
RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

THE SOVIET LATIN AMERICANISTS*

Cole Blasier
University of Pittsburgh

The Soviet Union has established what has become the largest, and probably the most prolific, research center devoted exclusively to Latin America. Soviet progress has been especially dramatic because the USSR was so weak in this field in 1961, when the Institute of Latin America was established in Moscow. The Institute now has one hundred full-time researchers and supports the activities of many other Latin Americanists there and in other Soviet cities. It also has maintained ties with new Latin Americanist groups in Eastern Europe, particularly in East Germany and Poland.

Soviet ambitions in Latin American studies have been apparent now for nearly a decade, but Soviet work has failed to attract much attention here, partly because few western Latin Americanists know Russian and they have been understandably skeptical about access to Soviet scholars and sources. My training as a Soviet specialist at the Russian Institute, Columbia University, and nine years as a career foreign service officer working in and observing Eastern Europe and the

*Research for this article has been supported by grants from the Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the International Research and Exchanges Board, and the National Council for Soviet and East European Research. I would appreciate receiving the names and addresses of U.S. or Soviet Scholars who have completed a research assignment of several months in the country of the other, as well as the names and addresses of U.S., Latin American, or other western university students who have a good command of Russian as well as Spanish or Portuguese. Please direct your correspondence to the Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

USSR caused me to share this skepticism. Then, in 1975, Allen Kassof, the director of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), told me that serious research in the USSR on contemporary problems, though still difficult, was possible. As a result, I paid a brief visit to Moscow that summer, which revived the fascination Russia has always held for me but provided little evidence to support Kassof's view. However, my acquaintance with the leaders of the Institute of Latin America became more firmly established, and we arranged later to have the Institute send representatives to the national meetings of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) in Atlanta in 1976 and Houston in 1977.

A year later I received an IREX grant for senior scholars, under an agreement between the American Council of Learned Societies and the USSR Academy of Sciences, which provided for four months research in Moscow, the first such grant for work at the Institute of Latin America. As late as Christmas 1978, when I left for Moscow, I feared that access to Soviet sources might be denied. My experience in the USSR was a pleasant surprise: I met many Soviet scholars and officials and was able to consult many Soviet books, articles, and other published works on Latin America.

The Institute of Latin America

Prior to the Cuban Revolution, which gave the decisive impetus to the formal establishment of Latin American studies in the Soviet Union (just as it did to the expansion of such studies in the United States), there were some Soviet Latin Americanists scattered about the country, particularly at the Institute of Universal History and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. When Anastas Mikoyan, the first high Soviet official to visit Cuba, returned home from his trip to the Americas in 1960, he recommended the foundation of an institute for the study of Latin America. In the spring of 1961 the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences authorized the establishment of the Institute of Latin America as part of its Social Science Department. Sergei Sergeevich Mikhailov transferred from the Soviet Foreign Service to become its first director. After four years at the Institute he was appointed ambassador to Brazil and was succeeded by the current director, Viktor Vaslavovich Vol'skii, then chairman of the Department of Geography at Moscow State University. A doctor of economic sciences, he is best known as a scholar for his book, *Latin America, Oil and Independence*. M. I. Lazarev, a legal specialist, was recently named deputy director.

The Institute of Latin America, referred to here as the Institute, is

located on Bolshaia Ordynka Street, a main artery leading to Red Square. It is just a fifteen minute walk to the Kremlin, and two subway stations are conveniently nearby. The offices are located in a yellow and white nineteenth-century Greek Revival mansion, once the home of a rich merchant. Cars and pedestrians enter the courtyard through wrought iron gates. Several older women, who request credentials from strangers, are usually in attendance inside the main entrance. The foyer is decorated with idealized figures of American Indians, other Latin Americans, and what appears to be their oppressors, including the U.S. Army.

The library of the Institute has about 54,000 books and journals. Catalogs in the Russian and Latin alphabets contain subject as well as author and title cards. The reading room proper houses a collection of reference works and most relevant Soviet and foreign periodicals. The collection on Soviet relations with Latin America and on the Communist parties for the period after 1961, when the Institute was founded, is the best I have used anywhere. Working conditions in the reading room are comfortable; the librarians are alert, attentive, and helpful. Although attached to the Institute of Latin America, the library is actually a branch of the Institute of Scientific Information in the Social Sciences (INION).

