



Testimonials

Author(s): Alejandro Álvarez Béjar, Tom Angotti, Ricardo Antunes, Robert Austin, Florence E. Babb, David Barkin, Marc Becker, Bernadete Beserra, Armando Boito, Julio Carranza, James D. Cockcroft, Raúl Delgado Wise, Haroldo Dilla Alfonso, Elizabeth Dore, Paul Dosh, Alex Dupuy, Steve Ellner, Marco A. Gandásegui Jr., James N. Green, Dale Johnson, Susanne Jonas, Saul Landau, Jim Levy, Francisco López Segrera, Michael Löwy, Mônica Dias M ...

Source: *Latin American Perspectives*, November 2013, Vol. 40, No. 6, CELEBRATING 40 YEARS OF "LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES" (November 2013), pp. 71-113

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24574811>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Latin American Perspectives*

JSTOR

Testimonials

Conocí a *LAP* desde los 1970s por amigos muy queridos que se comprometieron con causas mexicanas y latinoamericanas y que aportaron su talento a la revista: Susanne Jonas, James Cockcroft, Norma Chinchilla, Nora Hamilton, Tim Harding, Richard Harris y Michael Kearney. En pláticas personales que tuvimos y cada quien por su lado, me sugirieron la lectura puntual de algún artículo que pensaban podía interesarme o que debía leer sobre algún debate importante. Así aprendí que gente muy diversa en posiciones políticas, pero solidaria con las luchas mexicanas y latinoamericanas, seguía el pulso de la revista, en la que rápidamente identifiqué además su apertura a la diversidad, su solidez académica y un compromiso político irrenunciable.

Fue una revista que leí primero ocasionalmente; después fui invitado a escribir como autor, mas adelante a participar como colaborador editorial revisando artículos y retomarlos en forma de pequeños libros. En esas labores diversas fue crucial el contacto con otros colaboradores: Jan Rus, Miguel Tinker Salas, Heather Williams, Rosalva Aida Hernández, Héctor Díaz Polanco, Adolfo Gilly, David Barkin y el propio Ron Chilcote.

La cercanía con *LAP* me ha mantenido al día sobre los principales problemas y debates norteamericanos relacionados con México especialmente y con América Latina más en general: sobre los procesos democráticos, la violencia y el poder estatal, los nuevos regímenes políticos, los movimientos sociales agrarios y urbanos, las rebeldías ciudadanas y las luchas electorales, las tensiones culturales, los procesos de integración económica, las reconfiguraciones estatales, la emergencia de poderes populares.

A través de las páginas de *LAP* pude ampliar la visión sobre el despliegue de golpes militares y el terrorismo de Estado, la irrupción de guerras revolucionarias, las luchas de defensa de derechos humanos, la relevancia de las perspectivas de género, los balances de procesos revolucionarios, el debates sobre las perspectivas de nuestras transiciones democráticas, la comprensión de las complejas y variadas migraciones al Norte, los movimientos de solidaridad dentro de los Estados Unidos con los migrantes y los refugiados políticos, el seguimiento de los avatares de fuerzas guerrilleras y las desviaciones políticas. Tuvieron para mí valor especial, los debates sobre la complejidad de los ejercicios de memoria histórica, la crítica a las políticas neoliberales y a la globalización, y las reflexiones sobre los movimientos sociales.

Como lector y editor, he aprendido y me he beneficiado de la lectura de materiales que buscan publicación, tratando siempre de hacer mis juicios asegurando oportunidad en la entrega de revisiones, esforzando mi imparcialidad y objetividad al valorar las ideas de autores de las más diversas disciplinas sociales pero inspirados en la investigación participativa, con los que he tratado de dialogar aún sin conocerlos, señalando la forma de mejorar sus textos según su propia perspectiva o apurando su publicación.

También he aprovechado la lectura de los materiales más diversos como una fuente de información sobre nuevos temas y problemas, sobre enfoques multidisciplinarios novedosos, sobre perspectivas críticas en todos los temas. He usado *LAP* como herramienta política, didáctica y académica.

Pero sobre todo, *LAP* me ha servido para mantener un espíritu abierto a la polémica científica y política, una actitud positiva ante las diversas perspectivas teóricas y, sobre todo, para mantenerme alerta ante los nuevos fenómenos que cruzan por los Estados Unidos y llegan a Latinoamérica, para finalmente proyectar su influencia en el resto del mundo. Mi trabajo en ella ha sido pequeño pero siento que significativo dentro del gran esfuerzo colectivo que han coordinado incansables por largos cuarenta años Ron y el equipo editorial con quienes he tenido el privilegio de colaborar. ¡Larga vida a *LAP*!

—Alejandro Álvarez Béjar
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

LAP has kept alive, honed, and updated the spirit of opposition to U.S. intervention in Latin America that helped inspire its founding and my own involvement. Intellectually serious and rigorous, it stands apart from the scholarly journals geared only to the self-promotion of individuals. It gives voice to subversive ideas such as national liberation, true democracy, socialism, and communism. Its culture of collective responsibility and transparency are unique and refreshing. Thanks to Ron Chilcote and everyone serving on the editorial collective for 40 years of revolutionary scholarship!

—Tom Angotti
City University of New York

Latin American Perspectives chega ao seu 40th anniversary issue com uma longa histórica e rica experiência. Sua força é reconhecida em vários países e em diversos espaços acadêmicos (e também extra-acadêmicos) pela capacidade demonstrada ao longo destes anos em analisar, refletir e debater a América Latina em sua história e seu presente, em seus dilemas e desafios, em seus impasses e alternativas, em suas tensões e soluções.

Tanto em sua proposta mais geral, quanto nos diversos números temáticos que publicou, as diversas abordagens críticas e plurais sempre encontraram acolhida, quanto eram pautadas por qualidade intelectual e relevância temática. Assim, os temas do capitalismo e do socialismo, das lutas sociais, de classe, de gênero, de etnia, em suas múltiplas e autênticas transversalidade—sempre tendo como fio condutor o universo latinoamericano—foram sempre pontos de destaque na *LAP*.

Agora, ao publicar durante seus 40 anos, *LAP* tem um amplo, rico e complexo universo de lutas sociais, que suas paginas poderão, uma vez mais, ajudar em suas análises e reflexões. Isso porque estamos desafiados a compreender tanto a *nova polissemia* do trabalho, a sua *nova morfologia*, bem como o novo desenho das lutas sociais, das greves e rebeliões, das revoltas e revoluções, que estão eclodindo, em várias partes do mundo, nestas primeiras décadas do século XXI.

Se a era da mundialização do capital vem se ampliando acentuadamente nestas últimas décadas, estamos obrigados a analisar e melhor compreender as novas lutas e rebeliões que eclodem nesta era de mundialização das lutas sociais. E nossa América Latina—assim também como a Ásia, a África, para não falar da Europa—tem dado exemplos destas novas (e velhas) formas de confrontação anticapitalista.

Na Argentina, por exemplo, durante a crise de 2001, presenciamos a eclosão de formas de luta como o movimento dos *piqueteros* (trabalhadores/as—desempregados/as), que “cortan las rutas” e travam tanto a circulação de mercadorias para exigir que o tema crucial do desemprego seja efetivamente combatido. Também presenciamos a expansão significativa das ocupações de fábricas e de empresas durante o período mais crítico da recessão argentina, e também no Uruguai, Venezuela, Brasil, dentre outros exemplos.

Ao contrário da tese que defendia a perda de relevância das greves, temos inúmeros exemplos de uma retomada importante das ações grevistas no México, Brasil, Argentina, Bolívia, Colômbia, dentre tantos outros países.

As lutas dos trabalhadores rurais pela reforma agrária, pelo combate ao agrobusiness, contra os transgênicos, pelo direito ao trabalho, pela propriedade coletiva da terra e dos bens vitais (como a água, petróleo, gás), pela imprescindível preservação das florestas com suas áreas verdes), pelo combate à propriedade intelectual concentrada nas mãos das transnacionais, dentre tantas outras lutas e ações pelas *questões vitais*, eis aí um rico e complexo temário que certamente estará presente nesta nova etapa da vida da *LAP*.

—Ricardo Antunes

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

One tragic and one combative anniversary in one year: the fortieth September 11 since U.S.-led imperialism and the Chilean bourgeoisie decimated the Popular Unity experiment and the fortieth year for this journal, indispensable to International Studies and an instrument in the armory of struggle—what Amílcar Cabral famously called “the weapon of theory.” *LAP*’s first issues bore an eerie link with the Chilean Spring, just as they now bear one to the student-led struggle that has again placed radical social alternatives on the Chilean agenda. They debated the very conjuncture in which the peaceful road to socialism had been disastrously immersed but at a continental level: the theoretical contest between dependency and imperialism and the political struggle between reformism and revolution. Recent issues on Cuba have again drawn that tension into sharp focus, as the contradictions of postsoviet socialist development face the seductions of the post-Maoist Chinese road. These geographical extremes of Cuba and Chile also bookend *LAP*’s historical-analytical sweep from mature revolution to mature counterrevolution.

There has been a remarkable continuity between *LAP*’s original and its contemporary aims, expressed in the near-verbatim then-and-now “top priority” to be accorded “articles which strike directly at the heart of the most important theoretical issues . . . particularly subjects which have received inadequate discussion or are in sharp dispute” (*Latin American Perspectives* 1[1]). The collective has consistently applied its audacious support for relative unknowns

or emerging scholars alongside veterans, notably from Latin America—support that is essential if one is to confront the capital-policed boundaries of theoretical exploration and their interaction with material reality. High standards of peer review emphasize collaboration once an article is accepted for publication, enhancing both it and *LAP*. The robust collective is marked by vigorous debate in a constructive atmosphere, ensuring that the historical practice developed both enriches and is in turn enriched. We relative newcomers stand on wise and solidary shoulders; not all critical journals enjoy this collective maturity.

As the long capitalist downturn that would lead to the current global crisis began, *LAP*'s inaugural pages minced no words. They rejected the safe and well-worn paths of "the many bourgeois journals and scholarly associations" that "disguise their support of the capitalist system in Latin America behind a facade of 'academic neutrality,'" reminding us that "all scholarship has a political function." *LAP* resisted, largely successfully, the policy-studies turn that accompanied postmodernism's pinnacle in the 1980s and 1990s. Some debates, however, merit reconsideration, since their contexts have changed dramatically over the decades. Can a European-generated body of theory—Marxism—adapt to what García Márquez calls the "impossible reality of Latin America"? Does Bolivarian socialism revive or refocus the Third World–First World social science debate? Are armed forces capable of revolutionary socialist practice in any sustained way? Have armed exile and gender struggle had adequate space? Has imperialism receded, or simply diversified? Are any nongovernmental organization prototypes redeemable for the Second Independence? How can *LAP* best support the struggle against institutionalized state terror? What should be the role of intellectual workers, both in the university and in the street? Does the journal speak to and energize popular intellectuals and activists?

A final word on the Unfinished Chilean Revolution: Forty years on, one need only live briefly in Chile to sense the vacuous, miserable, financially enslaved, and deeply traumatized existence of the vast majority. The Cuban health workers I interviewed at a Santiago clinic in 2012 were unanimous: "Chile now has no soul." The Chilean left itself continues to dispute the recent past, though more constructively now that "President Berlusconi con Poncho" has starkly reminded all that Pinochet is far from departed. The catalyst for this positive turn has been the bold student mobilizations, less dependent on left party politics than is traditionally the case, generating a new if not unique history. Somewhere between this Chile and that Cuba lies the future of twenty-first-century socialism, a worthy theme for *LAP*'s future.

—Robert Austin

Centro de Estudios y Capacitación Técnico Pedagógica, Santiago de Chile

As a graduate student in the mid-1970s, I discovered *LAP* at a particularly apt time. I was preparing to carry out my doctoral research on market women in Peru and thrilled to come across a journal that had brought out—all in the course of one year and just in time to shape my thinking and my project—special issues on Peru and on Latin American women. As soon as I had consumed double-issue 12/13, *Women and Class Struggle* (4 [1-2], 1977), with articles by

Eleanor Leacock, Heleieth Saffioti, Carmen Diana Deere, Marianne Schmink, and others, I received issue 14, *Peru: Bourgeois Revolution and Class Struggle* (4 [3], 1977). That issue included articles by Elizabeth Dore and John Weeks, William Bollinger, Víctor Villanueva, and others. And then, wonder of wonders, issue 15 arrived with the theme *Population and Imperialism: Women in Revolution* (4 [4], 1977), with pieces by Nancy Folbre, Charles Wood, Bonnie Mass, Norma Chinchilla, and Helen Safa, among others. *LAP* was a treasure trove, and those special issues still sit well-worn on my office shelf along with many more issues of the journal, which I came to depend on over the years. What first attracted me was the consistently strong and well-written articles on issues of importance across the social sciences and, increasingly, the humanities. The contributors' critical engagement with cutting-edge theory and research and their left orientation were especially appealing.

Two decades ago I was invited to become a participating editor of *LAP*. This was my first invitation to sit on a journal's board, and I appreciated the collective's broad commitment to the process of supporting authors through the review, revise, and resubmit process, turning work that was already good into still more compelling publications. *LAP*'s dedication to clear writing that is accessible to a wide readership is laudable, and the journal's excellent copy-editing is evident in each issue. As an occasional contributor and guest editor of *LAP* issues, I'm pleased to see that the pace of getting material into print has picked up, making the journal's publications timely and particularly appealing to junior contributors who need to see their work in print more quickly. My participation with *LAP* has paved the way for me to become more involved with other journals, and I am now embarking on becoming the associate editor of another Latin Americanist journal.

What is most exciting in *LAP*, for me and no doubt many others, is the special theme issues that make their way into our mailboxes, now on a bimonthly basis. *LAP* has long been identified as a journal of political economy, and while it has retained this tradition it has also expanded to embrace concerns of an ever-growing number of readers. I was pleased when my two coedited issues in new areas of scholarship, *Gender, Sexuality, and Same-Sex Desire in Latin America* (29 [2], 2002, with Jim Green) and *Youth and Cultural Politics* (35 [4], 2008, with Jon Wolseth), were roundly supported and published. Other themes that run the gamut from regional issues to revolution, tourism to film and video, have expanded our knowledge and made us better scholar-activists. I'm proud of my association over the years with *LAP* and always look forward to seeing *LAP* friends and colleagues at Latin American Studies Association congresses and elsewhere. This is an intellectual community that has stayed vital and vigorous over the years, and I am deeply grateful to Ron Chilcote and the whole *LAP* collective for its steadfast work over the past 40 years. Here's to the next 40!

