

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND LATIN
AMERICAN STUDIES: A DISCIPLINE
IN SEARCH OF A REGION

John D. Martz, University of North Carolina

"FOR LONG IT HAS BEEN THE CONVENTIONAL WISDOM—REPEATED *ad nauseum* without ever an attempt at careful empirical demonstration—that the quality of Latin American studies is the lowest of all area scholarship. This judgment is clearly false for anthropology, history, and language and literature. How true is it for political science, one of the most maligned of the disciplines?"¹ Thus, the question posed by a leading political scientist during the disciplinary soul-searching which followed in the wake of the Camelot affair. Perhaps none of the disciplines concerned with Latin American studies have been so subjected to self-conscious evaluations and assessments in recent years. While much has represented professional cocktail-gossip and conventioneering punditry, it has generally reflected the less than edifying overview of Merle Kling in the early 1960's. Countless political science graduate students with Latin American interests have read his assessment:

Little capital (funds, talent, or organizational experience) has been invested in political studies of Latin America, and as a result the returns have been relatively meager. . . . Political scientists conducting research on Latin America, like some land-owners, have been reluctant to introduce advanced tools and machinery and to extend the intellectual acreage under cultivation—that is, to acquire new skills, to accept technical assistance, to encourage methods designed to diversify the crop of research findings, and to consider a redistribution of disciplinary properties. Political scientists specializing in Latin America have not reached, to borrow Rostow's familiar metaphor, the take-off stage.²

Evaluation similar in tone and thrust has been reiterated more recently. For Gomez, significant research on Latin American politics remains "encompassable," and given an accessible collection of materials, "a reasonably diligent and able graduate student would be able to read all of them during the typical period of graduate study and research."³ Nonetheless, the increasing quantity of Latin American studies, combined with the rapidity of intellectual innovations within political science, suggest the value of a more current reassessment. Moreover, there are at least a few non-continuous and discrete pieces of empirical evidence which serve to clarify previously muddled waters. Before iden-

tifying contemporary disciplinary trends and areas of research interest, however, a brief historical review is in order.

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES AND THE GROWTH OF POLITICAL DESCRIPTION

Political science was established as a new and burgeoning discipline which in institutional terms grew out of departments of history earlier in the century. Indeed, although the disciplinary concern with Latin America is largely a post-World War II phenomenon, the sum total of scholarly output on Latin American politics has been contained essentially within the years following 1903.⁴ It was early in the 1900's that James Bryce uttered a prophetic declaration that the Latin American republics were destined to play a role of increasing significance.⁵ Chronological narratives depicting the evolution of Latin American studies have properly noted that the early North American students of the region were largely historians, geographers, and anthropologists.⁶ Such scholars and teachers as W. R. Shepherd and William S. Robertson gradually began to attract the attention and loyalty of a few young graduate students. Early works included the investigations of Edward G. Bourne and Bernard Moses. In 1923 Herman G. James and Paul A. Martin collaborated on one of the earliest history textbooks on Latin America,⁷ and additional studies followed.

The productive volume of political studies increased during the 1920's, with hemispheric relations attracting interest. Diplomacy in the Americas had been stressed by Paul Reinsch during his career at Wisconsin (1899–1913) and by Leo S. Rowe at Pennsylvania (1895–1917). The former had already published the first article on Latin America to appear in *The American Political Science Review*,⁸ while Rowe was of course to become Director-General of the Pan-American Union for many years. Reinsch and Rowe were presidents of the American Political Science Association in 1920 and 1921 respectively. The tradition of diplomatic interests was extended in the 1920's by others, notably John H. Latané and Joseph B. Lockey.⁹ Political science was still in its infancy, however, and history continued to attract larger numbers of those interested in Latin America. The commitment to Latin American studies broadly construed was reflected characteristically by W. W. Pierson, himself an historian trained under W. R. Shepherd.

The position of Hispanic-American history in our scheme of education is no longer a question of serious debate. . . . It is with growing frequency obtaining a place in the curricula of our colleges. . . . Let it suffice, then, for me to record the conviction that this field of history may safely be compared as to importance, interest, and cultural value with those longer established.¹⁰

The narrow provincialism of political science continued during this pe-

riod, and "could scarcely have displayed greater indifference to the internal politics and governments of the Latin American countries."¹¹ Although country monographs on Argentina, Brazil, and Peru were published under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Institution of Washington,¹² these legalistic studies were the exception to the general rule. Even by the close of World War II the study of Latin America by political scientists had barely begun. A review of the literature for the years 1920–1945 has reported that political scientists, on the average, had produced but one professional article per year. Thirteen had appeared in *The Hispanic American Historical Review* and six in *The American Political Science Review*.¹³ Area studies in general remained in a depressing condition. Irving Leonard wrote in 1943 about the absence of properly trained personnel in Latin American studies, contending that with a few notable exceptions, there was a dearth of first-rate scholars.¹⁴ He saw the least undeveloped social science disciplines as including anthropology, archaeology and geography; for the humanities, he cited languages, literature and history.

Yet there was an optimistic belief that conditions would rapidly change. Thus a characteristic statement of collective opinion maintained that "Latin American specialists in many disciplines are found in United States institutions of higher learning. . . . Many of the problems which face specialists in other areas have been temporarily resolved or shelved in the Latin American field."¹⁵ For political science, a more cautious optimism began to be expressed with the appearance of descriptive textbooks and hemispheric political reviews. After years during which essentially history surveys had been employed in the classroom, it became possible—and fairly common for a few years—to use Russell H. Fitzgibbon's annotated compendium of Latin American constitutions in lieu of a formal text.¹⁶ First of the conventional political science texts was Austin F. MacDonald's *Latin American Politics and Government* (1949).¹⁷ Although not unaware of dynamic political forces, his country-by-country descriptions gave a rather pale image of reality. In keeping with disciplinary orientations, he divided discussions of each state into sections dealing respectively with political history and with a analysis of the existing constitution. While admittedly a pioneering work in its coverage and treatment, the volume set an essentially descriptive and static pattern which was to survive for years.

Miguel Jorrín's *Governments of Latin America* (1953)¹⁸ represented a progressive step in its stress upon certain political similarities and dissimilarities, while also incorporating sections on individual polities. Four year later the volume by William Whatley Pierson and Federico G. Gil¹⁹ became the first text to reject completely the country-by-country schema and its concomitant problems of duplication, repetition, and rapid obsolescence. Instead, its topical organization permitted comparative descriptions of political parties and elec-

tions, the economy, education, labor, and the church, as well as more legalistic surveys of the three powers of national government and of constitutions themselves. The growing preference for topical orientation continued through the decade as represented in the volumes by William S. Stokes and by Harold E. Davis.²⁰ Stokes provided a highly personalized interpretation, embracing rather idiosyncratic analyses of selected aspects of race and social structure. The Davis work, with chapters prepared by eleven contributors, directed attention to political actors and the variegated impact of dynamic forces within society, although several chapters were abundantly spiced with constitutional and legal ingredients. This tradition of descriptive political surveys, flavored to varying degrees by legalistic and constitutional concerns, had largely run its course by the 1960's. The major exception was the 1969 publication of Harry Kantor's massive volume,²¹ but it loomed as a somewhat anachronistic throwback to earlier years.

The early years of the 1960's saw the publication of several "mini-textbooks," the majority in paperback editions, which helped to suggest a trend toward classification and meaningful comparison. Rosendo Gomez's *Government and Politics in Latin America* (1960)²² provided brief topically-organized chapters which placed major emphasis on the impact of informal political processes, while the lengthier collaboration of Schmitt and Burks (1963)²³ narrated recent events as categorized by treatments of social and economic factors, interest groups, parties, and political dynamics. A pair of brief surveys by Robert J. Alexander (1962 and 1965)²⁴ also underlined the importance of comparisons, and classificatory typologies were suggested for political parties and the role of the military. In 1964 Maier and Weatherhead edited a collaborative volume²⁵ which was an admixture of regional comparisons, discussions of selected countries, and policy problems. In the same year James Busey's mini-text attempted hemispheric generalization through analyses of five selected countries.²⁶ Probably the best and most "modern" work was that of Martin Needler,²⁷ which presented thoughtful discussions of political culture, political and governmental processes, and policy concerns. These works were to varying degrees suggestive of new research interests and modes of analysis in political science. The concern for conceptual clarity and comparative investigation which by the 1960's had blossomed within the discipline had begun to fertilize the study of Latin American politics.

