
REPORTS

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES IN BRITISH UNIVERSITIES: PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS*

*Harold Blakemore, Institute of Latin American Studies,
The University of London*

BACKGROUND

APPROXIMATELY FIVE YEARS HAVE NOW ELAPSED SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT of Latin American studies in British universities on an institutional basis and, since the next quinquennium begins in less than two years' time, in 1972, and universities in Britain are already preparing their plans for that period, this may be an appropriate moment for taking stock of developments to date, and for speculating about the future.¹ But in order to appreciate the current situation, it would be useful to set the subject in its historical context and to consider first the state of Latin American studies in Britain before the establishment of Centres and Institutes, and the reasons why they came into being.

They did so as one of the results of a Committee set up in October 1962, "to review developments in the universities in the field of Latin American Studies and to consider and advise on proposals for future developments."² And this Committee, of which more will be said later, reporting to its parent body, the University Grants Committee in August 1964, revealed in comprehensive fashion the neglect of Latin America in British higher education, and the general ignorance of that continent in the country as a whole.

Certain obvious reasons explain this situation. Apart from the facts of

* This review article is based in part on a previous account, entitled "Latin American Studies in Britain. After Parry: A Report of Some Reflections," *Bank of London and South America Review*, 2:17 (May, 1968), 250–57, with considerable revision and up-dating of the material therein presented. The author wishes to emphasize that the views expressed are essentially personal and are in no way attributable to the institution of which he is a member.

physical distance between Great Britain and Latin America—perhaps more apparent than real—there existed cultural differences between their peoples, and there was the record of history. That history, it should be emphasized, involved not only Britain's relations with Latin America but also with the rest of the world. First and foremost, there did not exist in the past that involvement of the British government and people with the affairs of Latin America which obtained in Asia and Africa, and which even the independence of these areas from colonial control has done little to diminish. It is true, of course, that for about a century after the emancipation of the Latin American states, Great Britain was the most significant extra-continental power for most of them: her interests, however, were commercial and strategic, never imperial.³ The numbers of British people in commercial, banking, governmental and other walks of life with connections in Latin America were not inconsiderable, but they have never compared with the volume and range of contacts existing with Asia and Africa. Thus, the many Anglo-Latin American communities dotted about the continent today have always been somewhat on the periphery of British national consciousness of overseas connections, in comparison with the investment of sentiment and interest in the ex-colonial territories.⁴ This situation was, and still is, further reflected in British press coverage of world events, where a day-by-day analysis of leading newspapers would suggest that little of note ever happened in Latin America except for the sporadic violence of man and nature. On the other hand, a slight rise of political temperature in India or Kenya merits many column inches and a few background articles.

There were other natural and obvious reasons why British interest in Latin America should rate a low priority. The drastic reduction of British economic influence in the Western Hemisphere—in part the cost of two World Wars and the Great Depression—coupled with the dramatic growth of United State hegemony further reduced Britain's connection with the Latin American countries. Finally, in the aftermath of the Second World War, the rapid re-drawing of the maps of Asia and Africa, together with the remarkable resurgence of Europe, concentrated British attention on these continents and left Latin America largely as *terra incognita* in the minds of most people in Britain.

These facts are obvious and well known. Nor can it be denied that, until the decade of the 1960s, interest in Latin America in the United States and in Europe generally also took second place to concern with events elsewhere in a world of super-powers and developing nations.⁵ In this respect, there was, perhaps, nothing remarkable in the British case, and the question might well have been asked, in the light of the circumstances sketched out about, not why British interest in Latin America was so small, but why, indeed, that interest should exist at all.

The Committee set up to investigate Latin American studies in British

universities provided cogent answers to that question. Its report referred to the size and growing significance of Latin America in world affairs; to the world-wide interests and obligations of Great Britain, and her necessity to seek to understand so important a part of the international community; to the historical role British had played in Latin American development, including the wars of independence and the strong financial and commercial ties of the last century.⁶ The report also pointed to the distinguished British tradition of intellectual interest in Latin America, exemplified by such names as Robertson and Southey among historians, Maudslay and Joyce among archaeologists, and Bates, Wallace, and Spruce among naturalists, emphasizing that, apart from the importance of the serious study of Latin America on practical economic, social, and political grounds, the intrinsic interest of the continent to a wide range of university disciplines was no less compelling.⁷

Although some references were made in the report to the state of other area studies in British universities, no explicit comparisons were made. But it is interesting to note that when the Parry Committee began its investigation, the *second* major post-war expansion of Asian, African, Slavonic, and East European studies was already under way. The first, resulting from the report of a commission of enquiry which appeared in 1947, roundly declared that "the existing provision for these studies is unworthy of our country and people. . . . It would be harmful to the national interest to allow the present state of affairs to continue or even to deteriorate."⁸ At that time, over one hundred university teachers were engaged full-time in Asian and African studies, predominantly in language and linguistics. By 1960, the number of such staff had risen to nearly 250, and there had been a considerable increase in the range of disciplines they represented. Yet, when this programme of development came up for review in 1959, and the committee charged with that responsibility issued its report in 1961, it urged, among other measures, the creation of several more centres for these area studies and the establishment of a further 125 university posts over the next ten years, with emphatic concentration on departments other than language departments.⁹

Contrast that activity with the Parry Committee's findings on what then existed in British universities that could properly be called Latin American studies: isolated posts, no more than nine in all, designated to refer explicitly and exclusively to some branch of these studies; relatively few students; practically no provision for the recruitment and training of staff; and little opportunity for the interested few to undertake field research or find outlets for publication. For the British research student, hopefully investing his talents in the detailed study of the continent, the actual chance to visit it was hardly less remote than Latin America itself. The amount spent on Latin American collections by university and other important libraries indicated how few were the

funds to maintain, let alone extend, the interest that did exist: the British Museum's Library received an annual allocation for this purpose approximately one forty-eighth of that spent by the Library of Congress, while its famous newspaper library at Colindale took only two dailies from Latin America.

