

Number 37

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES:  
NATIONAL NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

By Louis Wolf Goodman  
Yale University

Contents

Summary

Introduction

Post-World War II Needs

Needs in 1979

The Current Capacity to Meet National Needs

International Studies and the Study of Latin America

Re-designing the Current Capacity to Meet National Needs

The Pool of Qualified Individuals

The Involvement of Specialists in Knowledge Creation through Basic Research

The Role of Established Area Centers in International Studies

The Role of Specialized Organizations in International Studies

Structuring Federal Support to Meet National Needs

Conclusion

Author's note: For presentation to the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. A preliminary draft was discussed at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. on April 25, 1979. The author would like to acknowledge valuable comments made on that draft by G. Reid Andrews, Colin Bradford, Albert Fishlow, Rose Lee Hayden, Lewis Lazarus, Abraham F. Lowenthal, Christopher Mitchell, G. Michael Riley, Alexander Wilde, John Wirth, and the financial support of the Inter-American Foundation. Inquiries may be directed to the author c/o The Council on Latin American Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520.

## ABSTRACT

Since World War II national needs related to foreign languages and international studies have evolved as the U.S. and other nations have become increasingly interdependent. The creation and diffusion of knowledge about other people and world areas has gained in importance and is being carried out by individuals, scholars, university centers, and other specialized institutions. These efforts have been remarkably successful. To serve future needs a strong structure is required which concentrates resources in a relatively small number of centers and makes them available to universities, other institutions, and scholars throughout the nation. Special attention should be paid to knowledge creation through basic research (when feasible through international scholarly collaboration) and to the diffusion of that knowledge through broad based teaching and citizens education.

Comprehensive recommendations to achieve these ends are proposed throughout the essay. These touch on the structure of support for individuals, universities, and other organizations; the nature of relations between universities and other organizations; the promotion of basic research through international scholarly collaboration; and the nature of federal support. Stress is placed on the distinctive benefits accruing from the study of Latin America and the Caribbean.

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES:  
NATIONAL NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

By Louis Wolf Goodman  
Yale University

Summary

This essay discusses the evolution of national needs and opportunities in foreign languages and international studies in the United States since World War II, with special reference to Latin America. In doing so it presents the following recommendations:

- 1) That a study be commissioned to collect data on international studies resources in the United States.
- 2) That new specialists continue to be trained, but in smaller numbers.
- 3) That training costs be funded at realistic levels.
- 4) That information be collected to judge the utility of M.A. Certificate programs.
- 5) That a program of regional seminars be instituted to maintain and upgrade competence of area specialists.
- 6) That a program of small grants be instituted to allow dispersed scholars to attend such seminars and to use the facilities of area studies centers.
- 7) That a program of short-term overseas grants be instituted to maintain and upgrade existing competence.
- 8) That a network of major research libraries be created to coordinate existing resources and to reduce costs of international acquisitions.
- 9) That funding of citizens' education programs be increased to permit more involvement by fully trained specialists.
- 10) That a national program of internships be created to involve university-based specialists with other specialized organizations.
- 11) That individuals in specialized institutions receive training in universities in international studies and foreign languages.

Recommendations Regarding Basic Research

- 12) That special attention be paid to knowledge creation through basic research.
- 13) That, when feasible, special preference be given to internationally collaborative basic research.
- 14) That the scope of the ISTC be expanded to include research in the social sciences and the humanities.

Recommendations Regarding University Area  
Studies Centers

- 15) That the total amount of funds allocated to area studies centers be increased.
- 16) That quality of service to national needs be the sole criterion for the designation of centers.
- 17) That the funding of centers be stabilized.
- 18) That doctoral training programs be reduced except in fields with good employment prospects for Ph.D.'s.
- 19) That undergraduate teaching centers produce materials for nationwide use.
- 20) That center resources be linked to citizens' education programs and to specialized organizations on a national scale.
- 21) That internships and mid-career training programs be created to link centers and specialized organizations.
- 22) That special attention be paid to the consequences of declining university enrollments for university-based international studies programs.
- 23) That centers both support intellectual activities and serve administrative functions.

Recommendations Regarding Specialized  
Organizations

- 24) That new specialized organizations be created where needed, especially to promote basic research and international scholarly collaboration.
- 25) That attention be paid to coordinating the activities of existing specialized organizations.
- 26) That certain domains be left to functionally specialized organizations.



Recommendations Regarding Federal Funding

- 27) That general support for foreign languages and international studies be increased.
- 28) That necessary budget cuts be made according to substantive priorities rather than using across-the-board bases.
- 29) That federal funds be used to stimulate support from other public and private sources.
- 30) That administrative complexity of federal agencies be reduced without damaging program objectives through excessive rationalization.
- 31) That advisory panels be used in the administration of federal resources.

\* \* \*

These recommendations and current trends in higher education suggest that resources be concentrated in a relatively small number of area studies centers each containing a "critical mass" of scholars capable of making important contributions to the creation of knowledge about other peoples and world areas. However, it also suggests that a well-coordinated network be created to effectively diffuse that knowledge. Such a network would include the following components:

1. A program of Ph.D. fellowships smaller than those currently in place.
2. A system of research-oriented area studies centers and major research libraries with funding above current levels.
3. A small number of teaching-oriented area studies centers which produce material for nationwide use.
4. Nationally dispersed citizens' education programs utilizing fully trained specialists and area studies centers.
5. Specialized extra-university organizations to promote international scholarly collaboration in research.
6. Programs coordinated by centers and regional area studies associations making center resources available to specialists through the nation.
7. Programs coordinated by centers and specialized organizations linking academic and extra-university servicing of national needs.

## Introduction

Foreign languages and international studies experienced remarkable growth in the United States in the twenty-five years following World War II. The United States had assumed the dominant position among industrialized nations despite the fact that it possessed relatively little knowledge of other nations and cultures. Its population and economy also expanded dramatically during that twenty-five year period, as did its university enrollments. The perceived need for the creation and diffusion of knowledge about other areas of the world received substantial financial support, first from the Ford Foundation, which created the Foreign Area Fellowship Program in 1952, and then from the federal government with the National Defense Education Act of 1966. The academic community's response to this national need antedated large-scale funding, with the formation of the Social Science Research Council's Committee on World Area Research in 1946, and the establishment of the Far Eastern Association in 1948 (now the Association of Asian Studies), and continued with the founding of the African Studies Association in 1956, and the Latin American Studies and Middle Eastern Studies Associations in 1966. As a result, during those twenty-five years, there was striking growth in the number of language and area specialists, in organized graduate level programs, in courses offered by universities, and in area-oriented instruction in secondary and primary schools. Although the amount of increase of these between 1945 and 1970 has not been documented, the eight-fold increase in Ph.D.'s on international studies subjects during that period is indicative of the magnitude of the response of American education to the post-World War II need to create and diffuse knowledge of other nations and cultures.<sup>1</sup>

The United States of 1979 is a very different nation from the United States of 1945-1970. Its population and economy continue to grow, but at a much slower pace. University enrollments are shrinking and may experience reductions of up to 20% by the early 1990's. Furthermore, thanks to developments beginning in 1945, a complex set of structures for creating and diffusing knowledge about other areas of the world is in place. The challenge for the United States of 1979 is how to utilize existing international studies resources and how to create new resources to meet the needs of the next twenty-five years.