Like the director, department and several sector heads have private offices. Staff researchers are usually grouped together, one sector to a room, with perhaps as many as eight desks crowded into small space. Such crowding is not as serious as it may seem because researchers do much of their work at home or in Moscow's libraries. More office space will become available in the next few years when the Institute takes over an adjoining building.

Most of the Institute's staff of one hundred full-time researchers have advanced degrees in historical or economic sciences. The *candidat* degree is roughly equivalent to the American Ph.D., the doctor's degree representing a higher level of achievement. Nine have doctor's degrees, five in historical sciences, four in economic sciences. About seventy of the remainder have *candidat* degrees. Researchers who work on politics, international relations, or social topics usually have degrees in historical sciences. The staff of the Institute, whose academic work is drawn up as a part of the Five Year Plans, are divided among three departments: country studies and international relations; sociopolitical problems; and economics.

Anotolii Nikolayevich Glinkin heads the department for country studies and international relations. A doctor of historical sciences, Glinkin wrote his *candidat's* and doctor's dissertations on U.S. imperialist expansion in Brazil (1945–52) and on Brazilian history (1939–61). He has published on other themes, such as Latin America and UNESCO, in

whose Paris office he worked for four years, and he was an exchange scholar at Columbia University for six months several years ago. The country sectors include Cuba, under the direction of A. D. Bekarevich, an economist. This group has probably published more scholarly work on Cuba than any other group in the USSR. Other sectors work on the Andean countries, the La Plata Basin and Brazil, and Meso-America. Much of the ethnographic work is under the direction of Iu. A. Zubritskii, a Quechua specialist, and leader of the Andean sector. Multidisciplinary surveys have been published on most of the leading Latin American countries. Soviet relations with Latin America also are in this department. A. I. Sizonenko is the responsible specialist and one of the Institute's most prolific scholars.

Anatolii Fedorovich Shul'govskii heads the department for research on sociopolitical questions. A doctor of historical sciences, he is another prolific writer specializing in Marxist-Leninist theory as it relates to Latin America. Sectors in his department deal with general social problems, the Communist and worker movements, ideology, and culture. This department's books have been about such subjects as the revolutionary process in Latin America, national liberation movements, the ruling classes, agrarian questions, the role of the army, political parties, and the Church. Lev Levovich Klochkovskii, a doctor in economic sciences, heads up the Institute's economic work. At one time he worked at the research institute of the Ministry of Foreign Trade specializing on Asia. His department has sectors dealing with general economic relations, Soviet-Latin American economic relations, territorial and regional problems, and geography. Among the department's recent projects is a study of Comecon economic relations with Latin America to which Latin Americanists from various Comecon countries contributed.

Between 1961 and 1978, scholars associated with the Institute have published more than two hundred books and countless articles, reports, conference papers, etc. Many of the most important and authoritative books appear under the imprint of Nauka, the publisher of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The Institute itself publishes, usually in inexpensive and limited editions, short specialized studies, reports, etc., which are useful to foreign scholars. These are sold from a small office in the wing directly across the court from the Library. However, the work of the Institute staff receives its widest and most frequent diffusion in the Institute's Journal, *Latinskaia Amerika*, founded in 1969. The offices of the journal used to be located at the Institute; now they have moved to more comfortable and freshly decorated quarters off Kropotkinskaia Street.

Although attached to the Institute and depending heavily on its scholars to fill its pages, the journal is also expected to reflect the work

of, and be responsible to, a larger scholarly community, since the Institute is part of the economics section of the social science department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. With other scholarly journals, *Latinskaia Amerika* reports through the Academy's publications' hierarchy, thereby gaining latitude vis-à-vis the Institute.

Some of the more innovative and unconventional Latin Americanists work outside the Institute, since, by Soviet standards, the leaders of the Institute tend to hold predominantly orthodox and conservative views. Opposing opinion within the Institute, especially among the junior staff, tends to be muted. Thus, *Latinskaia Amerika* provides a forum for the spectrum of scholarship approved by Soviet authorities, although it is livelier, more colorful, and more innovative than most other Soviet scholarly journals. Emphasis is on contemporary economic and sociopolitical topics; there are also articles on historical and cultural themes, and the journal reproduces Latin American art in full color and frequently publishes photographs of authors. Round table discussions among Soviet Latin Americanists are a standard feature (I had the unique opportunity to contribute several pages of commentary to one such round table on President Carter's Latin American policy, which was carried in number 4 [1979]). Interviews with leading Latin American political and intellectual leaders, most particularly from the Communist parties and the labor movement, are also frequent features. The editor of *Latinskaia Amerika* is Sergo Anastasovich Mikoyan. The journal has a circulation of about eight thousand, and *América Latina*, the Spanish edition, about fifteen thousand. Both editions began monthly publication in 1980.

