
REPORTS

THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION: A SUMMARY SURVEY WITH APPENDIX

Howard F. Cline, Director, Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress

ON MAY 7, 1966, A REPRESENTATIVE GROUP OF SCHOLARS WHO WERE INVITED to Washington, D.C. for a meeting sponsored by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies (of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council) and the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, formed the Latin American Studies Association. The members of the Latin American Research Review Board, representing the institutions contributing to the support of the Review, were among the scholars invited to this meeting.¹ When, on May 12 it was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia with a "perpetual" term, the new Association became a legal entity, a tax-exempt, non-profit professional body created by scholarly area specialists to meet their particular and growing needs.²

Below appear further details of the new organization, whose emergence is the most recent phenomenon in a lengthy evolutionary chain of events to which numerous groups and individuals have contributed over the years. Without attempting to be comprehensive, the following pages sketch the background out of which LASA grew, and place it in the historical context of the development of Latin American studies in the United States. We shall not attempt to encompass the general literature on the growth of area studies, or numerous writings diagnosing the ills and virtues of those concerned with Latin America. Rather we shall stick to a rather narrow theme: evolution of Latin American studies and various attempts to create for them a durable coordinating mechanism.

Traditionally historians, students of literature, anthropologists, and geographers have, in descending numbers in that order constituted the majority of Latin Americanists. Such area specialization slowly grew from diverse roots, taking on numbers and becoming more visible in form after 1900.

Among the first group of scholars who became self-conscious of common area interests were the historians. A remarkable generation of pioneers wrote texts, held meetings, and in 1918 founded a continuing journal, the *Hispanic American Historical Review*. They formally organized the Conference on Latin American History in 1928, a professional association which their successors incorporated in 1964. As early as 1917 the American Association of Teachers of Spanish embracing Latin Americanists was formed; the Association later added Portuguese to its name. It has long published *Hispania*. In 1939 the literature specialists in the United States joined with Latin American colleagues to form the International Institute of Ibero-American Literature. They have since then published *Revista Iberoamericana*, which stands near the top of critical journals in the field. The American Association of Geographers in 1963 created a Committee on Latin American Geography, modelled in part on the Conference on Latin American History, with which it cooperates.³

The field of Latin American studies has been conspicuously devoted to cooperation among scholarly disciplines. In 1934, early in its development, an important interdisciplinary conference was held at Chicago. Organized primarily by Professor Max S. Handman (University of Michigan), it brought together anthropologists, geographers, historians, and those interested in literature, to discuss common problems and formulate a general program. As often happens in such circumstances, the meeting thought another, larger and more representative conference should be held.⁴

On April 27, 1935 fifteen scholars interested in Latin American studies convened in the offices of the Social Science Research Council, which also provided the meeting funds. The purpose was "to enable specialists in the several disciplines to become personally acquainted with one another and their respective activities, and to suggest steps by which closer coordination might be achieved among them to the advantage of research in the general field of Latin American culture." The participants constituted themselves a "permanent but informal Committee on Latin American Studies," to which others might be added to make it more representative of the various disciplines in the country at large. The Committee agreed that further such conferences should be encouraged, and that it should sponsor "an annual selected and critical bibliography."

The 1935 Committee did in fact arrange various summer institutes and conferences (Michigan, 1939; Texas, 1940), and stimulated nascent interest in Latin America on university campuses.⁶ Its most enduring and important legacy, however, was to plan and arrange for publication in 1936 of the first volume of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*. Now in its 28th volume, HLAS ranks as the oldest continuing bibliography on Latin America, internationally recognized as a standard tool of research and teaching. Designed by

scholars to meet their specific needs, it has been loyally supported by them; unpaid they voluntarily serve year after year as its Advisory Board, corps of Contributing Editors, and Foreign Corresponding Editors, to provide their field of Latin American studies with an interdisciplinary bibliographical apparatus unmatched by any other group of specialists on other world areas.⁷

As part of the evolving climate of opinion stressing the increasing importance of Latin American work, the Library of Congress in 1939 created a special unit, the Hispanic Foundation, whose broad mandate was to become a center for studies of Spanish, Portuguese, and Latin American cultures.⁸ Its establishment, based on private benefactions and public funds, provided the incipient field with a permanent, stable and flexible liaison and developmental unit that for almost three decades has cooperated with individuals and institutions to strengthen scholarly activities in their common spheres of interest.

Establishment of the *Handbook* and creation of the Hispanic Foundation came near the apogee of one of the several cycles in the United States of interest related to Latin America and studies of it. The upward swing which continued briefly through the first months of the Second World War, was accelerated when in 1941 the United States became directly involved in the conflict. Enthusiasm in the United States for Latin America sparked far-flung programs of exchanging scholars, books, and ideas, of providing grants and fellowships, publication of many basic books, and conferences on all conceivable aspects of what generally were then called "our Good Neighbors." Funds for these exercises were relatively plentiful. Through a Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and an Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Relations, the State Department showered largess; where official money was unavailable or insufficient, it was generously supplemented by private grants, notably by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Under the forced draft of war the small "permanent but informal Committee on Latin American Studies" organized in 1935 proved incapable of coping with the many strains placed on it. It gave way to a larger body created on March 29, 1942 by the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the National Research Council. Robert Redfield, the first Chairman of this new Joint Committee on Latin American Studies wrote of it, "A small group of men assembled six or seven years ago to develop some agency which should promote and coordinate scholarly activity in the Latin American field. The present Joint Committee is unusual in that it represents an institutional recognition by all three learned councils of a movement which originated independently of all of them." During its relatively short life, the Joint Committee of 1942–1947 provided drive, focus, and funding for a number of activities related to its general purpose, "to promote Latin American studies in all fields of knowledge."¹⁰

From the parent informal Committee, the Joint Committee assumed sponsorship of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, and fostered the preparation and publication of several important guides and bibliographies. It started a sort of newsletter or research review entitled *Notes on Latin American Studies* to keep scholars informed of activities in the Latin American field; this died after two issues. It also planned and sponsored conferences and consultations often at the request of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, whom it advised on many matters.¹¹

The Joint Committee's scope of action was broader than its later successor, formed in 1959, discussed below. In 1942 the Joint Committee stated it was "prepared and willing to serve as an advisory agency, within its competence, to the various agencies of the Government, and is ready to assist such agencies in the promotion of inter-American intellectual and cultural relations and in the planning and execution of projects." Generally it aimed "to plan, assist, and encourage research and publication; to encourage the presentation of necessary tools of research, such as works of reference; to promote and improve education and training in Latin American fields, especially at the upper levels."¹²

Perhaps these years 1942–1947 represent the high point in that cycle of interest and support for Latin American studies. As the war effort expanded to encompass global matters, Latin America (as a non-combat or potential war zone) lost nearly all the priorities and special attention it had recently achieved.¹³ The learned councils gradually withdrew their support from the Joint Committee. Private funds from foundations tapered to an almost negligible point. This was all reminiscent of the similar decline which ensued during and after World War I, when the *Hispanic American Historical Review* [in 1921] had to suspend publication for some years, and universities dropped their war-spawned courses and interest in the area.¹⁴ In 1944, to salvage the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, the Hispanic Foundation in the Library of Congress accepted responsibility for its preparation.¹⁵ Harvard did not fill an endowed professorship for Latin American history and economics when the incumbent retired. Other Joint Committee programs were allowed to lapse; the Committee was formally disbanded in 1947.

