

Vivian Urquidi¹ 

Maria Cristina Cacciamali² 

Rafaela Nunes Pannain³ 

Bruno Massola Moda⁴ 
Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Pablo González Casanova (1922–2023): a great Latin Americanist

BJLAS opens issue 45 with a posthumous tribute to **Pablo González Casanova**, a great Latin Americanist intellectual and permanent reference in Latin American critical thought. He died in April 2023, at the age of 101, having been intellectually active until his last days and, at the same time, facing the challenge of interpreting Latin American reality. Hence, he left a lasting foundation of critical thinking in Latin American sociology. His starting point was his country, Mexico, where Casanova pointed out questions about the history of ideas, the State, democracy, the process of political and economic modernization, and the contrasts stemming from situations of inequality and social marginality, in addition to touching on the case of the need for plural society and social justice. He was active throughout his life within the field of the left, dedicating his last years to accompanying contemporary social struggles and the Zapatista indigenous autonomy initiatives.

¹ PhD in Sociology from the University of São Paulo and Post-doctorate at the Center for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra. She is Associate Professor at the University of São Paulo in the Public Policy Management Course and in the Postgraduate Latin American Integration and Cultural Studies Programs. E-mail: yurquidi@usp.br

² PhD in Economics from the University of São Paulo and Post-doctorate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at the Universidad de Nueva México. She is a Full Professor at the University of São Paulo at the Faculty of Economics and Administration and at the Latin American Integration Postgraduate Programs. E-mail: ciamali@uol.com.br

³ Master in Political Science/International Relations by the Université Paris 1 Sorbonne (2008) and Ph.D. in Sociology by the University of São Paulo (2014). Member of the CLACSO working group "Indigenous peoples and autonomic processes", Center for Research, Intersectional Dialogues and Latin American Epistemologies (Nupdelas) and of the Social Mobilizations Group at the University of São Paulo. E-mail: rafaelapannain@usp.br

⁴ Ph.D candidate at the Postgraduate Integration Programs in Latin America at the University of São Paulo. E-mail: bruno.moda@hotmail.com

Due to this rich trajectory, which includes being president of the *Universidad Autónoma de México (UNAM)* – the only left-wing president – he received from that institution the rare indication of emeritus researcher and professor for his active participation in the institutionalization and professionalization of Mexican sociology, as well as for the creation and consolidation of research centers, including the *Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos (CELA)*. Therefore, Casanova was consecrated as the father of an important generation of thinkers from various institutions and countries in Latin America; hence, our homage is also for a great Latin Americanist.

Casanova began his education in law school, an area in which many of the social scientists of that time began their studies. Until the 1950s, in Mexico and other universities in Latin America, Social Sciences and Philosophy were part of Law courses and, as such, subject to the guidelines of legal formalism.

However, in the 1940s, there was already a movement for the institutionalization of the social sciences and humanities and the development of the field and techniques of social research. Pablo González Casanova was able to follow this path by entering the *Historical Sciences* master program at the *Colegio de México*. This postgraduate program was characterized by the dialogue between History and Political Sciences, Sociology, and Philosophy, and it was supported by a generation of Mexican professors and, in particular, Spanish professors who arrived in Mexico with their expertise and also learnings from resistance struggles against Francoism and in defense of freedoms. In this way, in a renewed scenario of the social sciences and humanities characterized by the pluralism of ideas and insurgent thinking against the authoritarian forms of the State, Casanova learned to distance himself not only from fascist tendencies but also from the strong Stalinist dogmatism present amongst Mexican communist intellectuals.

In addition to earning his master's degree, González Casanova joined UNAM's *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales (IIS)*, a renowned research institution that helped establish sociology as a field of study in the nation. He enjoyed a favorable environment with one of the most significant social sciences libraries and a scholarship program for its students. Casanova's intellectual development in the fields of intellectual history and empirical sociological research took place in this milieu of political criticism, epistemic renewal, and research promotion.

The government provided significant financial support for higher education during that time, primarily from the 1930s onward, to produce professionals for the state apparatus. This supported the consolidation of the national-populist political and cultural project, which was based on social studies and the history of the rich Mexican cultural heritage.

In academic settings, however, intellectuals' affiliation with the state bureaucracy caused progressive discomfort due to the loss of autonomy, the gradual political erosion of populism, and the autocratic tendencies of the ruling party, the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI)*, which has imposed itself in the governmental apparatus without political alternation since its formation in the 1930s.