—Florence E. Babb
University of Florida

Collaborating from afar with *Latin American Perspectives* has always been a complex process. The unique editorial structure of a centralized editorial collective under the able direction of Ron Chilcote and his compañeros has

assembled a group of some of the most insightful and progressive social scientists in Latin America and Latin Americanists in the United States and Europe. *LAP's* long history and abundant production offer people in the English-speaking world access to some of the best analyses of the principal problems in the region. The collective continually focuses our attention on those involved in trying to overcome the systematic crusade of monopoly capitalism and imperial forces to place the region's resources and people at the service of political elites and the wealthy few in the region and in the "belly of the beast."

This undertaking is particularly notable for the support and understanding it offers for regimes that suffer constant attacks from the United States. The valuable materials it publishes about the extraordinary transformations occurring in Cuba and the painful process of political and economic reconstruction in Venezuela are significant contributions to the construction of an informed debate (unfortunately not a dialogue) in the United States. Similarly, the important discussions about gender issues, indigenous mobilizations, and grassroots initiatives offer important windows on some of the forces that are building bulwarks against efforts to subjugate the region and expropriate its resources.

As I reflect on the dramatic hollowing out of the productive apparatus in Mexico and the intensification of the use of state power to curtail hard-won worker and peasant rights while curbing social programs and narrowing debate on pressing political issues, *LAP's* political significance becomes even more apparent. The inevitable further militarization of the country and disappearance of opportunities for future generations will only be exacerbated by the environmental disasters provoked by ineffective remedial policies that overlook the root causes of the triple crisis that confronts us. In this climate, there is no more urgent task for academics than to strengthen and expand the outlets that *LAP* has constructed for identifying the principal contradictions that we face and promoting an understanding of the underlying dynamics that we must change.

—David Barkin

Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana–Xochimilco

I began reading *Latin American Perspectives* more than a quarter century ago when I began my graduate studies but only recently have had the privilege of joining the collective as an editor. My graduate school advisor identified *LAP* as one of five academic journals I should read in the field of Latin American studies. *LAP's* explicitly political orientation, active inclusion of Latin American scholarship, and thematically organized issues provided it with a profile that made it stand out from others in the field.

I came to graduate school after documenting U.S. imperialist interventions in Nicaragua with Witness for Peace and assisting refugees with asylum applications on the United States–Mexico border. I wanted a stronger and clearer theoretical orientation to help me understand the events that I observed in Latin America, and *LAP* played a key role in providing me with scholarly training and an ideological orientation.

My political work documenting U.S.-supported contra attacks against educators and health care providers in Sandinista Nicaragua and then recording stories of refugees fleeing civil wars in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala

largely focused on critiquing the ramifications of U.S. policy in the region. Increasingly, I wanted to understand Latin America from a Latin American perspective rather than only through the lens of U.S. imperialism. Once again, *LAP* provided me with perspectives and ideologies that grew out Latin America rather than only responding to U.S. political and economic interests.

As part of my efforts to understand Latin America from a Latin American perspective, I shifted my research interests in graduate school from Central to South America, where the United States historically has made less of an imperial imprint. Eventually, I ended up working with Indigenous movements in the Andes as they fought against exclusionary economic, political, and social policies. I have always worked at the intersection of political and academic work, and *LAP* embraces and encourages my work as a scholar-activist.

One of the key issues facing the Latin American left today is the tension between progressive governments and the social movements that laid the groundwork for the emergence of these governments through their organizing efforts and extended battles against neoliberal economic policies. *LAP* provides a serious arena for vigorous debate of these and other issues, and I am honored to play a small role in this process as both an author and an editor.

—Marc Becker
Truman State University

Ron Chilcote convidou-me a participar no coletivo de editores da *Latin American Perspectives* desde a minha entrada no doutorado em antropologia da University of California, Riverside, em agosto de 1995, mas foi Rizélia Duarte, conterrânea que fazia o doutorado em dança, quem insistiu para que eu a acompanhasse às primeiras reuniões de que participei.

Gostei enormemente da dinâmica das reuniões e do aconchego dos participantes. A reunião inicia sempre às 12:30h do primeiro domingo de cada mês, com exceção dos meses do verão, e acontece alternadamente nas casas dos editores que residem nas imediações de Riverside e Los Angeles. É aberta com uma breve seção de anúncios sobre conferências, livros publicados, algum relato de pesquisa de campo ou intervenção política e assim por diante. Depois passa-se à discussão dos pareceres dos artigos sob avaliação. É a quantidade de artigos a se avaliar em cada reunião que define a sua duração. Em geral, essas reuniões duram entre quatro e seis horas. Às 14:45 é servido o almoço, ocasião em que conversamos mais à vontade com os editores mais próximos ou somos apresentados a alguém que está entrando na revista ou mesmo algum editor associado, participante ou honorário, visitando o sul da Califórnia.

A última seção da reunião é dedicada ao que se batizou de “political education” e fica sob o encargo de um dos editores que, geralmente, apresenta uma análise de conjuntura sobre algum país ou alguma situação que, no momento, está despertando a atenção da mídia ou tem algum interesse ou importância para seus estudos, para os movimentos sociais ou para a revista.

Entrei na *LAP* como *intern*, que é como entram todos os alunos de pós-graduação que da revista participam. As suas tarefas são semelhantes às dos editores coordenadores, mas pelo fato de serem apenas alunos e não terem uma afiliação institucional, permanecem nessa categoria até a conclusão do doutorado. Consegui mudar da categoria *intern* para a de editor coordenador ainda

doutoranda pelo fato de já ser professora da Universidade Federal do Ceará. Como, então, estava já bastante envolvida e coordenando a publicação de dois números especiais, um sobre o nordeste brasileiro e outro sobre migrações, em parceria com Michael Kearney, o coletivo votou favoravelmente.

Participar da *LAP* foi como conhecer a “usina” por dentro, de um lado, e entrar num rio de muitos afluentes, de outro. Espécie de abre-te sésamo, a *LAP* abria muitas portas e me aproximava de pessoas, quase mitos, de quem, por outros meios, jamais teria me aproximado. Foi como palestrante em mesa redonda organizada pela revista que pela primeira vez participei de um congresso da Latin American Studies Association (Chicago, 1998). Como participante da revista, sentia-me abrigada e protegida naquele vasto mundo em que se transformam esses congressos acadêmicos quando não se pertence a um grupo. Naquele primeiro encontro com a *LASA*, eu já me apresentei como parte do “coletivo” de editores da *LAP*, o que não era pouco!

Precisaria de muitas páginas para descrever toda a riqueza que foi (e ainda é) a participação no conselho editorial da *LAP*! Concluo, porém, afirmando que através dela fiz grandes amigos e aprendi os rigores e a seriedade da carpintaria da produção editorial nos Estados Unidos. Permaneço membro do coletivo, como editora associada e é este, sem dúvida, um dos meus mais importantes intercâmbios acadêmicos até hoje.

—Bernadete Beserra
Universidade Federal de Ceará

Brazil is not very well integrated into Latin America. Not even Brazilian socialist thought closely follows the popular struggles and theoretical reflection that are taking place in other countries in the region. *LAP* has done a lot for me in overcoming this isolation. This has been crucial in the twenty-first century, when popular struggle is progressing in Latin America and political and theoretical debates are very rich in many countries of the subcontinent.

—Armando Boito
Universidade de Campinas

Como todo país de grandes dimensiones territoriales, numerosa población, grandes recursos y alto desarrollo económico, los Estados Unidos cuentan con una extensa e influyente comunidad académica que produce y publica conocimientos sobre todos los aspectos de la realidad. Los estudios sobre América Latina y el Caribe no son una excepción, muchos centros de investigación ubicados en universidades o fuera de estas que mantienen una intensa actividad de investigación y debate sobre diferentes aspectos de la vida en el hemisferio, las conferencias que cada 18 meses realiza la Latin American Studies Association, así como la Caribbean Studies Association son una muestra de este hecho. Por esta razón ubicarse como una de las publicaciones más serias y respetadas en Estados Unidos sobre temas latinoamericanos y caribeños en medio de esta rica diversidad constituye un gran mérito, y es eso lo que sucede con *Latin American Perspectives*, publicación seria, rigurosa, diversa y comprometida con las mejores causas, con la justicia social, la soberanía y la democracia.

Personalmente constituye una gran satisfacción haberme encontrado entre sus editores internacionales, acompañado por importantes personalidades de

la academia norteamericana y latinoamericana. Mi primera experiencia con la revista fue en la década de los 90 del siglo pasado cuando ocupaba la responsabilidad de subdirector del Centro de Estudios sobre América en La Habana que era entonces uno de los centros académicos de ciencias sociales más importantes y reconocidos de Cuba. Las páginas de *LAP* fueron uno de los principales espacios para publicar los resultados de investigación del Centro en Estados Unidos y articular el intercambio y debate con la comunidad académica norteamericana. De aquella experiencia surgió una relación de trabajo que nos ha enriquecido y se ha mantenido. Si algo tengo que lamentar es que debido a nuevas responsabilidades no siempre he dispuesto durante estos últimos años del tiempo necesario para hacer un mayor aporte como esta publicación merece.

Si me pidieran que destacara una cualidad fundamental de esta importante publicación que ahora cumple 40 años, diría que la objetividad y la pluralidad de los trabajos que incluye en sus páginas, su permanente disposición de buscar lo mejor de la producción científica de la región, sus relaciones con la comunidad académica de los países latinoamericanos. En el caso específico de Cuba esto ha sido de una importancia tremenda si se tiene en cuenta la complejidad de las relaciones entre los dos países, que en más de una ocasión ha afectado también el intercambio académico.

Cuando en el futuro se escriba con mayor objetividad la historia de esta compleja relación seguramente será reconocido el papel central que el intercambio académico entre los dos países jugó para mejorar las relaciones y superar las tensiones históricas, y en ese proceso *Latin American Perspectives* ha tenido un lugar muy destacado.

—Julio Carranza
UNESCO, Montevideo

Happy Fortieth Anniversary all you *LAP* readers, contributors, editors, and staff!

Many of us from the earlier generations of “*LAP*-istas” cut our teeth on the works of Latin Americans and were influenced by the Cuban Revolution. Now *LAP* incorporates countless Latin American scholars and activists, from whom we must continue to learn through critical debate.

None of this international intellectual endeavor—for that is what *LAP* was and, I hope, will continue to be—could have occurred in the absence of social movements influencing intellectuals and vice versa. That dynamic now must be intensified in light of the shaky future for all humankind brought on by the ongoing collapse of neoliberal capitalism and the economic, social, and environmental crises it has generated.

Fortunately, we can learn again from Latin America, where popular movements have toppled corrupt authoritarian regimes and defended new “socialist” or “anti-neoliberal” governments. These movements, led by the “the original peoples,” peasants, the working poor, the so-called *precariado* (the flexible and unstable working classes), women, youth, pensioners, and the educated intermediate classes facing no viable future under capitalism, are sparking historic changes in the international correlation of social forces.

Washington has lost its traditional control of the region. The Comunidad de Estados Latinamericanos y Caribeños (CELAC) excludes the United States and Canada, as do TeleSUR, PetroSUR, PetroCARIBE, the Banco del Sur, UNASUR,

MERCOSUR, and the Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América – Tratado de Comercio de los Pueblos (ALBA-TCP). Despite the power of local bourgeois oligarchies, a world context of capitalist and imperialist interventions, and the errors inevitable in any process of change, the goals and achievements of these institutions reflect what President Rafael Correa of Ecuador has termed “not an epoch of change but a change of epoch.”

Unfortunately, the declining imperialisms are counterattacking, especially the strongest military one, the United States, which continues its control over the colony of Puerto Rico and a part of Cuba (Guantánamo, now a symbol of modernized torture). France and Holland maintain their colonies in the region, and Britain refuses to negotiate its control of Argentina’s Malvinas. Despite having its military bases prohibited in Ecuador and Venezuela, the U.S. government has built new ones and sponsored countless military and “civilian” coup d’état attempts (Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Paraguay, and so on). On the pretext of fighting narco trafficking and terrorism, the U.S. empire and its allies are militarizing the world in a battle to control natural resources, intervening in dirty “humanitarian” wars of conquest that are destroying entire cultures. What is at stake is the sovereignty of nations and peoples, including food and climate sovereignty—that is, the survival of humanity and the planet.

The world’s social movements resist. The more they unite internationally, the greater will be the challenge to imperialism and the chance to realize humanity’s hopes. We must continue to think, imagine, and build—through popular assemblies, dialogue, and respect for differences—new libertarian, pluralist, internationalist, and democratically participative socialisms. That is a process already under way in a growing number of places and one to which *LAP* can contribute.