The cataclysmic, catastrophic tumble from 1942–1945 heights set the context for the following decade. As late as 1958 hardly a major university had undertaken a significant general Latin American area program. The paucity of support elsewhere for Latin American studies restricted recruitment to its thin specialist ranks. Fortunately the latter have always included individual scholars who have found Latin American studies sufficiently challenging to pursue their investigations whether or not the area attracted academic favor.

During the Cold War the disinterest in Latin America continued. Asian studies, Soviet and tension zone programs, then Africa, temporarily took the

center of the academic stage in area work. Despite generally unfavorable conditions, however, several individual Latin Americanists persisted in their seemingly futile efforts to prevent their chosen specialization from degenerating into a shabby genteel academic slum. Singly, in pairs, or in small groups, they worked at the thankless task of rebuilding.

If any single date could be given to the beginnings of a general renovative movement in Latin American studies, perhaps it would be April 13, 1958. The American Council of Learned Societies, in consultation with the Hispanic Foundation, convoked a small conference in New York to identify some of the problems plaguing the field, and to suggest their solutions. As a major conclusion, the small group found that "The single greatest need at this time is for the formation of a coordinating body, national in scope, nonofficial in nature, to study and act on problems."

The ACLS conference outlined its views on the nature and functions of an evolutionary series of such bodies. It suggested first a standing committee of ACLS to study matters further, and perhaps come up with a plan of organization, with the next step a reconstruction of the 1942–1947 Joint Committee "chiefly, if not exclusively dedicated to scholarly interests and the academic community," to be followed in time and sequence by "an Association or Society of Latin Americanists." It suggested that this would be a larger body, "with its core in the scholarly academic community," but making room for selected government, business, and other interests concerned with Latin America. Finally, the group thought that in due course that body might constitute itself a more visible Latin American Council or Institute, with a permanent headquarters and staff. Some seven major criteria which such organizations should meet were agreed upon.¹⁷ Finally, the ACLS Conference on Latin American Studies unanimously recommended that ACLS take steps "to constitute a Joint Committee on Research and Training in the United States on Latin America." Thus the future was blueprinted in 1958.

One of the immediate effects of the April 1958 conference was to mobilize the continuing support of the American Council of Learned Societies. While ACLS did not name a permanent committee on Latin American studies or at that moment create a Joint Committee, it took important steps to revitalize interest in Latin American studies.

The first of these was to call, again with staff aid by the Hispanic Foundation, a two day meeting at Newberry Library (Chicago), to which were invited leading scholars of Latin American matters in the humanities and the social sciences, as well as those who administered Latin American area studies programs. Participants were asked to prepare in advance brief statements outlining the principal obstacles to effective research and training in their specialties, suggestions for removing such obstacles, and the general program that could and

should be followed for about five years under the latter favorable circumstances. Held November 6–8, 1958, the meeting issued and circulated rather widely a bulky document that contained the outlines of a continuing program.¹⁸

The participants reached consensus that fellowship aid and grants for field research were an absolute *sine qua non*. They also agreed that small conferences within given disciplines and on an interdisciplinary basis were needed, as were expanded exchange of persons programs. The group stated strongly that a concerted effort should be made “as soon as possible to stimulate Luso-Brazilian studies in the United States.” The conference also endorsed the programs of the Hispanic Foundation to provide national surveys and basic research tools. A final conclusion was that as a first step, immediate establishment of a Joint Committee on Latin American Studies by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council was highly desirable. “Such a joint committee,” read the *Proceedings*, “would provide one form of liaison now notably lacking among scholars interested in the area.”¹⁹

Armed with the show of interest and obvious need by a responsible body of veteran Latin Americanists as results of the April and November gatherings, less than a year later the ACLS and SSRC created the recommended Joint Committee on Latin American Studies (September 1959). A program for a three year period, 1959–1962, was begun on funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It was primarily a post-doctoral grant program, with emphasis on Brazil and on Latin America in the national period; funds were also earmarked to sponsor or co-sponsor small scholarly conferences.²⁰ In short, the Joint Committee’s basic program was that outlined by the earlier April and November 1958 meetings.

Here it might be noted that the revitalized or reconstituted Joint Committee did not have as sweeping and general a mandate as its 1942–1947 predecessor, to initiate and stimulate activities in all fields through various specialized sub-committees.²¹ Its appearance, however, was a salutary sign that seemingly Latin American studies as a field was regaining vigor and was welcomed back to the academic universe. Continued support by the Joint Committee has been an important element in the rebuilding process, which it clearly accelerated.

Establishment of the Joint Committee in September 1959 coincided in time with the appearance of a more ephemeral organization that constituted itself on August 29, 1959. Various participants in a conference, sponsored also by the American Council of Learned Societies, organized by Syracuse University, and financed by the Creole Foundation, voted unanimously in Sagamore, New York, to form the Association for Latin American Studies (ALAS). To improve communication among Latin Americanists, to promote research and publication, to create the tools of research and teaching, and to raise standards of education and training at the college and university levels through a national organization were the main ALAS goals.²²

Both to explain how ALAS came into being, and then how it failed to reach its laudable objectives, requires a moment of digression. In 1952 the Pan American Union and the Hispanic Foundation co-sponsored a meeting in Washington at the request of local instructors of Latin-American courses chiefly to discuss improvement of teaching materials. When it was found that the matter required more than cursory attention, and related discussions broadened into other aspects of Latin American teaching and studies, a regional council was created, then in 1953 was incorporated, to provide a permanent forum. Like-minded groups in the New York-New England area shortly followed suit by creating the Northeast Council, renamed in 1957 Council for Latin American Affairs. By 1959, as a result of efforts by the Pan American Union to develop similar bodies elsewhere, the Southwestern Conference, the Rocky Mountain Council, and the Pacific Coast Council had come into being. One of the more positive results of the 1959 Sagamore meeting that created ALAS, was the organization of the Midwestern Council shortly thereafter. The regional councils, some of which continue to flourish, had varied histories and backgrounds, but in general they have usually tended to mix professional and non-professional groups often having in common only an interest in Latin America. Some Councils have also tended to be more social than professional, the mix varying by local leadership at any given time.