As a result, the post-revolutionary nationalist political model was already in crisis, and the contrasts caused by economic and industrial modernization, as well as the social exclusion of certain groups of people and indigenous peoples, forced the consolidation of a rigorous social science from a theoretical and methodological standpoint, whether in empirical social studies (a more consolidated aspect), in open dialogue with the North American academy, or in the critical matrix of Marxism. Both sources of thought and epistemic bases are articulated in the works of González Casanova.

After earning his master's degree, he furthered his career as a researcher in France by pursuing a doctorate at the Sorbonne under the mentorship of Fernand Braudel, a revolutionary historian.

During this time, in post-war France and amid the effervescence of Marxism in academic forums, González Casanova deepened his knowledge of historical materialism, finding among the Marxist currents the one that most interested him, that of the Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci. In the analysis of the structures of power and dominance and the recognition of the importance of the ideological and cultural struggle as a fundamental element in the reproduction of inequalities and exploitation, González Casanova was able to better think about the Latin American context and the cultural and symbolic structures that sustain the *Hegemony*. In this perspective, the concept of democracy takes on the broader meaning of popularly based power, which would include the organization and participation of civil society along the path of popular class struggles in the transformation of local political and social dynamics and social justice. Democracy would be a method of government, while the struggle for socialism would be a path of popular organization.

In his doctorate, González Casanova carried out an analysis – which is also a denunciation – of European historiography and the way it explains Hispanic-American reality between the 16th and 18th centuries, noting its influence on the interpretation, projects, and ideologies with which Hispanic-American authors analyze their own history, permeated by prejudices and Eurocentrism.

With this rich accumulation of knowledge and new socio-historical concerns, González Casanova returned to Mexico in the 1950s and was reincorporated into research at the *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales* at UNAM and into academia at the *Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales* (ENCPyS, future *Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*) at this same university. In the period between 1957 and 1965, he directed the

ENCPyS, where he led a project to professionalize sociology in Mexico, and in 1960 he created the *Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanas (CELA)*, a space and fundamental landmark for the constitution of Latin American social thought and political and socioeconomic studies in Latin America and the Caribbean. Since its creation, the clear Latin Americanist conviction – stimulated by the then-recent Cuban Revolution – in an interdisciplinary perspective, has given the Center the bases to develop critical thinking and research on the region, in addition to favoring the conditions for the progressive reception, in the coming decades, of influential intellectuals and thinkers – mainly Marxists – coming from other Latin American countries where the scientific field of sociology had also been consolidating since the 1950s, mainly at the *Instituto de Sociología* of the *Universidad de Buenos Aires*; and in the Brazilian critical school, following the path of Florestan Fernandes, at the *Universidade de São Paulo*.

The academic centrality of CELA since the 1960s in the production of knowledge about Latin America and the Caribbean – the postgraduate course in *Estudios Latinoamericanos* would be created soon, in 1973 – has to do with the undeniable commitment of UNAM as Mexico was constituted as a country of asylum for intellectuals from Latin American countries governed by dictatorships, mainly from the 1960s and 1970s. UNAM received social scientists of a high level of production of thought and research, such as the Ecuadorians Bolívar Echeverría and Agustín Cueva, the Bolivian René Zavaleta Mercado, the Brazilians Theotônio dos Santos, Vânia Bambirra, Sérgio Bagu, and Ruy Mauro Marini, the Chileans Hugo Zemelman and Orlando Caputo, and, among others, the Argentines Gregorio Selser, Adolfo Gilly, and José Aricó, in addition to Salvadorians Rafael Menjivar Larín, Rafael Guidos Béjar, and Ernesto Richter. Many of them were hosted at the *Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos*, resulting in avant-garde studies about the region.

At this time of the influx of the most lucid Latin American minds and Latin Americanists, in 1969, the *IX Congress of the Latin American Association of Sociology (ALAS)* was held in Mexico, and Pablo González Casanova was elected president of the Association (in the 1980s, he was re-elected again). Previously, he had also held the positions of Director and President of the *Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales* (1957-1965).

The context of coups d'état in Latin America, *liberation* struggles with revolutionary horizons, as well as the political crisis and progressive democratic deficit in Mexico, constituted the scenario for González Casanova to write, in 1965, one of his most influential works and a landmark of social and political studies, *La Democracia en México*.

