

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND
LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES:
Patterns and Asymmetries of Research and Publication*

John D. Martz
The Pennsylvania State University

"Scholars and intellectuals, like human beings in other walks of life, need to interpret and come to grips with the crises plaguing the contemporary global political and social system. Indeed, their obligation to do so may be a particularly special and important one."¹ This credo might properly be etched on the minds of all those who study the politics of Latin America. Scholarship is not restricted to an academic preserve in which the principal, even sole commitment must be the intellectual task at hand. Rather, the study of Latin American politics requires a heightened sense of self-consciousness, which is linked in turn to the parameters and strictures of the several professional disciplines involved.

The state of Latin American studies within political science is decidedly germane to this issue and should have a bearing on the quality of scholarship and its dissemination. There is ample reason to believe that long-standing tensions and contradictions between the discipline and the region have been compounded in recent years. Previous overviews of the relationship have generally been negative in tone. More senior practitioners in the field might well recall Merle Kling's 1964 tour de force. His opening words set an unmistakable tone. "Political research on Latin America resembles the area which is the object of its study. It retains underdeveloped and traditional features; it is under both internal and external pressures to modernize. . . . Political scientists specializing in Latin America have not reached, to borrow Rostow's familiar metaphor, the take-off stage. . . . They often have been content to play the role of consumers rather than creators of the newer conceptual products of modern political science."²

A few years later, Kalman Silvert denied the charge that the quality

*The author extends special thanks for the thoughtful comments of several anonymous referees. He is also indebted to the advice and suggestions of the *LARR* editors. In addition, it is important to acknowledge the research assistance of Debra Joy Sobrepeña in compiling the publications data.

of Latin American studies in many disciplines was low, but he was less sanguine regarding his own. He asked directly, "How true is it for political science, one of the most maligned of the disciplines?"³ In subsequent years, this question has been neither buried nor resolved. My 1971 response to Silvert was subtitled "A Discipline in Search of a Region."⁴ Among my contentions at the time was that although political scientists specializing in Latin America were perhaps unduly apologetic for the fruits of their labor, the collective state of ongoing research nevertheless remained "in a state of adolescence," with many pitfalls looming ahead.

Arturo Valenzuela subsequently revived the theme in an assessment first presented to the Latin American Studies Association in 1985.⁵ His inquiry into intellectual trends and analytic approaches being used in the field was guardedly optimistic. That same year, James Malloy was more positive still in discussing research on Latin America within the general field of comparative politics. He told a disciplinary round table on area studies and theory-building that Latin America was "perhaps the most productive area in generating concepts and theoretical approaches."⁶ Malloy characterized recent and contemporary Latin American scholarship as actively producing theory rather than merely consuming it.

The present undertaking, while redirecting attention toward the relationship between disciplinary and area studies, will also emphasize the patterns and asymmetries of research and publication. What does the placement of research reveal about disciplinary and area journals? To what extent are political science journals publishing material on Latin America? Where do theoretically important statements appear? What do the data reveal about these questions, possible explanations or rationalizations, and the implications for the study of Latin American politics? Specific data drawn from publication patterns over the past three decades will be discussed in seeking quantitative and qualitative indicators on which to base conclusions. These findings may in turn suggest whether or not the disciplinary search for a region alluded to in my 1971 subtitle has been abandoned or renewed.

QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS IN THE JOURNALS

The Pioneering Years

Political studies of Latin America made in the early years have been amply described elsewhere.⁷ The overall output was slender, as evidenced by one review of the literature for 1920–1945 reporting that political scientists had produced an average of only one article annually. Six had been published in the *American Political Science Review* and another thirteen in the *Hispanic American Historical Review*.⁸ In surveying the next two decades, Rosendo Gómez identified 150 articles on Latin American pol-

itics: the *American Political Science Review* led with 36 articles relating to Latin America, followed by 19 in the *Western Political Quarterly* and 14 in the *Journal of Politics*. The highest yearly output totaled 14 for 1959, followed by 12 each in 1949, 1951, and 1961. As late as the 1960s, significant research on Latin American politics was eminently "encompassable." Given an accessible collection of materials, as Gómez observed, "a reasonably diligent and able graduate student would be able to read all of them during the typical period of graduate study and research."⁹ These patterns, however, were about to change as the takeoff of the 1960s approached.

Major Political Science Journals

For the present study of articles appearing in major disciplinary journals since 1960, six journals were reviewed, beginning with the *American Political Science Review*, the *Journal of Politics*, and *World Politics*, the three most prestigious journals according to the 1963 and 1976 reputational rankings.¹⁰ The first is the organ of the national association, and the second, the product of the Southern Political Science Association. Three other journals published by regional disciplinary organizations were also reviewed: the *American Journal of Political Science* (previously the *Midwest Journal of Political Science*), the *Western Political Quarterly*, and *Polity*. The first rose in the reputational rankings from ninth in 1963 to fourth in 1976, while the second declined from sixth to tenth. *Polity*, the journal of the Northeast Political Science Association, only began publication in 1968 and was not ranked among the top ten in 1976.¹¹

Table 1 lists the total number of articles published each year by the six journals as well as the total dealing with Latin America. Review essays, research notes, editorial communications, and other miscellaneous items have been excluded throughout. The first reaction to the data by political scientists ardently committed to Latin American studies may be dismay that in more than a quarter-century, only 113 of 4902 full-blown professional articles have dealt with Latin American politics, a mere 2.3 percent of the total. This fact, however, barely begins to address the major concerns under discussion here. A longitudinal analysis is required to ascertain whether the disciplinary quest for Latin America has been abandoned, diluted, or placed in question in recent years. Of the first four journals cited (the most prestigious a decade ago and probably today), the most important is the official publication of the national political science association.

