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INTRODUCTION

by

Richard N. Adams

Scholarship cannot survive in an ivory tower. Not only does the real task of the scholar require the support of the wider society, but for many, the very thing being studied is the substance of society. A degree of protection and isolation, however, is essential. To allow time to reflect, to carry out the necessary research procedures, and to permit freedom from political and economic threats that constrict the creative process, the scholar must enjoy a leeway greater than that found elsewhere in the society. These protective necessities, however, must be constantly guarded by the scholar; and crucial to this is the support that an individual scholar grants to the wider community of his fellows, to strengthen their collective situation and capacity.

The vast expansion of the scholarly community of the United States has increasingly led its members to work in foreign countries. Latin America, with its rich fields for research and convenience of access, has been especially attractive. The scholarly community, however, while inherently interdependent, is naturally fragmented; not only are its members dispersed among colleges and universities, but intercommunication is apparently even more difficult within the institutions themselves. Once beyond the social controls of their own scholarly community, individual scholars occasionally forget that they still have obligations. The fact that they have left the physical bounds of their home academic institution does not mean that they drop their responsibilities to the larger community of scholarship.

It is not the purpose of the present report to make an issue out of specific errors of the past in these matters. It is our purpose to suggest guidelines for the future so that the whole scholarly community may benefit more fully from the efforts of its members. We will not, therefore, recount the variety of cases in which scholars have inadvertently or intentionally restricted and limited the development of their own community; nor will we recount the continuing labors of many to improve the condition of that community. Instead, we will review some aspects of the evolution of the problem and then propose a set of recommendations that we hope our colleagues will find sufficiently judicious and well formed to serve as a statement of common understanding concerning certain scholarly responsibilities.

Our scope is circumscribed. We are not here dealing with relations that may hold between the scholar and his own local scholarly community; or with his own sponsors; or with his own nation; or with his government; or with the world community at large. Our focus is on the relation between the scholar and world scholarly community. While the welfare of any local scholarly community is obviously dependent upon the welfare of the national community, we as scholars must make certain judgments in terms of what is best for general scholarship. As such, the focus of this effort is generally on the relation between the foreign scholar and the local scholarly community of the area within which he is working. If these obligations are satisfied, there should be little cause for complaint from other scholars, from sponsors, from governments, nations, or the world at large.

THE GENERAL PROBLEM

National scholarly communities have tended to evolve without sufficient attention to the welfare of the total scholarly community. The term "scholarly community" refers to that aggregate of organized and unorganized individuals with sufficient training and experience to work on a level of research and teaching reflecting reasonably advanced methods and theories of their respective disciplines. An individual is a member of a scholarly community not by virtue of what he chooses to study, but by his ability to carry on his chosen study with a competence judged to be professional by his peers.

Behind this lack of attention to the total world of scholarship lies the fact that the scholars of each nation also respond to customs and obligations within their own national community, and in some instances, to their own national government. While the community of scholars
supported by a specific nation have real obligations to that nation, it is a very different question as to whether this should, or even can, be interpreted to suggest that there is any comparable responsibility to a particular government. Governments of necessity reflect organizations of specific interests as well as the more general national interests; they do, consequently, at times pursue policies that are so inimicable to the goals of scholarship that no scholarly community should be held responsible to them.

A more difficult question is whether a scholar can be said to owe more to his scholarly community or to the national community. The differing conditions of the various communities make it difficult to formulate a general principle that escapes reflecting the particular preferences of one over the other. Nations are, by their very nature, social organizations set against each other in competition. Were scholars to identify themselves uniquely with their own nation, they would necessarily set themselves against one another. The dilemma is not easily solved, and every scholar owes it to the broader scholarly community to think through his own position in the matter. Irrespective of what a scholar owes the nation, however, there is absolutely no question that scholarship as such can develop only if there is productive interaction between scholars, and that failure to recognize and pursue this can only be regarded as lethal to the welfare of the entire scholarly community.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES

The practice of scholarship in Latin America and the United States has changed substantially in the years since the Second World War. The number of research establishments and working scholars has increased phenomenally. The body of U.S. scholars and students working in Latin America has grown as a part of this general expansion, and it is not unreasonable to assume that a disproportionately larger number of U.S. students with foreign area interests work in Latin America at one time or another simply because of the convenience.

While the total Latin American research establishment is smaller in both financing and personnel than is that of the United States, almost all Latin American countries do have well-established and varied research activities underway independent of foreign sponsorship or interest.

While the growth of scholarly establishments is parallel in the two areas, the interests are not. Latin American scholars tend to focus on the issues that surround development, the problems of the relative independence of and dependence on foreign nations, and features peculiar to their own natures. Since a great deal of the funding is done through government agencies, special attention has to be paid to this source of funds. Changing politics may find the Latin American scholar concerned not only for the welfare of his own work, but for the very survival of the scholarly community within which he lives. Finally, in a situation of real scarcity of support, the choice of research topics becomes more important, and opportunities to strengthen the scholarly establishment are especially valued.

The motives of North American scholars arise from a quite different set of conditions. The U.S. academic system, within which most of them work, is scaled by rank and salary differences, and prestige accrues by climbing through an academic hierarchy by meeting certain demands. The aspiring scholar must publish and show methodological competence. The career trajectory of the average U.S. scholar is little determined by what topic he chooses to study; but insofar as it is, it is safer to stick close to subject areas traditionally acceptable to the establishment. I specifically say the "average" scholar because the superior scholar may well make his mark by choosing particularly significant and unconventional topics. Like his Latin American colleagues, the U.S. scholar is also interested in the condition of his own establishment, but he seldom fears for its survival. He usually recognizes it to be an important part of the environment within which he normally operates and takes it for granted, assuming that it will be generally supportive.

It is clear that there is ample opportunity for the scholarly communities of these two areas to fail to mesh. The criteria for choosing topics, the relative concern over their scholarly organizational apparatus, the differential in available support and job security all differ strikingly.

The actual work of a foreign scholar brings other variables into play: the actual contacts, exchanges and communications that occur between the foreigner and the various components of the national scene. In reviewing the recommendations to follow, one specialist in literature felt that there was little relevant to the situation within which his colleagues found themselves. In all fairness, I feel that this view is somewhat misguided. It is not a question whether a specific discipline is immune to the problems to which these recommendations are addressed, but whether the individual's conduct runs counter to them. The literary scholar who explores socio-political or political influences may well find himself in the byways of social scientists, resort to the same field techniques, and have contacts with politically sensitive people. Under these circumstances, he must consider the effects his activities will have on the local scholarly community.

The central question is whether the foreign scholar's work has relevance, either productively or threateningly, for the local or national scholarly community. If it does, then these recommendations should be taken into consideration.

Because some U.S. scholarly activity in Latin America has caused particular notoriety and comment in the past decade, problems in this region generated the present set of recommendations. However, it is hoped that they will be suggestive for a broader area of scholarship.
The fact that special conditions exist in each region, and indeed each country, means that it would be unwise to generalize categorically without appropriate study. Work in Europe, the United States, the Middle East, Africa or Asia can certainly be expected to present important variations. For the foreigner working within Latin America, however, it is hoped that these recommendations may prove apt. In particular, the U.S. scholar cannot hide the fact that his is the most powerful and affluent nation on earth. Problems occurring in his relationships will not be duplicated in all international scholarly contacts. So while the work of the U.S. scholar involves specialized problems, we can nevertheless make suggestions that may be reviewed for other areas.

**THE BACKGROUND OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The need for the present set of recommendations was recognized by the committee that met to draft a constitution for the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) in 1966. Under that constitution, a standing committee on Interamerican Scholarly Relations was established within LASA. Lack of funds, however, made it impossible to set this committee in motion immediately. Fortunately, during the same period, Education and World Affairs (EWA) established its Council on Educational Cooperation with Latin America (CECLA). The interests of this Council and those set for the not-yet-existent LASA committee coincided. EWA joined in a cooperative arrangement whereby it would finance and LASA would carry out a study of U.S. research in three Latin American nations, and prepare a set of recommendations to serve both LASA and CECLA.

The study design, as approved by both committees, was to consist of a separate study of the work of U.S. scholars in each of three Latin American countries. Guatemala and Chile were chosen as cases of heavy research in a small and large country, and Paraguay as a country where little research had been done. Because of the shortness of time, it was with considerable luck that it was possible to assemble a team composed of Calvin P. Blair (economist, the Ford Foundation), Richard P. Schaedel (anthropologist, the University of Texas), and James H. Street (economist, Rutgers University). It was understood that the investigators should work as closely as possible with a broad range of Latin scholars and seek out local collaborators. A suggestion that Mexico should be one of the nations studied was accepted in principle, but it was recognized that the amount of U.S. research in Mexico was so great that in the few months available an adequate study would be completely impossible. The study team members compiled lists of researchers who had worked in the three countries and questionnaires were sent to them in the course of the summer. Field interviews were made in the summer or early fall of 1968 by each member of the team.

In November, the research group met with Victor Urquidi, Chairman of CECLA, Richard N. Adams, President of LASA, and Joel L. Johnson, of EWA, to work out a preliminary set of findings. Although Mr. Schaedel was unavoidably absent from the meeting, the first draft of his Chilean report provided the framework for the discussion by the other members. That meeting formulated a set of statements that led to the recommendations published herein. Modifications were proposed by the members of the LASA Executive Council and CECLA. In addition, CECLA suggested the addition of recommendation No. 8, a matter which accorded well with the general findings of the studies but had not specifically been mentioned by the authors. The final version of these recommendations has, then, been approved by the Executive Council of LASA, and by CECLA of EWA. Taken as a whole, the recommendations are derived from a long preliminary set of suggestions and reviews involving the people interviewed in the three countries, the study teams, and the LASA and EWA-CECLA groups.

It is not thought, however, that they are either all inclusive, nor necessarily in all matters perfect statements. Moreover, they must not be thought of as hard rules. They are guidelines, devised to remind scholars and granting agencies that they have responsibilities to the larger scholarly community. They will be effective to the degree that the Latin American and North American scholarly communities choose to be guided by them. They indicate to the individual scholar what he might reasonably be expected to do when working in a foreign area; and conversely, they suggest to the scholarly community of a host country what it might reasonably expect of a visitor. The recommendations as presented here are not free from further review. The scholarly community of each country will presumably judge the degree to which these are appropriate or not. Similarly, international organizations of scholars such as the Consejo Latino Americano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO) will have to submit them to review.*

While the recommendations to follow are officially approved by LASA and CECLA, this introductory essay and the three country studies upon which they were primarily based, remain the individual responsibility of the authors. In most instances the reviewing bodies accepted (insofar as their knowledge allowed them to) the findings of the authors. However, it seemed neither appropriate nor necessary that the studies should be "recommended." Proposals appearing in each of the country studies, therefore, do not necessarily reflect views of any of the sponsoring organizations.

Finally, should it not be evident already, I want to make absolutely explicit that the recommendations are designed to improve scholarship, not to detract from it; to facilitate it, not hinder it; to make it more humane.  

---

* CLACSO and LASA have established a joint committee that will, in addition to whatever other tasks it may have, pursue the discussion of these recommendations.
not less so. Under no circumstances should they be so interpreted to promote the lesser needs of a single sector of the scholarly community over the general welfare of the broader international scholarly community. Nor do they provide specific rules of conduct; they stand to be interpreted in specific cases. We do not imagine that they will eliminate problems; rather, their purpose is to shift problems into a context where their solution will rest on the good sense of scholarly peers, and not non-scholarly elements of the society. The general principle from which they clearly stem is that a scholar should so conduct himself that his work is conducive to the continuing improvement of scholarship.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTARIES

A. Responsibilities of the Scholar and the Sponsoring Organization

1. Research proposals, where feasible, should be made known to local scholars for professional opinions on relevance to local research priorities and adaptability to local conditions. Feasibility is interpreted as meaning that there is a community of national scholars, or preferably, a scholarly organization; consultation with such an organization is preferable to that with a single scholar. The inquiry may be made by the individual presenting the proposal, or by the sponsoring agency, but the sponsoring agency should require such a review where feasible.

Commentary: This is directed principally at scholars not familiar with the developing scholarly interests of the area in which they plan to work, or with the conditions under which the proposed research has to take place; it encourages them to seek a better view of the realism of the proposal as well as to enhance its contribution to the local scholarly interests. This in no way implies or suggests any right of veto by one scholar over the project of another. It is assumed, however, that local scholarly cooperation will vary with the degree of interest that local scholars have in the work and, therefore, the foreign scholar would be well advised to seek out advice on this matter prior to undertaking the work. This also does not suggest that either the sponsoring agency or the scholar should slavishly bend their interests to those of local scholars. Innovation is obviously critical for scholarly development. It is suggested that where consultation takes place, it is wiser to deal through an organized group of scholars where such is available, simply because it will give the foreigners a broader range of opinion, and a wider local community will be familiar with his research.

2. Individuals initiating research in a country should include in their plans necessary briefings from senior scholars familiar with the local research scene. Such advice should be sought among scholars in the host country, in regional scholarly organizations and elsewhere. Grants should enable scholars to make the necessary briefing contacts.

Commentary: Because there are bad gaps in the communication of scholarly work, efforts should be made to assure the foreign scholar that he has covered at least a reasonable range of information sources concerning his proposed activity; at the same time, it will inform the local scholarly community of the proposed work. It is, obviously, particularly important for those who are initiating work in an area where they are little known.

3. In cases where the inexperience of the scholar, or the complexity of the research task so suggests, scholars should make exploratory visits and supporting agencies should encourage them in doing so.

Commentary: See commentary on No. 2, above.

4. Supporting agencies should determine what previous research the scholar has carried out in a foreign area, and with which institutions and specific scholars he had had research relationships.

Commentary: Scholars who have worked in a foreign area usually leave a reputation as to their effect on the local scholarly community. The purpose here is to call the attention of sponsoring agencies to the fact that it is to their advantage and that of the broader scholarly community to determine whether such previous work has benefited the general scholarly scene or not.

5. Although it should be internationally obvious, scholars should be discouraged by mentors, colleagues or granting agencies from undertaking research without language abilities appropriate to the research task and the proposed research relationships.

Commentary: This should hardly be necessary to recommend, but the studies indicate that it is still a problem.

6. The international scholarly community needs to develop more rigorous supervision of scholars-in-training. Students should, where possible, be associated with scholars-in-residence, either through the auspices of local institutions, or under the direct supervision of a responsible experienced scholar. No short-term research for students should be sponsored without a guarantee of responsible supervision.

Commentary: This emphasizes the importance of not encouraging inexperienced scholars to mess up the field through unnecessary and preventable errors. It places the burden of control on the sponsoring scholars and agencies. It does not recommend that all students should be under direct supervision, especially those with previous experience in the area and those who intend to
spend a long enough time to familiarize themselves with local conditions. But it does specifically recommend that whenever possible, some kind of supervision should be used, and it especially ought to be used when the students will be present only for a short time. Obviously much depends on the personal and professional qualities of the student.

7. Supporting agencies have a responsibility to call constructively to a scholar's attention aspects of his activities which may suggest failure to meet responsibilities mentioned herein.

Commentary: This is to remind sponsoring agencies that they have a responsibility beyond handing out money. Again, particularly with young scholars, their role in the improvement of the condition of the wider scholarly community can be very important.

8. Supporting agencies and scholars should give special encouragement to joint research and to the emergence of local clearinghouses of research to be located in scholarly institutions. It would be advisable for sponsoring agencies to solicit from investigators evidence of an agreement to collaborate prior to supporting proposals for joint work.

B. Responsibilities of the Scholar

9. Scholars should offer and be willing to make themselves available to local scholarly organizations for informal teaching, lectures and other recognized modes of scholarly communication when so requested, providing that the activities do not seriously interfere with the central scholarly work.

Commentary: The purpose here is obviously not to inhibit or interfere with the chosen scholarly task, but to be a reminder that the continuing communication of scholarly processes and results is fundamental to a healthy scholarly community, and that there is a special obligation to see that this is realized within the local scholarly community. It is not suggested that this interfere with getting the research done, but that time be allowed for such activities when the project is planned.

10. When the disciplinary area in which he is working is not well developed in the host country, the foreign scholar should, where possible, incorporate within his project the training of local researchers.

Commentary: Again, it is not the purpose to insist on a practice which would hobble particular research projects, but to help strengthen local scholarly communities in areas where they are technically weak or need assistance.

11. The foreign scholar has the responsibility to communicate his findings periodically to the local scholarly community. Long-term projects (for example, of a year or more) should allow for interim progress reports. Upon terminating research in the country, the foreign scholar should make sure that the current status of his research findings is available to national scholars. Such availability might typically consist of a written progress report or, where feasible, of public discussions or other recognized forms of presentation.

Commentary: Here, again, the purpose is not to interfere with the research process, but to remind the scholar that the communication of work and findings is of special importance to the local scholarly community, and that time should be allowed for this. It is not implied that the responsibility for such communication should in any way pressure the scholar into premature conclusions; such a report should be by way of an account of "where we stand now," and may, but need not, include projected findings.

12. The scholar has a responsibility to the scholarly community within which he works to make sure that the findings of his investigations are available to that community. If such is indicated by the local scholarly community, this responsibility is not fulfilled until these results are available in the national language and located in a center where they may receive further distribution and be accessible to local scholars.

Commentary: This reiterates the scholar's responsibility to communicate his findings, but it further specifies that such communication is not achieved until the findings are available in languages necessary for the local interested scholarly community. Some kinds of reports and monographs are so specialized that interested local scholars can perfectly well handle them in the foreign language of the original. However, where interest in the work is broader, and the scholarly community includes a significant number of individuals who do not adequately handle the language of the original, then it is part of the responsibility of the scholar to make every effort to have the work translated into the language of the host community. It is suggested that the costs of translation should be sought by the foreign author, whereas the publication would rest with the available editorial processes in the host country. Since it is clearly beyond most scholars' ability to assure publication of their works, the most they can be held responsible for is depositing copies of the manuscript in local centers where they will be readily available to local scholars.

C. Recommendations to the Latin American Studies Association and The Latin American Research Review

13. LASA should undertake to study the setting up of a system whereby scholars may solicit from LASA or other appropriate agencies a
document identifying their scholarly and project credentials for research in Latin America.

Commentary: The purpose of this is to provide both local scholarly communities and foreign scholars with a device for identification of the scholar and his credentials. Particularly in the case of young scholars, it is often important that they be able to identify the source of their scholarly support. Local scholarly communities may well wish to know what an unknown scholar’s background may be, and under what sources of support he is working. This recommendation proposes that LASA, as well as other scholarly organizations, may wish to provide the scholar with a statement concerning his situation, upon the presentation of appropriate evidence.

14. LASA should encourage and cooperate in meetings of local scholars to identify crucial areas of research and training both from a local and continental point of view, and priorities among them. Consideration should be given to the elaboration of research guides on local research materials and institutions in order to foster research in areas that are receiving too little attention.

Commentary: Although many individuals interviewed in the studies indicated that foreign scholars should pay more attention to the research needs as defined locally, such needs are seldom well defined within the local scholarly communities. This recommendation urges LASA and its members to cooperate, where such cooperation is indicated, in clarifying the range and substance of local research needs.

15. The Latin American Research Review, the quarterly journal sponsored by LASA, should intensify its efforts to consolidate information about current research in order to avoid unintentional duplication of research efforts, and to diffuse information concerning areas of needed research. LARR editors should be encouraged to prepare an annual review summary which brings light to areas which are under especially heavy research attention, and to those which are clearly in need of further research.

Commentary: It was felt that LARR editors stand in a unique position to have a perspective of the entire area of research, and could most effectively provide a review of the type indicated.
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PREFACE

This report is based upon a questionnaire and interview survey and upon four weeks of field research in Guatemala during July and October of 1968. It also draws upon the author's frequent short-term visits to Guatemala in the period 1963–1968, and upon the works of many of his graduate students. A short questionnaire inquiring into the nature of research experience in Guatemala was mailed to 160 social scientists in the United States. A similar questionnaire was mailed to 150 individuals and institutions in Guatemala, and a special short questionnaire was mailed to 50 Guatemalan libraries. Extensive personal interviews were held with 30 key individuals in Guatemala, selected because of their official or scholarly role in the social sciences. Throughout this report, the term "social science" refers specifically to the fields of anthropology, economics, geography, political science and sociology—and sometimes to aspects of psychology and law.

I am indebted to untold numbers of helpers. I shall not embarrass them by mentioning names, I must, however, thank Flavio Rojas Lima and the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca for kinds and amounts of help which made the work possible at all. I owe great debts to the Ford Foundation, my indulgent employer, for allowing me to carry on the study in the midst of my advisory duties. I alone am responsible for the opinions and other content.

Mexico City
December 1968

Calvin P. Blair
THE NATURE OF U.S. INTEREST AND INVOLVEMENT IN GUATEMALA: AN AMERICAN VIEW

The U.S. Presence in Guatemala

Social science research in Guatemala since 1950 has taken place in an environment in which the United States has been almost omnipresent. A mixture of U.S. security, diplomatic, commercial, academic and evangelical interests has manifested itself in the presence of hundreds of Americans in Guatemala who are spying, spying or "trying to help": military advisors, the CIA, the AID, the Peace Corps, businessmen, students, teachers, academic researchers and missionaries, both religious and secular. Perhaps no other Latin American country has experienced in recent times so overt and pervasive an influence from an outside power; and surely no small country, save Panama, has felt so much U.S. influence in relation to its own size or world importance.

The current environment in Guatemala is heavy with memories of U.S. intervention in the internal politics of the country during the earlier years of the period under study. The precarious position of recent political regimes and the continued activity of terrorist groups on both the right and the left (signaled poignantly by the assassination in August 1968 of the U.S. ambassador) are reminders that the social conflicts which aroused U.S. fears, interest and intervention are still very much alive. It was Guatemala's misfortune to have begun a serious social revolution in the era of Cold War anxieties. Her first revolutionary reform president, Juan José Arévalo, was a school teacher with a philosophy of "spiritual socialism," a progressive set of notions popular enough in Guatemala but with enough social reform elements to arouse some apprehensions on the part of the landed wealthy, business conservatives, foreign enterprise and the U.S. government.

In 1950, Arévalo was succeeded by Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, a reform-minded army colonel who expropriated some lands for his agrarian program, built or allowed labor and peasant interest groups, used some Communist party members in his government, and reacted to internal and external threats to his regime with a liberal use of force and considerable jailing of the opposition. The rest is rather well-known history: The U.S. resolution at the Inter-American Conference in 1954, condemning Communist influence in the hemisphere; the aborted attempt of the Arbenz government to import arms from Eastern Europe; the easy invasion and victory of Castillo Armas, and his assassination in 1957; the corrupt and inept successor government of Ydígoras Fuentes, also ended by military coup; the interim military government of Peralta Azurdia, 1963–66; and the surprise election of the incumbent Méndez Montenegro.

The kind of political turmoil experienced by Guatemala since 1950 has contributed to a continuing and almost excessive interest on the part of the U.S. government, with security motives usually overt or thinly veiled. Those motives are overlain by and intermingled with other motives, including those expressed in U.S. programs of aid to underdeveloped countries in general, and to the post-1961 programs of the Alliance for Progress.

As a result, social science research by U.S. personnel in Guatemala during the period under consideration has always and legitimately been subject to some suspicion or speculation as to motive.

It is tempting to exaggerate the influence of U.S. officialdom. Indeed, one of our respondents argued against any effort at coordinating research on the grounds that it would "feed the atmosphere of conspiracy"; and he further argued that the difficulties of U.S. social scientists in Latin America are due to the political ineptitude and the irrelevant policy imperatives of the U.S. government, rather than to any errors in their own conduct. The results of this study do not bear him out. The prevailing attitude of the Guatemalans contacted in the survey was almost never one of hostility; it was frequently one of annoyance, and it sometimes bordered on exasperation. The annoyance grew more often out of the attitudes and behavior of U.S. academics than out of suspicions about motive or affiliation, though suspicion was often latent.

Nevertheless, it would be just as easy to understate official U.S. influence. Diplomatic and aid agencies are not neutral in their attitudes toward research and its results. They are involved in both the execution and the defense of policies which inevitably have detectable cultural biases; and they are usually sensitive to the public relations aspects of studies—a sensitivity which sometimes extends to a desire to present the American community abroad in a good light. Several Guatemalan respondents in this study complained of the number of reports which U.S. agencies make for internal use, often on the basis of much careful investigation, and then declare "classified" or otherwise refuse circulation, even in modified form, among interested nationals. And one U.S. respondent reported the concrete case of a U.S. official in Guatemala who threatened to prevent publication of the respondent's work because it revealed the miserable conditions of migratory workers on farms owned by U.S. citizens. The latter case may illustrate, more than anything else, the dangers inherent in doing research funded by U.S. agencies—although other respondents have published controversial studies financed in large part with just such official funds.

No blanket charge can be sustained against official U.S. agencies in Guatemala, obviously. Social scientists will find that research done under the aegis of defense or intelligence agencies is always suspect, and that research done under aid or development agencies is only occasionally so. The pervasive nature of U.S. influence, both official and private, and the vested interest nature of that influence in general, place the academic investigator under the obligation of making quite clear his purposes and his sponsorship.
Guatemala

The U.S. General Interest in Guatemala

The general interest on the part of U.S. citizens and their government in things Guatemalan—at least insofar as it is manifested in publications in English-language sources—runs heavily to concern with communism, business opportunities and travel. Where the general or public interest overlaps with scholarly specialties, particularly in the fields of political and social change, one often finds scholarly and semi-scholarly publications as well.

For the purposes of this study, three simple efforts were made to survey the general or public interest in Guatemala: The concerns of the U.S. government (other than those that get expressed in internal memoranda and classified documents) were reviewed in the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications for the years 1960–67; a broader general interest (including some of its scholarly expressions) was surveyed in the Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service for the same period; and the card catalogue of the Latin American Collection of the University of Texas at Austin was checked for English-language books, monographs and pamphlets on Guatemala for the longer period of 1950–1968. No effort was made to survey systematically the popular press, where the focus on communism is known to run high.

The general concern with communism in the early part of the period 1950–67 is impressive. Government propaganda and position papers, newsmagazine “scare” articles, popular books titillating the American public’s interest in the “grand design” of the Reds, and even serious inquiries of scholarly interest and quality abound.¹

Despite an abiding concern with communism and security, the U.S. government, in the 1960–68 period, focused its official publications on the more prosaic chores of reporting on business and living conditions, labor laws and practices, investment opportunities, the workings of the Alliance for Progress, trade and tariffs, the analysis of industries such as shrimp and minerals, problems of plant quarantine, highway agreements, export opportunities for U.S. goods, the minutiae of geographical names, and how to send gift packages.

Within Guatemala, the U.S. government maintained its military missions; and military, as well as other, purposes were served by such projects as the mapping mission of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey, headquartered at Guatemala’s Instituto Geográfico Nacional. But, by and large, the character of official U.S. activity in Guatemala after 1960 was that of administering a growing body of aid programs and serving a growing business interest on the part of its nationals. In a number of its programs it sponsored, if not academic research, at least research by academics—so that official and scholarly interests sometimes overlapped. AID-Guatemala and the Regional Office for Central America and Panama (ROCAP) have been frequent employers of academic personnel as consultants and advisors in Guatemala.

Business interest on the part of U.S. nationals has a long history. The story of the United Fruit Company is by now a classic tale of the involvement of a large U.S. firm in the economy and politics of small developing nations.² and to some extent its turbulent history still colors much of the thinking about U.S. business behavior in Guatemala. On a less dramatic scale, U.S. business interests have grown to significant proportions in cotton farming and in a wide variety of industries: dairy products, canned and packaged foodstuffs, confectionery, tobacco manufacture, sacks and cordage, paper products, paints and varnishes, chemicals, petroleum refining, metal manufactures and electrical apparatus.³

To the internal influence of U.S. investors must be added the continued economic dependence of Guatemala upon the United States as both export market and import supplier. In addition, Guatemala relies in greater or lesser degree upon loans from a number of institutions in which an official U.S. voice—rarely insensitive to U.S. business interests—is always strong and sometimes dominant: the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, The Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the World Bank.

The combination of official and private interests in the Guatemalan economy has produced a rather large body of literature.⁴

In addition to security, foreign aid and business motives, the U.S. general interest in Guatemala has involved a trickle of tourism and of literature of the travelog variety.⁵ Tourist-type interests are largely casual and vicarious; the actual flow of visitors has not been sufficient to keep Guatemala from running a deficit on tourist and travel accounts in its balance of payments.⁶

If one considers the relatively large U.S. presence in Guatemala together with the nature of U.S. interests as expressed in the published word, one gets the picture of a weak and dependent country which must be continually on its guard against domination by those who “want to help.”

It is in this environment of underdevelopment and dependency, permeated by national desires to get help and simultaneously avoid domination, that U.S. social scientists have carried out their research. It is an environment in which one should proceed carefully, avoid classified research, openly explain motive, method and finance, and in general look to good relations with locals.

It is surprising how little hostility or suspicion has been transferred to U.S. social scientists in the course of their work. It is equally surprising how elementary have been their faults, as seen from the Guatemalan side.

The U.S. Scholarly Interest in Guatemala: Social Science Researchers and Their Behavior

The level of influx of U.S. social scientists into Guatemala has been high by almost any standard. While no head count was possible, it was relatively easy to identify (though not so easy to contact) some 200 U.S. academics with a demonstrated special interest in Guatemala.
One-hundred-and-fifty of them were included in the questionnaire survey of this study, and 41 usable responses were received in time for inclusion in the analysis.7 (A preliminary directory of U.S. social scientists with research interests in Guatemala is given in Appendix I.)

The published output of the U.S. scholarly community dealing with Guatemala since 1950 runs to hundreds of items. In the various specialties of anthropology alone, the literature is abundant.8 An exhaustive bibliography is well beyond the scope of this paper, but the selected bibliography of Appendix I will illustrate the wide variety of interests on the part of U.S. social scientists who have turned their attention to Guatemala.

Replies to questionnaires, as well as the literature survey, show the obvious concentration of U.S. research interest in fields of anthropology: social and cultural change, language and linguistics, archaeology, ethnology and ethnography. Occasionally there appears a researcher interested in political science, history, art, architecture, drama, demography, education or nutrition; and, largely because of the special interests of the AID, there have been an impressive number of geographers. Academic economists from the United States have rarely published on Guatemala, although a number of them have served on research and advisory missions to various agencies there.9

We can piece together a description of the activities, the behavior and the influence of the U.S. social scientists from the 41 questionnaire replies, complemented by the literature survey and by the comments and criticisms of some 50 Guatemalans who granted personal interviews or responded to written questionnaires as part of this study. The description is representative of the U.S. social science community in some sense, at least in range of activity—though no representative sample in any statistical sense is claimed here.

Thirty-seven of the 41 U.S. respondents are academicians, affiliated with 27 different universities,10 the other four work for private research organizations or public museums.

To no one's surprise, anthropologists are by far the most numerous; and many of the other respondents have given their work an anthropological twist. Eleven of our 41 are social anthropologists, six are linguists and three are archaeologists. The social anthropologists have studied a wide variety of problems: culture conflict, power structures, cultural change, values, religion, race relations, social organization, modernization and development. The linguists have studied Quiché-Maya, Jalteco, Chuj and Cakchiquel. The archaeologists have done what archaeologists always do; they have excavated a few sites and studied the artifacts from many, including Tikal, Bilbao and Kaminaljuyu.