With several such regional organs active, during 1958 there had been increasing talk of banding the councils together in a national federation, or confederation. The need for a general association seemed increasingly apparent. The Sagamore meeting of August 1959 was called to discuss the problem and to act if advisable.

Extended debate on membership and organization resulted in compromises which had much to do with the eventual collapse of ALAS. Its governing body, a Council of 15 persons, was to have on it a representative from each regional council, plus members elected at large. The difficult questions of confederation v. federation v. individual memberships were never fully resolved, nor was an effective plan of action ever clearly formulated.

Numerous other difficulties impeded the development of ALAS as a cohesive national professional association. We shall not attempt to enumerate all of them but it can be said that its *Newsletter*, issued but twice, attracted unfavorable comment, as did the fact that its officers did not hold a meeting of its governing body, arrange regular elections, or even acknowledge dues payments. None of its committees met or functioned. It suffices to say that by about 1962 ALAS as a national organization was clearly moribund.²³

Its spectacular failure haunted the scene for some months thereafter, and cast a dark shadow on any subsequent attempts to replace ALAS with a better designed instrument. The Latin American Studies Association formed in Washington on May 7, 1966, its founders hope, is such an improved mechanism.

Various of its architects were fully aware of the structural and other weaknesses of ALAS. Purposefully they sought to avoid those deficiencies. To LASA we turn.

At some point in its future career, that organization might well erect a monument to Fidel Castro, a remote godfather. His actions in Cuba jarred complacency in official and university circles, dramatically revealing that all was not well in Latin America, and that something must be done about it. Revived national concern with Latin America again created a climate in which serious programs could begin and even flourish. The almost predictable result was that a new generation of Latin Americanists repeated the calls of the 1930's and the 1940's for some national organization.

Conditions became progressively more propitious. As in pre-World War II days government and private organizations were moved to inventory the disarray in the hemisphere, to rediscover the area as a seething laboratory of rapid social change, whose possible loss to the Free World imperilled national security. Post-Castro developments included a national Latin American policy that was called the Alliance for Progress. Federal interest also was engaged to the point of adding to Title VI of the National Defense Education Act a special program (Program B) of individual fellowships for advanced training in selected humanities and social sciences in Brazil and Spanish America. Under the same Act matching Federal funds became available to a group of universities to create or improve special centers for Latin American area graduate studies, a program later extended to undergraduates area studies.²⁴ Fulbright predoctoral grants became available for Latin America. These Federal commitments to support Latin America studies now seen imbedded as long-term programs.

A critical step in creating the preconditions suitable for forming the Latin American Studies Association in 1966 was entrance of the Ford Foundation into Latin American matters, both in the area and on the national scene. Following a decade of disregard for the area, the Overseas Development Program of Ford Foundation in 1959 named a Director for Latin America, and began a series of reconnaissance missions in Latin America to identify institutions whose work, chiefly in social sciences, should be supported. That effort grew until the Ford Foundation now has field offices to foster and coordinate its several programs in major Latin American countries: Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Venezuela, Mexico. Caribbean programs have New York as headquarters.

A second main effort was undertaken by the International Training and Research Program of Ford Foundation. Despite its name, its primary mandate is the support of United States university and institutional programs concerned with international matters. The trustees of the Ford Foundation in 1962 authorized special support of Latin American studies; to date they have approved \$11.7 million in grants. To aid in the formulation of a concrete program, ITR

sent a mission to survey the state of Latin American studies in selected United States institutions and to recommend how training and research for that area could best be improved.²⁶ In addition, support was given national programs of the Social Science Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, Center for Applied Linguistics, Hispanic Foundation, Brookings Institution, and Conference on Latin American History.

On recommendation of the ITR consultative mission, a Ford Foundation grant was also made to the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies for it to convene an extended seminar at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford to update and reassess at greater length and at greater depth questions which earlier had been posed at Newberry in 1958²⁷. Such a Seminar was held July 8–August 23, 1963. From various specialties came small teams of scholars to discuss with a resident panel two main questions: what is the status of our present knowledge of Latin America? How can we improve our understanding of that area? Some answers to those questions appear in *Social Science Research on Latin America*, edited by Charles Wagley, which is the report and papers of the Seminar.²⁸

Important discussions on improvement of Latin American studies had also come earlier at a May 1961 conference co-sponsored by the University of California and the Committee on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR), part of a growing national trend to hold such diagnostic sessions. It made recommendation on a variety of topics, especially concerning need for fellowships.²⁹

Many of the same assessments made by scholars at the various meetings after 1958 were also simultaneously paralleled within the Ford Foundation itself. On its own initiative it partially met a major need—fellowships—when it added Latin America to its Foreign Area Fellowship Program. In effect this significant broadening of FAFP occurred at a meeting on May 26, 1961,³⁰ to which the Ford Foundation staff had invited a number of outside advisers. Recently the administration of these particular predoctoral grants was transferred to an SSRC unit charged exclusively with carrying on the fellowship program.

In addition, in 1962 ITR of Ford Foundation developed and operated for a year a special program of postdoctoral fellowships. In 1963 these were turned over to the Foreign Area Fellowship Program. Under renewed Ford Foundation funding, the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies expects to continue that program in modified fashion. It originally permitted talented young scholars to work intensively for up to three years on important Latin American studies, or to permit non-Latin Americanists to acquire Latin American area knowledge, known in the trade as baptism by sprinkle rather than by immersion.

In the immediate background of our main story lay yet another effort. In

Latin American Research Review

1962 the Ford Foundation granted a million dollars to a consortium of six universities to increase the interchange of professors between them and Latin American institutions. A Management Committee administered this United States-Latin America Faculty Interchange Program.³¹ As the scope of the Program expanded when other universities increased their contacts under AID and other government contracts, and as NDEA and Ford-supported university centers for Latin American studies multiplied, questions arose about broadening the Management Committee or possibly replacing it with a more general administrative body.