THE QUEST FOR CONCEPTS: COMPARISON AND CLASSIFICATION

The relevance of comparison to the study of politics is scarcely new. As early as 1889 Woodrow Wilson had aptly written that North American politi-

cal institutions could be understood “only by those who know somewhat familiarly other systems of government and the main facts of general institutional history.”²⁸ Yet as with political studies of Latin America, non-United States investigation until the 1950’s was largely institutional and legalistic, with emphases placed on the forms and structures of government itself. Disciplinary dissatisfaction had been growing, however; as early as 1944 a panel of the American Political Science Association had noted the increasingly anachronistic nature of “foreign” studies, and pointed dissection of more traditional studies was increasingly common. A characteristic articulation of this view was that of Macridis, who described earlier work as parochial, static, and essentially descriptive.²⁹ In the 1950’s, then, political scientists came to regard as of paramount importance the consideration of informal political dynamics, notions of change, and broad-ranging interpretive evaluations of similar phenomena in different political systems. Gabriel A. Almond, a pioneer of the movement to modernize comparative political studies, appropriately pleaded that “it may be said of new concepts as it was of the salvation of souls . . . ‘there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, for many are called but few are chosen.’”³⁰

Such weeping and gnashing became a commonplace among political scientists studying Latin America. The concern with comparison induced a shift away from quasi-historical studies and from constitutional-institutional analyses. At first the pioneering undertakings began to move from a Western European setting toward the transitional or developing areas, and this was soon influencing the study of Latin America. Gomez has referred to the advent of broadly comparative works incorporating Latin American materials as among the most dramatic developments of these years. In his view, this trend was “a result of thorough self-appraisal among comparative governmentalists as to the state of the comparative approach to politics.”³¹ To be sure, the progression was uneven and halting. Kling aptly described as awkward the relationship between Latin American studies and comparative politics. In his words, research on the region, “rather than flowing into the somewhat turbulent mainstream of modern political science, often appears to drift in an isolated channel of its own, with its sponsors perched along the banks of the more swiftly moving waters of the discipline.”³²

Writing in the early 1960’s, Kling was doubtless accurate in suggesting that newer currents in comparative politics had frequently been rejected by Latin Americanists, at least in part as a function of the greater ease and intellectual comfort derived from what the discipline was coming to regard as “old-fashioned” analysis. Yet the long-range trends seemed to be more consonant with the position expressed by Gomez. George I. Blanksten, one of the early prime movers in the modernization of Latin Americanists, put it well:

We should not devote our careers to learning more about Latin America for the sole purpose of learning more about Latin America. Science seeks to generalize, and the more we can apply to other areas what we learn in Latin America, the greater the likely contribution to comparative politics and to political science as a whole.³³

Indeed, the first major evidence of Latin Americanists' responsiveness to ongoing trends came with Blanksten's fine essay of nearly eighty pages in the seminal Almond and Coleman volume.³⁴ While not always holding to the editors' conceptual framework, he generally followed their functional outline in describing Latin American political socialization, recruitment, interest articulation and aggregation, and the like. Seymour Martin Lipset's *Political Man* (1960)³⁵ also included Latin American materials, although in very small quantity. The series of Studies in Political Development which appeared throughout the 1960's under the sponsorship of the SSRC Committee on Comparative Politics testified both to the retarded disciplinary growth by Latin Americanists and to a gradual move in the direction of contemporary comparative analysis. The first three volumes, while allegedly inclusive of all transitional regions, were bereft of Latin American materials.³⁶ By mid-decade, however, this was altered through the involvement and participation of Robert E. Scott, who contributed pieces to the volumes on parties and political culture.³⁷

Given the extent to which the divergence between the sub-discipline of comparative politics and the areal specialization of Latin Americanists continued, a major factor was the difficulty encountered by those who would embrace the study of Latin America within the conceptual framework of ongoing research about the transitional societies. Stress was frequently placed upon the so-called "new nations;" interest was concentrated on those states and regions emerging recently from colonial status. The flow of theoretical studies reflecting a "Western/non-Western" dichotomy provoked further uncertainty. When in 1958 Lucian W. Pye undertook a characterization of the non-Western political process without specifying countries or regions,³⁸ the Latin Americanist inevitably wondered if his own region was included. Such treatments of the "new nations" as that of Shils further clouded the place of Latin America in the study of comparative politics, although he was eventually to state that the "South [sic] American states . . . exist in an intermediate zone between the modern, longer-established states and the unmodern new states."³⁹

Dankwart Rustow, while also stressing those countries emerging from dependency status, did exempt Latin America from the non-Western category, fleetingly hinting at an intermediate position for the region. He saw the Latin American nations as a

connecting link between contemporary Western and non-Western political experi-

ence. . . . While some of them have developed along very nearly European lines, others appear to offer a modified version of the present non-Western experience. Such features as ethnic and cultural cleavages, major realignments of boundaries, chronic governmental instability, the prominence of personal leadership and of military coups, and the need for economic development—all these are equally characteristic of many Latin as well as many Asian and African countries.⁴⁰

For several years, then, both comparativists and Latin Americanists found themselves puzzled by and uncomfortable with their relationship. The former tended to treat the region in generally misleading and often cavalier fashion, while the latter pondered the heuristic potential for Latin American studies of ongoing comparative research in the transitional areas. It was within this context that the present writer undertook a more detailed examination of the alleged validity of the Western/non-Western duality for Latin America. Using as referents a set of characteristics representative of the non-Western literature, it was argued that while certain Latin American countries “fit” the Western model, others more resembled the non-Western. The conclusion answered “in the negative the question as to whether or not the states of Latin America are homogeneous to an extent permitting their blanket inclusion”⁴¹ under either of the mutually exclusive rubrics.

Among additional implications were the deterministic overtones which existed in many of the comparative conceptualizations. Certainly the Western/non-Western analysis suggested a developmental continuum along which the countries of Latin America were ranged at presumably disparate positions—a Chile or Uruguay resembling the “modern” westernized model, with Paraguay, Nicaragua, or Haiti located at the other end of the scale in the company of many African and Asian states. Implicit was a normative culture—bias suggesting an inevitable progression toward an Americo-Anglo-European model. Students of Latin American politics were further troubled by the theoretical implications of linear progression, with an essentially uni-dimensional and therefore artificial ideal type.

On another level, it was also argued that those accepting the non-Western frame of reference would necessarily be forced to recognize the implications of studying the region in holistic fashion. The areal tradition in Latin American scholarship having been strong and deep-rooted, the region continued to be studied in considerable part as a single entity. Yet the obstacles have been and continue to be imposing: extreme geographic diversity, kaleidoscopic variety of the political as well as cultural and socio-economic experience, even the discontinuities of the philosophical and intellectual heritage, all combining to render difficult if not wholly unmanageable the magnitude of the task. Finally, there was the contention that a commitment to the selective application of non-

Western characteristics might well force a necessary reconsideration of the prevailing conviction that Latin America could indeed be meaningfully studied as a single unit of analysis.