Four of the respondents are geographers, with special research interests in land use, plant domestication and urban and regional planning. Three are sociologists who have dealt with such diverse topics as urban fertility, the adoption of agricultural techniques and nutrition; still another respondent is a food scientist who has worked for many years with both technical and social aspects of nutrition. Three education specialists have researched problems of educational administration and literacy; a psychiatrist has studied medical practices and beliefs; two historians have concerned themselves with the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history of the military and the missionary, and of colonization and immigration policies. Two literary specialists have studied Guatemalan culture through its literature. A communications specialist has studied the problems of decision making in agriculture; a professor of art has studied colonial architecture; a language teacher has studied dance-dramas; an economist has focused his attention upon migratory agricultural labor; and a political scientist has tried to make sense out of the whole Guatemalan political system.

Our respondents have rarely been casual or “quickie” visitors; only five of them reported having spent less than three months total time in Guatemala. While many of them used their summers as the most convenient time for field research, the typical pattern was one of repeated visits. Thirty of them have spent a total time of one year or more; and five of them have resided in Guatemala for periods varying from three to eight years.

They have gotten help in Guatemala from many institutions, most often from the Instituto Indigenista Nacional, the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, the Instituto de Antropología e Historia, the Instituto de Nutrición de Centro América y Panamá, and US-AID. Dozens of other agencies, public and private, have helped. (See the Directory in Appendix III.) The U.S. social scientists reported with surprising frequency the importance of help from local priests or other religious agents. They often received much useful advice and criticism from Guatemalan academics; and they very commonly employed students and locals as paid informants or assistants. But it was a rare occasion, indeed, when a Guatemalan was incorporated as a professional collaborator of equal status.

Our respondents proved their academic entrepreneur-ship by getting financial support from their own and other universities; from a great number of U.S. government sources, including the State Department, AID, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health and of Mental Health, NDFL programs and Fulbright-Hays; from private foundations—Ford, Wenner-Gren, Bollingen and Russell Sage; from the Social Science Research Council and the American Philosophical Society; and, on rare occasions, from the Guatemalan government. Multiple sources of research funds were tapped by many respondents, and only one person reported having to finance his research wholly out of his own resources. No one reported research financed by defense or security agencies, and a few reported that, as a matter of policy, they would undertake no such projects.
A rather extensive bibliography has resulted from the research reported by the respondents, and samples of it are included in Appendix I. Thirty-six of the researchers also report unpublished results available in the form of manuscript, field notes, photographs or tape recordings. Without exception, all of the respondents stated that they had not withheld significant results from publication because of the fear of offending someone or of making further research difficult—even in the one reported case where pressures were brought to bear on the respondent not to publish.

Publication in Spanish in Guatemala has been another matter, on occasion. A case or two were reported in which publication in Spanish has been delayed because of local political conditions. But on the score of publishing in the host language, this group of respondents scores high—despite the opinion held by Guatemalans contacted, whose constant complaint was that results of U.S. research in Guatemala are almost always published only in English. Nineteen respondents listed Spanish-language publications in their bibliographies, and the total number of titles directly relevant to Guatemala ran to 90, with many additional ones in preparation. There is also a fairly extensive bibliography in Spanish produced by U.S. social scientists who did not respond to this questionnaire survey.

It is true that important items often appear in Spanish only long after original publication in English, sometimes several years later; but it is also true that many responsible authors publish in Guatemalan sources reasonably soon after doing their research. The publications of the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca have done much to improve both the quantity of material produced by U.S. social scientists and the speed with which it becomes available in Spanish. U.S. social scientists have also published occasionally in Antropología e Historia de Guatemala, in Economía, in Boletín del Instituto Indigenista Nacional, in the Revista de la Universidad de San Carlos, in the Anales de la Sociedad de Geografía e Historia and in Guatemala Indígena—all publications edited in Guatemala—and in various other Spanish-language journals which should be readily available to Guatemalan academics. (See the bibliography of Appendix I.)

Publication is only one way—though it is by far the most important way—in which U.S. personnel have had some impact on the social sciences in Guatemala. A few of our respondents have conducted research-training seminars, or at least made the training of their own assistants a major purpose of their stay. The visits of so many academics have produced a trickle of nationals to do graduate study in the United States—but, up to the present, it has remained just a trickle. Recently, AID has provided the financial stimulus for an increased flow of graduate students in the social sciences, in AID/Guatemala’s urban geography projects, and in ROCAP’s joint program with the University of Kansas and with the Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano.

There have been a few cases of deep and lasting fluence. Sol Tax’s research interests, for example, have led to the training of several anthropologists in both the United States and Guatemala, to a continuity of attention to Guatemalan problems, and to a small two-way flow of personnel for teaching, study and research. Richard N. Adams, too, has left a lasting imprint by teaching, by training nationals in the Instituto Indigenista Nacional and several other agencies, by his work with the nutrition institute (INCAP), by helping to found the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, and by his many contributions to the literature, one of which, his study of ladino culture, has become a standard text in Guatemala. Kalman Silvert was also one of the founding fathers of the Seminario, and his classic work on Guatemalan government is used as a basic text by the Instituto Nacional de Administración para el Desarrollo.

There is also the special case of the AID. In its attempts to promote development projects, AID/Guatemala has employed many U.S. academics. It has financed serious research on social structure and power groups, industrial development, rural labor, migration and labor force, and urban and regional development. It has furnished teachers for curricula in public administration, geography and anthropology. And it has used the talents of at least a dozen U.S. geographers in its joint programs with Guatemalan government agencies for urban studies of Quezaltenango, Colónba, Chapeté, Puerto Barrios, Antigua, Amatitlán and Escuintla; for a regional study of the Asunción Mi Valley; for slum studies in Guatemala City; for the study of the location of manufacturing industries throughout the republic; and for a national atlas of Guatemala.

In somewhat anonymous fashion, other social scientists have taught, helped to develop curricula and have advised government agencies. But, by and large, the U.S. academic in Guatemala has found it difficult to detect any lasting influence on his host country. Indeed, influence on host country is scarcely a consideration in the U.S. academic game. The U.S. social scientist sees Guatemala as a place to test hypotheses and gather data for publication in scholarly outlets read by his peers in the academic system. He hopes in some general way to contribute to knowledge—and, simultaneously, to his own pay, promotion and prestige. The norms of his academic system conflict sharply with those of social scientists in Guatemala, who tend to see research primarily as a way of attacking immediate problems, and thus of proving the practical utility of the social sciences. Guatemalans are forced by their system, as a rule, to multiple job-holding and multiple functions in which research is typically immediate, practical, pedestrian, and directed to pressing problems of national urgency. They have neither the leisure nor the supporting academic system to devote themselves to the sake of the social sciences per se—though they, too, may be presumed to be busy at promoting both knowledge and themselves in the context of their own system.

While the U.S. and the Guatemalan systems are not mutually exclusive, their norms and theiroci are differ-
ent enough to cause frequent differences of opinion over what needs to be investigated and how, and to create a general suspicion on the part of Guatemalans that U.S. academics too often "aren't really interested in Guatemala."

The U.S. academic system tends to view a setting such as Guatemala as a fine place to send large numbers of students for some sort of experience in the field. At least six or eight major universities have sponsored occasional group activities. The presence of relatively large numbers of inexperienced students complicates the serious work of the professor or of the dissertation researcher by multiplying the claims on the limited time of Guatemalan informants. On this score, however, our Guatemalan respondents showed some indulgence, even though one of their major complaints was about duplication of effort and constant demands on their time. To cite a single recent example: one Guatemalan geographer, who has three major and separate jobs of his own, reported that no less than 20 U.S. academics had interviewed him for extended periods of time during the summer of 1968 (not including the writer of this study, who took another half-day of his valuable time!).

The problems of duplication of effort and of overuse of informants are major ones. Without exception, the Guatemalans interviewed in the course of this study pleaded for something to be done to coordinate U.S.-sponsored research, at least to the point of reducing such duplication and overuse. On the U.S. side, the response was considerably more cautious and variable, although a great majority of the respondents urged that mechanisms be developed for information and communication which would reduce duplication and avoid alienation of sources.

The U.S. academic system is by nature a virtual state of anarchy, and most social scientists there feel reasonably comfortable with it. It is one in which it is presumed, of course, that the individual scholar will make a thorough search of the literature; will take the time to contact those of his colleagues who have done significant work in his geographical and disciplinary areas; and will go to some pains to inform the scholarly community, in both his home and host countries, of the results of his own research.

The operating system falls far short of the ideal. In the first place, the disciplinary boundary lines are drawn sharply in the U.S. system, so that it may not occur to an economist, for example, that geographers and anthropologists have already tread his ground in the most literal sense, and have already used the time of those who will be his own principal informants. In the second place, a long time typically elapses between the performance of field research and the publication of results—a time span that is partly a function of the nature of good research itself, partly a function of the multiple claims on the time of a good academic, and partly a function of the backlog of material which reaches the better journals and publishers. In the third place, there are relatively few regular outlets which report on-going research in such fashion that readers may learn much from them. In the fourth place, there is no center in Guatemala itself where one can find out, in any systematic way, who has been there, what they have published, with whom they have worked, or how they have treated their topics. The most frequent suggestion made by respondents on both sides was for the serious development of agencies, in both the United States and Guatemala, to provide an information clearinghouse function for past, present and planned research. In the United States, the Latin American Research Review already attempts something of that function; and in Guatemala, the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca does a bit of the same. Each of these might be strengthened in its role of serving the much-needed information function; but it would require major financial and human resource inputs.

Other serious suggestions for improving communication among interested scholars were made by respondents: (a) the development of central depository libraries devoted to the collection of research studies, published and unpublished, and to the publication of bibliographies and newsletters describing them; (b) periodic scholarly conferences for discussion of research on Guatemala; (c) the establishment of a Guatemalan social science research council or committee who would look to questions of information and coordination; (d) the maintenance of a registry of scholars with special research interests in Guatemala; (e) cooperative publication of collected works (handbooks, readings and symposia); (f) a continuing bibliography project on social science research in Guatemala; (g) an increased exchange of professors and graduate students between U.S. and Guatemalan universities.

From the point of view of a large country like the United States, with its enormous academic community, these suggestions may sound like much to-do over a small country. But the very smallness of the country, and especially of its own scholarly community, makes the U.S.-sponsored effort seem at times overwhelming. Clearly, something needs to be done to prevent the current annoyance of Guatemalans from becoming an intolerable strain on their time and their goodwill.

THE USES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE:
A GUATEMALAN VIEW

Scholarship and Society: the Structure of the Social Sciences in Guatemala

The social sciences in Guatemala are practical professions on the one hand, or the pastime of self-taught aficionados on the other. But they are also at the moment in an exciting state of ferment and of basic change.

The formal study of law in Guatemala is over 400 years old; and the lawyers, in the best of European tradition, have always regarded themselves as being composed of one-part practical sociologist. The law school claim to the social sciences has been a serious one, and in the national university of San Carlos the official name
of the school is the Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales—a title which has been copied in the young but well-established Catholic university, Rafael Landívar. Despite the lawyers' claim, for very long periods of time they were not very serious about the theory or practice of the social sciences in any modern sense. There have grown up around them a number of faculties, schools, departments, centers, or institutes devoted more specifically to identifiable disciplines. The oldest and best established of these is the Facultad de Ciencias Económicas of the Universidad de San Carlos, formally established in 1937. The Catholic university has duplicated that administrative structure, too.

The economics faculty produces about ten licenciados per year, and its cumulative total of graduates form the largest, the most clearly identifiable, and the most closely knit group of professionals in the social sciences. As in most of Latin America, in Guatemala the relevance of economics to national priorities has long been unquestioned. No other branch of the social sciences fares so well, in terms of either numbers or acceptance. The economics faculty, like law, laid claim to the social sciences and named its research arm officially the Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales.

Despite the titles and the intentions of both law and economics, social sciences have sneaked in elsewhere—though they have little history of formal structure, and they certainly have no formidable budgets.

Anthropology in amateur version has been a practical necessity in a country which is two-thirds Indian; but, interestingly and amazingly, no formal university programs or degrees in anthropology exist, to this day. Many self-taught “anthropologists” work in the national Indian institute, the agrarian transformation agency, and in a dozen government entities which must deal with problems of culture and society; a few others have been fortunate enough to study in Mexico or the United States; still others have learned under the direct tutelage of visiting foreigners. But, if the count of one knowledgeable professional anthropologist who was interviewed is accurate, there exist no more than ten Guatemalan nationals with formal university degrees in anthropology. Three of those have remained outside of the country for lack of attractive positions. Only one of the ten has a doctorate, and he is, for the most part, unemployed. The situation is undergoing major change. Introductory courses in anthropology are now given through the faculty of humanities; there is a good young U.S. anthropologist on loan to San Carlos under AID auspices for purposes of curriculum development; and a dynamic rector seems very much interested in improving anthropology as a part of his drive to develop the social sciences in general. Despite its tenuous university position, anthropology does have its large number of aficionados, its museum, its institute and its scholarly journal.

Sociology as an identifiable academic discipline is undeveloped, save for an introductory course or two. There is apparently only one member of the national university faculty with formal training in sociology at the graduate level. Political science is in an equal state of disrepair with respect to personnel; but an experimental two-semester, introductory program in political science is being given in extracurricular fashion through the national university's center for population studies, relying heavily for the moment on visiting foreign personnel for faculty. There is some political science content in the graduate program of the Instituto Nacional de Administración para el Desarrollo which has also relied heavily on visiting foreigners in this field.

Geography is reasonably secure as a profession, despite the fact that no college major can be had in the subject at any level. The success of the geographers depends largely upon the Instituto Geográfico Nacional, where physical geography dominates, and where virtually the entire staff have had foreign training. Physical and cultural geography are being incorporated into the University of San Carlos curriculum; and AID stands ready to help geographical studies, both within and without the universities.

The current state of ferment in the social sciences has also infected both the architects and the engineers. The Facultad de Arquitectura and the Facultad de Ingeniería of the Universidad de San Carlos each has a brand new Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional. The focus on urban and regional studies in each case is heavy with the physical and technical aspects of the profession; but each department requires its majors to take a dose of the social sciences, including at least economics and sociology.

The ferment has also involved a new look in the school of law, where a Departamento de Integración has been organized under the stimulus of Guatemala's joining the Central American Common Market. The social sciences are given serious attention by the departmental chairman and his eight-man staff. Two of the professors have been sent to the special programs of the Instituto para la Integración de América Latina, in Buenos Aires, and virtually all of them have studied in Europe. The department has sponsored an intensive course on integration attended by representatives of both the public and private sectors in Guatemala; and it is now jointly sponsoring with the central bank a book on the same topic, authored by some 22 Guatemalans and other Central American regional experts. The program suffers, of course, from the weakness of the supporting social sciences in Guatemala, and from the fact that many experts who could contribute to basic research are prevented from doing so by their involvement in day-to-day problems at the national and Central American levels.

To recapitulate the situation in the universities:

The national university, San Carlos, gives serious, if limited, attention to the social sciences in its department of integration studies of the law school, in the faculty of economic sciences and its affiliated institute for economic and social research, in its center for population studies, in the departments of urban and regional planning in both architecture and engineering—all in Guatemala City—and in the schools of economics, law and
humanities of its Quezaltenango branch. If current plans at San Carlos are carried out, much of the research activity of these diverse units of the national university will soon be coordinated through an Instituto de Investigación para el Desarrollo Económico y Social de Guatemala, depending directly on the rector's office.

The Catholic university, Rafael Landivar, has faculties of law and social science, economics and humanities, all in Guatemala City. The protestant university, Mariano Gámez, has elementary social science in its two-year curriculum; it, too, is in Guatemala City. Finally, the newest college-level institution in Guatemala, the private, non-denominational Universidad del Valle, is giving special attention to undergraduate-level social science, also in Guatemala City. It goes without saying that neither of the latter two colleges has any research program at all; and Landivar university has almost none.

Almost without exception, academic social scientists in Guatemala are also employed by government or private agencies as advisors or consultants. In addition, there is a fairly large body of knowledgeable personnel, some of them academically trained in the social sciences and most of them not so trained, who are not in the academic community but who are involved in social science research. (See the directory in Appendix III.) There follows a brief review of selected academic, governmental and private agencies and their publications.

The national university publishes a magazine of general interest, the Revista de la Universidad de San Carlos, which occasionally includes articles with a social science focus. The law school also publishes its own journal, Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales, which is heavy in its emphasis on problems of national or Central American interest. The integration studies of the law school have already been mentioned above.

The Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales was founded in 1959 and began to publish its journal, Economía, in 1962. Its articles, too, have tended to focus mainly on problems of national or regional urgency.14 It is currently sponsoring a comprehensive study of economic integration in Central America, a volume which will likely be a year and a half in preparation; and its other current research includes studies of rural-urban migration, urban family income and expenditures and an evaluation of Guatemala's development plan. The institute has helped with a few projects done through the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin. Its Quezaltenango branch has its own modest research and publication program, and it has done studies of wheat farming and agricultural colonization.15

The Centro de Estudios de Población, created in 1967, has published nothing to date. However, its ongoing research includes a study of internal migrations in Guatemala and the preparation of general mortality tables for the country. It has devoted most of its attention to the extracurricular program in political science, mentioned above. The newest university entity with social science interest, the Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional of the Facultad de Ingeniería, was just created in July of 1968 and has had time to do neither research nor publication. Its somewhat older sibling, a department of the same name created in the Facultad de Arquitectura in 1966, has had a few architecture students doing studies of municipalities as part of regular course work, and it has gotten small bits of advice and collaboration from the University of Pittsburgh; but it has not published anything.

The Guatemalan government is replete with specialized offices and agencies which are engaged in some kind of social science research. Eleven of them responded to our interview and questionnaire survey.

The Dirección General de Estadística is in some ways the basic research agency of the government. A dependency of the Ministerio de Economía, it is responsible for the national censuses and for much of the "permanent" or regular, periodic statistics. The Instituto Geográfico Nacional, located within the Ministerio de Comunicaciones y Obras Públicas, does a wide variety of mapping, most of it physical, but with some recent projects concentrating on resources and land use.16 It is also the national agency designated to collaborate with AID/Guatemala, ROCAP and SIECA to produce a national atlas of Guatemala dealing with physical and human resources and with economic activity, scheduled for completion in 1970.

The Ministerio de Educación sponsors and finances a small but very important center, the Seminario de Integración Social Guatemala. The Seminario grew out of an original special seminar on social integration. It now maintains a small library, mails out a newsletter and bibliography list to hundreds of interested persons all over the world, helps visiting social scientists with contacts and orientation, and publishes in Spanish selected works of both Guatemalan and foreign authors. Its newsletter, Seminario, is distributed free. It sells its other publications, which are of three kinds: its major works, now numbering 22 volumes, with two more in preparation, and including works by U.S. authors; its series, Cuadernos del Seminario, with 19 published and a twentieth in preparation; and its special series, Estudios Centroamericanos, three of which have appeared, with two more in preparation.17 The Seminario, in many ways, offers the best prospects in all of Guatemala for being developed as the kind of agency recommended by so many of our respondents: information clearinghouse, depository library, research center, and publisher of research studies, bibliographies and registries of scholars.

The Ministerio de Educación has other dependencies which are important in the field of social science research. Its Instituto de Antropología e Historia de Guatemala has published since 1949 the journal, Antropología e Historia de Guatemala, which appears twice a year; it includes original articles by nationals and foreigners, some translations and bibliographical and other notes.18

The Instituto Indigenista Nacional has carried out a
long series of research projects, some of them with the help of U.S. anthropologists (e.g., Richard N. Adams, Norman McQuown and Benjamin Paul). The Institute's program has included a wide variety of studies of the Indian population: social structure, economic activity, rural credit, levels of living, blood types, medical practices, internal migrations—to mention but a few. The Institute has made repeated serious efforts at publication, sometimes frustrated for lack of budget. Its Indigenismo en Acción, intended as a quarterly newsletter and begun in 1967, was suspended after three issues. Guatemala Indígena, a journal begun with the first quarter of 1961, was "temporarily" suspended with the issue for the second quarter of 1963; five years later it is still suspended. The basic quarterly publication, Boletín del Instituto Indigenista Nacional, has been published since 1945. The institute has also published many studies of monographic nature in its series, "Publicaciones Especiales del Instituto Indigenista Nacional."

Still another dependency of the education ministry, the Oficina de Planeamiento Integral de la Educación, has made a number of studies, the most recent of which deal with a review of educational conditions in Guatemala and the development of a national plan for education for 1969-1972. The office has had technical and financial assistance on occasion from AID and UNESCO, and it has worked with advisors from Harvard and from the University of Utah.

The Escuela de Servicio Social of the Instituto Guatemalteco de Seguridad Social has a research department through which its students work on the research papers or theses required for graduation. The topics treated range broadly across the areas typical of specialists in social work.10

The Guatemalan government also sponsors the Instituto Nacional de Administración para el Desarrollo, which was founded with financial and advisory help from AID. The institute has a two-year master's degree program in public administration. Its students do some research papers, and the institute itself has sponsored a few major studies, including a recent guide to the Guatemalan legislature.20

Economic research sponsored by the Guatemalan government is carried out in a host of agencies, the principal one of which, in terms of some hierarchy of influence on policy, is the Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica. This council not only carries out major research on policy issues, but, in theory, coordinates to some limited extent the research priorities of all government agencies. In practice, each agency seems largely to determine its own priorities and programs in accordance with its own specific purposes.

Perhaps the most important economic research agency—and certainly the most prolific—is the central bank, the Banco de Guatemala. Two of its departments are responsible for a very large variety of continuing and special studies. The Departamento de Estudios Económicos is responsible for much macroeconomic analysis of money, credit and foreign exchange; of balance of payments; and of the national income and product accounts.21 It has a staff of well-trained economists, and it has occasionally used special advisors or advisory missions from the United States, from international agencies and from other parts of Latin America. The Departamento de Investigaciones Agropecuarias e Industriales, as its name indicates, focuses its attention on agriculture and industry, at the level of specific products, industries or markets. It has done dozens of these technical studies.22

Other specialized agencies of the government carry out or collaborate on studies of significance to the social sciences. The Empresa Nacional de Fomento y Desarrollo Económico del Petén (FYDEP), for example, has done studies of land use and cooperatives in the Petén. The Dirección de Límites y Aguas Internacionales, of the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, has collaborated on a number of geographical studies, including the basic mapping project for Guatemala, done in collaboration with the Instituto Geográfico and the U.S. government, and with a geographical dictionary.23

Guatemala City is also the seat of a number of regional organizations with some social science research interest. Among them are four discussed very briefly here. The Secretaría Permanente del Tratado General de Integración Económica Centroamericana (SIECA) does much research on economic integration, though very little of it is of basic or long-range nature, so busy is SIECA with the problems of the day. The Instituto Centroamericano de Investigación y Tecnología Industrial (ICAITI) has a division of industrial economics which does market research, industry studies, engineering and economic feasibility studies, and cost and productivity studies, typically of individual firms or for specific products. The Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá (INCAP) has always had a small number of social scientists on its staff. Its focus has been mostly on problems of nutrition, but its studies have included aspects of family organization, patterns of consumption, education and child-raising, medical beliefs and practices, food production and the relation between nutrition and mental development, among others. The Instituto Interamericano de Ciencias Agrícolas, of the Organization of American States, has in Guatemala a program on rural development and agrarian reform. Its researches have included studies of state-owned farms, agricultural colonization, agricultural extension, Central American regional agricultural policies, rural community development and technical assistance in programs of agrarian reform.

In the sphere of private, voluntary organizations, there exist in Guatemala a few which are reasonably serious about the research phase of their work. The Instituto para el Desarrollo Económico Social de América Central (IDESAC) is doing studies of population growth, knowledge of fecundity and language ability among the low-income population. The Fundación para el Desarrollo Internacional has a planning and regional analysis specialist on its staff. The Instituto Lingüístico
de Verano, while it has no systematic program of research, does expect its personnel to study the social conditions of areas where they live and work; and it collaborates with various agencies of the Guatemalan government responsible for working with the indigenous population.

There are in Guatemala many agencies, in addition to those reviewed above, with serious interest—if not serious programs—in the social sciences. All of them function in an environment in which trained personnel are the exception, social scientists are poorly paid and formal educational or training programs are inadequate.

Library facilities, too, are grossly inadequate for the social sciences. There exist only three or four reasonably good libraries, and except for the Biblioteca Nacional, all of them are small and specialized. Current holdings and rate of acquisitions are far from satisfactory, even for the best of them. Table 1 gives some basic data for a selected few of the libraries in Guatemala City.

Working in their own environment, Guatemalan social scientists are almost certain to view the nature and the use of the social sciences quite differently from their U.S. counterparts. Indeed, there is some question whether genuine counterparts really exist, given basic differences in the structure of the social sciences and the quite different demands which are made upon the community of social scientists in the two countries.

Guatemalan Perceptions of and Opinions About U.S. Social Scientists and Their Research

The result of the U.S. social scientist's interest in his own academic system and his real or imagined superior training has been the development of a brand of "intellectual mercantilism," in which Guatemalans are used as "hired hands" to gather data which are "exported" to the United States for processing and consumption. The infrequency with which Guatemalans have been used as professional collaborators has already been mentioned. The U.S. researcher often makes no commitment to leave in or send back to his host country either the data or the product derived from them—though we saw that our U.S. respondents in this study got fairly high marks on this score. When the U.S. social scientist does make an honest effort to return the fruits of joint labor, the results frequently are available only in English; and at that few copies or reprints ever reach Guatemalan agencies. A further sore point with the Guatemalans is the time lapse between research and publication, often so long that changes in personnel or in conditions in Guatemala make the studies almost useless. On the Guatemalan side, the combination of busy people, poor libraries and skimpy budgets means that interested scholars or agencies seldom get even that literature which could be had readily at their own initiative.

An effort was made in this survey to get Guatemalan opinions about the behavior of U.S. social scientists and suggestions about what might be done to improve the relationship between the visitors and their hosts. Some 50 Guatemalans responded. All of the points outlined in the preceding paragraph were made repeatedly; and there were a number of other criticisms.

Almost without exception, the Guatemalans complained of the lack of coordination of U.S.-sponsored studies. In their view, this has resulted in the duplication of studies, the neglect of many important topics and areas, and excessive claims on the time of a limited number of informants. This problem has been discussed above. For the most part, the Guatemalans, like their U.S. counterparts, recommended registration and orientation centers, document depositories, scholarly conferences or similar information mechanisms for dealing with the problems of duplication. At the extreme, one or two of them would have foreign investigators assigned their topics by some interested Guatemalan government agency; the more common suggestion, however, was that the visitor ally himself with a local institution and develop his project in consultation with academic and governmental agencies.
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The second major complaint about the behavior of U.S. social scientists was that they seldom see to it that Guatemalan agencies get the results of their studies. A corollary complaint was that they are generally reluctant to give progress reports or to review their preliminary findings before leaving Guatemala or before publishing in U.S. outlets. On this score, Guatemalan respondents urged the U.S. visitors to deposit copies of all field notes and original data with one or more appropriate Guatemalan agencies, and to send copies and reprints of all published works as soon as available. Many of them also urged that some Guatemalan agency be authorized from the beginning to bring out Spanish versions of the results simultaneously with any English original.

The third major complaint has to do with attitudes. Many of our Guatemalan respondents believed that U.S. social scientists often display a disdain or superciliousness toward their hosts. Others complained that Americans too often have stereotyped views of their Guatemalan academic counterparts, especially assumptions about radical ideological tenets. The visitors show a detectable brand of American missionary zeal which is offensive in itself and which implies an ignorance of and disinterest in local culture. Finally, too many visitors still arrive to study Guatemala without developing competence in Spanish, a defect which they seem unconcerned to remedy.

Despite the frequent criticisms of the methods, purposes, attitudes or commitments on the part of U.S. social scientists, our Guatemalan respondents showed a great deal of respect for the general quality of U.S.-sponsored research and a great deal of interest in collaborating. They also expressed an interest in learning from their visitors and in teaching them in turn by orienting them to Guatemalan society. No overt hostility to the idea of foreign research was encountered, nor were there exaggerated notions of national pride leading Guatemalans to think that their own ideas were always best or more appropriate.

Guatemalan suggestions for improving relationships are understandably replete with hopes of getting something of a better bargain; collaborating as equals; getting Guatemalan priorities a better hearing; getting the results as soon, and in as readily available form, in Guatemala as in the United States; improving the quality and the status of the social sciences in Guatemala as well as in the United States; in short, replacing the "intellectual mercantilism" model with one which is less hierarchical in nature.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

Social science research in Guatemala takes place in an environment heavy with U.S. influence of many kinds, much of it motivated in terms of U.S. interests, rather than Guatemalan welfare. The general U.S. interest in Guatemala has run heavily to concerns with communism, business opportunities and tourism. As a result, the U.S. social scientist forms, willy nilly, a part of a hierarchical system in which Guatemalans play a dependent role. His motives and his sponsorship are rightly subject to suspicion, and he must make special efforts to keep his intellectual relationships from adopting the same hierarchical forms.

U.S. social scientists in surprising numbers have turned their attention to Guatemala. Most of them have been anthropologists, but numbers of others have been there; and the literature runs to hundreds of titles. In addition, many social scientists have been involved in academic and governmental advisory missions.

A general state of anxiety has prevailed in the choice and execution of research projects, with a great deal of duplication, overuse of selected Guatemalan informants, neglect of many areas of study, poor communication among U.S. personnel and with Guatemalans, a bit of faddism in themes and some degree of disaffection on the part of the Guatemalan contacts.

There is a sharp conflict between U.S. and Guatemalan social scientists over the nature and uses of their science. The U.S. academic tends to see Guatemala as a place to test hypotheses and gather data for publications which contribute to knowledge and to his own professional progress. Guatemalans tend to see research primarily as a way to attack problems of national urgency with which they are involved as practical social scientists in the employ of government or, occasionally, of private agencies. The two systems cause frequent differences of opinion about topics and methods of research.

Guatemalans are critical of those visitors who display attitudes of superiority, of those who hold stereotyped views of Guatemala, of those who are zealous about imposing U.S. solutions or models, and of those who try to do serious research without requisite language ability. They are also sensitive to hierarchical relationships which cast them in the role of informants or employees but not professional collaborators. They also feel, generally, that not enough of the research results get back to Guatemala.

Guatemalans in general respect U.S. social science research and are interested in collaboration. They are weary of duplication and of the demands on their own time, and they are quick to suggest forms for changing the situation. On this latter point, they are joined by their U.S. colleagues, who offer a number of suggestions for improving communications among social scientists and for seeing that the host country gets more out of U.S.-sponsored research.

The social sciences in Guatemala are in a state of ferment which will increase both Guatemalan desires to collaborate with U.S. individuals and institutions, and Guatemalan abilities to do so to mutual advantage.

Recommendations

The recommendations listed here were developed from suggestions made by both North American and Guatemalan respondents, and to some minor extent...
from the experience of the author and his own students in Guatemala. They are meant to embrace the general recommendations in the introduction to these studies, including those about the preparation of the investigator for his project by briefing, by reviews of the literature, by language training, by correspondence with interested Guatemalans, and by an exploratory visit, if possible.

The recommendations are of two kinds. Some are suggestions that the U.S. social scientist give his host country something of value in exchange for the data and experience which he receives. Others are suggested mechanisms which would facilitate the performance of researchers and their utility to the scholarly community.

(1) As a matter of principle, the U.S. scholar should avoid research which is classified or destined for very limited circulation. Such projects heighten suspicions of motive in Guatemala.

(2) The scholar should make every effort to affiliate himself with Guatemalan institutions. Affiliation may well serve his needs while at the same time providing some constant feedback to his host country.

(3) He should attempt to incorporate Guatemalan personnel into his project at planning and directing levels.

