

LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM

THE WILSON CENTER



SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BUILDING WASHINGTON, D.C.

WORKING PAPERS

Number 112

TRENDS AND PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH ON
LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980s

A Rapporteur's Report

William L. Canak
Brown University

Number 112

TRENDS AND PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH ON
LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980s

A Rapporteur's Report

William L. Canak
Brown University

Author's note: This rapporteur's report is a summary of proceedings from a May 1-2, 1981 workshop on "Trends and Priorities for Research on Latin America in the 1980s" cosponsored by the Latin American Studies Association and the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560. Six papers presented at the workshop are collectively available in Latin American Program Working Paper No. 111: "Trends and Priorities for Research on Latin America in the 1980s: Perspectives on Anthropology, Economics, History, Literature, Political Science, and Sociology."

This essay is one of a series of Working Papers of the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Dr. Michael Grow oversees preparation of Working Paper distribution. The series includes papers by Fellows, Guest Scholars, and interns within the Program and by members of the Program staff and of its Academic Council, as well as work presented at, or resulting from, seminars, workshops, colloquia, and conferences held under the Program's auspices. The series aims to extend the Program's discussions to a wider community throughout the Americas, and to help authors obtain timely criticism of work in progress. Support to make distribution possible has been provided by the Inter-American Development Bank.

Single copies of Working Papers may be obtained without charge by writing to:

Latin American Program, Working Papers
The Wilson Center
Smithsonian Institution Building
Washington, D. C. 20560

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was created by Congress in 1968 as a "living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson . . . symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs."

The Center's Latin American Program, established in 1977, has two major aims: to support advanced research on Latin America, the Caribbean, and inter-American affairs by social scientists and humanists, and to help assure that fresh insights on the region are not limited to discussion within the scholarly community but come to the attention of interested persons with a variety of professional perspectives: in governments, international organizations, the media, business, and the professions. The Program is being supported through 1982 by three-year grants from the Ford, Mellon, Kettering, Rockefeller, and Tinker Foundations, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Xerox Corporation.

LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Albert O. Hirschman, Chairman, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J.
Fernando Henrique Cardoso, CEBRAP, Sao Paulo, Brazil
William Glade, University of Texas
Juan Linz, Yale University
Leslie Manigat, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, Venezuela
Guillermo O'Donnell, CEDES, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Olga Pellicer de Brody, El Colegio de México, Mexico
Thomas Skidmore, University of Wisconsin
Mario Vargas Llosa, Lima, Peru

TRENDS AND PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980s
A Rapporteur's Report

William L. Canak
Brown University

Introduction

The significant political and economic transformation of Latin America's social structure in the past quarter century would seem to demand an increased sophistication from those scholars whose work addresses complex questions of social organization, social struggle, and historical transformation. Against this backdrop of rapid change in Latin American societies there have occurred far-reaching changes in the context and practice of research. The Cuban revolution produced a rapid increase in interest and resources for research on Latin America. Enthusiasm continued through the 1960s, but in the 1970s North American scholars declined in numbers and, it appears, in public prestige.

The general retraction of support for Latin American research in recent years has encouraged some North Americans to abandon the field, but the effects of this exodus have been countered by the continuing commitment and experience of many of the best who have remained. While more modest in scope, the continued work of this community of scholars has proven itself of equal and perhaps even greater value than the massive, well-funded, and conceptually dubious projects of earlier years. For Latin American scholars themselves, the 1970s witnessed a maturation of the research community and the growth of research centers and scholarly publications, but the foundation for these encouraging trends has been insecure. Resources are still modest and lacking in continuity. Authoritarian regimes have mounted concerted attacks on research areas perceived as inimical or threatening. One consequence has been the collapse of research programs in the universities, due to political and economic restrictions, and the development of private research institutes supported by domestic and especially foreign foundations and agencies. Another consequence has been the incarceration, exile, and assassination of social scientists, artists, and humanists. Notwithstanding these conditions, much work by Latin American scholars has gained recognition and influence throughout the world. Theoretical and empirical studies in the areas of political theory, migration, urbanization, rural social structure, social movements, national development, and literature have broken new ground and redefined the terrain of inquiry within their respective fields.

In essence, the last fifteen years have witnessed an inversion. Intellectual dialog between North American and Latin American scholars has resulted in a deep self-reappraisal by the former and the emergence of the latter as the cutting edge of much new social theory. U.S. expertise

in quantitative data analysis has been matched in many instances as Latin American researchers have appropriated these techniques. Yet, an uncritical reliance on large surveys and aggregate data bases has not characterized the best of current Latin American research. Despite its precarious context, creative work has not paid excessive obeisance to intellectual or political authority.

In recognition of these changes and in anticipation of their implications, the Latin American Studies Association and the Latin American Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center convened an international and interdisciplinary group of scholars in Washington, D.C., May 1 and 2, 1981 to discuss "Trends and Priorities for Research on Latin America in the 1980s." The first day's workshop sessions were organized along disciplinary lines. After brief presentations and formal comments by selected discussants, the workshop as a whole engaged in debates regarding the context and conduct of research in the next decade in six different fields: political science, economics, sociology, history, literature, and anthropology. The second day's sessions were organized around two themes: the climate and context for research in Latin America, and the "practical consumption" of academic research in the United States by the government, the media, and the private sector. Workshop participants reached agreement on many matters of substance, particularly the nature of political and financial resources for research in the 1980s, but the discussions also revealed considerable differences in emphasis and priorities regarding topics for research, theoretical and methodological orientations, and disciplinary approaches.

Each of the sessions was focused on the questions of trends and priorities for research within specific disciplines. They began with a short summary presentation by the author of a position paper, submitted for each session, followed by a formal commentary, and then a general discussion. Participants did not adopt parochial attitudes. Presentations and discussions reflected breadth of concern and sensitivity to the wide variations in context that characterize different Latin American nations. Within this heterogeneous format there emerged an informal agenda of themes that the following rapporteur's report will adopt for its expositional structure. These themes may be briefly expressed as sets of interrogatives:

- (1) What have been the major directions and contributions of Latin American research to the areas of theory and methods? What anomalies have arisen in the use of theories in empirical research? What are the likely areas of new conceptual development? Have past methodological strategies proven appropriate and are we likely to see alternative methodological procedures adopted to study both new and old problems in the next decade?
- (2) What have been the dominant organizational characteristics for specific disciplinary studies in Latin America and for Latin American research in the United States? What changes are foreseeable in the immediate future? What is the state of recruitment and training of a new generation of scholars? What is the organization and orientation of work originating in private institutions, in state agencies, and among unaffiliated scholars?

- (3) What resources, financial and otherwise, will be available to support different types of research in the next decade? How will changes in resources affect both research topics and methods? What will be the relationship between Latin American research and the state?
- (4) What topics of research will stand out as priorities in the next decade? Which topics constitute a lacuna in past studies and should be encouraged as areas of inquiry?

This summary will follow the workshop format, using these four themes as an expositional framework for reconstructing the separate discussions. The report also integrates many points from the position papers and, for purposes of continuity, it does not attempt to differentiate systematically between observations made by panelists and discussants. The report, it should also be noted, was not circulated among workshop participants subsequent to its preparation, and represents the rapporteur's impressions of the workshop's discussions. The workshop's agenda and its participants are listed in the report's appendices.

Political Science

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. In his position paper on "Trends and Priorities for Political Science Research on Latin America," Robert Kaufman remarked that in the past twenty years the conceptual high-ground in political science has been transformed. One may witness this shift (if not one of formal paradigms, then at least one of perspective), by reflecting on the changing content of introductory courses. Roughly, the trend has been from traditional culturalist modernization theory to models emphasizing institutional structure (rooted in Weber's work), and a market model of power relations, to dependency theory. At present, argued Kaufman, these perspectives have proven themselves severely limited in their capacity to explain and predict recent history. Given this situation, at present the most encouraging specific studies are conceptually and methodologically eclectic, incorporating elements of both neo-Marxism and dependency theory. Good work must be sensitive to historical context and process. It should appreciate the need to move between levels of analysis that link local, national, and international factors as they relate to a specific problem. These "holistic" historical analyses are necessarily less parsimonious and more contingent than positivist theory and multivariate methods, but they promise greater sensitivity and insight regarding how political "outcomes" unfold.

This direction of theory is susceptible to teleological reasoning, but comparative research can serve as a check on this tendency. Kaufman observed that conceptual and analytic openness may nurture fads and fragmentation, but "boomlets and bandwagons" can have high initial yields. The concept of corporatism, for instance, "did much initially to highlight the way that, in some societies, interest intermediation differed from 'pluralist' or 'totalitarian' models," and it shed considerable light on state-party-labor relationships. Conceptual novelties are useful, but they should not be fetishized. (Nor should they be prematurely criticized, as Arturo Valenzuela observed in the case of dependency theory.)

Given the lack of any coherent hegemonic theoretical paradigm, we might encourage those directions of empirical research most likely to contribute to the construction of a new analytical framework. Less grandly, we must simply try to understand some very immediate crises and developments--in Central America, the Southern Cone, and elsewhere. Several suggestions for research directions come forth. First, there is historical research. This does not mean identifying a single unifying historical trait (such as Claudio Veliz's "centralist tradition") to explain the region, since the application of such concepts either distorts reality beyond recognition or ignores deviant cases. Historical studies must be informed by a comparative vision, especially cross-national comparisons. But explaining different historical trajectories would seem to be most fruitfully sustained by case studies of nations or institutions, not by large-scale aggregate data comparisons that reduce contextual meaning. Rather, approaches using small n's, with a theoretically informed selection process and in-depth focus, seem more promising. Such studies, however, can only contribute real advances if the analysis is nested in a macro-political economy perspective. The need in the 1980s is for a balance between macro studies and close in-depth case studies. Without the latter, said Kaufman, macro-political economy will grind its wheels forever; without the former case studies will lack content and meaning.