In this work, González Casanova analyzes the contradictions of a Mexico that is modernizing economically and politically but is incapable of overcoming its internal situation of underdevelopment and social marginality. This work opens a debate on the structures of domination, conformism, and social inequality and also proposes alternatives for political mobilization and the social struggle for democratic construction. The work is anchored in historical and empirical research with critical interpretations in the Marxist field on the *relative concept of democracy*, considering the Eurocentric character of the concept and experiences of reference, and thus allows understanding of a Mexico characterized by political, social, economic, and cultural relations of colonial heritage embedded in post-revolutionary history. The study deals with the nature of the Mexican political crisis from the point of view of criticizing populism, which required rethinking the role of the State – weakened by local economic powers and fragile sovereignty vis-à-vis the United States –, and authoritarian tendencies, in addition to the absence of party plurality. Bearing in mind the socialist horizon, the author criticizes the lack of union autonomy in scenarios of political manipulation and conformism and the

situation of popular organizations and marginalized classes, which are central challenges of a democratic project. It should be noted that in this period, in rural and urban areas, movements emerged, including armed ones, which would be strongly repressed by the State. An analysis of this period is presented in this **BJLAS** issue by historian Larissa J. Riberti in the article ***The Conditions for the Socialist Armed Movement's Emergence in Mexico and the Counterinsurgency between the 1960s and 1980s.***

In the same period between 1970 and 1972, González Casanova was appointed rector of the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, a period in which he tried to carry out profound pedagogical transformations in the institution, such as the participation of the university community in debates that would lead to decision-making on the structure – academic-scientific and physical – of the university. However, the institutional reaction, which included the risk of police invasion and loss of university autonomy, led González Casanova to present his resignation in the second year of his term.

In a convulsed Latin America, such scenarios were not strange when thinking about democracies in the rest of Latin American countries.

In this classic book of Mexican sociology, not only in it, González Casanova develops one of the most sophisticated understandings to interpret Latin American reality, *Internal Colonialism*. An analytical concept that would soon have repercussions in Latin American sociology and anthropology. For González Casanova, “*internal colonialism*” characterizes the experiences of countries marked by a situation of social “*marginality*” and “*social plurality*” – today one would say by *socio-historical and cultural heterogeneity*. It particularly defines the treatment of indigenous peoples and rural populations, with whom colonial-type relationships are established, similar to the relationships between metropolis and colony. In *internal colonialism*, the class struggle has the content of the struggle of

culturally distinct nations within the same country, with the segment that dominates politics and the economy being ethnically and culturally distinct from the dominated segment, that of indigenous nations.

We open this **BJLAS'** issue with the opportune article ***For a sociology for emancipation: Pablo González Casanova and Latin American militant sociology***, of sociologist Lia Pinheiro, professor, and researcher at the State University of Ceará (UECE, Brazil), in which the theoretical contributions and the actuality of the concepts and thought of González Casanova are thoroughly covered.

It is known that Latin American critical thinking was born from the challenges of thinking about regional complexity through the production of local knowledge and the political urgency of transformation. González Casanova assumed this commitment in the field of the left from the point of view of historical materialism but without orthodoxy. In his other classic book, *Sociología de la Exploración* (1969), he defends the validity of Marxist categories but criticizes the more orthodox and determinist perspectives on the stages of capitalism. He criticizes the *dependentist* theory for neglecting the theory of value. He dialogues with structural-functionalism but rejects the false empiricist rigor of modernization theories.

The contributions of González Casanova and the reception of his work throughout Latin America are uncontested testimonies of the validity of his epistemic strategies planted in ENCPyS and, later, in the *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales*, where researchers from and for Latin America were trained. In the coming decades, new generations of *Latin Americanist social theorists*, activists, and militants – including those in the armed struggle –, as well as indigenous intellectuals, were nourished by the reflections of González Casanova.

The voluminous work of González Casanova includes 24 books, such as the aforementioned classics *La Democracia en México* (1965) and *Sociología de la Exploración* (1969), as well as *Imperialismo y Liberación en*

América Latina (1990). He organized two central collections that favored dialogue between intellectuals in the region. The first focuses on studies on the situation of indigenous peasants in Latin America, and the second deals with the history of countries in the region over five decades of the 20th century, both edited by Siglo Veintiuno. The collection "*Historia Política de los Campesinos Latinoamericanos*" was published in five volumes between 1984 and 1985; the second collection "*América Latina: Historia de medio siglo*", was edited in two volumes published in 1977 (in Brazil, "*América Latina: História de meio século*", in four volumes translated by Editora da UNB and released in 1988).