(4) Contacts with regional agencies (e.g., UN, OAS, Central American Common Market) and with Guatemalan agencies, governmental and academic, will often teach him much, save valuable time and generate interest in his work.

(5) Full acknowledgement of Guatemalan help and full citation of Guatemalan sources are expected as a matter of common courtesy.

(6) The scholar should stand ready, when invited, to contribute to Guatemalan social science through classes, seminars, public lectures or training sessions.

(7) The U.S. scholar has a responsibility of communicating with Guatemalans at four stages: (a) preliminary discussion of research plans with interested parties; (b) occasional reports of ongoing activity, perhaps through informal talks or seminars; (c) a summary of preliminary research findings, however tentative, delivered in written form before his departure from Guatemala; (d) copies of all publications and unpublished analyses, as soon as they are available. In addition he should make provisions for the translation into Spanish of his reports, should leave copies of original data with some host agency, and in studies of national importance, should communicate the nature and the findings of his research to the press.

(8) Some Guatemalan agency should develop, with aid from U.S. institutions, a clearinghouse function for past, present and planned research in Guatemala. The Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca would be a good agency; and it is both willing and able to assume such a function, if it can get adequate financial help.

(9) One or more central depositories should be developed in Guatemala, with U.S. help, to which all scholars—national and foreign—would be asked to send copies of works on Guatemala. The Seminario de Integración Social has been mentioned as an appropriate center, as have the new central library of the University of San Carlos and the Academia de Ciencias.

(10) Periodic scholarly conferences should be held in Guatemala for purposes of discussing research; and a Guatemalan social science research council or committee should be organized.

(11) A newsletter, published by a Guatemalan agency, with collaboration and financial help from U.S. institutions, would keep interested scholars informed of research in progress. The Seminario already has a start on such a newsletter.

(12) A registry of scholars with special interest in Guatemala, developed and maintained by a Guatemalan agency, would facilitate professional contacts. Again, the Seminario would be appropriate.

(13) Cooperative publication by Guatemalan and foreign scholars of collected volumes (e.g., handbooks, readings and symposia) should be encouraged, especially by those U.S. universities with special interest in Central America (e.g., Texas, Tulane, Kansas). Frequent publication of bibliographies on social science research in Guatemala should be undertaken by those same universities.

(14) U.S. university presses, centers, bureaus and other publishing entities should be encouraged to donate important publications to one or more Guatemalan libraries.

(15) U.S. universities, especially those with special interest in Central America, should be encouraged to offer scholarships for postgraduate training of Guatemalan social scientists.
NOTES

1. The variety of treatment given to the issue of communism may be illustrated by the following items:


7. An additional twelve who replied were not included because they did no relevant research during the time covered here, or because they chose not to answer the questions.

bible of the past but is currently being revised. The original edition contains 300 titles, some 154 of them in English. The Lines bibliography attempts a comprehensive coverage, and it contains hundreds of titles on archaeological topics.

No specialized bibliographies for other disciplines were found (though bibliographical publications of several Guatemalan institutions are listed in Appendix I). Julio Quan, of the Instituto Geográfico Nacional, has collected a bibliography of items written by North Americans about Guatemala (without limit on time span), and it runs to more than 800 titles.


10. Fifty-nine universities are represented by the personnel listed in the Directory of Appendix II, including, of course, the 27 institutions of our questionnaire respondents.


12. Kalman H. Silvert, *A Study in Government: Guate-

13. Most of the studies have been published. They are available through AID/Guatemala; through the Instituto Geográfico Nacional; or through the Departamento de Estudios Geográficos and the Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano and Regional of the Ministerio de Obras Públicas.


19. A mimeographed list, “Lista de los trabajos de graduación de la Escuela de Servicio Social del I.G.S.S. de Guatemala, clasificados por campos de aplicación del año 1951 al año 1966” is available from the school. See Appendix III for the address.

20. *Guía del Organismo Legislativo, República de Guate-

21. One of its regular duties is to prepare the *Memoria de Labores y Estudio Económico*, Guatemala: Banco de Guatemala, annual.
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APPENDIX II

Preliminary Selected Directory of U.S. Social Scientists
With a Research Interest in Guatemala

(Note: This roster includes some persons who are not U.S.
citizens or residents, but who have done research under the
auspices of some U.S. institution.)

Richard E. W. Adams
Department of Anthropology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Richard N. Adams
Department of Anthropology
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas
D. E. Alleger
Department of Agricultural Economics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
Edmund Allen
Developmental Center
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida
Richard P. Applebaum
Roma 410, Dept. 2
San Isidro
Lima, Peru
Eduardo Arriaga
Department of Sociology
University of California
Berkeley, California
John P. Augelli
Department of Geography
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
Francisco Ayala
New York University
437 East Building
New York, New York
George M. Beal
Department of Sociology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
Ralph L. Beals
Department of Anthropology
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California
Bruce E. Rechtesol
Department of Geography
Chico State College
Chico, California
Calvin P. Blair
Department of Economics
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas

George I. Blanksten
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
R. S. Boggs
536 Altara Avenue
Coral Gables, Florida
Eric Bosc
Department of Geography
Rice University
Houston, Texas
Donald D. Brand
Department of Geography
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas
Fredda Bullard
Texas Research Associates Corp.
Austin, Texas
Louis E. Bumgartner
Department of History
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
Ruth Bunzel
Department of Anthropology
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.
Thomas K. Burch
Department of Sociology
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.
Theodore Caplow
Department of Sociology
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.
Robert W. Carmack
Department of Anthropology
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California
William E. Carter
Department of Anthropology
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
Pedro Carrasco
Department of Anthropology
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York
Gregg Clifford
Chicago Natural History Museum
Chicago, Illinois
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Robert H. Ewald
Department of Anthropology
California State College, Los Angeles
5151 State College Drive
Los Angeles, California

William A. Faunce
Department of Sociology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Timothy Fiske
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Walter Fitts
Department of Agricultural Economics
North Carolina State College
Raleigh, North Carolina

Troy S. Floyd
Department of History
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

George Foster
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

John Gillin
Division of Social Sciences
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Luis E. González Vales
Council on Higher Education
University of Puerto Rico
San Juan, Puerto Rico

Ian Graham
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

John Graham
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Frances Gramz
30 North Avenue
Elizabeth, New Jersey

William J. Griffith
Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Joseph Grunwald
Twentieth Century Fund
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Clive Harston
Department of Sociology
Montana State University
Missoula, Montana

William Hazard
Texas Research Associates Corp.
Austin, Texas

Robert F. Heizer
Department of Anthropology
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

John R. Hildebrand
Department of Economics
Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas

Bertha Clow
Department of Sociology
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

James D. Cochrane
Department of Political Science
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Michael Coe
Department of Anthropology
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Carl B. Compton
Interamerican Institute
Box 5133 NT
Denton, Texas

Davis Paul Cooper
60 South Munn Avenue
East Orange, New Jersey

Frances W. Goubaud Craig
220 East Reading Way
Winter Park, Florida

Patrick T. Culbert
Department of Anthropology
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Christopher Day
Department of Anthropology
The University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

William Davenport
Department of Geography
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Stephan F. de Borhegyi
Milwaukee Public Museum
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Calvin L. de Pass
Department of Economics
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

William G. Douglas
Department of Psychiatry
School of Medicine
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Melvin Droubay
AID/Guatemala
Edificio Cruz Azul
Guatemala, C.A.

Roland Ebel
Department of Geography
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Charles H. V. Ebert
Department of Geography
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Munro S. Edmonson
Department of Anthropology
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Gary Elbow
AID/Guatemala
Edificio Cruz Azul
Guatemala, C. A.
Guatemala

George W. Hill
Land Tenure Center
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Robert E. Hinshaw
30 Calle 17-50, Zona 12
Guatemala, C. A.

Allan Holmberg
Department of Anthropology
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Nicholas A. Hopkins
Department of Anthropology
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Oscar H. Horst
Department of Geography
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Don R. Hoy
Department of Geography
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth E. Hoyt
Department of Economics
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

Evelyn Urban Irving
Department of Languages
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario
Canada

Tom B. Irving
Department of Modern Languages
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario
Canada

David Jickling
AID/Washington
Washington, D.C.

Carl L. Johannessen
Department of Geography
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Frank Keller
Department of Economics
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Arden R. King
Middle American Research Institute
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

John Ladd
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

William R. Lassey
Center for Planning and Development
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

Robert L. Layton
Department of Geography
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Willard L. Leedes
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Edwin Lieuwen
Department of History
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Carroll Edward Mace
Department of Languages
Xavier University of Louisiana
7325 Palmetto
New Orleans, Louisiana

Ryland R. Madison
Long Beach State College
Long Beach, California

James Malamuth
2851 Dwight Way
Berkeley, California

Mark Mancall
Department of History
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Sidney D. Markman
Department of Art
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Gene E. Martin
Department of Geography
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Marvin K. Mayers
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Felix Webster McBryde
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Norman A. McQuown
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

E. M. Mendelson
21 Kidderpore Gardens
London, N.W. 3
England

Michael Micklin
International Population and Urban Research
University of California
2234 Piedmont Avenue
Berkeley, California

Clarence W. Minkel
School for Advanced Graduate Studies
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Magnus Morner
14 Horatio Street 15 H
New York, N. Y.

Donald F. Mulvihill
Department of Economics
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Manning Nash
The School of Business
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Robert A. Naylor
Department of History
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rutherford, New Jersey
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Simon Rottenberg
Centro de Investigaciones Económicas
Universidad Católica de Chile
Santiago, Chile

Arthur J. Rubel
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Notre Dame University
Notre Dame, Indiana

Charles Rust
Montana State University
Missoula, Montana

J. A. Sabloff
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Emil J. Sady
Public Administration Division
Technical Assistance Administration
United Nations
New York, N. Y.

Gary Schill
Department of Geography
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Lester Schmid
Land Tenure Center
310 King Hall
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Nevin S. Scrimshaw
Department of Nutrition and Food Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Ronald C. Sheek
AID/Guatemala
Edificio Cruz Azul
Guatemala, C. A.

William L. Sherman
Department of History
The University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Franklin B. Sherwood
Department of Economics
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Edwin M. Shook
Associated Colleges of the Midwest
c/o Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

Donald N. Sibley
Department of Agricultural Economics
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Kalman H. Silvert
The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, N. Y.

John W. Sloan
Dept. of Political Science
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

A. Ledyard Smith
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Guatemala

M. Joseph Smucker
Department of Sociology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Bruce B. Solnick
Department of History
State University of New York
Albany, N. Y.

Berkley A. Spencer
Department of Anthropology
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

Joseph Spielberg
Department of Anthropology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Charles L. Stansifer
Department of History
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Lawrence C. Stuart
University Museums
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Sol Tax
Department of Anthropology
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Robert N. Thomas
Department of Geography
Indiana State University
Indiana, Pennsylvania

Layton Thompson
Department of Sociology
Montana State University
Missoula, Montana

Raymond N. Thompson
Department of Anthropology
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Clarence Thurber
Department of Political Science and Administration
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Gair Tourtellot
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Melvin M. Tumin
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Charles Wagley
Department of Anthropology
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

Robert Wauchope
Department of Anthropology
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Robert C. West
Department of Geography
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Nathan L. Whetten
The University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Gordon R. Willey
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Eric Wolf
Department of Anthropology
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

William Robert Wood
5365 East Broadway
Long Beach, California

Clyde Woods
Department of Anthropology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Peter C. Wright
AID/Guatemala
Edificio Cruz Azul
Guatemala, C. A.

Alvan Zarate
Population Research Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Wilbur Zelinsky
Department of Geography
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania
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Preliminary Selected Directory of Guatemalan Institutions, Libraries, and Individuals with Social Science Research Interests

(Note: The list is far from complete. It includes only those persons or institutions contacted in the survey, or reported by those contacted. Addresses listed as “Guatemala” mean Guatemala City.)

Institutions
Academia de Ciencias
Av. Reforma 0–63, zona 10
Guatemala
Academia Lengua Maya Quiché
Quezaltenango, Guatemala
AID/Guatemala
Edificio Cruz Azul, zona 1
Guatemala
Banco de Guatemala
7a. Av. 22–01, zona 1
Guatemala
Cámara de Comercio
10a. C 3–80, zona 1
Guatemala
Cámara de Industria
3a. Av. 12–22, zona 1
Guatemala
Catholic Relief Services
Apartado Postal 739
Guatemala
Centro de Estudios de Población
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala
Centro de Salud Mental
4a. C 6–31, zona 1
Guatemala
Centro Guatemalteco de Desarrollo Industrial
6a. Av. 5–39, zona 1
Guatemala
Consejo de Bienestar Social
1a. C 4–34, zona 1
Guatemala
Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica
11 C 3–50, zona 1
Guatemala
Cuerpo de Paz (Peace Corps)
10a. Av. 13–12, zona 1
Guatemala
Departamento de Integración
Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales
Universidad de San Carlos
9a. Av. 9–79, zona 1
Guatemala
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Dirección General de Obras Públicas
Guatemala
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Facultad de Arquitectura
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Facultad de Ingeniería
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala
Departamento Técnico de Presupuesto
7a. Av. 5–41, zona 1
Guatemala
Dirección de Bienestar Infantil y Familiar
Secretaría de Asuntos Sociales de la Presidencia
Av. Reforma 2–43, zona 10
Guatemala
Dirección de Límites y Aguas Internacionales
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
7a. Ave. 0–70, zona 13
Guatemala
Dirección General de Desarrollo Agropecuario
12 Av. 19–01, zona 1
Guatemala
Dirección General de Desarrollo Socioeducativo Rural
8a. Av. 15–62, zona 1
Guatemala
Dirección General de Estadística
Ministerio de Economía
10a. C 7–69, zona 1
Guatemala
Dirección General de Investigación y Extensión Agrícola
Ministerio de Agricultura
“La Aurora” zona 13
Guatemala
Dirección General del Impuesto sobre la Renta
7a. Av. 4–49, zona 1
Guatemala
Dirección General Forestal
“La Aurora” zona 13
Guatemala
Empresa Nacional de Fomento y Desarrollo Económico del Petén (FYDEP)
2a. C 1–00, zona 10
Guatemala
Escuela de Ciencias Económicas de Occidente
Quezaltenango, Guatemala
Escuela de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales de Occidente
Quezaltenango, Guatemala
Escuela de Servicio Social del Instituto Guatemalteco de Seguridad Social
Apartado Postal 349
Guatemala
Escuela de Servicio Social Rural
Universidad de San Carlos
Quezaltenango, Guatemala
Guatemala

Escuela Facultativa de Humanidades de Occidente
Quetzaltenango, Guatemala
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
Universidad de San Carlos
C. Mariscal Cruz 1–56, zona 10
Guatemala
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
Universidad Rafael Landívar
17 C 8–64, zona 10
Guatemala
Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales
Universidad Rafael Landívar
17 C 8–64, zona 10
Guatemala
Facultad de Humanidades
Universidad de San Carlos
9a. Av. 13–39, zona 1
Guatemala
Facultad de Humanidades
Universidad Rafael Landívar
17 C 8–64, zona 10
Guatemala
Fundación para el Desarrollo Internacional
4a. C 5–73, zona 9
Guatemala
Instituto Centroamericano de Investigación y Tecnología Industrial (ICAITI)
Av. Reforma 4–47, zona 10
Guatemala
Instituto de Antropología e Historia (IDAEH)
“La Aurora” zona 13
Guatemala
Instituto de Fomento de la Producción (INFOP)
9a. C 9–47, zona 1
Guatemala
Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales (IIES)
Av. Reforma 0–63, zona 10
Guatemala
Instituto de Nutrición de Centro América y Panamá (INCAP)
Carretera Roosevelt, zona 11
Guatemala
Instituto Geográfico Nacional
Av. las Américas 5–76, zona 13
Guatemala
Instituto Guatemalteco de Seguridad Social (IGSS)
Guatemala
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala
Instituto Interamericano de Ciencias Agrícolas de la OEA
Zona Norte
1a. Av. 8–00, zona 9
Guatemala
Instituto Lingüístico de Verano
Apartado Postal 74
Guatemala
Instituto Nacional de Administración para el Desarrollo (INAD)
8a. C 5–72, zona 9
Guatemala
Instituto Nacional de Transformación Agraria (INTA)
14 C 7–14, zona 1
Guatemala

Instituto para el Desarrollo Económico Social de América Central (IDESAC)
5a. Av. 12–26, zona 1
Guatemala
Misión de Asistencia Técnica de la UNESCO
6a. C 9a–27, zona 1
Guatemala
Museo de Artes e Industrias Populares
10a. Av. 10–79, zona 1
Guatemala
Oficina de Planeamiento Integral de la Educación (OPIE)
4a. Av. 8–56, zona 1
Guatemala
Oficina Sanitaria Panamericana
9a. C 3–25, zona 1
Guatemala
Padres Maryknoll
Jaclaltenango, Huehuetenango
Guatemala
Patronato Antialcohólico
9a. C 2–64, zona 1
Guatemala
Sección Nacional del Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia
Av. las Américas 6–76, zona 13
Guatemala
Secretaría Permanente del Tratado General de Integración Económica Centroamericana (SIECA)
4a. Av. 10–25, zona 14
Guatemala
Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca (SISG)
11 C 4–31, zona 1
Guatemala
Servicio de Fomento de la Economía Indígena (SFEI)
“La Aurora” zona 13
Guatemala
Servicio Social Rural
Universidad Rafael Landívar
14 Av. “A” 4–11, zona 1
Quetzaltenango, Guatemala
Sociedad de Geografía e Historia
3a. Av. 8–35, zona 1
Guatemala
Unión Panamericana
4a. Av. 8–63, zona 1
Guatemala
Universidad Mariano Galvez
7a. Av. “A” 3–70, zona 1
Guatemala
Universidad del Valle
Apartado Postal 82
Guatemala

Libraries
Biblioteca de la Dirección de Desarrollo Socioeducativo Rural
8a. Av. 15–62, zona 1
Guatemala
Biblioteca de la Escuela Nacional de Agricultura
Finca Bárcenas, Villa Nueva
Guatemala
Biblioteca de la Facultad de Arquitectura
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala
Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community

Individuals

**Anthropology, Sociology**

- Daniel Aragón
  Instituto Indigenista Nacional
  6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Jorge Arias B.
  ICAITI
  Av. Reforma 4–47, zona 10
  Guatemala

- Jorge Berruscourt
  Escuela de Servicio Social
  12 C 4–17, zona 10
  Guatemala

- Gabriel Raúl Barrios Arriola
  3a. C 9–48, zona Independencia
  Totonicapán, Guatemala

- Armando René Bautista
  Escuela Normal Rural
  La Alameda, Chimaltenango
  Guatemala

- Jerónimo Camposeco Rojas
  Instituto Indigenista Nacional
  6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Hugo Cerezo Dardón
  4a. Av. 8–63, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Adrián I. Chávez
  8a. Av. 10–50, zona 1
  Quetzaltenango, Guatemala

- Ernesto Chinchilla Aguilar
  15 Av. "A" 5–57, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Manuel Colón Argüeta
  Departamento de Integración
  Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales
  9a. Av. 9–79, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Luis Fernando Cruz Sandoval
  4a. C 4–39, zona 10
  Guatemala

- Marcial Cutzal Maxía
  Instituto Indigenista Nacional
  6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Vicente Díaz Samayoa
  15 C. "A" 11–25, zona 1
  Guatemala

- Eliseo Escobar Gutiérrez
  Jefe, Servicio Social IGSS
  Guatemala

- Humberto Flores A.
  Escuela de Servicio Social
  Universidad de San Carlos
  Quetzaltenango, Guatemala

- Guillermo Grajeda Meno
  Instituto de Antropología e Historia
  "La Aurora" zona 13
  Guatemala

- Julio Hernández Sifontes
  Escuela de Servicio Social
  Quetzaltenango, Guatemala
Fernando de León Porras
Facultad de Humanidades
9a. Av. 13–39, zona 1
Guatemala

René Armando de León Schlotter
IDESAC
5a. Av. 12–26, zona 1
Guatemala

Luis Luján Muñoz
IDAEH
"La Aurora" zona 13
Guatemala

José Mata Gavidia
Facultad de Humanidades
9a. Av. 9–39, zona 1
Guatemala

Víctor Mejía Piviral
INCAP
Carretera Roosevelt, zona 11
Guatemala

Alfredo Méndez
Universidad del Valle
Apartado Postal 82
Guatemala

Adolfo Molina Orantes
11 C 3–77, zona 1
Guatemala

David F. Oltrogge
Instituto Lingüístico de Verano
12 Av. “B” 10–65, zona 2
Guatemala

Martín Ordóñez Chipín
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Carlos Enrique Reich Caal
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Mario Royna
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Francisco Rodríguez Rouanet
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Flavio Rojas Lima
Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca
11 C 4–31, zona 1
Guatemala

Juan de Dios Rosales
Panajachel, Sololá
Guatemala

José Rolz Bennet
Naciones Unidas
New York, N. Y.

Gerzon Ruiz
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Epaminondas Quintana
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

Héctor Samaya Guevara
Instituto de Antropología e Historia
"La Aurora" zona 13
Guatemala

Otilia H. de Santis
Escuela de Servicio Social
6a. Av. 15–40, zona 1
Guatemala

Ida Bremme de Santos
Centro de Estudios Folklóricos
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Rosalío Saquic
Instituto Indigenista Nacional
6a. Av. 1–22, zona 1
Guatemala

German Scheel Aguilar
Escuelas de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales de Occidente
Quezaltenango, Guatemala

Jorge Skinner Klée
9a. C 3–72, zona 1
Guatemala

Alfredo Tay
IDESAC
5a. Av. 12–26, zona 1
Guatemala

David Vela
El Imparcial
7a. C 10–54, zona 1
Guatemala

Economics
Carlos Acevedo López
ICAITI
Av. la Reforma 4–47, zona 10
Guatemala

Carlos Alpirez
Departamento de Investigaciones Agropecuarias e Industriales
Banco de Guatemala
7a. Av. 22–01, zona 1
Guatemala

Marco Tulio Benítez Gil
Departamento de Investigaciones Agropecuarias e Industriales
Banco de Guatemala
7a. Av. 22–01, zona 1
Guatemala

Jorge Lucas Caballeros M.
Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales
Av. la Reforma 0–63, zona 10
Guatemala

Carlos Manuel Castillo
SIECA
4a. Av. 10–25, zona 14
Guatemala

Anastasio Cruz R.
INFOP
9a. C 9–47, zona 1
Guatemala

Alfonso Figueroa
Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales
Av. La Reforma 0–63, zona 10
Guatemala
Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community

Geography, Regional Development

Mandlio Búlderín
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Dirección General de Obras Públicas
Guatemala

Coronel Oliverio Casasola
FYDEP
Flore, El Petén
Guatemala

Marco Antonio Cuevas
Rectoría
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Federico Fahlen
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Facultad de Arquitectura
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Raúl Lee
Instituto Geográfico Nacional
Av. las Américas 5–76, zona 13
Guatemala

Romeo H. de León
Dirección de Sanidad Pública
9a. Av. 14–65, zona 1
Guatemala

José López Toledo
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Dirección General de Obras Públicas
Guatemala

Rodolfo Perdomo
Instituto Geográfico Nacional
Av. las Américas 5–76, zona 13
Guatemala

Hugo Quan Ma
Departamento de Planeamiento Urbano y Regional
Facultad de Ingeniería
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Julio Quan
Instituto Geográfico Nacional
Av. las Américas 5–76, zona 13
Guatemala

Romeo Samayoa
FYDEP
2a. C 1–00, zona 10
Guatemala

Political Science, Administration

Jorge Arnoldo Daetz Caal
INAD
8a. C 5–72, zona 9
Guatemala
Guatemala

Arturo Fajardo
Centro de Estudios de Población
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Jorge Mario García
Centro de Estudios de Población
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Carlos Guzmán Böckler
Centro de Estudios de Población
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

José Monsanto
INAD
8a. C 5–72, zona 9
Guatemala

James R. O’Rorke
AID Advisor
INAD
8a. C 5–72, zona 9
Guatemala

Arnoldo Ortiz Moscoso
INAD
8a. C 5–72, zona 9
Guatemala

Others
Moisés Behar
INCAP
C. Roosevelt, zona 11
Guatemala

Otto Gilbert
INCAP
Carretera Roosevelt, zona 11
Guatemala

Robert McVean
Universidad del Valle
Apartado Postal 82
Guatemala

Fernando Quezada Toruño
Secretario
Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Edmundo Vásquez Martínez
Rector, Universidad de San Carlos
Ciudad Universitaria, zona 12
Guatemala

Arturo Díbar
Rector
Universidad Rafael Landívar
17 C 8–64, zona 10
Guatemala

Adalberto Santizo
Rector
Universidad Mariano Gálvez
7a. Ave. “A” 3–70, zona 1
Guatemala

by

Richard P. Schaedel
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ACRONYMS

AID  Agency for International Development
CEA  Centro de Estudios Antropológicos
CEDEM  Centro de Estudios de Estadística y Matemática
CEDEN  Centro de Estudios sobre la Realidad Nacional
CELADE  Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía
CENID  Centro Nacional de Información y Documentación
CEPAL  Comisión Económica para América Latina
CEPLA  Centro de Planificación
CESO  Centro de Estudios Socio Económicos
CHEAR  Council for Higher Education in American Republics
CIDU  Centro Interamericano de Desarrollo Urbano
CIE  Centro de Investigaciones Económicas
CIENES  Centro Interamericano de Estudios Estadísticas
CORFO  Corporación de Fomento
CORVI  Corporación de la Vivienda
DESAL  Centro para el Desarrollo Económico y Social de América Latina
ESCOLATINA  Escuela de Estudios Económicos Latino-Americanos para Graduados
FAFP  Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program
FAO  Food and Agriculture Organization
FLACSO  Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales
ICIRA  Instituto del Comité Interamericano para Reforma Agraria
IE  Instituto de Economía
ILPES  Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificación
INSORA  Instituto de Organización y Administración de Empresas
LTC  Land Tenure Center
OAS  Organization of American States
ODEPLAN  Oficina de Planificación
REF  Resources of the Future
SSRC  Social Science Research Council
CONTEXT OF THE SURVEY

The context in which this survey was carried out must be understood to put the data and their analysis in proper perspective. One major factor which most altered what might be considered the normal academic and professional environment in Chile in 1968 was the advent of a sweeping university reform. The “student power” movement had started a year or so previously and had already captured the Catholic University, where an interim administration was operating while details of the reform were being elaborated. Since late 1967 pressures for a similar movement in the national universities had been accumulating, and in 1968, the Rector and several Deans resigned; their successors decreed the reform, together with those Deans sympathetic to reform and acceptable to the students. By the time of my arrival, the university was still administered by the Vice-Rector, and real power was largely held by responsible student leaders; some of the faculties were resuming operations, while others were awaiting the election of interim deans. Therefore, both actual and potential members of the academic and professional community in Chile were concerned both to establish their position in the oncoming discussions as to the future structure of the university as well as their specific status, vis-à-vis university hierarchy and tenure in the immediate future. A high percentage of the individuals to be interviewed were in this group. Not only was it necessary to take into consideration the possible complications of trying to arrange for a relatively untrammeled interview (e.g., not select the day that the person involved was running for deanship), but to try to establish an impartial plane, if possible, free from the implications of the current controversy over the reform, upon which the interview could be carried out. This was not always possible, and at times I thought it was undesirable to preclude discussion of the reform and its effect on the questions of the survey, if the interviewee considered it relevant. Positions about the scope and nature of reform and its effect on research emphasis at the university varied, from a minority position that the reform provided the opportunity to emphasize research and training for research at the graduate level to one, also somewhat minor, in which the research function was to be reduced by equating, if not subordinating, it to the functions of teaching and extension. A central position seemed to be that research was to be sustained at the same levels as the other functions, but that it would be subjected to surveillance for results and coordination or integration into channels considered to be of national significance. In general, most persons interviewed considered that there was and would be a moratorium on research for the immediate future until agreement on reform policies could be reached.

This uncertainty about the potentialities for future research was further clouded by the pessimistic financial outlook affecting the national universities and the consideration that the present administration would use budget leverage to encourage its particular version of reform or to discourage that endorsed by opposing political factions. Seasoned outside observers considered that this political dimension would have countervailing, if not prevailing, force over any properly speaking academic consensus on reform that might be obtained. In the short time available to me, I was unable to arrive at a better alternative projection, although I would not exclude the possibility that university considerations might indeed override party alignments, at least in certain areas of the reform where research was involved.

The fact that the reform was launched preceding the crucial two years leading to the presidential election of 1970 also had much to do with the conditioning of the responses of the individuals interviewed. The maneuvering for the forthcoming elections is now getting into full swing, and the intellectual environment is saturated with discussions on the kinds of political alignments and splits that can materialize. It was almost a part of establishing the identity of an interviewee to be able to know what his particular political preference might be. While I made no effort to elicit this preference, most individuals either explicitly or implicitly made this point, both with reference to themselves and to other colleagues with whom they knew I had talked. Quite clearly, then, there was a political bias on the part of many persons interviewed which was more pronounced at this time than it would have been a year or so ago. Since I was careful to get a wide spectrum of political viewpoints, I feel that for the purposes of this survey the biases cancel themselves out. Nonetheless, the timing of my interviews was unfortunate, since political considerations loomed more important now than previously and in the opinion of some of the interviewees forced a more balanced appraisal of the North American research effort into the background.

This was particularly clear with regard to the research on current developments, where a large portion of per-
sons interviewed considered U.S. research, either rightly or wrongly, to have been a handmaiden of U.S. policy in supporting the Frei administration. Some of the more articulate Christian Democrats interviewed indicated that such indeed was not the case, and this opinion was borne out by other indirect evidence acquired in the course of the survey.

Thus, the survey of Chilean opinion should be viewed in the unique context of the university reform and the repetitive, but still abnormally charged, pre-election environment. Both these considerations had more effect on the interviewees than recollections of the Camelot scandal or the subsequent CIA disclosures (implicating that agency as funding international student movements) in influencing what might be considered reasonably well-formed judgments on the subject of the survey.

Apart from these limitations, the opinions of the individuals interviewed represented a collection of unusually well-formulated expressions regarding the major questions posed. Except for a few who did not choose to volunteer information for reasons of discretion, most interviewees moved directly to the major questions, giving very precise answers and, when called upon, citing illustrations to justify their observations. Most were careful to specify the extent of their awareness of and exposure to the problems. An air of courteous frankness characterized all of the interviews. I had anticipated, prior to beginning the interviews, a reluctance to discuss some of the subjects openly and also a disinterestedness, not to say indifference, in certain individuals to waste time on a remote subject. In this I was incorrect. Only a few government officials, whose reticence is perfectly explicable, showed any reluctance to answer the questions fully; but more surprising was the keen interest in the purpose of the survey that was indicated by almost everyone whom I interviewed. I was only a few times embarrassed in having to conclude an interview when the subject's reticence made further questioning an impertinence; characteristically I was embarrassed by having to break off or postpone conversations because the interview exceeded my optimum calculation. The fact that most individuals were fully occupied professionals, allocating to me part of a busy schedule, I can only interpret as an expression of genuine interest in the utility of this survey.