What will be the foreign language and international studies needs of the next twenty-five years, and how will they be different from those of the 1945-1970 period? While all prospective and retrospective specifications of "needs" are, of necessity, highly debatable, such a comparison is a necessary first step for determining how to meet future needs with both existing and new resources.

## Post-World War II Needs

The importance of developing knowledgeable specialists and increasing public awareness of international affairs was clearly recognized in the aftermath of World War II. This was felt acutely and was stated in rather broad-gauged terms. As articulated by one group of scholars, post-World War II needs were:

- 1) To provide American individuals and institutions with knowledge of practical value about the peoples and areas of the world;
- 2) To increase cross-cultural understanding;
- 3) To integrate the findings of research through interdisciplinary cooperation; and
- 4) To develop knowledge of the human condition which could be understood by specialists in different nations and cultures.<sup>2</sup>

Great strides have been taken to meet these objectives, especially the first three. Need 1: Since World War II the stock of practical knowledge about other areas of the world has grown exponentially. Almost no Ph.D. work was being done on international topics prior to World War II, and, by the 1970's, more than 25% of the dissertations awarded in fields like political science, history, and anthropology were on international topics. This growth is paralleled by increases in the number of scholarly and general titles listed in compendia such as Books in Print or The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.

Need 2: While it is easy to be cynical about American ethnocentrism, area specialists are clearly aware of differences among the cultures of the peoples of the world and that each has developed its own self-consistent solutions to life out of a unique past, with no one culture being inherently superior to others. This understanding is transmitted through the process of education and is utilized by private and public institutions through area specialist faculty, and through reading the results of specialized research.

Need 3: Research findings in international studies have consistently integrated the efforts of various social, scientific and humanistic disciplines, and have called to question the utility of classic disciplinary paradigms. The study of Latin American history and literature has become an important base for many social scientists attempting to describe social change in another culture. Similarly, the theories and explanations of social scientists become grist for the mill of many humanists when they carry out critical analyses.

Need 4: The development of universally understood knowledge of the human condition is the objective which is, as yet, least advanced. The realization of progress here, to a large part, follows the progress of the other three objectives. Furthermore, it requires the development of internationally collaborative ties among creators of knowledge in different nations. The task here is to clearly specify particular conditions under which human behavior occurs so that the interplay of particular cultural influences and more universal human predispositions may be understood by analysts irrespective of cultural orientation. The growth of research on the human condition by scholars in other world areas, the growth of competence among American scholars, and the beginnings of collaborative ties between them is only now beginning to make possible realization of this objective.

### Needs in 1979

In 1979 there is a continuing need to pursue the objectives which have been important since 1945. There is no end to the need for practical knowledge, cross-cultural understanding, and integrated research findings; progress on building a universally understood knowledge of the human condition is barely begun. However, changes in the population, economy, and international role of the United States as well as the thirty-five years of progress on these broad-gauged objectives have resulted in the emergence of a host of new more narrowly defined needs. As the most powerful industrialized nation, the United States conducts vital diplomatic relations with almost all the other nations of the world and, as a result of political stability and economic growth elsewhere, the United States is learning how to exercise power in a multi-polar world; as the largest producer and consumer of goods, the United States is engaged in trade and commercial relations with almost all the other nations and is increasingly pushed to adjust its policies in the face of strong competition from abroad; as the nation with the most extensive higher education system in the world, the United States is involved in the global process of knowledge creation and diffusion as well as providing advanced training for tens of thousands of citizens of other nations; in the fields of education, energy, environmental control, law, medicine, nutrition, public health, technology transfer, and transportation, American individuals and institutions are involved in interchange and cooperation with citizens and institutions in other nations.

In each of these areas training will be necessary in the language, culture, history, and politics of other nations. While few individuals will require the language skills required of diplomatic interpreters or the knowledge of a nation's past required of historical researchers, specialized functional training will gain in effectiveness if knowledge is also available regarding foreign contexts in which skills might be utilized. The argument that such training is not necessary because "everybody" speaks English or is motivated to work with Americans in our cultural context may be true in certain limited situations, but the increased interdependence of the United States with other nations suggests that lack of attention to international studies and foreign languages may, in the long run, cause America to become isolated among the world's powers and consequently become less able to pursue specific interests in concert with other nations.

### The Current Capacity to Meet National Needs

At the same time as the United States' needs are evolving and it is necessary to focus on more highly specialized concerns, the institutional base which services those needs is also changing.

Since World War II the objectives of international studies have become defined with greater precision. Broad-gauged knowledge of practical value is now transmitted through teaching in primary schools,

secondary schools, and universities as well as through the "outreach" to the general public of the educational system; more specialized knowledge is created through research and is transmitted by educational and other specialized institutions; knowledge of other cultures is also produced by research and attempts to foster cross-cultural understanding are included in general education; demands for specialized knowledge have become more diverse and, consequently, the efficient matching of existing resources to those demands has become an urgent new need; the integration of social science findings is a continuing objective of international studies; the development of universally understood knowledge of the human condition has become an objective of increasing promise. The four objectives identified after World War II can thus be said to have now evolved into seven more specific national needs. In summary form they are:

- 1) The provision of knowledge of the peoples and areas of the world through general education;
- 2) The provision of such knowledge through citizens' education;
- 3) The generation of specialized knowledge through research;
- 4) The generation of cross-cultural understanding;
- 5) The efficient matching of existing resources to diverse needs for specialized knowledge;
- 6) The integration of social science findings; and
- 7) The creation of universally understood knowledge of the human condition.

These needs can best be serviced by supporting excellent research and excellent teaching on international subjects as well as by the careful coordination of existing resources. How to achieve this will be the subject of the remainder of this essay. For example, in the field of international business, in addition to in-house training provided by firms, organizations exist which promote international business education, permit students to live and work abroad during their education, provide mid-career training for businessmen, supply firms and foreign parties with relevant business information, provide consulting services designed to supplement the expertise of American firms and the foreign parties with whom they do business. In the area of knowledge creation a limited number of organizations exist which translate and diffuse information about research carried out by scholars in other countries, provide fellowships which allow Americans to carry out research abroad and learn about foreign colleagues' work firsthand, provide support allowing foreign scholars and scientists to visit the United States to carry out research, promote cooperation among universities in different parts of the world, and permit the monitoring of current international research so that promising new research topics and neglected lacunae can be identified.



Although specialized agencies have been created to service many emerging needs, certain needs have access to more resources than do others. Specialized needs which are of interest to clearly identifiable clienteles such as business, health, or policy-related groups have greater possibilities for mobilizing and receiving financial support if their activities are perceived to be of direct relevance to their clienteles. More broadly stated needs such as the maintenance of a general and flexible foreign language and international studies competence or the promotion of universally understood knowledge of the human condition through international scholarly collaboration will have more difficulty generating sufficient and stable support. In part, private support for such needs will be lacking because they are seen to be of relevance to everybody and, as a consequence, to be supported by "others" or by some generalized source of support, such as the federal government or charitable foundations.

While new sources of support will not serve all new or continuing needs, traditional sources of support for international studies and foreign languages have undergone substantial change in recent years and promise to experience more change in the coming years. Universities have been the principal source of support and locale for training and research. International studies and foreign language programs have received university support largely because of their teaching contributions to undergraduate education. Additional program funds from the United States Office of Education, other federal programs, and from private foundations have supplemented university support. In addition, support in the form of individual fellowships from doctoral and post-doctoral research from extra-university sources have been crucial for allowing specialists in Centers and other universities to gain firsthand knowledge of their research and teaching topics. This complex funding structure has permitted the evolution of a three-tiered system of higher education containing: (1) centers focusing on specific world areas which encourage advanced research, provide graduate and undergraduate training, and promote citizen education; (2) formally organized but less comprehensive area programs; and (3) individual specialists at universities without organized programs.