He also wrote about the Cuban Revolution, armed struggles in Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Colombia; the coup against Unidad Popular in Chile; Che in Bolivia... and the Chiapaneca insurrection, the latter already in a scenario in which the socialist revolutionary horizon had disappeared from the political projects of the left and the consolidated democracy was the neoliberal one. At the age of 96, the *Comité Clandestino Revolucionario Indígena del Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* awarded him the worthy title of *Commander of the EZLN Pablo Contreras*, in recognition of his support for the movement in the peace process, for his struggle to comply with the San Andrés accords, and also for his articles, conferences, manifestos, and participation in events alongside the Zapatistas. Commander "Contreras" received the nickname for his always critical and independent thinking, insurgent, acting tirelessly alongside indigenous and oppressed peoples.

The new challenges of neoliberalism and the consolidation of the world system made Casanova rethink and update, in the 21st century, the concept of *internal colonialism* in light of the new forms of accumulation of transnational business and financial networks, the limits of the powers and functions of the State, the dismantling of the working class, and the crisis of the Nation-State. He also saw with hope the need to ensure the

internationalism of the new anti-systemic resistances and the reinvigorated struggles of the indigenous peoples of the new century. His thought, thus, has remained up-to-date, and for that reason, it will be constantly resumed in the challenges of the oppressed peoples of the 21st century, in the reconfigurations of (pluri)national States, and whenever the political urgency of the historical social issues in Latin America and the Caribbean so requires.

The ***Brazilian Journal of Latin American Studies*** wishes to dedicate issue 45 to this Latin American thinker and activist of the most legitimate and authentic Latin Americanism.

There is also a final highlight in this homage. Pablo González Casanova had several passages in Brazil at the *Centro Latinoamericano de Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais (CLAPCS)*, a research and teaching institution created with the support of UNESCO in 1957 to promote training and research in the social sciences exclusively about Latin America. González Casanova was president of CLAPCS twice, in 1961-1962 and 1965-1966. In the period between 1959 and 1976, the Center published the journal "*América Latina*", whose relevance is highlighted below.

Like González Casanova, CLAPCS received another great Mexican intellectual, the anthropologist Rodolfo Stavenhagen, who, in addition to assuming the General Secretariat of CLAPCS (between 1962 and 1964), edited the "*América Latina*" journal that published articles that made up one of the most fruitful debates and dialogues on a concept that was being born, *Internal Colonialism*. It would later become known that the concept was mentioned earlier in a CLAPCS Seminar by the American sociologist Charles W. Mills. Pablo González Casanova published in 1963, in issue number 3 of the *América Latina*", his first sociological reflections on the concept in an article entitled "*Sociedad Plural, Colonialismo Interno y Desarrollo*". In the following issue, issue number 4 of the same year, the concept appeared again in an article by Rodolfo Stavenhagen, under the

title “*Clase, Colonialismo y Aculturación*”, in which the cultural aspects of the concept began to be formulated. An intellectual debate thus began. Dialoguing with both, also in issue 3 of the journal, the Brazilian anthropologist Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira published the article “*Articulação e ‘Fricção Interétnica’*” in which Internal Colonialism denounced the role of anthropologists in assimilationist policies on indigenous populations.

It appears that at certain times, complex realities can pose questions that require creative responses from thinkers, questions that will progressively become central explanatory and analytical concepts, generative ideas, or true milestones of new common understandings about social heterogeneity. González Casanova has always been at the forefront of intellectual projects on Latin America, illuminating the path of social sciences in the region with his Latin Americanist sensibility.

This tribute will not be a reference article about the author, whose work goes far beyond the simple report of these words. Only aspects of the Latin Americanist production and political activity of the thinker were highlighted in recognition of his work and the feeling that his absence leaves us with. To this end, we base ourselves on studies by researchers who synthesized the course of the institutionalization of sociology in Latin America (TAVARES DOS SANTOS; BAUMGARTEN, 2005; TRINDADE, 2018), who followed the work and some of the author's central concepts (GANDARILLA, 2017; ROITMAN ROSENMAN, 2015; HERNÁNDEZ NAVARRO, 2015[2007]); and who focused on González Casanova's passage through Brazil (BRINGEL; LEONE, 2021), in addition to the thinker's own works gathered in a valuable anthology (GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA, 2015).

