

PAST AND PRESENT TRENDS
IN RESEARCH ON LATIN
AMERICAN POLITICS, 1950–1980*

David W. Dent
Towson State University

It has been almost two decades since trends in research on Latin American politics were measured in any systematic way.¹ The early profile of the state of Latin American research in political science developed by Peter Ranis showed that Mexico, Brazil, and Chile “receive about one-third of all political science research attention.”² Less than 1 percent of political science research was devoted to Honduras, El Salvador, Haiti, and Nicaragua. The subjects that received the most attention in the 1960s were interest groups (the military, students, and the church), the history of political institutions, and the nature of political, economic, and social change.³

In a more comprehensive, although less empirical, study of political research on Latin America, Merle Kling found that “little capital (funds, talent, or organizational experience) has been invested in political studies of Latin America, and as a result the returns have been relatively meager. Personnel with adequate training and appropriate technical competence have been in scarce supply, research techniques adapted to Latin American studies have been of a relatively primitive nature, and the level of productivity has been low.”⁴ A great deal has changed in the study of Latin American politics since Kling’s rather dismal assessment of the evolution of political studies and Ranis’s empirical measurement of political science research on Latin America for the period from 1961 to 1967.

The following trends suggest that political science research on Latin America has benefitted from both public and private efforts to understand better the Western Hemisphere since Castro’s revolution and Kennedy’s Alliance for Progress. First came the increasing influ-

*This paper was originally presented at the Eleventh International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, 29 September–1 October 1983, in Mexico City, and was revised for the Southwestern Political Science Association meeting 20–23 March 1985 in Houston, Texas. I would like to acknowledge the financial support of Towson State University, the research assistance of Brandt Kamka, and the helpful comments of the three anonymous *LARR* reviewers.

ence of Latin American scholars such as Cardoso, Cotler, and O'Donnell on the study of Latin American politics combined with the development of more institutionalized centers of Latin American political research in the larger countries like Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina.⁵ These centers are now publishing widely read articles on internal politics and international relations.⁶ These trends have produced a movement away from descriptive case studies of single political parties and interest groups to new conceptual frameworks and the integration of Latin American studies and political theory. Second, the expansion of the Peace Corps, the enlargement of graduate programs (including Latin American studies), and the growing importance of U.S.–Latin American relations have all contributed to an increase in political research on Latin America. Third, Latin American political research is growing in Europe, Asia, and the Soviet Union.⁷ Fourth, the growth in the output of materials on Latin American politics and government is possibly a consequence of better methods of resource acquisition, more professional journals, more competent Latin American bibliographers, and computerized data storage and retrieval systems. Foremost among these bibliographic materials and resources is the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, “the single most important [bibliographic] publication since 1935.”⁸

The purpose of this research note is to measure trends in political science research on Latin America over the past thirty years. Its aim is to fill in some of the gaps found in the earlier efforts by Kling and Ranis and to provide a more comprehensive look at trends in research on Latin American politics since 1950. For example, what countries receive the most attention and how does this trend fluctuate over time? What categories of research do those interested in political science research focus on and why? Also, to what extent do research interests dovetail with the major political and historical trends that have occurred since 1950?

Methodology

The major source of data for this research was nineteen volumes of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* covering the years 1950 to 1980. The *Handbook* acquires a vast amount of material from all over the world pertaining to Latin America and the Caribbean. But as an annotated bibliography, the *Handbook* does not include unpublished documents and dissertations. The *Handbook* is also selective in that each coeditor is asked to choose only those items that are judged to be of permanent value. On average, coeditors include approximately 60 percent of the materials that are sent for review by the staff in the Hispanic Division of the Library of Congress. For the purposes of this study, a total of 7,869

citations from the sections entitled "Government," "Government and International Relations," and "Government and Politics" in the *Handbook* were examined.⁹

Past and Present Trends in Geographical Areas of Research

The first step in measuring geographical areas of research was to count the number of *Handbook* citations per country for the thirty years under investigation. The results are presented in table 1. The most researched countries were found to be Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Cuba, and Mexico. These five countries accounted for about 58 percent of all citations for the 1950–80 period. These findings vary somewhat from the trends that Ranis discovered using a shorter time span, a smaller number of projects or citations, and strictly North American sources on Latin American political research. For example, it would seem that the inflated position of Mexico in Ranis's findings was a consequence of his strictly North American sources and a more limited time span.

