
EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Historical contexts profoundly shape the intellectual character and political implications of foreign area studies. The institutionalization of Latin American studies as a professional field took place in the 1960s against a particularly dramatic background of tension and controversy in inter-American relations. Fidel Castro marched into Havana on the first day of 1959. The U.S.-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 was followed by the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. In 1964 the Brazilian military overthrew a civilian government with tacit U.S. support. In 1965 President Lyndon Johnson ordered the U.S. marines into the Dominican Republic. In 1966 the military regime led by General Juan Carlos Onganía seized power in Argentina. And so it went until by the mid-1970s, most of Latin America was under military rule.

These historic events served as both stimulus and counterpoint to the professionalizing and institutionalizing of Latin American studies. As a direct consequence of the Cuban Revolution, Latin American studies was added in 1960 to the list of foreign area fields eligible for federal support under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). In 1962 the Ford Foundation awarded a grant of one million dollars to the Social Science Research Council for strengthening Latin American studies in the United States. Under SSRC auspices, a group of scholars met in December 1964 in Cuernavaca and agreed to establish the *Latin American Research Review*. LARR published its first issue in 1965. In October 1965, the LARR Editorial Board and the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs (CLASP) held a joint meeting in Ithaca, New York, and agreed to establish a new national association. Inaugurated in May 1966, the Latin American Studies Association proved to be a considerable success.

It was inevitable that the opposition between the revolutionary experiments in Latin America and U.S. government support of counter-revolutionary regimes in the region would be reflected in the intellectual and political agenda that came to characterize Latin American studies in

the United States. Issues of human and civil rights dominated intellectual concerns. U.S. Latin Americanists of all persuasions felt deep sympathy and support for professional colleagues suffering under dictatorship. LASA achieved a certain fame (or notoriety) for the frequency and vigor of its criticisms of U.S. actions in the hemisphere. Hence the contradictions between U.S. policy and Latin American developments tended to reinforce a sense of unity and common purpose in the field of Latin American studies.

Thirty years later, the hemispheric context has been transformed dramatically. With a few troublesome exceptions, democracy has returned to Latin America. The democratic agenda in most cases has included a reduction in the size and role of the state, *concertación* among political actors, neoliberal economic policies, export-led development, and regional economic integration. All these policies are being supported by the United States, which in recent years has compiled a good track record of encouraging the trend toward redemocratization in Latin America. The same Latin American intellectuals who once suffered persecution are now in many cases playing key roles in the governments of their countries, managing the new policies.

Such changes are also affecting Latin American studies. The new Latin American agenda is resulting in a diverse set of experiments and outcomes that require analysis. At the same time, the historic contradictions between U.S. interests and Latin American trends have diminished. As a result, the former sense of common purpose among U.S. Latin Americanists is being replaced by a flowering of diversity as well as by disagreement about the proper direction of the field in this "postmodern period." Some scholars are choosing to analyze the implications of the macro-economic policies and institutional experiments that seem to be transforming the region. Others are turning their attention to the international forces and agencies that are shaping the context in which Latin America must function. Still other scholars are turning away from the dominant policy agendas to investigate issues important to groups under-represented in previous research, such as women, indigenous peoples, and other ethnic, cultural, and religious minorities. Newer issues related to the costs of development, such as ecology and urban studies, are rising in importance. Finally, many of the themes of Latin America's extraordinary history are being reinterpreted and reinvestigated. All these diverse endeavors are reflected in the pages of *LARR*, enriching its contents.

Manuscript submissions to *LARR* during the year running from June 1993 through May 1994 continued to be numerous although down somewhat from the previous year (114 manuscripts as compared with 136 for the 1992–1993 period). This trend may reflect the absence of a LASA congress in 1993, given that such meetings tend to stimulate submissions. Twenty-one of these submissions were book review essays. The remain-

ing manuscripts entered the review process. By the end of May 1993, 10 manuscripts had been accepted for publication or accepted pending revisions, 52 has been rejected, 2 had been withdrawn, and the remaining 29 were still under original review or a second review following revisions. An additional 8 "old manuscripts" (from the previous report period) were accepted after being revised and resubmitted. The publication rate for articles and research notes that completed the review process (those accepted or rejected) is about 1 of 6 original submissions, with the proportion rising to about 1 of every 4 if resubmitted manuscripts are included in the overall totals.

The distribution by discipline reflected a slight increase in the proportion of political science submissions to 27 percent of the total. Second place was again held by history with 24 percent of submissions. Economics (15 percent) and sociology (11 percent) reversed their rankings of the previous year. Language and literature submissions were in fifth place with 8 percent of submissions, barely edging out anthropology with 7 percent of the total. Other fields such as bibliography, communications, education, geography, and studies of religion accounted for the remaining 8 percent of submissions.

<i>Discipline</i>	<i>June 1993– May 1994</i>	<i>June 1992– May 1993</i>	<i>June 1991– May 1992</i>
Political Science	27%	24%	32%
History	24	22	22
Economics	15	15	12
Sociology	11	12	15
Languages and Literature	8	9	5
Anthropology	7	8	7
Other fields	8	10	7
Totals	100%	100%	100%

Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian authors or coauthors, including those living in Europe and North America, submitted 33 percent of all submissions, down 8 percent from the previous year. Women authored or co-authored 26 percent of submissions, the same percentage as in the last manuscript report. Twenty-six percent of the manuscripts came from outside the United States, the same as the previous year. Forty-eight percent of these non-U.S. manuscripts came from Latin America and the Caribbean, as compared with 50 percent in the preceding report period. Latin American and Caribbean countries represented were Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Trinidad, and Venezuela.

Other countries represented included Australia, Canada, England, France, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, Scotland, and Switzerland.

The continuing diversity of subject matter, discipline, and the authors' backgrounds reinforces our belief in the wisdom of the traditional *LARR* policy of not commissioning articles or research reports. *LARR* publishes only two categories of refereed articles and research reports: surveys of the current state of research on Latin America and original research contributions that are judged to be of general and interdisciplinary interest. Change and diversity in Latin American studies are best represented in *LARR* if its contents reflect the initiative of authors and the informed judgments of peer referees rather than the preferences of the editors. Sometimes the outside evaluators reject pieces that the editors would have liked to publish or accept pieces that the editors find less meritorious. That is the nature of the peer review process and the best guarantee that collective wisdom will continue to be represented in these pages.

Gilbert W. Merx
Albuquerque, New Mexico