Topics for Research. Under conditions that resemble a paradigmatic crisis in the natural sciences, i.e., conceptual and methodological eclecticism and organizational fragmentation, one may identify some high priority research areas, Kaufman said. For example, mass political behavior, both in terms of insurgent social movements and mass political authority structures, has received close attention from sociologists and anthropologists, but not much from political scientists. Alexander Wilde cited a need for decision-making studies focusing on the formation of specific state policies and their outcomes. Other participants called for more attention to the processes of interest representation and the mediation of organized social struggle. The policies of repressive regimes, not only the processes but also the outcomes and implementations, require more careful analysis. Such studies would require investigation of how the state bureaucracy actually functions, what Laurence Whitehead referred to as the legal and institutional framework for policy. Related studies of leadership, of political and economic "elites," using the format of political biography, would be illuminating; noting the utility of such work for the disadvantaged sectors of Latin American society, Marianne Schmink pointed out that it is easier for U.S. scholars to undertake elite studies because the personal risk is less. Finally, Kaufman added, there is a need for macro-level political-economy studies, particularly in relation to comparisons of structural factors and ideology.

Context and Resources. The question facing Latin American political science in the 1980s will be how to continue as a coherent academic endeavor in an era of shrinking financial resources for research. Yet there is some room for optimism. The 1960s boom for Latin American research was in large part fueled by the availability of resources subsequent to the Cuban revolution. Growth in the previous decade, the 1950s, was associated with a period when a more democratic liberal political environment existed in many Latin American nations. In the 1980s it is not likely that either of these conditions will prevail in many countries. In a sense, as Jorge

Domínguez predicted, we are likely to see two trends: denunciatory social science and denounced social science. While Mexico and Brazil continue to have strong domestic research communities, political science elsewhere faces repression, restricted access to foreigners, and the elimination or exile of nationals whose work is viewed as threatening. Within this context, political science performs a vital social role.

Organization of the Discipline. In the 1980s, there will continue to be transformations in the institutional structure of the discipline and the conduct of research, partially resulting from external factors and partially reflecting the maturation of our theoretical vision and the incorporation of new methodologies. One likely trend will be the increase in collective and collaborative research--i.e., the further development of a "hyphenated" political science that links this discipline with economists, anthropologists, historians, and sociologists. Leadership here clearly lies within the Latin American research community, and this experience with collective work has produced a good deal of excellent scholarship. Collaboration thus represents one way to continue research with less funding. And in the 1980s, Kaufman urged, it should entail a restructuring of the disciplines themselves. "For economists, this means a recognition of the idea that 'factors of production,' understood abstractly, also reflect socio-political forces and power relations. For political scientists, it involves an attempt to address the question of how state and political forces are reproduced materially and the constraints implied by such a process." Ideally, such collaboration should also link U.S. scholars with colleagues in Europe and Latin America.

Reflecting historically on the development of the discipline, one can detect cycles of research productivity and thematic focus. One determinant of this pattern has been the impetus of political and economic crises--e.g., the Cuban revolution, Chile in 1973, Peru in 1968, and Venezuela in 1958. Scholars respond to crises, and this leads them to recognize ways they can link these events with their already existing research. Thus, until recently, Central America has remained a research backwater; it lacked a crisis. That condition is likely to change in the 1980s. Similarly, political-economy studies are now riding a crisis wave that will continue to be strong.

The conduct and quality of research is, of course, related to questions of personnel. Latin American political-science research will change in the 1980s due to the continued decline in graduate students, documented by Domínguez in his commentary, and the concomitant loss of financial support for graduate training programs. Many students are avoiding the field out of the conviction that politics and leadership are irrelevant or that the discipline of political science is in the service of evil. Recent events and developments reinforce this image. Moreover, Kaufman noted, political science has weak internal defenses: as a discipline it is exceptionally vulnerable to special interests--banks, companies, national security organizations--and its work is sometimes shaped accordingly, Whitehead observed.

Declining student recruitment has been exacerbated by the departure of some leading scholars from the field. Charles Anderson and Philippe Schmitter, for example, are now doing research in other areas. While

these personnel problems plague North American political science, the Latin American research community has been characterized by uneven development. In some nations--Peru, Mexico, Brazil--the combination of resources and an indigenous research community has made it relatively easy to do good work. Elsewhere the research community has been smaller, more fragmented, and less well-endowed. The next decade is not likely to see this pattern transformed.

Economics

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. Werner Baer noted that neoclassical models and econometric techniques based on behaviorist assumptions continue to dominate the discipline of economics, but that many of the most pressing problems facing Latin American nations are not amenable to current modes of analysis. Yet many economists, Baer said, continue to apply models and methods they learned during their graduate studies in the United States (i.e., price responses of agricultural producers, elasticities in trade, cost-benefit studies for state programs). This tendency is not universal, however, and some economists have come to recognize the need for alternative approaches. "The problem which thus often arises," as Baer posed it, "is this: what dictates research, the major problems of the region as perceived by specialists of the region or the problems which lend themselves to current methodological fashion?"

Economic realities of Latin America call for emphasis on institutional analysis. First, the role of state institutions, both as regulatory instruments and as direct controllers of production, has meant that the state's position in Latin American economies is substantially different than in many advanced industrial market economies. Conventional market models cannot capture the process of decision-making and resource allocation in this situation. The study of institutional behavior in this new social structure may provide more understanding of such problems as income distribution, agricultural productivity, and land tenure than would the mechanistic measurement of market forces.

Second, multinational firms tend to dominate many sectors of import-substitution industrialization. Thus the most dynamic growth centers, especially those oriented to export production, may be characterized by highly concentrated firm structures and centralized control. These firms tend to have vertically integrated production structures, but the production process itself is distributed internationally. The result is that decisions vitally affecting one nation's economy (investment levels, technology transfer, etc.) may be based on priorities of the firm that have little concern with the outcome for the host nation.

In this decade there should be a priority on "non-conventional" economic research--particularly on institutional case studies involving both the private sector and the state. At present there is little concrete information available, despite the existence of a substantial general literature. There are, of course, beginnings: Vaitos' work on MNCs, José Goldenberg's work on energy, Jorge Katz's analyses of Argentina, and Ratner's studies of private manufacturing in Brazil. Organizations such as the International Potato Center in Perú have also expressed concern about "appropriate technology" and failures of the "green revolution."

Solid studies of firms and state organizations will be required if we are to begin to have a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of economic structure and change in the region.

Conventional methods also play important roles, especially in the analysis of data used by governments to justify or legitimate past and future policy. One critical task is the debunking or demystification of official claims about economic performance. Under current political conditions much of the aggregate data is produced by economic institutions with ideological agendas. Figures are suspect and they often require adjustment and reinterpretation, notwithstanding their susceptibility to econometric analysis. Anthony Tillett gave one such example from Chile, where an independent examination of the state's own data compelled a change in the unemployment figures for Santiago from two percent to thirty percent.

As a rule, economists have not developed many methods of direct observation and investigation. The temptation is to use official data to make a verifiable statement about, let us say, the wage-price relationship. But this outcome, however innocuous its appearance, conveys an ideological message. To deal with basic issues, to confront questions of equity and productivity and state intervention, economists in the 1980s will have to address structural questions concerning the control of resources.

Topics for Research. Baer offered a lengthy set of priority research areas, beginning with the "internationalization of the Latin American economies" during phases of industrialization led by multinational corporations. There exists a considerable amount of general data on MNCs in Latin America, much of it produced by the United Nations, the World Bank, or the U.S. Department of Commerce. But these data-sets contain little information about decision-making, pricing, partnering, etc. What is needed are in-depth studies of various export diversification programs. Given MNC domination of export production, related studies must investigate determinants of investment, technology transfer, and production decisions within firms but at the international level. This approach calls for a focus on enterprises, both state and private, in both industry and agriculture. As Kaufman observed, it would require economists to engage in interdisciplinary work. But as Baer noted, this is more easily said than done: in economics there is little reward for work of this kind.

An additional topic for research involves the impact of changing energy costs, which have been enormous in Latin America. Industrialization began in an era of low-cost energy (especially for oil), and the production structure and consumption patterns of the region reflect this fact. Comparative studies of changing energy supply and cost impacts on national economies--i.e., inflation, income distribution, policy, etc.--deserve a high priority. State policy responses to energy costs entail trade-offs that also need analysis. For instance, Brazil's alcohol plan requires the transfer of land from food to energy production, but the social consequences of this policy and comparable policies in other nations have not come under scrutiny.

Many past economic studies have failed to appreciate the economic role of the state and public-sector enterprises in Latin America. State

ownership of core industry, utilities, and banks, is common. Shared control with foreign capital in certain investments is also frequent. Even so, economists have not yet produced substantial studies of these state enterprises or their position in the overall state structure. Future analysis, Baer suggested, should deal with the behavior of these institutions, their effects on other parts of the economy, and their relations both with each other and with MNCs.

This role of the public sector means that non-market forces and state interventions are extensive. Political bargaining power, not market forces, determines resource allocation and the competitive position of firms. Yet little is known of how these state enterprises function. Most economic theory and analysis of firm behavior is based on assumptions of a free market. We need both conceptual development and empirical studies about firms within the context of state participation.