In a very original analysis of Pablo González Casanova in issue 45 of the ***Brazilian Journal of Latin American Studies***, Lia Pinheiro Barbosa, sociologist and researcher from the *State University of Ceará (UECE, Brazil)*,

follows the work of González Casanova along the path that links critical theory and transformative practice. Barbosa begins analyzing the *sociology of exploitation* by presenting central concepts such as *internal colonialism* to progressively unveil the author's political project in terms of class autonomy, which will include an analysis of popular struggles such as that of the Zapatista indigenous movement. The article is entitled ***For a sociology for emancipation: Pablo González Casanova and Latin American militant sociology.***

The second article is an analysis of the historical scenario of the post-revolutionary decades in Mexico, in which the progressive inclination towards the hardening of the political regime under the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) and the growing tendency towards repression against the political opposition of other parties such as the *Communist Party*, the *Popular Party*, or the *Partido Obrero Campesino de México* are observed. In the article entitled ***The conditions for the Socialist Armed Movement's emergence in Mexico and the counterinsurgency between the 1960s and 1980s***, social historian Larissa Jacheta Riberti, from the *Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN, Brazil)*, analyzes the repression against the organized population and against political opposition parties, in addition to the control of the press and the violent use of the military and paramilitary apparatus. At the same time, it explains how armed struggle groups with socialist ideology emerge as well as other popular mobilizations, such as those of indigenous peasants in rural areas or those of university students. The *Massacre of Tlatelolco* and the *Halconazo*, among others, are events from this period that explain the emergence of the *Movimiento Armado Socialista* in Mexico.

In dialogue with the philosopher Michael Foucault and the concept of sovereignty, the next article we present at the ***BJLAS*** deals with progressive Latin American governments in recent decades and social inclusion projects. In an essay style, the author observes that the management of inclusion policies is ineffective because it is not able to

overcome the neoliberal hegemony and, also, because of the confluence of this hegemony with the ideological burden of coloniality still in force both in the elites and oligarchies and in the middle-class segments, here characterized as the *ruling classes*. In addition, governments are constrained by the relative autonomy of the State vis-à-vis domestic and foreign corporate capital, as well as by United States interference. Considering this scenario, the author states that progressive governments were not only marked by the failure of social policies but also because they now face a type of parastatal violence that adds to the historical forms of long-term violence and limits the success of social inclusion. The article titled ***Latin America: The trap for the reigning classes*** is by Marcos Cuevas Perus, a researcher at the *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales* of the *National Autonomous University of Mexico (IIS/UNAM, Mexico)*.

The fourth article in this issue dialogues with the analysis already presented from the arts perspective. Under the title ***“El Marxismo dará salud a los enfermos”***: ***Key idea of Latin American Social Medicine***, Diego de Oliveira Souza, a researcher at the *Federal University of Alagoas (UFAL, Brazil)*, establishes creative links between the philosophy of Social Medicine and engaged visual arts and thus contributes to the history of Latin American thought and art. Based on the interpretation of a painting by Mexican Frida Kahlo, recognized for her self-portraits inspired by post-revolutionary Mexico, the article relates questions of Mexican national identity with political concerns about class, racial relations, and the situation of women. Such a reading of reality has to do not only with his political position as a member of the Mexican Communist Party but also with his own experience of pain. In this article, Diego de Oliveira Souza interprets the painting *“El Marxismo dará salud a los enfermos”* (1954) [*“Marxismo will give health to the sick”*], based on Georg Lukács' formulations on aesthetics and politics. The originality of this analysis resides in the fact that the author, who graduated in Social Work,

establishes a dialogue between his area of knowledge and the history of medicine and art. It contextualizes the life of Frida Kahlo, her work, her ideological affiliation with Marxism, and her political activities in the Mexican Communist Party. He also places this scenario within a broader historical moment, the Latin American one, in which Social Medicine arises with concerns that are also Marxist and critical of how modernization and the market economy turn health into a commodity. In this way, the article allows us to recompose the different scenarios of the post-revolutionary decades in Mexico.