—James D. Cockcroft
State University of New York

Son muchas las razones para celebrar 40 años de *Latin American Perspectives*. Desde mi experiencia como académico y activista, así como mi involucramiento personal con la revista en calidad de lector, autor e integrante de su distinguido cuerpo de participating editors, quisiera destacar algunos ámbitos en los que, en mi opinión (y estoy convencido de que la de muchos más también), *LAP* ha contribuido decididamente a la proyección y enriquecimiento del pensamiento crítico latinoamericano. El primero de ellos es haber tenido el acierto y la visión de abrir un espacio de encuentro y debate que permitiera trascender las barreras lingüísticas que separaban a las comunidades académicas progresistas de América Latina y el mundo anglosajón, particularmente del resto del continente americano y más allá. No es un secreto que durante mucho tiempo los aportes teóricos y el nutrido debate académico y político que llevaron a cabo las corrientes estructuralistas y dependentistas en la región se conoció relativamente poco en otras latitudes y, a la inversa, salvo algunas excepciones, había sido exiguo y limitado el diálogo Norte-Sur y Sur-Norte en torno a la realidad latinoamericana. En este sentido, *LAP* ha venido a llenar un vacío académico en el ámbito de la economía política del capitalismo, imperialismo y socialismo, con énfasis en una realidad compleja, cambiante y difícil

de encasillar en moldes analíticos rígidos y preconcebidos. Pero *LAP* ha sido mucho más que ello. A través de los poco más de 2,500 artículos publicados en sus páginas, *LAP* ha contribuido también al debate de temas críticos para la región, con rigor académico y pertinencia política, lo que ha venido a perfilar una agenda de investigación que yo calificaría como alternativa, en contraposición a la agenda que se promueve desde las posturas dominantes enarboladas por el llamado pensamiento único (neoliberal). Al respecto, *LAP* es una muestra fehaciente de que la tentativa de imponer ese pensamiento fracasó y que el pensamiento crítico sigue y seguirá teniendo una extraordinaria vitalidad. Más aún, lo que este extraordinario—y yo añadiría: consolidado—esfuerzo editorial ha demostrado es que es posible abrir cauces para un debate académico fértil, constrictivo y sin concesiones, capaz de trascender las rigideces de las barreras disciplinarias y de contribuir a desentrañar nuestras complejas realidades, con el claro propósito de contribuir a su transformación en beneficio de los sectores populares y con una clara perspectiva y compromiso de clase. En otras palabras, *LAP* representa un esfuerzo serio por contribuir, desde la trinchera académica y de la mano de los movimientos sociales, a las luchas anti-sistémicas y antiimperialistas que se despliegan en la región. Estos aportes han permitido que las voces del Sur, de las periferias, cuenten con un foro de discusión continental y global, que ha hecho posible el enriquecimiento y proliferación del pensamiento crítico/transformador y libertario. Por estas y otras razones, me complace sobremanera haber sido parte, aunque modestamente, de lo que en estas primeras cuatro décadas *LAP* ha representado y que, estoy seguro, seguirá haciéndolo en los años y décadas por venir. Mis más sinceras y fraternales felicitaciones a todas las compañeras y compañeros que han hecho realidad, con su esfuerzo y compromiso cotidianos, una iniciativa editorial de la magnitud, alcances y trascendencia de *Latin American Perspectives*.

—Raúl Delgado Wise
Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas

Conozco *Latin American Perspectives* desde hace tanto tiempo, que a veces creo que crecí profesionalmente con ella. Y no creo que sea diferente para un amplio sector de latinoamericanistas que han encontrado aquí un espacio para interactuar con —y eventualmente desplegar—diferentes aristas del pensamiento crítico comprometido con un continente mejor y posible basado en la democracia, la justicia social, una relación amistosa con el medio ambiente y el antimperialismo.

Mi primer encuentro “íntimo” con *LAP* fue en el ya lejano 1994, durante una visita a la Universidad de Colorado en Boulder de la mano de dos entrañables amigos Joel Edelstein y Sheryl Lutjens. Recuerdo aquella noche en que tras una comida poco usual en un restaurante etíope conversamos largamente en casa de Joel sobre la conveniencia de incluir algunas personas del Centro de Estudios sobre América (CEA) en la lista de editores del *LAP*. Dada la relevancia que tenía entonces el CEA ello se veía como una manera de introducir algunas perspectivas críticas de izquierda sobre Cuba (que entonces atravesaba por esa inmensa crisis metafóricamente llamada Período Especial) y al mismo tiempo motivar a más académicos cubanos a escribir para la revista.

Ese fue probablemente el período de más intensa relación con la revista. Personalmente escribí varios artículos para ella y en mi calidad de coordinador de estudios latinoamericanos en el CEA invité a varios académicos cubanos a publicar sus resultados. Desde el propio CEA se hicieron varios eventos y proyectos cuyos resultados fueron parcialmente publicados por *LAP*. Creo que los logros que tuvo este malogrado centro intelectual en La Habana estuvo dado en buena medida por su contacto con la academia hemisférica, y dentro de ello *LAP* fue un elemento muy importante.

La marcha posterior de los acontecimientos condujo a la virtual disolución del CEA y la dispersión de sus investigadores sociales, algunos de los cuales dejaron de serlo. Y creo que por esa vía se perdió una interesante oportunidad de seguir ampliando esa relación. No obstante, el tema cubano ha seguido siendo un asunto de presencia en la revista, y algunos investigadores de la isla han continuado colaborando con *LAP*.

En 2000 tuve que dejar mi país y radicarme en República Dominicana, un país encantador pero con una vida académica menos activa. Entre esa falta de estímulo y los imperativos de sobrevivencia que todo exiliado tiene que encarar sin dilaciones, mi relación con *LAP* se debilitó hasta que desde hace algunos años comencé a ser movilizado más frecuentemente para producir dictámenes sobre artículos presentados. Ello me ha servido para explorar temas diversos de nuestra realidad continental, y muchas veces para obtener las primicias de trabajos excelentes que luego he visto colocados en la publicación. Y para recordarme que siempre estoy en deuda conmigo mismo cuando pospongo para uno y otro mes una nueva colaboración.

Por el momento, cuando abro mi correo y recibo los envíos de Alejandra, siempre apremiándome a ser rápido y preciso en mis lecturas dictaminadoras, sonrío pensando en otra oportunidad de conocer y en la recompensa de ser parte de esta familia académica que Ron Chilcote y sus colaboradores más cercanos han estado cultivando por cuatro largas décadas.

—Haroldo Dilla Alfonso
Grupo Ciudades y Fronteras, Santo Domingo

Thirty-five years ago I joined *LAP*'s editorial collective as a participating editor. I was young and hotheaded. Early on I published several articles in *LAP*. One (cowritten with John Weeks) stands out in my memory because it was dogmatic. I was going through a sectarian period of which I am neither proud nor ashamed. In those times dogmatism of one stripe or another was a condition shared by many leftists. Fortunately my disorder was brief, and I learned political lessons for life, particularly the narrow-mindedness that comes with possession of the truth. When we submitted that article, I fully anticipated that *LAP*'s editorial collective would reject it or, at a minimum, insist that we delete the more doctrinaire references. But no; we all engaged in a comradely give-and-take. The collective suggested that we elaborate our argument. We did, and the article was published.

Memory preserves versions of the past that may or may not have happened. My memories of early encounters with the *LAP* editorial collective are of respect—call it tolerance—of different political views. Possibly I've forgotten the clashes; maybe I never knew about them, never wanted to know. I was conveniently far from the center of the collective, far from California. In the

course of my relationship with *LAP* over three decades and more, the collective has demonstrated respect for differences within the broad left. Forty years on, this is *LAP*'s enduring strength.

—Elizabeth Dore
University of Southampton

Throughout both my graduate studies at the University of California at Berkeley and my teaching at Carleton College and Macalester College, *Latin American Perspectives* has consistently been my top source of published scholarship. My first contact with *LAP* was through a review essay that Heather Williams, then *LAP*'s book review editor, invited me to write. Published in July 2002, "Peace After Terror: Reconciling Justice and the Rule of Law in Argentina, El Salvador, and Guatemala" was my first peer-reviewed article and introduced me to the world of publishing. Heather told me that the review's compact size—covering six books in six pages—made it a good sample to share with prospective authors looking for guidance on how to structure a review essay.

Encouraged by that positive experience, the documentary photographer James Lerager and I submitted our article "Surprising Trends in Land Invasions in Metropolitan Lima and Quito," along with 12 black-and-white photographs. Ron Chilcote was eager to reintroduce the publication of photos in *LAP*, a practice that had lapsed. Our piece appeared in November 2006 (33 [6]) and contributed to the momentum not only for publishing photos with articles but also for publishing full-fledged photo essays such as James Lerager's "Taking the High Road: On the Campaign Trail with Evo Morales" (37 [4], 2010)—and also for *LAP*'s new cover design, which now includes a color photo. (Lerager also became photo editor.) Continuing this trend, Nicole Kligerman, James Lerager, and I published "Women's Voices on the Executive Council: Popular Organizations and Resource Battles in Bolivia and Ecuador" (37 [4], 2010), which included 10 black-and-white photos.

My involvement eventually led me to join *LAP* as a participating editor in 2008, and since then I have completed 37 manuscript reviews, as well as a 2013 review of Marc Becker's book *Pachakutik*. The opportunity to review manuscript drafts in English and Spanish helps me appreciate the full-scale pedagogical mission of *LAP* not only to publish significant *scholarship* but also to invest in coaching contributors to become significant *scholars*. Thus *LAP* is not just in the business of selecting scholarship but at the helm in the work of producing it. It continues to be a pleasure to play this role and gives me insight into the effort those three reviewers—Ron Chilcote, Richard Harris, and Heather Williams—generously put into helping me improve drafts of my first article back in 2002. I thank them and Fran Chilcote, Rosalind Bresnahan, and many others for their tireless efforts to sustain *LAP*'s vital role in shaping and sharing progressive scholarship on the Americas.

—Paul Dosh
Macalester College

From the very first issue on dependency theory (1 [1], 1974) to the latest issue on Latin America's left in power (40 [3], 2013), *LAP* has remained the leading outlet for critical analyses of the political, economic, social, cultural, environmental, and ecological problems confronting Latin America and the Caribbean

and the ongoing struggles—from revolutions to elections—to create societies that are more just, more equal, more democratic, more independent, and freer from exploitation and foreign domination.

LAP has done this by opening its pages to a variety of perspectives—left, progressive, socialist, Marxist, anti-imperialist, antiracist, feminist, environmentalist—without insisting on adherence to dogma and by observing the highest standards of academic rigor by subjecting all articles to peer review, whether they be from younger, unknown authors or from the well-known and venerated. *LAP* played an important role in my academic career and intellectual development by publishing my first article while I was still a graduate student and my first book as part of its series with Westview Press. I have subsequently published many articles and commentaries on Haitian affairs in its pages. I consider myself privileged to have served as a participating editor for many years and to have thus contributed in some small way to the journal's continued excellence.

To me, then, *LAP* remains an essential resource for the dissemination of critical analyses of the region and a voice for the struggles for a progressive alternative to the violence and injustices of capitalism. I hope to continue to be part of that project for a long time to come.

Happy fortieth anniversary, *Latin American Perspectives*!

—Alex Dupuy
Wesleyan University

In an ideal world *Latin American Perspectives* would be unnecessary. Even in the not so perfect world in which we live, some may question the rationale for the existence of an academic journal that consistently defends a given political perspective or set of positions. It may be argued that the articles in *Latin American Perspectives* could be published in politically neutral journals specializing in area studies or a given discipline such as history, political science, or sociology.

However, those of us who contribute to *Latin American Perspectives* do not find ourselves on a level playing field when it comes to the dissemination of our ideas. In the first place, while hardly monolithic in its orientation, the journal puts forward cogent explanations that are seriously underrepresented in the commercial media and the releases of major publishing companies. The media, which heavily influence attitudes toward Latin America, never came close to being evenhanded, but in the age of globalization the situation has worsened with the ever-greater concentration of capital on all fronts related to the diffusion of ideas. Media trends may seem irrelevant to those who (naively, in my opinion) view the academic world as a veritable Ivory Tower and thus unaffected by crass opinions expressed on television or in the press. The media, however, reinforce simplistic notions and stereotypes that were cultivated during the cold war and pervaded the universities at the time, as has been thoroughly documented. These misleading formulations are often refuted in the pages of *Latin American Perspectives*.

In the second place, the relationship between the U.S. government and academia is characterized by a two-way flow. On the one hand, the government to an extent encourages or discourages certain perspectives through funding

and other resources at its disposal. On the other hand, influential academics provide input in the formulation of policies. In the process, some academics on the left end up on the sidelines and occasionally victimized along the lines of McCarthyism.

Finally, well-financed foundations, which include the privately run but publicly financed National Endowment for Democracy (NED), exercise considerable influence on scholarly activity in favor of positions on the right and center of the political spectrum to the exclusion of those on the left. These foundations go a long way toward counterbalancing the journals and publishing companies covering Latin America that are committed to objective standards. *Latin American Perspectives* depends not on this kind of financial or institutional backing but on the dedicated collaboration of its nearly 100 editors, among others.

Latin American Perspectives's coverage of Venezuela provides examples of the analysis of widely held assumptions that underpin public policy and media coverage of political topics but has also informed scholarly works over a considerable period of time. Over the past two decades, the journal has dedicated three issues to Venezuelan studies. The first appeared in 1996, coordinated by Daniel Hellinger, and the other two came out in 2005 and were coordinated by Miguel Tinker Salas and myself. Articles in them argued against the thesis of "Venezuelan exceptionalism," which attributed Venezuelan democracy's alleged success and stability in the decades following 1958 to the political maturity of pro-establishment, pro-United States politicians, while ignoring their undemocratic behavior and policies unfavorable to autonomous development. Articles by Christopher Clement and William Avilés in the 2005 issues discussed the U.S. "soft intervention" in Venezuela promoted by the NED and other foundations in favor of (in the words of Clement) "the narrow and orthodox intellectual forces that underpin the practice of democracy promotion."

Latin American Perspectives articles have refuted another thesis inspired by cold war assumptions and applied to Venezuela, namely, the "good left"—"bad left" thesis promoted by Jorge Castañeda and others. The main target of this line of thinking is Hugo Chávez, who is characterized as a demagogue and a crass populist. Articles by Kevin Young and Pascal Lupien in the May 2013 issue on the twenty-first-century Latin American left documented the role of the media in promoting the notion that Chávez is the embodiment of the populist "bad" left.

In short, *Latin American Perspectives* has contributed to the debunking of the "Venezuelan exceptionalism" and "good left"—"bad left" theses, both of which bridge the public policy arena, the communication media, and the academic domain. In doing so, it has contributed to an appreciation of the complexity of the continent's recent political developments, which have taken specialists and nonspecialists alike by surprise.

—Steve Ellner
Universidad de Oriente

My first contact with *LAP* was back in 1975. Panama and the United States were negotiating a new canal treaty, and a group of Panamanians with academic ties was touring the major cities of North America. At California State

University, Los Angeles, we were told by the Brays and Tim Harding that we ought to visit the University of California campus at Riverside. This piece of advice turned out to be extremely productive. We met Ron and Frances Chilcote and a very young team of *compañeros* who were coordinating a new review that wanted to develop fresh ideas on the relations between Latin America and the United States, to get a better critical understanding of the left's agenda, and to join forces in the struggle against the repressive regimes that plagued most of the region at that time.

Ron explained to us the importance of creating a strong network of academic workers on both sides of the existing divide. U.S. academics could not go on studying Latin America as if it were a pawn in United States' foreign policy. The Kissinger theories and conspiracies were not the real object. U.S. academia had a sketchy idea of the social struggles and conflicts in Latin America and was subject to a strict diet of disinformation coming from the official think tanks operating out of Washington and Wall Street.

