freitas's *Nationalizing Nature* demonstrates that the state in both Brazil and Argentina wanted to affirm its sovereignty by establishing and maintaining national parks at the border. An unevenly developing state created an almost accidental and certainly contested environmentalism with long-lasting consequences. The state protected land and attracted sometimes troublesome settlers, who were later often expelled. *Nationalizing Nature* represents a major contribution to

the literature, one certainly worthy of the legacy of Professor Dean, even as it modifies his narrative of environmental decline.

9. Bolton-Johnson Prize

Committee: Herman Bennett (chair), Joel Wolfe, Sonya Lipsett-Rivera

Winner: Diana Montaña, *Electrifying Mexico: Technology and the Transformation of a Modern City* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2021).

Conquest, colonialism and capitalism but also development, modernization and modernity have long framed both the history and historiography of Latin America. For much of the twentieth century as scholars wrote some truly memorable histories—classics that we repeatedly turn and return to—where the impetus or dynamism, what today might be characterized as agency, resided with the Europe or the West. Few writers, for instance, initially conceived of capitalism’s disembodied invisible hand as being an indigenous or African appendage. Capitalism’s roots were allegedly in Europe so that in its long history in Latin America, it remained an alien, disruptive, and extractive force benefitting above all else European sovereigns, merchants, and elite. Characterizing the history of capitalism, this representation had its analogues in the narratives of the conquest, colonialism, development, modernization and modernity but also the histories of medicine, science and technology. Diana J. Montaña’s *Electrifying Mexico: Technology and the Transformation of a Modern City* breaks with this conceptual strategy and in doing so rewrites the story of technology in Mexico.

Montaña’s book is well written and engaging. This book builds on the work of the history of technology that engages with culture and society, but the author goes further by adding in cultural, gender, and spatial analysis. The prose is deft and absorbing. Because electricity has been part of our lives, it can seem invisible, but Montaña shows the ways in which it transformed Mexico City and challenged the citizens of the metropolis to adapt but also tailor the technology to their purposes. *Electrifying Mexico* goes beyond describing the introduction of electricity into a major city. It is a terrific study of the ways that the various aspects of progress infiltrated daily life and culture.

The book fulfills the promise of the best works on technology by contextualizing a universal tool or process in the local history and culture of a specific place. In doing so, Montaña enriches our understanding of both the establishment of electrical systems broadly and Mexico City’s drive for progress more specifically. That complex focus and Montaña’s beautiful prose make *Electrifying Mexico* a book that will no doubt be broadly read and taught. It makes a major contribution to the historiography on Mexico, Latin America, and technology in the Global South. For all of these reasons, we are pleased to award the Bolton-Johnson Prize to Diana Montaña for *Electrifying Mexico*.

10. Susan M. Socolow-Lyman L. Johnson Prize

Committee: Jessica Stites Mor (chair), Kevin A. Young, Fabricio Prado

Winner: Carmen Soliz, *Fields of Revolution: Agrarian Reform and Rural State Formation in Bolivia, 1935-1964* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2021).

Carmen Soliz's *Fields of Revolution: Agrarian Reform and Rural State Formation in Bolivia, 1935–1964* is a groundbreaking study of one of the twentieth century's most extensive and enduring land reforms. Prior scholarship tended to view Bolivia's 1953 land reform as a top-down project designed to promote individual ownership and strip Indigenous peoples of their ethnic and cultural identities. While there is some truth in this narrative, Soliz reveals that the process was fiercely contested at every stage. Based on painstaking research in untapped archives, *Fields of Revolution* shows that peasants and Indigenous people exerted major influence over the policies of the MNR regime, both by compelling it to prioritize land reform and by shaping how the reform was implemented. For instance, Indigenous mobilization forced the MNR to recognize the legitimacy of communal land ownership. As Soliz argues, "the timing, depth, and final outcome of the land reform – a process ostensibly carried out by the revolutionary party – was fundamentally defined by local and community forces." This book will serve as a model for how to study processes of revolutionary change and state formation in Bolivia and beyond.

Honorable Mention: Angeles Donoso Macaya, *The Insubordination of Photography: Documentary Practices under Chile's Dictatorship* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2021).

Angeles Donoso Macaya's *The Insubordination of Photography: Documentary Practices under Chile's Dictatorship* (University Press of Florida, 2020) profoundly pushes forward the field of history of the Southern Cone by introducing new methodological approaches from visual studies to unearth silences of Chile's long years under Augusto Pinochet. The work considers the practices of photographers, their scientific and documentary interventions, and their provocations to assist in recuperating and reconstructing lost collective memory. It moves from considerations of practices of display and archival work to the use of photographs in investigative journalism and as forensic material in legal environments. Donoso Macaya's wide range of source material also pushes the boundaries of the study of photography within the discipline of history. This book should serve as a guide for historians looking to engage their students with the practices of the visual and the work of documenting the past.