Traditional support for international studies and foreign languages is undergoing change. University enrollments are shrinking and overall enrollments in the study of foreign languages are declining, making it increasingly difficult for universities to adequately support international studies programs because of their contributions to teaching students. Furthermore, job prospects for Ph.D.'s--including those with international experience--have declined dramatically, causing graduate enrollments to shrink, and reduce the number of new university-trained international specialists. In addition, the asset base of the Ford Foundation and other private funders of international studies have been eroded due to declines in stock prices and increasing inflation. This has caused the foundation support of international studies both to shrink and to be targetted to specific policy-related areas such as international relations, energy, and food production with a consequent decline in support for the activities of more generalized units such as area studies Centers. Finally,

although sources such as the Inter-American Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities Public Programs Division, and the National Science Foundation's international activities offer new types of federal support, other sources such as the Agency for International Development and the Cultural Affairs Office of the Department of State (now the International Communications Agency) have substantially reduced their support. The likely net result is that federal support for international studies outside of the Office of Education (OE) has been reduced in recent years.

The impact of the combined action of shrinking overall undergraduate and graduate enrollments, decreased support from private foundations and non-OE federal sources combined with the emergence of more functionally specialized organizations will be felt differently by different parts of the American University system. Three new tiers will emerge:

1) Enrollments will decline in most publicly supported institutions making it difficult to sustain faculty and international studies Centers on the basis of contributions to teaching.

2) The few public institutions which do not experience enrollment shrinkage plus the few large private institutions with established international studies programs will likely continue to offer institutional studies courses at at least current levels. Although teaching and research in these institutions will suffer adjustments due to declines in graduate enrollments, and the overall level of their functioning will be hampered by inflation, in all probability they will be able to continue to carry out research and training in international studies at levels comparable to the present, with few prospects for expansion to service new needs.

3) Shrinking overall enrollments will cause severe crises in private institutions with few student applicants and in public institutions of low priority. Those that do not close their doors will likely close the doors of programs which do not command large student enrollments. Few international studies programs will survive in these universities and colleges.

In sum, the net result of these changes in enrollment and financial support for international studies will be an increased concentration of the capacity to meet national needs among a small number of institutions of higher education. The emergence of a new set of specialized needs will only partially be met by these institutions, and new more specialized institutions will service needs with clearly identifiable clienteles with access to resources. More general needs, and needs of diffuse clienteles lacking access to resources may go unfilled. Before discussing mechanisms for meeting national needs, I will turn to a discussion of the study of Latin America in the context of international studies.

International Studies and the Study  
of Latin America

The Lambert report indicated that in 1971 the United States had more specialists on Latin America than on any other region except East Asia. The September 13, 1978 Report of the Comptroller General<sup>3</sup> indicated that between 1959 and 1976, nearly one-third of the academic degrees received by participants on NDEA Center Programs were made to students of Latin America--a surprising figure in light of the fact that only one-eighth of the Center Programs are for Latin America. The Lambert Report and other documents have considered the problem of what to do about what appear to be imbalances in the national supply of area specialists.

The three logical solutions which have been considered are:

- (1) Correct the imbalances by providing more resources to areas with relatively few specialists such as Africa and the Middle East, and fewer resources to areas with more specialists such as East Asia and Latin America.
- (2) Build upon strength and concentrate resources in areas in which specialist competence is most advanced and in which there is the greatest promise for payoff.
- (3) Leave things as they are--no area seems to be critically neglected with the current distribution of resources.

The solution of evening out the distribution of specialists among regions has no substantive basis. Criteria for gauging how resources in international studies should be allocated should be based on characteristics of world areas and on aspects of relations between the United States and countries in specific areas which are deep seated and long term in nature. This suggests a pattern of support for the study of different areas of the world which combines elements of solution 2 and 3. On the one hand support is needed for each area so that knowledge can be generated to service both current and changing national needs. On the other hand, American interest in and ability to benefit disproportionately from the study of certain world areas suggests that some concentration of resources will produce exceptional payoffs.\*

It is difficult for me to evaluate the importance of other world areas in such terms, but it seems to me that many reasons exist for maintaining or increasing United States resources currently made available for the study of Latin America. The reasons which I find most compelling are presented below, although I am certain that other specialists would feel a need to add to this list.

- 1) The large number of American specialists and students of Latin America indicate a broad-based interest in the region. The disproportionate number of specialists reported by Lambert indicates that this interest

---

\* This is not to suggest that short-term foreign policy changes be used as a guide. Such policies will continue to change suddenly and result in unanticipated shortages of particular types of specialists. By the time programs are in place to service such shortfalls, public concern is usually diverted elsewhere.



has existed for some time. The large number of students reported by the Comptroller General indicates that this interest is a continuing one. This interest is based on phenomena such as the geographical proximity of the United States and Latin America, the large size of the United States' Hispanic population, the long history of close business and political ties between United States and Latin America and a host of more particular reasons. Whatever its roots, the broad base of long-term interest in Latin America by the people of the United States suggests that knowledge about Latin America generated in the United States will be put to good use at many levels of society.

2) Latin American societies have produced an autonomous body of intellectuals with original views of the study of the human condition. Writers such as Jorge Amado, Miguel Angel Asturias, Jorge Luis Borges, Pablo Neruda, and Octavio Paz have captured the imagination of readers and critics; social scientists such as Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Celso Furtado, Gino Germani, W. A. Lewis, Osvaldo Sunkel, and Claudio and Orlando Villas Boas are read and discussed by their counterparts in the United States as are the works of psychoanalysts such as Claudio Naranjo and Otto Kernberg. In the interdependent world of the 1980's it will be important for Americans to develop views of world problems which transcend positions dictated by their own national experience. The existence of this body of independent-minded intellectuals provides opportunities for dialogue and collaborative knowledge creation which are unequalled by other world areas, with the exception of western Europe.

3) Modes of knowledge creation used in Latin America are closely watched by policy-makers and scholars of other regions. For example, "dependence theory"--a third world approach to the study of international interdependence--originated in Latin America and is being adapted by scholars of other regions. The Latin American Social Science Council--a consortium of Latin American research institutes--has been called on to assist with the formation of similar associations in other third world areas. Policies adopted by Latin American policy-makers to combat inflation, housing shortages, and to regulate foreign firms are studied and sometimes copied by policy-makers in other regions. In a sense, much knowledge generated about Latin America can be of use for understanding future situations of other third world nations.

4) Like the United States, Latin America shares much of its cultural heritage with European nations. Unlike the United States, Latin America is a region of separate nations, not a federation of associated states. Like the United States, most Latin American nations achieved political independence over one hundred and fifty years ago. Unlike the United States, average annual incomes in most of Latin America total in the hundreds of dollars, and indices of nutrition and health are low, although not as low as many newly independent African and Asian nations. The fact that, of all third world regions, Latin America contains nations that are most similar to industrialized nations like the United States, yet still clearly different from the United States, makes studying it especially promising for testing the limits of knowledge created through the study of the United States. Careful comparisons of United States and Latin America

generated knowledge about topics such as political institutions, childhood socialization, and coping with poverty can constitute important steps toward creating understandings of universal human conditions, and of learning when certain conditions are limited to specific types of societies.