Furthermore, the existence of this large public sector means that both public and private firms have modes of credit access and marketing strategies that vary from traditional neoclassical models. And, with large-scale participation of MNCs in particular sectors of the economy, questions of firm control, investment, labor relations, and technology choice are likely to be mediated by non-market forces. Once again, the need is for in-depth case studies that will establish intra-firm strategies, clarify the structure of relations between private and public institutions, and allow for conceptual and analytic approaches.

Agricultural production will be an area of critical concern throughout the 1980s. Land tenure continues to be highly concentrated in rural areas, where large numbers of people reside, while urban growth places increasing demands upon the agrarian sector. Industrialization policies have in the meantime redirected export earnings away from the countryside. These tendencies pose serious contradictions for Latin American economies and for state policy. The trade-off is equity vs. efficiency. State policy in agrarian reform and resource allocation to agriculture will necessarily shortchange one of these priorities, and it will continue to have a strong impact on the structure of production and distribution systems. According to Baer, we need more studies of state agrarian policy and its consequences for each of these areas.

Labor markets in Latin America also need research, partly because they have different modes of absorption and segmentation than in North America. There is a growing urban industrial sector, but we need to understand its implications for the structure of employment and unemployment. As a field, labor economics is relatively undeveloped in Latin America, Baer noted. It must confront institutions of organized labor that differ in origin and functioning from U.S. models. Most commonly, they have a corporatist origin which shapes their relation to the state and to capital. We need to comprehend how this history has affected labor markets and labor-capital relations.

Latin American societies continue to have highly skewed distributions of income, wealth, and control over property and political power. This theme should continue to be a focus of economic studies, especially those

which focus on state policies and structural variables as they relate to inequality and underdevelopment. Inequality of wealth and income is not unrelated to processes of political centralization and the impact of international crises, which often compel nations to enact measures that exacerbate uneven regional development. Export-development priorities, as well as import-substitution policies, have acted to increase concentration of wealth, income, and power. We require studies of policy impact, regionally and sectorally, if we are to address priorities of increasing economic equality.

This list of topics struck Laurence Whitehead as suggestive but disaggregated. Given theoretical and methodological concerns about the intellectual coherence of the field, he urged, we must address ideological issues on their own ground--addressing, for example, the resilience and dynamism of the Latin American economies, and the difficulties faced by liberal and radical analysis in explaining the economic successes of some authoritarian regimes.

Context and Resources. Recent declines in financial support for research promise to continue in the years ahead. What is to be done? Though one could construe the cuts in National Science Foundation funding as a crisis, the consequences may not be wholly disastrous. In the past, econometricians have enjoyed preeminence at NSF, and the withdrawal of resources may bring their reign to an end. Some see this as a positive development, said Baer, not as a cause of mourning. With regard to institutions such as the Ford Foundation and the World Bank, others suggested, LASA and individual scholars should apply as much pressure as possible. Smith pointed out that LASA is attempting to address the problem. We must begin to consider what influence we can exert over the distribution of these funds. That, said Baer, is the issue.

Organization of the Discipline. First, one must recognize that although the best economic research in Latin America entails consideration of political and sociological factors, this sort of "hyphenated research" is not rewarded by the dominant institutions within the discipline. Neither interdisciplinary nor institutional research carry prestige. And therefore they are ignored by many promising students. Economics does not provide any training in political economy. The career requirements and opportunities compel students into a pattern of using government aggregate data, rather than rewarding them for getting out and engaging in direct observation in the field.

Institutional organization is not unrelated to the structure of funding. The disappearance of the Ford Foundation from its traditional position has been forcing Latin American researchers to do contract research and nonanalytical research that is neither political nor critical, a tendency that results in ideological fragmentation. There is little communication between professional sects, exclusive little circles that dot the academic landscape. Thus for researchers to survive, they must limit themselves in order to gain acceptance from other members of their group. This leads to concentration and monopolization of resources by a small group of highly visible economists who show up at international conferences. And all too often, some feel, their concern is with status and prestige rather than a challenge to the existing order.

Sociology

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. In the early post-World War II era, North American sociologists approached their Latin American colleagues with a measure of condescension, assuming their own theoretical and methodological superiority. This situation has radically changed, Harley Browning noted in his paper "Small (Scale) is Beautiful: Notes on Survival Strategies for Sociology Latin Americanists." Latin American scholars have developed new concepts to understand the social reality of their region, they have criticized the biases of U.S. research, and they have gained the respect of their North American colleagues. But ironically, as U.S. sociologists have begun to adopt the assumptions of such advances as the dependency perspective, Latin American scholars have themselves moved beyond it and many now show the influence of European theorists (especially Althusser and Gramsci). In Browning's judgment, the Latins have taken the lead.

Sociologists in the 1980s will continue to work within a world-system approach. The advantages of the perspective, with its bridging of political, economic, and social phenomena, have already been recognized by specialists on Latin America--Portes, Walton, Jones, and Eckstein among them. This framework should encourage an increase in historical sociology that attends to the changing structure of the international division of labor--prompting study of such topics as international capital and labor circulation, both in the form of "runaway" industry and as labor migrations from underdeveloped to advanced industrial nations.

Some sociologists of Latin America have labored under the assumption that survey research was a methodological priority, the preeminent investigative instrument. This, said Browning, is no longer true. Critics have stressed the importance of historical structural forces, they have noted difficulty in operational measurement for cross-cultural research, and they have challenged the method's tacit focus on the individual as a unit of analysis and its frequent association with the "modernization" paradigm. So surveys can be troublesome, Browning said, but they can also be enormously useful. Several large-scale data sets are now available for secondary analysis, and national censuses (including the 1980 returns) permit fundamental monitoring of social structures and longitudinal study of change over time.

The weakness of survey analysis arises when it focuses exclusively upon "the data," assuming that the application of high-powered statistical techniques will reveal the truth. It will not. Such work requires additional information from historical accounts, direct observation, ethnographic study, and other such sources. Here the intent of the researcher shifts from concern with representativeness and comparison of subgroups to concern with pattern. The goal is to reveal the structure and meaning of those most significant patterns within a social setting, rather than dwell upon statistical variations.

One can envision the need for future small-scale, intensive studies of households, factory work, peasant production, migration, etc. It will be essential to avoid ethnographic "reportage" that is not theoretically informed--i.e., that operates only at a journalistic level. And a more

fundamental methodological caveat exists. It rests in the conceptual rigor of these studies. There have appeared, for example, rather glib discussions of the household or family or of "survival" strategies, but these concepts have not always been well defined. Such work might be encouraged for its heuristic value, but in the future, Browning felt, we must encourage more systematic and thorough conceptualization.

In the case of both surveys and in-depth case studies, the methodological problems are not insurmountable. Moreover, the various techniques of data-gathering must be seen as complementary, not as mutually exclusive. Researchers should make careful, conscious choices of appropriate techniques. For some problems, as commentator Wayne Cornelius pointed out in the case of migration, it will be necessary to settle for less than ideal strategies for data collection while cultivating explicit awareness of the magnitude and direction of resulting biases. Quantitative studies must be supplemented by qualitative data. Small-scale studies must be seen as not only legitimate but also essential. And in turn, they can be enriched by large-scale sample surveys which can establish the context and representativeness of social phenomena. Further corroboration can come from comparative and longitudinal work, as exemplified by recent studies of Portes and Walton.

Topics for Research. Latin American sociologists have reached broad agreement on the desirability for research on development and, in particular, on two critical realms: agrarian capitalism, and the formation of the state. Agrarian research and the rural-urban nexus have taken center stage. The transformation of peasant economies, proletarianization processes, peasant survival strategies, export agriculture, the role of MNCs, and finally modes of state intervention, all are critical themes for research in the rural sector. Studies of urbanization and squatter settlements will no doubt continue, but they have come to a theoretical and empirical plateau and will no longer dominate the field. And in political sociology, the rise of authoritarian regimes and the changing role of the military have brought renewed attention to the state and political relations. State structure and policy are not new topics within sociology, but future research will probably be distinguished by emphases derived from European Marxist theory, especially that of Althusser and Gramsci. We will need more studies of state policy and its effects, not only at the national level but also at the micro level (this echoed points made in the session on political science).

Other research themes will reflect broad changes in social relations and social structure in the 1980s. Sharp changes in fertility rates, already evident in Mexico, Colombia, and other Latin American nations, will require explanation and evaluation for their impact on the society. Another likely focus of research, Cornelius predicted, will be the complementary areas of capital and labor migration. Runaway shops, border industrialization programs, and the structure of MNC participation are already attracting considerable interest by sociologists. International labor migration has emerged as a topic of serious investigation only recently, but the magnitude of the phenomenon, its political and economic implications, suggest its priority as a future topic. Indeed, the Latinization of North American society may soon allow U.S. sociologists to research Latin America within the borders of their own nation. A host of

questions suggest themselves in this context. What leads sojourners to become settlers? What are the impacts on sending and receiving communities? What is the extent of acculturation that occurs? We will require further labor market studies, as well as research on housing use, education, conflict between interest groups, etc. before we can begin to understand the multiple ramifications of this process.

Context and Resources. The past experience of Latin American sociologists is likely to prove instructive in the near future. They often have survived and conducted their research under the combined constraints of repressive military regimes and limited and insecure financial support. The limitations are present and real, and they fall under three categories: (1) research directly forbidden or indirectly discouraged by the state; (2) restrictions on collaborative research by U.S. institutions and Latin American counterparts; (3) financial resources. The question is clear: as Browning succinctly asked, "What can be done?"