The *American Political Science Review* (APSR) has published a total of seventeen articles on Latin America since 1960, roughly one every year and a half (or barely one each six issues). In these twenty-eight years, 1.5 percent of the articles have dealt with Latin America. A closer look shows

TABLE 1 *Articles on Latin American Politics Appearing in Political Science Journals, 1960-1987*

Year	<i>American Political Science Review</i>		<i>World Politics</i>		<i>Journal of Politics</i>	
	Total	LA	Total	LA	Total	LA
1960	33	0	22	1	27	0
1961	37	2	26	0	29	1
1962	41	0	21	0	30	0
1963	32	1	21	0	36	0
1964	33	0	18	0	36	1
1965	34	1	17	1	33	1
1966	29	1	17	0	28	1
1967	36	1	17	1	29	1
1968	48	2	14	2	35	1
1969	40	1	13	1	37	3
	363	9	186	6	320	9
		(2.5%)		(3.2%)		(2.8%)
1970	49	2	19	2	34	0
1971	44	0	16	0	35	1
1972	42	0	12	2	35	2
1973	40	0	16	2	27	1
1974	58	1	14	0	34	1
1975	38	1	21	0	31	0
1976	36	0	19	2	29	0
1977	47	1	14	0	27	1
1978	49	0	13	0	27	1
1979	38	2	16	1	26	1
	441	7	160	9	305	8
		(1.6%)		(5.6%)		(2.6%)
1980	41	0	11	1	26	0
1981	42	0	13	0	39	0
1982	41	0	15	0	33	0
1983	45	0	13	1	32	1
1984	49	0	16	1	34	0
1985	50	0	22	0	36	0
1986	41	0	14	0	29	0
1987	42	1	11	0	38	0
	351	1	115	3	267	1
		(0.3%)		(2.6%)		(0.4%)
Totals	1155	17	461	18	892	18
		(1.5%)		(3.9%)		(2.0%)

POLITICAL SCIENCE PUBLICATION PATTERNS

TABLE 1 (continued)

<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>		<i>Western Political Quarterly</i>		<i>Polity</i>	
<i>Total</i>	<i>LA</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>LA</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>LA</i>
16	0	58	2		
15	1	50	1		
15	0	42	1		
15	0	50	1		
17	0	49	2		
17	1	49	7		
24	0	37	0		
21	0	43	3		
24	1	44	1	10	0
29	1	42	2	17	0
193	4	464	20	37	0
	(2.1%)		(4.3%)		(0%)
31	0	48	1	19	0
31	1	58	2	13	0
36	1	44	4	15	0
29	1	41	2	15	0
39	2	37	3	17	1
39	0	37	0	15	0
34	1	37	1	13	0
38	1	38	0	19	0
40	0	29	3	20	0
36	0	30	0	21	0
353	7	399	16	167	1
	(2.0%)		(4.0%)		(0.6%)
33	0	37	1	22	1
36	0	41	1	24	0
34	0	36	3	23	0
33	0	36	1	24	1
34	0	33	0	25	2
40	0	38	0	26	0
36	0	42	0	26	0
36	2	41	0	25	0
282	2	304	6	195	4
	(0.7%)		(2.0%)		(2.1%)
828	13	1167	42	399	5
	(1.6%)		(3.6%)		(1.3%)

that the total of nine in the 1960s fell to seven in the 1970s and one in the 1980s. Even that single article is to some degree marginal to the Latin American category in that it probed inequality in agricultural land distribution by constructing and manipulating a multivariate causal model.¹² Thus for the national political science journal, at least, a veritable drought has prevailed in the last decade.

World Politics concentrates on comparative politics and international affairs. It would therefore be expected to publish more material on Latin America than the *APSR*, a supposition that is borne out to a degree by the data. Six articles appeared in the 1960s, then nine over the next ten years. Only three have appeared in the 1980s, however, a finding consistent with the *APSR* pattern. Articles published in the *Journal of Politics* also reveal a consistent level for the 1960s and 1970s that gave way to a dearth of materials in the 1980s. The single piece published in 1983 was the first since 1979. Articles dealing with Latin America represented 2.8 and 2.6 percent respectively in the 1960s and 1970s, and a minuscule 0.4 percent for the present decade. In the case of the *American Journal of Political Science*, long noted for emphasizing U.S. politics and quantitatively oriented studies, a consistently small proportion of material on Latin America has shrunk even further in the 1980s. Nine years passed without a single article on Latin America appearing until the 1987 issues.

Of the two remaining regional journals, the *Western Political Quarterly* has been a more frequent source of materials on Latin America, publishing twenty articles in the 1960s and sixteen in the following decade. Publications in the 1980s started off in similar fashion but have added nothing on Latin America since 1983. This category constituted more than 4 percent for twenty years but now represents half that amount. As for *Polity*, its general emphases on U.S. politics and political theory predict the uniformly small figures that were found.

What conclusions should be drawn from the small numbers and percentages in all cases? These patterns make it clear that fewer articles on Latin American politics have been appearing in these disciplinary journals, especially in the past decade. If one rejects the hypotheses that pernicious editors are hostile to Latin America and scorns the theory that those working on the region are essentially a group of second-rate scholars, then the explanations must be sought elsewhere. Before arguing for a growing intellectual rift between region and discipline, however, alternative explanations must be explored. Does a similar pattern affect other subfields of comparative politics, or is the situation unique to Latin American studies? What about the increasing emphasis on quantitative research in the disciplinary journals? These are important questions that may prove heuristically valuable. Of greater immediacy, however, is the possibility that research scholars are seeking publication in journals that have come into being more recently. This idea suggests examining the

preceding journals' competitors that, for whatever reason, may be attracting the work of today's more diligent students of Latin American politics.

Major Journal Alternatives

An obvious candidate would be the *Latin American Research Review*, which first saw the light of day in 1965. Expressly founded as a multi-disciplinary journal dedicated to strengthening systematic communication among the disciplines contributing to Latin American studies, *LARR* was later linked institutionally with the Latin American Studies Association. Appearing three times a year since its inception, *LARR* has cast its net broadly in disciplinary terms while paying particular attention to assessments of the state of scholarship for widely diverse subject matter.