Although *LAP* had a strong academic fabric, it was (and still is) working shoulder to shoulder with grassroots organizations, communities, unions, women, and many other groups. Our relationship, through the Center of Latin American Studies in Panama City, developed rapidly and extended to many other committed academic centers and militant groups in both the United States and Latin America. At the same time, *LAP* has grown and extended its work. It has become a reference for all academics doing critical research. It has also captured a large segment of U.S. readers in general, who are understanding better the many contradictions that characterize Latin America and its relations with Washington's policies.

In my opinion, *LAP*'s greatest contribution has been its permanent commitment to a better understanding of the region's grassroots movements, which are witnesses to a changing world as new contradictions arise and strengthen the people's will to overthrow their oppressors. The people of Latin America in the twenty-first century have given the world a healthy message of renewed struggles in the midst of signs of recession in the United States and Europe. We are experiencing a "changing of the guard," a crisis of hegemony, and Latin America is in no way disengaged. On the contrary, through its strong leadership (Chávez), new economic strategies (Brazil), and bold initiatives (the Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América, the Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños) the region is creating its own dynamics. All this is possible because of a growing political base that is getting stronger and stonger as contradictions keep accumulating. *LAP* has kept track of the changes in the correlation of forces for 40 years and is in a privileged position to give us the best analysis of present and future events. The class contradictions, the new political regimes, and the worldwide geopolitical alliances that involve Latin America and the United States can be followed to great advantage in the pages of a committed and critical *LAP*.

—Marco A. Gandásegui Jr.

Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos, Universidad de Panama

In 1990, when I was a M.A. student at California State University, Los Angeles, in Latin American Studies, Marjorie Bray asked me if I would like to participate in meetings of the *LAP* collective. It was a great honor, and I immediately

accepted the invitation. I had lived in Brazil for six years and participated in the underground opposition to the Brazilian military regime in the late 1970s, while also co-founding the gay and lesbian movement. I considered myself a dedicated Marxist. During the 1980s I had continued political work as an immigrant rights' and trade union organizer in Los Angeles, and it was exciting to join the collective as a means of retaining a close contact with scholars studying Latin America.

Collective meetings were exceedingly long, however. After 15 years of endless discussions in left-wing organizations in Brazil and the United States, I had little patience for the marathon Sunday sessions held monthly, which usually required another two hours on the Southern California freeway system to attend them. Yet the lively conversations about articles and politics were invigorating. They provided continuity from my previous years in Brazil and among Latina/o immigrant workers in Los Angeles, where the possibilities of revolutionary change in Latin America were palpable.

Sometime in 1991 or 1992, I recall commenting in one of our monthly meetings that I thought that *LAP* was probably going to go through a crisis of adaptation to the new international political situation after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the crisis in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and the demise of Soviet socialism. I expected the editors perhaps to begin internal fighting about the meaning of the changes taking place among the left throughout the world. This had been the case in many Marxist organizations that were disoriented after the great upheavals of those years. I predicted that *LAP* would possibly lose its subscription base or see a drop in submissions as scholars moved away from the kinds of politics reflected in the journal.

That has not been the case. In fact, Ron Chilcote, the dedicated and persistent managing editor, came back to the collective with a proposal to *increase* the number of journal issues a year. Although in my opinion there continues to be a crisis in Marxist circles worldwide, *LAP* has found and defended an important intellectual space. The journal's success is due to much more than its commitment to equalitarian collaborations with scholars from Latin America. It derives from a continued pursuit of solutions to the problems of the region that have propelled revolutionary and reformist social movements over the past half-century.

LAP has been in the forefront of encouraging the discussions about how Latin America can overcome poverty, social inequality, and injustice, as well as how those in the United States can confront the powers that perpetuate the status quo. That is why it has survived.

—James N. Green
Brown University

I entered the graduate program in sociology at Stanford University in 1959, the year of the Cuban Revolution. From the orthodoxy of the Sociology Department I soon gravitated toward the Latin American Institute at Stanford, organized by Ronald Hilton. There I had the good fortune to meet and work with Ron Chilcote, Tim Harding, Don Bray, Jim Cockcroft, and other compañeros of the era. The crew there put out a Latin American newsletter, the *Hispanic American Report*, that was a precursor of *Latin American Perspectives*.

We formed the Palo Alto branch of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. I recall traveling with a few of the group and our unique Marxist professor Paul Baran to the first meeting of the San Francisco branch. There the featured speaker was Lawrence Ferlinghetti, who read his poem “They Are Going to Get You Fidel,” a discouraging message for us young enthusiasts. Then Kennedy was assassinated, and the first publicity was that Lee Harvey Oswald was a New Orleans Fair Play for Cuba person. As I was chair of the Palo Alto branch, my phone started to ring with death threats, so I found it prudent to disappear from Palo Alto for a time.

After a period in Chile doing my dissertation work, in 1966 I returned to my first job in sociology at the University of California, Riverside, joining Ron Chilcote in political science. *LAP* was not yet being published, but I think the idea had been born, with Ron taking the lead and Don and Majorie Bray and Tim Harding at nearby Los Angeles colleges joining in. The next year I went to the nearby Claremont Colleges, where Jim Levy, a Latin Americanist who later moved to Australia, joined our L.A.-area group.

In 1970–1971 the Stanford Latin American historian John J. Johnson was president of the Latin American Studies Association. He had written a book, attempting to give some academic credence to Kennedy’s Alliance for Progress, about the progressive, democratizing mission to the middle classes in Latin America—just at the time the middle classes were beginning to assert themselves as a solid basis for future military coups first in Brazil and later in other countries. We young dissidents were in the LASA business meeting raising hell about resolutions on Cuba and other issues. Johnson became overcome with frustration and rage—got all red in the face and had to be helped away from the podium and off stage. Eventually, LASA officialdom had to write some regulations about procedures for issuing resolutions, which are still tough to get approved.

During those years I was active in a group called the Insurgent Sociologists. We too created a scene at an American Sociological Association meeting, marching up en masse to the stage and totally disrupting the meeting. Later the *Insurgent Sociologist* became a journal, eventually changing to a less flamboyant name, *Critical Sociology*. I don’t subscribe anymore, and when I look at what is published there from time to time it just does not compare with *LAP*. Transferring in 1970 to Rutgers, I also participated some in the Union of Radical Political Economists, but its journal, while good, does not compare with *LAP* in quality.

By the 1970s *LAP* was in full swing. We formed an East Coast group, meeting at Hoby Spalding’s Upper West Side New York apartment, and with Hank Frundt and others we put out several special issues of *LAP*.

Latin American Perspectives is truly outstanding among journals. I wish that I had time and energy to be more active.

—Dale Johnson
Barva de Heredia, Costa Rica

There was a dusting of snow on the ground for a morning or two that December 1968, when my husband and I visited Los Angeles from Berkeley—the last thing we expected in L.A. With less than four months as Californians, we were in exploration mode in this magnificent golden dream of a state. For me, one major exploration was meeting the southern California Latin America

scholars—on that trip, Tim, Marjorie and Don, Ron and Fran, Dale. In the next few years, I connected with Norma, Nora, and many others, some becoming friends as well as colleagues.

From grad school at the University of California, Berkeley, and then from the North American Congress on Latin America's Berkeley office, my connections to the L.A. group expanded. Even before *LAP*, there were California-wide conferences on Latin America during the late 1960s and early 1970s where we worked through the intricacies of dependency theory and U.S. imperialism. We also formed a radical caucus at the 1970s Latin American Studies Association congresses to sponsor panels and write resolutions condemning U.S. interventionist policies.

The first issue of *LAP* in 1974, an in-depth, multiperspective reassessment of dependency theory, brought to the fore one of the most basic elements of what united us, even when we had different interpretations. Virtually all of us in the social sciences could trace our intellectual *formación* to the brilliant Latin American intellectuals, many of them also politically committed, who had rejected U.S.-generated "modernization" paradigms and developed endogenous, authentic Latin American alternative analyses. They were our mentors.

Reflecting on those early years reminds me how much I owe to colleagues and mentors—and also to a few fortunate coincidences. My path to Latin America was quite improbable: playing the violin. In college, playing in the Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra and other groups was the center of my undergraduate life. That led to a unique opportunity to participate in a two-month HRO performance tour to Mexico during the summer of 1962.

We played concerts in almost every state, from DF's Palacio de Bellas Artes to plazas in dozens of small towns to the acoustically perfect Juego de Pelota in the Chichén Itzá Mayan ruins. On a day off in Taxco, I took a long early-morning walk up the steep, winding footpaths of the surrounding hills, high enough and far enough from the tourist center to get a close-up view of raw rural campesino poverty. The spectacular panoramic view in the distance opened up to green valleys dotted with tiny villages and surrounded by steep mountains. The juxtaposition of such poverty and such beauty—so common in Latin America—was seared into my brain and forever changed the direction of my life.

Five years later, in 1967, long before it became a center of world attention, and also somewhat by chance, I went to Central America. Exploring by bus and stopping in each country, I had an early front-row view of the region's dramas. Guatemala drew me in like a magnet, implicitly compelling me and other young scholars/activists to tell its stories throughout the United States—our way of being involved in its social justice struggles. By the early 1980s, *LAP* became an important space for analyzing Central America's complexities as they unfolded.

I share these glimpses to suggest how our generation was conceptually and culturally shaped. We have been enriched by participating in *LAP*'s ever-widening hemispheric circle of committed intellectuals and remarkable human beings. Today we see a new generation of editors and collaborators joining the founders to keep *LAP* on the cutting edge of research and analysis.

—Susanne Jonas
University of California, Santa Cruz

It warmed my heart to discover that a group of academics had come together to pursue progressive scholarship on Latin America and had invited me to contribute to its magazine. I tried to add my drop of knowledge to the collective soup on issues I had filmed, people I had interviewed, and out-of-the-way places I had visited. The *LAP* editors should feel proud of their collective work. It has added positively to students' education by offering antiestablishment interpretations of events and deeper analysis of revolution and counterrevolution than was available in the standard texts.

—Saul Landau
Institute for Policy Studies

Claremont, California, in the 1960s was a bit weird—on the one hand, a tight, conservative, religious community and bone-dry, not a drop of liquor to be bought or sold, and on the other more Peace and Freedom Party voters per capita than anywhere in the United States. I was teaching U.S. and Latin American history at Pomona College beginning in 1963 and struggling with both Claremont and my teaching.

My heart was in the right place but not my head. I knew what I didn't like about the United States then—the racism, the inequality, the war in Vietnam—but I didn't understand the processes that produced them. And then a new college came to Claremont—Pitzer College—and from its birth the faculty broke the mold. And there were Dale Johnson, Martha Giménez, and Norma Chinchilla. None of them stayed for long, but they made me listen—especially Dale. I remember vividly participating in a panel one evening during which, among other issues, we were discussing foreign “aid” and in particular the Alliance for Progress—a good idea, I believed, needed more of it and better directed. Then Dale in his quiet and civil way ripped into me, pointing out that aid was the stealthy hand of imperialism and did more harm than good. His analysis shook me not because the critique was in any way personal—it certainly wasn't—but because it forced me to think again, to dig deeper, to begin to ask how capitalism develops and causes the inequality and the wars I vigorously protested.

And then Dale, the good shepherd, led me to *LAP* (and to the North American Congress on Latin America) and to Don and Marjorie Bray, to Tim Harding, to Ron Chilcote, and thereafter to many others who have steadfastly and courageously fought the monster.

Well, I didn't last at Pomona and ended up in Australia where at the University of New South Wales we formed a small group that read *Capital* from cover to cover, and now I understand a bit more about capitalism. It helps in solidarity work as well as in the classroom. So, thanks, Dale, and *LAP*, too, and Martha and Norma. You helped to put my head in a better place.

—Jim Levy
University of New South Wales

Since 1974 *Latin American Perspectives* has published 192 issues in 40 volumes. Although the main focus has been on Latin America and the Caribbean, it has covered the main themes of our era from a plural and constantly updated

perspective. The predominance of a focus on the left and the Marxist paradigm has not meant dogmatism or lack of criticism of social processes, movements, and revolutions in spite of a rather sympathetic outlook toward them and their policies and actions. There are many journals devoted to Latin American studies, but none of them has the broad spectrum and innovative analysis that are found in *LAP*.

I have served as an editor of the journal, evaluating articles, and in Issue 177 (2011) I published “The Cuban Revolution: Historical Roots, Current Situation, Scenarios, and Alternatives.” This article was the result of the *Latin American Perspectives* Fellowship that I enjoyed for a month in 2010. I had met Ronald H. Chilcote many years before, but it was during my stay at the University of California, Riverside, on this fellowship that I was able to work closely with the marvelous *LAP* team. I have had many interesting intellectual experiences in my country and abroad, working with people such as Immanuel Wallerstein, Theotônio dos Santos, Francisco Mojica, Federico Mayor, Edgar Morin, the Nobel Prizewinner Ilya Prigogine, and, while founding an indigenous university in Colombia, Manuel Ramiro Muñoz. Nevertheless, my working experience with the *LAP* team was unique and remarkable. My wife, Mireya Vilaseca, went with me and also enjoyed this enriching experience.

In my last days in Riverside I had a long meeting with the *LAP* editors, and they all gave me very sound criticism of the first draft of my paper. Later, some of them—Ronald Chilcote, Sheryl Lutjens, Rosalind Bresnahan, Marjorie Bray, and Barbara Metzger—sent me detailed criticism by e-mail. I also received valuable bibliographical help from Rhonda Neugebauer at the University of California, Riverside, Library. I had to write eight versions of the article to get final approval for publication. This exhausting intellectual exercise helped me to improve my paper and a book based on it (2010) that was launched in Barcelona, at the Bildner Center in New York, and at Cuba’s Book Fair. My relationships with Ronald and Frances Chilcote, Donald and Marjorie Bray, Sheryl Lutjens, Armando González-Cabán, Rosalind Bresnahan, Rhonda Neugebauer, Armin Tchami, and Richard Harris and with the whole *LAP* team were warm and enriching. I miss their humanity, their honesty, their discipline, and their passion for their work. These were not just intellectual relationships but enduring friendships.