These are random examples and incidental statistics and, in any event, no one in academic life would assume a causal connection between quantity and quality. Indeed, in the field of Latin American studies before the Parry Report, the outstanding feature of such developments as had taken place was the contribution of a few individual scholars who, through their teaching and supervision of students, and their own research and publication, had done much more than merely keep alive an intellectual interest in Latin America. Nevertheless, they had done so largely on their own, without specific funds to enlarge their field of study, and they lacked, in particular, the reinforcing presence of other scholars either in their own or different disciplines to relieve their isolation in their own universities.¹⁰ What characterised the growth of Asian and African studies in British universities more than anything else was their concentration in a selected number of particular places where some strength already existed, and logic suggested that Latin American studies should be promoted in a similar way, though they had much less to build on.¹¹

The Parry Committee reported to the University Grants Committee in August 1964, and its report was published early in 1965. On March 18 of that year, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, the then Secretary of State for Education and Science announced the government's acceptance of "the broad objectives of the Report," and the Grants Committee had been asked "to enter into discussions with the universities and to put forward detailed proposals."¹² In fact, almost another year elapsed before the universities concerned knew precisely what funds would be available to implement those proposals during the rest of the current quinquennium (1962–67), a frustrating delay for those most concerned but not a critical one. Once the money had been provided, progress was made at a rapid rate.

THE PARRY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS¹³

The major proposal designed to create more informed knowledge about Latin America in the United Kingdom was to establish five university centres for studies of the area at Cambridge, Glasgow, Liverpool, London, and Oxford. Each Centre was to create a number of 'named' posts during the period 1965–72, that is, posts specifically designated as being concerned with Latin American studies; each was to receive earmarked grants for the expansion of library collections, and funds to invite for each year a distinguished Latin American scholar to be in residence. New postgraduate courses, leading to a higher degree in Latin American studies, were to be established, the emphasis

here being placed on an inter-disciplinary approach to the area. Specific provision was to be made for research studentships in the Latin American field, and the exiguous opportunities then available for staff to travel to Latin America were to be enlarged. Finally, the London Centre was to act as a national clearing-house for information on Latin American studies in the United Kingdom, collecting, collating, and publishing data for distribution to interested bodies at home and abroad.¹⁴

These recommendations were, in effect, the core of the Parry programme. Given the likelihood that available resources would be limited, the case for some degree of concentration at designated Centres was strong, though the Committee hoped that other universities which had shown interest in the field would continue their efforts and would be encouraged to do so. Although it was envisaged that a Latin American centre would exist primarily on a curricular basis, with staff from different disciplines and in separate departments co-operating in common purposes, it was also recognised that some modest architectural expression of a centre was desirable. The experience of Asian and African studies had shown that a local habitation and a name had greatly helped to identify their role both locally and nationally, and the academic concept of an area studies centre was made explicit through an actual building devoted exclusively to that purpose.

Inevitably, the Committee's choice both of the number of Centres to be set up and of the universities to be invited to establish them was not universally applauded, but the Committee was well aware of the highly invidious nature of its duty and discharged it reasonably well in the circumstances. It resisted the temptation, to which some might have wished it to succumb, "for something of an act of atonement by virtue of which anyone and everyone who professes interest in Latin America becomes thereby entitled to support from public funds."¹⁵ At the same time, while limiting its choice for concentration, it sought to encourage those other institutions and individuals with serious interest in Latin America by recommending some posts for non-centre universities and by the provision of travel funds for their staff.¹⁶ Concentration at the five designated universities was justified by their conformity or approximation to a number of highly relevant criteria of what a centre of Latin American studies should be, on the reasonable assumption that such studies could best grow there faster than elsewhere. The number selected was not an arbitrary total but a choice dictated by what was academically feasible and economically viable, coupled, no doubt, with a broad consideration of geographical factors.

THE PARRY CENTRES

With the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation, St. Antony's College, Oxford, had already begun in 1964 to create a Latin American Centre with which the university entered, in effect, into partnership; and in August 1965,

the Institute of Latin American Studies at London was established, to be followed soon after by Centres or Institutes at Cambridge, Glasgow, and Liverpool. Each university received earmarked grants for the establishment of new posts, for enlarging library resources, and for initiating teaching programmes at the postgraduate level, though the differences in structure of the universities concerned partly determined how the development of Latin American studies would be implemented. Thus, in London, far and away the largest British university in student and staff numbers, and with a long-standing federal structure embracing colleges, schools, and specialised institutes, the Institute fitted into a well-trying framework as the focus of interest in a specific field, with co-ordinating functions for the promotion of Latin American studies at the graduate level, and for the provision of opportunities for discussion and collaboration both between members of the university as a whole and also with other interested persons outside it. All posts established with earmarked funds, that is, Parry posts, therefore, are joint posts between the Institute and the appropriate colleges, so that teachers have an essential disciplinary base in the latter, as full members of departments and Faculties, and their link through the Institute with university colleagues who are also Latin Americanists. The anchors of this structure are the intercollegiate Master's degree in Latin American Studies, which the Institute administers, and a variety of seminars and meetings which bring teachers together. (More will be said of the postgraduate degree in the appropriate context.) Similarly, funds for library resources are allocated by a university committee to the many specialized collections which exist—history, anthropology, and geography at University College, literature primarily at King's College, politics, economics, and sociology at the London School of Economics, archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology, law at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, and so on. The Institute's holdings are deliberately limited to bibliographies, guides, aids to research, and works of reference, befitting its central position in Latin American studies within the university. And, as the Committee of Management of the Institute is broadly representative of the constituent parts of the university, including teachers of Latin American studies, and also outside interests, so also there exists a committee of librarians drawn from all university institutions with Latin American material.

Similar structures, though different in detail, exist at the other Centre-universities. Thus, at Liverpool and Glasgow, which do not have the collegiate structure of Cambridge, London, and Oxford, staff are appointed to the departments and have their meeting-place in the Centres; the degree of B.Phil. in Latin American Studies in Glasgow and Liverpool involves them in the Centre's activities, as do seminars and lectures. Here, however, library matters are much less complex, with a central university library playing the major role. Oxford

and Cambridge appointments are to university faculties, the lecturers usually being Fellows of particular colleges, but it is the Latin American Centres which co-ordinate activities in the field.