5) The largest ethnic group in the United States--the Hispanic community--traces its cultural heritage and family roots to Latin America, and the migration of persons from Latin America and the Caribbean to the U.S. is an important policy issue. While it is important not to lump together the study of Latin America with separate concerns of Hispanic peoples within the United States (and short-change both in the process), the importance of this group within the United States presents a special motivation for the United States citizens generating knowledge about Latin America.

6) Like other regions of the world, Latin America contains cultures, histories, languages, and societies which are fascinating objects in and of themselves. The contemporary cultures of the Caribbean, Mexico, the Andean region, and Brazil are each unique and multifaceted. The ancient civilizations--Carib, Aztec, Maya, Inca, and others--were nearly destroyed by European conquerors and are slowly becoming understood by contemporary specialists. Spanish and Portuguese, the region's dominant languages, share some Latin roots with English, but require years of study to master and repeated use to maintain. Other languages of the region--Aymara, Nahuatl, Quechua, and others--are still used by rural peoples and are fascinating objects of study. The variety of contemporary Latin American art, from the famous Mexican murals of Orozco and de Riviera, to Haitian primitivist painting, to the spectacular architecture of modern cities like Brasilia and São Paulo, have enriched the imaginations of people throughout the world. It is fruitless to attempt to rank regions of the world in terms of fascination as objects of study; it makes more sense to say that the study of each, including Latin America, has great potential for enriching and broadening our lives.

7) The strategic importance of Latin American nations is different from that of countries located near the borders of Asian and European communist powers. The propinquity of many Latin American nations to the United States and the fact that many are important and growing trading partners gives them a fast-growing significance based in substantial mutual economic and, to a lesser extent, defense-related interests. While such interests cannot rival recurring Mid-East crises and China or Russia-watching in capturing media attention, they are based in matters of deep importance to the continuing health of our society. For the remainder of the twentieth century Latin American nations will be among the United States' principal foreign energy suppliers and, with the exception of Western Europe, our major trading partners. Venezuela is already a major supplier of petroleum to the United States, and Mexico promises to soon become a supplier of great importance. These and Brazil and Argentina are fast-growing trading partners and smaller nations in the region are important suppliers of certain commodities to the United States. The markets of countries in Latin America have become important

sources of sales to many American businesses. At present 80% of American investments in third world nations are in Latin America; Latin American nations account for 20% of the United States' foreign trade. From the standpoint of national security, Latin America has an historic yet changing importance for the United States. The days of "gunboat diplomacy" have passed. The United States now attempts to guarantee its own security by sharing responsibilities with allies throughout Latin America. There is little urgency to contain real or imagined adversaries, but it is vitally important for the United States' national defense to have cooperative military arrangements with Latin American governments to have access to ports-of-call and to airfields south of the United States. Arranging such cooperation is only possible based on sound assessments of political relations between the United States and Latin American governments. Thus, from the standpoint of strategic importance, both in economic and in national defense terms, Latin America is singularly important by virtue of its economic ties and its location, together with the United States, in the western hemisphere.

\* \* \*

Other lists could easily be generated for discussing the study of Latin America within the context of international studies. However what any well-drawn list would indicate is that many deep-seated reasons exist for promoting the study of Latin America by citizens and institutions of the United States. Whether or not a disproportionate amount of resources should be concentrated on the study of Latin America is a decision to be made in other quarters, although this writer is clearly of that opinion. The remainder of this essay will discuss ways of re-designing the United States' current capacities in foreign languages and international studies to meet continuing and emerging national needs.

#### Re-Designing the Current Capacity to Meet National Needs

The current capacity to meet national needs in the area of foreign languages and international studies is tied to a support base which will soon be decimated by declines in university enrollments, continuing inflation, diminished support from private sources, public fiscal restraint, and the existence of few new clearly identifiable clienteles who could provide financial support. The knowledge Americans gain from international studies has been described in a report by the Comptroller General of the United States as, ". . . easily viewed as contributing to the national needs suggested by such contemporary problems as interdependence, trade relations, and U.S. leadership in a world community of nations. . . ."4 Since no standard of adequacy is accepted for measuring a satisfactory response to emerging national needs in this area it is impossible to precisely specify the amount of support needed to service international studies needs or the precise strategies to be employed. However it is possible to identify some areas in which changes are clearly needed and

others in which existing arrangements will continue to service national objectives. The three essential elements in any re-design of the national capacity to meet international studies needs are: (1) the pool of qualified individuals; (2) established university centers of area studies; and (3) emerging specialized organizations. In considering all three of these elements it will be important to give careful thought to how to best use the existing pool of resources which elements of the current stock of resources are not functional for meeting national needs, how adjustments in the pool of resources can be achieved such that the individuals constituting or involved with these resources experience the adjustments as personal growth rather than the rejection of hard-won personal competence, and how the environment in which these elements are arrayed might best be structured to both support and benefit from the promotion of international studies and foreign languages.

### The Pool of Qualified Individuals

In 1971 Richard D. Lambert identified 13,139 individuals he considered to be nonstudent area studies specialists. He also identified 7,177 students associated with an organized university area studies program. With adjustments for attrition and new student cohorts, Lambert's data would indicate that in 1979 the United States probably possesses nearly 20,000 foreign area specialists who have obtained their specialization as a result of formal training at the university level. Of these, approximately 25% would be East Asianists, 20% Latin Americanists, 17% East Europeanists, 14% Africanists, 10% Middle East specialists, 7% South Asianists, and 5% Southeast Asianists.<sup>5</sup> This estimate does not include individuals who have acquired substantial expertise either through experience such as business or family without receiving university training. Taking this into account, as well as the important international business and individual migration connections between the United States and Latin America, it seems safe to conclude that the total figure of 20,000 foreign area specialists is a low figure and that the estimate of 4,000 Latin Americanists is probably a substantially understated estimate.<sup>6</sup>

In considering how this pool of approximately 4,000 Latin American specialists might best service national needs, three questions must be addressed: (1) Is the current pool the optimal size? Or, assuming death and attrition how many new specialists should be trained each year? Or, posed at the extreme of depression over the Ph.D. glut, how many years should the field wait before training another specialist? (2) How can the current pool of individual specialists maintain and upgrade their competence? (3) How can the pool of specialists be oriented to service new national needs as they emerge?

However, before attempting to answer these questions, a basic weakness of estimates of current resources in international studies must be pointed out: the lack of up-to-date statistics. Not only are statistics lacking for numbers and types of specialists, but also on rates

of creation of new specialists, on actual unemployment and under-employment in different disciplines, on rates of attrition of established specialists, and on rates of discouragement of those in formation. Such information is basic for the framing of future policy. Therefore, the first recommendation of this paper is that a study be commissioned by the Office of Education, or some other government agency, to collect data on international studies resources in the United States. And now, despite an inadequate data base, I will attempt to answer the questions posed above.