—Francisco López Segrera
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

I must be one of the old-timers who have been following and cooperating with *LAP* since the beginning. Since its early days it has been a very distinctive publication. The subtitle announced the color, “A Journal on Capitalism and Socialism”—unrepentant criticism of the system and sympathy with those fighting to overcome it. It has voiced support—but also criticism—for all attempts to break with imperialist domination, from the Cuban to the Bolivarian Revolution. During all these years *LAP* has been able to combine research of the highest quality with a real commitment to the emancipatory struggles of the subaltern. Some issues and some articles were more on the academic side and others on the social or political, while some featured an open Marxist approach and others a more mainstream one, but the association of knowledge and

commitment has been a permanent feature of the journal from the first issues to the recent remarkable collection on the Latin American radical left. This certainly explains why the journal has become so influential not only in the United States but also in Latin America and Europe. For some time in the 1970s a journal with the title *Perspectives Latino-Américaines* was published in Paris with my help. It took its inspiration from *LAP*, although it never quite achieved the same quality.

My contribution to the journal has been limited—a debate on uneven and combined development, essays on the Brazilian military dictatorship and later on the Brazilian Partido dos Trabalhadores, a study on liberation theology, a paper on José Carlos Mariátegui, and a few others. If I may express a regret about those 40 years, it is not having been more active as a participating editor. I'll try to correct this in the next 40 years.

—Michael Löwy
Paris

I have been involved with *LAP* since 1998, when I was at the University of California, Riverside, studying for my Ph.D. My thesis, entitled "Sugar in the Backlands: Capitalism Offensive in Northeast Brazil," focused on the changing role of peasants and agriculture during the military dictatorship. My adviser, Ronald Chilcote, invited me to join the *LAP* collective, and I attended a number of meetings. On those occasions I was happily surprised by the critical theoretical approach of the discussions of the Latin American political situation. It is worth remembering that by that time the dominant perspective in Brazilian academic circles and almost everywhere else was that of neoliberal ideology and the concepts of the free market widely disseminated by international institutions such as the World Bank.

Gathering with scholars from different fields of knowledge for a whole day once a month in their own homes was really exciting for a foreign student! One of the most important things I learned from the experience was that a journal could be produced through a collective process of political education parallel to the editing procedures. The concern of the editors was to guarantee the dialogue between Latin American authors and reviewers in order to have better manuscripts and satisfy the curiosity of readers, mostly young students, on subjects barely explored in academic life. This was something new, coming from a U.S. journal!

Back home, I became a visiting professor at the Federal University of Ceará, and with some colleagues, among them two other *LAP* participants, Jawdat Abu-El-Haj and Bernadete Beserra, we started a research group dedicated to theoretical and empirical studies of the relations among nation-states and how they were affected by the global environment. The Nationalities Observatory, as we called the group coordinated by Manuel Domingos Neto and myself, took a broad approach to the issues of nationalism and internationalism, and its members came from a variety of fields: political science, history, sociology, literature, architecture, economics, geography, anthropology, and law. This multidisciplinary focus made it hard for us to have our academic production accepted in many scientific journals.

Inspired by the discussions at *LAP* meetings, we decided to create our own journal, *World Tensions*. The first issue came out in February 2006 and included an interview with Benedict Anderson, the well-known scholar and author of *Imagined Communities*. Today, in its fourteenth issue, *World Tensions* continues publishing the work of researchers from Brazil and abroad, focusing on the construction of national identities and its inherent multifaceted dynamics, including relations between societies and states, changes in the instruments of force, and cultural processes. Its purpose is to contribute to the understanding of the major political and cultural phenomenon of modern times, the emergence and affirmation of nation-states and the so-called international order. *LAP* played a crucial role in the establishment of the Nationalities Observatory and its journal, and the experience was very significant for me personally and professionally.

—Mônica Dias Martins
Universidade Estadual de Ceará

In 2008, I was delighted to be the first *Latin American Perspectives* Visiting Fellow hosted at the University of California, Riverside. This was a crucial period in my development as a Latin Americanist, and the one-month stay enabled me to work closely with central figures linked to the journal, including Ron and Fran Chilcote; draw from the special collections and archives linked to *LAP*; and participate in presenting my research to the Latin American studies program. During that period of intellectual fervor and friendship-building, I drafted a paper that was subsequently published in *LAP*—“Reflections on Uneven Development: Mexican Revolution, Primitive Accumulation, Passive Revolution” (*Latin American Perspectives* 37 [1]). I also participated in the meetings of the editorial collective of *LAP* and experienced its wonderfully collegial, comradely, and supportive atmosphere. As a leading journal in Latin American studies, *LAP* has been at the forefront of critical analysis of the region for over four decades. This is a monumental achievement in that the journal has consistently been ahead of debate, policy, and politics in the Americas. Mainstream academic analysis has flooded the study of Latin America. Conventional trends have covered the doctrines of modernization theory, political development theory, and democratization studies and democratic transition. Meanwhile, a wedge against the mainstream has been maintained by *LAP* and its commitment to analyzing the intersection of capitalism, imperialism, and socialism in the Americas. At a juncture when many journals have folded into mainstream positions, *LAP* has remained steadfastly committed to critical scholarship and pedagogy forged through intellectual openness, theoretical pluralism, integrity in peer reviewing, and social transformation. The voice of *LAP*'s editors and contributors remains loud and clear amidst the cacophony of mainstream “political science” perspectives. Long may this radical tradition continue! Spaces of resistance and hope remain in Latin America, but they are perennially threatened by neoliberalism, the latest phase of capitalist exploitation, imperialist expansion, and militarist governance. *LAP* is a persistent bulwark against these forces. ¡Viva *Perspectivas de América Latina*!

—Adam David Morton
University of Nottingham

The marketization of education and scholarship attempts to eradicate forms of being, acting, and thinking outside of commodified logics from our history and our political imaginaries. Yet practices of solidarity, collectivity, and critique appear in the cracks and on the margins. *LAP* resolutely fosters critical practices and subjectivities. Its traditions resist the logics of competition, instrumentalization, and commodification.

Marketization is constituted through multiple micro-practices of bureaucratization and professionalization. These practices aim at producing scholars as cognitive labor that commodifies creativity, sensitivity, commitment, and intelligence. The ideal neoliberal subject is thus grounded in individualization, infinite flexibility, and precarious commitments, oriented toward competition for survival and personal profit.

The standards of excellence imposed by marketization evaluate research in terms of its ability to bring in money by publishing in top-ranked publishing houses or journals targeted at the few. These standards push individuals toward the development of problem-solving theory that accepts the status quo as opposed to critical theory that disrupts and denaturalizes the market economy. They de-democratize education and access to knowledge. They poison the soil in which critical scholars attempt to nurture transformatory praxis.

LAP refuses to conform to these logics.

Its independent democratic decision-making process rejects centralization and privatization.

Working together, the California-based editorial collective and the international participating editors embrace an ethics of practice based on solidarity, care, and critical scholarship. Our practice is committed to maintaining open political horizons of worlds beyond capitalism. It nurtures scholars who are often misrepresented and devalued by marketized managerial power.

We reject the separation, specialization, and fragmentation produced by a commodified scholarship that defends and naturalizes capitalism. The critical scholarship we nurture supports a multiplicity of perspectives united in their commitment to demonstrating capitalism's historical and contingent character.

We reject the instrumentalization whereby one's valued partners are political and economic elites and "impact" is measured in terms of one's closeness to dominant centers of power. Instead we support critical scholarship that is embedded in the realities of communities in struggle.

We practice Marxism(s) as living, breathing theory that adapts, develops, and innovates in dialogue with popular struggles across Latin America.

We aim to keep alive the possibilities for critique to change the world in Latin America and beyond.

For this reason I am honored to be a participating editor of *LAP*.

—Sara C. Motta
University of Nottingham

I can still remember vividly when, as a student, I received the first three issues of *Latin American Perspectives*: No. 1, *Dependency Theory*, No. 2, *Chile: Blood on the Peaceful Road*, and No. 3, *Argentina: Peronism and Crisis*, all in 1974, after the Chilean coup and just before the one in Argentina. For me they picked up where Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto's *Dependencia y desarrollo*

en América Latina (1969) left off and opened up a critical political/intellectual path I could identify with. This was a radical perspective that did not descend into sloganeering. It brought a North American empirical tradition (C. Wright Mills comes to mind) into dialogue with the Latin American political essay tradition.

Over the years *LAP* developed into a substantial network of Latin American and Latin America-oriented scholars and activists. While its original radicalism remained, it was also open to new currents of thought when other “old new left” journals saw a threat to orthodoxy and often became, to be honest, a bit stale. It was perhaps in relation to Cuba that *LAP* most impressed me. When it would have been easy to take a celebratory approach, especially from a radical North American perspective, *LAP* continued to offer critical analysis, the only type of analysis that is of use to those who seek to change the world.

While I have never actually met the editorial team of *LAP*, I have seen them as part of my own political-intellectual community of practice over many years. This led to my organizing a number of *LAP* special issues—on politics in Argentina (1997), on postmodernism, politics, and culture (2000), and, finally, on labor and restructuring (2004)—that brought together new networks of researchers and teachers. For me it is probably this networking function of *LAP* that stands out as one of the main contributions of Ronald Chilcote and his close colleagues. The political skills and sheer perseverance needed to maintain such a network must not be underestimated, nor should we forget that *LAP* was born and developed as part of a political project for transformations in Latin America that remains as valid as ever today. The best way to celebrate the fortieth anniversary would be a renewal of efforts to analyze, critique, and transform Latin America.

—Ronaldo Munck
Dublin City University

Los 40 años de *LAP* son ya una larga vida de acercamientos, conocimiento y acompañamiento a las luchas y resistencias de nuestros pueblos latinoamericanos. Constituyen una muralla simbólica contra el dominio del poder imperial, edificada en su mismo corazón. A los latinoamericanos nos resulta muy estimulante saber que hay un público en ese país que se interesa y se hermana con nuestros procesos, pero además que exista un medio de gran calidad para que lo hagan. Por eso y más me siento muy honrada de colaborar con *LAP* que seguramente vivirá por muchas generaciones más.

—Mercedes Olivera
*Centro de Estudios Superiores de México,
Universidad de Ciencias y Artes de Chiapas*

My involvement with *LAP* originally came through prior solidarity work. When I came to Los Angeles in the fall of 1976 to begin my career as an assistant professor at Whittier College, I quickly became involved in Latin American solidarity work through the Los Angeles Group for Latin American Solidarity. Before coming to Los Angeles I had conducted dissertation research in Chile from 1972 through early 1974 and had been deeply involved in Chile solidarity

work upon my return to the United States, and I looked forward to continuing this work in Los Angeles through LAGLAS.

One of the unexpected side benefits of working in LAGLAS was getting to know a large group of progressive Latin Americanists who would become important friends and professional colleagues; most of these were scholars who were involved in *Latin American Perspectives*, including Marjorie and Don Bray, Nora Hamilton, Norma Chinchilla, and Tim Harding. The group provided an important base of support, as I was not only a new professor but also a new mother. I used to bring my baby daughter, Amy, to LAGLAS meetings, and I remember that Marjorie Bray was particularly welcoming and supportive. Later, in the early 1980s, which brought a widening of solidarity activities to Central America, I took part in a human rights fact-finding trip to El Salvador and Nicaragua in January 1984, and Marjorie Bray was part of that delegation. I was encouraged to submit a manuscript on Chile to the journal, which was accepted for publication. So, when I was asked to join the editorial collective in 1984, I was delighted to say yes.

Those were exciting years in *LAP*, with lively discussions and debates during our monthly meetings about issues confronting the left and disagreements within the left. There were always insightful analyses of specific manuscripts along with discussions of how to shape specific *LAP* journal issues. These interactions were invariably stimulating and thought-provoking. Having to review and edit numerous manuscripts certainly sharpened my own analytical skills. One of my major contributions during this period was serving as issue editor for an issue on military rule and the struggle for democracy in Chile, which came out in 1991. Looking back, I see how joining the editorial collective helped shape and inform my own development as a scholar.

As my family grew over time, so did my personal obligations; these made it increasingly difficult to dedicate the time I felt was due to *LAP*, as the daylong monthly meetings required significant preparation. As a result, I decided to resign from active participation in the editorial collective in 1989, although I maintained the personal relationships that had developed with a number of members. I value that period in which I was actively involved in the work of the collective both for the intellectual stimulation and growth that it provided and for the personal relationships that emerged from it. I have been delighted to help support the continuing work of *LAP* through support of the *LAP* Fellowship Endowment.

—Lois Hecht Oppenheim
Sherman Oaks, CA

Forty years ago a group of professors and students had the long-term vision to form a collective whose main task was rethinking Latin American society from critical perspectives. Some of us were Latin American students like me. I had come with my family from Chile after my father—a lifelong pro-Allende dentist—was discharged from the Chilean air force four years before the military coup. A year before the founding of *LAP*, the coup had taken place. By then I was in the middle of my Ph.D. course work at the University of California, Irvine. A group of us from UCI started to attend *LAP* meetings, which alternated among the various Southern California campuses. We got involved in Chile

Solidarity and witnessed the arrival of the first refugees. At the same time, some of us also engaged in Chicano/Latino and women's struggles. A key *LAP* issue on women marked our debates on sexual politics in those days. As a collective, *LAP* was broad and pluralist and never avoided heated epoch-making debates. Dependency theory, radical economy, a wide spectrum of Marxist questions about the nation-state, ideology, racism, colonialism, the organization of labor, and the tensions between agrarian and industrial societies were among some of the problems discussed when we met to evaluate articles and prepare future issues. Some of the tensions took a toll on us at times, but that was part of our political experience. Looking back, I think that what made the group most valuable for me was the variety of perspectives it engaged. Methodologically speaking, what was at stake was our ability to embrace differences with dialogue, mutual respect, theoretical depth, and creativity.