LARR has now been publishing for more than two decades, although its status as a major outlet was established only after the initial years, when editorial policies and priorities were still being developed. Thus it is illogical to argue that the present situation with political science journals is a result of the substitutability of *LARR* as an outlet. If *LARR* is somehow atypical, then what about other journals that might help to provide an answer? At least three merit consideration in this context: *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *Comparative Politics*, and *Comparative Political Studies*. The first began in 1965 and the second and third in 1968. *Studies in Comparative International Development* has been broader in scope and content and, consistent with its title, has willingly gone beyond disciplinary barriers while publishing materials from many social science disciplines. In contrast, *Comparative Political Studies* and *Comparative Politics*, under editors and consultants drawn almost exclusively from political science, have relied far more heavily on disciplinary scholarship.

Because these three journals did not publish during much of the 1960s, the data used here will begin with the 1970s. Articles not authored by political scientists (most frequently the case with *Studies in Comparative Political Development*) were not counted in table 2. This approach should sharpen the focus on the question of whether or not these journals are essentially taking over from the older disciplinary periodicals in presenting the fruits of research on Latin American politics. The answer will illuminate exploration of the relationship between Latin American studies and political science as reflected in the academic journals.

What is sought in this context is again longitudinal in nature. If the decline in Latin American materials published in disciplinary journals is a result of the rise of other possibly more attractive outlets, these data should reflect a secular increase in the publication of articles on Latin America. But even a cursory examination suggests that the data do not support such an explanation. *Studies in Comparative International Develop-*

TABLE 2 Articles on Latin American Politics Appearing in Comparative Politics Journals, 1970–1987

Year	Studies in Comparative International Development		Comparative Politics		Comparative Political Science	
	Total	LA	Total	LA	Total	LA
1970	15	5	23	2	18	1
1971	17	5	21	0	17	1
1972	16	7	19	2	15	2
1973	16	4	22	4	17	0
1974	18	4	16	3	22	3
1975	18	1	17	2	19	1
1976	17	5	17	2	14	3
1977	17	22	1	3	25	0
1978	16	4	21	0	20	2
1979	17	1	17	1	17	3
	167	38	194	19	184	16
		(22.8%)		(9.8%)		(8.7%)
1980	16	1	18	5	24	1
1981	12	2	19	5	20	1
1982	14	3	17	0	21	1
1983	13	3	18	2	20	2
1984	15	4	21	2	19	1
1985	17	3	20	3	20	1
1986	17	3	21	2	20	1
1987	11	3	23	2	20	5
	115	22	157	21	164	13
		(19.1%)		(13.4%)		(7.9%)
Totals	282	60	351	40	348	29
		(21.3%)		(11.4%)		(8.3%)

ment has consistently led in the percentage of Latin American political science articles published, followed by *Comparative Politics* and then *Comparative Political Studies*. Of 981 articles in the three journals, 129 focused mainly on Latin America for an overall percentage of 13.1 (13.4 percent for the 1970s, and 12.8 percent for 1980–1987). This consistency strongly supports the argument that the drop-off in scholarship on Latin America in disciplinary periodicals cannot be explained as a reflection of increasing publication in alternative publications.

In lieu of this rejected thesis, it might be contended that whatever the quality of research on Latin American politics, the sheer quantity has dropped. Certainly, one could hypothesize that this decline accurately mirrored the output of those studying Latin American politics. A convenient means of exploring some such reduction is available through assess-

ing the submission patterns of the *Latin American Research Review*. Although records for its early years are spotty, in the mid-1970s the LARR editors began to present data periodically on various aspects of manuscript submission. Selective references to the respective editorial reports of John Martz, Joseph Tulchin, and Gilbert Merkx will provide a useful glimpse into the prevailing disciplinary emphases in LARR submissions.

Early in the Martz editorship (from September 1974 through December 1975), submissions of political science manuscripts (22.6 percent) ran a close second to those from history (25.2 percent).¹³ Despite a period of rhetorical and practical activism by the staff to broaden the disciplinary mix, the pattern remained largely unchanged for January 1976 through September 1977. Although the overall total of manuscript submissions climbed, political science had moved into first place with 23 percent, followed by history at 19 percent, and literature and languages at 17 percent.¹⁴ The third and final report of the Martz editorship mirrored the continuing prevalence of submissions from political science, with the editor commenting that "despite my best efforts to eschew potential favoritism toward my own discipline, political science has risen 11 percent. . . ."¹⁵ Indeed, political science submissions had risen from one-fourth of all LARR submissions to one-third. History clung to second place, followed by languages and literature, sociology, and anthropology.

For the most recent years, the flow of articles from political science has continued uninterrupted. At the close of 1986, Gilbert Merkx provided data showing that for the period from February 1983 to June 1986, the discipline consistently provided between 27 and 29 percent of all submissions. History briefly dropped below sociology and economics before regaining second place.¹⁶ In Merkx's most recent report, covering July 1986 through May 1987, political science stood at 28 percent, followed by economics at 23 percent and history at 18 percent. The total number of manuscripts submitted remained steady, thus obviating any distortion in the representative character of percentages by discipline. Merkx noted both the "current predominance of political science and economics submissions" and political science's retention of "its traditional first ranking."¹⁷ All these figures, combined with the preceding data from the other journals, underline the fact that Latin America is still attracting the sustained attention of political scientists. Even so, it would be premature at this juncture to argue simply that the disciplinary journals have demonstrated an estrangement between political science and Latin American studies because not all alternative explanations have yet been exhausted.

Comparative Politics and Political Science

Granted that political science topics on Latin America are underrepresented in the major disciplinary journals, it cannot be assumed that

this situation is unique. It could be generally argued that most research on comparative politics has disappeared from the major disciplinary journals, with the possible exception of Western European politics. To explore this hypothesis further, I will begin by sketching the patterns that prevailed during the years when scholarship first began to focus on the "transitional" areas. The data were taken from Ralph Braibanti's study of comparative politics research for 1948–1966.¹⁸

Reviewing articles published in leading political science journals, Braibanti found that 6.7 percent of those in the *American Political Science Review* had dealt with the transitional areas, which he identified as Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. The figure for the *Journal of Politics* was 7.9 percent, and for *World Politics*, 13.9 percent. In surveying dissertation titles for the same years from the annual APSR lists, Braibanti noted a gradual but perceptible increase. By the period 1963–1966, 55 percent of all comparative politics dissertations dealt with the transitional regions. These data provide a useful benchmark when set alongside those for the 1980s. The results are consistent with those already reported.