While each person was asked if he wanted to make any recommendations to improve the situation between the North American researcher and Chile, its institutions and professionals, not as many were prepared to formulate suggestions. Toward the end of the survey, I tested out a few tentative recommendations and received prompt responses and comments on their feasibility.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHILEAN PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY AS SEEN THROUGH THE INTERVIEWS

Institutional Background

Despite the proliferation of research organizations in both government and university in Chile, which appears to be as high or higher in a per capita comparison than any other Latin American country, there is no single principal research center for more than one discipline analogous to the Colegio de México or the Torcuato di Tella Institute in Argentina. One of the principal points of this report is that there is a real need in Chile now for some center of coordination, or at least of information on the activities of these widely dispersed organizations. The need for this is manifest in the creation of CENID and in some of the functions assigned to ODEPLAN and CEPLA. While one or all of these agencies are assuming some kind of stock-taking role, they have not yet attained enough progress in communicating with the social science institutions to be of utility in this study. It is, nonetheless, appropriate in this section to treat these organizations now, since they appear ultimately destined to provide the research coordination and resources upon which the several research institutions must ultimately depend or at least to which they must relate.

ODEPLAN, the national coordinating agency, has the great responsibility of coordinating all national planning activities. As such it will be attempting to take stock of the extant research agencies and manpower necessary to implement planning programs. In the process of fulfilling this role, it may be assumed that ODEPLAN will inventory the research institutions of Chile and could provide a potential clearinghouse for plans and projects as well as a central means of communication to the numerous institutions engaged in social science research.

Since ODEPLAN has not yet assumed this role, it was not included in this survey, although toward the end of the visit it became increasingly apparent that the organization loomed large for its potential function. It is strongly recommended that any follow-up study in Chile direct primary attention to the structure and personnel of ODEPLAN to determine what the feasibility is for it to assume a research coordinating function. They are now working to rationalize the application for and use of international fellowships available to Chileans.

CEDEM is a kind of central servicing agency for the constructing of samples for quantitative social science testing. It originates some research, but mainly offers competence in the provision of carefully selected sampling for social science agencies, both of the government and the universities. Despite its short life, it appears to have won a place in Chile as a standard center for developing national regional or local samples according to the designs of various research institutions.

CENID has been operating for several years to coordinate the resources of the universities, both documentary, bibliographical and human. It has cooperated
Chile

with various other agencies in trying to inventory the natural sciences, and will soon begin to survey the social sciences. While the focus of much of this survey is to determine manpower requirements in cost, “brain drain,” etc., the research by-product has not been overlooked, and one may expect that this group or a related agency will ultimately produce a document indicating the actual research capabilities of Chile in the sciences as well as some projection of its potential. At the time of the survey, the agency had made impressive inroads in organizing itself for this large and complicated task, including setting up pipelines of communication and some rather comprehensive studies, but it was a long way from completing some of its primary tasks and was suffering from a lack of staff and funding.

CEPLA appears to be farthest along in surveying the potential manpower requirements in the natural sciences, but as yet has made no attempt to undertake a survey of the social science field.

The Libraries

Not unlike the rest of Latin America, research in Chile has been severely handicapped by inadequate, obsolete and decentralized library facilities. This latter deficiency is particularly acute at the central university (enrollment 40,000) where over 136 separate libraries exist. Much progress has been reported recently, through the intermediary of the Chile-California Universities Program, in a master catalog of all university holdings; this will ultimately be distributed to the main university branches, making possible at least the location of whatever source the university possesses. Both CENID and the university libraries are at work to develop priorities for filling principal research gaps. Reasonably well-trained librarians are a positive factor in an otherwise bleak assessment of the resource potential needed to process adequately and make available current books as well as fulfill acquisition needs.

One gets the impression that the extreme decentralization of the university library is a reflection of the less extreme decentralization of research and teaching agencies. There also appears to be some awareness now of the need to centralize both, if for no other reason than economy, both of time and money. Were the library to be more rationally centralized, there is the likelihood that it might induce a trend toward more collaborative research efforts on the part of the several institutes, if not to a certain merging of those with closely allied disciplinary background and project goals.

The foregoing illustrates some general characteristics of the Chilean research environment within which the individual researcher, be he Chilean or foreign, must operate. It has been, until very recently, a highly decentralized and dispersed one, reaching in certain extremes almost to the point of disarticulation.

Some of the recent trends, not the least of which is the current university reform, seek to arrest this decentralizing tendency. One may optimistically predict that certain progress will be made in the coordination of research resources, both in terms of services and documentation, barring unforeseen reversals in national policy or drastic reduction of funding and outside assistance. This will facilitate the work of the Chilean researcher, but will only slightly affect the foreign researcher who is accustomed to seeking his documentation and services, beforehand or afterwards, in the United States. Similarly, the efforts toward coordination of research potential will be for the short term largely concerned with inventories of the Chilean resources and output, and it will be some time before the foreign contribution will be a concern of the Chilean coordinating agencies.

Returning to the Chilean professional community, we should like to turn attention to the research institutes themselves with which or through which most Chilean research is accomplished. In so doing, we shall remark with frequency at the interdisciplinary character of certain units. This reflects an ambivalent tendency very much present in the current Chilean social science scene. On the positive side, it reflects an awareness of the need for a cross-disciplinary approach to certain problems; on the negative side the appropriation of representatives of sister disciplines into one’s own milieu adds to the diffusion of disciplinary expertise without necessarily strengthening it. The structural conflict this process has engendered is one of the root problems the current university reform aims to resolve.

The University of Chile Economics faculty is the umbrella for the largest block of research institutions in terms of personnel and output: the Instituto de Economía, the Centro de Estudios Socio-Económicos, the Instituto de Organización y Racionalización de Administración, and the Centro de Estudios de Estadística y Matemática. All four are separate and dispersed installations of some physical magnitude; all have responsibility for undergraduate teaching, and the two Institutes themselves operate graduate schools. Of these CEDEM, as we mentioned, operates largely as a servicing agency, much as our computer centers do in U.S. universities. Of the other three, IE concerns itself largely, but not exclusively, with straight economic research; INSORA concerns itself with management and organization problems in public and private administration; CESO is involved in economic research where the sociological or political dimension is considerable or predominant. Coordinating these units is largely up to the Dean, who, in addition, has other responsibilities. While IE tends to be fairly exclusively limited to economics, and participation in it to economists, INSORA has sociologists and economists added to a staff basically made up of industrial relations, management and public administration specialists. CESO is quite frankly interdisciplinary, encompassing the more politically minded political scientists and sociologists together with economists. The Instituto de Economía, oldest of the four, enjoys the greatest prestige and seems to have produced the most graduates in important government positions.
Other social science institutes at the University of Chile are housed either in the Faculty of Philosophy and Education (Sociology, Anthropology, History, Geography, Psychology), the Law School (Political Science), or the Engineering School (Economic Planning). All the disciplines have facilities for research and training and have publication outlets. The present clustering of these disciplines is a temporary reflection of their historic development (much as in the U.S. school of arts and sciences) rather than of a rational grouping, which might separate the social sciences from educational sciences and the humanities. This kind of new grouping is being discussed now as part of the restructuring in the university reform.

Two important interdisciplinary organizations of recent foundation are the Institute of International Studies (Instituto de Estudios Internacionales), organized directly under the Rector of the University of Chile and combining political science, economics and sociology; and the Inter-American Center for Urban Development (Centro Interamericano de Desarrollo Urbano), at Catholic University, with the disciplines of town planning, architecture, anthropology and sociology. Both have active teaching research and publication programs underway.

The Catholic University has a similar division of branches in the social science research fields, except that certain areas have not been or have only recently been developed. Thus, the Centro de Investigaciones Económicas of the Catholic University corresponds in importance and prestige to the Instituto de Economía, and the school and research center of sociology is a rival of commensurate size and significance to the School and Institute of Sociology at the University of Chile. On the other hand, psychology and political science are not as strongly developed at the Catholic University, social history is inchoate, and anthropology and geography do not exist as separate areas. Finally, a new kind of presumably interdisciplinary institute has been organized, but not funded: CEREN—which stands for Studies of National Reality. (This may be a stillborn product of the university reform at the Catholic University.)

Aside from the two principal universities in Santiago, there is the State Technical University, which has some educational research in its Instituto Pedagógico Técnico.

Outside of Santiago, in this survey, only the two universities in Valparaiso could be visited briefly. Several research institutions are now functioning at the University of Chile in Valparaiso, and there is a promising institute of social science and development recently formed at the Catholic University of Valparaiso. Developments in other Chilean universities were not investigated. Their exclusion in no way indicates the relative importance in social science research, in which Concepción University looms significantly.

Outside of the university structure and part of the professional research community are the international centers concerned largely with development studies: CEPAL, now mainly represented by ILPES; FLACSO in both sociology and political science; CELADE and ICIRA all wholly or partly under United Nations auspices and CIENES under the Pan American Union.

Of these, FLACSO bears a rather close relationship with the academic and ICIRA with the government community. FLACSO has sponsored research as part of its graduate training program for a number of years. As far as Chile is concerned, it functions as a kind of autonomous branch of the National University for Social Sciences, although it serves Latin America as a whole. Ultimately (when UNESCO financing runs out) FLACSO will be absorbed by the University of Chile, although the formula for such a graft has not yet been worked out. The political science branch of FLACSO is recent and only in 1967 undertook a research program in which students may participate, but which is largely performed by the staff. At the present, FLACSO-trained Chilean political scientists may join INSORA, or the political science branch of the Law School.

Political science as a career specialty in Chile has not yet been defined, in the U.S. sense. It is clear that the service-oriented training given by INSORA personnel, whose undergraduate degree is that of "commercial engineer" in administration, is at opposite ends of the spectrum from the politics-oriented training that FLACSO has as its goal. Both are at variance with the traditional and legalistic political science (study of government) orientation of the Law faculty, where the discipline is traditionally housed. Presumably, the final destiny and definition of political science will be another area in which the forthcoming deliberations of the university reform committees will have a significant role.

ICIRA is a United Nations Special Fund service agency designed more or less to help implement the land reform programs of Latin America, including field studies of the Chilean agrarian reform. One of its published studies was the object of some criticism in Chile because it appeared to support the present administration's program. Despite the polemical environmental in which it operates, ICIRA provides opportunity for applied research in agricultural economics, anthropology and rural sociology which has been utilized by Chilean and foreign researchers with concrete results.

ILPES, CELADE and CIENES are less directly involved with either the Chilean government or academic structure. They may and do provide studies on request. All three provide training, usually for one year, to a few persons, usually government employees, from each Latin American country. Chileans, other Latin Americans and a sprinkling of European and North American researcher-technicians provide the small permanent and larger transitory staff. These international agencies are an important part of the Chilean professional background as they act as a combination of manpower reservoir and "escape hatch" for Chilean social scientists, to which they may be drawn or may repair at strategic points in their career. Employees of these agencies, in
proportion to the time spent with them, form a sector of the Latin American technocracy that tends to be characterized by a loose network of interpersonal ties and a shared Latin American Weltanschauung, particularly as regards the problems of development.

Two private groups involved in research, with religious rather than governmental or international sponsorship, are DESAL and Centro Bellarmino. DESAL is Latin American in scope, and has branches in many other countries. It has its own socio-economic development policy which guides its decisions as to the type of social science research which it will sponsor or in which it will participate. Centro Bellarmino is concerned with Chilean development, particularly rural, and is sponsored by the Jesuits.

Summary

I have tried to present the background for locally generated research institutions in Chile without bias. I found the research effort essentially commendable and the personnel of the agencies committed and purposeful. As new research institutions have developed and proliferated there is a growing tendency to seek a kind of economic consolidation under some kind of blanket "social science grouping" which would permit each discipline a fair proportion of available funds and help the several disciplines to work on problems of mutual concern. The structure of the universities does not permit this, and this is one of the reasons for altering the structure. There is, however, the tradition that has produced this proliferation, where each new unit created has tried to mark out its own sphere and to maintain a rugged independence; and this temper remains as a strong undercurrent (if not undertow). Indeed, in some cases, it is clearly articulated. Hence it remains to be seen whether the several agencies will really submerge some of their independence in an effort to provide better facilities and conditions for research for all.

The research institutions which are international in character provide a stimulating international environment that serves to keep the national institutions' standards high. The movement of Chilean personnel in and out of these organizations further strengthens this function. Nevertheless, the emphasis of the research is on Latin American problems rather than on Chile, and the uncertain career of some of the international agencies (e.g., ICIRA, FLACSO) does not provide a more stable base for research that might provide more independence from government financing and manipulation than the research institutes already have.

Neither the private centers (DESAL or Bellarmino) nor the coordinating agencies such as ODEPLAN or CENID provide a substitute center where social sciences might enjoy a higher degree of continuity and interdisciplinary coordination. While one can evaluate the development of research institutes in Chile as basically positive in the long run, and point to a record of reasonably solid accomplishment, one can also easily deprecate the random manner in which this has been carried out. Obviously, the university reform movement is involved in producing a new formula in structure which should "rationalize" the research situation. Unfortunately, at the time of my study, there were no clear indications as to which kind of formula would be adopted. The disciplines that had fared best (and these were usually the oldest) wanted to band together to keep their prerogatives both in terms of freedom of operation and availability of funding; while those which had suffered more growing pains and less outside help preferred to unite all the social sciences under a single umbrella. Much resistance to interdisciplinary dialogue in the restructuring of the social sciences—from groups whose autonomy was threatened—was already apparent in the first few meetings. Should this individualistic tactic prevail, the
likelihood is that the structural changes will await the election of the incumbent rector, who will be expected to implement the new plan, but who will probably operate as the university power alignment at the time dictates.

The Individual Researcher

While the institutional environment in which the Chilean researcher operates is not as secure as that afforded to his U.S. counterpart, it is more favorable than most Latin American environments. This doubtless accounts for the existence of a reasonably wide spectrum of Chilean social scientists, and it also accounts for a positive attitude toward research as something desirable and worthy of praise. Most professionals I talked to were in agreement that Chileans had proven their capacity to undertake independent research and that their limitations were due to limited funding rather than lack of interest or capacity. They also felt that the situation for research could be improved pari passu with country-wide economic improvement and with a more concentrated, guided program of training researchers to orient their studies to the Chilean scene with a minimal amount of necessary time outside the country to acquire up-to-date techniques and methodologies. The Chilean social scientist is thus more self-confident and able to find himself a niche either in Chile or abroad than most of his Latin American colleagues.

As one institute director explained it, the Chilean professionals, most of whom have had some training and/or experience abroad, have a reasonably clear notion of the panorama of U.S. social science, and can evaluate the quality of U.S. talent in Chile on the basis of the standard international yardsticks. They are conscious of the so-called “quality” institutions in the United States as being the traditional centers for top-grade professionals. They are not awed any longer by an American Ph.D. per se, and most of them have had enough contact with U.S. professionals in Chile to discriminate on the basis of individual performance rather than as a group. For this reason, the Chilean professionals have little envy for their U.S. counterparts and view the total professional environment, both in Chile and abroad, somewhat dispassionately.

One point that impressed me about the Chilean professional is the preference for team studies in research. The tradition of the lone research eminence, which enjoyed considerable vogue in Chile, up to the end of World War II, and produced a number of distinguished scholars in various fields, is apparently on the wane. A few “loners” can still be found, generally in the over 50 year age group. Scholars in their 40s, however, by and large work with colleagues and argue that this is both advantageous and stimulating. Oftentimes, the actual specific research of each scholar is not shared, except in lecture or seminar sessions, but the general area of his research tends to be related to that of his colleagues. In this regard, the Chileans view the U.S. researcher as much more of a “loner,” and they took pains to praise Americans who showed an interest in sharing points of view and a willingness to teach or head discussion groups.

This preference for teamwork seems to be linked with the strength of the disciplinary groups that represent the various research entities and to prolong their existence and autonomy in the face of efforts to organize broader interdisciplinary bodies. Some Chilean professionals see the need for greater unification of the research entities, but they are regarded with suspicion by the others as empire-builders. There is also the element of infighting within the group, leading to fissoning and this process has occasionally produced new foci of research.

In terms of this study, however, I got the impression that the professional jealousies were largely suppressed when the interviewees talked about their colleagues. On many occasions they referred to professional rivals (with whom I knew they had had unpleasant relationships) in terms of high professional competence. In short, while I think their jealousy would prevent a better cooperation among individuals and groups for restructuring social sciences in Chile, I don’t think it impairs the judgment of the Chilean professional as to what the attributes of scholarship and research should be; on this there is relative consensus.

While the purpose of this study was not to investigate the role U.S. social science has played in developing the social sciences in Chile, this topic loomed large in the discussions. Both faculties of Economics (Universidad de Chile and Universidad Católica) have been heavily supported by U.S. institutions, and various bilateral contracts have contributed to the growth of other social science disciplines, as has the Fulbright program. Today, these types of development are still taking place (to cite a few of the many examples: the Chile-California Universities Program, the Ford Program for the Law Schools, and Wisconsin’s Land Tenure Center). But European and other international bodies have also played influential roles in developing social science, and Chile has a long tradition of seeking on its own initiative foreign assistance in building its sciences. If there is a weighted influence from the United States, it is largely because more opportunities are available for advanced study, visiting professorships and the like, but not because of any particular preference for U.S. social science. Neither is there any appreciable current of resentment for the large U.S. influence above and beyond the reasonable complaints about specifically U.S.-oriented research being given preference. Generally speaking, the Chilean professional views the contribution of American training in modernizing some of the social sciences as a useful, even positive, historical development without necessarily acknowledging any debt in the sense of being obligated to follow U.S. professional guidelines or academic models. Hence, when I was asked at a summary discussion toward the end of my stay, whether or not Chileans who had been trained in the United States were substantially more in favor of U.S. research in Chile,
than Chileans trained at home or in other countries, I could state that place of training seemed a negligible variable.

In summary, the Chilean professional, whatever his speciality, is little influenced in his judgment by specific conditions of his socio-economic situation, however important that factor might be in motivating him to act in the current “catchascatchcan” power struggle centering about university reform. He represents a consistent body of thought as to what constitutes professionally competent research and what the orientation of that research should be. Regarding the questions raised in the study, then, I found no specific predisposition for a Chilean professional to respond in a given way because of his role in the university or general social structure of the country, other than the caveats mentioned at the outset.

Of those who answered the questionnaire, the percentages vary for the disciplines least represented, but the selection is reasonably representative. It can be supplemented by the North American researchers interviewed in Chile, which tends to indicate that the percentage of political scientists was higher in previous years, probably because of the Frei election situation.

It would thus appear that, in any given year, the researchers in Chile average one-third economists and the other two-thirds are about evenly divided, with political science having perhaps 15 percent, history 10 percent and the other disciplines represented by one or two researchers. Since our several tabulations tend to average 30 as the total postdoctoral researchers in Chile each year since 1960, this can be taken as a minimal average. The maximum would be close to 40, as I estimate our survey missed an average of at least five postdoctoral researchers.

Professionals in the other disciplines, such as Law, Planning and Education (as might be expected) are also performing a service or technical assistance function. Perhaps 10–15 percent of the economists were similarly engaged.

The sponsorship of the individuals answering the questionnaire was as follows:

**THE U.S. PROFESSIONAL OR RESEARCHER IN CHILE**

The U.S. Researcher: Self Appraisal

Approximately 200 postdoctoral academics were identified prior to undertaking the field survey in Chile, and all were polled on their research in Chile, although many of the questionnaires did not arrive prior to my departure for Chile. The interdisciplinary composition of the group is indicative of the kind of North American research interest in Chile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>RESEARCHERS IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>ANSWERED QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>NORTH AMERICAN RESEARCHERS IN CHILE JUNE-JULY, 1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Science</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang.-Liter.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Econ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

211 53 35

* Professionals doing full-time administrative jobs.

  National
Science Foundation 1
Own university 9
Fulbright 7
SSRC 5
Doherty 6
Rockefeller 4
Ford 5
ILPES-REF 4
U.S. Gov. Agency 4
FAFP 2
LTC 2
OAS 1
Carnegie Corporation 1
CHEAR 1
AID 4
56

The Ford-financed scholars receive their funds through the Chile-California program or one of the other projects such as the Planning and Community Facilities Program. Most of the AID funding is also through a contract to U.S. universities, although the Land Tenure Center is listed here separately.* In the period covered

* Since it is funded through AID in Washington.
by this survey, and for the preceding few years, the steady sources of support have been (mostly predoctoral) the Doherty, Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and AID. All except Doherty maintain administrative officers who supervise the programs, although their administrative duties cover much more than facilitating the activities of the U.S. researchers.

Because it was not within the specifications of the project to determine the policies of the various funding agencies operating in Chile, the data here are cited only as indicative of the variety of sources that the American researcher draws upon in carrying out research. The Ford, Rockefeller and AID programs support research in certain fields at certain times, but Doherty and Fulbright can encompass individually designed research in most disciplines.

The questionnaire survey indicated that a limited number had been in Chile more than once, although three individuals had spent large periods of time. The average stay was ten and two-thirds months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Duration</th>
<th>Number of Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 months</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 7 months</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 10 months</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 12 months</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 18 months</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 33 months</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 – 48 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 48 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Reporting Time Spent (Includes those with several trips) 57
Types of Collaborators in Chile. Six scholars specifically declared that they made no use of collaborating institutions. Many, particularly historians, listed libraries and archives, which in general provided a different type of collaboration than the research institutes. The following is a list of the Chilean and non-Chilean institutions with which or through which the U.S. researchers worked and the frequency with which they were mentioned:

Collaborating Institutions and Groups in Chile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Frequency Listed by North American Researchers</th>
<th>Institutions Listed as Benefited by Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSORA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE/Univ. de Chile</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE/Univ. Católica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLA/CEPAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILPES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORFO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOLATINA (The Graduate School of IE/Univ. of Chile)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Inst. de Planificación/Universidad de Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELADE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLACSO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile-California Universities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Embassy/USAID</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Bellarmino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIRA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORVI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerio de Vivienda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerio de Educación</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro de Estudios Antropológicos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Dept. of History &amp; Archives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODEPLAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirección de Estadística y Censo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIENES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuela de Medecina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Companies &amp; Corporations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banco del Estado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto de Geologia y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto de Geografía</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Concepción</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad del Norte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public at Large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Mercurio (Newspaper)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Political Figures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad de Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Merged into IE/Univ. de Chile in 1967–68.
It can be readily seen that the economists gravitated to the Instituto de Economía of the Universidad de Chile or the Centro de Investigaciones Económicas de la Universidad Católica. Five of the nine political scientists, however, were among the six scholars reporting no institutional collaboration. This correlation is highly significant in terms of the type of criticism that the Chilean professionals expressed of researchers in this field.

Among the group of political scientists presently working in Chile which I contacted, this was not the case, and may reflect a reaction to the unfavorable repercussions of the past experience in this discipline. INSORA, in particular, appears to be an institution that welcomes the collaboration of the political scientist. CESO and Centro Bellarmino were two other institutional points referred to in the questionnaire replies to which political scientists looked for collaboration. (My interviews indicated that political scientists also returned to the institutes of sociology of both universities as well as the Universidad Católica in Valparaiso.)

Researchers were about evenly divided on those who listed collaborating individuals, and there appeared to be confusion as to how to answer the questions posed on this point. The clearest conclusion to be drawn from the question is the rather high percentage (almost 40 percent) that listed no collaborator (either student, assistant or colleagues and staff). The results of the various types of collaboration are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Collaborators</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaborator</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only (Mostly Staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Assistants Only</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaborator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Paid Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaborator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaborator, Paid Assistants, and Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Susceptible to Interpretation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Interviews and Questionnaires. The results of this set of questions merely reflect the frequency of questionnaire and interview techniques, and are tabulated to give some idea of the range. Even so, larger studies than those recorded here were carried out, and the a priori impression of massive U.S. research questionnaires and interviewing should be weighed against the large amount of similar activity carried out by FLACSO, CELADE and Chilean sampling agencies. The quantitative emphasis in American research is, however, underlined here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forty-seven of the 53 scholars answering the Questionnaire carried out interviews</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons interviewed</td>
<td>20,626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Interviews</td>
<td>6 to 9,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Individuals Interviewed by 45 Researchers (with samples under 1,000)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two large surveys accounted for about 15,000.

Sensitive Data. There was no evidence of material being withheld for reasons of “sensitivity.” The only reservations mentioned by any of the questionnaire group were those protecting the identity of individuals who furnished information in a study.

The only case of almost “classified” material was one educational planning report on Chile and another Latin American country, in which the author complained that the sponsoring agencies, having agreed to make it available in published form, did not do so, thus producing a situation of embarrassment to him.

Availability of Data. With regard to the availability of unpublished data, the questionnaire information indicated a variety of responses or none at all. It was possible to use only 30 of the 53 questionnaires. Of these, 20 indicated that unpublished data were available (in most instances by writing to the researcher); of these, however, only eight indicated they were available in Chile. Ten respondents replied that the data were unavailable. When they gave an explanation, they usually referred to the disorderly condition of the note file, or to the fact that the manuscript was being prepared.

Publications. Regarding published material, respondents listed 71 articles and 30 books. If one makes a somewhat dubious ratio of 5 articles to one book, one can measure quantitatively the productivity of field research in Chile (as requested in the guidelines for this study). This results in an article for every two and one-half man-months in the field, or approximately one book to a year’s field work. Never having made this kind of calculation before, I am nonetheless impressed by a rather high ratio of productivity. Comparing this with the complaints of Chilean professionals about the little time researchers spent on communication inside the country (see next section), I suspect this indicates that the researchers concerned themselves primarily with U.S. career requirements and only secondarily with the development of a favorable research climate. This observation is further substantiated when the relatively low quantitative output of scholars who were rated very highly by the Chileans is compared with the average.

To the question whether results of the research have been used in the host country, the answers were as follows:
This tabulation would seem to indicate that the North American scholar is unaware, if not indeed unconcerned, that his research is not primarily designed for use in Chile.

With regard to whether the scholar's research produced an influence on the host country, the answers were:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Interpret</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question relating to the specific beneficiaries of the scholar's work in Chile is tabulated on the same table with the institutions with which he worked.

Chilean Professionals' Assessment of U.S. Researcher

The following chart indicates my interview sample of the Chilean professional community:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologists</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologists</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Historians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to get a background judgment of the effects of North American research on other influential sectors in Chile, I interviewed a group of eight "non-credentialized" administrators, intellectuals and students, three of whom were non-Chileans with long residence in Chile. I also conducted interviews with five political leaders representing the spectrum from extreme right to left. The results of their opinions, when relevant to this study, will be noted specifically.

Unless otherwise noted, therefore, the following is a synopsis of interviews with Chilean professionals. Most of the interviews were generally focused upon open-ended answers to these three main questions:

(1) Are the topics chosen by U.S. researchers relevant to Chile?

(2) Generally, how is the research performed in the field; plus and minus impressions?

(3) What is the feedback in the way of results, permanent contacts, etc.?

The informants were asked to make any suggestions or recommendations for improving the research climate.

As a result the answers tended to crystallize about these three main areas, which have a kind of unintended processional quality that I will follow in summing up the interviews, but which I will later discard in putting the emphasis on what appeared to me the most significant observations.

Were the topics chosen relevant? Few respondents gave a blanket yes or no answer. The general consensus was that most topics were relevant, but that there was a percentage, ranging from 1 to 30 percent, which were considered minimally relevant to Chileans. These seemed to be evenly distributed by discipline, although most topics in applied fields like medicine and education were less likely to be listed; presumably experienced Chileans had intervened somewhere in the process of getting the topics researched. Still, there was some feeling that even in some of these areas (child nutrition, taxation, curriculum improvement) the focus was either not sufficiently narrowed or too narrowed to yield fruitful results. Generally the point was made that in this "minimally relevant" category the topics could be interesting over the long run, e.g., that they could contribute their little grain of sand to solve some ultimately important problems; but since the topics had been selected by foreigners who were not attuned to the Chilean ambience, they tended to choose a subject at random (topics in history were notable). One director of an important institute suggested that on the choice of topics, the Americans should concentrate on themes "to enlarge the field of knowledge," while Chileans should concentrate on "action research." This was echoed by other experienced informants who criticized their own country's research effort (and indeed that of Latin America in general) as wasteful to the degree to which it was devoted to basic research not specifically relevant to Chilean problems. These informants felt that North American researchers were entitled to select their topics in basic research as members of an affluent society, and did not criticize their operating in Chile for this purpose.

A second criticism, related to the relevancy of the research theme, was that it tended to be unrelated to other topics. One informant described the focus as "molecular." This could be contrasted with the Spanish term "globál," which had a positive connotation for most of my informants as indicating integrated research. Here
and acts in harmony with it; the middle-level researcher who can handle the language and make himself acceptable as a foreign professional, disinterested but competent; and those who miss the boat completely. It would appear from my sample that most Americans referred to fall into the middle category; although of the total number of American researchers in Chile since 1960, probably a greater percentage would fall into the third category.

The question now arises as to whether the research product of the group judged personally and professionally of low competence is indeed inferior by Chilean standards. The few Chilean informants who concentrated on this question tended to credit their published research as "adequate" and useful only when taken partially. The impact of their presence on research was considered from provocative to negative. The divergence of opinion on two scholars was extreme. The strong condemnations, however, generally applied to the "loner" type scholars.

The few individuals cited almost unanimously as good examples of American researchers were among those having the upper limits of time spent in Chile. Two social scientists, however, who had researched there for over three years were not so extolled.

On the third major question—the degree and kind of feedback—informants showed less interest. However, those who were interested were more critical than on the other two principal questions. Almost all felt that either direct or indirect feedback had taken place.

The politically involved group concentrated on the indirect feedback, or the supposed influence on American opinion produced by U.S. researchers writing on Chile. It was hard to discriminate between what stereotypes the U.S. press was responsible for and what stereotypes the research community had created. In many cases both would have to share responsibility. In these reactions, I found myself trying to clarify the gap that exists between the U.S. press and the academic community. I am afraid that I could not establish to my satisfaction that the non-professional interviewees were sufficiently well-informed of recent U.S. research on their country as opposed to what they obtained from the press.7

Generally, they blamed the United States (research community and press, along with the governmental and business interests) for blind endorsement of the Frei regime, agrarian reform and a presentation of Chilean society over-burdened by an outmoded aristocracy. Two of the Americans in Chile, through open forums and in newspaper interviews, were active in taking definite stands in defense of one of the Christian Democrat programs (prompted, to be fair, by what they regarded as false and interested attacks on the program by Chileans and other Americans). While their activity would not be properly termed feedback, it did create the kind of image of indirect feedback to which the political interviewees were referring. In the past, less justifiable inci-

dents had taken place. One individual received considerable unfavorable publicity for public lectures on the theory of private enterprise. Another scholar was cited as projecting an unfavorable image of the researcher by openly wagering on the elections of Frei and referring to a survey he had made as providing him with inside information on the likely outcome. This kind of immediate articulation of views on the current Chilean scene by North American scholars, whether a direct or indirect product of their own research, had more impact on the Chilean uninformed (nonscholarly) public than the ultimate consequences of their published research findings.

As might be expected, the comments of Chilean scholars on feedback ranged along the spectrum of response from those who considered the feedback high in terms of results of published research, benefits derived from exposure to U.S. research methods and focus, and long-time links between U.S. and Chilean researchers, to those who asserted that in all three categories feedback was at best feeble and sporadic.

When I mentioned that since 1960 at least 200 postdoctoral researchers had been in Chile, most informants expressed surprise and indicated that they knew relatively few of them and knew of only a few published reports. Most, however, were aware of the contributions of scholars in their own field. Even those who could be scored with a high index for feedback appraisal complained that the immediate results took too long in reaching them to be really useful. One U.S. economist who received high endorsement on all other grounds was criticized on this point. Some interviewees discriminated between relatively good feedback in certain fields (particularly in economics), and poor feedback in others (particularly political science) and blamed it on the lack of institutionalization of these disciplines in Chile rather than on the U.S. researcher's indifference or intentional failure to communicate.