The Institute has no "undergraduate" students; the training of Soviet Latin Americanists at the undergraduate level takes place at the universities—Moscow State and Leningrad State are the main feeder institutions, but other universities participate too. The Institute's primary mission is research, but it does train students in historical and economic sciences for the candidat and doctoral degrees. The year before last, the Institute had eighteen graduate students (*aspiranti*), the majority from Moscow State University. Aspiranti normally train at the Institute for three years under renewable annual stipends of 100 rubles a month from the Ministry of Higher Education, which, together with a Committee of the Council of Ministers, supervises the awarding of advanced degrees. Soviet aspiranti usually have completed five years of university preparation, and must pass a series of qualifying oral examinations in special fields. One is in foreign languages; most prepare in Spanish, some in English, and a very few in Portuguese, often in addition to Spanish. Another qualifying examination is in Marxist philosophy, a requirement common to study for all advanced degrees. Fi-

nally, aspiranti must pass an oral examination in their special field, such as the history of the international relations of Latin America. While they can take courses at other universities or institutes in preparation for that and other examinations, the Institute does not offer formal "courses" itself. Instead, members of the staff offer seminars, attended by clusters of graduate students, on themes directly related to such special fields.

The aspiranti spend most of their time doing research for and writing their dissertations, which are defended formally in oral examinations. There is also an unwritten rule that they publish the equivalent of about three articles before the award of the degree, which are apt to be drawn from the dissertation. Abstracts are published individually and widely distributed, and the dissertations themselves are ordinarily available to be read at the home institution. Aspiranti are assigned to advisors at the Institute whose interests correspond to the students' dissertation topics. The aspiranti are not responsible for helping complete the Institute's obligations under the Five Year Plan, but they do participate in the regular activities of their particular sector: they attend meetings and seminars, contribute to discussion, and the staff makes use of their findings. From time to time, the Institute publishes collections of students' work on particular themes. Many of the aspiranti have remained at the Institute as full-time researchers (*sotrudniki*) after completing their three year training period.

The Doctor's degree is not ordinarily achieved until mid-career, late thirties or older. Successful candidates for this degree have at least the equivalent of one book beyond the candidat's degree; the criteria relate, not surprisingly, more to the quality of the scholar's work and his professional stature.

Other Soviet Latin Americanists

Many of the first Soviet Latin Americanists were on the staff of the Institute of Universal History in Moscow, which still has one of the largest contingents outside the Institute of Latin America. The group of about ten specialists there, under the leadership of N. M. Lavrov, confines itself mainly to the pre-1945 period. The most influential institute in contemporary international relations is the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (from which came many of the original staff of the Institute of Latin America); Latin Americanists there include K. L. Maidanik and I. N. Zorina. The staff of the Institute of the International Workers' Movement, which deals with labor and political parties, includes Boris Iosifovich Koval', and I. V. Danilevich, daughter of the pioneering Soviet Latin Americanist, M. V. Danilevich; its year-book frequently carries chapters on Latin America. The Institute of Eco-

nomics of the World Socialist System and the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada have only recently begun to build up their expertise on Latin America. The former studies the Comecon countries and their relations with one another. Although it has several trained Latin Americanists and publishes works on Cuba, the main center of Cuba studies is still the Institute of Latin America. The Institute of the U.S.A. has added young Latin Americanists to its staff to interpret U.S. policy towards the region. Other Soviet institutions with several Latin American specialists are the institutes for geography, ethnology, and literature and the arts.