The subfield of comparative politics has not fared well in the 1980s, however, with the percentage of total articles clustering around 10 percent for the *American Political Science Review*, *Journal of Politics*, *American Journal of Political Science*, and *World Politics*.

When general articles and those centering on Europe and the Communist bloc are eliminated, attention to transitional areas is even more limited. Where Braibanti had identified 6.7 percent and 7.9 percent respectively for the APSR and the *Journal of Politics* between 1948 and 1966, publications in the 1980s averaged only 2.3 percent in each instance. Only *World Politics* displayed a different pattern that reflects its divergent character when compared with the other journals covered in table 3. These findings thus show not only a modest level of articles published on comparative politics but a sharply reduced output of those dealing with transitional areas.

As for articles on Latin America, their paucity makes it pointless to discuss at length the minuscule proportions in the disciplinary journals. As concerns the regional emphases, however, consider the record for the 1980s in *Comparative Politics* and *Comparative Political Studies*. In the first case, fifteen articles on Latin America appeared, followed by thirteen on Africa, nine on Asia, and eight on the Middle East. In *Comparative Political Studies*, Asia led with eighteen articles, Latin America had fifteen, and Africa and the Middle East trailed with six and three respectively. This distribution suggests that Latin American politics retains interest for those comparativists oriented toward transitional areas. But the relationship of research on the politics of all the transitional areas to the discipline of political science is even more problematic for the 1980s than it was previously.

TABLE 3 *Articles in Political Science Journals according to Comparative Politics Areas, 1980–1987*

Journal	General	Eastern			Middle East	Latin America	Total	
		Western Europe	USSR/	Africa				
<i>American Political Science Review</i> ^a	12	7	10	1	4	2	1	351
<i>Journal of Politics</i> ^b	5	11	7	1	1	3	1	267
<i>American Journal of Political Science</i> ^c	10	11	3	0	1	1	2	282
<i>World Politics</i> ^d	9	5	2	4	1	1	6	304
<i>Polity</i> ^e	5	12	1	1	4	0	4	195
<i>World Politics</i> ^f				4	14	2	5	115

^a Comparative politics articles numbered 37 (10.5 percent of the total); articles on transitional countries numbered 8 (2.3 percent); and articles on Latin America totaled 1 (0.3 percent).

^b Comparative politics articles numbered 29 (10.9 percent); articles on transitional countries numbered 6 (2.2 percent); and articles on Latin America totaled 1 (0.4 percent).

^c Comparative politics articles numbered 28 (9.9 percent); articles on transitional countries numbered 46 (1.4 percent); and articles on Latin America numbered 2 (0.7 percent).

^d Comparative politics articles numbered 28 (9.2 percent); articles on transitional countries numbered 12 (3.9 percent); and articles on Latin America numbered 6 (2.0 percent).

^e Comparative politics articles numbered 27 (13.8 percent); articles on transitional countries numbered 9 (4.6 percent); and articles on Latin America numbered 4 (2.1 percent).

^f Articles on transitional countries numbered 25 (21.7 percent); and articles on Latin America numbered 5 (4.3 percent).

RESEARCH AND THEORY: QUALITATIVE THEMES

The Theoretical Literature

This survey of quantitative indicators in the journals amply documents the decline of Latin American materials. Where, then, have major pieces of area scholarship been appearing? Before seeking answers, some broad categorization of influential bodies of literature is necessary. A convenient starting point is Arturo Valenzuela's contention that students of Latin America have left their mark on comparative politics by elaborating theories of dependency, corporatism, and bureaucratic authoritarianism.¹⁹ Modernization theory should be included in this list as well in order to provide a comparative framework that includes the 1960s as well as more recent years.

At the very least, this list of influential theories would seem consistent with the extended overall discussions of comparative politics at Harvard's Center for International Affairs, which were published in 1985 under the editorship of Howard Wiarda.²⁰ The list would also parallel the framework used in the 1986 collection edited by Peter Klaren and Thomas

Bossert.²¹ In their view, the so-called “theories of change” were presented under the rubrics of modernization, dependency and Marxism, corporatism, and bureaucratic authoritarianism. In adopting their framework for the present discussion, I am seeking to identify important and representative works, relying on the selections of Bossert and Klaren. To this simple but useful base can be appended a few additional items generally regarded as significant. The result will be less than exhaustive but should serve the present analytic purposes.

Modernization theory produced major works in professional journals as well as multiauthored collaborative volumes. Klaren and Bossert chose four statements, three of them book chapters and the other an article in a little-known British series.²² Among other contributions of considerable note using this theoretical perspective were four works of Charles Anderson, George Blanksten, Martin Needler, and Robert Scott. The first appeared as a major book,²³ the second was published in both the *APSR* and in Almond and Coleman.²⁴ Needler’s work appeared in the *APSR*, then in his book,²⁵ and Scott’s work was largely included in the multivolume series published by the Social Sciences Research Council.²⁶ Thus modernization literature in the 1960s included significant statements that appeared in political science journals, although many of these authors chose chapters in edited volumes as their publication outlet.