Along with engaging debates, *LAP* provoked the articulation of knowledge with concrete political experience on a wide spectrum of issues, an endeavor that made it easier for us to deal with the contradictory roles we played in our institutional daily lives. For instance, "Theory *is* praxis" stands out in my memory as one of the syntheses that we developed after important discussions at one of our *LAP* meetings. Yet, the motto—as wise and comprehensive as it was—became too difficult for some of us to handle in times when the assassination of Chileans was happening not only daily in Chile but also on the streets of Washington, DC. I felt that I had to "act"; academic work felt too far removed. I suspended my Ph.D. work and moved to San Francisco for eight years, where I became involved in Chile Solidarity at La Peña in Berkeley, cofounded the offices of Chile Democrático, and joined the Human Rights desk of the Bay Area Ecumenical Council. I was blacklisted by the dictatorship as a consequence. Deeply immersed in my activism, I felt that the ongoing debate about subjectivity, class struggle, and cultural production was too important for me to put off. In this context, Jean Franco and Julianne Burton's text on cultural imperialism made a radical impact on my life projects. I came back to academia, finished my Ph.D., was hired as an assistant professor at the University of California, Riverside, and joined the *LAP* collective again. Soon thereafter I was taken off the blacklist, and I returned to Chile, where I founded the Center of Gender and Cultural Studies. Both theoretically and concretely, the concept of "articulation" was to become a keystone of my praxis, a lifelong legacy left to all of us by Michael Kearney and the *LAP* collective. The personal and the public spheres, theory and political activism, masculine and feminine identities, class, sex, and race are but a few examples. It has become all too clear to me that a politically radical subjectivity can only be fostered *in difference*.

—Kemy Oyarzún
Universidad de Chile

I first got involved with *LAP* in the early 1990s, when I coedited a special issue on "Labor and the Free Market in the Americas" with Cliff Welch (22 [1], 1995). That was the beginning of what has turned out to be a long relationship. In the late 1990s I worked on two special issues with Diane Davis, with whom I had worked at the New School, on "New Patterns of Militarized Violence and Coercion in the Americas" (27 [2 and 3]). More recently, I co-published an

article with Ana Margheritis, who had been my colleague at Tulane University, on the neoliberal turn in Latin America (34 [3], 2007). The amazing thing is that I am still friends with all these collaborators. Getting these publications through the editorial collective at *LAP* was hard going at times, but it led me to respect the process at the journal and the seriousness with which people approached their unpaid work as reviewers. I am still involved in *LAP* as a reviewer. I occasionally talk about *LAP* with my near neighbor, Alfredo Saad-Filho, who teaches at the School of Oriental and African Studies in the University of London (while I teach at King's College London). I'd like to congratulate all the people involved with *LAP*, especially Ron Chilcote, for keeping the journal going and for reaching the milestone of its fortieth anniversary. *Parabéns!*

—Anthony W. Pereira
King's College London

The inaugural issues of *LAP*, of which I was a founding member, reflected a deep commitment to rigorous research harnessed to the struggle for socialism and against imperialism. The founding year coincided with the advance of workers' democracy in Chile via the industrial zones (*cordones industriales*) administered by elected workers' delegates and the dozens of worker-managed factories. I was invited to Chile by Orlando Letelier, then minister of defense, as an adviser and left shortly after President Allende yielded to rightist pressure and accepted the resignation of three constitutional generals, Prats, Pickering, and Sepúlveda. The U.S.-backed military-capitalist coup followed. Shortly thereafter the Italian socialist Lelio Basso and Jean-Paul Sartre launched the Bertrand Russell Tribunal II on Latin America, and they invited me to join Julio Cortázar, Eduardo Galeano, Gabriel García Márquez, and several other distinguished scholars and jurists in forming the jury and providing a human rights platform to publicize the crimes of the U.S.-backed emerging dictatorships.

Between 1973 and 1976 the tribunal directed its efforts to defending the *collective* rights of the people (not simply individual victims) and exposing the role of imperial multinationals. The essays published in *LAP* identified the link between U.S. imperial interests and the death squads and Latin American military rulers. *LAP* educated the broader academic public and encouraged active participation in the solidarity movements. Some academics engaged in Latin American studies responded positively; other confined their activities to passing resolutions at Latin American Studies Association meetings, especially as the association leadership incorporated some radical panels into its meetings.

With Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay, Chile, and Argentina ruled by U.S.-backed terrorist regimes and with their death squads murdering dissidents on three continents (Latin America, Europe, and North America), *LAP* published informative articles on the resistance movements, including armed guerrillas.

New struggles and movements in the Caribbean and Central America came to the fore: mass popular-based guerrilla movements in Colombia, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras faced off against U.S.- and Israeli-advised terrorist regimes and death squads. *LAP* played a major role in publishing articles and interviews by activist scholars who helped build mass

solidarity movements in the United States and provided material support to the revolutionary militants.

The success of the Nicaraguan revolution—the defeat of the U.S.-backed Somoza dictatorship in 1979—exposed the vulnerability of narrowly based dictatorships. Washington began to look for alternatives or “transitions” that sacrificed regimes to save the state and perpetuated “free-market” economic policies.

Throughout the 1980s, with the collaboration of Christian Democratic and Social Democratic electoral parties, ex-guerrillas and ex-supporters of the dictators introduced electoral systems dubbed by the State Department and its academic counterparts a “democratic transition.” *LAP* played a major role in explicating and denouncing the socioeconomic continuities and the authoritarian security state institutions in which the electoral regimes were embedded.

LAP, early on, published a series of issues exposing the dark side of the 1990s-neoliberal “golden years.” The corruption, pillage, and sell-off of thousands of public firms, the denationalization of the economy, and the concentration of wealth during the presidencies of Salinas and Zedillo in Mexico, Menem and De la Rúa in Argentina, Mahuad and Noboa in Ecuador, and Cardoso in Brazil were rigorously documented in *LAP*, in many cases against the neoliberal tide that engulfed LASA.

With the emergence of mass peasant, Indian, and unemployed workers’ movements and revolts in Latin America between 2000 and 2005, neoliberalism’s demise was documented in a special issue of *LAP* as mass social movements took center stage. The post-neoliberal regimes, especially the comprehensive socioeconomic advances in Venezuela, promised to put socialism on the agenda for a new generation of activist scholars, just as the Cuban Revolution did for the generation that founded *LAP* in 1973.

—James Petras

State University of New York, Binghamton

We communists do not want officialdom. We want revolution!

—Mao Zedong

Latin American Perspectives has lived the spirit of Mao’s motto ever since its inception, seeking not officialdom, popularity, or mainstream respectability but revolution. Its writers and editors are dedicated to analyzing revolution in Latin America, yes, but also revolutionizing the way scholars and teachers think about “Our America” by making the workers and peasants of the region their teachers. This Latino-revolutionary view of history and politics forces a rethinking of concepts critical to Latin American studies, from multiculturalism to transculturation to subalterns and hard and soft ways of fighting power. In the stories of working-class women and men *LAP* examines the continuum of resistance from church to shantytown, using weapons ranging from the female body to the Bible. Regardless of topic, every issue might be dubbed “Marginalization and Its Discontents,” chronicling the resistance of those silenced by history for the past five centuries. In the second decade of the

twenty-first century it is my firm belief that the journal is more relevant than ever, for we are now at one of those all too rare turning points in the history of what is now a global working class. As writers and editors, let us reflect on the timeliness and timelessness of our work, seeing the struggles of the oppressed in terms of a global war between the residents of the planet's slums and its luxury apartments while maintaining the focus on capitalism, underdevelopment, and revolution. Without wholly abandoning the historical materialist methodology and the centrality of class struggle, *LAP* has cultivated an appreciation of the personalities and ideas, among them cosmology, culture, and religion, through which women and men make history and make themselves heard. Being both editor and educator, in the classroom I continue to challenge myself to listen more to that plethora of voices and, with all due respect, less to academic contemporaries who base their pedagogies on the latest European philosophical fad. Above all, I continue to cling to the hope that historian, political activist, and philosopher can be united in one person who is able and eager to bring provocative insights to both the groves of academe and the politically minded public.

The three topics I have covered as an editor for *LAP* are intertwined: history, historiography, and pedagogy. I should like all of us who work for *LAP* to rethink our craft keeping that triad forever in mind: the ability to combine research, reflection, and creativity in writing, editing, and conveying our thoughts in the classroom. Facts do not speak for themselves; rather, the collective memory of the historical actors speaks through us to students of all things Latin American.

—Julio César Pino
Kent State University

It must have been sometime in late 1976 or early 1977. I was a first-year grad student in history at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. I really liked history, but I was pretty sure I did not like historians—at least not academic ones. To me they were boring; they seemed to have no relevance to the social and political issues that interested me. The continent was full of struggles, and my profs made me read about elites in Latin America or Lewis Hanke's positivist prose. I believed that we were into history, in spite of the fact that there was no money, little prestige, and power only over our students there, because we wanted to make a difference.

I knew there was something else out there. I had come across Hobart Spalding on Latin American labor, Boorstin on Cuba, and Womack on Zapata. But it was a book that I picked up, almost accidentally (because it was really thick), at the old Saint Mark's Bookstore on New York's Lower East Side—Chilcote and Edelstein's (1974) *Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond*—that was a revelation. Jim Petras wrote an awesome piece on Chile and Susanne Jonas an eye-opening one on Guatemala, and there were really good articles on Cuba and Brazil. (I did not like Eugenio Corradi's piece on Argentina because no Argentine will ever admit that another is right about anything.) If I remember correctly, all the contributors were listed as belonging to something termed "Latin American Perspectives." Well, I was a Latin American leftie, and there seemed to be U.S. progressives studying Latin America (somehow it had

never occurred to me). I looked for the journal and have been reading it ever since.

Let me put it bluntly: I loved it. The stuff on Cuba was thought-provoking; the pieces on Brazil or on Mexico were challenging; the ones on Chile made me rethink just about everything; and I was fascinated by the journal's take on Central America. Most important, the articles were readable and accessible not only to specialists but to anyone who was interested in Latin America. By this I do not mean to disparage either the *Latin American Research Review* or the *Hispanic American Historical Review*. They are serious, well-done, and academic, but since I wanted a more militant perspective they often bored me to tears. *LAP* was different. It was passionate, engaged, committed, polemical, "from the bottom up." And that was precisely what I needed to reconcile my soul with becoming a historian. *LAP* was an unusual journal. Yes, it was serious, but more important it was a place where you could find a perspective that could not be found anywhere else. It was challenging, and most of all it was fun in that it made your brain cells work overtime.

LAP was really important to me not only as a student but as somebody who had serious reservations about the uses of academe. I came back to Argentina once the 1976–1983 dictatorship was over. I was able to get a job at the Universidad de Buenos Aires, teaching Argentine history at first and then U.S. history (somehow they thought that because I had been to the United States I knew something about it). For about a decade I lost track of *LAP*, reading it whenever I could get the odd issue. And then I went to a Latin American Studies Association conference and got hooked again.

The journal had changed substantially since the mid-1970s—perhaps for the better, perhaps not. Some pieces had the old commitment and militant scholarship; others would have been perfectly at home in any other academic journal. My feeling is that we still owe ourselves, 40 years down the road, a good discussion on what has been achieved and what the new "perspectives" (if any) should be. Undoubtedly, at least in my view, *LAP* made a crucial contribution. But, 40 years later, both we and the world have changed, and there are times when I feel that *LAP* is not too clear as to the road we should follow.

As an editor, I still believe that *LAP* should be a progressive, challenging voice geared toward all those people who believe that we academics can contribute to making a better Latin America. This implies a political commitment, and it also implies a decision to deal with the problems that arise from engagement and scholarly research. It also means that our task (and challenge) is not the same as in 1974 but that it is no less important to define what it is to be a progressive Latin Americanist and identify what our contribution is to be.

I believe that the *LAP* project remains valid. My feeling is that the journal fulfills a crucial role in Latin American studies and that no other publication comes even close to doing so. At the same time, I feel that the collective is somehow unsure what that role is or should be. I believe that a crucial lesson of these 40 years is that a progressive, politically engaged journal that is serious, scholarly, and interdisciplinary is an important contribution to the field and, more important, to the new generations of Latin Americanists.

—Pablo Pozzi
Universidad de Buenos Aires

Quarenta anos é muito tempo. Se já é bastante tempo para uma vida, parece-me que corresponde a bem mais tempo para uma revista, devido às inúmeras dificuldades que se enfrenta para publicar praticamente cada número dela. Em poucas palavras, é um grande feito, por si só, manter a *LAP* todo esse tempo.

No caso da América Latina, os últimos quarenta anos foram especialmente longos. Em 1974 se sentia fortemente o impacto do golpe do Chile, tema do segundo número da *LAP*. Hoje, a morte de Hugo Chávez tem grande impacto na região. Resumidamente, na perspectiva da esquerda, que sempre foi a da revista, a *LAP* nasceu sob o impacto da derrota, que marcaria os anos 1970, em que o autoritarismo se espalhou por praticamente toda a América Latina. Depois da transição para a democracia, na década de 1980, e da implantação do neo-liberalismo, nos anos 1990, o século XXI latino-americano tem sido marcado pela eleição de governos identificados com a esquerda. Hoje, mesmo com a incerteza diante da do que virá depois de Chávez, a América Latina é vista como o principal lugar do planeta a partir do qual o neo-liberalismo é questionado. Como tarefa futura para a *LAP*, vale a pena se perguntar até que ponto vai esse desafio ao neo-liberalismo, especificando, por exemplo, as diferenças entre as diversas regiões e países que passam pelo que é chamado de “onda vermelha.” Em resumo, o problema principal a ser enfrentado é investigar como depois do fim do “socialismo real,” em 1989, podem aparecer alternativas ao capitalismo, que se apresenta, mais do que nunca, como uma espécie de “segunda natureza.”

Na verdade, o programa, de examinar meticolosamente as variadas experiências nacionais, é levado a cabo pela *LAP* desde seu início, a revista tendo dedicado números especiais ao Chile, Argentina, México, Colômbia, Cuba, Porto Rico, Peru, Bolívia, Brasil, Caribe, América Central, Equador, etc. Além disso, a *LAP* não deixou de prestar atenção aos grandes temas que, nas últimas quatro décadas, têm mobilizado quase o conjunto da América Latina, tratando de questões como a teoria da dependência, o feminismo, o campesinato, a classe operária, os militares, os movimentos sociais, o neo-liberalismo, a ecologia, a pós-modernismo, o setor informal, etc.

Nesse sentido, a coleção de números da *LAP* serve também como uma boa amostra das grandes questões que mais interesse provocaram na América Latina nos últimos tempos. Mais especificamente, o que dá unidade à revista, ao longo do tempo, é seu claro posicionamento na esquerda. Em outras palavras, por mais difícil que os últimos quarenta anos tenham sido para a esquerda latino-americana, a *LAP* é um exemplo de como se buscou enfrentar os grandes dilemas da região a partir dessa perspectiva política.

