

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Grant

Application Deadline: March 11, 2005

Please print and complete this checklist and attach it as the cover page of your grant application. For more information about RSC grants, please see <www.gustavus.edu/oncampus/facdev/grants/RSC.cfm>.

FACULTY INFORMATION

Name: Sujay Rao Dept.: History
Email: srao@gustavus.edu Rank: Assistant Professor

CHECKLIST

- ☒ Description of previous projects (and outcomes) funded by RSC grants - does not apply
- ☒ Complete project description, including separate statements of:
 1. **Purpose.** What are the intellectual, conceptual, or artistic issues? How does your work fit into other endeavors being done in this field?
 2. **Feasibility.** What qualifications do you bring to this project? What have you done/will you do to prepare for this project? What is the time period, i.e. summer, summer and academic year, academic year only? Is the work's scope commensurate with the time period of the project?
 3. **Project Design.** This should include a specific description of the project design and activities, including location, staff, schedules or itineraries, and desired outcomes.
- ☒ RSC Budget Proposal Form attached as last page of application
- ☒ Eight copies of complete application (including this checklist) to be submitted to the Faculty Development Resource Center (SSC 119)
- ☒ If successful, my proposal can be used as an example to assist future faculty applicants. This decision will not in any way influence the evaluation of my application.
(Yes) No (please circle one)

To: Faculty Development Committee and Dean of the Faculty
From: Sujay Rao, Assistant Professor, Department of History
Date: March 7, 2004
Subject: Application to Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Fund

Overview of Project

I am applying for funds to support final research for and preparation of a scholarly article on the nature of provincial political movements in Latin America during the early nineteenth century, focusing on the case of Argentina. This work will take place during the summer of 2004. By the end of the summer, I will have a roughly 30-page article ready to circulate for comments and eventual submission (during the 2004-2005 academic year) to a leading peer-reviewed journal in Latin American history or Latin American studies (e.g. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, or *Latin American Research Review*).

Project Description: Purpose, Feasibility, and Project Design

Purpose:

From 1810 to 1824, a series of independence movements stripped Spain of virtually all of her American colonies. Yet, nearly two hundred years later, the meaning of these movements remains unclear. The Latin American independence movements clearly formed part of the broader republican struggle that transformed “the Atlantic world” – rebels throughout Spain’s American colonies invoked Washington, Jefferson, and Napoleon far more often than they spoke of indigenous rulers such as Montezuma or Cuauhtémoc. But historians still dispute the nature of republicanism in early nineteenth-century Latin America.

To be sure, historians agree that the political movements of the nineteenth century can no longer be studied from the perspective of the national capitals. Early histories focusing solely on events in places such as Mexico City and Buenos Aires ignore one of the central political issues of the nineteenth century; as politicians in the national capitals contended for power, they encountered challenges from an unexpected direction, from the hinterlands. In Mexico, Peru, Colombia, and Argentina – to name only the most prominent examples – provincial political movements challenged traditional claims to power, leading to decades of civil war and ultimately transforming national politics. In Argentina, for example, provincial politicians destroyed the national state in 1820 and fought over the creation of a new one until 1862. In the end, these provincial politicians, thoroughly subordinated before 1820, became partners, albeit unequal ones, in a federal state led by Buenos Aires.

Yet while historians of Latin America widely recognize the importance of provincial political movements, they have only recently begun to examine their nature. To date, studies have fallen into one of two schools of thought. The first school of thought (typified by Tulio Halperín Donghi and John Lynch) has seen these movements as the embodiment of all that went wrong in Latin America after independence. Provincial politicians, in this view, were quite literally the barbarians at the gates – untutored in the ways of “civilized” life, they

mobilized mass followings through “charisma.” Ousting more “enlightened” leaders, they imposed brutish dictatorships that resulted in stability but also stagnation.

A second school (including José Carlos Chiaramonte, Peter Guardino, Charles F. Walker, and Ariel de la Fuente) contends that provincial political movements represented a struggle for a more just society in the wake of independence. Provincial leaders, this school argues, waged a desperate, and partially successful, struggle to distribute power more equally, a struggle to change authority rather than to destroy it. These leaders fought to break colonial monopolies on political power, placing authority in local hands. Their movements were successful, this school claims, because they reflected popular concerns, consciously employing popular rhetoric and promising to defend the Catholic faith against “enlightened” liberals.

Most historians of Latin America currently subscribe to this second school, viewing provincial political movements in the nineteenth century as popular crusades for more equitable distributions of power. However, this interpretation has two serious flaws. First, it is based largely on research done in Mexico. Second, there has been insufficient research on provincial politics, even in Mexico.

Roughly half of all scholarly work published regarding Latin America focuses on Mexico (one-fourth more focuses on Brazil). Historians’ understanding of politics across Latin America, then, is frequently shaped by research on Mexico – indeed, recent histories of nineteenth-century Argentina and Peru have explicitly invoked Mexican “models.” This focus on Mexico has been highly productive in some regards – in-depth studies of the Mexican Revolution of the twentieth century, for instance, represent some of the best work done on “Latin American revolutions.” However, the focus on Mexico has hampered our understanding of nineteenth-century movements. Village communities, often indigenous, formed an important part of Mexico’s landscape in the nineteenth century. These communities could be easily mobilized, leading to some degree of popular participation in politics. While there are some counterparts to these communities in countries such as Guatemala and El Salvador, other Latin American countries – Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, and Uruguay to name but a few – had far different political landscapes in the nineteenth century, offering fewer chances for mass mobilization. Popular participation in nineteenth-century politics, based on patterns observed in Mexico, cannot be assumed for all of Latin America.