In a survey of teachers of Latin American politics at American universities in 1974, Henry Kenski asked his sample to list both countries in which they had done field research and countries on which they felt they had the most expertise.¹⁰ His results also found Mexico to be the most favored nation for field research, followed by Brazil, Peru, Colombia, and Chile. In the category of "perceived expertise," Kenski found the top five to be Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Peru, and Argentina.

The countries in Latin America that receive the least attention are those in Central America and the Caribbean. As indicated in table 1, most Latin Americanists ignore Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Haiti, Panama, and Costa Rica. For example, only nineteen works of a political nature were cited and annotated in the *Handbook* for Nicaragua over a span of thirty years. El Salvador received scarcely more attention, with forty-one works cited over the same time period. But more recent data from the *Handbook* would seem to suggest that greater attention is being paid to the smaller countries of Central America and the Caribbean following the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua, civil strife in El Salvador, Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative, and the American invasion of Grenada in 1983.

The trends that emerged when geographical areas of research were examined by five-year intervals from 1950 to 1980 suggest a surprising amount of continuity combined with research responsiveness to major political events. The breakdown of research attention into five-year intervals in table 2 shows particular sensitivity in the cases of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Cuba. For example, Brazil received a low of 10.5 percent of the citations during the 1950–55 period but a high of 20.4 percent during the 1961–65 period, when President Goulart was

TABLE 1 Geographical Areas of Research, 1950–1980

Geographical Areas ^a	Number of Articles/Books	Percentage of Total (%)
Argentina	803	12.0
Bolivia	302	5.0
Brazil	1,064	16.0
Chile	679	10.0
Colombia	453	7.0
Cuba	679	10.0
Dominican Republic	128	2.0
Ecuador	107	2.0
Guatemala	129	2.0
Mexico	576	9.0
Panama	69	1.0
Paraguay	59	1.0
Peru	399	6.0
Puerto Rico	122	2.0
Surinam	4	.0 ^b
Uruguay	206	3.0
Venezuela	419	6.0
Other Central America ^c	151	2.0
Other Caribbean ^d	193	3.0
Totals	6,542	99.1 ^e

^aThe “General” category in the *Handbook* (1,327 items) was omitted from this table.

^bThe actual percentage for Surinam is .01%.

^cIncludes Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

^dIncludes Antigua, Barbados, French Guiana, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Martinique, St. Kitts, and Trinidad and Tobago.

^eRounding caused the total to deviate from 100% in this and the other tables.

overthrown and the Brazilian military began a long tenure of political control. Argentina received most of its research attention while either the Peróns were in power or Peronism was a major factor in Argentine politics. After the overthrow of Isabelita Perón in 1976, research attention declined dramatically to less than 7 percent for the 1976–80 period. This rapid decline in attention (from over 15 percent to 7 percent) occurred despite the “dirty war” that was part of Argentine security policy and the human rights component of President Carter’s Latin American policy.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Chile received from 3.3 to 7.0 percent of all citations for the twenty-year period. The election and overthrow of Salvador Allende, however, made Chile the most researched country in Latin America during the 1971–75 period, with 16.6 percent of all citations. The interest in Cuba clearly corresponds to the