Feedback in terms of advantages received from on-the-job training in research methods was regarded as average. It was usually linked with the presence or absence of a formal institutional connection. In cases where the results were positive, an institutional tie-in was usually referred to as producing the necessary conditions for American proffering and Chilean receptivity to the research techniques. In cases where no institutional arrangement existed, the results tended to be random, depending upon the rapport between researcher and interested colleagues or students (where the personality variable seems to have been crucial). Even those Chileans who operated under some institutional arrangement complained that some of their North American collaborators did not fulfill their end of the bargain: 1) by doing the analytical work in the United States, 2) by not offering opportunities for a critique on preliminary results before leaving Chile or 3) by holding to an a priori scheme of research with little interest to Chileans.
Chile

The third form of feedback, that of creating more permanent ties through the original research activities, was regarded as weakest of all. The few respondents who rated this category high were involved in long-range institution-to-institution arrangements, usually involving some administrative basis guaranteeing publication of results (INSORA-Cornell and LTC-Facultad de Economía, are examples) and providing Chileans with the opportunity to study in the United States.

Most informants could recall cases of complete severance of ties with the researcher upon departure, even though he had committed himself to maintain communications, especially with regard to the results. While this reaction might better be called simple lack of courtesy rather than negative feedback, it is inevitably the cause of a strong impression gathered from the interviews that there is a type of U.S. researcher who is completely unconcerned about the repercussions of his work on Chile or the Chileans. I could not determine in most cases whether the individual involved actually published something except when my informants so indicated (after hearing about it second-hand). Whatever the results, however, the Chileans universally expressed resentment that acknowledgement of assistance received was not forthcoming. I did not get the impression, however, that they considered this a particular North American failing, but rather an individual characteristic. In fact, one informant cited the case of a French group that contracted with the government of Chile for a study on which feedback was nil.

To a small but articulate and highly regarded group of informants who found the orientation and quality of U.S. research on Chile relatively poor (over two-thirds from bad to useless) the question of feedback was not as relevant. They put emphasis on reducing the influence of the U.S. researcher by limiting the quantity and improving the quality by a selective process in which Chilean social scientists would have a considerable voice. In this group, the opinion was generally emphasized that the published U.S. research suffered from either 1) lack of adequate knowledge of Chile to provide a proper interpretation of the data or 2) an a priori ethnocentric bias that smacked of reformism.

An observation made by this group, as well as others, was that the results of U.S. research on Chile do not get reviewed critically. They pointed to the lack of a standard journal for this kind of procedure. When this does happen, the review usually appears in the newspapers, and results are evanescent. They blame both U.S. and Chilean scholars for this failing, but point out that some concerted effort in this direction by appropriate professional organizations in both countries would have a salutary effect. As nearly as I could determine, the North American researcher was evaluated in Chile more by word of mouth than anything printed critically about his studies. U.S. scholars enjoying the highest reputations have published little and certainly no major research of book length on Chile. Their reputation appears to be based upon their lectures, personal conversations, appearances at symposia, short articles, not on an impressive bibliography or "hard cover" books. A few other highly regarded American scholars, who have a more productive publishing record based upon somewhat shorter stays, are known more for their teaching, lecturing and peripatetic conversations than for their research findings. Conversely, I received few comments on recently published books of a general scholarly interest; and with one exception (a rather detailed case study) the reactions I did receive ranged from moderate praise to disparagement.

Clearly, accessibility to North American publications is a problem, and one might reasonably expect Chilean scholars to have limited familiarity with the most recent publications. Knowledge of publications does diffuse, however, and a book's reputation gets established sufficiently to stimulate a local demand for it, a demand which would have been reflected in the comments of my informants.

I found it difficult, after concluding my interviews, to determine just how many of the published research results were known by Chilean professionals, or to indicate the basis upon which they were judging this aspect of U.S. scholarship. I therefore made a retrospective survey of my informants' familiarity with a hastily assembled bibliography of 163 items on Chile published since 1960:

1. Of the total of 46 to whom the bibliography was mailed, 29 responded, including one each in the non-professional categories of administrators and political leaders.

2. Of this compilation, the subject matter could be more or less classified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Economists</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologists</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

163

3. Of the two groups who answered in sufficient numbers, the results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Percentage Reporting</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td>6–15</td>
<td>7–36</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologists/Anthropologists</td>
<td>9–17</td>
<td>6–35</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Except for the historians, whose average was expectedly lower (12), none of the other disciplines was represented by more than one respondent.

(4) The overall average for the 27 professionals was 15.8. For the two non-professionals it was 6.

In view of the random nature of the bibliography, this survey seems to indicate that most informants had a reasonable basis upon which to judge the published results of American scholarship in Chile. The bibliography in the appendix indicates the frequency with which certain publications were cited.

A few informants claimed that there is a renascence of nationalism in Chile, which may in part account for a certain indifference, if not hostility, to North American research. I found some basis for a degree of indifference, but little actual hostility to American researchers, and I found this observation more typical of Chileans who had spent considerable periods of time outside Chile (in many cases in the United States) than among the average informant (most of whom had been outside Chile for at least a two-year period), so I am not inclined to credit this view as having much influence on the evaluation process.

In an attempt to quantify the results of the interviews, based upon a very rough three-point, and occasionally a four-point scale, I emerged with the following results, which were not based upon my general impressions from the interviews as set down previously; these latter were arrived at intuitively. In this tabulation I took into account only the 54 professionals.

Regarding the preparation of the researchers (taken as an average) I scored for two items, remarked upon by the interviewees: language deficiency and an adequate knowledge of the discipline and methodology as applied to Chile prior to arrival.

Twenty made observations on inadequate command of Spanish.

Responses on the degree of preparation could be roughly summarized as adequate and inadequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality an Asset</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Competence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding feedback, there was a general tendency to be less specific. This seemed to be a reflection of indifference or unawareness that any feedback should be forthcoming.

I broke the responses down into three clusters of responses:

(1) A high percentage of informants (47) remarked on the need for institutional affiliation of the North American researcher. This implies in most cases that the informants found institutional affiliation inadequate; or when they were familiar with it, preferred it as a more effective way of doing research than when the individual worked unaffiliated.

(2) A significant number of informants (21) remarked that the North American researcher had insufficient time. By this they implied that he was not able to grasp the context in which his research was being conducted. This tended to predispose him toward premature conclusions. There was also the implication that he did not have enough time, apart from his research, to participate more with Chilean colleagues and students on the progress of his research, and hence also benefit from criticism and commentary.

(3) The third clustering of responses dealing with cooperation while in the field does not lend itself to a single term, but for the moment I would designate it as "consideration." In this clustering are the observations regarding the North American's lack of awareness of the Chilean modus operandi, lack of reciprocity in working with individuals and institutions, failure to observe mutual agreements, e.g., divulging information collected, and an unwillingness to volunteer to teach, offer conferences or communicate in general about his research in progress. Twenty-four noted this deficiency.

In a rough attempt to determine the estimation in which the Chileans held North American professionals with whom they had dealings, I scaled them on a four-point basis, on personality grounds; and on a five-point basis on professional criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications are generally available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Limited Extent 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarce 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the data made available opportunely?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do long-term contacts result, or does the contact break off abruptly?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unusually Good 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Good Aftermath 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Nothing 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of U.S. Researchers Through Comments of North Americans Interviewed in Chile

The Americans interviewed varied in their attitudes toward their role in research in Chile. Some viewed their role as one of teacher or propagator of research techniques; others thought they should provide a model; and still others were simply concerned with carrying out research. Although I personally did not interview any with this approach, I heard from others about them.

There was a clear cut cleavage between the "institution builders," as one of the first groups was referred to, by those in the second group, and the teacher *qua* researcher. The latter were usually men who had spent several years in Chile, who identified a need to strengthen the Chilean institution capable of conducting research continuously, and a need to devote a significant portion of their time to backstopping or pushing institutional development while conducting their own research. Three such individuals could have given a fuller evaluation than I can of the American research effort by relating it in a more precise way with institutional support from the United States and the institutions and institutions in Chile upon which this support has had or not had repercussions over time. I did not have the time to make this historical study.

In any case, they summarized their views for me in succinct fashion. In general, they were unanimous in considering that the United States has played a major role in developing research in the social sciences in Chile, that the investment has had generally positive results, particularly in the field of economics where it has been heaviest, and also in several applied fields such as agriculture and medicine. They felt that the individual response in Chile was high, but that institutional and financial barriers precluded Chileans from taking as much advantage, as might be hoped, of U.S. sponsorship, stimulus and training. They are not unduly pessimistic about the present uncertain conditions of university reform, but feel that support should be continued and made sensitive to the institutional changes as they develop on the Chilean scene.

Regarding the performance of the U.S. researcher, their appraisal is generally similar to the more favorable spectrum of my Chilean interviewees (but by no means the most favorable). They strongly endorsed the need for institutional affiliation of U.S. scholars. They generally agree that U.S. scholars should orient their research to Chilean objectives as much as possible, taking an extra preliminary trip (if necessary) to work out the research design beforehand. They also agree more time is necessary for most researchers in the field and that language skills are absolutely *sine qua non*. One of the group suggested special assistance to U.S. scholars coming to Chile for the first time, including a few months devoted to special orientation prior to cutting them adrift. Most were cognizant of the typical personality defects singled out by the Chilean professionals, but considered that only unusual cases could not be handled through the orientation process. They particularly stressed the need for American researchers to know more than a smattering of information about the Chilean political scene to avoid being caught up in confusing situations because of too close an identity with one of two warring factions.

They regarded the results of American scholarship as more potentially useful to Chile than most Chileans I talked to, probably because they were more aware of the results. As noted earlier, my retrospective survey indicates a familiarity with these results, sufficient for the Chilean professional to make judgments. That the results are not better known by a wider group may be due to the disinterest of the researcher, the Chilean professional, or the result of a defective communications network. Although I incline toward the latter view, I think the first two factors loom as significant.

The second and larger group of American researchers in Chile were aware that the performance of their research ought not to be their exclusive role in Chile, and they took their associations and commitments to the Chilean institutions through which they worked seriously. One went so far as to organize an interdisciplinary colloquium among social scientists (Chileans, North Americans and other nationalities) to air methodological problems and discuss research in progress. Certainly the junior members of this group showed a strong disposition to communicate and to participate in matters Chilean related to research.

As a group they were a bit more ethnocentric in orientation than the "institution builders," as might be expected from their shorter time in Chile. They tended to criticize Chilean attitudes toward research, which they found ranged from indifferent to moderately keen, and they found the Chilean social scientist hypercritical of American methods. They also betrayed a tendency to overidentify with one or another political faction or
party in Chile. They had not yet developed the agility, which seems to come from experience, of maneuvering in complex interpersonal situations with Chilean institutions and personalities that would avoid some of the frustrations of which they complained. In short, there was a level of rapport which they had not yet reached which would have produced a more fruitful interchange of ideas.

Their view of the type of problem presented by this study tended to be more sympathetic to the North American researcher, both past and present, than one will get from the overall tone of this report. For one thing, they felt that without the stimulus of American research, or at least some of its models, Chilean research would not have attained its present level, and that many Chileans who had been exposed to North American training failed to get as much out of it as they could or should. Neither did the Chilean social scientists take advantage of the published research already done by North Americans. Hence, they felt that North Americans should not compromise their standards of methodology or reorient their approaches to fit unproved Chilean models; but they realized the need to sustain a dialogue at this stage of academic development in both countries to convince Chilean social scientists of the validity of the North American approach. They also felt that more of an effort should be made to get the best American social science talent to Chile—even if for short periods—to demonstrate or expound the latest theoretical and methodological developments. In general, however, their position seemed to be that the continued American presence in research was good, and necessary, both for Chile and the United States, and that the initiative for taking more advantage of its potential rests with the Chileans.

As I mentioned, a third class of American researcher was indicated to me as present. They were the fewest, and confined themselves pretty much to the task to which they were assigned. They had only minimal contact with Chilean social scientists beyond the confines of the classroom (they were also teaching), or with the persons who were necessary contacts for them to carry out their research.

I spoke with several third country nationals (from Colombia, Belgium, Argentina and Peru) who were also social scientists and working with one or another organization in Chile. In general, they sided with the more critical end of the Chilean spectrum of opinion regarding the results of U.S. research in Chile. As they would be more likely to hear frank appraisals of a more critical nature than most of my American colleagues, I considered this a reasonable validation of the critical shading of opinions that I set down.

* These were on temporary missions and not permanently in Chile.

The Issue of Security

One incident occurred while I was in Chile which introduced a new dimension to the problem of degree to which the research climate for North Americans was improving or deteriorating. A young political scientist arrived early one morning for a two-week stopover related to his previous research in Chile. He was greeted upon his arrival by airport police and told to return on the next plane as he was on a list of persons declared persona non grata. He was able to phone the American consul and Chilean acquaintances of sufficient importance to put in motion the machinery necessary to forestall his expulsion and establish his bona fide character as a social scientist, and he remained the two weeks to do his work. The incident received a brief notice in the press, where he was identified as being on a list with other people of left wing affiliation. The only other name given was a Canadian Marxist economist of German origin who had recently written a book on Brazil and Chile. I inquired freely about the existence of such a list and how it was elaborated, and I received very contradictory opinions. Most people (those to whom I talked for the study, as well as others who I thought might know something about the situation) considered that the list was drawn up by the U.S. Embassy in Santiago and given to Interpol through the CIA. Although I asked a friend in the Embassy to check this out, if it would not be awkward for him, I received no reply before leaving (although I made no insistent effort to get a response). Another informant whose reliability I have no reason to question asserted that he had seen the list, that the list was drawn up by Chilean authorities, that the list was made up of persons considered politically suspect, and that it had been used on two previous occasions (a few years ago) to remove a North American Ph.D. student from the scene of an area where some agitation was breaking out. He knew of the circumstances since the student appealed to him for assistance in avoiding expulsion from the country. Most professionals of all nationalities with whom I talked of the incident in Chile were shocked by the fact that any such list existed, and all affirmed that it was the first time they had heard of it being used at the airport. It struck them as very strange for something like this to happen in Chile. Quite clearly, this incident is of great significance to the ultimate objectives of this study. Within the bounds of my contract with EWA and commitment to LASA, however, there was nothing further I could do to establish the background facts of this case which probably merits further investigation, especially if it is one of a class of such incidents. I bring it to the attention of all concerned, indicating the results of my brief check of the possible sources, without further comment or analysis, since at this time not enough of the facts are available.
U.S.-SPONSORED SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

In the original EWA-LASA discussions of this study it was proposed that the study concentrate on the following questions: (1) who goes to Latin America to do the research, and how well are they prepared? (2) how are topics selected, do they overlap with other studies, and are these relevant to Latin Americans? (3) how much cooperation do the United States researchers have with Latin American institutions and scholars? and (4) how much feedback to Latin America is there from United States social science research?

Hopefully we have answered these major questions, both from U.S. and Chilean points of view. We cannot claim to have carried out a "thorough review of United States-sponsored research," however, since we had neither the time, financing nor commitment to do so. Nor has this study been concerned with the U.S. sponsorship as its point of focus. In preparing for the study, I familiarized myself with the various types of U.S. sponsors, but I could not pursue the administrative labyrinths that might lead to an analysis, much less an evaluation, of the sponsoring institutions. They were necessary as background information, and they are so treated in this report. Richard N. Adams and Charles C. Cumberland performed a service for certain U.S.-sponsoring institutions in Chile in their 1960 report, which gives details on one of the cases touched upon here (University of Chicago-Universidad Católica de Chile). Even then the Rockefeller Foundation supported this venture in a small way, and it still does. The weals and woes of other U.S. sponsors have not been documented, and although I collected some information on some operations (seen from the sponsoring institution's goals and investments), I do not have the complete picture, and can only comment in passing as the material is relevant to this report.

One does, however, in the summing up, come to a point where it is necessary to deal with institutional sponsorship. My point of view is that of the individual North American researcher and his Chilean counterpart. The largest sponsor in Chile at the time I was there (as nearly as I could determine) was the Ford Foundation-sponsored Chile-California convenio (agreement) which involved (according to the EWA survey of U.S.-Chile educational relations) $3,500,000 in the 1965-1968 triennium, of which 13.5 percent went for the social sciences. It was acknowledged by all concerned (including administrators of the project) that this project had its weakest impact in the social sciences, although more positive results are claimed in engineering, physiology and agriculture. The Library Program was effective and was universally praised, because it provided a centralizing service for the Universidad de Chile's 136 libraries. The difficulties encountered by the convenio in the social sciences are a subject for a special report (see bibliography), but for our purposes they may be summed up as basically due to bureaucratiza-

tion, both in Chile and in California, preventing any meaningful communication between the individual scholars interested in a mutual cooperation program of training and research. The scholars I interviewed in the field ranged from highly critical of the program to reasonably content, although the Chilean social scientists were uniformly derogatory in their references, blaming U.S. and Chilean participants equally.

Other Ford-sponsored programs in Chile fared better, as nearly as I could determine from limited contact. Of these CIDU, which provided an environment for urban planning studies for North American researchers and Ph.D. candidates, as well as the Universidad Católica, was just getting started, and apparently doing reasonably well. Of the other varied Ford-sponsored programs, I had contact only with those related to graduate training in economics, business and public administration (INSORA), teaching and research in the School of Sociology, economics training at the Universidad Católica, and the program of academic development with the University of Minnesota and the Universidad de Chile. These all facilitated the advanced research experience of Chilean professionals and American research-professors in Chile. I was indirectly aware of projects in the Center for Experimental Educational Improvement of the Ministry of Education and the tri-university law program. Relatively new Ford-sponsored programs involving U.S. and Chilean researchers in demography and political science are just getting under way.

The Rockefeller Foundation lends continuing support to the economics institutes of both universities, supports graduate Chilean research in the Center of Research on American History, and has supported CENID in addition to its traditionally strong support in the fields of medicine—family planning particularly—and agriculture.

None of these was observed in relation to foundation goals or expenditures. Insofar as I could observe from my Chilean informants, however, the reaction was favorable toward U.S. foundation sponsorship of Chilean institutional research. Only one observed that foundation money was suspect. A few felt that Ford sponsorship represented some kind of imperialistic "bind." but only one asserted that Rockefeller affiliation had any such stigma.

AID sponsorship of projects with a research component has a long history in Chile and continues, despite a rather dim image that AID enjoys among Chilean professionals. The Land Tenure Center group, however, which is identified with the contracting University of Wisconsin, enjoys a much more favorable image. Through its instrumentality, in collaboration with the Economics Faculty, a number of effective U.S. researchers have been sent to Latin America and counterpart students from Chile to the United States. Another AID-sponsored program, involving technical assistance in taxation, with Harvard, I heard of only second-hand.

Notre Dame, with both Catholic universities, and
Minnesota, with Concepción, operate the two principal university-to-university programs in the social sciences, while Cornell maintains a lingering liaison with INSORA in labor relations, similar to that between the economics departments of the University of Chicago and the Universidad Católica. In all these arrangements, U.S. professionals and Ph.D. candidates are brought to Chile for research and Chilean graduate students are sent to the United States to receive advanced training.

Although the institutional structure is quite distinct, the Fulbright program constitutes what has been the most steady, continuous link for providing U.S. researchers or teachers with some research responsibilities to the several Chilean universities. Beginning in Chile in 1956, the program has supported from four to twelve U.S. professionals annually. This organization has suffered from bureaucratization too, so that it has apparently lost its sensitivity to either Chilean or American needs. When the needs happen to be met (e.g., a requesting institution receives the kind of scholar it was hoping to acquire), it would appear due to chance. Chileans complained that they were seldom given any word on the candidates likely to be sent to their university prior to arrival (when it was too late to make counterproposals). A few U.S. scholars complained that the administrative conditions of the program made it unduly rigid and caused personnel turnover. For purposes of good institutional support, qualified and acceptable U.S. professionals should have been retained for longer periods. This is a criticism of the Fulbright program throughout Latin America which reduces its utility.

The "pork barrel" requirement that the U.S. professors come from a wide cross section of the country has contributed to the impression that the United States is sending second-class talent to Latin America because it considers it low priority. At best, Latin Americans believe (and to this writer rightly so) that the program serves as a means of exposing U.S. professionals to Latin America for short stretches, not for the good it will do Latin America, but rather to espouse the U.S. philosophy of life and project the American image. Although one well-informed interviewee assured me that the program had at one time been evaluated by a Chilean social scientist, I could not verify this. Its defects in the professional level were intensified at the graduate student level. Like the Chile-California universities program, it would appear that the local office of the program ceases to be effective either in communicating to Chileans or to the U.S.-based implementing agencies, which themselves lose contact with the most directly interested individual scholars and deal with clique networks. In effect, little control or expression of the Chilean point of view is transmitted any longer through this channel.

As stated earlier, this report refers only in a background sense to U.S.-sponsoring institutions. Nevertheless, because of the prominence in the interviews given by both the U.S. researchers in Chile at the time and the Chilean professionals, it was necessary to underline the image of ineptitude that both the Chile-California and Fulbright programs presented. It is hoped that whatever measures may be taken to improve the interchange of Chilean-North American researchers at any level, due precautions will be taken to avoid bureaucratization and clique monopolization, both in Chile and in the United States. Americans and Chileans agree that a wide representative spectrum of the interdisciplinary research community of both countries is needed. The insensibility of the Chile-California program (on the U.S. side) to constructive criticism over a one-year stretch from within was highlighted for me by one intrepid U.S. professional both in conversation and documented memoranda (see Bibliography).

This prologue to our summation has been necessary to define what is involved in the term "U.S.-sponsored research" which is bandied about so cavalierly. In referring to it, I made no greater deference to considerations about Camelot and CIA disclosures of funding to student organizations than was warranted by the opinions and impressions I gathered in my interviews. There is no doubt that the impression of U.S. Defense Department and CIA funding has cast doubts—which were already fairly firmly entrenched—on the objectivity and impartiality of U.S.-sponsored research. The tendency of U.S. government agencies to sponsor Chilean research directly was under attack during my stay, as disclosures of Defense Department contracts with the University of Chile Medical School were aired. The opinion was also voiced that the Ford Foundation was a kind of funding arm for State Department policy. Most Chileans with whom I talked felt that more impartial local funding, however desirable, was not too likely to increase over present levels of inadequacy. They thought the best one could hope for was to strive for a more equitable balance between countries financing research and to assign the researcher (individual or institution) the responsibility of guaranteeing the impartiality of his particular research. In short, much U.S.-sponsored research is suspect. However, the impact of Camelot and subsequent scandals on the funding of research for questionable reasons has not appreciably worsened the climate for research. It has probably had a salutary effect on U.S.-sponsoring institutions and researchers alike in making them more conscious of the sensitivity of Chileans to being regarded as objects of study rather than as participants in a joint venture from which they might expect to derive some benefit. I certainly noticed a higher degree of awareness, among U.S. colleagues and graduate students that their presence was not an unmixed blessing to Chileans than was the case in the early 1950s. The foundations have made significant changes by directly funding Chilean researchers and research organizations and thereby eliminating one source of resentment against American research procedures.

The Individual U.S. Researcher
As evaluated by seasoned colleagues and by Chilean
compeers, how does the North American researcher in Chile emerge from this examination? In terms of U.S. criteria, he is productive in a quantitative sense and, with a degree of reservation as to how we may indeed judge this impartially, in a qualitative sense as well. Except for the large number of political scientists who appeared on the scene around the Frei election times, the North American researcher has not been present in abnormally high proportion to the Chilean institutions with which he might affiliate. He has, however, not been as inclined to seek affiliation with Chilean institutions as Chileans would like. He is even more guilty of not participating with the institution with which he works or from which he solicits facilities. The following is how the U.S. researcher evaluated his own performance and that of his colleagues, the weaknesses he found and areas of improvement he identified.

The American Researcher’s Self-Evaluation

The questionnaire sent to U.S. postdoctoral researchers was compiled hastily and mailed to them late in the spring semester. Of the 200 odd individuals identified, 53 replied, which is some indication of the group’s interest in the problem. An additional four persons who were in Chile at the time I arrived, and two who gave me brief verbal impressions prior to leaving, would augment this figure slightly. As previously indicated, this 25 percent sample is representative of the disciplines involved.

On the questionnaire was an item asking for comments or suggestions “for coordinating scholarly efforts in Latin America.” The comments received constitute the basis for this section. Subsequently, I will refer to the impressions of American researchers with whom I talked in Chile.

Some of these remarks are appropriate in the discussion on recommendations. Those having to do with an appraisal of the current research environment will be dealt with here.

Forty-two percent replied with significant comments. An additional 16 percent endorsed the efforts of the Latin American Research Review or the present initiative of the Latin American Studies Association to improve coordination.

Most of the key observations made by Chilean professionals were also mentioned by one or more American researchers. Here, I think, the relative emphasis is important. Moving from one end of the spectrum (do more in Chile) to the other (do better in the United States), I would segregate the responses as follows:

One researcher suggested à la Galtung (in Horowitz, pp. 307 ff.) that we “encourage and try to finance research in the United States for Latin American students and scholars.” Somewhat less drastic were two researchers, one of whom I quote:

Use local collaborators, publish all results jointly, do something for the local students, the local laboratory, learn the local language and have some sympathy for the local system of education and research in the local country.

Three other respondents made the point that most research efforts would be more successful if they represented joint undertakings with host institutions. One researcher referred to the need for a preliminary orientation in Chile to design the research prior to embarking on it, something he was fortunate enough to be able to do. Another researcher referred to feedback:

I suspect . . . that failure of American scholars and organizations to repat Latin America in research findings continues to plague research efforts in that part of the world.

Overloading of the understaffed Chilean institutes was underlined by three respondents as a key problem. Another researcher, together with several who mentioned it as a factor, underlined the need for language facility as the most important.

Of those whose focus was on the North American side of the picture, six proposed more effective coordination of U.S. postdoctoral and dissertation research proposals, via a clearinghouse mechanism. Two others referred to their particular disciplinary problems: one on microfilming coordination and the other for support of an applied research and training program. Most conservative were two investigators, one of whom I quote:

As a kind of lone wolf in these matters, I’m somewhat allergic to ‘coordination.’ My only suggestion would be that those who have some experience in doing research in the area give whatever tips they may think useful, and give access to whatever relevant material they may possess, to other scholars who go down there. I for one, however, don’t want to be coordinated.

On balance then, 11 of the 21 offering comments were concerned with taking corrective measures of varying degrees to improve the American research image in Latin America, while ten were more interested in better coordination within the United States.

Here we are confronted with two contrasting images. The U.S. researcher tends to view his research in Chile as effective individual effort to be measured by its publishability, and only secondarily on what effect it might have had directly or indirectly upon Chileans or Chile. He is productive by U.S. academic standards, at least quantitatively. He considers that he has handled himself well in Chile and that he would be welcomed back if he could find the means to return.

The Chilean image presents a rather serious, time-pressed scholar, arriving with preconceived ideas of what he would like to study, an a priori research design and a need, but no great facility, for operating with Chilean colleagues and institutions working on the problems he is studying. He carries out his study by dint of perseverance and parsimony of time, and occasionally of funds. This result, however admirable to the Chilean
observer, leaves much to be desired, since the U.S. researcher achieved minimal interaction with the Chilean environment (in the broadest sense) and probably missed relevant ideas or even data that would have made his research more meaningful. Furthermore, he usually left an impression, at best, of a kind of impromptu cordiality, and at worst, of cavalier professional ethics in terms of fulfilling commitments. Despite this image, the Chilean contemplates the presence of the North American researcher as a positive characteristic, on balance. He sees the value of people dedicated to research as useful, and he conceives of whatever research stimulus the American scholar is willing to volunteer as a resource badly needed and in short shrift. Hence, he continues to welcome the researcher, perhaps with just a show of jaded hospitality, offers his cooperation and awaits developments.

Quite clearly, the efficient and productive researcher has contributed to our knowledge of Chile as well as helped Chilean individuals get research training. He has been much less effective than he might be, however, in creating an environment of mutual trust and mutual cross-fertilization in ideas for continuing research. For this the individual is not entirely responsible as I hope to indicate in the part which follows.

FINDINGS

I

The principal cause for the lack of effectiveness of U.S. researchers in Chile is in the contradiction between the U.S. academic career system and the developmental functioning of the academic and research structure in Chile.

The U.S. professional program is entirely geared to stateside specifications. In Phase 1, the student who goes abroad for his Ph.D. dissertation orient the dissertation to satisfy the faculty of his department who are basically more concerned with his competent application of a methodology than the accuracy of data relevant to the foreign context in which the study occurred. This dilemma of the dissertation student trying to put the Chilean data into the straightjacket of a U.S.-conceived problem was abundantly referred to by my informants in Chile (Chilean and American). Time allowed for the candidate was usually inadequate. Mostly, those willing to make the personal sacrifice of staying longer than their grant permitted or the faculty desired managed to salvage a worthwhile thesis problem. The others appear to have represented preconceived studies of little significance or research that had to be drastically retailed to meet dissertation requirements.

In Phase 2 the assistant professor wants to be promoted. Again he seeks support (usually for a short term—like a summer, or at the most a semester) as he cannot be spared for a longer period, and he goes abroad to make a study which can yield a publication. This work, as one can readily imagine, is very hurried. Secondly, when published, it usually appears in a journal inaccessible to Chilean readers and, as likely as not, with no "communications to the editor" section for critical review. He has thus passed in some cases through two stages without really exposing his research to critical review. His North American audience is likely to leave the article untouched because most of his colleagues lack specific area knowledge. Whether well or badly received, the article or articles enter the published record and count toward promotion.

Phase 3 involves a research project of more magnitude that may produce a book, also needed for higher academic advancement. With the enviable record of publications behind him, the associate professor applies for and receives (particularly in the years of abundance following the ascendance of Castro) a year's grant to study a problem of major dimensions. He is now usually encumbered by family and dependents and the requirements of orientation are multiplied in the foreign environment. Domestic demands on his time diminish effective working time and are likely to diminish time for relevant social contacts. Despite the full-year allocation, the research time is usually too short; he would like to remain to finish up but the university can ill afford to be without him for more than a year. So he returns, makes the material fit into a hard cover book, satisfies the university that he has "achieved," and becomes a full professor.

In all three stages, the individual has valid pressures to do a better job and remain longer in the country (Chile) where he is doing his research. In practically all three cases, he short changes his better judgment because the rewards system in the United States is designed to punish him if he remains. Contrariwise, if he pushes his thesis past the committee, and secures publication for his articles and book, he has little fear of reprisals no matter how inaccurate they might be about Chile. He cannot be blamed for following a conformist pattern.

Chileans understand the problems involved, but cannot understand why the academic system is so inflexible. Quite clearly, the need for, and the effectiveness of, the U.S. researcher-teacher, ceteris paribus, is in proportion to the time spent in the country. But for researchers willing to remain in Chile and sought by Chilean institutions, it is most difficult through normal academic channels to gain sustained support for more than one year. Few universities countenance sustained absences of key staff regardless of where the financing comes from.

Those few North Americans who managed to stay in Chile for long stretches of time without damaging their North American career pattern were not only ingenious, but fortunate enough to be there during an era of abundant grants to Latin America from sources public and private. Their reputation in Chile is a tribute to the utility of this effort as contrasted to that enjoyed by the conformists, and it is one of our major findings that their experience be used to justify a modification in
the tenure specifications governing area specialists at universities.

