〈講演〉

Latin American Studies in the United States

Barbara Stallings

Good afternoon, it's a very great honor for me to be here this afternoon. I would like to thank the Association of Latin American Studies for inviting me, and especially I would like to thank Professor Akio Hosono of Tsukuba University and Professor Gustavo Andrade of Sophia University, both colleagues of mine whom I met when I was here last year. I bring you all greetings from the Latin American Studies Assn. of the United States, which is known as L. A. S. A. I also bring the hope, which I will discuss at the end of my presentation, that my presence here today will be only the beginning of much more interaction between your association and ours in the future.

I have been asked by Prof. Hosono to speak on the topic of Latin American studies in the U. S. I'll begin by giving you a general overview of how Latin American Studies are organized there. I will then talk about the main subjects of interest to U. S. researchers working on Latin America. I then want to say at least some brief words on our relationship with Latin American scholars. I'll finish with some possible ideas on future cooperation between your association and L. A. S. A.

Latin American Studies Assn. is the largest and most dynamic of the

groups of scholars studying third world regions in the United States. The reasons are fairly obvious. One is simply geographical proximity. A second is the long set of historical relationships between the United States and Latin America (sometimes good and sometimes not so good). Also, I would add a practical point : certainly Spanish and Portuguese are relatively easy languages to learn in comparison to many Asian and African languages.

By best estimate, there are about 2,000 active academic researchers on Latin America in the United States. This figure includes only people who are holders of Ph. D's, and who are actively writing books and articles on Latin America. There is certainly a much larger group of people who teach about Latin America, either at the university level or the High School level, but who aren't active researchers. This group of 2,000 is almost exclusively located in the areas of humanities and the social sciences. The largest single discipline is Spanish and Portuguese literature, followed by history, economics, anthropology, political science, sociology and geography. There's also a growing interest in Latin America within what we call the professional schools, (for example, law schools, business schools, even medical schools). So there's been a bit of a spread from the traditional disciplines into these professional areas.

All of the major universities in the United States have Latin American programs, and many of the smaller universities do as well. To give you an idea about how these programs are organized, I thought I would use the example of the program which I used to direct at the University of Wisconsin. I think that the University of Wisconsin's Latin American program is quite typical of those of the largest universities in the country.

Our program has nearly 100 faculty members affiliated with the program and, as I said, these are not just from the traditional disciplines like history and anthropology, but also the professional schools. And it might be of some interest to you to know that there is another group of Latin Americanists which we don't usually think of in that way. For example, two of our most active participants at Wisconsin include a zoologist who studies plants which grow only in a particular area in Latin America, and a meteorologist who studies glaciers in the Southern hemishere. These people have decided that some knowledge of the culture and society of Latin America will enhance their own ability to do research in those areas and so take part in a number of our activities. Our program, like most others, is a coordinating center. That is, the actual appointments of faculty members are in the specific departments. No one has an appointment in Latin American Studies per se. The center does, however, run an interdisciplinary major for undergraduate students, of which we have about 100 right now, and a master's degree program in which there are about 20 students.

The idea generally exists in the United States that people should not get Ph. D.'s in Latin American Studies, that they should instead get Ph. D.'s in a particular discipline, perhaps with an emphasis on Latin American Studies. So, in addition to these students I have mentioned who are in interdisciplinary programs, there are also probably several hundred students in the different departments who are taking classes on Latin America and who are writing dissertations that have some relationship to Latin America. These people will then go on to get jobs in their particular fields, but will teach with a Latin American specialty. They'll teach, for example, Latin American history, Latin American politics, or Latin America economics but within their own

disciplinary departments.

In addition to coordinating courses, our center and virtually all the other major centers run extensive programs which bring in speakers, run conferences, and sponsor cultural events, films, musical programs, and things of that sort. We finance visitors (hopefully some of you might be among those in the future) who stay anywhere from one day to one year, depending on the particular purpose of a visit. And, extremely important, we provide funds to send both students and faculty members to Latin America to do research. The idea exists there, as I'm sure it does here, that trying to do research on Latin America without making frequent trips to that region is a very poor way to understand what's going on in Latin America.