In more recent years it has become apparent that more refined conceptualizing by comparativists has moved away from the somewhat simplistic models based on artificial constructs of Western and non-Western ideal types. Given the inherent problems mentioned already, this can be regarded as fortuitous for the study of Latin America. The expenditure of energy in pursuing such research models for the region, it is believed, would have been misplaced; certainly the Western/non-Western discussions have subsequently faded from the scene. Instead, attention has been devoted to studies of political culture, nationalism, nation-building, and political development—the latter a rubric which at this writing is being widely employed through fairly disparate and sometimes contradictory interpretations. Considerable attention was devoted for a time to the concept of political culture, although today's literature suggests that this is in the process of tacit rejection by many political scientists, and most definitely by Latin Americanists.

Anthropological studies of Latin America had naturally stressed the cultural component, and among these were holistic interpretations of Latin American society. In 1955 John Gillin discussed what he termed the "ethos components" of the region, giving particular attention to the Hispanic conception of the individual and of such characteristics as *dignidad*, *machismo*, *personalismo*, ceremonial friendship, and familial relationships.⁴² The same year Wagley and Harris formulated a typology of Latin American sub-cultures as a means of delineating both parallels and dissimilarities of cultural traits.⁴³ More than a decade later Wagley was again exploring the common denominators of Latin American culture, stressing the persistence of traditional ways of thought and behavior patterns and their tenacity in the face of fundamental socio-economic change.⁴⁴ At the same time political scientists were beginning to consider more fully the broader socio-cultural context within which political systems operated. There was a conscious effort to extend the boundaries of study in order to accommodate the uniqueness of individual societies as well as to derive more universal propositions and generalizations about politics.

As early as 1956 Almond was speaking of political culture as a 'pattern of orientations to political action,' related to but not identical with general culture.⁴⁵ More explicit attention came in the work of Samuel Beer, who incorporated political culture along with power, interests, and policy as the major aspects of ongoing political systems. While employing the notion of political culture as both a causal factor and a political determinant, Beer stressed the impact of a given political culture on issues of stability or instability and con-

sensus or dissensus.⁴⁶ In the early and mid-1960's, comparativists continued to study the explanatory and conceptual utility of this approach. Almond was again a leading figure in the enterprise, and in conjunction with Sidney Verba he identified attitudinal subcultures as being parochial, subject, or participant in orientation.⁴⁷ Discussion of a Western-style "civic culture" concerned with degrees of popular participation attempted explicitly to bridge the theoretical gap between macro- and micro-political analysis. Almond subsequently collaborated with Powell in a study which included further treatment of political culture, by this time definitionally denoted as a pattern of individual attributes and orientations toward politics by the members of a political system.⁴⁸

Pye and Verba devoted further attention to the subject, most notably in a collaborative volume in which Scott presented an essay on "Mexico: The Established Revolution."⁴⁹ In seeking to enrich political analysis through the contributions of several different intellectual traditions, the editors committed themselves to a definition of political culture as constituting a system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols and values, and interrelationships between political ideals and norms of operation. In short, stress was placed on the subjective orientation to politics, with attitudinal beliefs classified as cognitive, evaluative, and expressive or affective. The operationalization of research, it was argued, could properly be conducted along such dimensions as national identity, identification with one's fellow citizens, governmental performance and output, and decision-making processes. The historical element, which was given considerable weight, contributed to the articulation of a series of "crises"—such as those of identity, legitimacy, penetration, participation, integration, and distribution.⁵⁰

Despite conscious efforts toward conceptual precision and definitional clarity, such writings found it difficult to provide more than insightful descriptive analysis based on previous scholarship. Scott's personalized examination of Mexico in the Pye and Verba volume gave ample evidence of his long experience and intuitive understanding of the country; however, his socio-psychologically oriented essay could have abandoned the terminology of the volume without losing its interpretive force. With political analysis concerned about explication of political phenomena, the nature of interrelationships between political forces, and causality of dependence or independence, advocates of the political culture approach were frustrated in seeking to achieve such goals. There was an apparent need to fall back on discussions of political culture as a residual category to interpret political behavior which could not otherwise be explained—precisely this criticism was voiced by Matthews and Prothro in a US-based study.⁵¹ Perhaps the most pragmatic argument against the validity or utility of political culture as a theoretical framework derived

from the blunt fact that the years following the publication of such works as those cited above were not distinguished by continuing efforts to apply such concepts. In the Latin American literature, perhaps the single exception is a recent work bearing as subtitle "A Study of Chilean Political Culture."⁵² Yet the author of this particular work had in mind a distinctive intellectual concern; for him the concept was largely a means of expressing in idiosyncratic and individualistic fashion the importance of psychological pattern of thought toward systemic authority and legitimacy.

Concurrent with the interest in political culture was a renewed examination of nationalism and nation-building, which in time evolved toward political development, change, and stability. The study of nationalism, while among the older concerns of traditional political science, had continued to attract attention in more recent years, as witness the contributions of Emerson, Deutsch, and Snyder's compilation, *The Dynamics of Nationalism* (1964).⁵³ Somewhat strangely, however, students of Latin America had devoted relatively little attention to the subject. Then in 1966 a pair of books showed a renewal of interest: the German historian Gerhard Masur attempted to synthesize a lifetime of Latin American experience within the framework of nationalism,⁵⁴ and the distinguished historian Arthur P. Whitaker collaborated with the political scientist David C. Jordan in a consciously structured interpretation of Latin American nationalism.⁵⁵ The latter authors, treating nationalism as a concept and a mobilizing force for change, nonetheless encountered terminological difficulties from the outset. After beginning with a fivefold classification of nationalism, they largely departed from this in discussing manifestations in individual countries. Ultimately they were to imply that virtually every significant political movement in the region had been predominantly nationalistic, with adjectival descriptions ranging through benign or aggressive, ideological or pragmatic, populist or comprehensive, polycentric, canonical, and so forth. While discussing the multi-faceted implications of nationalism with considerable intuitive wisdom, they did not in the end provide heuristically valuable suggestions for further research.

Greater precision in terminology and classificatory conceptualization came from the more sociologically oriented work of Silvert on the same subject.⁵⁶ In his introductory essay, "The Strategy of the Study of Nationalism," he provided a context within which fruitful analysis might well be extended. Silvert viewed nationalism as social value, class, development, and as ideology. He further underlined his conceptual stance with a case study of Argentine "antinationalism." Chapters in the same work by Patch on Bolivia and Bonilla on Brazil also presented substantial contributions to the literature on nationalism, although not framed within Silvert's schema.⁵⁷ Despite a plethora of ways

in which attitudinal and public opinion studies might be linked to Silvert's analysis, little has been forthcoming in more recent years. It may be that the nature of classic studies of nationalism is sufficiently oriented toward historical analysis and normative judgments as to discourage scholars interested in "new" concepts and approaches. Whatever the reason, the bibliography of political science studies of Latin American is far from overrepresented by works on nationalism.

All of this seeking for bases of classification and comparison came to be reflected in the more recent political textbooks. In 1964 Martin Needler and fourteen collaborators followed a general schema which—owing an intellectual debt to the Beer and Ulam work on Western European politics⁵⁸—presented political narratives woven about the rubrics of socio-economic background, political history, political processes (parties, interest groups, the military, students, and press), governmental institutions, and public policy.⁵⁹ Shortly thereafter a broadly similar undertaking was organized by Ben G. Burnett and Kenneth F. Johnson,⁶⁰ with fifteen scholars providing "country" chapters. Reflecting the sub-title, "Dimensions in the Quest for Stability," individual polities were analyzed under the labels of political environment, political structures and roles, processes of function and dysfunction (elections and representation, socialization and recruitment, public policy), and dimensions of systemic change. Both of these volumes, while recognizing the need for conceptualization and concerned with the classification of political systems in order to facilitate theory-building, also exemplified the reluctance of individual contributors to adapt themselves to the editors' organizational categories. Thus the efforts at classification were erratic and the bases for comparison disparate and discontinuous.