Scholars have limited means of responding to political restrictions and state censorship. One option is to appeal to world opinion. The second kind of restriction, on collaboration, derives from the historical legacy of political and ideological domination. Research institutions run substantial risks if they initiate joint projects with North American institutions. To circumvent this problem, North American scholars can rely on informal, individual contacts with Latin American colleagues. And as for financial restrictions, money was never abundant in the first place. In the future there will be less. Researchers will have to adopt strategies that are less dependent on large-scale financing. National and regional surveys will for the most part be impossible, but scholars can make good use of existing data sets. These include:

- (1) National censuses, mentioned above; CELADE is now an important repository of samples extracted from census data and available for study.
- (2) Large-scale surveys, particularly the intercensal results from Brazil and Mexico.
- (3) The World Fertility Survey in Latin America, which contains a great deal of data on household and family composition, labor force participation, etc.
- (4) I.L.O.-sponsored PREALC surveys of labor force behavior, which have data for in-depth study of both the formal and informal sectors.
- (5) Community surveys, including the Mexico Mobility Surveys, a multi-community survey of reproduction by CEBRAP, and various others of this sort.

Much future field research will probably be undertaken by small teams or individuals. This is not in itself a disadvantage. It calls for highly developed research skills and clear conceptualization, but it can also have the advantage of maintaining a relatively low profile. Given the potential for official hostility to sociological research, smallness of scale may become a survival strategy for researchers themselves.

History

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. The historiography of Latin America has produced exciting developments in recent years, and Charles Bergquist focused in his position paper on the appearance and potential consequence of two underlying trends. First is an appreciation for the relevance of dialectical analysis, for Marxist approaches to class struggle and dependency. The idea that development and underdevelopment within the world capitalist system represent not separate but interrelated phenomena is leading historians to reconsider 500 years of Latin American history with a new vision. The second trend is the growth and influence of social history, a substantive and methodological approach that has revolutionized the profession. The focus on everyday life, the expanding definition of relevant source materials to include work-a-day documents, and the appropriation of analytical concepts and quantitative techniques from the social sciences have provided new means of recapturing the past. Social history has shown both the feasibility and the importance of doing history from "the bottom up."

Both currents of contemporary historical research have drawn extensively on contemporary Marxist theory. In this respect, Bergquist maintained, they can be appropriately viewed as cultural phenomena related to the demystification of political and economic domination deriving from Third World liberation movements. Despite their common intellectual and activist roots (dating back to the 1960s), they have not yet, however, been brought together as integrated tools for research and analysis. This separation of trends is unnecessary and regrettable, since the excesses and deficiencies of each are, at least partially, corrected by the other. It is also, said Bergquist, a major challenge for the historical imagination.

The first approach, emphasizing economic change and the international division of labor, frequently suffers from economism and determinism. By neglecting the role of human forces (social classes, political parties, etc.) dependency analysis in Latin America undermined its own capacity to explain the history of economic change. Social history, on the other hand, has provided close analysis of peoples' daily lives, struggles, and modes of organization, but has in general refrained from consideration of objective structural limits on class interests and class capacities to organize and struggle. The question is how to bring these two theoretical and methodological approaches together and thus, in the process, transform understanding of our own history as well.

Historians of Latin America are in a promising position to achieve this integration, but difficulties lie ahead. Some important social questions and relationships do not fit easily within a Marxist framework: these, said Peter Smith, include such issues as race, family, and sex roles. Bergquist acknowledged the existence of the problem but defined it as one of intellectual development. Social and global history are susceptible to merger in some fashion, he contended. What we need is to confront these theoretical dilemmas in a direct, self-conscious way.

Boris Fausto expressed doubt about the adequacy of a normative dichotomy between Marxist and non-Marxist historians. Radical approaches to the past held sway between the two world wars, he recalled, but they

did not produce great history. Marxist scholars of that era generally adhered to rigid ideological outlooks. This is not to assert that Marxism does not offer a vital and valuable perspective; it is merely to say that it does not constitute the only viable approach.

In his commentary, Richard Sinkin agreed that historians have turned away from the study of kings, battles, and diplomacy, as they now attempt to tell the story of the "inarticulate." But in doing so, he cautioned, we should not abandon traditional narrative history. Bergquist concurred, saying once again that it is a matter of interpretation. The task ahead is to redo and rewrite diplomatic and cultural history by using new concepts and techniques of social history and macro-structural methods.

Herbert Klein observed that social history is rapidly demolishing old theoretical models of analysis. In the next decade, he said, many of our assumptions about "traditional" society will be destroyed. Already many conventional ideas about labor organization and hacienda life have been severely challenged. The nineteenth century, too, is suddenly appearing as a complex amalgam of social classes, a social order whose intricacy and dynamism have never before been revealed.

Topics for Research. The rise of the new social history and global structural perspectives is just beginning to define an agenda for historical research. One obvious topic is the history of the working class, which must be recaptured but not presented as a folkloric artifact. Most current work of Marxist historians stresses organizations--those institutions that working classes collectively created in their struggles to sustain themselves and their culture in the face of ruling-class strategies for social control and the dehumanizing tendencies of capital accumulation. The 1980s will present an opportunity for a more thorough treatment of Latin American working-class history and, therefore, for a deeper and richer history of the whole society. Questions of labor organization and union struggles must be embedded in an analysis that attends to the particular structural constraints acting upon popular movements. They require an appreciation of the obstacles, opportunities, and tendencies characterizing different stages of capital accumulation. Such perspectives have already made notable contributions to the historiography of the colonial period, in which researchers have placed detailed work on social, ethnic, and demographic change within the context of the global economy.

Some historians of Latin America are taking the insights of their craft outside the academy. In this role they can either speak for those "out of power," or, in many cases, they address themselves to those in power--to political and corporate decision-makers, who occasionally turn to historians for political risk analysis. As Sinkin asserted, contemporary questions of policy and policy impact all have crucial historical dimensions, and decision-makers often lack an awareness of this. Current negotiations with Mexico, for example, are taking place in an atmosphere that shows little historical appreciation of the process by which Mexican oil production became nationalized. A similar blindness permeates discussions of labor migration. In short, history has a rightful place in the realm of policy.

Context and Resources. The new and developing vision of Latin American history, as Bergquist described it, is directly related to the ways

in which our lives are being changed by the evolving world capitalist system. The liberation struggles of Third World people encourage us to formulate hitherto unasked questions regarding the nature of our economic system and its developing historical contradictions. The cultural assumptions undergirding rationalization of European imperialism have been challenged by a new understanding emerging from the perspective of Latin American and other Third World social scientists whose analysis is deeply informed by these liberation struggles. New capacities to see the world, to see history, do not exist independent from the surrounding conditions of class struggle.

One may interpret the distance between social history and structural analysis as a consequence of the unequal distribution of resources for writing history. Third World historians have largely ignored social history largely because the conditions of their work make it unattractive and difficult. Moreover, social history is expensive. Training and support of social historians in Third World nations is constrained by funding and institutional climates. The research centers, libraries, and computer facilities available in the developed world are commonly lacking in Latin America.

Even so, the conditions for historical research in Latin America are, in some respects, superior to those elsewhere in the Third World. A cadre of historians and social scientists exists with some degree of institutional support. These scholars are linked to international funding and scholars in the advanced capitalist nations. While their emphasis to date has been on structural and economic problems, viewed in light of the developing world system, they are aware of social history and they share with other historians the burden of a received theoretical and methodological baggage.

The climate and funding for these new trends in Latin American historical research will no doubt change in the 1980s. Ideological and professional pressures will increase. Funding will diminish. The resources of foundations, universities, and private institutes will decline. Competition for grants and positions will intensify. It was predicted by some workshop participants that ruling-class and imperialist "needs" and "interests" will inform the decisions of professional organizations seeking to survive. According to Klein, a historical "counterrevolution" has to some extent already begun. In Argentina, political authorities and right-wing groups have effectively eliminated social history, and the government is rewriting its own version of the past.

This reflects a deep new conservative current in Latin America. North Americans cannot ignore this fact. Conservatives are in the ascendancy now, while radical historians are at the same time capturing much of the past. These conflicts oblige North Americans to recognize and accept their social roles, to utilize all available resources to elucidate problems and issues for the benefit of colleagues in Latin America. There are, in the region, simultaneous feelings of hope and despair. Social history has bright intellectual prospects but it is under attack, and there are efforts to write an alternative history, one that will legitimate the hegemony of the military and the ruling class. Thus General Pinochet was able to say in March 1981, claiming historical justification: "When

we began we were isolated in our crusade. Now they [U.S. leaders] agree with us and we've not compromised our principles."

Organization of the Discipline. In Latin America, the organizational structure and modes of survival for historians have encouraged interdisciplinary, comparative, and global studies. Such work is much more developed there than in the United States. Indeed, most North American historians are not trained to do collaborative or global-systemic work, but transformations in the academic scene may lead to changes in this situation. Economic and political changes, Sinkin guessed, may lead to changes in the mode of operation and organizational structure of history as a discipline.

There is a continuing erosion of the field in regard to recruitment. Numbers of graduate students are down, partially due to the decline in academic positions, partially due to changes in the context of research, and partially due to changing conditions in the university in general. This forces historians to consider the role of personal praxis. It seems paradoxical, if not contradictory, to write traditional history and then attend a political demonstration. It might be understandable to withdraw from confrontation under these conditions, Bergquist said, although perhaps we must encourage just the opposite. It is commitment, even action, that brings clarity to the historian's vision.