1. The training of new specialists.—While the traditionally most inexorable of national needs--the demand for university teachers--now dictates that the pool of qualified individuals shrink rather than grow, there is a need for continued training of new specialists, although enrollments of traditional types of students should probably be substantially less than the 1,802 Latin Americanists reported by Lambert and considerable specialization in training should probably take place. This need for continued training stems from the needs of universities and other organizations for highly trained individuals who might not be available in the current pool. At least as vital, it also stems from the importance of not losing the momentum of enormous expansion of knowledge creation occasioned by the post-World War II growth of international studies by entirely skipping an age cohort because of a perceived short-term excess in supply of specialists over demand. In short, it is recommended that new specialists continue to be trained, but in smaller numbers. Resources for training, however, should not be reduced in step with enrollment reductions. Current fellowship, field research, and data analysis support for students is woefully inadequate and is likely to become even less adequate as universities are strapped for funds and the costs of student living standards in the U.S. and abroad increases. Reductions in graduate enrollments should free resources for use elsewhere, but part of the savings should be used to encourage the very best potential specialists to undergo the arduous process of training by funding training costs at realistic levels.

While it seems appropriate to train fewer Ph.D.'s, less complete training--at the M.A. or Certificate levels, or through introducing international materials into functionally oriented programs--can provide background helpful for serving non-university teaching related needs. It is therefore recommended that information be collected to judge whether M.A. or Certificate programs should be expanded or if it is sufficient to include additional international material in existing functional programs.

2. Maintaining and upgrading current competence.—If future enrollments do decline, and all indications are that the decline began a few years ago, the importance of maintaining the competence of the current pool of specialists increases in importance. Current prospects of job insecurity for younger academic specialists and increased responsibilities for more senior academics do not serve as incentives for the maintenance of competence, but push specialists into other fields, not all of which are related to international studies specializations. Although



not substitutable for improved employment prospects or better work conditions, a number of programs could be instituted at a national level which would serve to maintain and upgrade competence within the existing pool of area specialists: (1) A program of regional seminars could be instituted. Such seminars would regularize similar, but irregularly held, functions now sponsored by regional Latin American Studies Associations and would parallel programs in Chinese and Japanese Studies currently administered by the Social Science Research Council. These seminars would bring together area specialists in a broad geographic area at campuses of major Latin American Studies Centers for programs in which recent findings in specific substantive areas are discussed. In addition to making contact with both leading scholars in a particular substantive area and other specialists located in one's region, seminar participants could be granted access to library and data processing facilities for the duration of the seminar so that the resources of the Center might be utilized by scholars working in campuses with less specialized facilities. (2) Such seminars might be planned in conjunction with programs of small grants which would permit scholars to travel and stay at Center facilities for periods ranging from a few days to several months. The provision of such grants and seminars would reinforce currently developing regional associations and provide a formalized focus for the maintenance and upgrading of competence. (3) A third program would be the institution of a program of short-term overseas research grants (i.e. from 2 to 8 months' duration) which would renew specialists' field exposure within the limitations imposed by academic year schedules and sabbatical leaves. The short duration of such grants and the possibility of combining them with normal academic year salaries and sabbatical pay would result in substantial upgrading and new knowledge creation at a modest cost. (4) In addition to providing grants for individual study and research, investment would be desirable in facilities to be used by individuals throughout the nation. Funds could be utilized to create a network of major research libraries building upon existing strength and paying attention to regional dispersion. Specialists throughout a given region could have permanent access to such collections, access which would be considerably facilitated if used in conjunction with regional seminars or small grants such as those suggested above. Such a network might diminish the international acquisitions problems currently facing university libraries. These acquisitions are endangered, not only by the twin perils of inflation and budget reductions, but also much of remaining budgets are consumed by the maintenance of existing serials, and international acquisitions are further buffeted by changes in exchange rates--always unpredictable and often unfavorable to the dollar.

3. Orienting the pool of specialists to new needs.—Although the maintenance of existing competence will require considerable expenditure of resources, time and energy, this must be complemented by orienting the pool of specialists to also service emerging national needs. The most effective means for achieving this objective would involve specialists in new activities which would build on existing competence and involve them in new opportunities for personal growth. Similarly, it would prepare the environment in which these specialists would operate to utilize their skills as efficiently as possible. There are two levels of concern

to which the current pool of specialists should become increasingly oriented: (1) The general concerns of citizens' education now serviced in a limited way by "outreach" programs. (2) The more focussed concerns of specific institutions and organizations dealing with Latin America in areas including the press, organized labor, business, and government and many others.

Few incentives currently exist for orienting the pool of specialists to these concerns or for making the environment interested in using the skills of these specialists. Any attempt to re-design the United States' current capacity to meet international studies needs should, rather than attempt minor adjustments in current arrangements, consider the creation of genuine incentives which would be seen as beneficial both by the pool of specialists and by those entities in the environment which would benefit from inputs of specialists' skills.

An incentive for orienting specialists to these concerns would be the design and funding of new and existing programs such that involvement with citizens' education and with institutions outside universities is seen as desirable. Outreach programs are currently funded at such low levels that international studies centers lack resources to pay trained specialists to work on them. When such specialists do involve themselves in citizens' education activities it is usually at some financial or professional cost. When they involve themselves with specialized organizations on behalf of universities, there is a similar loss of time, sometimes made bitter by encounters with highly paid consultants looking to them for unpaid assistance. Even within the current situation of little pay and low status payoffs for such activities, international affairs specialists do devote substantial time and energy to such activities. However, their talents could be put to better use if programs for involving specialists outside universities were put in place.

Some elements of such programs might be the following: (1) Increase funding of citizens' education programs so that universities could afford to release specialists from some teaching responsibilities and involve themselves in building programs and providing services of citizen education. Many current responsibilities in "outreach" programs are assumed by individuals with great enthusiasm but little training. Budgets are so limited that these organizers are often only able to involve specialists in marginal roles. If the mission of universities could also be redefined to accord such activities prestige comparable to teaching and research, strong incentives would be built for such specialist involvement.<sup>7</sup> (2) Create internships or similar programs in which universities would be compensated for granting release time to specialists for involving themselves in the activities of non-university specialized organizations. University release-time funds would likely have to be complemented by additional funds needed to arrange such internships in businesses, government agencies, labor unions, media organizations and the like. In addition, such involvement would inevitably decrease the Ph.D. glut by both creating new space for specialists in universities and by showing specialized organizations how to overcome institutional isolation and make use of trained international studies specialists in their own operations. I hesitate to make suggestions about the funding mechanics of such a program here, but the

institution of such a program would go far toward deparochializing university attitudes about the non-university environment and deparochializing other United States institutions about global concerns. (3) Create programs in universities to provide international studies and foreign language training to individuals working in specialized organizations. Limited programs of this sort are already being carried out at some universities. Such training could be targeted at new employees or at mid-career, and would be an efficient way of allowing universities to draw on existing strengths to service community needs, and would be made more effective if carried out in conjunction with others of the suggestions presented above.

Finally, specialists should not be so oriented to serve such emerging needs of citizens' education and non-university organizations that they neglect teaching responsibilities and basic research needs. Attention must not be diverted from the knowledge creation and diffusion process which is vital to the progress and renewal of our society. Inasmuch as knowledge creation involves individual specialists together with established centers and specialized organizations, I will turn to this subject before more fully discussing the roles of Centers and other organizations.

#### The Involvement of Specialists in Knowledge Creation Through Basic Research

All of the activities discussed so far--citizens' education, involvement with specialized organizations, the provision of training, interaction among specialists, and scholarly research--are part of the process of knowledge creation and diffusion. Each of these activities plays a different role in the overall process. Of these, basic scholarly research may be in greatest need of special efforts for funding. The reason for this is that while basic research is of general importance to social progress and renewal, it has no clearly identifiable immediate clientele other than the scholars who carry out such research. Lacking such a clientele it is dependent on the ability of broadly responsible entities such as the federal government and charitable foundations to provide it with support.