Much the same was true of Edelmann's text,⁶¹ which presented its quasi-sociological content through topical chapters such as "Demographic Potpourri of a Society in Transition" and "The Social Classes and the Family: Fermentation in the Structure." As with the Needler and the Burnett and Johnson volumes, Edelmann placed greatest stress on the input side of the idealized model of political systems, concentrating on political parties, organized labor, the role of the military, and the like. Policy outputs generally received limited attention, a condition which has characterized much of the literature on Latin American politics. Edelmann, however, did go further than his predecessors through the inclusion of discussions on agriculture and land reform, industrialization, foreign aid, and economic planning and integration. Much greater attention to policy matters came in 1967 from Charles W. Anderson's *Politics and Economic Change in Latin America*.⁶² While not in the orthodox sense a textbook, this imaginative and thoughtful study gave added momentum to the

study of policy processes, the content of governmental outputs, and the political ramifications of economic problems.

In addition to such texts, a growing trend in the direction of comparative politics country studies has become evident. Federico G. Gil's work on Chile⁶³ and that of L. Vincent Padgett on Mexico⁶⁴ became prototypes for similar volumes in comparative series. Furthermore, by the end of the decade an exclusively Latin American series was in preparation under Gil's general editorship, contemplating some half-dozen works to be organized about a broad developmental framework. Among the countries to be included were Costa Rica, Brazil, Cuba, Chile, Mexico, and Ecuador. Despite these developments, it yet remained for areal political scientists to undertake research motivated by the disciplinary quest for explanation and prediction. And it was with the growth of this recent tendency that a consideration of methods, techniques, and research tools assumed larger importance.

THE QUEST FOR METHODS: EXPLANATION AND PREDICTION

Clearly, new and different approaches have emerged in comparative politics literature, many of which have been adopted wholly or in part by Latin Americanists. At the same time the discontinuities between broad conceptual statements and areally-oriented research have continued. Points of controversy have become increasingly methodological in substance, as Schmitter has recently suggested. This shift in emphasis he characterized in the following language:

Several years ago, students of Latin American politics discovered with some alarm that the subdiscipline of comparative politics had not only been ignoring their scholarly efforts, but the area altogether. At that time the principal focus of discontent was conceptualization. Classification schemes, typologies, checklists, functions and isolated concepts about the politics of translation were being derived and applied without reference to and relevance for Latin America. . . .

More recently, scholars have been placing greater emphasis on operational strategies—upon passing directly to problems of discrete measurement, analysis of fit and causal inference. In many instances conceptual disputes have been thrust aside or postponed in the drive for quantification and index construction.⁶⁵

Such methodological matters for a time revolved about the generalized impact of the behavioral sciences upon the broad study of politics. Bitter controversy over the use and application of quantitative techniques and upon studies of political behavior mathematically analyzed had characterized the entire discipline in the decade following World War II. Although the dispute eventually reached an acceptable level of resolution and consensus, the behavioral revolution also provided the bases for disagreement among Latin Americanists.

Quantification came to students of Latin America more slowly than to political science in general. Thus it was still necessary for Kling to address the problem in 1964, declaring that Latin American political research had reached a transitional stage in the movement from "traditional" to "modernizing" methods and techniques. Observing that the prevailing trends were bearing a growing commitment to mathematical and statistical methods, he predicted for Latin American studies "the substitution of quantitative measurements wherever feasible for impressionistic, qualitative appraisals."⁶⁶ Since that time, the volume of these studies on Latin American politics has increased measurably, in many instances providing meaningful contributions to cumulative understanding. Perhaps inevitably, there have also been cases where a fascination with the use of technique for its own intrinsic worth has resulted in sophisticated mathematical manipulations largely devoid of theoretical content or meaning. Similar criticism can of course be directed toward disciplinary research unrelated to Latin American topics.

The fierce resistance to quantification and to the use of statistical data has properly receded, notwithstanding criticisms which can and have been directed occasionally at individual pieces of research. There is little sympathy here for such shot-gun attacks as that of Richard M. Morse, a noted historian who patronizingly saw "poor political science" as committed to a "dutiful mobilization to produce 'scientific' studies . . . [which] makes the next ten or twenty years of political inquiry predictable, and therefore drab."⁶⁷ There is no longer a need to discuss the issue at length. More to the point is the observation that the present limits of quantitative analysis in political science as a whole are less restrictive than within the Latin American sub-field. The sheer lack of basic data treating of many topics provides an inhibiting element for the student of Latin American politics. The unreliability of much statistical information on Latin America is notorious, although there are more exceptions than some would concede, and the problems of availability and accuracy of data should not be used as a rationalizing crutch for eschewing quantitative work.

Much of the statistically-based analysis by Latin Americanists has come from the rapid emergence of political development and modernization as a significant component of the comparative sub-field. Initially the "nation-building" label was in vogue, although Scott's essay in an edited volume⁶⁸ was virtually the only Latin American example, and heavily stressed the historical tradition out of which contemporary politics and societies have emerged. One of the earliest statements came from a memorandum by Samuel P. Huntington which was included in the Kling report on Latin American political research. Huntington's recommendation for the utilization of political development and modernization as a framework for ordering Latin American data was char-

acterized by Kling as "the most comprehensive and systematic statement on the research implications of the approach."⁶⁹ Huntington regarded the progression from traditionalism to modernization as offering "the best framework for analyzing Latin American politics."⁷⁰ He identified four areas as subsuming the major characteristics to be studied: mass mobilization (communications, integration, socialization and participation); interest articulation; elite broadening (expansion of number and type of political activists and the assimilation of new types into leadership roles); and institutional development (stressing parties, executives, legislatures, judicial bodies, and the 'rules of the game'). Political development, he held, takes place along all four channels, and is of crucial importance in achieving a balanced relationship among them.

While there were criticisms that Huntington's formulation was normatively skewed toward political stability—a point which should not be pressed without consideration of his more recent and extended discussion⁷¹—there were few who rejected the developmental approach out-of-hand. Indeed, students of Latin American politics have become demonstrably enamoured with developmental concepts as derived from quantitative analysis of data. Thus far the emphasis has been on hemisphere-wide generalizations about development, rather than on single-country studies. There seems to be a somewhat hypnotic fascination with the possibilities of broad cross-national comparison as framed by notions of development and change. The forerunner of such work on Latin America was Russell H. Fitzgibbon's series of studies of democratic changes.⁷² In a project which has now covered over two decades, he has generated data from Latin Americanists' subjective responses to a questionnaire concerning country-by-country evaluations of fifteen broadly-drawn indices of "democratic change." In the more recent surveys Fitzgibbon has been increasingly interested in the identification of alleged change across the time dimension.

Others have grappled more directly with developmental issues, however. While such scholars as Vekemans and Segundo and Stepan have examined political and economic interrelationships,⁷³ others have been more concerned with stability, instability, and the role of violence. Douglas Chalmers did not employ statistical tests in identifying conditions under which greater or lesser degrees of change and reform emerged from what he called "crisis situations,"⁷⁴ but Douglas P. Bwy applied sophisticated quantitative techniques, including extensive factor analysis, as a means of refining existing notions of violence and anomic activity. The result was a provocative if critically received "cross-cultural test of a causal model."⁷⁵ Kenneth F. Johnson has also employed quantification in studying factors of political instability and developmental progress, while Duff and McCamant constructed interrelated indices of societal welfare and social mobilization. To these they added data on economic growth,

income distribution, governmental extractive and distributive capability, and political party organization, from which they derived system stability scores. These in turn were utilized for country-by-country profiles from which predictions for system stability were drawn.⁷⁶

Yet another example of this approach was Peter G. Snow's scalogram analysis, in which he attempted to identify patterns of political development by country. It permitted the scholar, he argued, "to rank nations as to their relative degrees of development; . . . to rank developmental characteristics as to the frequency of their occurrence; . . . to determine which nations depart from a general pattern of development, . . . *and all of this can be done in a single process.*"⁷⁷ Perhaps the most extended developmental analysis by a Latin Americanist has been that of Needler.⁷⁸ Blending historical tradition with the use of a variety of political and socio-economic indices, he employed as quantifiable measures years of constitutional government, participation as measured by voting, and various indicators of economic development. From these he formulated a series of "theorems" which attempted to generalize about the whole of Latin America and to lead in the direction of meaningful prediction. For one example, he contended that the maintenance of a high order of constitutional integrity accompanied by deteriorating economic conditions required restrictive policies which in turn would lead to a reduction of participation.