TABLE 2 *Geographical Areas of Research by Five-Year Periods, 1950–1980*

<i>Geographical Area</i>	<i>1950–55 (%)</i>	<i>1956–60 (%)</i>	<i>1961–65 (%)</i>	<i>1966–70 (%)</i>	<i>1971–75 (%)</i>	<i>1976–80 (%)</i>
Argentina	17.0 (64)	17.0 (69)	11.0 (130)	11.0 (151)	15.0 (298)	7.0 (91)
Bolivia	3.0 (13)	6.0 (23)	6.0 (70)	7.0 (100)	3.0 (54)	3.0 (42)
Brazil	11.0 (40)	20.0 (84)	20.0 (237)	16.0 (224)	13.0 (255)	18.0 (224)
Chile	4.0 (16)	3.0 (14)	5.0 (55)	7.0 (101)	17.0 (324)	14.0 (169)
Colombia	6.0 (21)	3.0 (11)	4.0 (45)	8.0 (111)	9.0 (182)	7.0 (83)
Cuba	3.0 (12)	9.0 (36)	19.0 (218)	14.0 (195)	7.0 (133)	7.0 (85)
Dominican Republic	3.0 (11)	4.0 (16)	2.0 (18)	3.0 (48)	1.0 (24)	1.0 (11)
Ecuador	4.0 (16)	2.0 (8)	2.0 (26)	1.0 (11)	1.0 (26)	2.0 (20)
Guatemala	5.0 (19)	6.0 (23)	1.0 (17)	2.0 (28)	1.0 (21)	2.0 (21)
Mexico	13.0 (48)	10.0 (43)	6.0 (66)	8.0 (113)	9.0 (168)	11.0 (138)
Panama	.2 (1)	1.0 (6)	3.0 (30)	1.0 (14)	1.0 (14)	.3 (4)
Paraguay	2.0 (6)	2.0 (9)	1.0 (9)	1.0 (14)	1.0 (12)	1.0 (9)
Peru	3.0 (10)	5.0 (19)	5.0 (59)	6.0 (84)	7.0 (127)	8.0 (100)
Puerto Rico	6.0 (21)	1.0 (6)	1.0 (11)	2.0 (27)	2.0 (37)	2.0 (20)
Surinam		.2 (1)	.01 (1)	.01 (1)		.01 (1)
Uruguay	6.0 (23)	5.0 (21)	2.0 (27)	3.0 (49)	3.0 (59)	2.0 (27)
Venezuela	8.0 (29)	5.0 (21)	6.0 (75)	7.0 (95)	7.0 (129)	6.0 (70)
Other Central America	6.0 (24)	2.0 (7)	1.0 (13)	2.0 (24)	1.0 (23)	5.0 (60)
Other Caribbean	1.0 (4)	.2 (1)	4.0 (50)	2.0 (30)	3.0 (58)	4.0 (50)
Totals	101.20 (378)	101.40 (418)	99.01 (1157)	101.10 (1420)	101.00 (1944)	100.31 (1225)

Note: Figures in parentheses are base numbers for the adjacent percentages.

early stages of the Castro revolution, the Bay of Pigs invasion, the Cuban missile crisis, and the Alliance for Progress, all of which occurred during the 1961–65 period. Mexico, with an overall ranking of fifth for the thirty-year period, ranked second in research attention in 1950–55 and third in 1970–76 but dipped to a sixth-place ranking in 1961–65, when research attention shifted to Brazil and Cuba.

The patterns that are revealed in the top five countries combined with the relatively consistent patterns of most of the others can be explained in several ways. First, size plays a major role in determining which countries attract the most research. The larger the Latin American country, whether stable or unstable, the more likely it is to draw the attention of political researchers. The larger countries are also more developed and therefore somewhat easier places to conduct fieldwork in comparison with the smaller Latin American countries. Second, Mexico's position in the top five is largely due to its geographical accessibility to North American researchers, its economic growth rate since 1950, and its relatively successful political apparatus. Third, political development and leadership characteristics are also important in explaining patterns of research attention. Argentina and Chile, for example, received a great deal of attention during the 1950–80 period because of populist forms of government, military rule, and forms of charismatic leadership. Fourth, "alien" leftist ideologies, revolutionary programs, and Cold War hysteria serve in part to explain why Chile and Cuba, despite their small size, have received so much research attention. Chile and Cuba tied for third-place ranking among total citations for the thirty-year period of investigation. Thus the radical renovationist policies of Castro and Allende and their impact on the United States and Latin America served to increase greatly the amount of research attention devoted to these two small Latin American countries.

Subject Areas of Research

The kinds of studies done by political scientists on Latin American politics include a broad range of subjects. The trends presented in table 3 indicate that the political subjects of research reflect a strong interest in four areas: first, revolutionary movements, terrorism, and political violence; second, dictators and oligarchs of various types; third, political parties and elections; and fourth, government institutions and functions. The above four categories constitute 53 percent of the subjects of research during the 1950–80 period. In contrast, the five least studied subjects include the role of women in politics, education and student politics, political socialization, human rights, and politics and the news media. These five subjects make up a paltry 6 percent of the total subjects studied during this thirty-year period. It is interesting

to note that in most cases, the subjects of political research remain remarkably constant over the period of investigation. The emphasis on revolutionary issues, government institutions and functions, political parties and elections, and various types of leaders in table 3 suggests a much different pattern than Ranis found in his investigation during the 1960s. For example, Ranis found that "interest groups and political party research account for almost one-third of all political science investigation on Latin America" ¹¹ Using the *Handbook* and a much broader time frame, it was found that interest groups and political parties account for no more than 10–15 percent of the political science research on Latin America. Thus the data in table 3 suggest that North American researchers are much more interested in interest groups and political parties than their Latin American counterparts.