Por outro lado, a *LAP*, assim como outros empreendimentos com uma preocupação “continental” em relação à América Latina, é uma iniciativa que não provém da região, mas dos EUA. Assim, se o próprio interesse por temas latino-americanos nos EUA foi motivado, em grande parte, por preocupações relacionadas com a política externa do país, não deixou de estimular também uma revista, com perfil crítico, como a *LAP*. Temos, assim, um exemplo e tanto de efeito não intencional.

—Bernardo Ricupero
Universidade de São Paulo

It is no exaggeration to say that I cannot remember a time that I have not turned to *Latin American Perspectives* for radical analysis and historical and theoretical understanding of the social forces that shape our hemisphere. The very first issue I ever got my hands on, *Central America: The Strongmen Are Shaking*, was published in 1980, shortly after the Somoza dynasty was overthrown and as insurrection and counterinsurgency swept El Salvador and Guatemala. Back then the journal was oversized and bulky; that issue remained stuffed for many months in my luggage as I trekked through the Isthmus, among other things to report to my news agency, Agencia Nueva Nicaragua. *LAP* was one of the few English-language periodicals, together perhaps with *NACLA Report on the Americas*, that was read on a regular basis by radical intellectuals in the region. You had to be careful what books, journals, and periodicals you carried with you when traveling. Luggage was searched in the “Northern Triangle,” and you didn’t want a soldier or a customs official to catch you with subversive or “communist” literature. What we did was to rip off the covers of books and periodicals, leaving nothing but the fine print of the first page of text. I still have on my shelf that issue, *Central America: The Strongmen Are Shaking*, its cover missing.

LAP is unique in its combination of scholarship and conjuncture analysis. The journal offers the best of these two worlds from the voices of scholars both North and South. If you want a scholarly progressive perspective behind the burning headlines of our times, you turn to *LAP*. It is a tool for organic intellectuals and a resource for each upcoming generation. The journal has been there from the demise of the South American dictatorships through the revolutions in Central America, socialism in Cuba, the onslaught of neoliberalism, globalization, feminism, and the rise of new social movements to the ascent of the left to power in the Andes. I cannot imagine a Latin American studies without *LAP*. Today, its articles fill up my course readers. I refer all my undergraduate students in my Latin America courses to it as a resource for their assignments. My graduate students rely on it, as I do, for research or simply to stay informed.

—William I. Robinson
University of California, Santa Barbara

I started reading *Latin American Perspectives* in early 1975, not long after the first issues. My wife, Diane, and I had just begun our graduate field research in Chiapas, and my research partner, Robert Wasserstrom, suggested that one of us subscribe to *NACLA* and the other to *LAP* and then we could trade them. I hesitate to say which of the two fell to me and Diane (although I guess I just did), but we have subscribed to or read both ever since.

Why *LAP*? As graduate students among the Maya, we were heirs to a major tradition of North American ethnography. By the 1970s, anthropologists from U.S. universities had for almost 30 years been analyzing the internal social organizations and mores of the Maya communities of southern Mexico and Guatemala. Working in native languages, they had described the communities’ interlocking systems of moral beliefs and cosmology, civil and religious government, marriage and family customs, and the rituals and techniques of men’s and women’s productive activities. Given the intensity of their focus on the

“inside” of communities, however, they had left the impression—for many, perhaps unintentionally—that indigenous communities were self-contained, cut off from the world around them. Rob Wasserstrom and I, who had been students of both anthropology and, with John Womack, Mexican and social history, felt for both intellectual and political reasons that the next obvious direction for research was to connect indigenous communities more closely to their political economic context and history. In this we were hardly alone. During those same years scholars of indigenous people across the world were turning increasingly to political economy and history to understand colonization, ethnicity, and the relationship of small societies to the world system. In our case, looking for clues about how to reframe indigenous peasants and generate questions for ethnographic fieldwork, from the beginning of graduate school in 1972 we had been reading among others Eric Wolf, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, André Gunder Frank, Arturo Warman, Roger Bartra, Andrés Medina, Mercedes Olivera, Henri Favre, Carlos Guzmán Böckler, and Jean-Loup Herbert.

And then about the time we got to Chiapas to begin our research, these same writers, considered abstruse, even marginal in our anthropology program, began turning up in the new journal *Latin American Perspectives*. It is hard to describe how exciting it was to find dependency, social class, and the status of Latin American peasants discussed, and debated passionately, in an English-language journal. Frank and Stavenhagen were in *LAP*'s first issue, as was my later close friend Tim Harding. By the end of 1975, just in the circle of my own special interests, the journal had also published Roger Bartra, David Barkin, Mary Kay Vaughn, Norma Chinchilla, Karen Spalding, Nora Hamilton, and Carlos Monsiváis, and by the time Diane and I returned to the United States in 1977 it had added Eleanor Leacock, Carmen Diana Deere, and Elizabeth Dore. Running through all of those issues, editing and writing introductions, was Ron Chilcote. *LAP* became the theoretical backdrop of the first years of research projects that still occupy me and Diane.

My first actual contact with the people of *LAP* was at the 1988 meeting of the Latin American Studies Association in New Orleans, where I found Michael Kearney staffing *LAP*'s booth (according to the journal's *usos y costumbres*, everyone takes a turn at the table at LASA). We spoke for a long while about migration, indigenous politics, and *testimonio* (Diane and I had been coordinating a native-language publishing project in Chiapas for several years), and the meeting ended with his suggesting that, although it would mean a lot of work (an understatement!), if I came back to Southern California I should look *LAP* up. The “looking up” did not actually happen until 1994, after the Zapatista Rebellion, when, back in Los Angeles, I was invited by Tim Harding and Don and Marjorie Bray to a meeting of the *LAP* collective. From then until now *LAP*'s editors have been my enduring intellectual community in the United States.

Thinking about the strengths of *LAP* during the years I have been associated with it, its commitment to empirical research framed in terms of larger political economy and history—themes that come from the very first issue—continues to make it vital, the research and analysis evolving as the world system changes. But writing now as a social science professor based in Mexico, I would like to

point to two other, procedural strengths. The first, perhaps a by-product of *LAP*'s origin in the left of the late 1960s and 1970s, is a commitment to an open review process: Manuscript reviews are signed. *LAP* still rejects a high percentage of submissions, but with our names at the foot of the page we perhaps take more trouble to explain ourselves. For young scholars, perhaps non-North Americans in particular, this tends to make *LAP* a more welcoming introduction to publishing.

The second is that, of the major Latin Americanist journals in English, *LAP* does the most to bring both established and emerging Latin American voices to an English-speaking audience. Almost uniquely, the journal has always covered the cost of translating manuscripts submitted in Spanish, Portuguese, and French. Beginning in the early 2000s, however, the collective made the decision to intensify the search for non-English manuscripts—to make an effort to publish *Latin American* perspectives. For the past decade, from a third to just less than half of published articles have been from other than English originals.

I feel as if I ought to end with a ringing endorsement of some sort, but maybe it isn't necessary. The day-to-day solidity and solidarity of *LAP* over these 40 years, the very normality of its extraordinariness, have been its own best endorsement.

—Jan Rus

*Centro de Estudios Superiores de México,
Universidad de Ciencias y Artes de Chiapas*

Latin American Perspectives—y Ronald Chilcote, como su dirigente fundamental—fueron siempre la referencia fundamental para el pensamiento crítico latino-americano a lo largo de esas cuatro décadas. Sintiéndonos siempre en un territorio extraño, hostil, en los Estados Unidos, siempre contamos con espacio de análisis alternativos sobre los Estados Unidos y sobre el mundo, así como para interpretaciones críticas y solidaridad sobre la misma América Latina, en *Latin American Perspectives*.

Las relaciones del pensamiento crítico latino-americano prácticamente vienen de la década de 1960, cuando el impulso izquierdista cruzó todas las fronteras geográficas e institucionales, proyectando hacia nosotros un pujante marxismo norteamericano. Las obras de Paul Sweezy, Paul Baran y Leo Huberman, entre otras, junto con la *Monthly Review*, nos permitían comprender los procesos de acumulación de capital, mas allá de los modelos mecanicistas que las interpretaciones soviéticas difundían por el mundo.

Esa tradición izquierdista norteamericana siempre fué nuestra referencia inicial para dialogar con la intelectualidad crítica de los Estados Unidos. Posteriormente, pasamos a tener a en *LAP* nuestra referencia fundamental.

Durante mucho tiempo *LAP* fué la única institución no latino-americana y caribeña asociada a el Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales. Además de los vínculos generales con CLACSO, cuando se constituyó el Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estados Unidos, tuvimos la participación y el apoyo directo de *LAP*, que tradujo y reprodujo textos elaborados por el grupo en números especiales de la revista.

De todas maneras, creemos que habría que estrechar todavía más los lazos del pensamiento crítico latino-americano con sus correspondientes norteamericano de que *LAP* es su mejor expresión. Ojalá se consiga organizar eventos

de CLACSO en territorio estadounidense que permitan proyectar trabajos conjuntos.

Nosotros tenemos una inmensa admiración por gente como las que construye *LAP*, por saber lo que significa trabajar en un territorio hostil, adverso, fuente de las políticas de terror y de superexplotación en el mundo. Queremos, en esta oportunidad, volver a expresar nuestros sentimientos de solidaridad y agradecimiento hacia la gente de *LAP*, compañeros nuestros en todas las jornadas, teóricas y políticas.

—Emir Sader

Universidade Federal de Rio de Janeiro

I published my first article with *LAP* in 1977, three years after it started publication. At the time I was still at Livingston College, Rutgers University, which was then notorious for leftist activism and scholarship. This milieu helped transform my political consciousness to a more Marxist orientation for which *LAP* served as a reputable outlet.

The titles of my articles published in *LAP* reflect my changing focus on class, then gender, and finally race in grappling with inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean. In 1980 I became director of the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida in Gainesville, where I remain to the present (having retired from teaching in 1997). I was elected president of the Latin American Studies Association in 1983. These heavy administrative duties cut into my research, writing, and publishing. All told, however, with three major articles and a special issue on race that I organized, I think I have published more in *LAP* than in any other social science journal. I have also been a frequent reviewer. I thank Ron Chilcote and Sheryl Lutjens for facilitating these publications.

Those of us who have been working on Latin America and the Caribbean these 40 (in my case 50) years would like to see more progress on the issues of class, gender, and racial inequality in the region. Latin America and the Caribbean continue to be the global region of greatest inequality, but some advances have been made from the days of brutal repression under military dictatorships to the more democratic regimes in place today. Class protest seems to have declined with the weakening of trade unions in favor of stronger movements for gender and racial equality. The women's movement has achieved important recognition in pursuit of greater economic and political equality and made possible the emergence of leaders like Michele Bachelet. Afro-descendants in Latin America and the Caribbean are organizing and making claims for greater recognition politically. They are still far behind the indigenous movement, which is more visible internationally and has succeeded in some claims for land and redress of other inequities. There is no doubt in my mind that the recent conviction (since overturned) of the Guatemalan dictator Efraín Ríos Montt, who ordered the massacre of entire villages among the Guatemalan indigenous population, is in part due to the firm support of the charges against him of the indigenous movement.

In the past decade I have worked mainly on Cuba, the small and courageous country that has withstood a 50-year economic blockade, an invasion by Cuban exiles, and countless other forms of intervention. I have dealt less with these

political issues than with trying to understand Cuban culture and the impact of the 1959 revolution on its people. My last article in *LAP*, published in 2009, dealt with the weakening of gender, class, and racial hierarchies in Cuba, as seen in changes in household composition and patterns of racial intermarriage. Undoubtedly, the Special Period (as the economic crisis of the 1990s brought on by the collapse of trade and aid from the former Soviet Union was called) again hardened some of these hierarchies, but the progress made was undeniable. *LAP* has never lost sight of Cuba and has dedicated repeated special issues to its study.

We all owe a great deal to Ron Chilcote and his staff for providing us for so many years with this valuable publication.

—Helen Safa
University of Florida

Muitos se perguntarão sobre qual é o segredo da *LAP* para se ter tornado na revista mais importante sobre temas latinoamericanos publicada em inglês e numa das mais importantes publicadas em qualquer das outras línguas, incluindo as revistas em português e espanhol que se publicam no sub-continente. São várias as razões. A primeira foi a opção clara desde o início por uma teoria crítica plural, atenta à reprodução dos sistemas de dominação e de opressão vigentes no continente e à resistência das classes populares contra eles. Sendo certo que outras revistas fizeram a mesma opção teórica, onde residiu a diferença da *LAP*? Residiu no cuidado com que manteve, no plano epistemológico, a distinção fundamental entre objetividade e neutralidade. A *LAP* procura sempre produzir uma ciência social objetiva, privilegiando estudos empíricos (não empiricistas) e teóricos (não esotéricos) solidamente informados e consistentes. Mas em nenhuma circunstância confundiu essa objetividade com neutralidade. A *LAP* soube sempre de que lado estava, do lado dos oprimidos, dos excluídos, dos explorados. Deu voz às suas lutas e credibilidade às suas aspirações.

A segunda razão reside em que a *LAP* viu muito cedo que as lutas e os processos políticos e sociais da América Latina tinham potencialidades para influenciar o mundo muito para além das fronteiras do sub-continente. Para a *LAP*, a América Latina era um laboratório de inovação social, política e cultural que mais tarde ou mais cedo mostraria os limites etnocentrismo eurocentrico e ofereceria novas possibilidades ao mundo na luta pela emancipação social. Esta aposta da *LAP* mostrou-se ganhadora e por isso não admira o prestígio de que ela goza hoje. Estou certo de que vai continuar a ser merecedora dele. Para isso basta que se saiba renovar sem esmorecer na fidelidade á inspiração fundadora que a trouxe até aqui.

—Boaventura de Sousa Santos
Universidade de Coimbra

I think Tim Harding first approached me about *LAP* at a Latin American Studies Association meeting in the 1970s. He eventually invited me to coedit an issue on imperialism (January 1976) and since then I have participated in or coedited several other issues. I was also part of a short-lived East Coast *LAP*

collective founded by Dale Johnson and others at what was then Livingston College of Rutgers. For years I regularly attended the editors' get-togethers at LASA and managed to go to several of the California meetings, usually held at Fran and Ron's. Over time I have given some thought to the question of *LAP*'s role. I serve on the boards of three other progressive publications, one dedicated to Latin America, the other two more general but with a healthy interest in Latin American themes, and I find marked similarities in the trajectories of all four as laid out below.