VII. IN APPRECIATION: CLAH ENDOWMENT AND FUND CONTRIBUTORS

Antonine Tibesar Prize

Stephen Lewis

CLAH Prizes and Awards

Margaret Chowning

John F. Schwaller

Corinna Zeltsman

Mary Kay Vaughan

James Sanders

Eric Van Young

Elinor Melville Prize

Robert Wilcox

Howard F. Cline Memorial Prize

Heather Roller

Lewis Hanke Award

R Dellacava

James R. Scobie Awards

R Dellacava

Maria Elena Martinez Prize

Juan Pablo Morales Garza

Susan Socolow-Lyman Johnson Prize

Carmen Soliz

Warren Dean Prize in Brazilian History

Yuko Miki

Robert Wilcox

VIII. LIFETIME MEMBERS (NEW MEMBERS IN BOLD)

Alden, Dauril
Aleman, Gladys
Anderson, Rodney
Andrews, Reid
Appelbaum, Nancy
Arrom, Silvia
Barragan, Yesenia
Bassi, Ernesto
Beezley, William
Bell, Stephen
Bennett, Herman L.
Bigelow, Allison
Borges, Dain
Borucki, Alex
Boyer, Christopher
Buchenau, Jurgen
Bunker, Steven B.
Burkholder, Mark
Burns, Kathryn
Cagle, Hugh
Carey, Elaine
Castilho, Celso
Castro, Donald
Cline, Sarah
Coatsworth, John
Coerver, Don
Cohen, Theodore
Connell, William F.
Conniff, Michael
Cook, Karoline
Cooney, Jerry
Couturier, Edith
Covert, Lisa
Cowan, Benjamin
Craib, Raymond
Cummins, Victoria
Davies Jr., Thomas
Dávila, Jerry
De La Pedraja, René
De La Teja, Jesús F.
De La Torre Curiel, Jose

Delson, Roberta
Duenas, Alcira
Eakin, Marshall
Edwards, Erika
Eller, Anne
Erbig, Jeffrey
Flemion, Phillip
Friedman, Max Paul
Ganster, Paul
Gao, Jian
Garrett, David
Gonzales, Michael
Gram, Bill
Graubart, Karen
Greever, Janet
Grieco, Viviana
Horna, Hernan
Jaffary, Nora
Jaksic, Ivan
Johnson, Harold
Juni, Mayer
Kiddle, Amelia
Knight, Franklin
Komisaruk, Catherine
Lane, Kris
Langer, Erick
Lavrin, Asunción
Lee, Monica Kittiya
Lesser, Jeff
Lewin, Linda
Logan, Alison
Lombardi, John
Lopez, Rick
Love, Joseph
Lucero, Bonnie
Lutz Christopher
Macias-Gonzalez, Victor
MacLachlan, Colin
Mallon, Florencia
Matthew, Laura
McEnroe, Sean

Milton, Cynthia
Moulton, Aaron
Myers, Alfred
Navarro, José Manuel
Nobles, Rex
O'Hara, Matthew D.
O'Toole, Rachel Sarah
Olcott, Jocelyn
Owens, Sarah
Pieper Mooney, Jadwiga
Poole, Stafford
Porter, Susie
Premo, Bianca
Proctor III, Frank (Trey)
Pruitt, Jennifer
Putnam, Lara
Radding, Cynthia
Ramos, Frances
Rankin, Monica
Rausch, Jane
Resendez, Andrés
Rice, Mark
Rich, Paul
Roch, Gabriel
Roseblatt, Karin
Safford, Frank
Sanders, Nichole
Schlotterbeck, Marian

Schwaller, John
Scobie, Ingrid
Scott, Rebecca
Silva Campo, Ana Maria
Soto Laveaga, Gabriela
Stern, Steve
Stevens, Donald
Stewart, James
Stowe, Noel
Sullivan-Gonzalez, Douglass
Summerhill, William
Sweet, David
Tenenbaum, Barbara
Terraciano, Kevin
Tinsman, Heidi
Tulchin, Joseph
Vazquez, Josefina Z.
Vinson III, Ben
Vrana, Heather
Wakild, Emily
Walker, Andrew
Walker, Louise
Warren, Richard
Weber, Rebecca
Wright- Rios, Edward
Yannakakis, Yanna Panayota
Young, Julia
Zyblikiewics, Lubomir