The five Parry Centres are linked with one another through an informal conference of their Directors, and they have sought to define fields of interest so as to minimise competition between them for scarce personnel. However, and thankfully, movements of staff cannot be directed, and we all know that subject interests follow the teachers. Moreover, while the movement of good graduates for postgraduate work to recognized centres of excellence is to be encouraged, this does imply a degree of self-denial on the part of universities which is difficult to achieve since they are all anxious to keep their best products. Despite these problems, some progress has been made in the Parry set-up in the last five years. In the subjects for which there is likely to be little demand, solutions are not so difficult. Thus, the Centres recognise that Latin American archaeology should be confined to London, with its large Institute of Archaeology and proximity to the British Museum, and to Cambridge, with its strong tradition of interest and the Fitzwilliam Museum. Latin American law is also mainly confined to London. In the more widely read disciplines, a higher degree of definition may be required. Thus, in Latin American history, which is, with literature, the subject most in demand, London's strong specialisation in the history of the colonial period, the independence movements and the nineteenth century, particularly in Brazil, the River Plate region, and Chile, makes the Centre there an obvious focus of such interests. The library collections of the Institute of Historical Research and of University College, coupled with the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and many other national repositories, strongly re-inforce the emphasis. Oxford also has strong historical interests, but the deliberate concentration here is on nineteenth and twentieth century developments, and on politics. St. Antony's College, with its world-wide coverage of contemporary affairs and modern history, is thus the natural home of the Latin American Centre. The accessibility of London to Oxford and vice-versa has encouraged co-operation between the centres in regard to such a definition of interests, and consultation between them is frequent and fruitful, even extending to the experiment of a joint post. In Glasgow, the tradition of literary interest and the existence of strong departments of International Economic Studies and of Government and Public Administration again dictate the emphases, particularly since the social science departments have on-going research projects of some size and importance in Latin America. Liverpool, again, with its long-standing Department of Hispanic Studies and as the home of the *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, has strong literary interests, and Departments of Geography and Politics which are increasingly turning their attention to Latin America.

Nevertheless, the degree of definition of a particular Centre as *the* place to study this or that subject has not yet arrived, and, indeed, it would be surprising if it had. The Parry Committee asked for a ten-year programme of development, with a review of what had been achieved to date by the start of the 1972–77 quinquennium.¹⁷ In view of past neglect of Latin American studies, the Committee had no illusions that the build-up would be anything but slow, given the need to recruit suitably qualified staff from a very limited pool, perhaps train postgraduates of high quality for teaching posts, build up library and research collections, and, most important of all, establish Latin American studies within universities in comparable academic esteem to that enjoyed by other areas of study. The development was to be soundly based, to avoid “indiscriminate recruitment to the ranks of Latin American ‘specialists’ [which] would, within a few years, discredit this whole field of study.”¹⁸ On the whole, this policy has succeeded: since the Centres were established, some 30 new teaching and research staff have been recruited to them, and this, for five centres, can hardly be regarded as a massive increase, nor one that is likely to endanger academic standards.

The overall aim of the Parry Report, insofar as one can be defined, was the enlargement of understanding between Britain and Latin America. An important contribution to this end was seen to lie in new postgraduate courses to be offered by the centres.¹⁹ These are taught higher degrees which the Committee hoped would have practical as well as broad intellectual ends, though, in any case, the dichotomy is often a false one. In the first place, these courses were seen as part of that general movement away from insularity which has characterized much of British education in recent years, a movement which, despite its critics, is felt broadly to be desirable in view of changes in Britain’s position in international affairs. The past concentration on Britain and Europe is no longer enough if young men and women are to understand the world in which they live and in which they will work. While some students would seek to acquire through a Latin American area studies degree a necessary basis for more specialized research, others would aim to obtain a sound foundation for careers where an understanding of Latin America might be necessary or desirable. Whatever the motive for taking the degree, all the students would be exposed to the cultural complex of Latin America and, it was hoped, would carry that experience with them into their working lives.

All the centres, except Cambridge, instituted such a degree within a short time of coming into existence and, while again there are differences of detail, the structures are comparable. London has an M.A. degree which may be taken in one or two years, depending on initial qualifications; Liverpool has a similar B.Phil.; Oxford and Glasgow offer the B.Phil. degree after two years of study. Candidates select from a range of available disciplines major and minor sub-

jects, and there is provision everywhere for the writing of a thesis as part of the examination requirement. Whether the provision of these taught higher degrees has created the demand or is, in fact, simply meeting a demand which exists is a moot point, but the numbers of postgraduate students applying has increased steadily year by year.²⁰ And applications show an increasing proportion of foreign students—from Europe, the United States, and Latin America—as well as from Great Britain. Competence in Spanish and/or Portuguese is a basic requirement for entrance to these multi-disciplinary courses.²¹

These degrees have been in existence for three years, *más o menos*, and the results so far perhaps are too small a sample to give valid conclusions on how far they are meeting the purpose for which they are designed. But it may be of interest to note that so far as the London experience is concerned, most of the students have, in fact, found occupations in which their training has been of direct relevance: several have gone on to doctoral research, a number have entered public services in the Latin American field—the B.B.C., the British Council, etc.; some have entered banks and business-houses concerned with Latin America, and some have gone into teaching.²²

In addition to these specific postgraduate degrees based on teaching—largely by the seminar and tutorial method—there is, of course, the research degree, and the establishment of the Centres and the greater attention given to Latin America generally in Great Britain in recent years has led to an increase in the number of well-qualified graduates undertaking research on Latin America. In 1966–67 there were 117 theses in progress on Latin American subjects in the universities of the United Kingdom; by 1968–69, the number had risen to 175, and by 1969–70 to 215.²³ By themselves, these statistics are not necessarily a matter for congratulation, except in so far as they reflect an increase in knowledge about Latin America which cannot be weighed, and the training of a number of minds which have yet to demonstrate that they can do more than tackle a thesis. But it may be of interest to note that the balance of subjects in which postgraduate research on Latin America is undertaken is changing. In 1966–67, history and literature dominated, as they were bound to do since these were the fields with the most staff and the best facilities: the number of dissertations in each was 47 and 27 respectively, and in 1969–70 the figure was 43 in each subject. By the same year, however, in comparison with 1966–67, theses in anthropology and sociology had more than doubled, from 10 to 26; in government and politics there was a rise from 5 to 30, in economics, from 21 to 31, and in geography, from 14 to 26. The data are somewhat crude and there is, of course, a sizeable overlap, with students taking two or three years for their research degree and thus appearing in more than one annual list. Moreover, since returns are made to the National Information Centre voluntarily, the picture may not be complete. Nevertheless, the ap-

parently increasing attention being given to certain of the social sciences is a highly desirable development. Latin American studies in Britain are particularly strong in history and literature, but comparatively weak in the social sciences. This is, of course, true of the situation in the United States also, though the disproportion is not so striking as in Great Britain. While, again, compulsion cannot be entertained in directing graduates to seek higher qualifications in other disciplines than those they choose themselves, greater encouragement for the weak fields of study is a necessity. There is something ludicrous in a situation in which Great Britain is producing highly qualified historians of Latin America who cannot then find academic posts in Great Britain, and have to seek them abroad, notably in the United States when, at the same time, the social sciences are starved of talent.