To discuss these and related problems the Management Committee of the FAFP decided to hold its semi-annual meeting in Cuernavaca, Mexico, where the seven universities that had NDEA support for Latin American Language and Area Centers had already scheduled their annual meeting. Four of these universities were not represented on the Management Committee, so a two day meeting was arranged for on December 2–3, between the scheduled sessions of the Language and Area Centers and the Management Committee to which representatives of the other universities with Latin American programs but not active in either of the two previously mentioned groups were also invited. The agenda prepared by the Foreign Area Fellowship Program included topics well beyond the possible reconstitution of the Management Committee, and there were extensive discussions on the advisability of founding a professional national organization.

One large topic of discussion at Cuernavaca was the growing need for a scholarly organ to carry evaluative review articles, comprehensive reports on institutional and individual research in progress, and scholarly news items related to Latin American studies. As a result of conversations over an eighteen months period plus five months of intensive planning on organization and format, the representatives from the University of Texas Institute of Latin American Studies presented a draft proposal for such a review. At Cuernavaca came a mandate for them to canvass the major centers of research and teaching on Latin American studies in order to secure the financial and professional institutional support necessary to initiate publication of the journal and guarantee its operation for a minimum of two years. The *Latin American Research Review* with which we shall deal further below was the happy result.

Another topic equally relevant to our complicated chronicle was debated at Cuernavaca. As happened so frequently after 1960, when any group of Latin Americanists from various disciplines met in any one place, talk in Mexico turned to the urgent need for a national association directly responsive to the needs of the field, under whose auspices these several problems of communication, teaching, exchanges, and the like could be discussed and perhaps resolved. One group of scholars at Cuernavaca felt rather strongly that on the spot such

an association should be constituted; another, some with lingering memories of ALAS (which had suffered from inadequate advance planning) and lacking mandate from colleagues or their universities, counselled further discussion and systematic preparation before launching an association. The Cuernavaca group as a whole, therefore, agreed to ask the Joint Committee to examine the need for a national organization and to suggest ways to stimulate its early formation.³² The Cuernavaca meeting, which thus nearly became a constituent congress, was an important catalyst, bridging the critical gap between talk and action.

The Joint Committee responded to the Cuernavaca request in February 1965 by naming a subcommittee to review the problems of a national organization of Latin Americanists and to submit recommendations. The subcommittee met for two days in Kansas City on June 5–6, and fulfilled its charge. It advised the Joint Committee that a large gathering of professionally qualified Latin Americanists should be brought together for an essentially academic meeting, and that upon the termination of scholarly sessions, a carefully prepared proposal for a national association should be discussed, amended, accepted, or rejected. It agreed to plan such a meeting, and to prepare detailed plans for a national organization.³³

Meanwhile, the Latin American Research Review Board was created. The University of Texas had found that more than 20 universities (and the Hispanic Foundation) would each pledge \$1,000 a year for two years to create and maintain such a needed journal. Each participating institution named one member to represent it on a general governing Board. The first meeting of this Board, made possible by FAFP support, was held in Austin, Texas on June 14, 1965, where a constitution was drafted and approved. The Board also outlined basic policies to guide the first issue of the *Review*, and named Richard P. Schaedel as its Managing Editor. Tom E. Davis (Cornell) was elected Chairman of the LARR Board.³⁴ In addition to the pledge and payments made by the sustaining institutions, the *Review* received a grant of \$40,000 from the Ford Foundation for its first three years of operation. The first issue was scheduled for Fall 1965, less than a year after Cuernavaca. The tempo of events was speeding up.

The Chairman of the Latin American Research Review Board called a second meeting of the Board body in Ithaca on October 7, 1965 to deliberate further on *Review* policies and discuss the Managing Editor's recommendations. The LARR Board meeting in Ithaca coincided with the appearance of Volume 1, Number 1 of the *Review*. Representatives of the then 30 sustaining institutions, plus invited observers from NDEA sponsored Latin American Area Center programs, the Management Committee, Social Science Research Council, government agencies, and foundations were also present. LARR busi-

ness was dispatched expeditiously. Rather than have 30 or more members of the Board directly involved in professional editorial matters, the Board voted to constitute a smaller editorial committee of scholars, headed by the Chairman of the LARR Board, including the Managing Editor, *ex officio*, to handle such matters for it.³⁵

Again, as in Cuernavaca, the assembled group of Latin Americanists in Ithaca discussed at length whether this was the proper time and place to form a national association, and what form it might take. There was consensus that the time was clearly near but various opinions on its structure and functions were aired. A temporary committee was appointed by the Chairman of the LARR Board to assess these diverse views, to restate the issues, and to recommend the next immediate steps.³⁶ That committee, in turn, suggested that a representative five man committee be named to draft a constitution and by-laws for a national association and to act as the organizing committee for a constituent assembly of Latin Americanists who would discuss and ratify the draft constitution and thus create in the immediate future the long-awaited national association.³⁷

The Constitutional Committee was formed in the established tradition and recurring tendency of Latin Americanists to create such *ad hoc* bodies. The Constitutional Committee included the chairman of the subcommittee earlier named by the Joint Committee. That subcommittee was discharged, leaving further organizational matters exclusively in the hands of the new Constitutional Committee.³⁸

The Constitutional Committee met in New Orleans on January 22–24, 1966. The members drafted a constitution and by-laws, wrote a long supporting memorandum explaining why in these documents the Committee chose certain courses, drew up a provisional list of persons to be invited as participants or observers of the constituent assembly, and secured the promise of funds from the Joint Committee to stage such a meeting.³⁹ Its Chairman also obtained an agreement from the Librarian of Congress that the Hispanic Foundation would provide local arrangements and staff aid for a constituent meeting, whose date was set as May 6–7, 1966.

One delicate matter the Constitutional Committee found beyond its immediate mandate to handle was the future relationships between the extant LARR Board (now grown to 35 representatives of participating institutions) and the prospective new professional association. The Chairman of the LARR Board proposed to call a meeting of that body immediately following the constituent assembly, to which all Board members were invited, then to ascertain the official opinion of the LARR Board about such relationships.

On the morning of May 6, 1966, approximately 75 invited Latin Americanists and observers met in the Whittall Pavilion of the Library of Congress,

under the chairmanship of Frederick Burkhardt, President, American Council of Learned Societies, to examine in detail the draft constitution and by-laws. Mr. Burkhardt named a committee to insert in them the changes or amendments which might emerge from floor debate. He also appointed a committee to nominate a slate of officers for the association. By the close of May 6, the text of a constitution and by-laws had been discussed, occasionally amended, and approved item by item by the assembly.