Our Latin Americanist faculty tends to be organized both through their own disciplinary associations, for example the American Historical Association or the American Economics Association, and they are also members of LASA. As some of you know LASA holds international meetings every eighteen months, where we try to get large numbers of Latin Americans and Europeans to attend, as well as people from the United States. We certainly hope in the future to have more participants from Japan, as well. The meeting this year will be held in Puerto Rico, it was held in Mexico a few years ago, and in 1992 it will be held in Spain. Again we hope in those future meetings to see many of you present.

Funding for Latin American Studies in the United States, like funding for most academic areas, is both erratic and insufficient. I've heard that kind of complaint here in Japan, but it's not only in Japan where we think we don't have enough money to do our work. The reason, or certainly one of the most important reasons, that funding is

erratic in the US is that public interest and funding, especially from the government, tends to follow cycles of public interest, and public interest in Latin American Studies has come and gone in different periods. During the 1960's, for example, thanks to Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolution, there was a major upsurge of interest, and one might say concern about Latin America. Therefore, during the middle and latter part of the 1960's the federal government, as well as the private foundations, poured large amounts of money into Latin American Studies. This time in the 1960's was one when many new Latin American programs were started in the U. S. universities, or else those that existed were greatly enlarged, new faculty members were hired, and new courses were introduced. But, as you all know, Americans have a rather short term horizon, and so by the late 1960's, interest had shifted toward Asia, principally around the Vietnan War, (which was building up in that period of time). As a result, Latin America was forgotten in large part during the entire decade of the 1970's. As a consequence, funding declined quite dramatically compared to what it had been in the 1960's.

Now, in the 1980's, there is again a bit of a resurgence of interest in the Latin American region. It is fueled by public interest in events that are taking place. In this case, of course, it has been an interest in Central America, which has not only been the interest, but the obsession of my government, during most of the 1980's. There has also been interest in the two trends going on in Southern America : the debt crisis, on the one hand, and the process of re-democratization on the other... the negative and positive aspects of South America in the 1980's, if you like. Again as a consequence, there has been an increase in funds available for Latin American Studies, but it's also the case that allot-

ments are far below what they were in the 1960's.

In actuality, the government is not the major funder of Latin American Studies ; the individual unversities are by far the most important source of funds. I would say that between 90 and 95% of the allotments for Latin American Studies come from the individual universities, including salaries that are paid, to people who work in the Latin America area. But in addition, the Federal government, through our Department of Education, designates about a dozen Latin American centers as what they call National Language and Area Studies Resource Centers. These are centers which are supposed to develop the country as a whole. These centers get varying amounts of money on a competitive basis. The private foundations also provide some resources : the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation as well as a number of smaller foundations have also been important in financing Latin American Studies.

Now let me leave organizations and financial matters and talk a bit about a more interesting topic : the subjects that scholars are working on in regard to Latin American Studies in the United States. A way to begin this discussion, is with the geographical focus of people who work on Latin America. Not surprisingly, the largest group works on Mexico. Probably about a quarter of all people in the U. S. working on Latin America have their main focus on Mexico. This is not only because of geographical proximity, but also because there is the strong feeling in the U. S. that because we share a 2,000 mile border with Mexico that it is consequently important to finance studies of that country. Mexico is followed by Brazil, (basically because of its large size, I would guess) and Peru (because of interest in the Andean cultures which both historians and anthropologists find very intriguing). And

after that the most important countries are Chile, Argentina, Colombia, and Cuba. Recently there has been an upsurge of people working on Central America. That's a big change from the 1970's when there was virtually no one with much information on Central America. Nicaragua was the best example. During the Nicaraguan revolution in 1979, it was difficult to find any scholars in the United States who knew anything about it. Fortunately there were two people that one could find, and they appeared in every television show, every newspaper interview, etc., that had to do with Nicaragua as they were the only two knowledgeable people who any one had ever heard about. On the contrary, these days, there dozens of books on Nicaragua, another example of following fads in scholarly activities as well as politically.

Let me now say a bit about topics which I think are of major interest to my colleagues working on Latin America. I'd like to point out that there's a bit of a bias here because some of the things that Latin Americanists do I find more interesting and thus I'm more likely to talk about those, but I've tried to include a fairly broad representation. If there are other things that you would care to ask about, please feel free to ask me during the discussion session, and I'll be glad to give you my best impression.