The taught higher degrees may go some way to correcting this situation by interesting good students in other possibilities than those they had assumed at the first-degree stage. Another tack, which is part of the Centres' operation, is to create Research Fellowships of two or three years' duration, and award them to graduates with good disciplinary training but lacking area orientation. With no teaching duties involved, the Fellow can devote his time to acquiring language competence, immerse himself in a research project which involves field-work in Latin America, and become, in effect, the makings of a Latin Americanist who might then obtain a teaching post in a university. Each Centre has two or three such posts which are a combination of training and research fellowships, and a number of holders of these in the past are now in teaching posts elsewhere. But there are, and there will continue to be, serious bottlenecks, of which the most striking is economics. Unless the interest of students is fired at the undergraduate level, it is unlikely that the situation will improve, but the Centres are aware of the problems and are doing their best to meet them.

THE NATIONAL INFORMATION CENTRE

Another co-ordinating mechanism for Latin American studies in Great Britain is the National Information Centre at the London Institute. Each university with academic interests in Latin America has a correspondent who maintains contact with the Centre, supplying on an annual basis information which it is felt would be useful not only to British institutions and scholars but also to those abroad. With the co-operation of its correspondents, the Institute is able to publish annually three publications containing this material: *Latin American Studies in the Universities of the United Kingdom*, a list of teaching and research staff and a summary guide to courses available at both undergraduate and postgraduate level; *Theses in Latin American Studies at British*

Universities in Progress and Completed, listing the research dissertations in the field; and *Latin American Studies in the Universities of the United Kingdom: Staff Research in Progress or Recently Completed in the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, listing the books, papers, and articles on Latin American topics on which academics are engaged. Four issues of the first two pamphlets, and two of the third have so far appeared, and they will continue to do so, so long as there is a reasonable demand for them.

The Information Centre keeps in touch with its counterparts abroad, such as the Centre for Latin American Studies and Documentation at the University of Amsterdam, which publishes a *Boletín Informativo* on Latin American studies in Europe, and also with this *Review*, clearly the major vehicle for information on Latin American studies in the United States. These Institute publications have a very wide distribution, not least in Latin America, and serve to present a picture of Latin American studies both inside and outside Great Britain year by year. It cannot be claimed that the picture is anywhere near complete, and there is clearly scope for enlarging the picture presented, both in terms of greater detail of what the current publications contain, and for increasing the range of such factual material. To date, for example, there does not exist in Great Britain an inventory of affiliations and contacts in the fields of medicine and science between British and Latin American institutions, yet one suspects that, in volume at any rate, they are greater than in the humanities and highly important for the objectives postulated in the Parry Report. Nevertheless, a start has been made in the systematic presentation of information about Latin American studies in Great Britain where nothing existed before, and these publications have been universally welcomed.

LIBRARY RESOURCES, THE NATIONAL UNION CATALOGUE, AND PUBLICATIONS

"There can be no true development of Latin American studies in this country," the Parry Committee reported, "until the necessary book collections have been planned and financed."²⁴ And the Committee devoted a good deal of time and careful thought to this question. In establishing the Centres, the University Grants Committee made both capital and recurrent grants to their universities for the purpose of strengthening Latin American collections, and since that time a good deal has been done to provide scholars with the necessary tools to get on with the job. A particular attempt has been made, in line with the efforts of the Directors of Parry Centres, to move towards a definition of specialised fields of interest, to co-ordinate the building-up of library holdings, so as to produce in Great Britain one outstanding library of Latin Americana, made up of a large number of individual collections. In view of the large areas of common interest in disciplines shared by the Centres, and in view of similarly

structured teaching programmes, some considerable duplication is inevitable. But the national limitation of resources for Latin American studies imposes on all concerned an obligation to co-operate. It would be sheer folly, for example, for each centre to attempt to collect the equivalent of the *Congressional Record* or *Hansard* for all the Latin American states, or to spend their modest library grants in reckless attempts to outbid one another for valuable collections which come on the market. By the same token, works on those parts of Latin America in which no Centre has a specific teaching or research interest now, should not, for that reason, be ignored entirely. In a country the size of Great Britain, some viable degree of rationalization ought to be possible, though the attempt to achieve it is faced with the same problems as elsewhere—widely different interpretations by librarians of how they see their duties, the movement of staff, and therefore of academic interests, university autonomy, and so on.

To meet this situation, at least in part, the Centres have tried to define their major academic interests, and to agree that while duplication of monographs cannot be avoided, other materials, such as collections of printed documents and runs of less obvious journals, are in a different category. Progress is inevitably slow: as has been noted above, a large university such as London, with its many libraries, itself requires a high degree of co-ordination and co-operation if public money is not to be wasted, and the same is true of Oxford and Cambridge. In addition, this is far from being merely a university matter: it involves the great national libraries outside the universities, such as the British Museum, and this, in turn, raises the further question of borrowing rights and other thorny issues.

It is in this context that the formation of a National Union Catalogue of Latin Americana, recommended by the Parry Report, is crucial. The catalogue will be an indispensable tool both for the location of material and for the identification of significant gaps, and work on the project has been one of the less noticed but highly important aspects of the development of Latin American studies in the period under review.

Work was begun on the catalogue at the London Institute in a modest way in 1966–67, but the project was not fully staffed until the beginning of 1969. The recording of current acquisitions began with the purchases of the Parry Centres and of the British Museum, and 22 major British libraries now submit duplicate copies of their catalogue entries. A further seven submit accessions lists, and retrospective searches, with varying terminal dates, have been made in 13 major libraries. By June 1970, the catalogue recorded 52,000 locations of 40,000 titles, and the rate of filing locations is well over 2,000 a month. Contributing libraries receive lists of additions to the catalogue at regular intervals; these are arranged in 16 subject divisions, further sub-divided by country. In addition, a computer-produced author-index to last year's output of subject-

arranged lists will soon appear, and the whole subject of computerisation of data is very much to the fore in future planning.²⁵

The National Union Catalogue will not, of course, solve problems which depend upon co-operation of a different kind, such as with respect to purchasing policies, inter-library loans, and definition of areas of interest. But it should be an aid to some of those ends, as well as a *sine qua non* for researchers in Great Britain.