The universities, and particularly those outside Moscow, tend to offer more courses in literature, history, geography, and anthropology than in economics and politics, which depend more on access to current sources. Most Soviet training in economics is technical, without an area focus, and training in government and politics often has a legal or administrative orientation, or is part of Marxist-Leninist indoctrination. As a result, undergraduate students often may never take broad introductory courses on Latin American politics or economics of the sort now common in the United States and the United Kingdom. Part of the explanation also lies in the Soviet and European organization and philosophy of higher education as mainly professional in character; for instance, Patrice Lumumba University has over a thousand Latin American students, almost all in programs of professional study. Cities in other republics with nascent programs in Latin American studies include Minsk, Kishinev, and Kiev. Latin American specialists from other Soviet cities come to Moscow for brief periods of research.

Several of the most influential Soviet Latin Americanists are not employed directly by the Institute of Latin America. No doubt the most politically powerful is Mikhail Fedorovich Kudachkin, the chief of the Latin American section of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Kudachkin heads a staff of about thirty professionals concerned mainly with Soviet party relations with the Communist parties of Latin America and general oversight of Soviet policies toward the area. Kudachkin, who appears to have minimal contact with representatives of the capitalist West in Moscow, recently edited an authoritative, discursive study of the contemporary history, organization, and policies of the Latin American Communist parties.

K. A. Khachaturov, who has published extensively on U.S. propaganda operations in Latin America, is deputy director of the Soviet press agency, *Novosti*, the major agency for foreign propaganda. Iosif R. Grigulevich of the Institute of Ethnography was recently elected as a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, one of the few Latin Americanists ever to be so honored. Great prestige is attached to such election as well as extra compensation; 500 rubles a month for

full members and 300 rubles for corresponding members. Since the vast majority of Academy members are from the natural sciences and the remaining seats for the social sciences and humanities are few, prospects for additional memberships for Latin Americanists are not promising. Grigulevich has written on indigenous populations in Latin America and, under his pen name, I. R. Lavretskii, has published popular biographies of many Latin American heroes from Bolívar to Ché Guevara. He is also the editor of the Academy's Spanish-language journal, *Ciencias Sociales*. Another of the Academy's corresponding members is Georgii Vladimirovich Stepanov, director of the Institute of Linguistics and author of a book about the Spanish language in Latin America.

Foreign Ties

The Institute of Latin America has also been active in organizing conferences and research projects with Latin Americanists from other socialist countries. Formal gatherings of Latin Americanists from socialist countries usually take place at least once a year. Among the principal collaborators are the Latin American section of the Wilhelm Pieck University, Rostock, the German Democratic Republic; the Latin American section of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw; and the Institute of World Economies of the Hungarian Academy of Science, Budapest. The Czechs often participate, and occasionally the Rumanians; Bulgaria has been the least active of the European socialist countries. The Institute of Latin America has developed close ties with Cuban specialists through the Cuban Academy of Sciences. The European socialist countries emphasize their particular strengths: the Poles, history and anthropology; the East Germans, revolutionary movements and literature; the Hungarians, economics. The Comecon Latin Americanists recently published a book on their economic relations with Latin America (mentioned above), and a book on their political relations was published in 1979.

Leaders of Latin American Communist parties routinely visit the Institute during their periodic stays in Moscow and give lectures to the staff; leading Latin American intellectuals and artists also visit the Institute and contribute articles or give interviews to *Latinskaia Amerika*; and students from Latin America frequently work at the library. There were no Latin American scholars (other than Cubans and students) in residence at the Institute during my stay. Latin Americanists from Western countries occasionally come to the Institute, but these visits have a largely formal and social character. Contacts between U.S. and Soviet Latin Americanists have not been extensive. Since 1968 several Latin

Americanists from each country, usually academic administrators, have made brief visits to the other's country, devoted primarily to getting acquainted, establishing professional ties, and participating in conferences, such as the national meetings of LASA or international congresses of historians or geographers; few scholars have engaged in field research in the other's country. Russell H. Bartley, a historian from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the first U.S. Latin Americanist to conduct fieldwork in the USSR, was in Moscow during the academic year 1967–68. To my knowledge, the only Soviet Latin Americanists to complete research assignments in the U.S. are A. N. Glinkin and E. E. Litavrina. As far as I know, neither U.S. nor Soviet students in Latin American studies have completed a term or more of graduate work in the country of the other.