Certainly one of the major topics is relationships between the U. S. and Latin America. This is a topic of interest to economists, political scientists, and (in somewhat of a different way) to historians. Relations between the U. S. and Latin America didn't just begin in the post WW II period, despite what some of my colleagues may think. People who work on this topic have used a variety of methodologies, and there are some case studies where people look at particular countries and how they have related to the United States and to the world economy in

general over time. Additionally, there are other kinds of works which are more theoretical kinds of analysis. For example, what is the role of multinational corporations in Latin America?, what is the history of military intervention in different countries in Latin America?... There are no agreed-upon conclusions to this topic. As a matter of fact, it's quite controversial as to whether the United States and the international system in general have been positive for political and economic development in Latin America, or whether they have been quite negative. One of the concepts that has come out of this set of studies is the concept of dependency, or the concept of dependent development. Again, this is a very controversial topic, and it portrays the notion that in some ways the relationship between the US and Latin America has produced not the development that many of us would like to have seen, but at best a kind of distorted development or no development at all. These have been the kinds of controversies that flow around this general set of topics on US-Latin American relations.

The second group of topics is of primary interest to political scientists, but also to sociologists and historians, as well. It has to do with types of political systems found in Latin American countries, and especially the changes from one type of political system to another. A lot of the interest in this particular focus arose in the 1960's. Previously, there was a dominant theory that said economic development is likely to be positively correlated with democracy. And so, if one wants to promote democracy in Latin America or the third world regions, the best way is to promote economic development and democracy will naturally follow. This type of relationship was never really specified very well, but this correlation was believed by most people to exist. This correlation and this theory were both upset substantially by the

series of military government that came into power in the 1960's and '70's, in Brazil (1964), Argentina after that, followed by Chile and Uruguay. Also, ironically, it seemed that the countries that were most economically developed were the ones where these military, authoritarian governments were being set up. These weren't just short-term military governments, as had been seen in the past, but governments that came in with the intention of staying for a long period of time. This trend produced a body of literature that came to be known by a very infelicitous phrase called "the bureacratic-authoritarian state". Now, as events have dragged us again in a different direction, there has been an increasing emphasis in the 1980's on re-democratization, trying to explain why these authoritarian governments broke down and why democracies are returning. It's not at all clear that there is any relationship between economic characteristics and political characteristics, but there is certainly a more complex relationship than was believed to be in the past. One interesting question is whether or not the new democracies of the 1980's, and hopefully the 1990's, will be similar to the democracies of Latin America in the 1960's.

The third topic which I think is especially relevant to people in Japan and East Asia in general is the question of development strategies. This is a topic which economists and political scientists are very intrigued by and has generated a number of comparative projects on East Asian countries and Latin American countries. There are two basic questions that are being asked. One is why in the 1960's did East Asian countries (here I'm talking about primarily the East Asian NIES such as Korea, Taiwan, et al.) move toward an export promotion type of development strategy while Latin America continued in an import substitution strategy? There is that historical question and then there's

the more practical policy-oriented question for the 1990's. Which of these strategies is more effective, and should Latin American countries move in the direction of more export-oriented development policies? This is one of the subject matters that has real policy relevance rather than just being a theoretical debate.

As I see I'm going on a bit longer than I had intended, let me just mention, without going into too much detail, two or three other broad subject areas that people in the US working on Latin America have been spending a lot of time on. One is the question of revolution and protest movements. Protest movements do not refer to classical revolutions in Mexico, Bolivia, or Cuba, but rather to much more, practical, day-to-day issues such as movements to try to get electricity in shanty towns around major cities. It also includes Christian-based communities organizing to try to educate people (usually again in the shanty towns), on different ways of viewing the relationship between religion and politics. It furthermore includes some of the dramatic guerrilla movements in Latin America, of which the "Shining Path" is perhaps the best known.

I don't want to stop without mentioning a topic which I find to be extremely important, though I don't work on it myself. That is the issue of women and development in Latin America. This concerns various aspects: the role in production, the role of women in politics, and the role of women in social movements. There's a very great interest in knowing how the issues of gender and class interrelate. Again, this is a topic that has both practical and theoretical interest, in the sense that if women aren't brought into the labor force, or aren't brought into the political sphere, Latin America will lose a very large percentage of potentially important contributors to their societies.