The possibilities that art allows for representing contemporary political and social dilemmas are the theme of the fifth article published in ***BJLAS*** under the title ***In pursuit of a symbiotic cinema: Shun by the Ecuadorian Sani Montahuano and Yollotl by the Mexican Fernando Colin Roque***. The article analyzes two short films that, through the language of cinema, allow for symbiosis between humans and non-humans. The article proposal gets enriched with references to Amerindian thought, allowing it to question aspects of contemporary society, such as the environmental crisis, and offer solutions based on a reinterpretation of ancestral knowledge. Both short films are interpreted by researcher and visual creator Lucía Fernanda Romero Paz y Miño, from *Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (UASB, Ecuador)*, and were produced by Ecuadorian indigenous filmmaker Sani Montahuano, who still adds female elements into her works, and by filmmaker Fernando Colin Roque, Mexican indigenous.

The article that follows establishes a dialogue between the arts and the social sciences. The author is sociologist Dédallo Neves, from the *Federal University of Paraná (UFPR, Brazil)*, who presents research on the impact of the Cuban Revolution on the work of Brazilian poets and intellectuals. The source that the scientist uses is an anthology of poems, entitled *Violão de Rua (Street Guitar)* (three volumes), organized by the

writer and researcher Moacyr Félix between 1962 and 1963. As a member of the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), Félix included in the anthology writings by authors such as Ferreira Gullar, Affonso Romano de Sant'Anna, and Geir Campos, with verses about the Cuban Revolution, Che Guevara, and the Peasant Leagues. In the poets' prose, there are anti-imperialist ideals and the overcoming of capitalism, in addition to hope in the Third World, the struggles of proletarian workers and peasants, and the desire to guide the course of the Brazilian people toward the Revolution. These are themes that echo the impact of the Cuban Revolution, in which the horizons of radical transformation of society composed what the author of the article, Dédallo Neves, calls "revolutionary Brazilianness". The name of the article is ***The Cuban Revolution among Brazilian artists and intellectuals: The "Violão De Rua" Case.***

The last four issues of this journal guarantee the thematic diversity of publications in ***BJLAS***, as they are articles in the fields of Law, History, Political Sciences, and Economics. All proposals use theoretical models to interpret or intervene in reality.

From the observation that in Latin America there is no effective internal protection of Human Rights, the article entitled ***Legal pluralism as an alternative for Latin America in the supranational scope of multi-level protection of Human Rights*** is a proposal and an exercise to think about the possibilities of building a supranational protection system that complements national policies for guaranteeing rights. The study analyzes the possibilities and virtues of supranational protection alternatives, focusing specifically on legal pluralism. With prudence, the limitations of these alternatives are also discussed, mainly regarding legal issues or the internal cultural aspects of each country, such as the presence of indigenous peoples and their own ways of exercising justice. The article is written by legal scientists Guilherme Marinho de Araújo Mendes and

Claudyvan José dos Santos Nascimento Silva, both from the *Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB, Brazil)*.

In the following article, the theoretical exercise is to interpret populism in Latin America, specifically Argentine Peronism between the years 1946 to 1955, using the Metaphysics of Historical Time as a tool and the assumption of multiple temporalities, according to the model of the German Reinhart Koselleck. The approach allows analyzing the temporal convergences in the populist discourse of Perón and the Argentine people. The research source is the official documents of Perón's speeches. The article is entitled ***The Peronist present: "Space of experience" and "Horizon of expectation" in the populist discourse of Juan Domingo Perón (1946-1955)*** and was written by a researcher in History, Ana Laura Galvão Batista, from São Paulo State University Júlio Mesquita Filho (UNESP, Brazil).

The Venezuela of the Chavista governments is the locus of the next article. The proposal is to use a methodological model that distinguishes temporal insights or political cycles, in which the critical conjunctures of the cycles are analyzed, and the result in terms of democratization or not. The first moment interpreted is that of the transformations of the Hugo Chávez government, whose content would be social and political democratization. In the second moment, the des-democratization phase of the Chavista experience is evaluated, especially after Chávez's death, when Maduro's management begins. This second phase would be characterized as the cycle of (de)democratization. The proposal is by Jefferson Nascimento, a political scientist at the *Institute of Social and Political Studies at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (IESP/UERJ, Brazil)*, and is entitled ***Critical conjunctures, changes in political cycles and de-democratization in Venezuela throughout the Chavista governments.***

The last article in the journal is also a theoretical exercise in the analysis of two experiences of industrialization in Argentina and Brazil in the middle of the last century, based on two authors: Nicholas Kaldor

(1908-1986) and Raúl Prebisch (1901-1986), placed here in comparison and, as it turns out, complementary when it comes to economic growth and development. The article is titled ***Kaldor and Prebisch: Reflections on Industrialization and the Economies of Brazil and Argentina*** and was written by Francisco Thainan, an economic scientist at the *Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP, Brazil)*.