Literary Criticism

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. The recent history of literary criticism, according to Jean Franco, displays several transformations in theoretical and methodological practice. In the 1940s and 1950s, U.S. academia reflected the hegemony of the "new" literary criticism, emphasizing close analysis of text or even of small elements of text. Restricted to the study and evaluation of a limited number of "canonized" literary texts, it was remote from its own culture. In the 1960s, the new literary criticism was replaced by structuralism, which introduced conceptual and analytical strategies from other disciplines--notably anthropology, linguistics, and psychology--and thus eroded the traditional boundaries of literary criticism. Structuralism and post-structuralism emphasized the "autonomy" of the literary text, taking literary criticism beyond the study of authorial devices. The tools for textual exegesis came to include phonemic, syntactic, and lexical patterns. Narrative guideposts of theme, character, and plot gave way to concern with enigmas, parallels, and anticipation. Attention turned to questions of order, duration, frequency, and mode, as well as stylistic techniques for creating a context of meaning. North American scholars have recently focused on the symbolic and semantic structures of texts, on assumptions about readers and their knowledge, and on the phenomenology of reading and interpretation.

This process of development in U.S. literary criticism did not initially take root in Latin America. Given the context of literary life, close textual analysis seemed to be an either irrelevant or decadent activity, at any rate a luxury. Emphasis rested on ethical criticism. Writers and texts were evaluated as moral acts and actors. Literature was judged mainly for its relevance to class and national interests. With "the revolution" viewed as an imminent reality, critics in Latin America throughout the 1960s demanded fidelity to social cause from literary artists.

This situation shifted in the 1970s, as interpreters recognized the limitations of demands for ethical purity and sought new critical modes. As commentator Elizabeth Garrels explained, they accepted the need for socio-criticism to incorporate structuralist and post-structuralist approaches in order to analyze avant-garde texts whose form and content could not be adequately understood as unmediated expressions of social and historical settings.

Structuralist analysis has broadened and transformed critical appreciation of the multiple levels of expression and communication that operate in a given piece of literature. In the new socio-criticism, this insight has been related to conceptual notions deriving from dependency theory. This breaking from the old boundaries, establishing an interdisciplinary base for literary criticism, allowed critics to see Latin American culture in terms of its own identity and not as an anachronistic and distorted reflection of Europe. Franco observed that it also paved the way for disposing of the sense of cultural hierarchy which dismissed popular culture as insignificant.

The concepts of "production" and "ideology," albeit vaguely defined, are central to the new socio-criticism in Latin America. For example, production has been used both to designate a functionalist view of culture and to indicate something almost equivalent to style. Althusser's analysis of ideology as "the imaginary representation of the subject's relationship to his or her condition of existence" has been influential, but it has been extended in original ways and linked with concepts drawn from linguistic analysis, identifying deep and surface structures in texts. Socio-criticism in Latin America has also developed analysis of processes of displacement and condensation within works to express the resolution of ideological contradictions found in the culture. In Angel Rama's view, ideology is a kind of structuring energy. Thus ideologies are not distortions, but means of perception characterized by possibilities and constraints of vision.

In the 1980s we can anticipate two related streams of theoretical and methodological development in Latin American literary criticism. The first is cultural criticism. The second is discourse analysis, which begins with the assumption that the text is co-extensive with the social; it is an ensemble of meanings. Producing a "reading" of these multiple levels of text, Garrels noted, places enormous demands upon the breadth and depth of the critic's knowledge. The fact of this difficulty--plus continuing resistance to these trends--means that the next decade will continue to feature older currents as well, with close textual readings, ethical analysis, and Eurocentric interpretations of Latin American literature. This last perspective is still evident in condescending discussions of Latin American literature's new "maturity." This contrasts with the truly radical redefinition of the discipline marked by its most progressive elements. That change, Garrels said, entails a democratization of the object of study, invalidating traditional canons which view the artist as "superior" and "autonomous," culture as "hierarchic," and the object as a "sacred" item independent of historical context.

The new socio-criticism involves a different process of abstraction and a different sense of the object of analysis. It stipulates that there

are historical and structural limits on the possibilities of the imagination. The developing field of discourse analysis is grounded in the intellectual initiatives of White's Metahistory and Burke's work on grammar and motives, but in Latin America it is most directly linked to the work of Foucault and Althusser. The advances of socio-criticism must be understood not as a new form of criticism that has sprung sui generis from Latin America. The theoretical and methodological tools developed in the structuralist school and the study of semiotics are now being used to analyze institutional discourse and everyday life.

These far-reaching transformations in literary theory have revised and amplified the critics' terrain of study, said Franco. Culture is no longer seen as an accumulation of texts; it is real. Criticism must therefore address broad and basic themes, and this commitment has already begun to produce some results. It has encouraged groups to study cultural resistance in authoritarian regimes; in Argentina, for example, CEDES is studying "fear." FLACSO is sponsoring analyses of ideology, how it is imposed and resisted. The extension of literary criticism into the realm of cultural and social phenomena brings the discipline fully into the world of historical struggles. Culture and struggle thus become part of the object of study, not just as a tool of manipulation, but as a conflict and transaction over preferred interpretations and "readings" between dominant and opposition groups. This type of discourse analysis is aptly illustrated in Hernan Vidal's article on "The Politics of the Body," which unravels the metaphors, ideologemes (Jameson's term for class fantasy), and narrative style of the Chilean junta's "Declaration of Principles" and the forms that oppositional writings have taken in response.

Topics for Research. Franco believes that these new developments are likely to encourage research in at least four areas: (1) everyday life; (2) the media; (3) popular culture; and (4) feminism.

Everyday life: The first studies of this genre are emerging from Chile, where José Brunner is documenting the transformation from a "cultura de compromiso" to a "cultura autoritaria." State control, intervention into family, leisure, etc., mean that these areas become new spaces for resistance as repression and censorship close off other arenas of struggle. Literary criticism can contribute to an understanding of how symbolic meanings are created and sustained within these institutional and cultural settings.

Media analysis: Although in the past these studies have been dominated by sociological analysis, especially simple theories of manipulation, recent work in Britain by Raymond Williams and the Birmingham Center for Cultural Studies is providing new outlooks and insights. The focus on the grammar and syntax of images, the specificity of different types of media technologies (cinema, TV, radio, newspaper), and their interaction in unevenly developed societies is opening up new understanding of the media's role in reproducing and transforming social relations. Themes and modes of symbolic meaning in oral culture become reflected in new form within other media. As Jameson demonstrates, "high" culture incorporates modes of perception encouraged by advanced capitalism and by its differentiation from mass culture's appropriation of realist plots and characters.

Popular culture: Popular culture presents a novel opportunity. In the past, intellectuals did not see mass culture as a valid field of inquiry. Now literary criticism seeks to span the interaction of technology and the intellect, attempting to interpret how media shape a sense of reality and determine the form of cultural resistance movements. Technologies offer different capacities for control, manipulation, and insurgency: censorship is stronger in television, for instance, than in the print media. Under various contexts of repression, a culture of resistance comes about in various forms, as Franco observed, some very hard to control--theater, music, jokes, etc.

Feminist criticism: This is certain to be a high priority in the coming decade. Women authors are numerous and the male-oriented conceptions of authorship come close to comprising a scandal. An emergent feminist criticism in the United States, in Mexico, and in other parts of Latin America is drawing on discussions of patriarchy, psychoanalysis, and the trends of socio-criticism. In the 1980s, it will explore how gender divisions operate within ideology, beginning with the assumption that capitalism and patriarchy have distinct histories and conditions of existence.

Context and Resources. The recent developments in literary criticism have revealed a dialectical relationship between a heterogeneous group of philosophers, anthropologists, and political thinkers. They express a broadening awareness that textual analysis of meaning has implications for all of the social sciences. Dependency theory encouraged a revision of critics' vision of Latin American culture, granting an integrity to the region's own intellectual history. Previous evolutionary models that postulated an inevitable sequence of literary stages derived from the European experience (e.g., from the epic to the bourgeois novel) were replaced by a focus on the conjuncture of social and economic processes that seemed to coincide with transformations in literature. It is this linking of literary criticism with political economy that has been the foundation of a new vision, both of the project of textual exegesis and the appropriate subject matter of the discipline. The definition of cultural productions that fall within the range of critics' attention now extends into territories more commonly associated with each of the other social sciences. This has markedly influenced Latin Americanists in the United States, where scholars have begun to work on cultural resistance in authoritarian regimes. But, as Garrels and Kenneth Maxwell pointed out, practical problems of academic survival--and the reward system in U.S. universities--make it hard to realize the full potential of the field.

Literary critics have come to recognize that cultural and social actors in Latin America today do not fit their old analytic categories. People are reading (that is, establishing meaning) in their own lives in new ways, albeit getting repressed for it. As they are drawn out of the safely removed confines of narrow and abstract structuralist criticism, critics are becoming linked to new social movements and popular culture. These movements seek cultural hegemony and are infused with a consciousness of the dangers deriving from culture imposed via media from abroad. Shifts in a global political economy have profound consequences for how people see themselves. Literary critics' capacity to analyze the production of meaning within this global pattern challenges, and sometimes clashes with, humanistic views of the individual.

Organization of the Discipline. Cultural criticism and discourse analysis greatly extend the horizons of literary criticism, and they imply a convergence of disciplines in ways that challenge the departmental organization of the university. In North American universities, close textual readings once represented the dominant mode of work. New trends demonstrate cross-disciplinary development, and in the future literary criticism will be increasingly dependent on other fields and vice versa. We should therefore encourage cross-disciplinary seminars and collaborative research.

Recent developments in literary criticism require extraordinary expertise--in languages, in the humanities, and in all of the social sciences. At issue is whether any single scholar can carry it out. Nor has close textual analysis itself been abandoned. Rather, the new movements mean that texts must be subjected to an even greater scrutiny. They have also prompted departments throughout the United States to bring out "popular culture" courses and diversify their own curricula.