As a result of the new inputs of opportunity and resources for Latin Americanists which have been provided in the past five years, the output of publication on Latin America from British presses has increased markedly. A few recent developments are worthy of note. An important new series of monographs, the Cambridge Latin American Studies, was launched by the Cambridge University Press, and now seems to be well established.²⁶ The same press publishes the *Journal of Latin American Studies*, in association with the Parry Centres, and this bi-annual, multi-disciplinary academic publication—the first dealing exclusively with Latin America to be published in Great Britain—is now in its second year.²⁷ Its scope is the study of the continent from the standpoint of the social sciences, including history, geography, anthropology, sociology, politics, and economics, but it does not embrace language and literature, which are the province of the *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. The Centres have initiated, or are initiating, their own publications also: London has embarked on a series of Institute monographs, publications too long for an article but too short for an average-size monograph;²⁸ Oxford has in press a Latin American volume in the well-known series of essays, *St. Antony's Papers*, and Liverpool has in preparation a series of publications produced by its own staff.

These are encouraging developments, as is the re-discovery by British commercial publishers generally of a continent they have long regarded—and rightly—as the world 'blind-spot' of the book-buying public. Nevertheless, scholarly works on Latin America will continue to have a limited market and, with the current high costs of book production, publishers may well require subsidies for manuscripts which are not really commercial propositions but which deserve to be published. It was to meet this contingency that the Latin American Publications Trust Fund was established in 1969, on the initiative of the Bank of London and South America, and with the financial support of a number of other banks and business houses. The Fund is administered by trustees appointed by the Bank but their advisory committee consists largely of academics and, while the main objective of the Fund is to support publication of works on Latin America in the way described, and particularly works dealing with contemporary economic issues, it will also itself promote suitable publications.²⁹

Developments at other Universities and Elsewhere

So far in this review of developments in Latin American studies in British universities, attention has been concentrated on the five Centres established specifically to promote such studies. But this is by no means the whole story. When the Parry Committee reported, a number of British universities, apart from those designated for support, already offered courses in the Latin American field for examinations; in some of them such courses had been in existence many years. But there is no doubt that it was in large measure the creation of the Committee, and its Report, which further stimulated interest in the continent. Despite the lack of earmarked grants for Latin American studies in other places, there has been a manifest increase both in numbers of academic staff devoting themselves to these studies and in the numbers of research students turning their attention to the continent. Today, 24 British universities, not including the Centres, offer at least some courses in Latin American studies. In many instances, this may mean no more than that a particular teacher has inserted his Latin American interest into the syllabus, but in some universities—Bristol, Essex, Manchester, Newcastle, and Southampton, in particular—the range of options is wide. While the emphasis is clearly undergraduate, postgraduate provision can be made available in some cases, and, no less important, experience with the taught higher degrees at Centre universities indicates that many of their students are recruited from other universities where they have received their first exposure to the continent. In a country as small and homogeneous as Britain, whose resources for Latin American studies can scarcely be called abundant, this is an entirely rational development which should be encouraged. One would, of course, be misled to suppose that such a development is universally applauded: no self-respecting university likes to think that it cannot provide its best products with adequate intellectual inducements to stay where they have been nurtured. In addition, teachers at a given university need to be assured that another place is, in fact as well as in theory, a better training-ground for their undergraduate students who seek to go on to postgraduate work. These are complicated issues, in which personal attitudes and inclinations play a considerable role. Yet, in terms of national need and of rational growth, such academic mobility is crucial. There is little point in creating Centres of area interest if they are not seen to be better equipped than other places, for particular tasks. The onus of responsibility lies no less on the Centres themselves than on the other universities. If the latter are to practice a self-denying ordinance, the former must show such effort has not been in vain. In other words, a Centre is not simply a Centre by being so designated: it must possess trusted academic excellence.

The growth of Latin American studies in recent years, outside the Centres,

is to be welcomed in view of their past neglect and present need, if the continent is to receive the attention that is its due, and if, in Great Britain, the widespread misconceptions about Latin America which still prevail are to be corrected. The plea that is entered here is simply for the rational use of exiguous resources.

In any event, some developments of particular interest outside the Centres call for comment, because they represent contributions of some significance and because they do not conflict with the premises stated earlier in this report. The comparatively new University of Essex has from its beginning in 1964 shown a marked interest in Latin American studies, which it demonstrated at the start by building them into its academic structure.³⁰ In 1967, the university received a large grant from the Nuffield Foundation for a five-year period; with this support it established its Latin American Centre. The Centre has, obviously, some features in common with those of the Parry Centres. Like them, it has a part-time Director; it is intimately connected with the university's wide range of courses in Latin American studies, both undergraduate and postgraduate, to support which an impressive library collection has been built up in a short time; and it is a focus of seminars, discussions and lectures on Latin American themes. It is, in short, a lively and developing organization for the dissemination of knowledge and understanding of the Latin American continent. The context of a large campus and the enthusiasm of creation in a new university have also played an important part in the rapid growth of Latin American studies at Essex. The appointment of staff, the provision of courses, and the expansion of library resources have been accomplished with the university's own resources, within the context of the degree structure, while the Nuffield grant has enabled the university to develop a scheme of Fellowships and Studentships for Latin Americans which is highly important in the development of Latin American studies in Britain as a whole: the operation of this programme is the Centre's main function. The University aims, through the attraction both of senior scholars and of promising postgraduates from Latin America, to establish a number of institutional links with Latin American universities and other similar organisations, and to promote and stimulate collaboration and joint research projects with them. Thus, the Latin American Centre at Essex is not a Centre of Latin American Studies in terms of the Parry Report, but it is a means to the end of a community of scholarship between Britain and Latin America. The Latin American scholars who spend a year at Essex are not necessarily specialists in Latin American literature, sociology, politics, or government—though they may well be: they may also be mathematicians, physicists, or engineers; in other words, scholars in those disciplines in which the university has a strong and continuing interest. The links thus forged, no matter in what field, are clearly of benefit to Latin American studies in Britain.

The same is true of the scheme whereby distinguished Latin American scholars are invited to spend part of the year at Parry Centres, not to teach a programme, but to give occasional papers, to visit other Centres, to make or renew contacts and to pursue their own researches. The number of such Visiting Scholars is small—at most five in any one year—and they can usually stay only one term on the funds available. But the effect is cumulative and the contacts are firm. Like the University of Essex, and on Ford Foundation money, the Centre of St. Antony's has been able to bring over rather more Latin American scholars and postgraduate students than the other Centres, but they reach a far wider audience than the Centre itself. St. Antony's also has made considerable progress in the establishment of institutional links in Latin America with the aim of collaboration in research. And the institution of the Simón Bolívar Chair of Latin American Studies at Cambridge, by the munificence of the Venezuelan Government, enables that University to have in residence for a year a distinguished Latin American scholar.³¹

To catalogue the links of this kind between British and Latin American scholars and institutions would be tedious for Latin Americanists in the United States, to whom all such arrangements are commonplace. But to a British Latin Americanist who has seen his field of study finally recognized as academically respectable after decades of indifference, such developments are new and exciting, and enthusiasm may be excused.