I think that over time significant things have happened within *LAP*. When it started, the magazine was clearly a journal of the left, the marxie left (not Marxist). It attempted to deal with the larger picture, the broad important themes, focusing (though not always exclusively) on continuing struggles across the continent. As such it became for me a valuable teaching tool. It was written in a style that undergraduates could read and understand. It contained a clear political punch.

Gradually, however, this began to change. *LAP* became clearly less political. I have reviewed several articles that might appear in any mainline academic journal. Despite my noting this, they almost all got published with little or no revision, sometimes with the lame excuse that "It fit." At some point—and I do not have a clear date here—I could no longer use *LAP* in my undergrad courses. I still used it at the M.A. level, but the same thing happened there. Ph.D. level, same thing. Most issues no longer proved useful, being too specialized or not sharp enough. I have never ceased to recommend *LAP* to advanced students as a very important resource and still consider it one of the best sources available (it belongs in every college library), but it clearly has changed. Some sectarians might comment, "Of course, what do you expect from petit-bourgeois intellectuals?" I am not judging the transition good or bad but only noticing what I think has happened. I brought this up with a friend who founded a radical publication in the 1960s (still going), and he agreed with my observations about that magazine and others, too.

The *LAP* community should give a hearty *abrazote* to Ron Chilcote, who has guided things during these past decades. He has been a tireless worker. *LAP* will also stand with other progressive journals of what some people have called "the second wave of radical journalism." Just the ability to survive is an accomplishment. I hope that *LAP* will be around a lot longer than us old-timers and that those editing the journal will still constantly evaluate where it is, what it aims to do, and how well it is doing it.

—Hobart Spalding
Brooklyn College, City University of New York

A pesar de algunas discontinuidades determinadas por mi alejamiento temporal de las actividades científicas, académicas y editoriales que he venido desarrollando en Cuba, durante casi 30 años me he mantenido vinculado a la ingente labor editorial de *Latin American Perspectives*. En todo ese tiempo, esa publicación ha sido una importante fuente de conocimientos especializados sobre la realidad latinoamericana y caribeña, al igual que sobre las muchas veces conflictivas interrelaciones entre los gobiernos de los Estados Unidos con los de los estados políticamente independientes situados al sur del Río Bravo y de la península de Florida. También ha sido un insustituible y valioso puente

para el intercambio de perspectivas teórico-metodológicas con otras y otros colegas del continente americano y, en particular, con aquellas y aquellos que cultivan el pensamiento crítico y descolonizado.

Mis vinculaciones con *LAP* también me han posibilitado la traducción y publicación en Estados Unidos de algunos escritos que—por mis compromisos con las luchas populares, democráticas y antiimperialistas, así como por la emancipación nacional y social de las naciones y pueblos del “sur político” del continente americano—no han encontrado acogida en prácticamente ninguna otra publicación de los Estados Unidos, ni siquiera de aquellas que editan prestigiosos centros académicos de investigación o think tanks de ese país.

Como fruto de mis cada vez más cercanas interacciones con las y los prestigiosos colegas integrantes del consejo editorial *LAP* y, en particular, con el incansable Ronald H. Chilcote, en 2012 tuve el privilegio de disfrutar de una de las becas que ofrece el *Latin American Perspectives Visiting Fellowships* que tiene su sede en la Biblioteca Tomas Rivera, ubicada en el recinto de Riverside de la Universidad de California. La consulta de los valiosos fondos bibliográficos que tiene acunados, así como todas las atenciones recibidas por la coordinadora del *Latin American Perspectives Visiting Fellowships*, Rhonda L. Neugebauer, me abrieron una invaluable ventana de conocimientos sobre las multifacéticas interrelaciones de Cuba con los gobiernos y otras fuerzas sociales y políticas de América Latina y el Caribe. Sin ellos, me hubiera sido muy difícil continuar avanzando en las investigaciones que aún estoy desarrollando sobre las que he denominado “utopías de la Revolución Cubana.”

Por todo lo dicho, puedo concluir este testimonio indicando que, si *LAP* no hubiera sido fundada hace 40 años, ahora habría que fundarla para establecer los imprescindibles vínculos que deben existir entre las instituciones, las y los investigadores, docentes y académicos, así como las publicaciones de ambas partes del continente americano; en particular, entre aquellas y aquellos que desde el periódico, la cátedra y la academia estamos interesados en construir un mundo y un continente más bonito y mejor, ya que como nos dejó dicho José Martí: “Resolver el problema después de conocer sus elementos, es más fácil que resolver el problema sin conocerlo. . . . Conocer es resolver.”

—Luis Suárez Salazar
Unión de Escritores y Artistas de Cuba

Jorge Luis Borges sentenció hace ya muchos años que ninguna revista de ciencias sociales sobrevive mas allá de unos diez años. Era ese un escepticismo basado en la experiencia. Son pocas las excepciones que corrigen el fatalismo de Borges. *LAP* es un buen ejemplo—un extraordinario ejemplo porque ha atravesado distintas épocas, distintas modas. Se fundó cuando empezábamos a utilizar la noción de dependencia, que *LAP* llamó teoría. Luego llegó el tema de la transición al socialismo desde el subdesarrollo (Nicaragua) y ahora nos toca ver a América Latina desde el fracaso del socialismo—las luchas por alcanzar un capitalismo que permita sobrevivir a las mayorías. Deseamos a *LAP* mas años de vida cuando tengamos de nuevo la oportunidad de imaginar una nueva sociedad.

—Edelberto Torres-Rivas
United Nations Development Program, Guatemala City

As I watch the Brazilian people assert their power in the streets, I am thankful that some journals actually study such spreading phenomena. *LAP* is one of these, and writing for it, reviewing articles for it, and editing two special issues on Latin American social movements and a resultant book have been quite a ride. The first piece I submitted to *LAP*, in the 1980s (“Marx and the Peasant in Latin America,” 9 [4], 1982)) was first accepted, then rejected for its unorthodox Mariateguista views, and then—after I appealed the rejection—published with a five-page critique. Despite some temporary angst, it was quite an honor for me to be published in a Marxist journal of Latin American studies, and I have always treasured the progressive views that *LAP* represents and the open critical atmosphere that characterizes the decision and editorial processes. As a former managing editor of a journal, I very much appreciate the transparency of the *LAP* review process and the opportunity it gives authors to examine and respond to the reviews of referees whose identities are known. Likewise, the frequency of the issues and their broad inclusion gives younger and more radical scholars opportunities to disseminate their work that might not exist elsewhere. For these and many other reasons, I continue to be proud and honored to be part of this process and look forward to the forthcoming articles on the popular mobilization in Brazil and to many more decades of *Latin American Perspectives*.

—Harry Vanden
University of South Florida

Me integré al cuerpo de corresponding editors de *LAP* en 1984. En esa época yo vivía y trabajaba en Nicaragua. Eran tiempos de revolución y esperanzas de cambio ahí y en Centroamérica, y Argentina estaba experimentando los primeros, difícilísimos pasos del restablecimiento democrático. A lo largo de estos treinta años acompañé a *LAP* en su recepción de gran parte de los estudios académicos progresistas sobre Latinoamérica y el Caribe, como evaluador de manuscritos y también como autor. *LAP* fue, y sigue siendo, una consistente expresión del pensamiento crítico del hemisferio, conjugando el rigor académico y el compromiso intelectual con las aspiraciones emancipatorias de las grandes mayorías del continente. Como latinoamericano, encuentro especialmente satisfactoria la progresiva apertura de la revista a autores de nuestra región, que ha permitido un rico intercambio de perspectivas y de visiones “gringas” y “criollas” de los temas analizados y los enfoques teórico-metodológicos desarrollados. Como autor, agradezco a los anónimos editores de *LAP* sus aportes a mejorar mis textos; como editor, reconozco los esfuerzos de Ron y de sus colaboradores directos para perseguirnos implacablemente con los manuscritos y con los deadlines; como lector, confío que *LAP* persistirá en su labor de acoger y difundir el pensamiento académico progresista sobre América Latina y el Caribe. En lo personal, espero que las fuerzas y las neuronas me permitan seguir evaluando manuscritos de los jóvenes colegas. ¡Salud!

—Carlos M. Vilas
Buenos Aires

Latin American Perspectives is, I would argue, the only journal of Latin American studies in English in which critical scholars have been able to pursue their research agendas openly, consistently, and uncompromisingly over the entirety of the last 40 years. The journal was born in an era of relative ascendancy of left-wing forces and concomitant intellectual dynamism across Latin American studies, expressing itself in different theoretical currents of Marxism, dependency, and national liberation. It was born in a propitious time, in other words; but instead of merely riding on the coattails of emergent debates around the fate of the political economy of Latin America it became the preeminent English channel for the enrichment, development, and refinement of these eclectic Marxist, dependency, and national-liberation frameworks. In the tougher ideological periods of the 1980s and 1990s—when neoliberalism achieved hegemony, albeit unevenly, across much of the world—the journal managed to survive, and even flourish, as one of the few outlets for the work of scholars who refused to submit to the idolatry of the market. While engaging with new intellectual trends over this period (particularly variations of post-modernism, postcolonialism, subaltern studies, and the general “cultural turn” of the social sciences and history), in contrast to a number of other critical journals, *Latin American Perspectives* did not unthinkingly submit itself to these novel—some would say faddish—research agendas. It was still possible, even predictable, to find in its pages critical interrogations of political economy, social movements, changing agrarian relations, state theory, urban class transformations, imperialism, and labor unions, to name a few recurring materialist thematics appearing in the journal over these two morbid decades. Alongside these classical questions the journal devoted significant space and attention to what might be called anti-oppression politics extending beyond the remit of class without losing the class dynamic; here, we could list, among others, the subjects of sexuality, gender, coloniality, and ethnicity. Since the early 2000s, a new ideological wind across Latin America has pumped renewed energy into the sails of the journal. The uneven and contradictory shift to the left in the region over the past 15 years or so—across the multiple social movement, political party, and regime modalities—has been examined from diverse vantage points through several special issues organized either thematically or through intensive investigation of a single country. The journal has once again distinguished itself as a venue for the elaboration of critically sympathetic engagements with evolving developments of the region’s left broadly conceived. I enthusiastically wish all the contributors and editors a happy fortieth anniversary and look forward to several more decades to come in which we seek in its pages both to understand the world and, most decisively, to change it.

—Jeffery R. Webber
University of London

First, and most important, congratulations to everyone involved with *LAP*! Forty years is an important milestone for any publication and particularly one on the left.

I was invited to participate in the *LAP* collective as a grad student. It was a great honor to work with Ron and Fran Chilcote, Michael Kearney, Nora

Hamilton, the Brays, Tim Harding, Richard Harris, and Bob Dash. Because of my association with *LAP* I was able to meet wonderful academics/intellectuals who helped me during my thesis research in Mexico, including Roger Bartra, Carlos Tello, Alejandro Álvarez, Diana Alarcón, and Eduardo Zepeda. To be part of the dynamics of *LAP* was truly inspirational.

Being involved with the creation of the *LAP* Fellowship Endowment was another high point of my involvement with the collective. As always, I appreciated Ron Chilcote's collaborative support.

Helping contributors with their manuscripts and participating in the discussion of important issues relating to popular movements, political economic development, and the left in Latin America have been enriching intellectual experiences.

—Russell White
Kent, WA

Over the past decade and a half *Latin American Perspectives* has paid special attention to women in Latin America and to migration, both internal and transnational. Three special issues on women came out in 1995, 1996, and 1999 (two edited by Sheryl L. Lutjens and one by Jennifer Abbassi), and various issues of *LAP* have contained articles about the situation of women. A special issue on violence against women in Latin America is forthcoming in 2014, and another on women and democracy is in preparation. Migration has also received much attention, with articles on this theme scattered throughout a number of issues. There have also been special issues on it, among them *Migration and Identities: A Class-Based Approach* (edited by Michael Kearney and Bernadete Beserra, 2004), *Engendering Mexican Migration* (edited by M. Bianet Castellanos, 2008), *East Asian Migrations to Latin America* (edited by me, 2004), and *Peruvian Migration in a Global Context* (edited by Ayumi Takenaka, Karsten Paerregaard, and Ulla Berg, 2010). A special issue on indigenous migration in honor of Michael Kearney edited by María Dolores París and Laura Velasco will be published in 2014.

I began my affiliation with *LAP* in 1990, when I became an intern while still a graduate student at the University of California, Los Angeles. Since then I have had the pleasure of contributing articles to the journal and editing various special issues, including *The Urban Informal Sector* (1998), *Mexico in the 1990s* (two issues with Enrique Ochoa, 2001), *The Impact of Tourism in Latin America* (2008), and *Tourism, Gender, and Ethnicity* (with Annelou Ypeij, 2012). I most recently served as issue editor for the forthcoming *Violence against Women in Latin America*, for which I received positive feedback and suggestions from Rosalind Bresnahan and Sheryl L. Lutjens. Currently I am working on a special issue on China in Latin America with James Cypher and Richard Harris.

I have been interested in migration for a long time, since both my step-grandfather and my step-grandmother were immigrants to the United States, he from Scotland and she from Hungary. I knew many international students while in college and graduate school and shared living quarters with women from Indonesia, Pakistan, Thailand, Poland, and India in the course of my student career. I became interested in Mexican migration when I was doing graduate work at UCLA and got to know an extended family from a *ranchito*

(unincorporated rural settlement) in Zacatecas. During the amnesty period mandated by the 1986 immigration law I volunteered to register people to help them get documents. Later I did Ph.D. research in Mexicali on migration to a squatter settlement in that border city and on migration to the United States from a rancho in Jalisco. Eventually I published *Women's Migration Networks in Mexico and Beyond* (2009), tracing the migration trajectories and network dynamics of daughters of a woman I met in Mexicali.

Working with *Latin American Perspectives* has been a pleasure, with collective members supportive and managing editor Ronald Chilcote always open to ideas on new issues.

—Tamar Diana Wilson
University of Missouri, St. Louis