With the rise of dependency literature, the patterns shifted somewhat. In selecting works on dependency for their broad overview, Klaren and Bossert chose four selections, three of which were excerpted from books: the selections from the works of André Gunder Frank, Celso Furtado, and Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto.²⁷ Most other important theoretical statements about dependency did not appear in disciplinary journals either, although exceptions occurred, such as the article by Theotônio dos Santos in the May 1970 issue of *American Economic Review*.²⁸ Some authors preferred ideologically identifiable outlets like *Latin American Perspectives* and the *New Left Review*. At the same time, the *Latin American Research Review* was emerging as an important organ for theoretical contributions by such writers as Ronald Chilcote, Richard Fagen, and Tulio Halperin Donghi.²⁹ It was also the outlet for Richard Bath’s and Dilmus James’s typological review of the literature and Cardoso’s definitive “Consumption of Dependency Theory.”³⁰

As for the corporatist literature, little of it appeared in major political science periodicals. To begin with, important contributions by historians like Richard Morse, Ronald Newton, and Fredrick Pike were placed in the *Hispanic American Historical Review*. Influential works by political scientists Glen Dealy, James Malloy, and Philippe Schmitter, along with those of Ronald Newton first saw print in collaborative multi-authored books under the editorship of Malloy, Pike and Thomas Stritch,

and Wiarda.³¹ Wiarda is virtually the only author who presented his work in political science journals.³²

The literature on bureaucratic authoritarianism is a body of theory sparked essentially by one scholar—Guillermo O'Donnell. His first important statement was published, somewhat improbably, in a monograph series issued by Berkeley's Institute of International Studies.³³ His most consequential subsequent theoretical expositions then appeared in the *Latin American Research Review*, the collective work on Latin America's "new authoritarianism" edited by David Collier, and a Spanish-language reformulation published in O'Donnell's native Argentina.³⁴ Of the critiques and reassessments of bureaucratic authoritarianism, few were published in the pages of political science journals. Perhaps the only important exception was Karen Remmer, who set forth her views in *Studies in Comparative International Development* and *Comparative Politics*.³⁵ She also collaborated with Gilbert Merx in a penetrating reevaluation of O'Donnell's work in the *Latin American Research Review*, where the latter's rejoinder was also published.³⁶

Patterns may change as new formulations emerge, but there are few indications at the moment. Increasing attention to problems of democratization and the transition from authoritarianism has produced major statements in virtually every publication setting except the disciplinary journals. Those seeking both introduction and immersion into this literature will find that the primary sources are collaborative, multiauthored compendia: the collections edited by O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, by Malloy and Mitchell Seligson, and by Enrique Baloyra.³⁷ It seems that this prevailing practice has become deeply entrenched and that major theoretical contributions to the study of Latin American politics are not being written for the major political science journals. Once again, what emerges from the analysis is the gap between area studies and political science as a discipline. In order to probe this situation from a different perspective, let us now review the thematic and substantive interests represented in the pages of the political science journals.

Thematic and Substantive Interests

In compiling the data for this study, the subject matter of articles was also recorded. This information provides further insight into the character of work being published across the years and also documents shifts in emphases. In examining this more qualitative aspect, attention was directed to the three journals whose prestige has endured throughout the past quarter-century: the *American Political Science Review*, the *Journal of Politics*, and *World Politics*. The *APSR* presented ten articles on Latin America in the 1960s; six focused on a single country (Mexico in three

instances), and four dealt with broader comparative questions. Particular attention was devoted to regional political development, system stability, the role of the military, and electoral analysis. Half of the articles employed quantitative techniques and half did not. Among those of theoretical importance were the contributions of Martin Needler, Ernest Duff and John McCamant, and Russell Fitzgibbon and Kenneth Johnson.³⁸

In the 1970s, the number of *APSR* articles on Latin America fell to seven, four of them strongly country-oriented. Thematic interests included electoral behavior, political participation, urbanization, and political attitudes. At least two pieces stood out for their attention to broad theoretical issues, and the overall quality of scholarship was consistently high.³⁹ Four articles relied substantially on quantitative techniques, employing various types of data sets. All but one had generated original empirical material through substantial external grants. Since the two pieces that appeared in 1979, the *APSR* has produced only a single article dealing with Latin America.⁴⁰

In the *Journal of Politics*, nine articles on Latin America appeared during the 1960s. Five dealt with individual countries while the remainder presented broader comparative materials. Noteworthy attention was paid to political parties (in four articles) and electoral, student, and labor politics; only two pieces employed quantitative methods to any significant degree. Scholars attempting broad-gauged studies were Fitzgibbon, Peter Ranis, and Martz.⁴¹ As noted earlier, the 1970s saw the publication of eight contributions in the *Journal of Politics*, six of them country-based and two more comparative. Although political campaigns and electoral behavior received some coverage, the subjects addressed varied. Half were approached by quantitative methods. As has been the case with the *APSR*, the 1980s have been largely bereft of Latin American materials, the only article published being Charles Davis's data-rich comparative model of mobilization in Venezuela and Mexico.⁴²

World Politics published five articles in the 1960s that defy categorization. Ranging over such disparate topics as population control, business interests in Cuba, and Castro's revolutionary ideology, perhaps their only common characteristic was the authors' fundamentally traditional approach. The 1970s witnessed another group of disparate articles. Of the nine published, all but two focused on single countries, with Cuba garnering the most attention. Quantification was again absent. The contributions of Albert Hirschman and Howard Wiarda stood out as especially relevant for their theoretical analyses, while James Payne and Oliver Woshinsky coauthored an imaginative methodological approach to the study of political participation.⁴³ *World Politics* has published three studies in the 1980s, the most recent in 1984. Two centered on Mexican politics and one on Peru; all are qualitatively strong, with one of them employing hard empirical data.⁴⁴

If reviewing these journals has produced suggestive findings, they are also consistent with the broader record for the 1980s. The *American Journal of Political Science* has published only two articles on Latin America since 1977, while the only piece to appear in the *Western Political Quarterly* in the last five years presented a test of discriminate function analysis based on Venezuelan electoral data.⁴⁵ Perhaps surprisingly, *Polity* (a journal not associated with emphases on either international relations or comparative politics) has published at least two essays dealing with theoretical issues.⁴⁶ Now let us examine the record for the so-called alternative journals—*Comparative Politics*, *Comparative Political Studies*, and *Studies in Comparative International Development*, especially for the 1980s.