It can be argued that if developmental concepts are to register a lasting impact, the identification and study of more narrow and rigidly defined universes will be necessary. The broad-brush strokes of Bwy, Duff and McCamant, Snow, Needler, *et al.*, can be extended almost inexhaustibly, with researchers selecting slightly different indices, subjecting them to differing modes of analysis, and "proving" diverse or even contradictory assumptions about Latin American politics. The point of diminishing returns may be rapidly reached, beyond which there can be little further accumulation of knowledge and meaningful insight. Whether or not this quantified developmental literature will provide continuing intellectual challenge to Latin Americanists or, in contrast, whether it will truly provide something of heuristic significance for Latin American politics cannot yet be foreseen. For the present, however, it is representative of the commitment to greater precision of conceptualization and of method than was previously the case.

This developmental literature also typifies the growing use of aggregate data analysis in the quest for more rigorous methods and for more systematic knowledge and insight. In many cases demographic and census data is sufficiently complete and detailed to be used, and there is much that can be done through analysis of election returns. Schmitter's article provided a sound and carefully reasoned set of guidelines for the future of aggregate analysis. While

agreeing that the collection and manipulation of aggregate data would by no means resolve all dilemmas, he believed that the resultant explicitness and degree of comparability would "spur the examination and probable falsification of many customarily accepted truths of the field and shift its focus from description to causal analysis. . . [also serving] to pin-point deviant cases and the impact of idiosyncratic and random variables."⁷⁹ Certainly today's body of knowledge about Latin American politics includes a vast store of commonly-accepted folk wisdom which deserves a skeptical questioning and, where possible, empirical testing.

The choice of analytic method and type of data naturally varies widely, although few of the depths have yet been plumbed by Latin Americanists. However, the younger scholars emerging recently from graduate training are beginning to explore the possibilities. Increasingly, inquisitive investigators are generating their own data in a variety of often imaginative ways. Notwithstanding the multitude of procedural and technical problems encountered, experience in field research suggests that despite environmental and cultural differences, many research problems are not fundamentally dissimilar from those characteristic of scholarly inquiry in other regions. To cite but one example, the distribution, completion, and gathering of mailed questionnaires to a selected universe entails in Latin America obstacles which have been commonly undergone in the United States and elsewhere, although admittedly for Latin America there is an additional tier of difficulties requiring a sensitivity to and understanding of local customs and folk-ways. If students of Latin American politics must sometimes employ considerable ingenuity in gathering data appropriate to their interests, this is becoming recognized as an intellectual and professional challenge rather than an insuperable obstacle defying solution by a foreigner. Granted the vast expanses which are yet virgin territory, there is cause for neither hesitance and timidity nor narrow-minded glibness on the part of the traditionally oriented. If there is no single road to knowledge and insight, this is but to say that there is an abundance of paths lying at the feet of the intelligent and dedicated scholar.

LATIN AMERICAN RESEARCH INTERESTS AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL SCIENCE

Several recent studies have provided fresh information on Latin American research as undertaken by political scientists, and have also permitted comparison with other regional specializations within the discipline. Braibanti analyzed dissertation titles published annually in *The American Political Science Review*,⁸⁰ computing percentages of topics classified by field over five-year

periods. He first noted a marked upward trend in comparative politics. While 12% of all titles from 1948–52 fell under this heading, the figure had risen to 27% by 1958–62 and reached 33% in 1963–66, representing easily the largest single category in the discipline. For the entire 1948–66 period, 21% of the titles fell under comparative politics, a total second only to the 29% listed under international organization. Braibanti further showed that among comparative politics topics themselves, growing attention had been directed toward “transitional systems” rather than to “developed western systems.”

Whereas from 1948–52 studies of developed systems comprised two-thirds of the total, by 1958–62 those devoted to transitional ones had surpassed the former by a narrow margin (48%–45%); from 1963–66, 55% of the comparative politics titles were transitional, with only 37% devoted to developed western systems. Given the heavy preference for western systems in the early postwar years, the 1948–66 data showed 50% of the studies listed in this category, with 43% classified as transitional. Dissection of the transitional category into geographic regions indicated that attention to Latin American consistently ranked second among the four categories (Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East), although the fluctuations were irregular. From 1948–52, with only 144 titles listed as transitional, the Latin American share was 26%, running second to Asia with 49%. A relative decline in the 1950's saw the percentage slip to 14% and later to 10%. By 1963–66, however, the total was back to 22% of the 395 transitional studies. For the entire 1948–66 period, Asia stood first with 43% and Latin America followed with 19% of the 1,105 titles.

The Latin American-comparative politics relationship was traced further by Braibanti's review of articles published in leading political science journals.⁸¹ Examining the same time span, he identified the upward trend in comparative politics, although there were variations for certain of the individual journals. In *The American Political Science Review*, 5.1% of the articles published from 1948–52 dealt with the transitional areas; the highest figure was 10.4% for 1953–57, while the figure for the eighteen years stood at 6.7%. Similarly, the 1948–66 years showed a total of 7.9% in *The Journal of Politics*; 11.8% in *Western Political Quarterly*; 13.9% in *World Politics*; and 14.8% in *Political Science Quarterly*. For Latin America, percentages had generally remained steady since 1952, rising from 2 to 3 percent by 1963–66 in four of the five journals. In 1963–66, articles on Asia consistently ran first in all five publications, with second place alternating between Africa and Latin America. Reviewing the eighteen years, Braibanti found a similar picture: Latin American articles were more numerous than those on Africa, but trailed well behind Asia. Latin Americanists could see that of *all* articles published in these journals from

1948–66, only 1.8% in the *APSR* represented their own work; the range extended from a low of 0.9% in *World Politics* to a high of 4.2% in *Western Political Quarterly*.

Braibanti also undertook to relate membership in national disciplinary associations with that of the various areal national organizations (such as the Latin American Studies Association). While these figures scarcely permitted definitive conclusions, they provided useful summaries by discipline and by region of concentration. The Latin American Studies Association reported at that time that 28% of its members were historians; economists were second with 13%, and political scientists third at 11%. In contrast, political scientists with Asian interests represented the second largest group in that specialization, while with Africanists the largest percentage was composed of political scientists (tied at 21% with anthropologists). Data relating Latin American studies to political science showed that while 57 members of LASA were also affiliated with the American Political Science Association, the number of Africanists belonging to the disciplinary organization was 110, with Asian specialists numbering 637. It should be noted that Middle Eastern specialists were not represented by an areal organization of their own, presumably being affiliated with either the African Studies Association or the Association for Asian Studies. Moreover, the Latin American Studies Association had been only very recently organized at the time of Braibanti's inquiry, thus membership figures were less fully representative than would otherwise have been the case. By 1970, LASA membership had risen to some 1500.

Beyond Braibanti's broad examination of comparative politics, understanding of Latin American-related research is supplemented by the analyses of Rosendo Gomez and Peter Ranis. The former⁸² identified the article output in professional journals from 1945 through 1964 by Latin Americanists; 150 had appeared during these twenty years, with annual variations failing to conform to any clear pattern. The frequency had increased slightly but erratically during the five most recent years, averaging nine annually. Yet the highest yearly output was 14 in 1959, while there were 12 each in 1949, 1951, and 1961. Gomez' survey had also determined that this two-decade output represented 70% of the entire number since the year 1906. Furthermore, 122 of the 150 pieces had been published in six journals,⁸³ only three of which were political science outlets. *The American Political Science Review* had published 36 Latin American-related articles during the 1945–64 period; there were 19 in the *Western Political Quarterly* for 16 years, and the figure for *The Journal of Politics* was 14 in 16 years.