There is resistance to these trends as well. Formerly predominant perspectives have strong exponents who proclaim that new tendencies are bankrupting the discipline. The field is therefore fragmented and full of acrimony. The worst splits in the social sciences sometimes seem minor, said one editor of an interdisciplinary journal, when compared to the disputations of literary critics. Especially in Great Britain, the conflict between structuralism and old literary criticism has been a bitter one. But it was not accidental. Old-school critics see themselves as "guardians" of culture, i.e., of what we are; now there is a challenge to what was sacrosanct. Ultimately, counseled Franco, we should see these polemics as a sign of health, not as a cause of demise.

Anthropology

Trends and Priorities for Theory and Methods. Despite the intermittent prominence of such scholars as Oscar Lewis, anthropology has for many years maintained a relatively low profile. At the moment, however, there is cause for optimism about the vitality and development of the discipline. There are profound divisions in approach, but in Latin American and Caribbean research each of the theoretical and methodological tendencies holds considerable promise. As June Nash explained in her position paper, these trends express both evolutions within the field and the appropriation and applications of concepts and methods from the other social sciences. They may be divided into four trends: ecological, structural, ideological, and developmental.

Ecological studies in Latin America, a time-honored focus of the discipline, were first represented in ethnographic studies that emphasized race, tribes, and folklore. Later work established correlations between environment and human biology, migration, social structure, and subsistence base. Now ecological work is analyzing the world capitalist system and its impact on environment and the social organization of peoples previously unaffected by markets and commodity production relations, as shown particularly in publications of Cultural Survival. World-system and dependency analysis is being combined in the study of regional and urban development, exemplified in Carol Smith's comparative studies of primate and provincial cities in Guatemala.

There is a mounting effort to link micro-studies with an appreciation for the multiple levels of socioeconomic structures that affect people's daily lives. One conceptual approach to the relationship between world markets and local populations stresses the articulation of modes of production. Structural analysis is thus related to dependency theory, but it rejects the notion of a single dominant capitalist mode of production. Rather, as Nash put it, the argument here envisions "different coexisting modes of production defined in terms of relations of production rather than exchange." Anthropological emphasis on cultural variation and the view from below is entirely compatible with such a theoretical perspective. However, the conceptual problems of this approach are compounded by the simultaneous participation of various family members in varying modes of production, so that it is hard to know exactly who is doing what. This calls for the sort of direct empirical observation which anthropologists have long been trained to do.

Trends in ideological analysis are revealing the social and political content of ritual. More forms of linkage between the two, for example in cults, are now becoming apparent, and anthropologists are increasingly willing to tie these phenomena into a larger context.

We are also witnessing the incorporation into anthropology of concepts borrowed from labor-market analysis. Concepts of segmented labor markets are encouraging anthropologists to study questions of social control, particularly as migrant workers interact with the native labor force. These ideas, Nash said, are prompting new work on "internal" labor markets and on class divisions, as well as other forms of social conflict.

Conceptual development has emerged as well in urban anthropology, especially as these studies have used micro-analysis to explore characteristics of the informal urban economy. Here anthropology's capacity to delineate complex forms of social organization within the household and larger social networks has proven invaluable. These urban studies, and the general trend of structural analysis, have led to wholesale rejection of once-commonplace polarities: rural/urban, peasant/proletariat, traditional/modern, etc. Current studies delineate indigenous modes of adaptation by utilizing network analysis, oral life histories, event analysis, and multivariate approaches. As these works appear, Nash predicted, we are establishing the foundation for comparative and longitudinal studies of social change in the 1980s.

Standards of scientific proof are hard to establish and sustain. Anthropology takes theory and methodological tools into the field and focuses on anomalies and contradictions. This sometimes leads to the perception that anthropological investigations are fragmented, impossible to replicate, and noncumulative. Additivity is a plausible criterion for methodological adequacy, Nash argued, but one that does not often get applied elsewhere in the social sciences, although there is a common genuflection to it by those who hold to an abstract ideal of proof. What anthropologists can do for verification, now that they are dealing with more literate populations, is to check their work with their subjects and do follow-up studies that focus on social change. The core of the discipline has been, and remains, ethnographical fieldwork. The methodology emphasizes direct contact with the marginal and oppressed. The present

demand, Marianne Schmink said in her commentary, is for more theoretical rigor, particularly under the influences of French structuralism (Levi-Strauss) and Latin Americans in exile in France after 1964.

Topics for Research. The transformations in anthropological research have led academics to investigate a variety of previously neglected topics. In this respect there has been a certain rapprochement of anthropology with the other social science disciplines. Economic anthropology reflects the recognition that such themes as policy-making and the state fall within the realm of anthropological research, once it turns from an almost exclusive focus on isolated and aboriginal cultures and toward concern with an articulated and integrated global political economy. Anthropology's "view from the bottom," Nash suggested, can reveal to policy-makers the variety and complexity of indigenous strategies for exploiting resources. It can also provide what is so often lacking: careful study of the process and actual impact of policy implementation.

Anthropologists are also prepared to study the impact of organizational policy in the private sphere on local populations. These studies, informed by dependency and world-system perspectives, can show how the multiple forms of domestic and cultural organization interact with capitalist production. The distribution of household labor not only demonstrates the complexity of survival strategies under conditions of social transformation linked to capital accumulation, but also establishes an avenue of research that integrates macro-structural studies with forms of class struggle in labor markets, the sexual and cultural division of labor, and even migration of capital and labor. Studies of MNC organizational behavior, such as Fernández's work on maquiladoras in Mexico, bridge all of these topics and provide an exemplar for anthropological research in the 1980s.

Experience in societies with less developed divisions of labor and less specialized social institutions has prepared anthropologists to view ideology and consciousness in flexible, relative, interpretive terms. During transformative periods, political, economic, and religious beliefs become related in ways that often justify and legitimate overt struggles. The most compelling and relevant dimensions of class interests may not be easily reduced to economic categories during these times. It is anthropologists whose tools and disciplinary traditions may provide the clearest insights to consciousness formation. Here traditional concerns with myth and ritual are being turned to analysis of contemporary social transformations. These various cosmologies become an architecture, a cognitive scaffold within which peasants and miners build coherent visions of the world and social change.

Ethnic consciousness has also provided an important focal point for social movements in Latin America. Future research, Nash predicted, will explore this relation without reducing ethnicity to either native-defined or theoretically-derived categories.

Context and Resources. There is a growing demand for trained ethnographers. These skills are in short supply in the other social sciences and, as Cornelius observed, researchers are increasingly aware of the need for this dimension in their studies. There is also a demand for anthropologists in bureaucratic organizations and in development programs--in state agencies,

social impact analyses (even, Sinkin said, in the Reagan administration!). As anthropologists focus attention on questions of power and privilege, they, like other scholars, will be obliged to address seriously the social functions of their scholarship. In this respect, Nash and Schmink asserted, they must realize their social responsibility to the people of Latin America and to the subjects of their studies. The relevant constituency for their work should not be limited to other academics and to those in power.

Ironically, just as the field is developing, the resources for doing cultural and economic anthropology are being cut, especially in the United States. The reduction in National Science Foundation funds will certainly have an impact on the capacity of researchers to continue their work. There appears, to some, to have been a selective bias in the allocation of these cutbacks. Physical anthropology is being favored over research with immediate political relevance.

The popular perception that anthropologists concentrate almost exclusively on isolated cultures and primitive groups has worked to its tactical advantage in Latin America, especially in nations such as Argentina where other social science disciplines (sociology and psychology) have been targets of repression. Anthropology escaped because it was less visible and viewed as relatively safe. As a result, critical social scientists have been attracted to anthropology and have begun to influence it, politicize it. Schmink forecast that the discipline's image as a distant, abstract, and nonquantified social science will be changing in the 1980s.

Organization of the Discipline. In anthropology, as in other social-science research, interdisciplinary collaboration is much more common in Latin America than in North America. In part, the field has gained breadth of focus because of the influx of scholars from other disciplines. Exiles who studied in Europe brought back the influence of French Marxism and structuralism. One can see a parallel development in U.S. and Latin American anthropological study, with Latin America acting as the source for a research agenda. That agenda, and the general posture of the discipline, have contrasted with the other social sciences. This difference may be attributed to the fact that anthropology is principally an area-studies discipline, in which researchers must live in the place that they wish to study. This gives anthropologists a close feeling of identification with their subjects, one that may limit the much-honored synthetic and abstracting practices of the other social sciences, but which relieves anthropology of the role of "guardian of high culture."

There are two further organizational priorities in the discipline. These refer to training and personnel. First, it is crucial that people with jobs outside of academia (e.g., government employees) be brought into training sessions for exposure to the insights of anthropological studies. Second, there is necessarily going to be a greater focus on applied programs in response to cutbacks in academic jobs. It will be difficult to get people to retool and work outside of university settings. Yet, as academic positions stagnate and the demand for good ethnographers grows, both in the other social sciences and in business and government, the flow of anthropological personnel into these nontraditional career patterns and research settings will surely accelerate.

The Context for Social Science Research in Latin America

A paper by Anthony Tillet examined "The Changing Context of the Social Sciences in Latin America." The roles of social science within a society are subject to considerable variation. Social science researchers, their subject matter, and the content and form of their analyses, are deeply influenced by the societal context. In an environment in which pluralism and critical analysis are supported, where economic security and freedom from reprisal are sustained, the social sciences are open to conjecture, discussion, and the free dissemination of their findings. In Western industrial market economies, social science has been recognized as an important public institution for two centuries, although undergoing important changes during that time. Yet there are trends within these societies, as well as in socialist and peripheral capitalist nations, that indicate elementary misunderstanding of the contribution that an unfettered critical social science makes to the general welfare. The interaction of social science and state institutions has led to the creation of a complex infrastructure that limits public knowledge of social-science research. Increasingly, said Tillet, social science is viewed by those in power, by those with a capacity to both nourish and constrain analysis, as an ideological or technological tool to further social engineering.