Three other specific developments at British universities in the Latin American field may be of interest to readers of this *Review*. At the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, a Centre for Latin American Linguistic Studies has been instituted to promote research in the fields of Amerindian languages and of Ibero-American dialectology. Courses are offered in Quechua and Guaraní, and regular field-work is an essential part of the Centre's activities. Again, Latin America is emerging more significantly in the work of the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, perhaps, appropriately, an institution which has had a very rapid but soundly based growth. The Institute is a national institution "to organise courses of advanced study on the problems of overseas development in all aspects of economics, social studies and administration," with "special attention to the practical experience of developing countries," and "also carry out research so that the Institute will play a leading part in advancing our knowledge and working out a development strategy."³² The implications of the Institute's work for Latin America go without saying, but more specifically, in terms of Latin American interest, one result of its activities has been the growth of an excellent library of Latin American material on development programs. Finally, at the University of Manchester, the Department of Overseas Administrative Studies has, for the past few years, and in conjunction with the training and scholarship programmes of the Ministry of

Overseas Development and the British Council, promoted courses of public administration studies for government officials of Latin American countries.³³ Again, this is a little to one side of the mainstream of Latin American studies in British universities, but its contribution to the revival of the connection between Latin America and Great Britain cannot be gainsaid.

These are random examples of some of the ways in which Latin American studies have grown in Great Britain under the stimulus of a general reawakening of interest, but no one is more conscious than the writer of the fact that, if comparisons are odious, selection is invidious. Yet, perhaps enough has been said to demonstrate the fact that Latin American studies are now established in British universities as a legitimate field of study, and we should now turn our attention to their prospects in the future. That future is not necessarily assured simply because considerable progress has been made; it depends much more upon the continuing validity of the arguments which created the development, and upon a consensus that it should continue and, possibly, be expanded.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The new impetus given to Latin American studies by the acceptance of the Parry Report has been sustained, to a very large degree, by the earmarking of grants to the designated Centre-universities. The Parry Committee was convinced that support of this kind must be continued over a ten-year period, and further recommended that "any new commitment accepted by a university at any point within that period should be supported by an appropriate grant for ten years from the date when the commitment begins."³⁴ In this regard, the Committee were impressed by the experience of other area studies which, strongly supported by earmarked grants from 1947 to 1952—the result of the Scarborough Report—then found further expansion impossible when earmarked grants were stopped.³⁵ Not until the Hayter Report was implemented, ten years later, did this situation improve.³⁶ Yet these studies had a longer institutional tradition in British universities than Latin American studies have now, and their promotion was aided by the general historical factors considered in the introduction to this article. Five years is little enough time to establish new courses and profit from the experience of running them; to recruit and train young scholars and persuade them to invest their talents in new fields of study, particularly if their future is uncertain; to build up teaching resources such as libraries and union catalogues to support these other developments, and, in short, to create centres of academic excellence of international standing. It is, therefore, important that specific support should be provided for Latin American studies for a further period, if the promising beginnings of the past five years are not to be curtailed or even stultified. No one is asking for a blank cheque made payable to bearer, but for a modest further investment to bring the

operation to real fruition. This is not to argue that all developments over the past five years have been equally good or necessary, and stress has been laid throughout this article on the 'deliberate' speed which the Parry Committee recommended to safeguard standards. Indeed, the proposal for a review of developments before the 1972–77 quinquennium underlined the Committee's sense of responsibility for the spending of public money to promote a desirable development, but one which would be subject to scrutiny.

These are the normal safeguards in any system of accountability, and those concerned with Latin American studies in Britain would wish to be judged by results. If, in fact, it is decided that further earmarked support is justified, in terms of the continuing relevance of the Parry Committee's recommendations, it seems possible that a considerable emphasis in the next quinquennium will be placed not only on developing and refining the projects which have been started, but also, it may be hoped, in promoting new initiatives both to bring Latin America much more centrally into the British world view and to extend and diversify our intellectual contacts with the continent for the common good.

In the first place, it has not been possible in the past five years, presumably for lack of money, to implement a number of the Parry Committee's recommendations which, in the view of the writer, should have been implemented. One of these concerned the existing provisions for Latin American postgraduate students to come to British universities, students whose numbers, the Committee suggested, should be increased from the 193 in full-time study or research in 1962–63, out of a total of 14,020 overseas students.³⁷ In 1968–69, the latest date for which statistics are available, the figures were 392 out of a total of 16,154.³⁸ This may be regarded by optimists as an increase of 100%, but pessimists cannot but reflect that postgraduate students from the whole of Latin America totalled only ten more than from a non-Commonwealth country like Iraq. The disparity, though less than it was at the earlier date—when three times as many students came from Iraq as from the whole of Latin America—is still striking. British higher education and British research techniques enjoy a deservedly high reputation in Latin America and there can be no question, despite problems of language and different educational traditions, that many more good graduates from Latin America would come to Britain if they had the chance. Acute competition for the limited opportunities available is testimony to that. To double or even treble the number of postgraduate awards for Latin American students would be a very small investment in terms of the return in future close relations.

Similarly, while a number of postgraduate awards to British students working on Latin America were requested by the Parry Committee, it asked for too little in view of the demand, and experience with the new taught higher degrees, in particular, which the Committee wished to encourage, has shown

that they are at a positive disadvantage compared with doctoral work. Travel and research opportunities for academic staff have certainly improved in the period under review, with both the Parry allocations for the Centres and the establishment of a travel pool for Latin Americanists not holding Parry posts. But competition is, again, acute, though some welcome relief has been afforded junior staff and those completing higher degrees (research) by the extension of the Foreign Area Fellowship Programme to Great Britain in the last two years. These are quantitative suggestions only to improve the present position. The same point could be made about Visiting Scholars, not only from Latin America, but also from Europe and the United States, about library collections, and so on. It is a truism that we would all like more money for such purpose, and no less axiomatic that we are unlikely to get it.