As an editorial project, the ***Brazilian Journal of Latin American Studies*** presents, at the end of each issue, reviews of recently published books on Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as well-known works of regional literature or works written by authors with an important intellectual trajectory on this region.

The first work reviewed is an organization in the field of the history of ideas and the history of concepts on the formation of Latin/Hispano/Ibero-American identities. In ***A Latin America in constant (re)definition***, Igor Lemos Moreira, from the *State University of Santa Catarina (UESC, Brazil)* makes a detailed review of the chapters of the book *Continent to be Defined: The Ideas of America in the 20th Century*, organized by Eliana Regina de Freitas Dutra and Jorge Myers.

The second book review is a classic of Latin American genre literature. In the review, ***Flora Tristan and the patriarchal justice system: the insurgency of "Pilgrimages of an Pariah"***, Joana das Flores Duarte, researcher from the *Health and Society Institute from Federal University of São Paulo (ISS/UNIFESP, Brazil)*, presents the book *As peregrinações de uma pária (Pilgrimages of an Pariah)*, in which the author, Flora Tristán, deals with her trip to Peru from France, as a testimonial work of her relationship with the country and her political position against the patriarchal justice system. In Peru, Flora Tristán wrote her memoirs at the beginning of the 19th century, which makes her an avant-garde author of the feminist movement and her work a classic of Latin American literature written by a woman.

The last book review is on Latin American economic thought and was written by Héctor López Terán, from the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)*. The review preserves the title of the book ***The Challenge of Development. Trajectories of the Great Latin American Economists of the 20th Century***, organized by Juan Odisio and Marcelo Rougier. Intellectuals such as Aníbal Pinto, Víctor Urquidí, Carlos Mallorquín, and Celso Furtado, among others, are highlighted in the review.

References

BRINGEL, Breno; LEONE, Miguel. La construcción intelectual del concepto de Colonialismo Interno en América Latina: Diálogos entre Cardoso de Oliveira, González Casanova y Stavenhagen (1959-1965). **Mana**, v. 27, n. 2. p.1-36, 2021. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1590/1678-49442021v27n2a204>

GANDARILLA, José. Notas sobre la construcción de un instrumento intelectual. El “colonialismo interno” en la obra de Pablo González Casanova. **Pléyade**, n. 21, jan-jun. 2018. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0719-36962018000100141>

GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA, Pablo. **De la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación: Pensar América Latina en el siglo XXI**. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI/CLACSO; 2015. Available in: <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/coedicion/casanova/casanova.pdf>. Access at: 29 jun. 2023.

HERNANDEZ NAVARRO, Luis. A Don Pablo. In: GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA, Pablo. **De la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación: Pensar América Latina en el siglo XXI (Antología)**. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI/CLACSO; 2015. Available in: <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/coedicion/casanova/22.pdf>. Access at: 29 jun. 2023.

ROITMAN ROSENMANN, Marcos. Pablo González Casanova: de la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación. In: GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA, Pablo. **De la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación: Pensar América Latina en el siglo XXI (Antología)**. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI/CLACSO, 2015[2007]. Available in: <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/coedicion/casanova/01.pdf>.

Access at: 29 jun. 2023.

TAVARES-DOS-SANTOS, José Vicente; BAUMGARTEN, Maíra. Contribuições da Sociologia na América Latina à imaginação sociológica: análise, crítica e compromisso social. Dossiê Sociologia na (em) América Latina, ALAS, **Sociologias**, v. 7, n. 14, jul/dec 2005, p. 178-243. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-45222005000200009>

TRINDADE, Hélgio, “Disciplinarização” e construção institucional da sociologia nos países fundadores e sua reprodução na América Latina. **Sociologias**, v. 20, n. 47, jan/apr 2018, p. 210-256. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/15174522-020004707>

DOI:[10.11606/issn.1676-6288.prolam.2023.214626](https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1676-6288.prolam.2023.214626)

*Received on: 30/07/2023
Accepted on: 30/07/2023
Published on: 30/07/2023*