The Institute's exchanges of persons and publications are managed by the Department for International Liaison. Its head is A. D. Maevskii, a former Soviet government official who served in Latin America; his deputy is A. N. Borovkov, whose dissertation for the candidate's degree dealt with Bolivia's contemporary foreign relations. The department receives foreign visitors and helps selected visitors with personal travel, interviews, and other arrangements that do not fall within the scope of the Soviet tourist agency, Intourist. Such matters in the Soviet Union are far more complicated and time consuming than in the United States, or so they seem to foreign visitors. The rules and procedures tend to be detailed and inflexible, causing a variety of complications not experienced in the West. They impose a heavy burden on Maevskii's department, which ordinarily does its best to satisfy the visitor within the existing norms. Its services, often welcome and sometimes indispensable, obviously also help insure close supervision and control over visitors.

One of the most sensitive aspects are interviews between foreign visitors and Soviet scholars and officials. The latter ordinarily make available data that is generally understood to be suitable for release, and give interpretations of developments that are in accord with party and government policies. Well-informed foreigners soon learn the rules and can predict Soviet responses; most Soviet scholars and officials, but significantly not all, follow those rules. Established controls over foreigners' appointments and interview situations reinforce existing Soviet procedures governing the transmission of information and opinion. Some foreigners hastily conclude that this restraint applies only to Western visitors. However, Soviet specialists are believed to be only somewhat less restrained with visitors from other socialist countries. Even with respect to their own colleagues, especially in public situations,

Soviet specialists are more cautious in expressing themselves than most of their counterparts in the West. One suspects that controls over information are more a matter of domestic than of foreign policy.

Soviet Latin Americanists' ties with their counterparts abroad are limited. Not surprisingly, contacts with scholars from the socialist countries are most frequent, but even these are probably more reserved and formal than in the West. Soviet acquaintance with scholars in the West is limited mainly to that of a few senior men who have been authorized to travel abroad in the past. Soviet Latin Americanists are hungry for books and contacts with the West but many seem reluctant to initiate contact or to press on with contacts once made. Senior staff of the Institute are frequently invited to receptions at Latin American embassies, and, although Latin American diplomats usually are warmly welcomed at the Institute, personal contacts are rather formal and limited. This pattern is not unusual and corresponds to that of Soviet contacts with foreign embassies generally; there may be slightly more personal contact with the large staff of the Cuban embassy.

Trips to Latin America, and even more to Western Europe and the United States, are dreams of many Soviet researchers. Such trips last usually from two to four weeks so the objectives are as much personal as professional, serving as an exhilarating break with the daily routine.

Fieldwork

A glaring handicap of Soviet scholarship related to Latin America is insufficient field experience in the area, outside of Cuba. Graduate students rarely have an opportunity to visit the area before the completion of their dissertations, much less engage in sustained field research. Those who have shown exceptional scholarly promise, or tactical cleverness, are able to arrange short trips as tourists, interpreters, delegates, and the like. Few senior men have been able to complete field investigations of an academic year or more. The Institute's academic administrators make frequent trips to the area, but these are usually limited to a few weeks and are largely of an administrative character. Cuba constitutes a happy exception in that there are institutional opportunities for field experience at almost all levels; Mexico and Peru are the two other countries to which trips are easiest to arrange. When prospects for visits to the area come up in conversation with some researchers, they exhibit a depressing pessimism and resignation, a personal version of "geographic fatalism."

Shortage of hard currency is frequently, and correctly, cited as a deterrent to fieldwork. The Soviet authorities could allocate the necessary foreign exchange but do not assign the area a high priority. The fact

that Aeroflot, which has had weekly service to Mexico City and Lima and daily service to Havana, can provide space payable in rubles greatly facilitates travel. Such flights are vital to the maintenance and expansion of Soviet scholarly relations with the area. Foreign exchange to cover expenses in Latin American countries must also be raised; most Soviet scholars are dependent on host country institutions to pick up these expenses, in exchange for which they can usually arrange to cover reciprocal expenses in the USSR. But scholars in Latin America have difficulty raising locally funds for visitors from Europe and the United States, much less the Soviet Union. As a result, Soviet Latin Americanists face an uphill struggle in building exchange relationships in the area. Soviet scholars sometimes also cite political discrimination: visas are refused or, more likely, delayed many months. Latin Americans may prefer not to be closely associated with Soviet exchanges. Certain governments, such as the traditional military dictatorships, may be hostile. Two countries with military regimes where trade has been relatively large, Brazil and Argentina, are frequently charged with spotty and sporadic discrimination. Foreign currency problems and Latin American disinterest are enough in themselves to minimize fieldwork opportunities. But the Soviets may not want to expand such exchanges too rapidly for domestic political reasons. Soviet society is so effectively insulated and protected from influences from the outside world that the authorities may not want a sudden increase in the number of Soviet scholars in foreign areas, including Latin America.