On May 7 the assembly ratified and adopted the constitution and by-laws as a whole, thus constituting The Latin American Studies Association.⁴⁰ The election of officers was then held.⁴¹ The newly elected President, Kalman H. Silvert (Dartmouth College), then took formal charge of the meeting. He sounded opinion on a wide variety of topics of present and future concern to LASA. He pledged that his administration would pursue a cautious course on a broad spectrum of policy decisions which lay before the Executive Council.

When the historic constituent meeting of LASA had adjourned shortly after noon on May 7, the Latin American Research Review Board met under its Chairman, Tom E. Davis. All officers of the Board were re-elected; the Managing Editor reported on the generally favorable state of *Review* affairs. A spirited discussion then took place on the relationship of LARR and LASA.

The discussion was resolved by a majority vote of the Board. They agreed (subject to approval by sustaining institutions to relinquish whatever residual rights they might hold) that the LARR Board would dissolve itself as of June 30, 1967 and turn over the assets and liabilities of the *Latin American Research Review* to the Latin American Studies Association, on the understanding that the latter would indicate its willingness to continue the publication of the *Review* in essentially its present form with its present staff through July 1, 1968 when the terms of the remaining members of the present Editorial Committee expire.

It should be clear from the above record that development of the *Review* as a highly professional organ added untold impetus to the formation of a truly national, representative, professional scholarly association. LASA in turn expects to maintain the high quality and increase the utility of that journal.

To formulate programs, the President of LASA called a meeting of the Executive Council in New York on May 25–26, 1966. Among other matters the Council set dues, determined by lot the staggered terms of its selected members, accepted the offer of the Hispanic Foundation to serve temporarily as its secretariat, and debated policy and strategy matters.⁴² The Council also met with the Chairman of the LARR Board and LARR's Managing Editor on May 26, and indicated its willingness to assume responsibility for the *Review* after July 1, 1967, and to continue to publish the *Review* in essentially its present form and with its present staff through July 1, 1968. The Council named as

Latin American Research Review

Chairman of the LASA Publications Committee, the Chairman of the LARR Editorial Committee; it named to that LASA Committee the present members of the LARR Editorial Committee.

The Executive Council also approved the incorporation of the Latin American Studies Association as a non-profit corporation, making it eligible for tax exemption as a professional association. The Executive Council created a number of committees, and named their chairmen and members. It strongly supported the prevalent view in the constituent meeting that membership in the several categories be as inclusive as possible, stressing in its mandate to the membership committee that all qualified scholars should be invited to become Members, and that (within constitutional limits) the number of Associates be as large and representative as possible.⁴³

Such, in bare outline, are the remote and immediate origins and backgrounds out of which The Latin American Studies Association emerged.⁴⁴ Its existence is a fact.

In view of the checkered and often discouraging history of the field and the previous attempts to provide it with a central body, what are the prospects for LASA's success? Historians like the writer are notoriously reluctant to prophesy. He can personally report, however, that there seems to be a general air of genuine optimism among scholars in the field as a whole about LASA's future which certainly did not exist in the case of ALAS in 1959. Such a feeling seems objectively to rest on valid grounds, when one scans the academic landscape and compares then with now, a proper historiographical exercise.

A number of converging developments over the past decade have favorably altered the environment around Latin American studies. The academic community, in the first and prime instance represented by universities, has generally accepted commitments and responsibilities which previously it shunned for substantial fostering of Latin American work as a permanent activity. With funding available from government and private sources for training, the field is claiming more nearly a fair share of an increasing number of qualified graduate students, thus assuring an expanded cadre and continuity. Branches of knowledge whose earlier excessive ethnocentrism restricted their research preoccupation to Atlantic triangle areas are now being increasingly engaged in testing their hypotheses by Latin American fact; they are belatedly but enthusiastically discovering one of the world's most complex and interesting areas. Behavioral scientists working on Latin American problems may broaden the base on which understanding of the area can rest and do add personnel and approaches previously absent. In short, larger numbers of qualified persons, institutions, ideas, are currently organically related to Latin American studies than in 1958, less than a decade ago.⁴⁵

These at least are observable circumstances which would favor the future

THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

healthy growth of LASA, a condition fervently hoped for by those who created it and who are charged with guiding it over its formative period. However, in the last analysis, LASA's ultimate fate rests with the continued support it can generate from individual scholars dedicated to Latin American studies.⁴⁶ It is their forum and instrument.

NOTES

1. The Chairman of the Research Review Board and the Executive Council of the Latin American Studies Association on May 26, 1966 requested the writer to prepare this summary. He acknowledges, with appreciation, helpful comments from several colleagues, among them Cole Blasler, Frederick Burkhardt, Robert N. Burr, Robert Carmin, Tom E. Davis, Melvin J. Fox, Charles C. Griffin, Lewis Hanke, Robert Heussler, Irving A. Leonard, Marshall R. Nason, Earl J. Pariseau, Norman P. Sacks, Richard P. Schaedel, Bryce Wood.
2. "Articles of Incorporation, May 12, 1966."
3. Howard F. Cline, "The study and teaching of Latin American history in the United States since 1898," in *Latin American History: essays on its study and teaching in the United States, 1898-1965* (2v., Austin, Texas [In press] University of Texas Press), edited by Howard F. Cline. Howard F. Cline, "The Conference: a fecund decade, 1954-1964," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 45: 434-438 (Aug. 1965).
4. Preston E. James, "Report on the Sagamore Conference, August 26-29, 1959," (Syracuse, N.Y., 1959, mimeo), p. 2. I have not examined any original records of the 1934 meeting.
5. Clarence H. Haring, "Preface," *Handbook of Latin American Studies* [for 1935] (Cambridge, 1936), 1: xi-xii. The April 1935 Committee included C. H. Haring, Chairman; A. S. Aiton; John M. Cooper; Carl E. Guthe; Max S. Handman; Lewis Hanke; Herman G. James; Preston E. James; C. K. Jones; Chester L. Jones; Sturgis E. Leavitt; Raye R. Platt; Robert S. Platt; Clark Wissler. Later it was enlarged by addition of M. J. Andrade; Charles W. Hackett; A. V. Kidder; A. L. Kroeber; Irving A. Leonard; P. A. Martin; Robert Redfield; J. Fred Rippey; James A. Robertson; William Spence Robertson; Carl O. Sauer; and Alfred M. Tozzer.
6. James, "Report . . . 1959," p. 2.
7. Charmion Shelby, "The Handbook of Latin American Studies: its first fifteen years," *Revista Interamericana de Bibliografía*, 1:89-94 (abr.-jun. 1951). "Handbook of Latin American Studies, nos. 1-20," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, 21: xi-xvi, and in each issue, "Editor's Note," for changes.
8. *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for 1939* (Washington, 1940), pp. 1,439-440; *ibid.* 1940 (Washington, 1941), pp. 61-78. *The Hispanic Activities of the Library of Congress* (Washington, 1946).
9. Robert Redfield, "The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies," *Notes on Latin American Studies*, 1: 3-6 (April 1943). Edited by Ralph L. Beals, this publication ceased with No. 2 (October 1943). Redfield was Chairman of the Joint Committee from March 1942 through February 1944, at which time Lewis Hanke replaced him, until the Committee was discharged June 30, 1947.
10. The Joint Committee consisted of ten members; 32 other specialists regularly served on its major committees (Personnel; Research; Publications), and many others took on special assignments, Redfield, "Joint Committee," p. 3.
11. Redfield, "Joint Committee," pp. 4-5. Many of the Committee's achievements are also documented by Lewis Hanke, "The development of Latin American studies in the United States, 1939-1945," *The Americas*, 4: 32-64 (July 1947).