In times of inflation, pressure to reduce the role of government, and diminished foundation assets, it is difficult for such a response to be forthcoming. Basic research is sometimes supported in conjunction with specific research needs of specialized organizations or with citizens' education programs. Although such combined efforts make sense, and would be further facilitated by certain of the recommendations of this report, the benefits of such research are reduced to the extent that basic research is only focussed on the needs of special interests. Important knowledge is created through applied research on practical problems, but too much reliance on applied work runs the risk of not creating knowledge about topics of potential importance which lack immediate clienteles or topics of general importance which specific clienteles assume that "someone else" will support.



Opportunities for creating useful new knowledge about Latin America has increased as a result of the training and research of large numbers of new Latin American and international studies specialists. Rather than closing off areas for inquiry, increased research on Latin America has raised new questions whose answers will, in turn, further improve the state of knowledge of Latin America. To sustain the contributions made by this knowledge creation, questions must continually be asked and new investments must be made in basic research so that such questioning is possible.

Basic research in international studies has two modes of operation. (1) It can be carried out by scholars exclusively from one society such as the United States. Such research can create much new knowledge of immediate use to that society, but even with extreme precautions it can easily be shaped by the special concerns of that society. (2) Basic research can be carried out in collaboration by scholars from a number of societies. Such research can incorporate a variety of viewpoints, and can both clarify the nature of differences caused by particular national circumstances and more fully test whether given findings are generalizable across a number of societies.

To date most basic research in international studies has been of the first type. While important liaison work has been carried out for some time by organizations such as the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education, the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, the Institute for International Education, and the International Research and Exchanges Board, it has only rarely been possible to create situations in which scholars in the humanities and social sciences from the United States and from Latin American nations have both worked together on basic research and have jointly defined the needs and objectives of the research program. As was emphasized recently by Francis X. Sutton, equal status collaboration in research has been the preferred formula for some time, but actual conditions have not frequently made such arrangements possible.<sup>8</sup> Such conditions are now increasingly in evidence. With the recent growth of knowledge and specialists the process of mutual identification needed for international scholarly collaboration has become possible. Furthermore, in recent years specialized agencies such as the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council (JCLAS), the Joint Commission on Latin American Economic Integration (ECIEL), and the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars have begun to actively promote such collaboration.

This need has been recognized by President Carter who in his address to the Venezuelan Congress of March 29, 1978 announced his intention to form a Foundation for International Technological Cooperation--now the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC). The objectives of the ISTC are to transcend the donor-donee relationship of usual aid mechanisms and "move toward collaborative, jointly managed and jointly funded programs" for establishing ways to sustain flows of knowledge and technology between the United States and developing nations.<sup>9</sup>

This is an extremely significant proposal. However, the ISTC has one major potential shortcoming. The ISTC does not specifically propose to support international scholarly collaboration in the social sciences and the humanities. Its focus to date has been on facilitating international flows of technology-related knowledge. This is but a portion of the knowledge of interest to both the United States and to other nations which could now be advanced through international scholarly collaboration. As indicated above, such collaboration is perhaps most promising between scholars in the United States and scholars in Latin America, due to the existence there of a body of autonomous scholars. It is therefore a recommendation of this report that the scope of areas for international scholarly collaboration be broadened beyond the technology and policy-related focus of the ISTC to foment, when possible, internationally collaborative scholarly research in fields across the spectrum of the social sciences and the humanities.

Finally, although knowledge creation should be promoted through international scholarly collaboration to the extent possible, it should not be promoted by neglecting support for work done by United States scholars alone in areas where little research has been carried out, or where the process of mutual identification of scholars in the United States and abroad has not proceeded sufficiently to permit collaboration.

\* \* \*

In short, it is recommended that special attention be paid to promoting the creation of knowledge about Latin America through basic research. This is stressed both because of the inherent importance of basic research and because it is often difficult to muster special interest support for knowledge creation through basic research that is not tied to applied objectives. Furthermore basic research should be promoted both through research carried out by United States scholars and through research done in collaboration with scholars of other nations, especially Latin Americans. Where feasible, internationally collaborative scholarly research should be given preference because of its superior promise for incorporating disparate viewpoints and for testing the limits of cross-cultural generalizations. If special support is forthcoming for international scholarly collaboration it should not only include technology and policy-related research, but should also include topics which touch on as many areas of the social sciences and humanities as is feasible.

#### The Role of Established Area Studies Centers in International Studies

Title VI of the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) authorized grants to institutions of higher education to establish and operate "centers" to teach any needed modern foreign language for which adequate instruction was not readily available in the United States and to support instruction in other fields needed to fully understand the geographical areas in which the language is commonly used. Ten centers for the study of Latin America currently receive support from Title VI of the NDEA.

The September 13, 1978 Report of the Comptroller General concluded that "these programs . . . contribute to national needs suggested by . . . contemporary problems." And that "one cannot place a value on this apparatus . . . [which] . . . when the Nation faces a 'present educational emergency' . . . is capable of delivering at an increasing rate highly specialized area study and language training. . . ." And finally, ". . . if [this apparatus] is lost, it can be replaced in the future only at great cost over a long period of time." (pp. 28-29)

It is indeed crucial that a system of area study centers be maintained in the United States. However continuing and emerging national needs are such that the organization of these centers requires some changes. First, as implied by recommendations made above and to follow, if national needs are to be adequately serviced, the total amount of funds allocated to centers should, in all likelihood, be increased. Increased funding is needed because support currently provided is not sufficient for existing programs and requires financially strapped universities to make additional contributions, accept program inadequacies, or to cut programs; because emerging national needs will require additional support; and because inflation erodes the value of current support levels. This essay is not the proper vehicle for making budget estimates, but it appears that many important national needs associated with international studies cannot find specialized clientele who can provide adequate financial support, and, as a consequence, if such needs are to be met, they must be met, at least in part, through federal allocations.

A second recommendation is that support for centers should be authorized through a two-step process. Competitions for federal support should be based in the ability of prospective centers to service national needs, with special attention to the ability of area studies specialists associated with the center to make important contributions to knowledge creation as a result of the establishment of the center. The criterion of regional dispersion should not be taken into account until the initial designation of centers is accomplished. It should then be taken into account, not to distribute centers uniformly across the nation, but to provide mechanisms, such as those described in previous sections, through which centers can serve as foci for area studies activities for rather extensive areas. In this manner, as is current OE practice, quality of service to national needs would be the sole criterion for the designation of centers. Means for seriously relating the resources of institutions and individuals across the nation not associated with centers would then be considered separately from the process of designating centers. It cannot be assumed that center resources will be related to non-center individuals and institutions merely because centers are relatively evenly dispersed throughout the country. The net result of such a process would not alter the current distribution of centers, but it would cause more emphasis to be placed on how to relate center resources to non-center institutions and individuals.

A third recommendation is that funding for centers should be stabilized. Uncertainties associated with the provision of funds for short (one, two or three years) periods of time are magnified when the length of

funding cycles varies. Efforts should be made to regularize the length of funding cycles and to lengthen them so that longer range research and training planning can be undertaken by centers and so that greater stability in center staffing can be achieved. Endowment support would be the best solution for stabilizing the situation of centers and allowing staff to expend energies on servicing national objectives rather than preparing applications for funds to service these needs. Short of this, support for at least five years would allow for the creation of a stable set of centers capable of adjusting to changed national needs. By phasing the indication of new centers and naming only a portion each year, dynamic new programs could be designed to adjust to changed conditions. Longer term funding cycles would improve situations which only over-burden both center staff who prepare applications and federal administrators who must review them.