Insufficient field experience has had its impact on the Soviet scholars' concept of research: most seem to view it as something that takes place exclusively in a library. The younger people work with what they find there (which, incidentally, is considerable), and a few of the resourceful will request missing materials, too. Many do not seem to be motivated to seek the reports and documents, that is, the memoranda, government publications, business reports, and other public and private publications, which can be so illuminating. One reason may be that such materials are so hard to come by in the USSR that they are not in the habit of using them, much less requesting them from abroad. The younger scholars, particularly, may not be fully aware of, or are pessimistic about, the possibilities for capitalizing on interviews and informal personal contacts. Even if opportunities for such contact in Latin America are limited or absent, some opportunities do exist in Moscow (few Soviet scholars approached me for data or ideas about their research; most contacts were initiated by me). They also do not seem to have much contact for specific research purposes with the Latin Americans who come to Moscow.

Professional Life

Most scholars at the Institute of Latin America are full-time researchers. A few who love teaching, or want a following of younger scholars, teach at local universities in their "spare" time. For this they receive extra pay (as much as 200 rubles a month) and an academic title, the latter carrying prestige. Teaching in addition to research responsibilities, however, imposes a strain that many scholars prefer to avoid.

The entire staff is required to be at the Institute on Wednesdays, when many administrative meetings and lectures take place. Researchers must also be present on a second day each week, with different departments coming in on different days. Much of the socializing and casual plotting, so common to scholars everywhere, takes place in a low-ceilinged, white-tiled cafeteria in the basement. On week days, the concessionaire, a sturdy, no-nonsense matron, dispenses soups, meats, cheese, cabbage, sour cream, tea and other beverages to a chatty queue of staff members. Fridays she sells sausage and fowl to take home to families for the weekend. During the three days of the week the staff are not required to be at the Institute, they work at home or in various libraries in the city; among the most popular is the Institute for Scientific Information in the Social Sciences, whose glass and steel structure is a showplace located in the rapidly developing southwest section of Moscow; other collections used by the staff are the Lenin Library and the Library for Foreign Literature.

Salaries at the Institute vary from 100 rubles a month for graduate students to 600 rubles for the director. Scholars' other earned income is from sources similar to that of their counterparts in the West. Payment for articles and books is made by the *list* (a unit of printed text, equivalent to about twenty-four legal-size pages typed double spaced); as a result, there is no economic incentive to keep articles short, a partial explanation why so many Soviet articles are wordy. Royalties range from one hundred or more rubles for articles to several thousand rubles for books, the latter mainly for books in mass circulation, rare in the Latin American field. Scholars also take commissions for various kinds of propaganda work, such as publications distributed abroad or radio. Selected books have been translated into Spanish and distributed in Latin America by the Soviet publishing house, Editorial Progreso.

Some members of the Institute staff are also active in binational friendship societies whose Soviet headquarters are located only a few minutes by subway from the Institute. These societies appear to serve primarily public relations and social purposes.

Vacations are more generous for the scholarly professions than in government and industry. Junior scholars have under a month and se-

nior scholars, for example doctors of sciences, approaching two months vacation annually. Some of the latter have cars, possibly a dacha. The director of the Institute is assigned a car and driver.

The Scholar's Club (Dom Uchenii) is among the most prestigious of the clubs for intellectuals. The Writers' Club and the Journalists' Club are also frequented by employees of the Academy of Sciences. Most of these Clubs emphasize their dining and bar facilities. Some have athletic or other recreational facilities and arrange programs for families. Membership in such clubs may not prove easy to obtain, requiring letters of recommendation and screening through a committee.

All members of the Institute staff, as far as I could determine, are Soviet citizens. There are no permanent staff who are Latin Americans, as is frequently the case in U.S. universities and research centers. There were two Cuban researchers in residence during my stay, but long visits of Latin American scholars from other countries are rare. Usually, there are several Latin American graduate students in residence, and Latin American students from local universities frequently use the Institute's library and participate in Institute activities.