Conversely, it appears that the wishes of Chilean institutions and researchers are seldom considered in approving the grant applications of U.S. researchers planning to work in Chile. Grants are secured by many who would normally not be requested by the Chilean institution or the collaborators with whom they eventually work. That Chilean institutions accede is simply an indication of their need for experienced research assistance and their hope that something positive might result. Nonetheless, because of what I have referred to as “clique monopolization,” or the “pork barrel” philosophy, the North American selection often results in individuals being sent with no qualifications other than a desire to “see Chile”—while experienced researchers will be rejected. Were Chileans allowed to express opinions, the results would be different. This situation is less deleterious when a researcher comes for the first time than when it produces a repeater who is already unpopular. The effective lack of any kind of host country evaluative mechanism in the process of grant applications is remarkable at this stage of overseas research development. As stated earlier, the establishment of a “board” in the host country, as in the case of Fulbright, does not resolve the problem of Chilean preference except in cases of extreme ineptitude (I know of no rejections yet). In most cases, where Chileans are asked for concurrence, the choice comes at the end, when the individual has already been selected and approved in the United States.

II

The coordination of research activities in Chile leaves much to be desired, particularly at this moment in time. It is hence a major task for anyone reasonably well-informed on Chilean social science research to know what individual is with what organization, let alone knowing what research topic is under his particular scrutiny. Despite the desire of Chileans to work in teams, the research tends to be disarticulated between teams, oftentimes working at cross purposes, and between groups and individuals. Some measure of help to potential coordinating agencies (information coordination) is being rendered; but more could be absorbed fruitfully. Even an American insinuation that some clearinghouse center would serve a useful purpose to U.S. researchers and funding institutions would prove a stimulus to getting the information more adequately funneled into one or two depositories. The utility of such a mechanism would be equally advantageous in channeling research results—preliminary and final—to the individuals and institutions concerned.

III

One of the reasons for this study was to determine the degree to which the sheer quantity of American researchers might not prove a problem for the limited staff of Chilean social scientists with whom they would presumably have most of their dealings. Chile was selected as a country where the quantity of U.S. researchers was among the highest (at least on a per capita basis) in Latin America. We found, as the report indicates, that the degree of “saturation” was not so high among the postdoctoral researchers as to warrant critical concern. About 35 or 40 American researchers are in Chile annually (the average seems to be a peak, which will decline somewhat). The distribution indicates that researchers are concentrated in the disciplines where Chilean institutions also have most depth, so the proportion of researchers is not overwhelming, except in a few cases. These cases would not exist were the researchers adequately prepared prior to arrival in Chile or were some concerted effort made to concentrate on their orientation upon arrival.

IV

The same is not true of Ph.D. candidates and graduate students. Although this was not a subject of principal concern, I was obliged to deal with it because it involved the total research picture in many ways. On the question of “saturation,” I was told on several occasions, and by distinct disciplines, that the number coming to Chile was indeed too excessive for the Chilean staff and facilities. The Ph.D. candidate usually is much less prepared than the postdoctoral researcher in all respects, including general maturity. In addition, few were prepared by their mentors for what to expect, and a large majority were completely lost upon arrival and for months afterward, particularly Fulbright grantees. Some seek refuge with American institutions in Chile, others seek out Chilean scholars to whom they have been recommended (usually without prior knowledge or indication of willingness to undertake responsibility for guidance). Most eventually gravitate to one or another Chilean center for data or whatever their other needs might be. The burden in time consumed and facilities offered outweighs the merit of the not-too-typical Ph.D. candidate who is capable of offering the institute some-

° The phase of “saturation” of postdoctoral researchers appears to have occurred at the time of the Frei elections, and it was also the time when most unaffiliated researchers were visiting the country. My findings indicate that the U.S. professionals are rectifying this situation themselves, although a word of caution is in order to avoid a repetition when some other striking event takes place in Chile. Opposition to the postdoctoral researcher without institutional affiliation in Chile was well nigh universal.
thing in return. Flagrant abuses of the system of "farm ing out" the dissertation candidates to Chilean acquaintances were recounted to me, with enough frequency to warrant my emphasizing that here is an area where Chilean cooperation may soon dry up. The Chilean professionals indicated a lack of time and limited staff as the principal reason, although they felt some economic subsidy to cover cost of facilities and remuneration to assistants would help improve the situation. Qualified Chilean researchers have to give their time to their own research and to the training of their own researchers. They suggested that U.S. universities specifically assign staff to work with doctoral candidates (as Chicago was doing in the Universidad Católica) if they desire to continue the system of producing quantities of overseas dissertations.

There were, however, outstanding cases of qualified doctoral candidates who did remarkable work in both teaching and research training with Chilean peers, but their frequency would not have been as high as one in five, and more likely one in ten. The procedure of sending graduate students in their first or second year of graduate school found even less enthusiastic response from either Chileans or seasoned U.S. professionals in Chile. Here the Chilean institutions felt less of an obligation to shelter them, and the individuals were left to shift for themselves, in rather pathetic circumstances, unless one of the American centers (LTC, Ford, Rockefeller, etc.) could find some place where their energies might be usefully channeled. If the purpose of these grants is to give the graduate student an initial familiarity with the problems of doing research in an alien environment, clearly more responsibility for initial orientation and guidance should be provided by the sponsoring institution. Several Chilean institutions were obliged to refuse them acceptance, and the animosity engendered did nothing to improve the U.S.-Chilean research environment.

V

Lack of continuity of Chilean personnel was a problem referred to in my second finding. Here I should like to emphasize this factor in the administrative sphere. Adams and Cumberland point out the good and bad points in their study (196:155 ff.), and the same observations apply today. This perspective of a changing administrative cadre may well discourage the U.S. professional from any more than minimal institutional collaboration, and justify his stand as of now. I found that most Chilean professionals recognize this as a feature of the Chilean academic and governmental administrative hierarchy and recognize its deterrent effects on themselves as well as foreign researchers. American presence, however, has stabilized certain structures, as one can see by comparing institutions where U.S. researchers have been more or less continuously present with those where they were absent. By stabilized I do not mean encrusted, but simply that the policy toward research has tended less to vary than the individuals in the different echelons. The long-term presence of competent U.S. professionals has had an even more noteworthy effect on this kind of stabilization. French and German professionals have had similar effects in certain institutes. Therefore, despite the apparent contradiction, it would appear desirable for the American researcher to intensify his efforts at institutional collaboration, particularly where he has a good precedent. He should not be preoccupied with moving into relationships with an institution that has had only sporadic contact with foreign research in the past.

VI

The propaganda effects of Camelot and the lack of confidence in impartial U.S. sponsorship of research has been of mixed significance. The environment, both public and professional (academic and government), is now more sensitized than before to the research proposal and its protagonist. Chilean institutions want more credentials and satisfactory explanation of the antecedents and ultimate objectives of proposed research before offering cooperation or information. In the public there is a growing antagonism to questionnaires, induced as much by U.S. researchers, by FLACSO and other non-U.S.-sponsored surveys, as by Camelot. In general, however, the researcher who has nothing to hide will find little resistance to a study a priori on grounds of being U.S.-sponsored. If the subject is regarded by Chilean colleagues as nonsensitive, he can pursue his research successfully. On the other hand, he must expect resistance to opinion sampling in the metropolitan areas because of the plague to which the inhabitants have been subjected without apparent benefits. I was somewhat amazed, as were some seasoned U.S. observers, that some researchers continue to broach what we could consider "sensitive" topics they conducted in the United States. In such cases, however, the researcher is politely discouraged and the suggestion made that he shift to some less touchy area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In developing recommendations, as in all other aspects of this study, I communicated freely with my Chilean informants and asked them to share in the process. While a limited number had concrete, positive suggestions, many commented upon recommendations that I formulated in the later phases of the interviews. These recommendations, then, have been tested both on American and Chilean audiences and represent a consensus of the best-informed opinion on what should be done to improve the climate for research in Chile for all
concerned. They are submitted not as unilateral recommendations, although some pertain mostly to U.S. organizations or individuals for their implementation, but as general recommendations which require cooperation on the part of North Americans, Chileans and other concerned nationalities for their successful implementation. The reader will note that recommendations II, III, IV, VI and VII, as well as part of I, are contemplated in the general recommendations formulated in the introduction. The others have specific reference to the improvement of the research environment of Chile.

I—That the process of grant applications—approval and follow-up—for postdoctoral foreign area research (specifically to Chile) be revised to include the following considerations:

(a.) That the granting institution require:

(1) A commitment on the part of the applicant that he will (if he has not already done so) identify colleagues in the country who may be expected to be familiar with his research and submit beforehand a sketch of his research proposal so that he may receive the benefits of commentary.

(2) In those types of research where he will be working with a Chilean institution and where no formal agreements exist, that the researcher commit himself to inform the institution of the research as it is progressing by some convenient mechanism (e.g., periodical roundtable discussions) and that he prepare a report of his preliminary conclusions, a copy of which he will leave with the host institution, and which he will deliver in a session to which all concerned Chilean and other foreign scholars who would be interested are invited to participate.

(3) A commitment to have the final report translated into Spanish and distributed in the quantities requested by the institution with which he worked (or such other interested scholar of the host country whom he may designate to be responsible for the distribution). The cost of preparing the Spanish version of this report should be added to the grant as a percentage of the total cost, much as the item for administrative costs is now computed.*

(4) That copies of the documents confirming that these aforementioned commitments have been fulfilled, and sent to the granting institution to be retained in the grant file.

(b.) That the form for the grant application have a space to be filled in for applicants who have previously done research in Latin America, indicating the names of individuals and institutions with whom they had formal on-going working relationships who would be used as references in addition to others listed by the applicant.

II—That area studies centers at U.S. universities and institutions that sponsor research on individual grants undertake the modification of current blanket specifications of lengths of stay and duties to allow for the following:

(a.) That the length of time for a researcher making his first trip to Latin America be longer than that of an applicant with previous experience (assuming the scope of the research project is roughly equivalent).

(b.) That a demonstrated degree of language fluency of Foreign Service Institute 3 be the minimum for an applicant going for the first time, and 4 for all others.

(c.) That short-term grants for research be limited to a minimum of six months, except for exceptionally well-qualified and experienced researchers. Advocacy of short-term trips, in anticipation of a planned research project, to arrange the research design and nature of the contributions of researcher and host institutions or collaborators, should, conversely, be encouraged. It should be understood here that studies of a comparative nature, involving more than two countries, would not be covered by this recommendation. Short-term trips to complete research started earlier should, where possible, be incorporated into the original research proposal.

(d.) In the case of individuals doing research under the secondary sponsorship of a macro-project with an administrative base in Chile, arrangements should be made to provide the part-time services of a senior social scientist to orient the first-time researcher to the institutional structure and *modus operandi* of the host country. Where such a facility exists, the calculated length of the grant may be proportionately reduced.

(e.) It should be understood that all researchers will be expected to devote some time (normally devoted to research were he on a grant in the United States or certain parts of Europe and Asia) to informal teaching, offering seminars and general "public relations." This should be stipulated in brochures announcing foreign area postdoctoral grants, both to forewarn the applicant regarding a realistic estimation of what he may accomplish, and to guarantee to the host country that the conditions under which he is there permit him a minimal amount of time to make known to them the significance of his research.

(f.) Special provision should be made for extending grants of individuals whose commitment to improving the research environment is demonstrated and for whose extended services the host country has made specific request. This will involve difficult concessions from university administrations, but the fact that certain high ranking universities do allow extended absences (e.g., Wisconsin) indicates that it is feasible.

III—A regulatory body of LASA should be set up with representation of all the disciplines to give something similar to the "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" certificate to scholars (so requesting it) doing research in foreign areas. The document should indicate that the research is bona fide and the sponsoring institution is not suspect. While the legitimacy of the grant is usually not questioned by the individual or institutions

* This does not imply publication cost.
with whom the researcher has steady contacts, there are many other persons and organizations (not the least of which is the press) with whom he will have sporadic relations, and for whom the document will be most helpful.

IV—To avoid duplication, the effort of the Latin American Research Review to consolidate all information about on-going postdoctoral research should be intensified. Grant awarding agencies may generally lend greater cooperation to LASA and specifically help by requiring the applicants to list other scholars in the field doing related research.

V—A mechanism should be set up through the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) to diffuse information on proposed doctoral dissertations, the field work for which is to be done in Latin America. This would be similar to the LARR arrangements for postdoctoral research. Regional subcommittees in each discipline should meet for a semi-annual review to discuss possible changes of country or at least host institution where the doctoral candidate will be expected to work. The committee should have corresponding members in all Latin American countries with whom it may consult to determine the relative capabilities and priorities for handling predoctoral candidates. The committee should be established with the knowledge and consent of the major grant offering institutions as well as the institutional affiliates of LASA.

VI—With regard to Chile, approval of an active host research institution which will agree, in writing, to make itself responsible for orientation and guidance, should be mandatory for all other student grants with a research component.

VII—A clearinghouse for on-going research projects should be established in Chile with representative membership of all the organizations now carrying out research in the social sciences. Ideally, the seat of the organization should be ODEPLAN with an Executive Secretary designated by that office. Initially, the clearinghouse would consolidate the information of on-going research and issue a tri-annual or semi-annual bulletin, indicating research concluded, research contemplated and research in progress. It would also indicate priorities in terms of topical area where qualified foreign personnel would be welcome. This bulletin could be made available to LASA for general distribution to all area centers and individuals with Chilean research commitments.

Subsequently the organization could assume additional functions to avoid duplication of efforts in Chile, to recruit desired personnel and to facilitate the exchange of Ph.D. candidates and professors.

VIII—Greater attention should be placed on making journals of learned societies such as the HLAS, and standard monograph series on Latin America, available to Chilean research institutions. LARR proposes to offer a blanket cost-printing rate subscription to all Latin American scholars and suggests that other standard social science journals take similar action. Concomitant with making more efforts through social science journals, space should be allowed for reviews of books by Latin Americans on their own country and a section of "brief communications" which would facilitate rejoinders to articles by Latin American scholars.

IX—LASA, or some similar organization, should issue a brochure on professional ethics abroad, which should cover, among other items, guidelines for good research rapport:

(a.) Language facility and a previous preparation on the culture and history of the host country are sine qua non;

(b.) Expect, even if they are not demanded, that quid pro quo arrangements should be made for services offered;

(c.) Develop an awareness of the fact that at any time there exists a community of North American scholars (at least in the minds of the host country) in the host country, and the impact of each one has repercussions for both this group and subsequent ones;

(d.) There is an urgent need to communicate and associate with Chilean professionals and students;

(e.) Avoid the tourism image, with all that this implies;

(f.) Understand that at least one-third of one's time will be devoted to commitments and non-research activities;

(g.) Curb any innate tendencies to over-identify overtly with any one political group.
NOTES

1. Budget support from the national government rose 10 percent from 1964 through 1967, but for 1968 and thereafter little, if any, real increase was expected. This reflected the general state of Chile's public finances; education had received a large share of the proceeds of President Frei's tax reform of 1965-1966, but further revenue increases would require a faster rate of growth in the economy.

2. The economic libraries put together a union catalogue of periodical holdings in 1961, perceiving correctly that CENID's international financing would take years to obtain, and that the natural sciences would have priority.

3. This Ford-financed arrangement should be distinguished from the earlier AID-financed State of California-Chile Program.

4. This title is usually shortened to: Instituto de Administración.

5. Chilean examples and cases also tend to permeate the literature and thought of graduates of these training programs, even though they are at times no more relevant than cases drawn from Europe or the United States.

6. This point of view is well expressed in Osvaldo Sunkel's paper (1966:28-29) wherein he states:

   The interpretation given has above all had the purpose of illustrating the highly complex and interrelated nature of the day-to-day problems faced by development policy, and particularly to look at the relationship of so-called short-term problems like inflation, budget deficits, devaluations, food shortages, etc., to some deep-rooted institutional and structural factors. I hope to have made it clear that without taking these elements into consideration it is quite impossible to understand the extraordinary persistence of these problems and their recurrent nature in most countries of the region.

7. The complicated intertwining of research and reporting from one country to the other is well exemplified in an incident which reflects on Chilean and ICIRA (UN-financed and FAO-implemented) research. The original article was by a U. S.-trained Chilean economist from the Universidad Católica who attempted to use FAO-ICIRA data, evaluating agrarian reform in a group of reform settlements and adding his own economic data to prove hypothetically that the reform settlements were losing propositions. The article was published in the journal, Economía y Finanzas, re-republished in the organ of the National Agrarian Society and ultimately picked up in the original or a subsequent: more distorted version by a reporter for the Copley News Service to the Miami Herald, under a headline "Chilean Agrarian Plan is Failing." The American economist then in Chile, who called this incident to my attention, attempted to get some redress by writing the editor of the Miami Herald and rebutting the Chilean economist's position on methodological grounds. The letter was not published; the Herald editor said that his quarrel was with the News Service, not the paper that printed the story. Readers of the newspaper article were left with the impression that Chilean economists are disproving the economic viability of the agrarian reform, while the FAO-ICIRA researchers are unable to evaluate it correctly. The two economists later took part in a public forum on land reform organized by Chile's active professional society for planners, PLANDES. The aspect of this incident which is atypical is the concern of the North American economist to right an erroneous impression in the North American press created indirectly by the research of a Chilean colleague. The types of misimpressions caused by press usage of research articles, whether in Chile or the United States, is, unfortunately, typical.

   Perhaps visiting researchers from both countries should follow the example of the economist cited and assiduously concern themselves with rectifying misimpressions in their home press about the other country, but they seldom do.
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SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Changing Atmosphere in Paraguay

Paraguay is a geographically isolated and economically poor country with very limited natural resources. It has long suffered from political instability, but since 1954 has been under strong authoritarian rule. These factors condition the possibilities for effective social science research within the country. Yet the past 20 years have witnessed a widening opportunity for education and investigation that promises an increase in intellectual contact with the outside world.

One of the effects of the exceptional duration of the administration of President Alfredo Stroessner, notwithstanding its early severity, is that it has given the country a period of political stability in which to heal its familial wounds, work out its economic problems and direct attention to internal development. There has been a tangible relaxation of tensions within the country and the generation of a popular feeling of optimism that is quite apparent to the visitor who returns after several years of absence. The President himself seems to feel more secure and to have mellowed and softened his style of administration, though he undoubtedly remains sensitive to any threat to his position. He has allowed the political opposition, except for the Communist underground, to express itself within limits that seem to be well understood, and the degree of open criticism permitted in the press and within the church is surprising in light of earlier repression. The returning visitor may well be deceived by the apparent gain in freedom, yet the bitterness and overt brutality associated with the civil war of 1947 and the political anarchy that followed have clearly subsided. Paraguayans no longer feel the constant presence of Argentine intervention in domestic policy strongly manifested during the regime of Juan Domingo Perón, and which the Paraguayan government probably never accepted with the cordiality that it affected at the time.

Gradual but significant economic changes have likewise been occurring in Paraguay. Surrounded as it is by less stable economies, the country has enjoyed remarkable fiscal and monetary stability in recent years, and the standard of living—at least in Asunción and the other commercial towns—has visibly improved. New banks, office buildings, hotels and private homes have been built, and the river port and the airport have been improved. The new municipal water system is functioning, though it reaches a limited radius. The Acaray power plant near the eastern border with Brazil and its transmission lines to Asuncion are nearing completion and will soon relieve the acute deficiency in power supply. City streets have been paved and the highway system extended from Asuncion east and north to points in Brazil, as well as far northwest into the Chaco, past the Mennonite settlement at Filadelfia to the Bolivian frontier. These infrastructure improvements have been made possible largely through the U.S.-AID program, but also with particularly effective assistance from Brazil.

The new routes of communication permit bus and truck lines to tie the country together for the first time, and both legitimate and contraband trade flourish. A major bridge across the Alto Paraná River, on the border with Brazil near the Iguazú Falls, has generated tourist as well as commercial traffic. A considerable dispersion of population is taking place as farms are colonized along the new roads.

These developments have been accompanied by a superficial modernization reflected in the adoption of the miniskirt and folk-rock music. The transistor radio has reached the villages of the interior, and a television transmitter in the capital disseminates the standard American reruns (in Spanish, though not yet in Guarani). These changes convey a sense of progress in Paraguay, though the country is far from fulfilling its basic aspirations of viability and growth that would lift the population out of the poverty and the cultural isolation that have afflicted this remote social outpost.

Positive Factors Affecting Research Opportunities

In the present improved state of affairs, foreign social science researchers would encounter fruitful opportunities for research, particularly in the fields of anthropology, history and sociology, as well as in some branches of economics. Much of the historical record of the development of the Paraguayan nation and its troubled relations with its neighbors is still to be written, and some of the important documents are rapidly disappearing for lack of systematic preservation. Studies of a diversity of communities in early stages of development and with differing social problems could well be made, particularly using techniques of ethnology, comparative sociology and ecological geography. Development problems of a frontier environment should appeal to the economist who wishes to accumulate his own raw data where conventional modes of research have hardly been applied.

Since Paraguay was selected for this survey as a country little studied by outside investigators, it is not surprising that few problems have arisen from ungenial relations between Paraguayan scholars and foreign researchers. Because of its geographic and political isolation, Paraguay did not feel the repercussions of Project Camlot, nor have its scholars as a group developed a noticeably hostile or suspicious attitude toward the North American investigator. Instances of incompetence and insensitivity on the part of visiting researchers have undoubtedly occurred, but not in sufficient number to muddy the waters for the newcomer who wishes the cooperation of Paraguayan collaborators. On the evidence of the survey, most of the members of the small Paraguayan professional community are eager for outside contacts and would like to see visiting researchers make a contribution to local training programs, even though it is not always easy to know how to utilize such help effectively. They are also appreciative of research that may have an application to the solution of Para-
guayan problems, especially if it becomes available in translation.

Negative Factors in the Research Environment

The circumstances that make it difficult to carry on social science research in Paraguay according to general international standards affect some disciplines and some subjects more severely than others.

The facilities for library research in Paraguay are extremely limited, and the physical working conditions are poor. Collections of historical documents are woefully incomplete, haphazardly cataloged, and in a continual state of physical deterioration. Lighting facilities in the National Archives are so bad that people must leave the library at sundown. A small portable microfilm reader is available but rarely used.

The best collections of books, private letters, memoirs and even official records are in private hands and accessible only by special arrangements which may take years of personal cultivation to secure. Statistical data are scarce and often unreliable, although some attempt is now being made to collect and preserve important records, including census publications and other government reports, in special libraries such as the one maintained by the Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos.

Another factor affecting the foreign (as well as the domestic) investigator is the pervasive interest of the government in certain fields, notably politics and economics. It is exceedingly difficult for the political scientist to study operating political institutions, important as these are, because of the secrecy with which the government and all political parties carry on their internal operations, and because nearly all word-of-mouth sources are politically biased. A foreign researcher in political science, in the relatively small Paraguayan community, will always have high visibility, and both he and his informants must expect to be under surveillance much of the time. Moreover, there are currently no professional co-workers or assistants trained in political science, since that is a field not yet formally developed in the Paraguayan educational system.

Many of these cautions also apply to the economist who proposes studies on a national scale or with significant policy implications. Both business records and some government data are subject to secrecy and administrative doctoring. Hence it is difficult to reach conclusions of even reasonable reliability. Such considerations, however, may not impede smaller studies of technical significance or direct application to the solution of problems in which the government is interested.

Another circumstance that limits somewhat the opportunities for research in Paraguay is that it is a relatively small and economically diversified unit. For practical purposes there is no minerals sector and only rudimentary manufacturing and transportation sectors. Peasant and labor movements are dormant or non-existent, and the middle class is quite small. As a result the society, though divided by political tradition, tends to be rather homogeneous in structure—a condition offset only to a minor degree by the remnants of several indigenous tribes and an interesting variety of foreign colonies made up of European and Canadian Mennonites, German Hutterites, wartime Jewish refugees, Australians, North Americans, Koreans and Japanese.

This ethnic diversity poses another problem for the researcher who wishes to work at the community level: he may have to master a difficult native language as well as Spanish, Guaraní is widely spoken in the countryside and is the language of command and affection even in the city. In the remoter areas several of the indigenous tribes speak distinct languages of their own. This precludes effective ethnographic work on a short-term basis, unless the investigator is able to utilize reliable native interpreters who have been in contact with these groups long enough to establish rapport. Moreover, the researcher who takes the trouble to learn Guaraní will find little use for the language outside of Paraguay and neighboring areas of Brazil.

Recommendations

In addition to the general recommendations derived from the entire study, which are contained in the introductory section of this volume, the following recommendations specifically applicable to Paraguay were reached on the basis of suggestions made by the survey respondents and the writer’s own observations in the field.

1. Filling the Research Gaps in Paraguay. While several Latin American countries, particularly in certain localities and certain fields, seem to have been saturated by researchers from the United States in recent years, Paraguay remains a neglected and largely unexplored site for significant field work. Although small, isolated and afflicted with special problems, Paraguay is an underdeveloped country now going through an interesting period of social change and should afford a variety of novel situations for investigation. (Some of these will be suggested in the concluding section of this report.) The opportunities appear particularly promising in history, anthropology, sociology and geography, but are not excluded in the other social sciences.

This is not to suggest that great numbers of investigators could be accommodated and utilized in Paraguay at one time, nor is such a flow likely to occur. However, if the attention of a succession of serious scholars in several fields could be drawn to the country as a site for field work, the quality of information about the country would be greatly improved and an impetus would be given to the work of the small nucleus of Paraguayan intellectuals who are struggling to launch their own programs of research.

2. Stimulating Contact with the Outside World. Because of its long isolation, which has been alleviated only in part by the advent of air travel, Paraguay has suffered from limited intellectual contact with metropoli-
tan centers, and this has gravely affected the development of its academic institutions. It is particularly important that U.S. researchers who work in the country seek collaboration with local scholars who may be lacking in background and special training, but clearly not in intelligence and interest. Only in this way can the American investigator repay in some measure the opportunity to mine the foreign cultural lode. Investigators should take care to make accessible the results of their research, including duplicate sets of raw data, if feasible, to local researchers, and to provide translations of their work when possible.

Since the advanced training facilities in Paraguay are so limited, more Paraguayan students and even mature scholars should be given opportunities for study abroad, particularly in methods of research applicable to their own needs. As it would be difficult to accomplish this on a university-wide scale with the limited resources available, individual faculties should be encouraged to send their ablest students abroad on some rotating basis by fields, with a clear understanding that returning trainees will be utilized on an appropriate teaching staff. Such opportunities should also be made available to the private research institutes that have no university attachment or basis of government support.

3. Encouragement of Interdisciplinary Research.
Owing to the traditional organization of higher education, there is a notable deficiency in interdisciplinary studies and interdisciplinary research in Paraguay. Since most of the country’s social problems involve a complex combination of political, economic and other cultural factors, the reliance on a single disciplinary approach sometimes results in an unduly sophisticated or unrealistically narrow set of solutions where a broader approach would have been more useful. This is why geography or anthropology-sociology-linguistics sometimes provide a better basis for understanding Paraguay’s problems than a more limited, purely quantitative study (although there have been few of these). Such interdisciplinary studies do not demand less rigor, but they open the way for greater insights through the cross-fertilization of ideas from separate fields. Some recent efforts at team research by local representatives of several disciplines have been made, especially by the Colegio Cristo Rey group and the Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos, and will be described in the body of this report. Such efforts should be encouraged by the direct participation of foreign scholars whenever indicated by common interests.

4. Preparation of the Prospective Investigator. While it is important for every researcher going abroad to be briefed by mature scholars who have already worked in a particular country, conditions in Paraguay require that the prospective researcher, especially if on his first foreign assignment, be informed about the very limited facilities upon which he will be able to count, and the special problems of working in the atmosphere of the authoritarian state. One of the respondents to the survey suggested the establishment of a “locator file,” containing comprehensive information about the research that has already been done or that is under way in Paraguay, and about the bibliographical resources available. The research inventory in this report and the accompanying bibliographical appendices are intended as a contribution to such a file. In addition, a continuing service to the researcher would provide current information about existing libraries, research centers and other facilities which would enable him to organize his work in advance.1

With respect to the political atmosphere in Paraguay, it is unlikely that the foreign researcher will be in any personal danger, but he must always consider the potential effect of his associations, his public statements and his publications on the professional reputations and personal liberty of his informants and co-workers in collaborative research. Often the inexperienced researcher is unaware of the political overtones attached to social inquiry in a rather small community where information easily filters to those in control, and he should be briefed in advance about the possible consequences of the indiscreet use of material permitting the identification of respondents. An advance briefing with someone who has recently worked in Paraguay should be particularly helpful in this regard.

INVENTORY OF COMPLETED AND PROJECTED U.S. RESEARCH

Purpose of the Study
The object of this study has been to learn what research in the social sciences, broadly defined, has been conducted by U.S. investigators concerning Paraguay during the period from 1950 to 1968, and what possibilities there are for fruitful independent and collaborative research in the future.

A subsidiary motive was the belief that serious investigation in the social sciences in Latin America has suffered in the recent period from an influx of North American investigators, including graduate students, who have unintentionally affected the climate of research in some countries by their sheer numbers and by insensitivity to the problems of local scholars working with inadequate financial support and in an unstable political environment. It was thought that some research coordination in the United States might effect a more tolerable distribution of visiting researchers in Latin America.

Paraguay was included in the three-country survey because it had been relatively little studied by U.S. investigators and merited more attention. It was recognized that Paraguay presents some special problems for effective research by general international standards, but there were also some indications of active local interest in promoting social investigation that could be nurtured by sustained and helpful outside contact. This
report therefore includes, in addition to an inventory of research on Paraguay by U.S. social scientists, a description of current research efforts by Paraguayan scholars, a review of problems associated with research collaboration in Paraguay, and some suggestions for research opportunities that appear promising.

In order to determine the range and types of research conducted since 1950, a bibliography was compiled from standard bibliographical sources. An attempt was made to secure a comprehensive listing of all published work by U.S. scholars (as well as foreign scholars now resident in the United States) pertaining to Paraguay and falling within the social sciences as defined below. To these publications were added completed but unpublished doctoral dissertations and master's theses, and some completed working papers available only in manuscript.

From the resulting bibliography, a list of authors was prepared, and a questionnaire was sent to all for whom addresses could be found. On the basis of the replies and by means of further inquiries, the bibliography was expanded to its present length. (See Appendix A.) The fact that the entire list of completed work consists of only 116 items, some of which must be considered journalistic articles or fictionalized history rather than results of formal social science research, indicates how little attention has been given Paraguay during a period when research in other Latin American countries was expanding rapidly. Part of the published research does not represent field work conducted in Paraguay, but was based on secondary sources available outside of the country.

On the basis of the questionnaire and such sources as the Current Research Inventory of the Latin American Research Review, and the External Research lists of the Department of State, a listing was made of unpublished manuscripts and research in progress related to Paraguay. While such a list cannot be complete, the fact that only 29 items were uncovered (See Appendix B.) suggests that North Americans are conducting little current research on Paraguay.

In order to carry out the remaining objectives of the study, the writer conducted a field survey in Paraguay in June and July, 1968, visiting the principal centers of intellectual activity and conducting interviews with resident Paraguayan and North American investigators regarding the local climate for research. The fact that he had spent an academic year in Paraguay in 1955 on a Smith-Mundet lectureship and had since made occasional visits to the country provided a basis of comparison from which to assess the changing atmosphere.

With the assistance of Paraguayan scholars, a bibliography of publications since 1950 by Paraguayan authors was compiled. (See Appendix C.) This list is illustrative of the work going on and probably contains most of the important recent publications in the social science fields.

**Research by U.S. Scholars**

For the purposes of this survey, the fields represented in the social sciences were defined as anthropology, economics, education, geography, government and political science, history, psychology and sociology. Education was included because several of the studies which have been made of the Paraguayan educational system contain valuable sociological data and throw light on such matters as the standards of public administration and the university environment in which much social research would ordinarily be carried on. Studies in anthropology and sociology, whose research products—especially in Paraguay—are often difficult to distinguish, include linguistics, since it is closely related to anthropological and sociological interests. Economics includes some applied studies (even by engineers) of agriculture and transportation, important sectors in the Paraguayan economy. Geography clearly overlaps some of these fields and includes some travel literature and journalistic descriptions which might be useful to the geographer.