The dominance of the subject area of revolutionary movements, terrorism, violence, and political ideology, with over 25 percent of all citations, is influenced basically by two opposing perspectives for understanding government and politics. The Latin American perspective often stresses such variables as class, economic control, and elitism combined with a more polemical style of writing and analysis. The North American perspective tends to be less polemical and more eclectic in analyzing the "causes" of development and underdevelopment. Thus the North American perspective is more likely to employ bureaucratic, cultural, and political variables in its research designs. This discrepancy in orientations is perhaps best explained by the fact that Latin American scholars often stress relevance and the desire to act more than methodological elegance.

Future Trends and Research Agendas

Several trends emerge on the basis of the government and politics citations in the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* during the 1950–80 period. The first trend is the amount of attention being devoted to the larger Latin American countries, with the two exceptions of Cuba and Chile. Seven countries received over 70 percent of all citations between 1950 and 1980. The second trend is the increased amount of research attention devoted to Central America and the Caribbean beginning with the 1976–80 period. This interest no doubt results from the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua and the downfall of Anastasio Somoza Debayle in 1979. The 1981–85 period should reflect a continued interest by political scientists and others in the events in El Salvador, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the invasion of Grenada, and President Reagan's efforts to topple the Nicaraguan government with a "secret army" of counterrevolutionaries (*contras*). The third trend is the decline in the volume of literature for the military-authoritarian governments as

TABLE 3 *Subject Areas of Research by Five Year Periods, 1950–1980*

<i>Subject Area</i>	<i>Total Period (%)</i>	<i>1950–55 (%)</i>	<i>1956–60 (%)</i>
Revolutionary issues	25.0 (2000)	18.0 (76)	27.0 (186)
Government and legal institutions	11.0 (849)	35.0 (151)	9.0 (63)
Parties, groups and elections	10.0 (787)	10.0 (45)	10.0 (69)
International relations and foreign affairs	9.0 (727)	1.0 (5)	22.0 (153)
Country and comparative studies	8.0 (654)	9.0 (37)	8.0 (54)
Leaders	7.0 (576)	12.0 (52)	13.0 (93)
Armed forces	6.0 (497)	3.0 (12)	2.0 (16)
Economic issues	5.0 (413)	3.0 (12)	3.0 (21)
Urban issues	4.0 (312)	1.0 (4)	.2 (2)
Church and state	3.0 (206)	1.0 (5)	1.0 (8)
Agrarian issues	3.0 (244)	2.0 (7)	1.0 (4)
Theoretical and empirical analysis	2.0 (193)	2.0 (8)	1.0 (4)
Education	2.0 (140)	.4 (2)	.4 (3)
Other ^a	3.0 (271)	4.0 (16)	2.0 (13)
Totals	98.0 (7869)	101.4 (432)	99.6 (689)

Note: Figures in parentheses are base numbers for the adjacent percentages.

^aThis residual category includes women in politics, intellectuals, political socialization, human rights, political prisoners, criminal justice, and the media and politics.

Table 3 (continued).

1961-65 (%)	1966-70 (%)	1971-75 (%)	1976-80 (%)
28.0 (383)	23.0 (432)	26.0 (528)	25.0 (395)
6.0 (87)	8.0 (157)	11.0 (231)	10.0 (160)
10.0 (138)	10.0 (162)	10.0 (204)	11.0 (169)
20.0 (271)	12.0 (231)	3.0 (39)	2.0 (28)
10.0 (134)	11.0 (214)	6.0 (128)	6.0 (87)
7.0 (97)	5.0 (112)	6.0 (116)	7.0 (106)
4.0 (56)	6.0 (104)	10.0 (189)	8.0 (120)
4.0 (55)	6.0 (103)	7.0 (147)	5.0 (75)
1.0 (18)	3.0 (59)	5.0 (100)	8.0 (129)
2.0 (24)	3.0 (53)	3.0 (60)	4.0 (56)
2.0 (24)	4.0 (69)	4.0 (72)	4.0 (68)
1.0 (8)	2.0 (45)	3.0 (69)	4.0 (59)
2.0 (31)	3.0 (51)	2.0 (35)	1.0 (18)
2.0 (30)	4.0 (75)	4.0 (87)	6.0 (92)
99.0 (1356)	100.0 (1867)	100.0 (2005)	101.0 (1562)

these governments have made way for the return to civilian rule. With more than 90 percent of the governments of South America now in the hands of democratically elected leaders, this trend should be even more pronounced for the 1981–85 period. The fourth trend is derived from the growing number of Latin American political scientists whose professional training and research competence will clearly contribute to theoretical and empirical understanding of Latin American political phenomena. All of these trends do not suggest that the situation found by Merle Kling over twenty years ago has been corrected. But the study of Latin American politics has progressed to the point that the investment has reaped major returns: personnel with adequate training and technical competence are no longer in short supply, research techniques are of a sophisticated nature, and the level of productivity is increasing at a dramatic rate.