The collegial body ruling the Institute is the Scholars' Council (Uchenii Soviet). I attended one meeting of the Council, which reminded me of the meetings of professional societies in the United States. While there were comments and suggestions from the floor, all the important business appeared to have been prepared and decided earlier and the members present quietly ratified committee and administrative action. The Institute has its own Communist party and Komsomol (Youth) committees; their meetings appear devoted primarily to political education and follow-up on party directives. Lectures and discussions elucidate the decisions of higher party bodies, examine prominent political documents, such as Brezhnev's autobiography, and celebrate anniversaries important in party life. The leadership of the party committee appears to correspond to the leadership of the Institute: the higher administrative posts in the Institute are occupied by party members; membership may be desirable but not necessarily essential for scholarly advancement.

Difficult to verify is the question whether, on balance, the private life of Soviet scholars cuts more or less deeply into professional time than in the United States. On the one hand, shopping for food and other consumer items is far more time consuming and frustrating than in the West. Paperwork and red tape seems everywhere more burdensome, if such could be possible. More Soviet scholars are members of families where both husband and wife work. (The burden on the Soviet wife is proportionately greater than in the United States, since Soviet husbands seem to take on fewer family chores.)

On the other hand, other housekeeping responsibilities are less time consuming. Small apartments require less care, maintenance is theoretically and sometimes actually provided by the building staff, and there are no lawn chores. ("Voluntary" labor is not taken very seriously.) The great majority do not have automobiles, nor the burden of keeping them operational. Families are slightly smaller, frequently only one child or less. The strain of getting children into the "right" university or institute (like the Institute of International Relations, Moscow) can be great, but the state pays most education bills. As a result, Soviet scholars seem more carefree in these respects. This is not to say that Soviet scholars would refuse the houses, gardens, cars, and their accompanying cares that are part of academic life in many Western countries.

Scholarly Climate and Contributions

A place of intellectual discovery and excitement is rare enough in the West, and I did not expect that the Institute of Latin America would be one. The announcements, posters, and other visible signs confirmed my expectations and the discipline that tends to ensure politically approved behavior and findings. Some critics might term the atmosphere routinized and stale, but such a characterization seems harsh. My impressions of the Institute's intellectual climate, always such a subjective matter anyway, were of diligence and competence. There is evidence of tension and a respect for time, which often characterize purposeful institutions. The Institute also has its fair share of critics, particularly among the younger, energetic, and influential groups in the Academy of Sciences. Soviet Latin Americanists appear to be suffering from the same occupational hazards as their colleagues abroad, who get typecast as professionally parochial, committed as they are to an isolated and politically neglected area of the world.

The Soviet Latin Americanists of my acquaintance are dedicated to the study of the region, have a good reading knowledge of one of its languages (ordinarily Spanish), and seem broadly knowledgeable about the literature on the region. In general, they seem better informed about U.S. work on Latin America than U.S. scholars are about European work on the area. Assigning each researcher to a relatively narrowly defined topic for sustained investigation with limited or no teaching responsibilities permits greater specialization. Not surprisingly, their work, which is supposed to meet Soviet ideological and policy criteria, often seems stereotyped; such scholars are usually more interesting to talk to than to read.

Two decades ago, Soviet studies of Latin America were weaker and more rudimentary than in any other advanced industrialized so-

ciety, except possibly Japan. Today, the Soviet Union has the largest centrally planned research program on the area in the world. I have listed below from the perspective of an international relations specialist some topics on which I believe the Soviets have made, and are likely to make, impressive contributions towards the advancement of scholarship in the field:

1. Russian and Soviet relations with Latin America: political, economic, and cultural. Russian and Soviet sources are indispensable for research on these topics.

2. Communist, revolutionary, and labor movements. Soviet sources are convenient and desirable for this subject, and indispensable for certain aspects: illegal Communist parties, historical episodes where primary sources have been lost or are inaccessible, and defining interaction between Soviet and Latin American party leaders. Such sources supplement Communist publications on international congresses and the like, which are usually available in western languages.

3. Highly specialized fields with a relatively low ideological, political, or policy content. Talented Soviet scholars may move ahead of their counterparts in the West on certain topics; archaeology, ethnology, and prerevolutionary history may have the greatest promise.

4. Data collection and collation. The Soviet scientific leadership has a great capacity to focus massive resources on sharply defined topics. The Institute of Latin America, for example, routinely assigns a half dozen or more scholars to work full time on a particular theme. As a result, Soviet scholars are able to bring together quickly vast information from widely dispersed sources on topics not always treated systematically in the West.