Comparative Politics has published eleven articles that were strongly country-oriented (Mexico again leading with three items), while the remaining ten were more broadly comparative. Only three articles published in the 1980s relied heavily on quantitative data, although many revealed a high level of intellectual rigor. Theoretical interests were amply displayed in various works: Robert Dix discussing consociational democracy, the ideas of Arend Lijphardt, and Samuel Huntington's ideas on revolution; Susan Eckstein on revolutions and restructured economies; Daniel Levy on authoritarianism; Peter McDonough on elite-mass relations and repression; and Karen Remmer on transitions from authoritarian rule.⁴⁷

Comparative Political Studies has published nine articles with a strong country orientation (including three on Peru). The preoccupation with broad theoretical trends and issues was less pronounced than in *Comparative Politics*. Among the more noteworthy pieces were Henry Dietz's Peru-based study of the relationship between poverty and voting behavior and the multivariate analysis of regime type and public-policy outputs by John Sloan and Kent Tedin.⁴⁸ The twenty-two articles appearing in *Studies in Comparative International Development* have been consistent with the journal's title: developmental issues were analyzed in single countries or compared across nations. About one-quarter relied substantially on hard data. Particular attention was devoted to Brazil in a special issue edited by Gláucio Ary Dillon Soares.⁴⁹

To summarize, Latin American themes and topics have not changed greatly in these journals over the past three decades.⁵⁰ They have tended to parallel the concerns of political scientists working in other regions. Indeed, one senses an inclination to follow the "strong herding instinct" identified by Joseph Tulchin as characterizing Latin Americanists across the disciplines.⁵¹ At the same time, the 1980s have witnessed a marked decline in the amount of Latin American material appearing in the major disciplinary journals. The few items to appear have been strongly quantitative in orientation. More theoretically oriented articles have been published in alternative outlets, especially in *Comparative Politics*. Even so,

important contributions to the theoretical and intellectual evolution of the literature are seldom appearing in the political science periodicals. Such works are most likely to be placed in books or monographs, but if they appear in academic journals, they will probably be found in *LARR*.

CONCLUSIONS

At the outset, I posited the existence of a large and widening gap between disciplinary and area studies in political science. Evidence to support this contention was sought in publication and research patterns for studies of Latin American politics. Several points merit restatement here. First, a gradual decline in Latin American materials published in political science journals became perceptible in the 1970s, and by the late 1980s, the drop-off had become precipitous. Second, publication patterns in comparative and developmental politics journals founded in the latter half of the 1960s do not adequately account for the change noted in disciplinary journals. The availability of *LARR* as an outlet cannot be undervalued, but as has been shown, many significant theoretical statements in the field have appeared in books and collaborative volumes. In sum, ample documentation is available to buttress the argument that Latin American studies and political science have become increasingly estranged.

If this description is accurate, then the question of the reasons underlying this estrangement becomes paramount. Are the political science journals too dominated by formal modelers, or do they otherwise prefer a focus too narrow to attract Latin Americanists? Can the decline in the number of articles on Latin America be ascribed to the greater availability for the developed nations of data sets and empirical evidence that permit using the methodologies dominating the pages of political science journals? Or, to paraphrase the comment of an anonymous reviewer, are political scientists specializing on Latin America arrogantly isolated from broader disciplinary trends, preferring to live in a Latin Americanist ghetto that allows them to publish in sources free from peer review? If so, it appears that Africanists, Asianists, and other Third World specialists are similarly "ghettoized."

The present assessment has touched on several explanatory points. First, evidence exists that Latin America shares with other transitional areas a noticeable underrepresentation in the major disciplinary journals. Except in treatments of Western European politics, where the availability of data sets permits varied methodological techniques, more traditional methods are likely to be used. The disciplinary emphasis on quantification therefore seems to have had a decidedly negative impact on comparativists in the so-called developing areas, including Latin America.

At an earlier time, it might have been said that graduate programs

in political science were failing to produce Latin Americanists who were competent in statistics and quantitative methodology. It was even argued that such training was irrelevant for them: Latin American census and demographic data were inaccurate and noncomparable; electoral statistics were both scarce and unreliable; and public opinion surveys were unknown in most Latin American countries. But this situation has changed in recent years. Graduate methodology requirements have been applied more broadly to all advanced students. Thus political scientists who completed doctorates in the 1970s and 1980s have possessed quantitative methodological skills. In short, the disciplinary concern with quantification is no longer likely to disqualify research by Latin Americanists because of technical incompetence. But the thematic emphases of those studying Latin American politics, with the concomitant research techniques, may not have been compatible with the publication emphases of the disciplinary journals.

It might be asked, then, where we should anticipate empirical or theoretical contributions to the evolution of the literature on Latin American politics. If reformulations, refinements, or original contributions emerge, where will they be found? Not in the political science periodicals, it would seem. That commentary alone speaks eloquently about the relationship between Latin American area studies and the discipline of political science.

NOTES

1. Gustavo Lagos and Horacio H. Godoy, *Revolution of Being: A Latin American View of the Future* (New York: Free Press, 1977), xiii.
2. Merle Kling, "The State of Research on Latin America: Political Science," in *Social Science Research on Latin America*, edited by Charles Wagley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 168.
3. Kalman H. Silvert, "American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot," in *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship between Social Science and Practical Politics*, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1967), 98.
4. John D. Martz, "Political Science and Latin American Studies: A Discipline in Search of a Region," *LARR* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1971):71-99.
5. Arturo Valenzuela, "Political Science and the Study of Latin America," paper presented at the meetings of the Latin American Studies Association, Albuquerque, N.M., 18-20 Apr. 1985.
6. For a fuller discussion, see James A. Bill, "Area Studies and Theory-Building in Comparative Politics: A Stocktaking," *P.S.* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1985):811.
7. In addition to Kling and Martz, see Federico G. Gil, "Latin American Studies and Political Science: A Historical Sketch," *LASA Forum* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1985):8-12; Irving Leonard, "A Survey of Personnel and Activities in Latin American Aspects of the Humanities and Social Sciences at Twenty Universities of the United States," *Notes on Latin American Studies*, no. 1 (April 1943); and Charles Wagley, *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas*, SSRC Pamphlet no. 6 (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948).
8. Rosendo A. Gómez, *The Study of Latin American Politics in University Programs in the United States* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1967), 11.