But whether we get it or not, the growth of Latin American studies in British universities over the past five years suggests certain possible developments for the future. In the first place, we should expand the total quantity of research on Latin America, thinking less on lines of individual scholars cultivating their own *minifundia*, and more in terms of multidisciplinary teams, drawn from different universities. Indeed, within Great Britain, the scope for increased co-operation between Centre and non-Centre universities alike is considerable: it ought to be possible, in so small a country, for groups of universities to promote joint courses, even joint degrees, make joint appointments, and so on, and thus make maximal use of their Latin American resources.³⁹ Accepting the premise that the goal to be aimed at at the research level is particular specialisation at different places, such developments will be necessary and not merely desirable. It may not be too fanciful, even at this stage, to look beyond co-operation within the national boundaries. It is, for example, a relevant consideration that the growth of Latin American studies in Britain has been paralleled by a revival of Latin American interest in Europe, and a number of strong Centres have also emerged there in recent years. Contacts between us are growing rapidly and plans are currently being made for concrete schemes of co-operation. National Union Catalogues are an obvious case in point, since measures to promote the interchangeability of data would be of immense value to scholars and others working on Latin American themes. It is possible to foresee a time when international research projects in Latin America, with groups of scholars drawn from European and Latin American institutions, will develop in a genuine community of scholarship, and work on problems of direct relevance to Latin America's needs. The political advantages of such arrangements are obvious, though the practical difficulties of mounting these operations are, to put it mildly, somewhat more forbidding than they were in the days of Humboldt and Bonpland. But that example is not a bad one to cite: if such ideas were to come to fruition, they would have to be based less on institutional, for

mal arrangements than on the mutual respect of scholars with common intellectual interests, and on the personal friendships which a genuine community of learning inspires. Clearly, this matter is one of great complexity: problems of planning and, more importantly, fund-raising, would necessarily involve institutions as well as individuals, but the success of any such enterprise would turn on the latter, and on their willingness to work as a team. Bi-lateral arrangements will, no doubt, continue to play the dominant role for a long time to come, but we should be thinking now of a more international ethos for the study of Latin America.

It goes without saying that such developments are predicated on the growth of relationships with Latin Americans themselves, and on their willingness to join with scholars from other countries in such programmes. And this, in turn, raises a whole complex of issues associated with ideas of 'intellectual imperialism,' which are beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the multilateral approach has here a clear advantage over the bi-lateral one.

Another aspect of the growth of Latin American studies in Great Britain which requires emphasis in coming years is the need for those in universities to go outside the walls. The support given to the Parry Committee by the business community was one of the factors in its success, and the connection has been maintained, in part, by an annual course organized at the London Institute, specifically for businessmen and staff of government departments on some particular region of Latin America.⁴⁰ These courses benefit the academic world no less than that of commerce: for those in business, exporting may not be fun, but there is no reason why market research should not be intellectually stimulating. And for the academic, the confrontation of his (usually) more detached and wider vision with the day-to-day reality can be equally refreshing. Another important, if not, indeed, crucial 'extramural' audience is the teaching profession in schools and colleges: the wider introduction of Latin American studies, albeit at a modest level, in schools would do more to correct misconceptions about the continent in British society at large than any other single measure. A properly organised programme of teacher-instruction and pupil-stimulation, in which universities would play the major role, could do much to give Latin America that attention in British education that is no more than her due.⁴¹

Lack of space forbids further thoughts of this nature. It may well appear already that what is being asked for here is not only more money but also a forty-eight hour day. Of course, the universities must keep as their priorities their teaching and research, and the Centres of Latin American studies in British universities must be judged primarily on their success or failure with both. But more direct and explicit ways to serve the wider community of which they are a part, and which, in the last analysis, supports them, must not be neglected. If the impetus for Latin American studies provided by the Parry Report is to be

maintained, and even strengthened, it will need the continuing support of those outside the universities as well as the advocacy of those within them.

"Latin America," it was said when the Parry Committee was appointed, "offers everything that should be a challenge to keen-minded young men and women. . . . It would be reasonable to expect that this complex of developing nations with so much in common between them and with such refreshing diversities would act like a magnet on British youth. But it cannot do so until facilities for understanding what is involved are much improved. Until they are, curiosity about Latin America will stay in the doldrums in which it has for too long been becalmed."⁴² Latin American studies in Britain are no longer in the doldrums, but those professing them are hopeful of a continuing fair wind for the rest of the voyage.

NOTES

1. All British universities are independent, self-governing institutions, financed in large part by the state through the University Grants Committee which is appointed by the Treasury but is strongly representative of the Universities themselves. University developments and financial provision are planned on a quinquennial basis.
2. *Report of the Committee on Latin American Studies* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965), iii. The Report is usually referred to as the Parry Report after the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. J. H. Parry, now Professor of Oceanic History at Harvard University, who needs no introduction to readers of this *Review*. The eponymous designation will be used hereafter.
3. See James Hunt, 'Britain and Latin America,' in Claudio Veliz, ed., *Latin America and the Caribbean: A Handbook* (London, Anthony Blond, 1968), 441-447, for a convenient summary.
4. Expressed in literary terms, the writer knows of nothing in the British-Latin American connection comparable to E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* or, for that matter, to N. C. Chaudhury's *A Passage to England*. Perhaps the closest approximations in Anglo-Latin American terms are, at least on the British side, the writings of W. H. Hudson and R. B. Cunninghame Graham, but they are neglected in England.
5. See Lewis Hanke, *Contemporary Latin America: A Short History* (Princeton, N. J., D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1968), 6-8.
6. Parry Report, 6-7.
7. *Ibid.*, 8.
8. *Report of the Interdepartmental Commission on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies (the Scarborough Report)*. (London, H.M.S.O., 1947), 8.
9. *Report of the Sub-Committee (of the University Grants Committee) on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies (the Hayter Report)*, (London, H.M.S.O., 1961), *passim*.
10. The outstanding example is R. A. Humphreys, Professor of Latin American History in the University of London at University College since 1948. Not until 1961 was a second post in Latin American history created in the University, also at University College. Raised to a

Latin American Research Review

Readership in 1964, this post is held by Dr. John Lynch, like the author a former student of Professor Humphreys. A Lectureship in Latin American Geography was established in 1958, and an Assistant Lectureship in Latin American Economics in 1962, both, like the second history post, through the generous support of the Leverhulme Trust.