Influences on social science research, Tillet suggested, fall under three general headings: rights, universities, and the state. Although the relationship between elements of this triangular foundation for the social sciences in North America and Europe has until recently been either benign or beneficent, it now threatens to reduce their autonomy and security. By contrast, social science in Latin America has only infrequently enjoyed so fortunate a context, although even there the situation has deteriorated in recent years. In the 1950s and 1960s, Latin American governments embraced development goals and exhibited degrees of tolerance. There was growing state support, and university settings led to the flourishing of social science in many nations. Research institutes appeared, and international funding provided further cause for optimism.

The rapid growth of student populations and demand for social studies in the 1960s were associated with government support, but they also gave rise to political militancy in the schools and struggles for university autonomy. The economic crises of the 1970s (recession, inflation, and unemployment) cut the state's resources and its inclination to continue large-scale expansion of the universities. The post-coup military governments of Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, and Argentina all moved to control the universities, and, especially, to limit the role of the social sciences. University enrollments have since declined and many of the best students are shying away from social-sciences disciplines.

There are, of course, wide variations in these patterns. For example, Brazil seems to be at a stage where centers of research are flourishing, a large research literature is being disseminated, a Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science thrives, and where, finally, there is an annual festival of criticism of the regime. In Cuba, the state has made a decision that the social sciences are important and deserve strong support; the climate is highly utilitarian, however, focusing largely on applied science. In Mexico, Tillet surmised, there is at present better funding for social science than in the United States.

Elsewhere in Latin America the situation is decidedly worse, although better than in some regions, such as Africa, where the indigenous research community is miniscule. In some nations, such as Argentina, it is not only social science that has been affected; repression has hit physics as well. In Chile, some traditional styles of political science continue at La Católica in Santiago, but the sociology department's offices there were bulldozed by the government in January 1981. Philosophy and history departments are now in two separate locales in the city. The government has exercised a concerted effort to fragment the social sciences; yet they persist. The only discipline in Chile that enjoys the government's support is economics. It has grown, Arturo Valenzuela reported, but in a narrow and subservient form, dominated by monetarists who act as managers of state agencies. The ideology of conservative economics is changing society, the universities, and the universities' relationship to society.

As institutional settings have changed, various strategies for survival have emerged. Independent research centers have sprung up in Southern Cone countries. Former university personnel have begun working collectively, in small groups, on small budgets, often going without salaries. They have been willing to point out the impact of state policy and raise policy issues, but they are compelled to exercise self-censorship since open criticism would not be tolerated. Often they test the waters by presenting papers at conferences; if there is no response from the government, then they consider publication. Occasionally a visiting foreign scholar may be informally commissioned to talk with government officials and get a sense of what work will be accepted within the "rules of the game." Of course, the price for this activity is high. Continual concern with self-preservation often produces self-condemnation. The long-term social and psychological dimensions of this situation can be devastating. The realization that authoritarian regimes are not temporary phenomena is threatening intellectual commitment, too, as researchers see no hope for improvement over the course of their entire lives. They begin to doubt themselves, their assumptions, and their purposes. Having to acknowledge the durability of oppressive regimes, they are forced to reevaluate their most basic convictions. Frequently, Tillett noted, a split develops between those who stay and those in exile.

The breakdown of social values that support social-science research combines with systematic governmental repression to produce a growing social illiteracy in Latin America. The government does not want social information; it does not care for accuracy. In Chile, the junta is funding a rewriting of high-school history books. In other countries, there is a widespread shortage of agricultural technicians and a general collapse of research capabilities. Thus the knowledge required for effective policy formulation and implementation is lacking.

The survival strategies and new forms of research organizations that have developed within this context of repression and scarce resources constitute what may be termed an "informal science sector." This is the result of heroic efforts by social scientists in a world that for them is bleak and even catastrophic. For funding, they must rely on international donors, of which there are precious few. Consequently, they are forced to compete with each other for this money. They also spend inordinate amounts of time and energy in search of funds, so that there is little opportunity

to do research. Frustration builds. Facilities add to the discouragement. And although many of the studies being produced at present find their way to colleagues in the United States, they do not have any reliable means of dissemination.

North Americans ask themselves what they can do to aid their colleagues in Latin America. The options are several. First, as Jean Franco suggested, they can work within their own universities to set up teaching programs, such as summer-abroad programs, wherein they appropriate internal funds to assist in paying the tuition for students and scholars who come from Latin America. They can also attempt to influence agencies such as CEPAL at the United Nations and even the OAS. They can also attempt to find funds in the United States for conferences and seminars. At present U.S. funding agencies are reluctant to provide support of this kind, although LASA is attempting to address this question of priorities. Finally, North Americans should encourage the accumulation and distribution of research findings and documents. The library situation is a critical constraint on scholars working in Latin America. It was suggested, too, that the Latin American Research Review should publish a list of reports produced each year by the various independent institutes. That alone would enhance the exchange of information and awareness of others' work. These international links must be nurtured and sustained in every way possible. They not only support individuals; as Peter Bell said, they can also serve to provide the sort of legitimation and visibility that can ensure their survival.

Practical Consumption of Academic Research

Concluding the workshop was a panel discussion featuring representatives from different institutions that "consume" social-science research. Panelists James Buchanan, Susan Kaufman Purcell, Paul Sacks, and Patricia Ellis presented their views of the problems which they have in securing usable information from academics. A general discussion followed.

James Buchanan of the State Department urged academics to consider the potential practical impact of their work. This is not to assert that social science must necessarily have a direct practical utility, he said, either for the State Department or the government in general, in order to be judged worthwhile. The question is what policy-makers see as the practical and useful contribution of social-science research. The State Department makes its own effort to produce studies through its research division, which also has the responsibility of keeping current with the academic literature and maintaining contact with the university community.

People at the State Department generally want to know what is "up to date," what is the best quality work (in English), and they want it in less than 25 pages. Why? Time is of the essence. Officers at the State Department do not have time to read everything that comes across their desk. There is simply too much. Therefore the packaging of information becomes important. Government officials read articles, not books. They want syntheses. They do not want to wade through jargon. They have no concern with theory. They have trouble reading tables, so that findings should not be presented in undigested quantitative form. They are interested largely, almost exclusively, in problems seen as current.

Bureaus at State are often asked what type of research they would like, and that is what gets funded. One of the best ways they have found to get information from scholars is to organize small symposia of perhaps a half dozen academics; for these meetings the State Department asks scholars to think about specific problems and requests, usually, ten-page speculative papers. If academics want to have a practical impact on the State Department, then they must know how to get their research to the policy makers. One way to do this, of course, is for researchers to take government jobs. Another way is to establish informal personal contacts with policy makers.

Susan Kaufman Purcell, herself a scholar working at the State Department, agreed that time is the issue. There is a deep prejudice in government against academics, she noted, because they are viewed as long-winded; they never get to the point. State Department officials do not want 20 pages or even two pages on the history of Mexico; they want two paragraphs. Scholars are seen as impractical and out of touch with reality. Moreover, foreign service officers usually have more current information than academics on specific problems and conditions in the various countries. What, then, do they need from academics? What kind of writing is useful?

In response to her own question, Purcell suggested that one approach would be for academics to write about alternative scenarios for the near future. Analysis of current developments is commonly dismissed because State Department officials assume, often correctly, that their own information is superior. The real need is for academics to write about the historical currents and trends in the society--that is, about the contextual framework for interpretation of data--and to make short-run extrapolations and projections. This is most easily achieved in brief interpretive articles, or in personal contacts with individuals at State. Small symposia are valuable tools for communication with these decision-makers.

There is also an ideological difference, real or imagined, between Washington and academia. Policy-makers are often unlikely to turn to scholars for guidance and advice. Scholars working on Latin America are usually seen as "far left" and thus irrelevant. LASA itself is seen as very radical. At present there seems to be a deep and damaging split between those who shape U.S. policy toward Latin America and those who produce studies of Latin American society and politics. As an academic, Purcell urged her colleagues to consider taking government jobs for a year or so in order to learn the other side of the street.

Paul Sacks, from the consulting firm of Multinational Strategies, Inc., lamented the almost complete absence of exchange between academia and business. U.S. academics know little about the needs and goals of U.S. companies and the types of information which they want and could use. Businesses want information on the short- and medium-term future. They also want people to take tough positions and defend them. Their perspective on the world is decidedly "firm-centric": they want to know what will affect the firm. They have little interest in theoretical elegance per se. They are concerned with immediate practical issues. This, Sacks said, might be thought of as "supply side" political analysis.

Naturally, business leaders need to know how stable or unstable a society might be. But the implications of instability for business can be quite varied. On some occasions, Sacks pointed out, instability may create excellent business conditions.

The only way for academics to understand such concerns is to work with the business community, but opportunities do not abound. The research and development budgets of most MNCs are small. Companies tend to rely on external sources of information, rather than their own research departments, but they do not have overwhelming confidence in governmental sources. Thus the emergence of "political risk analysis," which is not, Sacks warned, a blue-chip industry itself. At present there are very few scholars doing this sort of work. What academics need to do is to convince the corporations of their utility, much as econometricians did in the recent past.