The classification is somewhat arbitrary, and doubtful cases are determined by the author’s discipline. Thus a demographic study may be regarded as sociology or geography or even history, depending on the author’s training and hence the methods he might use. The only significance of classification is to make sure that the inventory is inclusive of what may broadly be construed as the social sciences (where the total effort has been so small), and to determine the relative degree of interest in Paraguay by fields.

No systematic attempt has been made to evaluate the quality of the items in the inventory. Yet, since one of our purposes is to understand the climate of research in Paraguay, this report will venture some comments to illustrate problems of field investigation of which other prospective researchers should be aware.

**Economics**—The greatest number of items in the inventory of research by U.S. investigators is in economics (42 items), and within this field, a considerable number of studies relate to agriculture (16 items). Many are specialized technical papers emerging from the work of the U.S. Operations Mission to Paraguay under the Point Four and subsequent AID programs. A considerable number represent the work of Frederic R. Fisher, a Point Four economist who was stationed in the country for a number of years and who became thoroughly familiar with its economic problems and administrative limitations. In contrast, some of the other Operations Mission papers were prepared by short-term visiting consultants unfamiliar with Spanish and are notably deficient in content.

As a whole, the Operations Mission papers are valuable not only as the product of field research by trained investigators, but because they often reflect problems of public administration and of securing reliable economic data in an underdeveloped country operating under a tightly controlled government and for a time under the political and economic influence of a powerful neighbor (Argentina under President Juan Domingo Perón).
Most of these papers were mimeographed or hectographed, and some are lost or virtually unavailable. Only single copies of some of the most significant reports remain in the Reference Library of the U.S.-AID Mission in Asuncion. The same is true of reports in the field of education, to be described below. The Operations Mission reports as a group are distinguished by the fact that they have been translated into Spanish with a high degree of regularity, and have thus become readily available to local students and researchers, while many other studies made by U.S. researchers have not.

Only one general survey of the Paraguayan economy by an American author has emerged during the period covered by the inventory. It was written by a former economic adviser to the U.S.-AID Mission stationed in Paraguay, and contains useful geographic appendices by Timothy G. Smith.

It is notable that our listings record only a single doctoral dissertation on the Paraguayan economy since 1950, and that almost nothing has been published by any American economist with field experience in Paraguay, other than reports produced under sponsorship of the U.S. Operations Mission. It is probable that the unpublished files of the Mission contain a substantial quantity of economic information to which a responsible investigator might gain access, so long as this did not adversely affect the Mission’s relations with the Paraguayan government. Some of the difficulties of conducting serious economic research in Paraguay and publishing the results freely will be commented on below.

Joseph Grunwald of the Brookings Institution is currently directing a series of cooperative studies of economic integration in eleven Latin American countries, including Paraguay. Since the field work is being conducted by Paraguayan and other Latin American economists stationed in Asuncion, this project will be described in the next section of this report.

History—The second largest number of items in the inventory fall into the field of history and include several substantial pieces of investigation. Most are unpublished doctoral dissertations and were based on secondary sources available in the United States rather than on primary materials to be found only in Paraguay. Microfilmed Paraguayan archival materials are available in only a few outside depositories, such as the UNESCO center in Mexico City, the library of Miami University in Ohio, and the Latin American Collection of the University of Texas, as well as in the National Archives in Asuncion. Some important nineteenth-century documents were removed to Brazil during the occupation after the War of the Triple Alliance.

Perhaps the only published American historian who has spent extensive periods in Paraguay is Harris G. Warren, whose Paraguay: An Informal History remains one of the few general histories in English, although its publication date (1949) falls outside the limits of this survey. Warren’s work accounts for a significant portion of the completed historical items in the inventory, as well as those currently under way. Professor Warren has also prepared a selected bibliography of historical materials related to Paraguay since 1830 which is currently in press. (See Appendix E.) Philip Raine, a former Foreign Service Officer stationed for a time in Paraguay, has also written a general history.

Two historical novels are of interest because they represent considerable historical research. One is William Edmund Barrett’s Woman on Horseback, a fictionalized account of the era of Francisco Solano López and his mistress, Madame Lynch. The other, Edward Lucas White’s novel concerning Dr. José Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia, El Supremo, falls well outside the time limit of the inventory since it was first published in 1916, but a new edition of this well-researched book has recently appeared with an appreciative introduction by George W. Broehl, an economist and amateur historian who has spent some time in Paraguay.

The inventory includes the principal work in English of Magnus Mörner, a Swedish historian, on The Political and Economic Activities of the Jesuits in the La Plata Region: The Hapsburg Era (Stockholm, 1953). This item was included since Professor Mörner is now on the faculty of an American university; however, he completed his field work for this study before 1950.

Current historical research on Paraguay includes several doctoral dissertations in preparation on the basis of materials available in the United States. (See Appendix B.) John Hoyt Williams, a graduate student at the University of Florida, is presently reviewing documents in the National Archives in Asuncion for a dissertation on the regime of Dr. Francia from 1810 to 1840.

Anthropology, Sociology and Linguistics—The first anthropological field study by North Americans in Paraguay was made by Elman R. and Helen S. Service during 1948–49. This was a study of the town of Tobati and raised fundamental questions about the influence of the aboriginal Guaraní Indian culture on modern Paraguay. The study has been criticized on the grounds that the Services were unable to use the Guaraní language (which they acknowledged), and were thus limited in their access to informants. Knowledge of the language would seem vital to the theme of their research. A follow-up study of the same town by John and Mavis Biesanz, also anthropologists, has not been published.

Joseph W. Fretz, a sociologist, has written two books about the Mennonite colonies in Paraguay, and Anne-marie Krause, a geographer, a number of shorter papers, only one of which has been published. These colonies, as well as the Bruderhof (Hutterite) community, have also been described by other visitors who were not professional social scientists.

La Colmena, the first Japanese colony established in Paraguay (1936), was studied intensively by Norman R. Stewart, a geographer, in a published doctoral dissertation. He has other research under way concerning immigration to eastern Paraguay. Frederick Hicks, an anthropologist, conducted field research in the town of Capiatá while resident in Paraguay as a Fulbright lec-
turer from 1963 to 1965. This resulted in a series of articles, one of which has been published in Spanish.

A number of items in the inventory under this heading are by students of linguistics (chiefly Joan Rubin and Jacob A. Loewen) who became interested in the relation of Guaraní and other Indian languages to the Paraguayan culture, or who were concerned with adjustment problems of the Mennonite colonists in the Chaco with hostile indigenous groups. Emma Reh, a nutritionist, made a useful study of two Paraguayan communities (Piribebuy and Barrio Obrero in Asuncion) in connection with two years of field work on dietary problems. This report antedates the survey period, but became available in Spanish in 1953.

Two anthropology students from the University of Illinois, Odin and Kay Toness, are presently conducting investigations for their respective dissertations in the village of Yaguarón—a project that requires them to learn the Guaraní language. They are studying agricultural and commercial aspects of rural Paraguay.

Mary Jane Wilkie has completed field work in Paraguay for a master’s thesis at the University of Wisconsin on the use of folklore as an element of nationalism. Her study is based in part on anthropological materials.

Geography—In addition to the community studies by geographers already mentioned, there have been two master’s theses based on field studies in Paraguay by graduate students in geography. One, by Timothy G. Smith, describes the southeastern province of Itapúa, and is effectively mapped and illustrated. The other, by David James Owens, is a reconnaissance of the port of Asunción, based in part on aerial mapping. Owens plans to return to Paraguay to study factors which influenced the location of the Jesuit missions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Little work in physical geography has been performed by Americans in Paraguay, but some transportation studies have been made that are listed under the Economics heading. A useful guide to the literature related to geography in Paraguay, not confined to U.S. sources, has been prepared by Lynn S. Mullins. (See Appendix E.)

Government and Political Science—Published research on the contemporary Paraguayan political system by any American political scientist who has obtained a direct experience in the country is almost nonexistent. (Philip Raine, whose background is in political science, and whose historical work is referred to above, treats the period only to 1954, when General Alfredo Stroessner came to power.)

Paul H. Lewis’ doctoral dissertation on the Feberrista Party, which was completed in 1966 and subsequently published in revised form, was based entirely on interviews with Paraguayan exiles living in Argentina.10 Byron Nichols, a student in political science at Johns Hopkins University, has recently completed the field work for a dissertation on “The Role and Functions of Political Parties in Paraguay.”

William R. Garner’s The Chaco Dispute: A Study of Prestige Diplomacy concerns chiefly the effects of international diplomatic rivalry between the United States and Argentina on efforts to settle the war of the Chaco, and treats only incidentally the internal political considerations within Paraguay and Bolivia.11

Education—The most extensive survey of the Paraguayan educational system is that conducted in 1960–61 by a team of U.S. and Paraguayan educators headed by Henry C. Herge.10 The report describes the social situation within which Paraguayan education takes place, but is confined chiefly to primary and secondary education. The report was issued in mimeographed form and only a few copies are available.

Another, though less extensive, report was prepared by Robert J. Young, also under the auspices of the U.S. Operations Mission. It appeared in mimeographed form in both English and Spanish and was so candid in its assessment of the system of popular education that it reportedly led to a serious rift with the Paraguayan Ministry of Education. (Among other things, it described phantom schools that existed only on the payroll records of the Ministry.)

A report on the National University of Asunción made in November 1959 for the Operations Mission by Ralph A. Burns, a visiting consultant, contains little concrete information about the university. It is notable, however, for its recommendation of a two-year program of preprofessional general education and the creation of a central university library, which the administration of the university subsequently sought to put into effect, with little success.

A more revealing description of the status of higher education in Paraguay is provided by Daniel J. Socolow’s report to the Ford Foundation dated September 1966, which is available only in manuscript form. It also describes briefly the lower levels of the educational system.

Other reports on Paraguayan education sponsored by the Operations Mission concern chiefly plans for education in medicine, nursing and science.

Psychology—The survey did not reveal any research by a U.S. investigator in psychology related to Paraguay.

Collaborative and Interdisciplinary Research—No significant instances of team research involving participation by U.S. social scientists from more than one discipline were found. The instances of collaboration between U.S. and Paraguayan scholars on joint studies have been similarly rare, although there are a few instances of joint authorship resulting from the employment of Paraguayan assistants by American specialists on the Operations Mission staff. As a consequence, there has been little opportunity for Paraguayan students of the social sciences to obtain field training through association with working investigators from the United States.
Research Activity in the Social Sciences by Paraguayan Scholars

The Universities and Research

Most social science research by Paraguayan scholars has taken place outside of the National University of Asuncion, long the only institution of higher learning in the country. The situation has been similar in the recently founded (1961) Catholic University, Universidad Católica Nuestra Señora de la Asunción, except for a few professors in the Faculty of Philosophy and Educational Sciences who have tried to begin a program of research using student assistants. These professors, chiefly Jesuits with foreign training in anthropology, psychology or sociology, have had little support from the central administration of the University.

Research at present is simply not a university function in Paraguay, and when it occurs, it generally reflects the pursuit of individual interests by persons who must find their own means of support. University teaching, except for the members of religious orders, is a part-time and often largely honorary activity, so poorly compensated that it does not permit the development of an active interest in research. Students in the social sciences are occasionally assigned téses and trabajos prácticos, which are little more than personal essays or exercises in the accumulation of available secondary data and rarely reach the level of original research. Since few of their professors have any interest in investigation of their own or devote any time to instruction outside of the classroom, students have little opportunity to acquire training as research assistants.

Research by Individuals and Research Centers

The following description will therefore concentrate on the efforts of the few individuals who for reasons of personal motivation have produced published works, and who form the nucleus of scholars on whom future development of the social sciences in Paraguay must depend.

Anthropology and Sociology—The principal operating center for social science investigation in Asuncion (and hence in Paraguay) is still in its formative period. This is the Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos ( Eligio Ayala 973, Asunción). Founded in 1964, the center has been maintained for nearly two years by the Instituto Latinoamericano de Relaciones Internacionales (ILARI) which operates regional and national centers for cultural exchange in seven Latin American countries. ILARI was established in January 1966 as a replacement organization in Latin America for the International Congress for Cultural Freedom, which had been rendered ineffective when its financial support by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency was exposed. ILARI is financed by funds of the Ford Foundation and performs an important cultural function in Paraguay by supporting both the Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos and the only two social science journals that are published with any regularity: the Revista Paraguaya de Sociología and the Suplemento Antropológico de la Revista del Ateneo Paraguayo. The secretary general of the ILARI center in Asuncion is Enrique Chase Sardi, an amateur anthropologist who coordinates the two publications.

The Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos was established early in 1966 and has a full-time staff of three persons. The director is Dr. Domingo M. Rivarola, a graduate of the Law Faculty of the National University of Asuncion and a self-taught student of sociological investigation, to which he now devotes his entire time. He is director of the Revista Paraguaya de Sociología, and is assisted by Dr. Güilhermo Heisecke and Maximo Sosa.

Dr. Rivarola is acknowledged to be the moving spirit in promoting empirical social research in Paraguay, and his center has become the principal point of contact for visiting foreign scholars. The center maintains a small but growing library and documentation center and publishes through its journal specialized bibliographies compiled by Dr. Heisecke. Recently Dr. Rivarola was able to salvage for the documentation center a copy of the Paraguayan Census of 1886, one of about five known copies in the country. It was found in a pile of refuse on the street. He is now engaged in trying to recover the punch cards for the Census of 1962, which were found rotting in a damp storage room of the national statistics bureau. He is also attempting to obtain the records of the Census of 1936, which was conducted by the government chiefly in order to provide employment for the troops demobilized at the end of the Chaco War, and which was never published.

Although Dr. Rivarola has taught in both Paraguayan universities, he has found the university atmosphere unsuited to the stimulation of social research. In June 1966, the center therefore established an independent school for advanced teaching and research, the Escuela Superior de Ciencias Sociales (at the same address). The school seeks to provide instruction in social science research methods for government technicians and university professors, as well as for undergraduate students, but has had a slow start because of the scarcity of competent instructors in Paraguay. The school attempts to utilize foreign specialists whenever they are available, and encourages them upon completion of their research in Paraguay to deposit their primary data in the documentation center.

Dr. Rivarola’s own research has been in the areas of social stratification and mobility, migration and student political participation. (See Appendix C.) He is currently attempting, with very limited support, to carry out a study of the origins of Paraguayan entrepreneurs and their attitudes toward change, following a pilot study conducted by Enzo Faletto of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America in Paraguay in 1965.18

Operating in the Paraguayan environment, the center
must take care while encouraging free intellectual inquiry, criticism and the open publication of research findings, to maintain an institutional position of absolute political neutrality.

A companion organization to the center for sociological studies is the Centro de Estudios Antropológicos, which has split off from ILARI after some unsatisfactory attempts among the local sociologists and anthropologists to carry on joint research. The anthropological center is at present the relatively inactive organization headed by Dr. Ramón Juste, dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Educational Sciences of the Catholic University. Dr. Juste studied at an undergraduate at the University of Santa Clara in California, and received his doctorate from the Universidad Javeriana in Bogotá, Colombia. He has conducted some investigations in physical anthropology in eastern Paraguay, but currently devotes most of his time to teaching and administration.

The Centro de Estudios Antropológicos began in 1966 to publish its own journal, using as a vehicle the infrequently published literary review of the Ateneo Paraguayo, an old and respected cultural society. Hence the journal, the fifth issue of which is in press, is titled, *Suplemento Antropológico de la Revista del Ateneo Paraguayo*. The journal offers an outlet for the writings of folklorists and antiquarians, as well as those with formal anthropological or sociological training, of whom there are very few in Paraguay.

The most impressive work in Paraguayan anthropology has been done by Dr. Branislava Susnik, director of the Andrés Barbero Ethnological Museum and Library, and a professor in the Faculty of Philosophy of the National University. She has completed three volumes of a projected six-volume series on the colonial Indians of Paraguay. She has also participated in joint research with Dr. Domingo M. Rivarola and Manual Benítez González on rural social mobility, and recently completed field studies in Bolivia on the relations of the Chiriguano and Guarani tribes in the colonial period.

Dr. Susnik was trained as an ethnologist in Vienna before World War II but as a displaced person after the war was unable to return to her profession until she arrived in Paraguay about 12 years ago. She has since organized an impressive collection of artifacts and other materials related to the aboriginal Indian tribes of Paraguay, which is housed in the Andrés Barbero Museum (España 217, Asuncion). The museum also contains a library devoted to books and journals on ethnology for all of Latin America. In their present state of professional organization the museum and library comprise one of the finest social science resources in the country, and are a valuable base for any foreign ethnologist working in Paraguay.

Another potential nucleus for sociological research is a group of relatively young and progressive Jesuit teachers in the Colegio Cristo Rey, the site of the Faculty of Philosophy and Educational Sciences of the Catholic University. They include the dean, Dr. Ramón Juste, an anthropologist and a dynamic administrator, who has already been mentioned; Dr. Luis Ramallo, who holds a Ph.D. in psychology from Harvard University; and Father Pascual Paez, a sociologist, as well as a few other members of the faculty. Dr. Ramallo is absent from Paraguay this year to offer a course in the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) in Santiago, Chile, and thus was not available for an interview.

The Colegio Cristo Rey group is devoted to promoting the application of social research to the solution of Paraguayan social problems and consider this part of their religious mission. They would like to develop a well-rounded social science program in their own faculty which would include philosophy and education as well as history, psychology and sociology. This has brought them into conflict with other branches of the university, particularly the Law Faculty, and the office of the rector, which are dominated by older, more conservative priests and lay faculty. Dr. Juste believes that sociology, as it is now taught in the Law Faculty, is characterized by a legalistic rather than an empirical and applied approach and is not geared to the needs of the country or of the teachers being trained in his faculty. The dean of the Law Faculty has, however, resisted the efforts of the Faculty of Philosophy and Education to introduce modern sociology into its program, and as a countermeasure has proposed a new institute of sociology to be set up under the exclusive control of the Law Faculty and with a strong legal orientation.

The controversy over the social science curriculum in the Catholic University is a reflection of the general conflict between younger and older clergy that has affected the entire Catholic world. When the rector of the university was recently designated by Pope Paul VI to be the successor to the aging Archbishop of Asuncion, a group of younger priests, including the Colegio Cristo Rey group, protested in a petition that caused the Pope to reverse his decision. This action has embittered the rector, who cut off all financial support to the Philosophy Faculty. Work on the construction of a new building was halted, and the Colegio, which offers instruction at the primary, secondary and higher education levels in a single set of buildings, must depend on the Jesuit order for its support. Nevertheless, it maintains in a converted storeroom one of the best organized—even small—general libraries in Paraguay, with about 12,000 volumes well cataloged and accessible to its students. (This contrasts strongly with the library services in the National University.)

The Colegio Cristo Rey group has recently brought out a compendium of social data on the Paraguayan social system, collected from many sources and with no apparent plan of organization. However, the text includes descriptions of various aspects of the social system that are undisguisedly critical of current conditions.

**Demography**—In the field of population studies, the chief professional demographer is Dr. Arnaldo Silvero,
an employee of the government's central planning agency (División de Programación Social de la Secretaría Tecnica de Planificación). His division has made analyses of population based on the Census of 1950 and 1962, and estimated projections to 1970, summaries of which have been published in the two sociological and anthropological journals. (See Appendix C.) However, there has been little analysis of earlier census materials on a national scale. The work on population migration of Domingo M. Rivarola and Branislava Susnik has already been mentioned. Emilio Fadlala, an economist in the Faculty of Architecture of the National University, has conducted local surveys of population and housing in the communities of San Lorenzo (1964), Lambare (1966), and Fernando de la Mora (1967). (See Appendix C.)

Economics—Until recently nearly all of the effective economic research in Paraguay was carried out by or at the initiative of technicians with the U.S. Operations Mission, or by such international agencies as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank. These studies, some of which have already been described, are only partially available in published form.

Under the impulse of the Alliance for Progress, however, President Alfredo Stroessner authorized in 1962 the creation of a national planning authority directly responsible to his office, to be known as the Secretaría Técnica de Planificación del Desarrollo Económico y Social. Within this agency a rather hurried effort has been made to build up a staff of technically trained economists and planners who could guide a series of two-year and five-year national plans.

The first task of this group was to assemble all of the available information about economic conditions in Paraguay, particularly in the primary, or extractive, sector. This was published in September 1963 as an historical review and evaluation called Antecedentes y diagnóstico preliminar del sector agropecuario y forestal. Discussion of this report led to its revision and amplification during the following year, but assertedly because of printing costs the full text of the second diagnosis was not published. Only a summary containing the conclusions became available as the Síntesis del diagnóstico del sector agropecuario y forestal.

The government used the second diagnosis as the basis of its first Biennial Economic and Social Development Plan, which after considerable public discussion was put into effect in July 1965. The use of planning and programming techniques required several of the government's operating agencies, including the Institute of Rural Welfare, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, the Central Bank and the National Development Bank to set up their own planning departments—a task for which the country was ill equipped for lack of trained professionals.

Under the National Development Plan, a series of priorities for programs by products, by services and by areas was established. The products selected for highest priority were wheat, tobacco, cotton and vegetable oils. An economic study of the production and marketing of each of these products was initiated. Under area programs, the government gave highest priority to a program of the Institute of Rural Welfare (Instituto de Bienestar Rural, IBR) for the "Consolidation of Colonies" to promote a more efficient use of land resources. Under service programs, similar priority was given to an integrated study of agricultural credit, in which no less than seven domestic agencies and three international agencies have been involved. In preparation for the second two-year plan covering 1967–68, a third Diagnosis of Paraguayan Agriculture and Forestry was compiled which contains a comprehensive set of official data relating to this sector.

Following his reelection to another five-year term in February of this year, President Stroessner called for the immediate preparation of the data for a five-year plan to begin in 1969. Members of the planning secretariat are now at work on this plan, with the occasional technical assistance of members of the U.S.-AID Mission.

Other branches of the Paraguayan government not directly engaged in the planning operation, such as the National Development Bank, carry on their own economic studies in relation with internal operations, but these become available only as statistical reports in such official publications as the Boletín Estadístico Mensual (reasonably current) of the Department of Economic Studies of the Central Bank, and the Memoria, or annual report of the Bank (four years behind in publication).

The most significant nongovernment research in economics is being carried on by a relatively new private organization, the Centro Paraguayo de Estudios de Desarrollo Económico y Social (CEPADES). This center was founded in 1960 to offer a training program in economic and social development planning, and was patterned closely after the Latin American Institute of Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America in Santiago, Chile. The center has given one-year training courses to over 100 technicians, chiefly economists, most of whom are now employed in planning operations within the Paraguayan government. The National University recognizes the CEPADES teaching program as a form of advanced training, for which a certificate is awarded that bears the signatures of the rector of the University and the dean of the Faculty of Economic Sciences. However, the center operates as a private institution; its main financial support comes from fees charged to students and from funds provided until 1965 by the Technical Assistance program of the United Nations, and thereafter by the Inter-American Development Bank. The Paraguayan government provides space for the center in rather inadequate quarters in the National Library.

The research activities of CEPADES consist of par-
ticipation by some members of its staff in three studies related to the economic integration of Latin America under the general direction of Joseph Gruwald of the Brookings Institution. These studies are part of a cooperative research program being carried on by economics research institutes in the eleven countries that comprise the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA). The three studies in which CEPADES is participating are to obtain uniform information for inter-American comparisons of income and consumption patterns; wages in manufacturing; and prices, purchasing power of currencies and gross national product among the LAFTA countries. One of the advantages of this type of cooperative, internationally sponsored research is that it seeks to develop and apply common techniques of investigation and standards of reliability, and thus tends to raise the level of research as it has previously been carried on in Paraguay. This effort is as yet barely under way, but it is one of the most promising developments in Paraguay in the direction of effective economic research.

History—There are a number of Paraguayan historians, most of whom work as individual scholars without institutional support, but some of whom also hold teaching posts in the universities. The two leading historians who have attained international recognition are Dr. Julio César Chaves and Dr. Efraim Cardozo. Dr. Chaves, whose principal work is the Compendio de la historia paraguaya,17 is president of the Instituto Paraguayo de Investigaciones Históricas. This organization began to publish its annals in 1956 under the title La historia paraguaya, and they have appeared irregularly since. Dr. Chaves is reputed to have one of the finest private historical libraries in Paraguay—a collection of some 16,000 items, including at least 1,000 items on Paraguay and the remainder on the Cuencas del Paraguay and on other Latin American countries.

Dr. Cardozo regularly researches the documents contained in the National Archives and publishes a running account of the events of a century earlier in La Tribuna, one of Asunción's leading daily newspapers.18 His Breve historia del Paraguay19 is now used as a basic textbook in the National University of Asunción and is considered by outside scholars as representing an improvement in objectivity over historical texts previously used.

Dr. Carlos Pusinieri is president of the Casa de la Independencia, an organization that maintains an historical shrine in one of the colonial houses of Asunción, and that seeks to provide historians with access to collections of documents that may be in private hands. Other Paraguayan historians include Dr. Carlos R. Centurión, Dr. Juan B. Gill Aquinaga, Dr. Marcos A. Leonich, Dr. Mariano Luis Lara Castro, Dr. Juan Isidro Ramírez, Dr. Benigno Riquelme, Dr. Rafael Eladio Velazquez and Dr. Carlos Zubizarreta.

Respondents to the survey who have conducted historical research in Paraguay reported that local historians and others, including public officials, were often extremely cordial and helpful in providing guidance to local sources and in securing access to privately held documents. One American historian was even able to gain entrance, through a personal friend, to the ordinarily restricted Foreign Office Archives.

However, a common complaint is that the public depositories are poorly maintained, inadequately cataloged and staffed by untrained librarians, while some of the most significant materials are in private hands and inaccessible except through close personal contact. It is not uncommon for retired military officers to retain official documents which they propose to use to prepare favorable accounts of military campaigns, or for retired presidents and other officials to withhold public records which they may need for their memoirs. One private collector offered microfilms of his materials for a fee, but insisted on controlling the selection of documents that he would release. These are conditions that a working historian might encounter in any country, but are particularly constricting to research where the public archives are so incomplete. Even for the Paraguayan historian the limitations may be severe. As has been noted, many historical records were captured in the Battle of Piribebuy and removed to Brazil. The contemporary Paraguayan historian who is not a member of the party in power may not be able to obtain government data that are considered to have political significance. Several instances of this sort were reported in the survey.

Geography—Little current research in geography has been done by Paraguayans. Geografia del Paraguay, a general work by Juan Natalicio González, was compiled by a former president of the country who died in 1966.20 It is written in a journalistic style and is not documented. An earlier work with the same title by Hugo Ferreira Gubetiç is now in its sixth edition.21

Paraguay, with its diversity of regional characteristics, offers a considerable field for geographic exploration and description. Yet since the main outlet for geographic studies will probably continue to be the elementary and secondary school classroom, it is unlikely that the professional career of geographer will develop in the foreseeable future.

Education and Psychology—These are also neglected fields of research, since the faculties of education are mainly occupied with training teachers for the elementary level and in sufficient numbers to meet basic needs. Although some students at the Colegio Cristo Rey have expressed interest in pursuing advanced work in psychology, no professional career requiring such training has yet emerged. Even the career of school guidance counselor, demanding as it does some knowledge of psychology, is not likely to open up while other needs are so much more urgent.
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SPECIAL PROBLEMS AFFECTING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN PARAGUAY

In response to the survey questionnaire, American researchers who have worked in Paraguay described special problems that make research as it is carried out in the United States particularly difficult. These problems vary, of course, with the field of investigation and the nature of the study, but in general they impose exceptional requirements of patience, ingenuity and persistence on the serious investigator.

Research Facilities and Access to Data—Most American researchers do background reading before beginning a study, and historians rely upon reviewing documents. Both practices are difficult in Paraguay because of the paucity of library materials, their unorganized state and the absence of trained library staff to provide research assistance.

Paraguay has had until recently no institution or teaching program dedicated to the training of librarians. According to Dr. Gaston Litton, a resident American archivist and library consultant, there is no librarian in the country who may be considered fully trained. (Dr. Litton is a member of an advisory team supplied by the State University of New York at Buffalo under a contract with the U.S.-AID Mission to provide technical assistance to the National University of Asuncion in carrying out the terms of a $1,500,000 loan from the Inter-American Development Bank. His chief assignment is to help develop a central library for the National University.) A few Paraguayans have attended rudimentary library programs in Argentina, but only three or four have taken advanced work at the principal Latin American training center in Medellin, Colombia, or at library schools in the United States, and none has so far earned a master’s degree in library science or has the equivalent in experience.

At the request of the National University, in April 1968 Dr. Litton organized a special training program for librarians emphasizing the minimum requirements. It consists of six basic courses in library methods offered in the School of Public Administration of the Faculty of Economic, Administrative, and Accounting Sciences. The courses are staffed by Mrs. Arlene Campbell, the wife of a U.S. specialist, Miss Dorothy Graham, a Peace Corps Volunteer, both of whom are graduate librarians; and Dr. Litton, the director of the program. One of the objectives of the project is to train Paraguayan counterparts supplied by the School of Public Administration who will become teachers in the library program after the American staff leaves. About 20 students have been in regular attendance.

The previous lack of training and the low economic level of the country account in large part for the present condition of the public libraries. The national superintendent of libraries and museums is Juan Emilio O’Leary, a poet and historian who is best known for his eulogy of the nineteenth-century dictator Francisco Solano López, which raised López to the status of a national hero. Dr. O’Leary is 88, and is popularly known as “El Bronce” for the bronze bust erected to him in the Parque de los Heroes, the central square of Asuncion.

The Biblioteca Nacional is housed in a modern building presented to Paraguay by the Argentine government, but the building has been poorly maintained and has inadequate illumination. There is no card catalog, and the entire general collection is so limited that it is contained in two tiers of shelves in one room. The only classification is a typed list of titles compiled as books are acquired. The collection of Paraguayan publications is very small, and while it may contain useful material, it is also unorganized.

The more recently established Biblioteca Municipal is insecurely located in the central area of the city. It occupies rented quarters and has moved twice during the past year. The entire collection is limited to a few hundred books and cannot be considered significant for research purposes.

The Archivo Nacional, which is the principal working library for the historian, contains a valuable collection of newspapers, as well as government reports, testamentary wills and books on Paraguayan history. Virtually all of the holdings date from the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth centuries. Despite their historical value, these materials are in a very poor state of preservation and are deteriorating rapidly. The lighting in the dilapidated building is so poor that the archives must close when daylight fades. Because of overcrowding, some books and newspapers are stored in an open courtyard, subject to the weather. As in the public libraries, there is no card catalog, and it is necessary to locate material with the help of the single untrained custodian. Some of the documents in the collection have been microfilmed, but the only microfilm reader is a small portable which is so inconvenient that it is rarely used.

There are other and more adequate general library facilities in Asuncion, such as the Biblioteca Franklin Delano Roosevelt of the Centro Cultural Paraguayo Americano and the library of the Colegio Cristo Rey. Each contains over 10,000 volumes (the former mainly in English) and a small collection of books related to Paraguay. They are well organized and offer some facilities for the working scholar, but cannot be called research libraries. The acting librarian of the Roosevelt Library has had some specialized training at Peabody College in Tennessee and at the Inter-American Library School of the University of Antioquia in Medellin.