Moreover, studies of provincial movements – even in Mexico – have been insufficient, focusing almost exclusively on brief episodes of provincial participation in national affairs. Historians have spent far too little time exploring how provincial politicians exercised power on a daily basis – the ways they secured support, raised funds, established schools, administered justice, managed relations with neighbors and constituents, and handled political transitions, for example. The nature of the provincial movements of the nineteenth century – widely recognized as vital features of Latin American history – can only be understood through comprehensive research done in provincial archives. Studying provincial politicians’ brightest moments in the national spotlight, as recent historians of Mexico, Peru, and Argentina have done, cannot suffice.

For this reason, I focused my dissertation research on the provinces of Argentina's "littoral" region – the provinces of Santa Fe, Entre Ríos, and Corrientes, which lie along the rivers stretching between Paraguay and Buenos Aires. This region was involved both repeatedly and decisively in the Argentine civil wars that raged from 1814 to 1862. The provincial archives of this strategic region provide the comprehensive view of provincial political movements that is necessary to go beyond the "Mexican model" and understand nineteenth-century Latin America more broadly.

I intend to revise material from my roughly 500-page doctoral dissertation and to conduct supplemental research in order to publish a scholarly article on the provincial political movements in Argentina's littoral region. My goal will be to question the validity of the "Mexican model" for Latin America as a whole. Provincial political movements were not necessarily popular movements. On the contrary, the federalist movements of the littoral were led by colonial oligarchs, often relatives of politicians in Buenos Aires. Political participation in these movements was minimal – perhaps 1% of the population participated in elections, for example. Even informal participation was strictly limited and decidedly unenthusiastic – provincial armies, the arm of the "popular" crusades, were decimated by desertions. And the commitment of provincial politicians and their followers to federalism was lukewarm – federalist politicians in the littoral often backed centralist regimes, even fighting fellow federalists, with no apparent loss of local support.

Colonial oligarchs in the provinces, in fact, retained far greater control over regional politics than historians have recognized even as they challenged the traditional supremacy of the national capitals. Provincial politicians in the littoral were not the "barbarians at the gates" – they were the kinsmen of the "enlightened" politicians of Buenos Aires. Nor did provincial politicians lead popular crusades for local sovereignty. Though the republican movements of the independence era reshaped power in Argentina, provincial movements demonstrate the survival of colonial elites, the persistence of patronage and other traditional forms of social order, and the limits of ideological conflict. Historians must take notice.

Feasibility:

Much of the research for this project has already been completed. The most important research – the work in the Argentine provincial archives – was completed as part of my Ph.D. dissertation. Moreover, through my dissertation and my teaching I am broadly familiar with relevant work on other Latin American countries. In short, the outline of the article I intend to write is already in place. Over the summer, I intend to conduct supplemental research on countries other than Argentina, principally through secondary literature, and to write the article itself. Based on my experience with my dissertation, I expect to be able to complete both the research and writing in roughly two months, easily completing the project before the end of the summer.

Project Design:

I think of this project in 2 concurrent stages:

1. Conduct supplemental research, reading the most recent secondary literature to appear in major journals and revisiting important sources on local politics in neighboring countries such as Uruguay. This stage will require an estimated 4 daytrips to the University of Minnesota library, which has excellent holdings on nineteenth-century Latin America. This stage will also require some photocopying of key materials (particularly limited-edition works from Latin America) obtained through Interlibrary Loan.
2. Writing the roughly 30-page article, which I will then circulate among colleagues at other institutions and submit (at some point in the 2004-2005 academic year) for publication by one of the major peer-reviewed journals in my field (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, or *Latin American Research Review*).

Budget

Funding requested:

- Stipend: \$700
- Mileage: \$213 (4 daytrips to University of Minnesota Library: 4*142 miles*\$3.75)
- Photocopying \$300 (copying of key materials, especially limited-edition works)
- **Total: \$1213**

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider this application! I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Sincerely,



Sujay Rao
Assistant Professor
Department of History

BUDGET PROPOSAL FORM

Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Grant

ITEM		AMOUNT
Equipment (not to include computer hardware)		\$
1:	Cost:	
2:	Cost:	
3:	Cost:	
Materials		\$
1:	Cost:	
2:	Cost:	
3:	Cost:	
Personnel (check the faculty book white pages for recommended rates)		\$
1.		
2.		
Travel Costs		\$ 213
Airfare:		
Mileage: Number of miles <u>568</u> @ \$0.36/mile <u>37.5¢/mile</u> <i>new IRS rate</i>		
Lodging		\$
Number of days _____ @ \$ _____/day		
Other Expenses (check the faculty book white pages for excluded items)		\$ 300
1: <u>Photocopying</u>	Cost: <u>\$ 300</u>	
2:	Cost:	
3:	Cost:	
Faculty Stipend (\$500 professor; \$600 associate professor; \$700 assistant professor)		\$ 700
TOTAL EXPENSES		\$1213
AMOUNT REQUESTED (not to exceed \$1500 + stipend commensurate with rank)		\$1213