Latin American Research Review

12. Redfield, "Joint Committee," pp. 3–4.
13. James, "Report . . . 1959," p. 6, notes that "after the invasion of Africa [1942] attention to Latin America sharply decreased; and between that time and Mr. [Richard] Nixon's visit to South America in 1958, Latin American problems were given the lowest priority, and public interest in that part of the world all but disappeared."
14. Cline, "Study and Teaching of Latin American history [1966]."
15. Beginning with No. 11 (1948), the Library of Congress assumed financial and other responsibility; shortly thereafter with No. 13 Harvard University Press ceased to publish the *Handbook*, which since No. 14 (for 1948, published 1951) has been issued under cooperative arrangements between the Library and the University of Florida Press, Gainesville. See above, Note 7. Lewis Hanke resigned as Director of the Hispanic Foundation, 1951, and was replaced by the present incumbent, 1952.
16. Howard F. Cline, "American Council of Learned Societies Conference on Latin American Studies, April 23, 1958: Report, with a recommendation" (Washington, 1958, mimeo), p. 4.
17. Cline, "ACLS Conference. . . 1958," p. 6.
18. Howard F. Cline, ed., *Latin American Studies in the United States: Proceedings of a Meeting held in Chicago, November 6–8, 1958, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Newberry Library (assisted by the Hispanic Foundation, with working and related papers)*, Hispanic Foundation Survey Reports of Teaching and Research Resources and Activities in the United States on Latin America, No. 8 (Washington, 1958, multilith).
19. ACLS Conference . . . 1958, p. 40.
20. "Grants for Latin American Studies: a new program of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies," SSRC, *Items*, 13/3:31 (September 1959). In addition to Bryce Wood, staff member of SSRC (which administered the program), the first committee included Sanford Mosk, chairman (deceased, replaced by Robert N. Burr); Frederick B. Agard, Henry P. De Vries, Wendell C. Gordon, Irving A. Leonard, Charles Wagley, Robert Wauchope.
21. SSRC, *Annual Reports, 1959–1960* (p. 39); *1960–1961* (pp. 45–46); *1961–1962* (pp. 45–46); *1962–1963* (pp. 41–43); *1963–1964* (pp. 41–42); *1964–1965* (pp. 44–45).
22. James, "Report. . . 1959," pp. 9–12.
23. Records of ALAS are deposited in the Hispanic Foundation. From these records and as participant on ALAS Executive Board, the above sketch on ALAS has been prepared.
24. NDEA Title VI grants are covered in Lyman H. Legters, *The National Defense Education Act and Latin American Studies* (Austin, Texas, n.d. Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas); his "NDEA Support for Undergraduate Language and Area Studies," *Liberal Education*, 51: 278–283 (May 1965); Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, *NDEA Language and Area Centers* (Washington, 1964. Office of Education), pp. 27–32. Luso-Brazilian Programs were initiated 1959–60 at New York University and Wisconsin, followed in 1961–66 by Latin American graduate programs at U.C.L.A., Columbia, Florida, Texas, Tulane, Wisconsin, Yale, Cornell, Illinois, NYU, Stanford. Undergraduate programs were founded at Miami (Florida), Antioch, U. of Virginia, New Mexico, and U. of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).
25. Dr. Carl Spaeth (Stanford) was engaged as Consultant to ITR, with Dr. Robert Heussler as Ford Foundation staff member; on various occasions, Howard F. Cline was invited to join their missions, as an unpaid adviser and observer. See below, Note 27.
26. First University grants included Texas, a consortium of Chicago-Iowa-Illinois, Florida, Columbia, Cornell, Stanford, California (Berkeley), Yale, Tulane.

THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

27. Robert Heussler, "Recent stirrings: a note on the Seminar on Latin American Studies, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Summer 1963," *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 7:33 (September 1964).
28. Charles Wagley, ed. *Social Science Research on Latin America: Report and papers of a Seminar on Latin American Studies in the United States held at Stanford, California, July 8–August 23, 1963* (New York, 1964. Columbia University Press). In progress is a volume, to be published in Portuguese, Spanish and English, on social sciences in Latin America, papers of a conference held in Rio de Janeiro (March 1965), at which distinguished Latin American scholars critically examined the Wagley volume.
29. "Conference on the Status of Latin American Studies in the United States, February 9 and 10, 1961, UCLA, Los Angeles, California" (Los Angeles, 1961, mimeo). In attendance were Ralph L. Beals; Wendell Bell; Frederick Burkhardt; Robert N. Burr; Mario Cassinoni; James S. Coleman; Henry P. De Vries; Fred P. Ellison; Russell H. Fitzgibbon; Risieri Frondizi; Keith Glennan; Juan Gómez-Millas; Wendell C. Gordon; Kenneth Holland; John B. Howard; James F. King; William W. Marvel; Robert G. Neumann; James A. Perkins; Joseph M. Stycos; Anisio Teixeira; Antonio Barros Ulhoa Cintra; Charles Wagley; Robert Wauchope; A. Curtis Wilgus; Alfred C. Wolf; Bryce Wood; Franklin D. Murphy, Chairman of the conference.
30. The meeting on May 26, 1961 had the following outside participants: Floyd Lounsbury; Sidney Mintz; William Nicholas; John Plank; Charles Wagley; Bryce Wood; Robert Byrnes; James Coleman; Abraham Weisblatt. I am indebted especially to Bryce Wood and Melvin J. Fox for details on the fellowship programs.
31. The Management Committee consisted of representatives from the following universities: California (Berkeley); California (Los Angeles); Columbia; Harvard; Minnesota; Texas, under chairmanship of Schuyler Wallace, of the Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowship Program. The Program it managed will terminate in Fall 1966, with certain of its features retained by the programs of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.
32. Foreign Area Fellowship Program, "Conference on Latin American Studies, Cuernavaca, Mexico, December 2 and 3, 1964" (New York, 1964, multilith). See esp. "VI. The exchange of information pertaining to Latin American studies," and Appendix C, "Proposed informational review of Latin American research," and "VIII. Formation of a Latin American Studies Association." About 35 persons, including staff, attended.
33. The Joint Committee on February 2, 1965, named a Subcommittee on Associational Matters, consisting of John P. Augelli, chairman; Charles W. Anderson; Howard F. Cline; Tom E. Davis; John P. Harrison, and later Frank Dauster, and voted funds for a meeting of the Subcommittee. John P. Augelli, "Preliminary report of the Subcommittee on Associational Matters of the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Latin American Studies," [July 18, 1965] (Typescript copy, Hispanic Foundation, LASA Archive files).
34. "Minutes of the organizational meeting of the Latin American Research Review Board and Constitution of the Latin American Research Review Board, June 14, 1965," (Ithaca, N.Y., 1965, mimeo).
35. Details of the meeting appear in *The Latin American Research Review*, 1/2:168–169, 199–200. (Spring 1966).
36. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Formation of a Latin American Studies Association included Oscar Fernández, chairman; Charles D. Ameringer; John P. Harrison; Frederick B. Pike; John V. D. Saunders; Kempton E. Webb. It submitted its report on October 8.
37. The recommendations by the Ad Hoc Committee were approved by voice vote of the group.