Research agendas for the future can never be precisely or comprehensively enumerated. What follows is a call for careful scholarship that will add to the growing quality of materials on Latin American government and politics. Political scientists will continue to follow research agendas that are popular or feasible, and what happens in the media will no doubt shape funding opportunities, graduate programs, and research foci. Moreover, research agendas that center on military-authoritarian and fascist regimes will be constrained by having to deal with “safe” topics in-country while reserving the more incisive critical analyses and investigations of government and politics for publication outside the country.

The Breakdown of Military-Authoritarian Regimes / Latin American politics now seem to have entered another cycle of democratic rule after more than a decade of predominantly military governments. How can one explain the breakdown of governments based on armed bureaucrats who must rely on force and violence to rule over any sustained period of time? This topic of scholarly analysis should also strive to elucidate the structural, budgetary, and institutional effects of military rule. The prime prospects for this type of analysis are Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and Bolivia.

Career Analysis of Political Elites / One of the large gaps in our understanding of Latin American politics is the need for background information on political leaders in executive and legislative positions. Unlike the situation in the United States and Europe, researchers are woefully ignorant of the careers and behavior patterns of the individuals who make legislative and executive policy in Latin America.

Political Biography / The field of Latin American politics has not been one in which good biographies have been available to help scholars understand political leadership and development. No scholarly biographies exist on even such important Latin American leaders as Fidel Castro and José María Velasco Ibarra.

Contrasting Styles of Latin American and North American Political Analysis / How is political life viewed and analyzed by different political researchers? This old debate is one that needs renewed attention because of the increasing influence of Latin American scholars on Latin American political studies.

Legal and Governmental Institutions and Processes / The call for this kind of research agenda results partly from the fact that only 10 percent of all research between 1950 and 1980 focused on legal and institutional aspects of politics. Perhaps with the return of democratic institutions and the demise of authoritarian regimes that have restricted scholarship, more research attention will be devoted to institutional analysis, particularly by Latin American scholars.

Economic Policy-Making / Not enough attention has been devoted to the politics of economic policy-making in Latin America. The pathbreaking works by Charles Anderson¹² and Albert Hirschman¹³ have provided important beginnings for studies of political economy. Except for the recent works of Gary Wynia¹⁴ and Pedro-Pablo Kuczynski,¹⁵ however, careful analyses of political economy in Latin America are difficult to find.

The Politics of Urban Labor / Except in the cases of Argentina and Mexico, knowledge of labor unions and labor movements in Latin America has not kept pace with knowledge of other important actors in the political game.

The Relationship between Electoral Behavior and Democratic Rule / Knowledge of electoral systems and participatory attitudes is rather weak except for some of the research on the Venezuelan system by Enrique Baloyra and John Martz.¹⁶ Unfortunately, other Latin American democracies have not attracted the attention needed on this subject.

Sustaining Democracy in Latin America / More theory-building and comparative cross-national research designs are needed to help to explain the sustenance of democracy in such countries as Colombia, Venezuela, Costa Rica, and the Dominican Republic.

The Politics of Drug Trafficking in Select Latin American Countries / The growing impact of drugs (primarily marijuana and cocaine) on the politics of Colombia, Bolivia, Jamaica, and Peru needs to be investigated. The interconnections between illegal economic activities and key actors in the political system will no doubt have lasting effects on the structure of power and the organization of the economy of those countries.

Despite the fact that much needs to be done in the study of Latin American politics, the literature on Latin American government and politics has attained a level of sophistication that few could have envisioned in the 1950s. In 1979 Philip B. Taylor, Jr., concluded twenty-two years as coeditor of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* with the following assessment of the gains that have been made in the study of government and politics:

While *pensadores* still publish throughout the hemisphere (some having found a fashionable and inferentially militant genre in *dependencia*) the generational change in Latin American universities that began in the 1960s now produces regularly more insightful, perceptive and careful studies. The qualitative and quantitative improvement in the U.S. is also notable. In Europe, however, few institutes and scholars have attained this level. The coming of age of literature on Latin America can be attributed to scholarly competition, based on the substantial change in the environment fostered by professional organizations such as the Latin American Studies Association, and to the ever-increasing number of active researchers.¹⁷

Therefore, those of us who labor to understand political life and social change in Latin America have some reason to rejoice over what has been accomplished during the past thirty years. May the next thirty years continue to expand the wealth of literature and the level of sophistication so evident in the current study of Latin American politics.