The Institute has prepared one-volume national studies of broad scope on almost all the important countries in the area, and a large, two-volume encyclopedia on Latin America is in press. Soviet scholars have also edited books that deal comprehensively with the literature and arts of a leading country, and handbooks for statistics and political parties. Books on agrarian, religious, educational, and other topics assemble information from around the continent (I have found the book on foreign policy of Latin American countries since 1945 to be a handy reference). However, most Soviet works on Latin America will continue to appear only in Russian, but the authors write articles on the same or similar subjects for *América Latina*, and their books are usually reviewed there.

Public and Policy Impacts

Soviet specialists have had and will continue to have great opportunities to raise the level of public knowledge on Latin America, which has lagged behind many leading western countries. As in other fields, little information about Latin America from outside the Soviet Union is available to the Soviet citizenry. To help educate the public, Soviet Latin Americanists write popular articles and books for schools and institutions of higher learning, the media, and other bureaucracies. The All-Union Society for Knowledge, which popularizes advances in science and the arts, occasionally devotes one of the monthly issues of *Znanie* (*Knowledge*) to a Latin American topic in a format similar to that of the Headline Series of the Foreign Policy Association. Others who publish books on Latin America for the general public or for rank-and-file party members are Politizdat and Mysl'.

Soviet Latin Americanists exert some of the same kinds of influence on trade and diplomatic officials as do their counterparts in the United States. Soviet scholarship increasingly provides the basis for these officials' formal training about Latin America, a source of useful background and reference information. Except for training stints, however, government officials, there as here, often lack the time or the inclination to pursue such subjects systematically. Soviet scholarly materials on Latin America are also used to prepare the authoritative textbooks used in the schools of the Communist party.

Determining scholars' direct impact on Soviet policy is difficult. Western scholars may play their greatest role in policy decisions, such as it is, through criticism in letters to the editors of influential papers and through popular articles and books. Soviet scholars clearly have no such opportunity, at least after party decisions have been taken. Recently, there have been lively discussions in the pages of *Latinskaia Amerika* about the interpretation of developments in Latin America; the authors tend to avoid explicit discussion of Soviet policy, but their interpretations of "realities" have policy implications.*

When asked how much impact his work has on policy, a Soviet scholar gives the same wry smile as would his U.S. counterpart. The various Soviet bureaucracies (party, government, scientific) may be even more insulated from one another than those in the United States. Lateral transfers occur more often *from* policy positions *to* the Academy of Sciences than the reverse, and if they take a turn in operations, scholars are more apt to do so in some international organization than in the Soviet diplomatic or commercial service. Thus, such lateral moves as those of Kissinger and Brzezinski, and their counterparts in the Latin American

*See the article by Hough, which follows in this issue.—Ed.

field, like Grunwald or Fishlow, seem rarer than in the United States. The Soviet Foreign Office consults scholars from the Institute of Latin America, but the instances described to me seemed insignificant. The Institute appears to have less political influence than certain other Soviet institutes, like those dealing with the United States or China. The latter two regions are much more important to Soviet interests and, correspondingly, their leaders are better placed in the party and government hierarchies.

Conclusions

The isolation and insulation of Soviet Latin Americanists from Latin America and from their colleagues in the West is awesome; yet, in their own way and by their own rules, they are working steadily to break out. Soviet authorities have assembled a large, well-trained, and productive group of specialists on Latin America, and a rapidly growing literature on almost all aspects of life in the region is now widely available within the Soviet Union. Research on Soviet-Latin American relations, the Communist parties, and the labor movement, and handbooks for reference on many topics are among the products of Soviet scholarship that will be useful to the few western scholars who know Russian. As in other fields, Soviet prospects for eventually meeting and surpassing Western scholarship in Latin American studies are probably best on topics farthest removed from politics and policy. The single most important handicap of the Soviet research effort that can ultimately be remedied within the existing Soviet context is insufficient opportunity for scholars and graduate students to have field experience in Latin America.

The Soviet Latin Americanists are doing a constructive job of informing the Soviet public and training Soviet officials, but their direct impact on policy appears slight. For Westerners, the most convenient, up-to-date source on Soviet scholarship in the field is the Spanish language monthly, *América Latina*.