11. In the field of Asian studies, the School of Oriental Studies of London University had been founded in 1916, partly to train those entering the colonial service. It is not without interest that this step was taken when the *raison d'être* of the British Empire had begun to be questioned, and that the big expansion of Asian and African studies after the Scarbrough and Hayter Reports came when the Empire was being changed into the Commonwealth.
12. *The Times*, March 19, 1965.
13. The Committee ranged widely over a number of questions which are relevant to Latin American studies but which are not dealt with here. They included language teaching in schools and universities, and Latin American studies in institutions other than universities. The scope of this article is limited to university developments.
14. Parry Report, Summary of Finding and Recommendations, 1–3.
15. Parry Report, 23. The writer clearly remembers being told by a senior professor of a British university in the 1950s that Latin American studies would always be “purely peripheral in British higher education.” The professor subsequently took up an interest in the field, which was at its height soon after the establishment of the Parry Committee.
16. Parry Report, 28–29. In the event, funds were not forthcoming for posts but a travel fund was set up by the Grants Committee for Latin Americanists not holding Parry posts.
17. Parry Report, 68.
18. *Ibid.*, 23.
19. *Ibid.*, 25–26.
20. The taught higher degree has become more prominent in British universities in recent years partly in consequence of the recommendations of the basic document on the expansion of British higher education in the 1960s and 1970s: *Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961–63*. (The Robbins Report) (H.M.S.O., 1963). See particularly 100–103.
21. The controversy over ‘language as a tool’ cannot be discussed here because of its complexity and partisanship. Suffice to say that the London degree requires candidates without a formal language qualification to demonstrate, by examination if necessary, that they can *understand* what they are reading in Spanish or Portuguese. They are not required to do composition.
22. The writer must confess that this outcome, predicted by the Parry Report, has so far exceeded his own expectations. But the numbers of students are still comparatively small: the real test will come with greatly increased numbers wishing to use their newly-acquired expertise in a direct way.
23. *Theses in Latin American Studies at British Universities in Progress and Completed* (London, Institute of Latin American Studies, 1967), and *ibid.* (1969 and 1970).
24. Parry Report, 47.
25. The Librarian of the London Institute, Bernard Naylor, is the Director of the Catalogue. London, Institute of Latin American Studies, 1967), and *ibid.* (1969 and 1970).
26. The titles published so far are: Simon Collier, *Ideas and Politics of Chilean Independence*,

- 1808–1833 (1968); M. P. Costeloe, *Church Wealth in Mexico: A Study of the Juzgado de Capellanías in the Archbishopric of Mexico, 1800–1856* (1968); Peter Calvert, *The Mexican Revolution, 1910–1914: the Diplomacy of Anglo-American Conflict* (1968); Richard Graham, *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil, 1850–1914* (1968); Herbert S. Klein, *Parties and Political Change in Bolivia, 1880–1952* (1970), and Leslie Bethell, *The Abolition of the Brazilian Slave Trade* (1970). Other volumes are in the press and in preparation. The series is edited by Professor David Joslin and Dr. John Street, both well-known Latin Americanists at Cambridge.
27. The Editorial Board of the *Journal* consists of the Directors of the Parry Centres, together with the editors, Professor David Joslin and the writer. It is edited from the London Institute.
 28. The first two titles are: R. A. Humphrey, ed., *The 'Detached Recollections' of General D. F. O'Leary* (London, the Athlone Press, 1969) and Bernard Naylor, ed., *Accounts of Nineteenth-Century South America: An Annotated Check-List of Works by British and United States Observers (ibid.)* Other monographs are in press and in preparation.
 29. For example, D. J. Robinson and D. Fox, *Cities in a Changing Latin America: Studies of Urbanization in Mexico and Venezuela* (London, 1969) and D. J. Fox, *Tin in the Bolivian Economy* (London), 1970). These two papers were originally given as lectures at a conference at the London Institute, and the Fund thought them sufficiently interesting to promote their publication. The offices of the Fund are at the London Institute.
 30. At Essex, the academic departments and centres are grouped into four interlinked Schools of Study and are not, as in many British universities, divided into separate Faculties. Thus, there are Schools of Comparative Studies, Social Studies, Mathematical Studies, and Physical Sciences. In the School of Comparative Studies, Latin America is one of three geographical areas—the others are North America and Russia—which may be chosen, along with Britain, for disciplinary study in the second and third undergraduate years, after an introductory year. Such study may be in art, government, language, literature and sociology. The modern Language Centre provides intensive courses of one year in Spanish and Portuguese (Brazilian).
 31. The first holder of the Chair was the distinguished Venezuelan parasitologist, Dr. Arnoldo Gabaldón; the second, the well-known Mexican poet and scholar, Dr. Octavio Paz.
 32. *Third Annual Report of the Institute of Development Studies, 1968–69*, 3.
 33. See W. Wood, 'The Manchester Course. A Course of Public Administration Studies for Government Officials of Latin American Countries,' *Bank of London & South America Review*, 3: 32 (Aug., 1969), 484–490.
 34. Parry Report, 60.
 35. *Ibid.*, See also Hayter Report, 22.
 36. It is true that during the 1952–62 period complete stagnation did not obtain but such developments as were possible depended largely on the generosity of Foundations and not of government.
 37. Parry Report, 57.
 38. Figures compiled from information supplied by the Association of Commonwealth Universities.
 39. It may be interesting to note that when new Centres of Asian Studies were set up after the Hayter Report, Chinese studies were established at Leeds, Japanese Studies at Cheffield and

Latin American Research Review

South East Asian studies at Hull, all three universities being in Yorkshire and easily accessible to one another. Inter-university collaboration benefitted from this choice. So far as Latin American studies are concerned, improvements in national communications in recent years make a similar result perfectly possible: at least six universities with Latin American interests are within an hour's travelling-time of London.

40. The Parry Report recommended this kind of development. See 29–31. The London Institute has now held five such courses, and they are an integral part of its programme.
41. The considerable expansion in numbers of undergraduate students at the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London in the early 1960s, a factor in the favorable view of its development in the eyes of the Hayter Committee, was a result of "intensive efforts by the School to interest teachers and sixth-form pupils in these studies." Hayter Report, 26. In fact, virtually an extramural division of the School is now in existence, and its impact has been remarkable.
42. *The Times*, Oct. 16, 1962. Since this article was written the London Institute, in co-operation with the Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Councils (Canning House), has received from the Leverhulme Trust Fund a grant for a period of five years to initiate a scheme of School-teacher Fellowships. Under this scheme, selected teachers from British schools will spend a sabbatical term at the Institute and Canning House on the study of Latin America, in order to be better-equipped to introduce a consideration of the continent into their curricula, or to extend it where it already exists.