A fourth recommendation is that the number of Ph.D.'s receiving training be decreased, but not discontinued. Current levels of training should be continued only in fields such as economics where jobs for new Ph.D.'s remain plentiful. This point has already been argued above. Savings from training fewer Ph.D.'s should both be applied to other programs, and should be used to fund remaining training at levels which accurately reflect the financial cost of undergoing such training.

A fifth recommendation is that centers focusing on undergraduate teaching should be funded only if they are designed to produce teaching materials which could be used by programs and individuals in other universities or in non-university specialized organizations. The provision of internationalized general education is a primary objective of international studies. Therefore, rather than merely funding additional teaching locales, undergraduate centers should have a special role for providing imaginative teaching materials. This material could be diffused through the creation of a national network whose objective is to relate specialists at all institutions to both the teaching and the research resources of the system of area studies centers.

A sixth recommendation is that attention should also be paid to linking centers to citizens' education needs and the needs of specialized organizations on a national basis. It is altogether possible that a west coast center might best serve the needs of a New York media firm seeking knowledge of Latin America, or that a Washington, D.C. center might be best prepared to help a midwest citizens group seeking information about inter-American foreign policy. As with teaching, attention should be paid to the creation of the best possible national system of centers rather than centers with regional responsibilities.

A seventh recommendation is that programs such as internships and mid-career teaching should be developed and incorporated into center programs. These would link programs in centers with the activities of specialized non-center organizations, and thus further involve area specialists with applied problems. This point has also been argued above. As with previous points, such programs should be instituted in the context of a national system of centers, without neglecting special opportunities for centers to service the needs of groups located near their universities.



An eighth recommendation is that special attention be paid to the problems different universities will face as student enrollments drop during the 1980's. Universities facing sizable enrollment decreases will find it difficult to effectively mount international studies programs if staffing is cut back in line with enrollment decreases.

A final recommendation is that centers should support major intellectual activities as well as serving administrative functions. The increased competence of Latin American specialists and of their counterparts abroad will, ironically, cause increased numbers of international contacts to be made through channels other than centers, such as through chairmen of academic departments or through deans of professional schools. This is a healthy development, indicative of substantive international scholarly collaboration. Centers can facilitate this by seeking to involve area specialist and non-specialist members of departments and schools in center activities, thus orienting them to their disciplinary counterparts abroad and making the center, together with other parts of the university, foci for intellectual activities. Such activities are, of course, enhanced to the extent that centers, like departments, have the power to offer faculty positions, and have the resources to support research and to sponsor publication series. Means for supporting such activities in centers should be explored.

#### The Role of Specialized Organizations in International Studies

With the growth of international scholarly exchange and collaborative research, international business, international cultural exchange, international tourism, international public policy planning, and other forms of contact between the United States and other nations, new specialized organizations have been created to service these endeavors and to help them grow. For each of these areas of contact many different organizations have been created. Although some involve universities, area specialists, and area centers, others have not found it necessary to make use of these formally identified international studies resources.

Sometimes such separation of activities is an indicator of healthy autonomous growth in a field. In other instances it results in lost opportunities and inefficient servicing of national needs. For example, in seeking advanced training in the United States, Argentine physicians normally make arrangements through training hospitals here and have no contact with United States Latin Americanists. For such circumstances the knowledge needed to arrange proper training is in the area of medical science and the fact that the physicians placed are from Latin America is merely incidental. However, judgments in certain other areas, such as the appropriateness of certain business arrangements in a particular Latin American nation, normally involve mixtures of functionally specific skills and area knowledge. Opportunities can be lost or mis-structured if area knowledge is ignored when such judgments are made.

Sensitivity to three kinds of problems is important for specialized organizations to service national needs in the area of international studies:

1) As discussed above, areas may exist where needed specialized organizations will not be able to be established without the provision of public financial support. Many such organizations already exist including such familiar organizations as the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars and the Inter-American Foundation. However, specific national needs may go unserved if organizations more specialized than area studies centers are not established to work on them. Of particular concern to me is the absence of a specialized organization equipped to capitalize on recent advances in knowledge creation and to promote new knowledge creation through international scholarly collaboration in the humanities and the social sciences. (Although I have suggested above the possibility of expanding the purposes of the ISTC to serve that function.) A number of organizations do currently promote some international scholarly collaboration together with a range of other objectives. However, the absence of an organization with this specialized concern means that opportunities for such knowledge creation are taken up, only when they coincide with other objectives. As a result, few promising opportunities for international scholarly collaboration are developed, most are lost and others are initiated but not fully carried through. The dimensions of this essay do not permit a full discussion of an organization expressly designed to promote international scholarly collaboration in the social sciences and the humanities. However, if such an organization were established it should not preempt other efforts. It should promote the creation of universally understood knowledge both through its own work and by reinforcing international scholarly collaboration promoted by other organizations. In this instance and others it is not sufficient to assume that new specialized organizations will be formed without conscious planning or that existing organizations can always adapt themselves to fully meet emerging needs.

2) Areas may exist where the most efficient servicing of national needs requires collaboration between specialized organizations and centers or other international studies resources, but no such collaboration has been arranged. For example, in the field of international business, as clearly indicated in the report, Business and International Education,<sup>10</sup> there is much room for further cooperation to both assist businessmen to understand and anticipate economic and political developments on the international scene, as well as to promote more in-depth study of the conduct of international business in institutions of higher education. Specialized institutions such as universities and business develop their own modes of operation with resulting insulation from the operations of other organizations. It is important to develop sensitivity to ways in which this insulation and resulting mutual suspicion can be overcome. In this regard a number of suggestions for integrating activities of specialists, centers, and specialized activities have already been presented above. In particular these suggestions have aimed at exchanges of individuals among institutions rather than programs of "general education. It is felt that strong encouragement of bridge building by individuals is the best way to develop links between different kinds of organizations.

3) Areas may exist involving international studies resources which might be better left to functionally specialized organizations. For example, in the area of knowledge creation, there are many areas in which scholars in the United States and Latin America have advanced their respective understandings such that scholarly contact should be taking place between specialists on particular substantive concerns, whether or not they possess corresponding area knowledge. Restricting scholars in Latin America to contact with United States Latin American specialists may, in some areas, slow the progress of knowledge creation. Therefore, when knowledge is advanced significantly in particular substantive areas, functionally specialized organizations such as the American Economic Association or the American Sociological Association should be encouraged to complement some of the international knowledge creation activities initially stimulated by organizations such as the Latin American Studies Association.

In all of these areas of concern--in the creation of needed specialized organizations, the coordination of existing ones, and the division of labor between area and non-area specialized organizations--an essential element in the successful servicing of national needs is a perception of how the various organizations and individuals which might make contributions relate to overall objectives. This involves the stimulation of awareness among these various parts so that organizations and individuals can autonomously respond to needs and coordinate and divide up activities. For the most efficient servicing of national needs in the areas of foreign languages and international studies, it is important that individuals, centers, and the different types of specialized organizations be aware of the part each is playing. On that basis it will be possible to work out a more vital and broad-based program for meeting those needs.