9. Ibid., 3.
10. The 1963 data was taken from Albert Somit and Joseph Tannenhaus, *American Political Science: A Profile of a Discipline* (New York: Atherton Press, 1963). The data for 1976 came from Walter B. Roettger, "The Discipline: What's Right, What's Wrong, and Who Cares?," paper presented at the American Political Science Association, New York, Sept. 1978. Also see the comments of Michael W. Giles and Gerald C. Wright, Jr., "Political Scientists' Evaluations of Sixty-Three Journals," *P.S.* 8, no. 2 (Summer 1975):254-56.
11. Other journals ranked among the top ten, which would not ordinarily be expected to present many articles dealing with Latin America, included *Public Administration Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, and *Public Opinion Quarterly*.
12. An excellent piece, however, that is oriented more toward quantitative theoretical issues is Edward N. Muller and Mitchell A. Seligson, "Inequality and Insurgency," *American Political Science Review* 81, no. 2 (June 1987):425-53.
13. John D. Martz, "Editorial Comment," *LARR* 11, no. 2 (1976):5.
14. Martz, "Editorial Comment," *LARR* 13, no. 2 (1978):3.
15. Martz, "Editorial Comment," *LARR* 14, no. 3 (1979):3.
16. Gilbert W. Merx, "Editor's Foreword," *LARR* 21, no. 3 (1986):5.
17. Merx, "Editor's Foreword," *LARR* 22, no. 3 (1987):4-5.
18. Ralph Braibanti, "Comparative Political Analytics Reconsidered," *Journal of Politics* 30, no. 1 (Feb. 1968):25-66.
19. Valenzuela, "Political Science and the Study of Latin America."
20. *New Directions in Comparative Politics*, edited by Howard J. Wiarda (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1985).
21. *Promise of Development: Theories of Change in Latin America*, edited by Peter F. Klaren and Thomas J. Bossert (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1986).
22. Klaren and Bossert chose excerpts from historian John Johnson's *Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958); and from French sociologist Jacques Lambert's general textbook, *Latin America: Social Structures and Political Institutions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. The Lipset selection was his major contribution to *Elites in Latin America*, edited by Lipset and Aldo Solari (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967). Silvert's work, "The Politics of Social and Economic Change," first appeared in *Sociological Review Monographs* 11 (1967): 47-58. This journal was published by Latin American Sociological Studies, University of Keele, and was edited by Paul Halmos.
23. Charles W. Anderson, *Politics and Economic Change in Latin America: The Governing of Restless Nations* (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1967).
24. George I. Blanksten, "The Politics of Latin America," in *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, edited by Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960), 455-532. Also see Blanksten's "Political Groups in Latin America," *American Political Science Review* 53, no. 1 (March 1959):106-27.
25. Martin C. Needler, *Political Development in Latin America: Instability, Violence, and Evolutionary Change* (New York: Random House, 1968). Also see Needler, "Political Development and Military Intervention in Latin America," *American Political Science Review* 60, no. 3 (Sept. 1966):616-26; also his "Political Development and Socio-economic Development: The Case of Latin America," *American Political Science Review* 62, no. 3 (Sept. 1968):889-98.
26. Robert Scott's work did not appear in a number of the SSRC series volumes. But his "Mexico: The Established Revolution" appeared in *Political Culture and Political Development*, edited by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), 330-96; see also Scott, "Political Parties and Policy-Making in Latin America," in *Political Parties and Political Development*, edited by Joseph LaPalombara and Myron Weiner (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966), 331-69.
27. André Gunder Frank, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution: Essays on the Development of Underdevelopment and the Immediate Enemy* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969); Celso Furtado, *Economic Development of Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970); and Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto,

- Dependency and Development in Latin America*, translated by Marjory Mattingly Urquidí (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979).
28. Theotônio dos Santos, "The Structure of Dependence," *American Economic Review* 60, no. 2 (May 1970):231-36.
 29. Ronald H. Chilcote, "A Question of Dependency," *LARR* 13, no. 2 (1978):55-68; Richard R. Fagen, "Studying Latin American Politics: Some Implications of a *Dependencia* Approach," *LARR* 12, no. 2 (1977):3-26; and Tulio Halperin Donghi, "'Dependency Theory' and Latin American Historiography," *LARR* 17, no. 1 (1982):115-30.
 30. C. Richard Bath and Dilmus D. James, "Dependency Analysis of Latin America," *LARR* 11, no. 3 (1976):3-54; and Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States," *LARR* 12, no. 3 (1977):7-24.
 31. See *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America*, edited by James M. Malloy (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977); *The New Corporatism: Social-Political Structures in the Iberian World*, edited by Fredrick B. Pike and Thomas Stritch (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974); and *Politics and Social Change in Latin America: The Distinct Tradition*, edited by Howard J. Wiarda (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974). It should be noted that the Pike and Stritch piece appeared a year earlier in the *Review of Politics*. For the record, from 1980 through 1987, the *Review of Politics* published a total of 149 articles, of which 22 (14.8 percent) would qualify as comparative politics, and a grand total of 4 (2.7 percent) dealt with Latin American themes.
 32. For example, note Howard J. Wiarda, "Toward a Framework for the Study of Political Change in the Iberic-Latin Tradition: The Corporative Model," *World Politics* 25, no. 1 (Jan. 1973):206-35; Wiarda, "Corporatism and Development in the Iberic-Latin World: Persistent Strains and New Variations," *Review of Politics* 36 (1974):3-33; and Wiarda, "The Corporative Origins of the Iberian and Latin American Labor Relations Systems," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 13 (1976):3-37.
 33. Guillermo A. O'Donnell, *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1973).
 34. O'Donnell, "Reflections on the Patterns of Change in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State," *LARR* 13, no. 1 (1978):3-38; "Tensions in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy," in *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*, edited by David Collier (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979), 285-319; and O'Donnell, 1966-1973, *El estado burocrático autoritario: triunfos, derrotas y crisis* (Buenos Aires: Editorial de Belgrano, 1982).
 35. Karen L. Remmer, "Exclusionary Democracy," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1985-86):64-85; also Remmer, "Redemocratization and the Impact of Authoritarian Rule in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 17, no. 3 (Apr. 1985):253-76.
 36. Karen L. Remmer and Gilbert W. Merkx, "Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism Revisited," *LARR* 17, no. 2 (1982):3-40; and O'Donnell, "Reply to Remmer and Merkx," *LARR* 17, no. 2 (1982):41-50.
 37. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*, edited by Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America*, edited by James M. Malloy and Mitchell A. Seligson (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987); and *Comparing New Democracies: Transition and Consolidation in Mediterranean Europe and the Southern Cone*, edited by Enrique A. Baloyra (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1987).
 38. Martin C. Needler, "Political Development and Socioeconomic Development: The Case of Latin America," *American Political Science Review* 62, no. 3 (Sept. 1986):889-98; Ernest A. Duff and John F. McCamant, "Measuring Social and Political Requirements for System Stability in Latin America," *American Political Science Review* 62, no. 4 (Dec. 1968):1125-44; and Russell H. Fitzgibbon and Kenneth F. Johnson, "Measurement of Latin American Political Change," *American Political Science Review* 60, no. 3 (Sept. 1961):515-27.
 39. Robert L. Ayres, "Development Policy and the Possibility of a 'Livable' Future for Latin