Latin American Research Review

- The Constitutional Committee thus named included Richard M. Morse, chairman; Richard N. Adams; John P. Augelli; Cole Blasier; Norman P. Sacks.
38. The SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee, at its meeting on November 12, 1965, discharged the Subcommittee on Associational Matters, whose chairman, John P. Augelli had at Cornell been named to the Constitutional Committee.
 39. Constitutional Committee for the Latin American Studies Association, "Memorandum on intent and procedures (revised April 17, 1966)" (New Haven, 1966, multilith). While not bound by it in detail, the LASA Executive Committee has accepted this "Memorandum" as a provisional guideline.
 40. "The Constitution and By-Laws of The Latin American Studies Association" Appendix.
 41. Results of the secret ballot were election of Kalman H. Silvert, President; Richard N. Adams, Vice-President; Members of the Executive Council: Stanton Catlin; Howard F. Cline; John Englekirk; Federico G. Gil; Kenneth N. Karst; William P. McGreevey; Kempton E. Webb; Alternate Members of the Executive Council: Robert E. Quirk; Raymond Vernon. Seven rather than six members of the Executive Council were chosen, to bring that body to its stipulated nine members, as no retiring President would be on the Council for its first year.
 42. Richard N. Adams, "Minutes of the Executive Council . . . New York City" (typescript, LASA Archives) . . . Results of the lottery for Council membership terms were, for 1 year: Stanton Catlin, William P. McGreevey, John Englekirk; for 2 years: Howard F. Cline, Kempton E. Webb; for 3 years: Federico G. Gil, Kenneth N. Karst. The Council also agreed to ask John N. Plank to act as Treasurer; until other arrangements can be made and until organizational matters of the secretariat and incorporation are completed, the Director of the Hispanic Foundation is acting as Secretary, *pro tem*.
 43. Richard N. Adams, "Minutes." The verbatim transcript of the Constituent Meeting (May 6-7, 1966), and other similar documents concerning LASA and its formation are housed in special files in the Hispanic Foundation, which is acting temporarily as secretariat for LASA. The final text of the LASA Constitution and By-Laws appears as the Appendix.
 44. Omitted have been some developments which, in the author's view, were marginal to the main lines of national evolution. The Academy of Latin American Studies, for instance, came into being about 1960, with A. Curtis Wilgus and Robert McNicoll as its U.S. members; its official organ, *Journal of Inter-American Studies* continues publication at the University of Miami (Coral Gables). An Institute of Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Studies, organized by Ronald Hilton at Stanford about 1961, had a short life, about which the author has no information.
 45. Similar optimistic views are stated at length by a Ford Foundation official, in Melvin J. Fox, "Universities and Latin American Studies," in Cline, *Latin American History* (1966).
 46. All interested individuals and institutions are invited to apply for membership. Direct correspondence to Robert A. Potash, Department of History, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., Chairman of the Membership Committee.

THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

APPENDIX

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF
THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Adopted and ratified May 7, 1966; reviewed and approved by the
Executive Council, May 26, 1966.

CONSTITUTION

I. *Name and Status*

1. The name of this organization shall be THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION.

2. It shall be a non-profit corporation that shall qualify and remain qualified as exempt from federal income tax under Section 501 (c) (6) of the United States Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as the same may be from time to time amended.

II. *Purposes*

The purposes of the Association are to provide a professional organization that will foster the concerns of all scholars interested in Latin American studies and will encourage more effective training, teaching, and research in connection with such studies, and will provide both a forum and an instrument for dealing with matters of common interest to the scholarly professions and to individuals concerned with Latin American studies.

III. *Membership*

1. There shall be three categories of membership: Members, Associates, and Institutional Associates.

2. Members shall be elected from among scholars whose professional commitment and attainment in Latin American studies, or whose professional careers, have made substantial contributions to the development of scholarship in the various disciplines of the field. Associates shall be elected from among other individuals interested in scholarly matters relating to Latin America. Institutional Associates shall be elected from among institution and organizations interested in scholarly matters relating to Latin America.

3. The Membership Committee shall nominate Members, Associates, and Institutional Associates under procedures specified by the Executive Council. Election of Members, Associates, and Institutional Associates shall be by majority vote of the Executive Council. The Executive Council by a two-thirds vote of its full membership may suspend or cancel membership of a Member, Associate, or Institutional Associate, following 90 days written notification with particulars to the affected Member, Associate, or Institutional Associate of the proposed suspension or cancellation of membership.

4. The Executive Secretary shall prepare and present annually to the Executive Council a list of the membership, including Members, Associates, and Institutional

Latin American Research Review

Associates, which list shall be open to inspection by the membership, and may be published at the discretion of the Executive Council.

5. Only Members in good standing shall be eligible to vote, to be officers and to serve on the Executive Council and on Standing Committees.

6. Members, Associates, and Institutional Associates shall equally receive general communications and publications which the Association distributes to its membership.

7. Annual dues for membership shall be fixed in the By-Laws. There shall be no initiation fees.

IV. *Officers*

1. The officers of the Association shall be a President, a Vice-President, an Executive Secretary, and a Treasurer.

2. The President shall serve a one year term. Upon retirement as President, he shall remain on the Executive Council for one year.