Further clarification resulted from Peter Ranis' compilation of scholarly work on Latin American politics during the 1961–67 years.⁸⁴ Excluding "international" titles in order to focus on studies of internal and domestic politics,

he provided a form of listing similar to Braibanti's. Examining 674 research titles during the indicated years, he attempted the elaboration of a profile of contemporary interests, classified both by general subject and by geographic area or country. Ranis isolated fourteen categories of subjects, of which the largest and most sustained attention was directed toward interest groups (107 entries, or 16% of the total). Of these 107, 74% were concerned with the overall role of interest groups in the political process, and more specifically toward the military, students, and church-state relationships. The military by itself accounted for 36% of the entries. Second to the study of interest groups were two categories encompassing historical studies of political systems and analyses of evolution and change. Without denying the awkwardness and artificiality of these rubrics, each applied separately to 14% of the total subjects. Political parties also represented a major research area, with 81 entries providing 12% of the overall total. While nearly one-third of the party studies were of a broad comparative nature, many dealt with individual countries, of which Chile led the way with 15 projects, or 18% of the party total. Another 8 centered on parties in Venezuela.

Looking at research in the light of country-based topics, Ranis determined that 26% of the listed projects were region-wide in scope and treatment; individual countries receiving the greatest attention were Mexico, Brazil, and Chile, with 77, 76, and 65 entries respectively. There was a large gap between these three and the next grouping, in which Argentina, Peru, and Venezuela numbered 38, 34, and 32 projects. At the bottom of the listing were three countries with only two entries (Paraguay, Honduras, and El Salvador), and two with but a single entry (Haiti and Nicaragua). Within individual countries the division by subject heading was varied. The category of "administrative and political organization and process," which Ranis applied to administrative decision-making, bureaucracy, and institutional organization, was the most popular for Mexico (16% of the Mexican total), Brazil (14%), and Peru (10%). Of the other most-studied countries, the subject of parties received the greatest attention in Venezuela (25%) and Chile (18%), while 39% of the studies related to Argentina were "historical studies of political systems." All such findings were admittedly lacking in much refinement, given the inevitably noninclusive and overlapping nature of many of the categories and sub-headings. It might be added, however, that such presumably significant and frequently-recommended topics as elites, revolution and violence, political socialization, and social structure and values received but minor emphasis. Taken together these categories were represented by only 16% of all items, with the individual breakdown running from 6% for social structure and values down to a mere 3% apiece for elites and for revolution and violence.

As these evolving research interests continued for Latin America, compara-

tivists within the discipline returned for yet another round of reassessments, certain of which have borne considerable relevance to the region. In the 30th Anniversary Issue of *The Journal of Politics*, Andrain and Apter gave explicit emphasis to “developing new nations” in their survey of comparative politics.⁸⁵ After reviewing the changing patterns of social science thought and research, they identified the tendencies emerging from three approaches—the normative, the structural, and the behavioral. Each of these was considered through such “elements” as the analytic problem, units, variables, assumptions, and techniques. It was their judgment that “the structural-behavioral combination represents the frontier of future comparative political studies in the developing nations.”⁸⁶

The structural component was envisaged as dealing with requisites necessary for the maintenance and modernization of social systems, with whole societies, nations, government institutions, and political groups serving as units of analysis. Key variables included system maintenance and development, structural differentiation and integration, and the allocation of power and responsibility. The behavioral was regarded as revolving about the internalization of cultural values and norms, personal needs and motivations, and attention to ideology and to the role of dominant personalities in the creation of authority pattern. The unit for analysis was the individual and small group, while significant variables would include both personality traits and such processes as socialization, perception, motivation, and adaptation. In a conclusion for this study of *new* nations which Latin Americanists might also ponder, it was emphasized that the highest priority was neither geographical nor technical, but rather theoretical. In short, “analytical sophistication, quantitative technique, and descriptive area knowledge will need to be more effectually integrated in a theoretical context.”⁸⁷

Latin America was also incorporated into the Braibanti article. Speaking from a wealth of experience and research of an areal nature, he saw as the ultimate objective of comparative analysis the derivation from separate political systems and cultures of hypotheses characterized by presumptive universal validity and the verification necessary for the elucidation of theories of politics. He gave particular attention to what was termed configurative analysis, by which he meant “the identification and interpretation of factors in the whole social order which appear to affect whatever political functions and their institutional manifestations have been identified and listed for comparison.”⁸⁸ A cultural or contextual mode of analysis would encourage the elucidation of generalized understanding of the political process. In urging his configurative approach on comparativists, he seemed at times to be presenting a sophisticated and subtly reasoned brief for area studies. Yet he viewed the priorities of the

areal concept as incompatible with those of systems analysis. In short, he saw the configurative approach as the best means of confronting the existing ambivalence between area emphases and systematic analyses.

Further reevaluations of comparative politics were aired in the initial issue of a new journal bearing the same title. Such authorities as Lasswell, Beer, Rustow, La Palombara, Macridis, and Duchacek took up the cudgels in a series of sharply analytical essays. In a commentary pregnant with suggestions for Latin Americanists, Rustow decried the frequent denial in the existing literature of the primacy of politics, along with the concomitant attempt to explain it away through "the widespread acceptance of stability and equilibrium as the central ordering concepts of our social theory."⁸⁹ Noting the proclivity to relegate politics to the position of the ever-dependent variable, he praised the efforts of a minority of scholars to work towards truly *political* empirical theories. While favorably inclined toward disciplinary efforts to break out of traditional Western parochialism, Rustow also underlined the problems encountered in the popularity of the quest for universality. Citing the values of such organizing concepts as modernization and social change, political culture, and the inclusion of an enriching historical perspective, he argued for the introduction of more extensive notions of change into existing conceptions of politics. For Rustow, "the study of modernization as macro-political change would grow organically out of the study of the rise, transformation, and fall of political groups, institutions, and leadership as processes of micropolitical change."⁹⁰

Among the most provocative and stimulating assessments was that of La Palombara, who penned an angry condemnation of much ongoing comparative research. Citing a widening chasm between macrotheories and microapplications, he contended that methodological and intellectual innovations and trends in recent years had been less than an unmixed blessing for the discipline. His considerable intellectual wrath was brought to bear on "the recent whole-systems theoretical output of the discipline" which signified to him a return "to the ancient art of scholasticism, armed to be sure with new terminology, but not any more successful than were the ancients in narrowing the gap between abstract formulations and theoretical realities."⁹¹ Agreeing with Rustow's remark about 'politics, the ever dependent variable,' he pointedly cited Sartori's view that systems theorists were taking politics out of political science. He also decried the tendency toward impressionistic, somewhat abstract, and deceptively empirical observations strung together by logical statements of varying elegance.

Arguing for a renewed emphasis on partial political systems, La Palombara recommended the generation of middle-range propositions of legitimate comparison for political institutions, processes, and behavior. This would have the advantage of redressing exaggerated holistic theorizing, introducing instead a

degree of parsimony into a rather sprawling and disorderly range of disciplinary concerns. Moreover, he saw such middle-range scholarship as helping to fill the basic information gap—still a problem of large proportions in the Latin American field—while also encouraging the articulation and testing of relevant propositions. La Palombara also suggested appropriate topics for study, although not engaged primarily in the enumeration of an all-inclusive research agenda. He cited as appropriate for middle-range comparative research such subjects as decision-making in legislatures, bureaucracies, and political parties, preferring these to studies of political socialization, patterns of recruitment to governmental roles, or societal communications systems. Without dissecting such preferences within the Latin American context, it can simply be noted that little work has been done on *any* of these topics. One might use Kling's listing of some three dozen concrete research proposals—explicitly neither exhaustive nor all-inclusive⁹²—as a lengthier means of reaching the same conclusion.