- America," *American Political Science Review* 69, no. 2 (June 1975):507-26; also Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier, "Inducements versus Constraints: Disaggregating 'Corporatism,'" *American Political Science Review* 73, no. 4 (Dec. 1979):967-87.
40. A multivariate causal model that examined agricultural land distribution and sought broad theoretical significance for comparativists (the isolated piece was not centrally concerned with Latin America) was Muller and Seligson's "Inequality and Insurgency," in *American Political Science Review*.
 41. See Russell H. Fitzgibbon, "Measuring Democratic Change in Latin America," *Journal of Politics* 29, no. 1 (Feb. 1967):129-67; Peter Ranis, "A Two-Dimensional Typology of Latin American Political Parties," *Journal of Politics* 30, no. 3 (Aug. 1968):798-833; and John D. Martz, "The Place of Latin America in the Study of Comparative Politics," *Journal of Politics* 28, no. 1 (Feb. 1966):57-81.
 42. Charles L. Davis, "Political Regimes and the Socioeconomic Resource Model of Political Mobilization: Some Venezuelan and Mexican Data," *Journal of Politics* 45, no. 2 (May 1983):422-49.
 43. Albert O. Hirschman, "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," *World Politics* 32, no. 3 (Apr. 1970):329-44; James L. Payne and Oliver H. Woshinsky, "Incentives for Political Participation," *World Politics* 24, no. 4 (July 1972):518-47; and Howard J. Wiarda, "Toward a Framework for the Study of Political Change in the Iberic-Latin Tradition: The Corporative Model," *World Politics* 25, no. 2 (Jan. 1973):206-36.
 44. Susan Kaufman Purcell and John F. H. Purcell, "State and Society in Mexico: Must a Stabler Polity Be Institutionalized?," *World Politics* 32, no. 2 (Jan. 1980):194-228; Steven E. Sanderson, "Presidential Succession and Political Rationality in Mexico," *World Politics* 35, no. 3 (Apr. 1983):315-35; and Cynthia McClintock, "Why Peasants Rebel: The Case of Peru's Sendero Luminoso," *World Politics* 37, no. 1 (Oct. 1984):48-85.
 45. David J. Myers and Robert E. O'Connor, "The Undecided Respondent in Mandatory Voting Settings: A Venezuelan Exploration," *Western Political Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (Sept. 1983):420-33.
 46. Robert H. Dix, "Why Revolutions Succeed and Fail," *Polity* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1984):423-46; and John D. Martz and David J. Myers, "Understanding Latin American Politics: Analytical Models and Intellectual Traditions," *Polity* 16, no. 2 (Winter 1983):214-41.
 47. Robert H. Dix, "Consociational Democracy: The Case of Colombia," *Comparative Politics* 20, no. 3 (Apr. 1980):303-21; Dix, "The Varieties of Revolution," *Comparative Politics* 15, no. 3 (Apr. 1983):281-94; Susan Eckstein, "Revolutions and the Restructuring of National Economies: The Latin American Experience," *Comparative Politics* 18, no. 4 (July 1985):473-94; Daniel Levy, "Comparing Authoritarian Regimes in Latin America: Insights from Higher Education Policy," *Comparative Politics* 14, no. 1 (Oct. 1981):31-52; Peter McDonough, "Repression and Representation in Brazil," *Comparative Politics* 15, no. 1 (Oct. 1982):73-99; and Karen L. Remmer, "Redemocratization and the Impact of Authoritarian Rule in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 17, no. 3 (Apr. 1985):253-76.
 48. Henry A. Dietz, "Political Participation in the Barriadas: An Extension and Reexamination," *Comparative Political Studies* 18, no. 3 (Oct. 1985):323-55; and John Sloan and Kent Tedin, "The Consequences of Regime Type for Public Policy Outputs," *Comparative Political Studies* 20, no. 1 (Apr. 1987):98-124.
 49. For the special topic issue, with an introduction by Gláucio Ary Dillon Soares, see *Studies in Comparative International Development* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1986).
 50. For broader and more detailed treatments that draw substantially on the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, see David W. Dent, "Past and Present Trends in Research on Latin American Politics, 1950-1980," *LARR* 21, no. 1 (1986):139-51; and Dent, "Political Science Research on Latin America: North American versus Latin American Subjects of Investigation, 1960-1985," paper presented at the meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, 17-19 Mar. 1988, New Orleans.
 51. Joseph S. Tulchin, "Emerging Patterns of Research in the Study of Latin America," *LARR* 18, no. 1 (1983):89.