3. The Vice-President shall serve a one year term, upon the completion of which he shall advance to the Presidency. In the event that he does not, nominations and elections for the Presidency shall be as prescribed in the By-Laws for the Vice-Presidency.

4. The Executive Council shall elect the Executive Secretary and the Treasurer, who shall hold office for such terms and under such conditions as the Council may specify.

5. The President, with the advice and majority consent of the Executive Council, shall appoint such committees as are specified in the By-Laws, and such others as may be found appropriate from time to time. The President shall serve as Chairman of the Executive Council and shall be responsible for preparing the annual budget for submission to the Council.

6. In the event of the absence, death, resignation, or incapacity of the President, his duties shall fall upon the Vice-President, who shall serve as President through the current and succeeding one-year terms. If neither President nor Vice-President is able to serve, the Executive Council shall elect one of its members to serve as Acting President.

7. The Executive Secretary may be a salaried executive officer of the Association and shall be responsible to the Executive Council. He shall supervise the permanent secretariat of the Association, and he shall report the activities of the Association to the membership at least once a year.

8. The Treasurer, under the *direction of the Executive Council*, shall be custodian of the funds of the Association and carry out such other duties as are specified in the *By-Laws*.

9. Any person made a party to any action, suit, or proceeding by reason of the fact that he is or was an officer of the Association or of any corporation which he served as such at the request of the Association, shall be indemnified by the Association against the reasonable expenses incurred by him in connection with the defense of such action, suit, or proceeding except in relation to matters as to which it shall

THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

be adjudged that such officer is liable for negligence or misconduct in the performance of his duties.

V. *Executive Council*

1. The Executive Council shall administer the affairs of the Association, and for corporate purposes be considered its Board of Directors.
 - a. The Executive Council shall be composed of nine persons: Retiring President, President, Vice-President, and six elected Members;
 - b. The terms of the elected Members shall be for three years. Two shall be elected annually by mail ballot as prescribed in the By-Laws.
2. The Executive Council shall carry out the Association's purposes and promote its professional interests.
3. The Executive Council shall conduct and supervise the business of the Association, manage its properties, receive gifts, grants, donations, approve and implement annual budgets, and take all necessary actions in the interest of the Association.
4. The Executive Council shall meet as frequently as the interests of the Association dictate, and at least once a year. The President is empowered to call meetings of the Executive Council, and is required to do so on the petition of four Council members.
5. The Executive Council is authorized to call meetings of the Members or the membership.

VI. *Annual Audit*

There shall be an annual audit of the accounts of the Association, the results of which shall be reported to the membership.

VII. *Amendments*

Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of the members of the Executive Council, or by petition of one hundred Members in good standing. Ratification of such amendments shall require approval of a majority of those Members who vote within 90 days following a mailing by the Executive Secretary of a request for such vote.

BY-LAWS

I. *Nominations*

1. The Nominations Committee shall make nominations for the Vice-Presidency and the Executive Council, and shall submit them to the membership six weeks prior to the formulation of the official ballot.
2. The Nominations Committee shall include at least one representative from each of at least three different disciplines represented in the Association.
3. In its nominations the Nominations Committee shall seek to maintain a broad representation of disciplines, making sure that at least four disciplines are represented on the Executive Council at all times.
4. Candidates for the Vice-Presidency shall be nominated according to the following procedures:

Latin American Research Review

- a) The Nominations Committee shall nominate two candidates each year;
 - b) Members of the Association may propose additional candidates by submitting petitions signed by at least one hundred Members in good standing for each such candidate;
 - c) The Executive Secretary shall enter on an official ballot the names of the two candidates proposed by the Nominations Committee and the names of all candidates by petition.
5. Members of the Executive Council shall be nominated according to the following procedures:
- a) The Nominations Committee shall nominate six candidates each year for two vacancies on the Executive Council for three-year terms;
 - b) Members of the Association may propose additional candidates for the Executive Council by submitting a petition signed by at least twenty Members in good standing for each such candidate;
 - c) The Executive Secretary shall enter on an official ballot the names of the six candidates proposed by the Nominations Committee together with the names of the candidates by petition.
6. In the event of death or resignation of the Vice-President or a member of the Executive Council, two candidates will be nominated for each additional vacancy.

II. Elections

1. The Vice-President and the members of the Executive Council shall be elected by mail ballot.
2. Of the candidates for the Executive Council on the ballot, the two receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected to the Council for the ensuing three years. The two receiving the next highest number of votes in that order shall be alternates for one year to serve in the event of temporary or permanent inability of a regular member of the Executive Council.

III. Treasurer

The Treasurer shall cooperate with the President to prepare an annual budget and for proposing long-range financial policies and plans. Receipts and disbursements of all monies shall be handled by duly authorized persons after it has been ascertained by the Treasurer that the amounts are correct and after the expenditures have been authorized by him. The Treasurer may be bonded at the discretion of the Executive Council.

IV. Removal of Officers and Council Members

Any elected officer or member of the Executive Council may be removed from office by a petition bearing the signature of two-thirds of the Members. In such an event the Council shall call a special election to fill the vacated post.

V. Committees

1. The Standing Committees shall include a Membership Committee and a

Nominations Committee and such others as the President, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, may appoint.

2. The President may also appoint other committees, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council.

3. The size and terms of office of all committees shall be determined by the Executive Council. The chairman of each committee shall make such reports on the work of his committee as may be requested by the Executive Council. The names of the members of each committee and their terms of office shall be made known to the membership of the Association at least annually.

VI. *Dues*

The annual dues of the Association shall be due and payable to the Executive Secretary, January 1.

- a) The annual dues for Members shall be \$7.00.
- b) The annual dues for Associates shall be \$5.00.
- c) The annual dues for Institutional Associates shall be \$10.00.
- d) The annual dues for graduate students, whose status shall be certified by their principal advisors, shall be \$3.00.

VII. *Amendments*

Amendments to these By-Laws may be proposed by two-thirds of the members of the Executive Council, or by petition of fifty Members in good standing, and must then be published and distributed to the Members by the Executive Secretary. An Amendment proposed or endorsed by two-thirds of the Executive Council shall be considered ratified if fewer than one hundred Members in good standing protest it in writing within 90 days after its distribution. Amendments protested by one hundred or more members, or amendments by petition not endorsed by two-thirds of the Executive Council, shall require for ratification approval by a majority of those Members who vote within 90 days following the mailing by the Executive Secretary of a request for such vote.