NOTES

1. Peter Ranis, "Trends in Research on Latin American Politics: 1961-67," *LARR* 3, no. 3 (1967):71-78.
2. *Ibid.*, 72.
3. *Ibid.*
4. 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.
5. Fernando Henrique Cardoso is a Brazilian associated with the Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) in São Paulo. Julio Cotler is a Peruvian associated with the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP) in Lima. Guillermo O'Donnell, an Argentine, was formerly associated with the Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) in Buenos Aires and is currently with the Instituto Universitário de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro (IUPERJ) as well as the Kellogg Institute of International Studies at the University of Notre Dame.
6. For a comprehensive list of Latin American and Caribbean political research centers, see Abraham F. Lowenthal, "Research in Latin America and the Caribbean on International Relations and Foreign Policy: Some Impressions," *LARR* 18, no. 1 (1983):154-74.

7. For Asia, see Carmelo Mesa-Lago, "Latin American Studies in Japan," *LARR* 17, no. 3 (1982):173–92; Gustavo Andrade, S.J., "Latin American Studies in Japan," *LARR* 8, no. 1 (1973):147–56; Fumio Nakagawa, "The Japanese Contribution to Latin American Studies," *LARR* 17, no. 1 (1982):105–13; R. Narayanan, "Latin American Studies in India," *LARR* 18, no. 3 (1983):179–84; and Mark Sidel, "Latin American Studies in the People's Republic of China," *LARR* 18, no. 1 (1983):143–53. For Europe, see Volker Lühr, "Recent Research on Latin America in West Germany," *LARR* 15, no. 2 (1980):262–68; David E. Stansfield, "The Study of Latin American Politics in British Universities," *LARR* 9, no. 2 (1974):95–104; and Karl-Christian Goethner, "Research at GDR Universities in Latin America," *LARR* 18, no. 3 (1983):165–78. For the Soviet Union, see Victor V. Vof'skii, "The Study of Latin America in the USSR," *LARR* 3, no. 1 (1967):77–87; Cole Blasier, "The Soviet Latin Americanists," *LARR* 16, no. 1 (1981):107–23; Joseph D. Barnard, "Recent Soviet Efforts in Latin American Studies," *LARR* 14, no. 1 (1979):234–38; and Jerry F. Hough, "The Evolving Soviet Debate on Latin America," *LARR* 16, no. 1 (1981):124–43.
8. Peter T. Johnson, "Bibliography: Current Practices and Future Trends," *LARR* 18, no. 1 (1983):261.
9. The emphasis in this study of past and present trends is on internal politics in Latin America, including the Caribbean nations. But editorial policy changes in the preparation of the *Handbook* made it necessary to include some inter-American titles in the compilations. For example, starting with 1950 (Volume 22), the *Handbook* staff categorized constitutional and political affairs under the heading of "Government." Then from 1961 (Volume 23) until 1971 (Volume 33), the internal political literature and international relations materials were categorized together under the heading "Government and International Relations." This period (1961–71) also witnessed the *Handbook's* shift from an annual edition that included both the humanities and social sciences to an annual edition that covers the humanities one year and the social sciences the next, continuing in alternation. From 1973 (Volume 35) on, the *Handbook* has categorized internal political literature under the heading of "Government and Politics," with subheadings that distinguish between a general category and various subregional categories.
10. Henry C. Kenski, "Teaching Latin American Politics at American Universities: A Survey," *LARR* 10, no. 1 (1975):91.
11. Ranis, "Trends in Research," 72.
12. Charles W. Anderson, *Politics and Economic Change in Latin America* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1967).
13. Albert O. Hirschman, *Journeys toward Progress: Studies of Economic Policy-Making in Latin America* (New York: Twentieth-Century Fund, 1963).
14. Gary W. Wynia, *The Politics of Latin American Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
15. Pedro-Pablo Kuczynski, *Peruvian Democracy under Economic Stress: An Account of the Belaúnde Administration, 1963–68* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).
16. Enrique A. Baloyra and John D. Martz, *Political Attitudes in Venezuela: Societal Cleavages and Political Opinion* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979).
17. Philip B. Taylor, Jr., "South America: East Coast," *Handbook of Latin American Studies* 41 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979), 517.