All of the preceding, finally, would suggest the difficulty in making a straightforward, precise characterization of political science research on Latin America. Certainly at this writing the sub-field is in a state of flux as never before, and identification of future trends requires an intellectual venture into supposition where a premium would be placed on powers of imagination. It may be inferred that the effort to place Latin American studies more squarely within the context of comparative political analysis, whether or not ultimately successful, will be substantial. Greater reliance upon quantification and mathematical operationalization of investigation seems probable; it must also be hoped that the growing utilization of sophisticated quantitative analyses will not replace but rather will supplement the concern with theory-building and conceptualization. At the same time, the record would seem to suggest that Latin American political studies have more often than not been unimaginative in concept and pedestrian in approach. A certainly healthy eclecticism has been diluted by a Pavlovian tendency to respond to passing fads within the discipline. Political scientists committed to Latin American studies have in recent years rushed to follow the comparativist pack. They have distinctly been trend-followers rather than trend-setters. Only the increasing preparation of new Ph.Ds. by the ranking departments of the discipline, producing fully competent political scientists as well as broadly trained areal specialists, is likely to bring about a significant shift away from established patterns.

For many observers, the dilemmas facing students of Latin American politics are deeply embedded in constantly shifting disciplinary emphases, compounded further by a plethora of concepts, theories, approaches and techniques. There is still occasional debate over the connotations of the very word "science" in the title of the discipline, and the Latin American subfield retains as one of

its characteristics that of unstructured bits and pieces of information and data, often weak in empirical bases, theoretical sophistication, and systematic presentation. Proposed directions of new investigation in some cases run closely parallel to one another; at other times, however, they spray forth radially from a small core of knowledge in seemingly unrelated and noncumulative fashion. It should go without saying that methodological and conceptual problems cannot be met and resolved instantaneously. The collaborative use of related but varying approaches will contribute to a forward progression, and there remains room for as wide variations as the mind's breadth can visualize. It can scarcely be overemphasized that tolerance is necessary in the march toward deeper knowledge, and that there should be neither time nor energy wastefully expended on dogmatic controversy over differing modes and means of research.

Each individual effort requires its own *raison d'être*, and the invasion of uncharted territories within Latin American political studies enlarges rather than shrinks the potentialities. Students and researchers should be imaginative, precise and realistically hard-nosed in examining their own work and that of others. A prime example of what should be the proper rationale was expressed by Duverger regarding his work on Western European political parties. Thus he declared at the outset that he found it "impossible to give a valid description of the comparative functioning of political parties; yet it is essential to do so."⁹³ While the construction of theory required much preliminary work, those very studies could not be profound without the existence of general theory. He was therefore forced to break abruptly into this vicious circle. Students of Latin American politics might well adopt a similar attitude. For while meaningful theorizing requires the existence of prior studies, such efforts themselves are enhanced by theoretical content. Scholars should therefore reflect a spirit of *élan* which recognizes realistically the formidable obstacles ahead, while tempering this with a venturesome willingness to accept the hazards inherent in embarking on intellectual voyages across alien seas which will some day be familiar to all.

NOTES

1. Kalman H. Silvert, "American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot," in Irving Louis Horowitz (ed.), *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics* (Cambridge 1967), 98.
2. Merle Kling, "The State of Research on Latin America: Political Science," in Charles Wagley (ed.), *Social Science Research on Latin America* (New York, 1964), 168.
3. Rosendo A. Gomez, *The Study of Latin American Politics in University Programs in the United States* (Tucson, 1967), 4.
4. *Ibid.*, 5.

Latin American Research Review

5. James Bryce, *South America; Obserations and Impressions* (New York, 1913).
6. Charles Wagley, "Introduction," in Charles Wagley (ed.), *Social Science Research on Latin America* (New York, 1964), 4–7.
7. Herman G. James and Paul A. Martin, *The Republics of Latin America* (New York, 1923).
8. Paul S. Reinsch, "Parliamentary Government in Chile," *The American Political Science Review*, 3:1 (1969).
9. See John H. Latané, *The United States and Latin America* (New York, 1920), and Joseph B. Lockey, *Pan-Americanism, Its Beginnings* (New York, 1926).
10. William Whatley Pierson, *Hispanic-American History: A Syllabus* (Chapel Hill, 1926), 3.
11. Kling, in Wagley (ed.), *op. cit.*, 171.
12. See Herman G. James, *The Constitutional System of Brazil* (Washington, D.C., 1923); Leo S. Rowe, *The Federal System of the Argentine Republic* (Washington, D.C., 1921); and Graham Stuart, *The Governmental System of Peru* (Washington, D.C., 1925).
13. Gomez, *op. cit.*, 11.
14. Irving Leonard, "A Survey of Personnel and Activities in Latin American Aspects of the Humanities and Social Sciences at Twenty Universities of the United States," *Notes on Latin American Studies*, 1 (April 1943), 45.
15. This statement, emanating from a 1947 panel of Latin American experts meeting under the auspices of the Committee on World Area Research of the Social Science Research Council, was reported in Charles Wagley, *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas* (New York: SSRC Pamphlet No. 6, 1948), 39.
16. Russell H. Fitzgibbon (ed.), *The Constitutions of the Americas* (Chicago, 1948).
17. Austin F. MacDonald, *Latin American Politics and Government* (New York, 1949).
18. Miguel Jorrín, *Government of Latin America* (New York, 1953).
19. William Whatley Pierson and Federico G. Gil, *Latin American Governments* (New York, 1957).
20. William S. Stokes, *Latin American Politics* (New York, 1959); and Harold E. Davis (ed.), *Government and Politics in Latin America* (New York, 1958).
21. Harry Kantor, *Patterns of Politics and Political Systems in Latin America* (Chicago, 1969).
22. Rosendo A. Gomez, *Government and Politics in Latin America* (New York, 1960).
23. Karl M. Schmitt and David D. Burks, *Evolution or Chaos: Dynamics of Latin American Government and Politics* (New York, 1963).
24. Robert J. Alexander, *Today's Latin America* (Garden City, 1962); also Alexander, *Latin American Politics and Government* (New York, 1965).
25. Joseph Maier and Ricahrd W. Weatherhead (eds.), *Politics of Change in Latin America* (New York, 1964).
26. James L. Busey, *Latin America: Political Institutions and Processes* (New York, 1964).
27. Martin C. Needler, *Latin American Politics in Perspective* (Princeton, 1963).
28. Quoted by Sigmund Neumann, "Comparative Politics; A Half-Century Appraisal," *The Journal of Politics*, 19:3 (Aug., 1957), 369.
29. Roy C. Macridis, *The Study of Comparative Government* (New York, 1955), 7–11.
30. Gabriel A. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," *The Journal of Politics*, 18:3 (Aug., 1956), 409.
31. Gomez, *op. cit.*, 17–18.
32. Kling, from Wagley (ed.), *op. cit.*, 189.
33. George I. Blanksten, "Political Groups in Latin America," *The American Political Science Review*, 53:1 (March 1959), 126.