#### Structuring Federal Support to Meet National Needs

The recommendations contained in this essay have not been presented in a coordinated fashion permitting the design of an overall national program of Latin American Studies or International Studies. Nor have estimates of amounts of funding needed been attached to programmatic suggestions. Although such overall program design and budget making are of great importance, it is first important to achieve clarity with respect to policy priorities. However, the range of recommendations made in this document and in those prepared by the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs suggest that increased funding is very much needed if Latin American Studies programs and International Studies programs in the United States are to adequately service national needs.<sup>11</sup> It is one conclusion of this report that servicing the national needs implicit to objectives of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies requires continuing support to many existing programs, and the creation of innovative new programs. This would require corresponding increases in financial support, with additional adjustments for inflation.

It is hoped that the familiar administrative practice of approving programmatic objectives resulting from the deliberations of a body such as the Commission, yet authorizing funding only up to a self-recognized partial level of need, is not the budgetary response of the executive or legislature to commission recommendations. A crucial aspect of the structure of federal funding is that authorized funds be sufficient to permit approved tasks to be done well. If it is necessary to reduce optimal budget levels because of funding limitations, it is important that cuts be made according to substantive priorities of programs rather than through across-the-board reductions. All too often cuts made in such fashion result in tasks being only partially done. Often not undertaking partially funded research, training, or citizens' education is preferable to attempting to stretch insufficient funds, due to the fallout from unfulfilled expectations and the distortions resulting from attempting to "piggyback" programs.

The second set of recommendations of this section responds to a more subtle need, but perhaps one that is easier to act on. Projections of declines in funding available from universities and charitable foundations suggest that, in the future, federal funds will support larger proportions of international studies programs than has been the case to date. While increased dependence on a single source is obviously preferable to no programs, it does suggest potential pitfalls which should be avoided if possible. Funding recipients may lose autonomy if only one funder is available for important programs. Therefore, it is important that three types of measures be implemented, when possible:

1) The authorization of federal funds should be used to stimulate support from other sources. Where it is likely that other funds will be forthcoming, having federal funds "match" those of other donors would be desirable. In such situations, and in situations where the identification of non-federal funders is more problematic, it will be especially important for officials of federal funding agencies to be in contact with other potential sources of support and to work closely with international studies specialists to generate new sources of funds. While "working for a single master" may not necessarily reduce autonomy and program quality, such a danger is real, no matter how benign the intentions of the "master." Therefore, it is important that existing funders as well as funding recipients work together to locate additional sources of funds.

2) When the federal government is the sole funder, it is important that the structure of government organization correspond with the purposes of the programs to be funded. On the one hand, it is important to avoid creating such a multiplicity of funding agencies that disproportionate amounts of funds are spent deciding how to allocate support or that potential recipients are confused or ignored in a maze of overlapping missions. On the other hand, it is equally important that the objective of administrative rationalization not take precedence over program objectives. This is especially important when the federal government is the sole funder of important programs. Maintaining a diversity of funding sources within the federal government may, in part, reduce the risk of diminishing recipient autonomy and program quality caused by working for a single master.

3) A third important measure which can be instituted to blunt inadvertent autocratic control by single federal funders or sychophantic behavior by funding recipients is the careful construction of advisory panels to play major roles in the administration of federal resources. This would serve as an important corrective to unintended signalling an responding between funder and recipient and would facilitate input from appropriate clienteles regarding the uses for funds. Such panels are already in use by many agencies of the federal government involved in international studies funding and have also been used by a number of private foundation funders such as the Ford Foundation, the SSRC and the ACLS. The use of such panels should be encouraged, despite complications that may be added to the process of allocating scarce resources.

\*

\*

\*



## Conclusion

Since World War II an evolving set of national needs have been serviced by foreign language and international studies in the United States. The importance of creating and diffusing knowledge about other people and world areas has gained increasing significance as the nations of the world, including the United States, become increasingly interdependent. Special benefits are to be gained from the study of Latin America, an area containing nations similar to, yet less developed than, the United States and Europe, and much more developed than African and Asian nations.

A strong structure of foreign language and international studies is needed to serve current and future needs. Such a structure would pay special attention to knowledge creation through basic research (when feasible through international scholarly collaboration) and to the diffusion of that knowledge through broad-based teaching and through citizens' education. Individual specialists, university-based area studies centers, and other specialized organizations are all essential to a strong structure, and all require substantial federal support. The various elements of the nation's structure of foreign languages and international studies programs will need coordination by private and public organizations to match efficiently diverse needs and existing resources.

These diverse needs will require continuing government support to guarantee the creation and diffusion of needed knowledge. Such support will be handsomely rewarded by increasing the abilities of the United States and its citizens to pursue their interests in an increasingly complex world.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The "Lambert Report"--Richard D. Lambert, "Language and Area Studies Review," Monograph 17 of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Philadelphia, 1973) notes this growth and the lack of measures to document it precisely. The growth of Ph.D.'s in Language and International Studies has been documented by Robert A. McCaughey in his essay, "The Permanent Revolution: An Assessment of the Current State of International Studies in American Universities" (Barnard College, mimeo, 1979).

<sup>2</sup>Adapted from Robert B. Hall, Area Studies, 1947; Charles Wagley, Area Research and Training, 1948; Julian H. Steward, Area Research, 1950; and Wendell C. Bennett, Area Studies in American Universities, 1951. All of these works were published by the Social Science Research Council, New York, as the result of the work of its Committee on World Area Research.

<sup>3</sup>Report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General: Study of Foreign Languages and Related Areas, Sept. 13, 1978 (ID-78-46).

<sup>4</sup>Report of the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General: Study of Foreign Languages and Related Areas, Sept. 13, 1978 (ID-78-46), p. 28.

<sup>5</sup>These are my rough projections of Lambert's data on nonstudent specialists and current students. They should not be presumed to indicate with precision current or past distributions of specialists, but, if used at all, should be used to reflect relative magnitudes of specialists of different world areas.

<sup>6</sup>This statement should not be interpreted to imply criticism of Lambert's conclusions. They are admirably derived from painstaking data analysis. However his focus on university-trained specialists is more narrow than that of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. The clarity of Lambert's methodology, however, permits the utilization of his data base to estimate the size of the current pool of specialists.

<sup>7</sup>For a fuller discussion of citizens' education which makes similar recommendations, see Richard E. Greenleaf and Gene S. Yeager, "Outreach and Citizen's Education for the 1980's: Current Concerns and Recommendations," prepared for the conference, "New Directions in Language and Area Studies: Problems for the 1980's," Wingspread Conference Center, Racine Wisconsin, February 18-20, 1979.

<sup>8</sup>This point is made clearly in Francis X. Sutton's Keynote Address to the Invitational Seminar of the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education, April 3, 1979, "The International Liaison of Universities: History, Hazards, and Opportunities."

<sup>9</sup>The description of the ISTC is taken from excerpts from a December 4, 1978 draft document of the Foundation, presented by John M. Hunter in his position paper, "Development Assistance Programs," prepared for the February 1979 conference, "New Directions for

---

FOOTNOTES

Language and Area Studies," and from "Institute for Technological Cooperation, FY 1980, Congressional Presentation," February 23, 1979.

<sup>10</sup>Business and International Education, a report submitted by the Task Force on Business and International Education to the Government/Academic Interface Committee of the International Education Project of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., May 1977.

<sup>11</sup>These papers were presented at the conference "New Directions in Language and Area Studies."