Patricia Ellis, from the MacNeil-Lehrer Report, stated that the media have little use for academics. MacNeil-Lehrer is one of the few television shows to use academics on a regular basis, either as sources of background information or as participants, on the program. As in the case of other consumers of social research, media people place a high priority on conciseness and clarity of exposition. The most productive role for academics, she suggested, would be to put current events in perspective. It is important to offer a special "angle" on a story, however, not just furnish background for its own sake.

Scholars should be out there getting in touch with the media, Ellis urged; they should contact producers who set up the programs. Media staffs have few ways of knowing who is working on what. Stories break rapidly, and producers and editors most often pursue personal contacts. As a result, they frequently miss the best people.

Following the panelists' presentations came a wide-ranging and sometimes intense exchange of views. With regard to academia and government, Abraham Lowenthal suggested that the State Department hire a Latin American specialist to read all cable traffic and write a memo, say once a week, critiquing the assumptions in those messages. This is the role of the internal critic. That, Buchanan countered, is precisely what the research division is designed to do, but it is not clear that this system works. Critical voices are not always heard within bureaucracies. For this very reason, Purcell added, academics tend to stay away from such institutions as the State Department: when they question basic assumptions, they are dismissed as "far left." Ironically, she continued, academics who work in the government are seen by other scholars as being on the "right," so that they wind up in a no-win situation. One explanation for this ideological problem, Buchanan said, comes from discourteous treatment of government representatives at academic conferences.

Werner Baer forcefully rejected the demand that academics write very concisely, since this can corrupt their work. The world is a complex place and often requires complex analysis. Scholars begin to feel that their role in government would be that of public-relations experts for unenlightened bureaucrats. Moreover, Baer and others declared, we should not assume a natural collaboration between academia and government. This is ideologically difficult and empirically incorrect. Scholars commonly

have a role in opposition to government and business. We must ask who we are and what we will do. Consulting is one thing, as Jorge Domínguez asserted, but writing classified documents or speaking on behalf of the government is something else again. Academics must not restrict their audience to those in power. It is not simply a question of tailoring expository skills to the needs of the official or corporate world; it is also a matter of commitment and belief. Many academics will not allow themselves to do this kind of work. Domínguez proposed that scholars seek alternative consumers for social research--unions, cooperatives, mass-based organizations--so that they could reconcile intellectual activism with personal ideology.

Commenting on the business community, Paul Sacks stressed the importance of understanding that corporate employees go to work for a company. They enter the relationship as outright mercenaries, as partners in internal coalitions over which they have little if any control. Academics (like others) must ask themselves at the beginning who they are working for. There is no need to be obsequious, though, or to try to find out what findings are preferred. It is possible to resist pressures for simplistic formulations. Working in a business, however, one cannot apply the moral and ethical guidelines of the university. As Sacks facetiously said, talking about ethics among consultants is like searching for beaches in Alaska.

Corporate executives do not, as a rule, pay much attention to political risk analysis. There are some consulting firms, "beltway bandits" in the language of the trade, who provide very elegant mathematical models of sociopolitical phenomena. But most corporations are not misled by this pretentiousness and they will not spend much money on it. Besides, it does not get read, similar to the cables that come into the State Department. Why? Businessmen form something of a caste, and they do not trust people who come from the outside. Academics, like many others, do not belong.

As for the media, the problem is one of communication. If producers want to use academics, either as consultants or otherwise, they have to know whom to invite. Ellis repeated her earlier point: it is up to academics to reach out to the media. Editors and journalists would love to have this happen. But they will continue to need information from academics in an organized, concise format--and it must be timely, as well.

Summary Reflections

For two intense days, participants seized avidly on the opportunity to discuss concerns of pressing professional interest. There was much give-and-take and not infrequent disagreement, but a markedly collegial spirit underlined the discourse and dialogue. And through the course of the proceedings, at least three general points of consensus emerged.

One such point, however basic it might seem, was a recognition and reaffirmation of the intellectual integrity of Latin American studies. The papers and discussions convincingly demonstrated that Latin American specialists are pursuing crucial themes of theoretical importance, exploring uncharted empirical territory, and conducting meaningful research--whether or not it appeals to monied sources or the policy-making community.

Revealingly, colleagues from the hard-core social sciences--economics, sociology, political science--felt somewhat less sanguine about their fields, perhaps because the decline in support from foundations and the government conveyed a negative judgment. In contrast, representatives from the humanities, which had never had such support in the first place, expressed optimism and even ebullience about the prospects for their disciplines. (To some, the moral seemed plain: what you never had you do not miss, and intellectuals should not rely on outside sources for a sense of validation.)

Latin Americanists currently occupy positions of respect and even leadership within their several disciplines, and there is every indication that this situation will continue. In short, the imposition of financial and institutional constraints (and cutbacks) has not undermined the intellectual vitality of the field. It has simply made the task more difficult.

Second, the sessions revealed the value and vigor of interdisciplinary work. At the outset, some participants expressed skepticism about the structure of the meeting, publicly and privately wondering what representatives from such diverse fields would have to say to one another. The substance of discussions quickly laid these doubts to rest. Not only are there common, or at least overlapping, sets of conceptual concerns, most conspicuously evinced in the universal preoccupation with the world system and its effects on Latin American society. There is also a widespread acceptance and use of methods and techniques from other disciplines. Literary critics employ the tools of linguistics, psychology, and sociology. Anthropologists borrow from medicine and economics. And economists, as they ponder the role of the state, are beginning to acknowledge the limitations of econometric model-building and to explore structures of political and social organization. For area specialists in general, and for Latin Americanists in particular, academic disciplines have come to represent obsolete institutional conventions rather than useful categories of intellectual endeavor. The goal is not, however, to reject the traditional disciplines; it is to build upon their foundations.

Finally, the meeting produced a heightened awareness of the ethical implications of research on Latin America. North American scholars must seek knowledge not only for intellectual or aesthetic satisfaction. They also have social responsibilities, and obligations pervade all aspects of professional activity. Reflecting on the proceedings, then LASA President Peter Smith would take explicit note of this: "As funds from conventional sources dry up, the availability of research contracts (for such things as 'political risk analysis') may impose tacit priorities on the scholarly agenda. The official designation of oppressive regimes as 'authoritarian' instead of 'totalitarian' in order to deemphasize human rights has disturbed political scientists who might agree with the categorization but never accept the conclusion. And at a time when colleagues in Latin America struggle and suffer to maintain their intellectual integrity, North Americans become aware that they speak through their silence as well as their words."

Agenda

Workshop on Trends and Priorities for Research
on Latin America in the 1980s

May 1-2, 1981

Friday, May 1

"Trends and Priorities for Political Science Research on
Latin America"

Robert Kaufman, Institute for Advanced Study

Commentator: Jorge Domínguez, Harvard University

"Trends and Priorities in Economics Research on Latin
America"

Werner Baer, University of Illinois

"Small (Scale) Is Beautiful: Notes on Survival Strategies
for Sociology Latin Americanists"

Harley L. Browning, University of Texas

Commentator: Wayne Cornelius, University of California,
San Diego

"Latin American Historical Studies in the 1980s: One View"

Charles Bergquist, Duke University

Commentator: Richard Sinkin, University of Texas

"Trends and Priorities for Literature on Latin America"

Jean Franco, Stanford University

Commentator: Elizabeth Garrels, MIT

"Anthropological Research in Latin America in the Eighties"

June Nash, CUNY

Commentator: Marianne Schmink, University of Florida

Saturday, May 2

"The Climate and Context for Research in Latin America"

Anthony Tillett, IDRC

Commentator: Arturo Valenzuela, Duke University

Panel: "On the Practical Consumption of Academic Research"

James Buchanan, Bureau of Intelligence and Research,
Department of State

Patricia Ellis, MacNeil-Lehrer Report

Susan Kaufman Purcell, Office of Policy Planning,
Department of State

Paul Sacks, Multinational Strategies, Inc.

APPENDIX

TRENDS AND PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICA IN THE 1980s
 Sponsored by the Latin American Studies Association
 and the Latin American Program of the
 Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
 May 1-2, 1981

Participants

Werner Baer
 University of Illinois

Peter Bell
 Inter-American Foundation

Douglas Bennett
 The Wilson Center

Charles Bergquist
 The Wilson Center

Harley Browning
 University of Texas

James Buchanan
 Department of State

Wayne Cornelius
 University of California,
 San Diego

Carl Deal
 University of Illinois

Jorge Domínguez
 Harvard University

Ariel Dorfman
 The Wilson Center

Patricia Ellis
 MacNeil-Lehrer Report

Boris Fausto
 The Wilson Center

Jean Franco
 Stanford University

Elizabeth Garrels
 Massachusetts Institute of
 Technology

Jorge Heine
 The Wilson Center

Robert Kaufman
 Institute for Advanced Study

Herbert Klein
 The Wilson Center

Abraham F. Lowenthal
 The Wilson Center

Kenneth Maxwell
 The Tinker Foundation

June Nash
 City University of New York

Susan Kaufman Purcell
 Department of State

Riordan Roett
 School of Advanced International
 Studies,
 Johns Hopkins University

Paul Sacks
 Multinational Strategies, Inc.

Marianne Schmink
 University of Florida

Peter Smith
 Massachusetts Institute of
 Technology

Richard Sinkin
 University of Texas

Anthony Tillett
 International Development Research
 Centre, Ottawa

Participants (continued)

Arturo Valenzuela
Duke University

Giles Wayland-Smith
Allegheny College

Laurence Whitehead
The Wilson Center

Alexander Wilde
The Wilson Center

Rapporteur:

William Canak
Brown University