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

34. Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton, 1960).
35. Seymour M. Lipset, *Political Man; The Social Bases of Politics* (Garden City, 1960).
36. Lucian W. Pye (ed.), *Communications and Political Development* (Princeton, 1963); Joseph La Palombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton, 1963); and James S. Coleman (ed.), *Education and Political Development* (Princeton, 1966).
37. See Lucian W. Pye and Signey Verba (eds.), *Political Culture and Political Development* (Princeton, 1965); also Joseph La Palombara and Myron Weiner (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development* (Princeton, 1966).
38. Lucian W. Pye, "The Non-Western Political Process," *The Journal of Politics*, 20:3 (Aug., 1958), 468–86.
39. Edward Shils, *Political Development in the New States* (The Hague, 1962), 10.
40. Dankwart A. Rustow, "New Horizons for Comparative Politics," *World Politics*, 9:4 (July 1957), 546.
41. John D. Martz, "The Place of Latin America in the Study of Comparative Politics," *The Journal of Politics*, 28:1 (Feb., 1966), 77.
42. John P. Gillin, "Ethos Components in Modern Latin American Culture," *American Anthropologist*, 57 (1955), 488–500.
43. Charles Wagley and Marvin Harris, "A Typology of Latin American Subcultures," *American Anthropologist*, 57 (1955), 428–51.
44. Wagley, *The Latin American Tradition: Essays on the Unity and the Diversity of Latin American Culture* (New York, 1968).
45. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," *op. cit.*, 391–409.
46. For a critique of Beer's views, see Young C. Kim, "The Concept of Political Culture in Comparative Politics," *The Journal of Politics*, 26:2 (May 1964), 324–31.
47. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Princeton, 1963).
48. Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach* (Boston, 1966), cf. pp. 42–73.
49. Published in La Palombara and Weiner (eds.), *op. cit.*
50. Further explication appears in Lucian W. Pye, *Aspects of Political Development* (Boston, 1966), esp. pp. 89–113.
51. Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, *Negroes and the New Southern Politics* (New York, 1966), 219; also discussions in chs. 9 and 16, pp. 237–65 and 469–83.
52. Francisco José Moreno, *Legitimacy and Stability in Latin America: A Study of Chilean Political Culture* (New York, 1969). After the completion of this essay, Stanford University Press published Richard R. Fagen's *The Transformation of Political Culture in Cuba* (1969). Fagen's conception of political culture is broadly similar but by no means identical to earlier treatments in the discipline, and in the context of his study stresses Cuban systemic changes in the areas of education and civic participation.
53. Louis J. Snyder (ed.), *The Dynamics of Nationalism* (Princeton, 1964).
54. Gerhard Masur, *Nationalism in Latin America: Diversity and Unity* (New York, 1966).
55. Arthur P. Whitaker and David C. Jordan, *Nationalism in Contemporary Latin America* (New York, 1966).
56. Kalman H. Silvert, "Introduction: The Strategy of the Study of Nationalism," in his edited *Expectant Peoples: Nationalism and Development* (New York, 1963), 3–38.
57. Richard W. Patch, "Peasantry and National Revolution: Bolivia," and Frank Bonilla, "A National Ideology for Development: Brazil," both in *ibid.*, pp. 95–126 and 232–64.

Latin American Research Review

58. Samuel H. Beer, Adam B. Ulam, Herbert J. Spiro, Nicholas Wahl, and Harry Eckstein, *Patterns of Government: The Major Political Systems of Europe* (New York, 1958).
59. Martin C. Needler (ed.), *The Political Systems of Latin America* (Princeton, 1964).
60. Ben G. Burnett and Kenneth F. Johnson (eds.), *Political Forces in Latin America: Dimensions in the Quest for Stability* (Belmont, 1968).
61. Alexander T. Edelman, *Latin American Government and Politics; The Dynamics of a Revolutionary Society* (Homewood, 1965).
62. Charles W. Anderson, *Politics and Economic Change in Latin America: the Governing of Restless Nations* (Princeton, 1967).
63. Federico G. Gil, *The Political System of Chile* (Boston, 1966).
64. L. Vincent Padgett, *The Mexican Political System* (Boston, 1966).
65. Philippe C. Schmitter, "New Strategies for the Comparative Analysis of Latin American Politics," *Latin American Research Review*, 4:2 (Summer 1969), 83.
66. *Ibid.*, 103.
67. Richard M. Morse, "The Strange Career of 'Latin American Studies,'" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 356 (Nov., 1964), 112.
68. Robert E. Scott, "Nation-Building in Latin America," in Karl W. Deutsch and William J. Foltz (eds.), *Nation-Building* (New York, 1963), 73–84.
69. Kling, in Wagley (ed.), *op. cit.*, 195.
70. See his memorandum in *ibid.*, 195–96.
71. Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven and London, 1968).
72. For comments on the Fitzgibbon studies see Gomez, *op. cit.*, 20. A new version was begun in late 1969 by Professor Fitzgibbon with the collaboration of Kenneth F. Johnson, who will continue the survey following Fitzgibbon's retirement.
73. See Roger Vekemans and J. L. Segundo, "Essay of a Socio-economic Typology of the Latin American Countries," in Egbert de Vries and José Medina Echavarría (eds.), *Social Aspects of Economic Development in Latin America* (Paris: UNESCO, 1963); and Alfred Stepan, "Political Development Theory: the Latin American Experience," *Journal of International Affairs*, 20:2 (1966), 223–34.
74. Douglas Chalmers, "Crisis and Change in Latin America," *Journal of International Affairs*, 23:1, (1969), 76–89.
75. D. P. Bwy, "Political Instability in Latin America: Cross-Cultural Test of a Causal Model," *Latin American Research Review*, 3:2 (Spring 1968), 17–89. Also see comments and criticisms in *ibid.*, 67–87.
76. Kenneth F. Johnson, "Causal Factors in Latin American Political Instability," *The Western Political Quarterly*, 27:3 (Sept., 1964), 432–46; Ernest A. Duff and John F. McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements for System Stability in Latin America," *The American Political Science Review* 62:4 (Dec., 1968), 125–44.
77. Peter G. Snow, "A Scalogram Analysis of Political Development," *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 9:7 (March 1966), 36.
78. For his fullest statement, see Martin C. Needler, *Political Development in Latin America: Instability, Violence and Evolutionary Change* (New York, 1968).
79. Schmitter, *loc cit.*
80. Ralph Braibanti, "Comparative Political Analytics Reconsidered," *The Journal of Politics*, 30:1 (Feb., 1968), 25–66.

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

81. The journals which he listed were *The American Political Science Review*, *The Journal of Politics*, *Western Political Quarterly*, *World Politics*, and *The Political Science Quarterly*.
82. Gomez, *op. cit.*
83. These were *The American Political Science Review*, *The Journal of Politics*, *Hispanic American Historical Review*, *Western Political Quarterly*, *Journal of Inter-American Studies*, and *World Politics*.
84. Peter Ranis, "Trends in Research in Latin American Politics: 1961–1967," *Latin American Research Review*, 3:3 (Summer 1968), 71–78. Ranis examined the listings in *The American Political Science Review* (1961–67), *US Department of State, External Research: American Republics* (1964–67), *Latin American Research Review* (Fall 1965 to Fall 1967), *The Dissertation Abstracts* (1961–67), and *Latin American Research Review Supplement*, 2:2 (Spring 1967).
85. Charles Andrain and David E. Apter, "Comparative Government: Developing New Nations," *The Journal of Politics*, 30:2 (May 1968), 372–417.
86. *Ibid.*, 415.
87. *Ibid.*, 416.
88. Braibanti, *op. cit.*, 49.
89. Dankwart A. Rustow, "Modernization and Comparative Politics: Prospects in Research and Theory," *Comparative Politics*, 1:1 (Oct., 1968), 39.
90. *Ibid.*, 51.
91. Joseph La Palombara, "Macrotheories and Microapplications in Comparative Politics: A Widening Chasm," *Comparative Politics*, 1:1 (Oct., 1968), 54.
92. Kling, in Wagley (ed.), *op. cit.*, 192–94.
93. Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, tr. by Barbara and Robert North (New York, 1963), xiii.

The JOURNAL OF THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES (REVISTA DEL CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS EDUCATIVOS), a scientific quarterly about Latin American educational problems, will be published in Spanish beginning January 1971.

Annual Subscription:

Mexico \$150.00 pesos

Outside of Mexico: \$ 15.00 U.S. cy (includes airmail postage)

Please direct all correspondence related to subscriptions and submission of articles to:

REVISTA DEL CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS EDUCATIVOS
Culiacán 108, 4o. piso
Apartado No. 27-321
México 11, D.F.
MEXICO