Some government agencies, such as the Central Bank, maintain specialized libraries in such fields as economics and public administration, and the foreign researcher can usually gain access to these collections by special permission. The U.S.-AID Mission maintains a small staff library which is useful chiefly for its file of Operations Mission reports, some of which have been reduced to a single remaining copy. The ethnological library of the Museo Andrés Barbero has already been mentioned.
The finest general libraries in Paraguay, some containing unique materials relating to the country's history, are to be found in private homes and can only be consulted by making personal arrangements. Two of the best are those of Dr. Julio César Chaves, the historian, and Edgar Ynfrán, a former Minister of the Interior under the present government.

The library resources of the National University consist of small scattered collections attached to the various faculties of the university. The current plan for expansion of the university calls for the establishment of a central library on a new campus at San Lorenzo, about five miles outside the city of Asuncion. Progress in the creation of this library has been slow, in part because of the reluctance of the deans of the faculties to commit themselves to a new suburban location. They object to the site as inconvenient for part-time teachers and students whose principal employment is in the central city. As a consequence, Dr. Litton has considered it inadvisable to try to combine the existing faculty libraries into a single collection. The new library will be assembled completely from new materials and will be housed temporarily in rented quarters over a stonemason's shop in downtown Asuncion. After two years, it is planned to relocate the central library in a combined administration and library building on the San Lorenzo campus. A list of recommended books and furniture was submitted in early 1967, but administrative delays left the orders unplaced at the time of my visit over a year later.

The North American researcher will also encounter unusual difficulty in locating reliable social and economic data. In some cases, the problem is simply a reflection of the fact that Paraguay is an underdeveloped country. For example, Joseph Pincus asserts:

There are no reliable data on the Gross National Product (GNP) of Paraguay. . . . The methodology employed in compiling the national accounts has been so poor, the number of persons working in the field so limited, and the budget for statistical investigation so insignificant, that the validity of the data is rather low. The Subcommittee of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) that reviewed the Paraguayan economy in November, 1965, remarked upon the poor quality of the country's statistical information and urged an immediate improvement in Paraguay's statistical services, leading toward a total reform of the national statistics system.22

Dr. Pincus adds that agricultural statistics are also highly unreliable. “There is no crop reporting system in Paraguay, and the production figures are 'made up' in the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock. Moreover, the figures published in various sources vary as much as 100 percent.”23

On the other hand, an economist currently working for the U.S.-AID Mission in Paraguay believes that there are many sources of data in the government ministries that would be useful for cross-checking and for establishing the reliability of benchmark data for earlier dates. These would require a team of investigators to “dig out,” as well as the cooperation of the government officials in charge.

In some instances, however, such information is treated as a state secret and would be virtually impossible to obtain. Examples are the number of property titles actually granted to farmers under the current land reform program, and information concerning the internal operations of the Central Bank in financing the national deficit and stabilizing the exchange rate. Dr. Pincus reports that in May 1966, he attempted to obtain data from the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock concerning the distribution of large landholdings as between Paraguayan and foreign landowners and was told that the pertinent tabulation cards from the 1961 census had been “thrown away.”24

Of course, all countries treat some military and other classified information as top secret, and some current economic statistics, such as those relating to central bank operations, as highly confidential. Yet this condition seems to be more prevalent in Paraguay, and is particularly burdensome to the social scientist because so much factual information can be obtained only from governmentally controlled sources.

Other problems affect the anthropologist who wishes to do field work in Paraguay. Even in the larger towns, except for Asuncion, living conditions are quite primitive and communications with the interior are difficult. It is not easy for the ethnologist to make a preliminary general survey of the country in order to determine which locality best suits his purposes for study. The remnants of the three major indigenous groups, the Guaraní, the Moro and the Guayaki, live in small, isolated communities and are generally hostile to outsiders. Dr. Branislava Susnik, who has worked extensively on the cultural histories of these groups, believes that further studies of their acculturation as a result of contact with other tribes and with criollo society would be useful, but points out that seven distinct languages, as well as a number of subsidiary dialects, are required to communicate with all of the indigenous peoples represented in Paraguay. She believes that foreign anthropologists can hope to cope with these problems only by first providing advanced training in the United States or Europe for a few carefully selected Paraguayans, and then working with them as a team in their native country. Present conditions in Paraguay do not offer the promise of a career for the native anthropologist working alone; nor can the foreign anthropologist acclimate himself sufficiently within the usual period available for field work. Hence a team operation is essential.

The Political Climate—The political atmosphere in Paraguay was characterized by a recent observer as follows:

The Government of Paraguay under the Alfredo Stroessner Administration operates as a more or
less benevolent autocracy through a republican form. The elite group is the military, which assures stability of the regime. There is little doubt, however, that the regime has the support of the majority of the people. A substantial degree of individual freedom is permitted and, by February, 1967, all major political parties in Paraguay had been recognized by the government. Thus all important groups were able to participate in the process of revising the 1940 Constitution, which began in 1966. The major purpose of the constitutional revision presumably was to permit President Stroessner to run again for that office in the 1968 elections.

Opposition newspapers are vociferous in their criticism of the Administration and are quick to point out instances of corruption and inefficiency in the public sector. Nevertheless, there is an unwritten but well-understood proscription against direct criticism of the President, his family, and his friends. Political satire and caricatures are absent in Paraguay. A state of siege continues in certain parts of the country, and a number of political prisoners reportedly are held in jail.  

This appears to be a balanced appraisal, to which may be added the observation that the business community no longer seems to be under tight political control, nor so subject to political favors and discrimination as it was a few years ago, when economic conditions were more austere. It is no longer necessary for all of the principal officers of a successful business firm to be members of the party in power, and members of competing parties may work cooperatively for commercial purposes. University students are permitted a degree of dissent and have recently been carrying on a campaign against the policies of Dr. Crispín Insaurralde, the elderly rector of the National University and long-time leader of the Red Banner (Giunón Rojo) wing of the Colorado Party.

Persistent political criticism has also come from younger members of the Catholic clergy, notably Father Gilberto Jiménez, director of Comunidad, a weekly tabloid newspaper, and the Jesuit teachers in the Colegio Cristo Rey. Their complaints are rarely directed at the person of the president, but against lesser figures and against social conditions they would like to see improved.

The present atmosphere of tolerated dissent has increased the prospect for genuinely free inquiry in Paraguay, and in certain fields and on many subjects there is virtually no problem. However, this report has already suggested that taboos still exist in some areas of interest, and that the foreign investigator must expect that not only he but his subjects will be under occasional, if not constant, surveillance. Of about 29,000 employees in the public service, excluding the military, some 8,000 are reported to be in the police forces, and this reflects the importance that the government attaches to this means of maintaining political stability.

The effect of the political situation on academic work was specifically constricting in a few cases. One researcher who had conducted the major part of a politically sensitive study outside of the country decided not to continue the investigation inside Paraguay when placed under virtual house arrest shortly after arriving in the country. In another instance, the writer of an article prepared with a Paraguayan collaborator omitted details in the Spanish version that might have been construed as politically biased and therefore might have endangered his co-worker's position. Another social scientist, who had been a visiting lecturer in the country, decided not to publish a critical report based on his stay for fear that it would create difficulties for future visiting lecturers and would interfere with an educational exchange program that he hoped to establish with his own university. He subsequently found that it was exceedingly difficult for a selected student who was not a member of the Colorado Party to secure an exit visa for study abroad, though in time this problem seems to have eased.

An earlier instance of the effect of political considerations on research reliability was reported by an American statistician who was provided by the United Nations to the government of Paraguay to improve the techniques of the central statistical bureau. He spent a year compiling and refining the statistics on Paraguay's foreign trade, a task made particularly difficult by the need to determine correct values for exports and imports subject to a wide variety of multiple exchange rates. When the revised data were ultimately published, after he had left the country, he discovered that they had been systematically altered to make a better picture for political purposes.

The Condition of the Universities—It has been pointed out that the present state of the two Paraguayan universities is not conducive to the promotion of social research. Both are dominated by aging and unprogressive administrations. The most progressive deans in the social sciences, Dr. Hermógenes González Maya of the Economics Faculty of the National University, and Father Ramón Juste of the Philosophy Faculty of the Catholic University, have been unable to overcome the general stagnation.

Dr. González Maya, who is also the vice rector of the National University, has succeeded during the past 14 years in revitalizing the teaching program in his branch of the university, which is now known as the Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Administrativas y Contables. Formerly confined to the traditional fields of accounting and business law, this faculty is now divided into three schools which offer specializations leading to doctorates in economics, administration and accounting. Each specialty requires proficiency in either English, French or German, as well as the preparation of a thesis, and represents a considerable improvement in standards. The chief innovation in the content of the program has been the creation of a curriculum in public administration directed by Dr. Fernando José Ayala, an energetic
young leader in university affairs. (His school has provided a home for the specialized program in library methods.)

Dr. Juste's contributions as dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Educational Sciences of the Catholic University and as a working anthropologist have already been described.

Despite the efforts of these and a few other outstanding deans, both universities have recently failed to utilize substantial offers of financial assistance which might have improved the educational environment. As a result of the Burns report, the National University embarked upon a plan of reorganization in 1961 which was to be financed by U.S.-AID. The plan called for the creation of a School of General Studies to provide a year of basic science and humanities studies common to all faculties that would be required of all students in the university, preferably on a central campus. Ultimately the school was to provide the foundation for a departmentalized university at the higher levels.

The Burns plan, which was modeled on a North American liberal arts college, was almost totally foreign to the experience of the Paraguayan faculty and students, who objected to the interference it would create with their normal pattern of life. Although the plan was enthusiastically supported by Rector Insaurralde, his influence waned when it was discovered he intended to appoint his daughter director of the new School of General Studies.

The plan was revived in March 1965, when the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) granted a loan of $1,500,000 from the Social Progress Trust Fund to the National University for the reorganization and expansion of its program. The loan was to finance the creation of a School of General Studies, the strengthening of scientific and technical faculties, the establishment of a central campus (the Ciudad Universitaria at San Lorenzo), and the construction of a central library to be equipped with a scientific documentation center annex. The Paraguayan government agreed as part of the loan contract to supply the equivalent of $650,000 in guaraní counterpart funds to meet local costs, and the loan was later supplemented by a grant of $100,000 from U.S.-AID to provide consultants as advisors in the execution of the plans. A team of consultants was subsequently supplied by the State University of New York at Buffalo under the terms of a contract with AID.

Although the IDB loan called for comprehensive plans to modernize the university—both administration and curriculum; to construct new buildings on a centralized campus and to equip them with library and laboratory facilities, unaccountably the loan did not provide for the training of Paraguayan students and teachers abroad, which is probably what the university needs most acutely to achieve internal reform.

During the initial three-year period in which the University was to begin utilization of the loan, little was accomplished. An Institute of Science, which was created in 1963 by UNESCO with a grant of $250,000, and which was to be incorporated in the new plan, was already well under way. However, there is no coordination between the basic science instruction in this institute and the courses taught in the technical Faculties of Engineering and of Agronomy and Veterinary Medicine. The creation of the central university library is moving slowly, as we have seen; construction of buildings on the San Lorenzo campus is at a standstill; and the plans for the School of General Studies have virtually been abandoned. At the end of three years, the representative of the Inter-American Development Bank threatened to recommend that the loan be withdrawn, but was persuaded to extend the period during which the university could formulate its plans.

No satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming from the university administration for its failure to utilize the exceptional opportunity provided by the IDB loan to expand its facilities, and it was well into 1968 before a report was issued on the progress of planning. In the meantime disension continued over the proposals for a suburban campus and a program of general studies, and rumors circulated that the proceeds of the loan, or at least the guaraní counterpart, were being into private hands associated with the university administration. The American and IDB administrators of the loan denied these allegations, insofar as they applied to the dollar allocations of funds. They attributed the delays to administrative inexperience and to disagreement over the desirability of carrying out the planned objectives. It seems hard to avoid the conclusion, however, that nepotism and political favoritism were at the root of much of the administrative inefficiency within the university.

Late in 1968 Rector Insaurralde came under attack once more for having approved the commissioning of a Brazilian architectural firm to prepare the construction plans for the Ciudad Universitaria. The deans of the Faculties of Architecture and Engineering and their student and faculty supporters were incensed that the contract had been awarded to a foreign firm and opposed the award on patriotic grounds. It was evident that they felt that their own faculties should have the opportunity to draw the plans. The contract was thereupon rescinded on November 28, 1968, with the result that the planning operation was certain to undergo further delay.

The Catholic University has had a similar, though smaller, opportunity to utilize a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank. Initiative in securing the loan was taken by the Colegio Cristo Rey group, but when the Bank offered $600,000, the amount was too large for the Faculty of Philosophy and Educational Sciences to undertake by itself. The IDB then made the loan to the entire university through the office of the rector, Monsignor Juan Moleón. However, a member of the Cristo Rey faculty charged that a year after the loan had been granted, the only expenditure had been $150,000 for the construction of a new rectory.

It is clear that at the present time Paraguay's two uni-
Universities and its public library system are suffering from unprogressive educational policies and are failing to provide an environment in which social research can flourish. Consequently, it has been necessary for most working scholars and researchers to carry on their activities in private institutes or as personal pursuits. It is not possible to predict how long this condition will continue.

Limiting Characteristics of the Paraguayan Economy and Society—Although there is a considerable variety of areas for fruitful social science research in Paraguay, the nature of the country itself limits the range of topics that may be investigated. The economy in its present underdeveloped state is comparatively small and undiversified. The principal resources are those of agriculture, livestock raising and forestry. For practical purposes there is no mining sector and only rudimentary manufacturing and transportation sectors. Commercial and financial activities are more significant and have unique features that make them interesting subjects for study.

The social characteristics of Paraguay are similarly limited by the country's degree of development and by traditional types of control. Peasant movements are virtually unknown, and the labor movement under the present regime is dormant, if not suppressed. There is only a small middle class, made up of merchants, government officials and professional and white collar workers. The evolution of this class is, of course, noteworthy, as are the complex political identifications of the traditional parties and their internal factions.

Paraguayan society thus tends to be rather homogeneous, except for the circumstance that it still includes remnants of a variety of tribes who populated the region before the arrival of the Spaniards, and that in recent times the country has been a focus for small but culturally significant groups of colonists: Australian socialists; Mennonites and Hutterites from Germany, the Soviet Union, Canada and the United States; Japanese and Korean farmers; immigrants from Argentina and Brazil; Jewish and Nazi refugees from war-torn Europe; and even coffee growers from the United States.

The effective study of such diverse groups requires a knowledge of the appropriate languages; some Japanese colonists in remote rural areas are said to speak only Japanese and Guarani. Guarani is prevalent throughout the countryside and is probably the first language learned by most Paraguayan children. Joan Rubin describes it as the language of affection (intimacy) and command in Paraguayan society; among educated bilingual Paraguayans living in Asuncion, the choice of Guarani corresponds to the use of the familiar form in Spanish and other European languages. A knowledge of Guarani is essential for some types of sociological research.

Opportunities for Productive Research

Paraguay offers many opportunities for social research, within the limitations that have already been described. Some suggestions arising from the survey for particularly promising or urgently needed types of investigation will be made below, following a brief review of the working experience to date.

Reception of U.S. Scholars in Paraguay—Visiting representatives of North American colleges and universities have in general been well received in Paraguay. During the course of the survey, no complaints were received from Paraguayan scholars that American researchers had made undue demands on their time or unfairly exploited the products of their own research. (In part this may merely reflect the fact that very few American social scientists have actually spent extended periods in Paraguay to carry on research.) To the contrary, most of the members of the small Paraguayan professional community are eager for more outside intellectual contact and are willing to offer significant personal assistance in locating data and in facilitating research as their means allow. Some see definite advantages in becoming more familiar with specialized research methods through demonstration by visiting investigators and through guest seminars in which their own students can participate. In turn these students are often willing to carry out field work, such as questionnaire surveys, for little or no compensation.

One American researcher observed that so many groups from both North America and Europe had begun to study the Mennonite community and its relations with neighboring Indians that both the Indians and the settlers had developed a negative attitude toward researchers in general. This seems to have been a purely local condition.

Perhaps because of its geographic and political isolation, Paraguay did not feel the repercussions of Project Camelot when they occurred in Chile, and hence there was no evidence of the development of resultant suspicion or hostility toward representatives of North American universities. Within the academic community there has been some criticism of the financial assistance allegedly given by the American government in support of the Stroessner government and of the close working relationship said to exist between the American military mission and the Paraguayan armed forces; yet no one suggested that such relationships would impair the scholarly integrity of Americans arriving under officially sponsored exchange programs.

The only direct criticisms of visiting scholars that were reiterated were that they frequently do not have a command of Spanish, and hence cannot be effective either as teachers or researchers for many months; and that they are often naive in accepting as fact information received from casual acquaintances who have a political bias or a personal ax to grind. One investigator in particular was criticized for relying on a village priest as his
principal interpreter when interviewing members of the community, with the result that much of his information was filtered through an attitudinally biased channel.

National pride sometimes affects relations with foreign visitors. One invitation for a visiting American historian to conduct lectures on research methods and Paraguayan history in the National University was withdrawn after a group of students objected to having a citizen of the United States teach Paraguayan history. In another case, a proposed survey project involving the use of trained Uruguayan interviewers was strongly opposed on the grounds that the interviewers must be Paraguayans (although American supervisors would have been accepted). In such cases there may also be an element of economic interest as well as of personal prestige. It is often difficult for university deans to provide visiting lecturers with courses to teach, since most of the curriculum is strictly prescribed and each existing course has at least one Paraguayan professor assigned to it who cannot be displaced without loss of his pride and income, however small the latter may be.

Several respondents to the survey stressed that one of the most important ways to maintain the confidence of Paraguayans and thereby to insure good working conditions for future visiting researchers is to respect strictly the anonymity of informants and to keep in confidence political opinions that may be uttered in private conversations. Paraguayans tend to be an open, friendly people and often express themselves quite freely in intimate conversations without considering how such expressions may appear if published in a form that can be traced back. Paraguayan communities and intellectual circles, even in the city, are actually quite small, informants may be fairly easily identified through association, and the penalties for making controversial statements to outsiders may be severe.

In summary, the reception of U.S. scholars in Paraguay has been almost uniformly cordial, and there is considerable room for expansion of research activity in the country.

Suggested Areas of Investigation—In the course of the survey several suggestions were made for projects that would be useful within Paraguay, as well as providing general descriptive information for outsiders. These suggestions included the need for a comprehensive demographic and social history; a general economic history; a well-documented description of present-day Paraguay and its basic institutions, including the political system; and a definitive history of the War of the Triple Alliance, none of which is now available. Such works are no doubt needed, and if carried out with care and objectivity could be standard textual references.

However, such works would necessarily be the product of scholars who could engage in each study for a long enough period to become thoroughly familiar with the Paraguayan environment, and these may be few. The suggestions that follow chiefly concern more specialized topics that might be investigated by North American doctoral candidates subject to the usual limitation of a year in the field, or by postdoctoral researchers who do not necessarily intend to become specialists on Paraguay. The topics mentioned are not intended to exhaust the possibilities—merely to be suggestive.

In the fields of anthropology and sociology, Paraguay affords abundant opportunities for ethnological and community studies. Dr. Branislava Susnik, who has devoted much of her research to the historical past, believes the current period affords unique situations for ethnological field work among the remaining indigenous groups before they are assimilated to the rest of the population, and that the criollo populations as well merit description while they are still relatively stable communities.

Many of the immigrant colonies have not yet been fully described, especially in respect to recent social changes. For example, there is the untold story of the Hutterite colony of Primavera, once a thriving community with its own skilled woodcraft industry, but since dispersed as a result of a bitter conflict between the generations. In contrast, some of the Japanese colonies have been amazingly successful. These immigrants arrived with few resources to become "stoop" farmers, but some in the first generation are now entering the merchant class in Asuncion and even sending their children to college in the United States. The new frontier colonies in the Acaray-Monday region are also promising subjects for study, as Paraguay's land reform program is concentrated in this zone and mechanized agriculture is beginning to take hold. Moreover, it is an area strongly subject to Brazilian influence on consumption standards. At another point on the Brazilian border is the American colony of Pedro Juan Caballero, which began as a community of coffee planters, and now prospers on contraband trade. Far from the centers of control, it operates much as a town of the Wild West and has attracted a particular "breed" of settler.

In the field of economics, despite the difficulties mentioned in this report, exploratory studies may be possible on the relative prosperity and stability of Paraguay in the current period, whether due primarily to an unregulated trade policy, to foreign economic assistance or to other factors. It appears that the record of foreign aid (chiefly in the form of U.S. and Brazilian assistance) has been exceptionally good in Paraguay, perhaps in part because it has been concentrated in strategic sectors such as transportation and agriculture. Certainly the effect of improved internal communications on development is beginning to be demonstrated in Paraguay and should be examined for its manifold linkages.

During the coming period the effort to create appropriate financial institutions in banking, insurance and securities markets may prove interesting, and it may become feasible to conduct a monetary and financial survey of the Paraguayan economy tracing its evolution from the former multiple-exchange rate period through the reform of 1957 and its consequences. As time passes
and the political issues involved become less sensitive, data on this period should become increasingly available.

There are also opportunities for studies in the field of entrepreneurial history, such as an account of Azucarerera Paraguay, a sugar company closely held by four families, three of Dutch origin. The firm controls 190 miles of private railway and embraces a company town (Tebicuarí) with some 250 employee families. While firms of this size are uncommon, some of them have uniquely interesting aspects in the Paraguayan setting. Such firms include Industria Paraguaya, the Carlos Casado enterprise, and the International Products Company.

In the field of general history, the opportunities will depend to a considerable extent on a diligent search of the documents, many of which have not yet been exploited. Harris G. Warren has turned up many sidelights on Paraguayan history in pursuit of his larger goal of a general history of Paraguay during the period of reconstruction, 1870 to 1928, and John Hoyt Williams has similarly found material for special articles on the now extinct Negro population of Paraguay in connection with his research on the regime of Dr. Francia.

In an interview Magnus Mören asserted that he believes it is time for a criticism of the early chronicles relating to the Cuenca del Paraguay, and he suggested the construction of a history of technology and science dating at least from the time of the Jesuit reductions, similar to a recent history of engineering in Venezuela.

In the field of education, or perhaps of public administration, an illuminating study could be made of the basis on which the Inter-American Development Bank reached a decision to extend substantial financial assistance to higher education in Paraguay, and the subsequent frustrations when this program (to date) could not be implemented. This is, of course, a sensitive subject with many ramifications, but assuming the investigation could be properly carried out, it would throw a great deal of light on the problems of development in an underdeveloped society. It would also raise questions about the adequacy of the preparatory planning in undertaking a program of this type.

Other research topics and investigative approaches will undoubtedly occur to social scientists with a different background from the writer’s. For this reason, any major project would justify a preliminary visit to the country to examine its feasibility in the local milieu. Some visitors to Paraguay have felt that the limitations on rigorous investigation have exceeded the probable fruitfulness of an undertaking; others have been attracted by the virgin character of the research landscape. This choice can really be decided only in the actual environment.

Stimulation of Collaborative Efforts and Training—In the course of this survey, North American researchers were asked about the desirability of coordinating scholarly efforts in Latin America, and for suggestions as to how this might be done. Few of the respondents saw any need for this type of coordination on the part of American scholars in Paraguay, since there are so few of them in residence at any given time, other than to provide them with a common file of bibliographical material.

Yet a number of respondents stressed the desirability of increasing collaboration with the nuclei of empirical investigators that have begun to form in Asuncion. These groups of Paraguayan scholars are important to provide the thread of continuity that keeps research alive and stimulates training of local assistants essential to any survey type of operation. In addition, they are enormously helpful to short-term visitors. They are beginning to accumulate the specialized libraries and data banks that will become more and more useful as they grow, and they support the outlets for scholarly publication within the country. For all of these reasons, every visiting American scholar, whether a teacher, consultant or research investigator, should contact these centers and, when feasible, offer his services in the training process. This type of collaboration and coordination is highly important in helping to improve the research situation in Paraguay—a matter of concern both to the domestic and to the foreign scholar.
NOTES


16. This report is available in a convenient translation made by Dr. Adlai F. Arnold, an agricultural economist in the U.S.-AID Mission; National Secretariat of Planning in the Presidency of the Republic, *Diagnosis of Paraguayan Agriculture and Forestry*. Asuncion, April 1968.


18. A collection of these articles has appeared as *Hace cien años: crónica de la Guerra de 1864-70 publicada en "La Tribuna" de Asunción en el Centenario de la Epopeya Nacional*, Asuncion: Emusa, 1967.
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Young, Robert J. "Preliminary Management Survey, Ministry of Education and Worship, Republic of Paraguay."


General


APPENDIX B

Research in Progress by U.S. Investigators

Arnade, Charles W. "Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay." Department of History, University of South Florida. Estimated date of completion unknown.


Cooney, Jerry W. "The Paraguayan Independence Movement." Ph.D. dissertation in progress, Department of History, University of New Mexico. The period covered will be approximately 1806 to 1816. EDC 1970.

Criscenzi, Joseph Thomas. "Bibliography of Travel Literature on Latin America." (Includes Paraguay.) Department of History, Boston College. EDC unknown.


Krause, Annemarie E. "The Development of a Middle Latitude Culture in a Tropical Environment." Department of Geography, Andrew University. EDC 1968.

---. "Ruta Trans-Chaco—The Road that Opened an Area." EDC 1968.


Nichols, Byron A. "The Role and Function of Political Parties in Paraguay." Ph.D. dissertation in progress, Department of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University. EDC unknown.

Owens, David James. "Location Factors for the Guarani Mission Colonies Established by the Jesuits." Ph.D. dissertation in progress, Department of Geography, University of Kansas. EDC unknown.


Stewart, Norman R. "Demographic Patterns in Eastern Paraguay." Department of Geography, University of Nebraska. EDC unknown.

---. "History of Immigration and Development of Foreign Colonies in Paraguay." EDC 1968.


Willkie, Mary Jane. "Folklore and Literature of Paraguay." M.A. thesis in progress, Department of Spanish, University of Wisconsin. Study of use of folklore as an element of nationalism, based in part on anthropological data. EDC unknown.
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—. “Segunda estimación de las exportaciones del Paraguay para 1951.” Asunción: Instituto de Asuntos Interamericanos, n.d.


Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community

Instituto Histórico y Geográfico del Uruguay. Artigas: Homenaje en el Centenario de su Muerte. Montevideo: Imprenta Nacional, 1952. 120 S. Cursos de Conferencias, 1930. (Contiene lecturas de José Gervasio Artigas’ relations with Paraguay by Carlos Pastore, Julio César Chaves, Juan Stefanián and R. Antonio Ramos.)
———. Reforma agraria paraguaya. n. pub., n.d.
Prieto, Justo. "Contribución al estudio de las migraciones contemporáneas (El éxodo paraguayo)," La sociología y las sociedades en desarrollo industrial. Cordoba, Argen-
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Selected Bibliography of Writings on Paraguay

By Other Authors, 1950–1968


APPENDIX E
Special Bibliographies of Social Science
Materials on Paraguay


Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development. Inventory of Information Basic to the Planning of Agricultural Development in Latin America: Selected Bibliography. Washington: Pan American Union, 1964. Includes references to literature on natural resources; the farm unit; agricultural credit, prices and marketing; and governmental plans and objectives of Paraguay. Numerous citations of publications of Guillermo Tell Bertoni, distinguished Paraguayan scientist.


APPENDIX F
Official Reports and Sources of Statistical Data on Paraguay


Inter-American Development Bank. “Contrato de préstamo entre la República del Paraguay y el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.” Asuncion, April 1965.


Paraguay


—. Estudio sobre el transporte fluvial en el Paraguay. Asuncion, June 1964.

—. Estudios demográficos: Nos. 1, 2 y 3. Asuncion, n.d.


—. Censo de Población y Vivienda de Fernando de la Mora. Asuncion, 1967.


APPENDIX G

Paraguayan Serial Publications Related to the Social Sciences

(See also Appendix F for official reports issued serially.)


La historia paraguaya. Anuario del Instituto Paraguayo de Investigaciones Históricas, Asuncion, Paraguay. Published in 1956 and irregularly thereafter.


Asunción—daily newspapers


A new tabloid-size morning newspaper founded in 1967 by Aldo Zuccolillo, a wealthy industrialist, and a group of other investors. Using modern presses, it features a lively format with a lavish use of color in news photos and advertisements. Generally well edited, it has good foreign wire-service coverage (AP, EFE), and reasonably good local news coverage which it handles with considerable independence. Incidentally, *ABC Color* is so novel in appearance that it is being featured on Buenos Aires newstands—surely the first time this has happened to a Paraguayan newspaper in the sophisticated metropolis!


The oldest functioning independent newspaper in Paraguay, *La Tribuna* was founded on December 31, 1925, and long held a monopoly on significant outside news coverage. A regular-sized morning newspaper with a conventional format and a rather stodgy style, it has lately been responding to the vigorous competition of *ABC Color* with more thorough news coverage. It relies on UPI and ANSA wire services, and although the Schaerer family has been identified with the Liberal party, the local coverage is carefully apolitical.

*La Tarde*—“Independent” (see below). Directors: Emilio Saguer Aceval and Enrique C. Ugehall. Address: Benjamín Constant 686, Asunción, Paraguay.

The only afternoon paper, a tabloid founded in 1961 by Emilio Saguer Aceval, a professor in the National University of Asunción. It carries mostly foreign news, obtained from the AFP service. Although bearing no political label, *La Tarde* is considered to be the direct voice of the Stroessner government (rather than the Colorado Party).

*Patria*—Colorado Party. Director: Dr. Ezequiel González Alcina. Address: Tacuari entre 25 de Mayo y Cerro Corá, Asunción, Paraguay.

Official organ of the Colorado Party, *Patria* is a full-sized morning daily that carries one page of foreign news received via AFP. All local news is carefully edited from the point of view of the Colorado Party and tends to be non-controversial.

Encarnación—daily newspapers


The only other daily newspaper in Paraguay. Chiefly local circulation. No other information.

Asunción—weekly newspapers


This is not the authorized Catholic newspaper, but only a Catholic tabloid founded in 1956 and vigorously directed by Father Gilberto Jiménez, who is not a member of a religious order. The paper follows a militant Christian Democratic line, strongly influenced by the personal views of Father Jiménez, who is at present the most effective critic of the government. It is outspoken in criticism of the administration's policies (though not of the President), of the programs of the other parties, and of the American society and government. It prints, without comment, official statements of all of the political parties in such a way as to draw attention to the inconsistencies and absurdities of their positions. Although Father Jiménez makes no pretense of objectivity, his paper is widely read, particularly by young Paraguayans, for whom it has a special appeal as an outlet for their unexpressed frustrations.

*El Radical*—Radical Liberal. Director: Justo Pastor Benitez. Address: Piribeuy 292, Asunción, Paraguay.

Official organ of the Liberal Radical Party, which regards itself as the authentic opposition to the government (as opposed to the Lez Radical wing). Consistently attacks appointees of the government on grounds of incompetence and corruption, and publishes names of political prisoners allegedly held in local police commissariats without trial. Although increasingly outspoken, *El Radical* is apparently tolerated by the government on the principle that “you can say anything you want to about me, so long as you say it only once a week.”


Published partly in Guaraní, *El Enano* is the political organ of the Rolón wing of the Radical party.


Official organ of the Levi wing of the Liberal party, which regards itself as the functioning opposition within the Congress, but the paper apparently speaks chiefly for the family of Dr. Fernando Levi Ruffinelli.


A newly founded organ of the Febrerista party.


A Colorado Party weekly founded in 1961. It appears irregularly and does not have the importance of the Colorado daily, *Patria*.