There is also, of course, an enormous interest in the question of how one should study cultural phenomena, not just literature, which is the most obvious, but all types of film, music, and a variety of topics of this sort. There are a variety of questions that have been asked along these lines. I think the most novel one is the idea that one shouldn't study literature, or film, or whatever in a vacuum simply for its aesthetic characteristics, but that one needs to know how cultural phenomena are related to ongoing social and political, even economic phenomena in the region. Along these same lines another new way in which culture has been seen is as an industry ; i. e. "the production of culture." Why is it that culture is produced and consumed in certain ways? What does this mean for societies as a whole? What kind of culture is being consumed? Is it soap operas from the US or is it indigenous culture that is being propogated and consumed as well?

These above mentioned six general topics, I think, are representative of the kinds of issues that Latin Americanists in the US are most concerned about in the 1980's. Now let me turn briefly to relationships between US and Latin American scholars. I want to mention this because this interrelationship is one of the things that has distinguished Latin American Studies in the US from study of other third world regions. That is, there has been a particularly close relationship between US scholars working on Latin America and Latin American scholars themselves. A way that I recently heard of this being symbolized is that Latin American Studies are not something we do to Latin America, it's something we do with Latin American. As a result, there's a big emphasis on bringing Latin American students to the US. Certainly there are a larger number of Latin American exchange students than students from any other region in the US, though not

surprisingly this number has declined substantially during the economic crisis of the 1980's. There's also emphasis on sending students, and faculty members as well, from the United States to Latin America. This is to give students an idea of what the Latin American region is like, and also part of the whole research process, LASA itself has been extremely active in trying to make sure that Latin Americans are members so that they participate in meetings. And I think it's fair to say that we feel that many of the important theoretical, as well as empirical, breakthroughs about Latin America have been made by Latin American scholars themselves. If you were to do a survey among Latin Americanists in the US as to who the most important scholars on Latin America are, I think you would find a good number of Latin Americans on that list. What is more, I'm quite certain that in political science, economics, and in the various cultural areas, Latin Americans might well lead those lists. So we have found it to be extremely fruitful to interact with these people, and we certainly hope that this will continue in the future.

This discussion of Latin Americans and Latin Americanists in the US brings me to my final topic: possible future relationships between US and Japanese scholars who are interested in Latin America. As Japan becomes a major actor in international, political, and economic affairs, it is crucial that Japanese scholars also play a greater international role. The importance of Japanese scholars should come to match the importance of Japan in political and economic terms, and certainly the Japanese Association of Latin American Studies is an important vehicle for introducing Japanese scholars into the international arena. So, I'm hoping in the future that your organization and LASA can work together much more closely along these lines. There are several kinds

of activities that (merely as a beginning), the Japan association and LASA might want to think about doing together. The simplest is to have more Japanese scholars attend LASA meetings and vice-versa. There will be, as some of you are certainly aware, a delegation of Japanese scholars at the LASA meeting in Puerto Rico in September. There will also be two panels that we've organized on Japan, the US, and Latin America, and this is simply a beginning. We hope that in future meetings there will be many more of you who will want and be able, to come. And I certainly hope that at the next meeting of your association, there will be one or more representatives of the US there as well.

In a more ambitious vein, I would hope that we would be able to organize some kinds of joint activities between your association and LASA in the course of the next few years. It seems to me that an obvious starting place might be some kind of a symposium on a topic that is of interest to both US and Japanese scholars and that would be an analysis of how Japan, the US, and Latin America interrelate. This could bring in economic kinds of relationships, political, as well as cultural. I think this would open up a lot of doors for interaction between the three groups of scholars, and I would venture to hope that we could work toward such a symposium, either as a part of one of these meetings in the future, or possibly as an independent kind of meeting.

Another type of activity which I think has great long term importance is a greater exchange of scholars between our two countries, both students and faculty members. Now, it's true that neither your association nor mine has the capacity in and of themselves to carry out exchanges of this type, but, I think that both of the associations could

act as intermediaries for people who are interested in going to the other country. In organizational terms, I think it might be useful for the Japanese delegation at LASA to try to address the issue of setting up mutual committees on scholarly relationship with the other association. LASA already has committees on scholarly relations with the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China. It would seem to me that we could certainly think about setting up a committee that would coordinate interactions between Japan and the US around issues of Latin America. I can assure you there is increasing interest in the US with respect to Japan in general and Japanese relations with Latin America in particular. I think what we need to do is to try to look for ways to cooperate and extend our mutual interests, to bring together our perhaps different viewpoints with respect to Latin America, or perhaps our similar viewpoints. So let me close by expressing the hope that my visit here will be only the first of many visits going in both directions, and I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible in the US in future years.