

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

*Margaret Todaro Williams**

MANY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WORKING TODAY IN LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ARE SKEPTICAL, if not hostile, to the notion of incorporating psychological theory and methodology in their research. Some contend that studies of individual personality formation, while perhaps inherently fascinating and certainly of professional interest to the psychologist, contribute little to our greater understanding of Latin American society. Social behavior and social systems, others argue, are wholly explainable in terms of structural-materialist-power factors. Consequently, there is no need for a social psychological approach. Still others view this type of orientation as essentially conservative, an effort to attribute Latin American problems (for example, underdevelopment) to the existence of a "Latin American mind" or a "Latin American personality" (through generally pejorative categories, such as the inability to exert oneself).

The first two criticisms are directed to the question of the relevance and utility of social psychology to Latin American studies. The third implicitly regards the theory and methodology of the discipline as a resurrection of past and generally discredited attempts at explaining social society as a construct of some vague ethos.

It is my contention that social science will achieve a fuller understanding of Latin American social behavior and social structures by treating social and psychological factors together. The purpose of this paper is to examine the criticisms that have been raised to a psychological approach to Latin American studies, to delineate some research areas that will respond most fruitfully to this type of approach, and to suggest ways in which we might grapple with initial interdisciplinary problems.

I

When social psychologists undertake studies in foreign cultures, they do so primarily to test general hypotheses about human behavior. For the Latin Americanist, however, it is the *relationship* between personality and culture, or between personality and some specific variables (which he chooses on the basis of interest in a problem outside the personality, such as political activism) which he seeks rather than the characterization of the personality itself. This does not imply a simple causal relationship

* I am indebted to the Social Science Research Council for a year of training in social psychology through the Council's Research Training Fellowship. This paper represents an assessment of this training in relation to Latin American studies. I also wish to thank David Lopez (sociology, UCLA), Norman Miller (psychology, USC), Susan Kaufman Purcell (political science, UCLA), and James Wilkie (history, UCLA), for their careful reading of the manuscript and for their valuable comments. This paper was delivered at the Latin American Studies Association meeting in Madison, Wisconsin, on May 3, 1973.

Latin American Research Review

between personality and (say) politics, or between personality and any other social variable. However, connections and congruences do exist. The Latin Americanist, therefore, studies personality as an *element* in the chain of societal analysis. Since his chief concern is with the psychological aspects of Latin American sociocultural patterning, the development of a conception of human (individual and group) personality does not unduly concern him.

Seen in the light of specific social questions, social psychology puts to our respective fields a host of new, provocative questions. If, as Irving Louis Horowitz suggests, "development affects personality structure even more decisively than personality structure affects developmental decisions,"¹ can a better understanding of character needs and anxieties ease the destructive potential in rapid social change? And what of the destructiveness of the *status quo*? The continued marginality of most Latin Americans and their societally-enforced inability to affect their destinies influence both the characterological development of the people involved and the society which evolves without their participation. But in what specific ways?

Certainly questions about social structure, social systems, and social interaction can be answered in non-psychological terms. Yet, in so doing, Latin Americanists frequently make any number of psychological assumptions about Latin American individualism, egocentrism, violence, orientation to the past, familism, and fatalism. Latin Americanists employ words of heavy psychological content to describe the area's social experiences—words like *patrón-peón* relations, *caudillismo*, *personalismo*, *palanca*, *pistolão*, and *machismo*. Often these images are but half-formed, although they may be insightful. A social psychological approach to Latin American studies carries with it a recognition that the investigator must probe more systematically into the meaning of many such key assumptions.

In some cases, interpretation made without regard to social psychological factors breeds misinterpretation. Robert Redfield, for example, elaborated the influential concept of the ideal rural culture, based on his study of Tepoztlán. Oscar Lewis, who extensively utilized social psychological methods and theories in his restudy of the same village, arrived at very different conclusions:

The impression given by Redfield's study . . . is that of a relatively homogeneous, isolated, smoothly functioning, and well-integrated society made up of a contented and well-adjusted people. His picture of the village has a Rousseauan quality which glosses lightly over evidence of violence, disruption, cruelty, disease, suffering and maladjustment. . . . Throughout his study we find an emphasis upon the cooperative and unifying factors in Tepoztecan society. Our findings, on the other hand, would emphasize the underlying individualism of Tepoztecan institutions and character, the lack of cooperation, the tensions between villages within the municipio, the schisms within the village, and the pervading quality of fear, envy, and distrust in interpersonal relations.²

Lewis' blend of social psychology and anthropology helped tear down conventional stereotypes of the good village-bad city variety.

Studies which ignore social psychological elements may produce correct but

unnecessarily incomplete interpretations. Areas such as race relations and racial prejudice seem to cry for some explanation in psychological terms—which is not the same as saying they are not susceptible of sociological, economic, and other interpretation.

The historian, for example, might ask the question: Why did the black Paulista organizations of the 1930's fail? He would have to seek his answers in political events (the outlawing of parties in 1937), sociological data (the internal social differentiation of the Negro milieu), and economic factors (the lack of financial support, the swindling practices of some leaders).³ Yet to neglect to analyze the weaknesses resulting from the black's attitude toward himself as a black and from his over-identification with the master race would constitute basic omissions.

Arlindo Veiga dos Santos, founder of the Frente Negra Brasileira (1927–1937), spoke to me at length of his Lusitanian origins, but mentioned his descentance from Nigerian kings only in passing. Perhaps this is significant. Some deep-seated attitudes help account for the failure of Brazil's blacks to create cohesive organizations for self-protection and self-awareness, as did their U.S. counterparts. It would seem that the findings of social psychology on prejudice, intra-group relations, inter-group perceptions, leadership, and group identification would be peculiarly rewarding in this context.

Similarly, *patrón-peón* relations, generally conceived of as rational adaptations to power factors, may receive further illumination when studied in relation to dependency needs, identity problems, and irrational (no longer valid) fears (of malevolence, punishment, denial). Latin Americans from Bolívar to Rodó to Castro have comprehended the psychological components of colonialism and neo-colonialism, the international varieties of patron-client relations. Psychopolitical studies of a nation's perception of itself, its perception of how it is perceived by others, and the role of communications media in the formation of national perceptions may add new dimensions to social science interpretations of the phenomena.

Finally, a social psychological approach to Latin America is *not* a search for psychopathology, ethos, modal personality, or grand constellations of culturally characteristic drives. Rather, social psychology aims at understanding "how the thought, feelings, and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of others."⁴ The term "implied presence" refers to the many activities the individual carries out because of his position (role) in a complex social structure and because of his membership in a cultural group.

Sociology, anthropology, political science, and economics seek inclusive laws of social structure, social change, cultural patterning. By contrast, social psychology wishes to know how the individual's character (personality) formation is affected by and affects the social stimuli that surround him. It aims at answering the question: How is the individual both a cause and a consequence of society? And, while allowing for an idiographic approach to personalities, it will generalize concerning the societally-induced commonalities.

Latin American Research Review

Developments within the discipline in recent decades have lent broader applicability to social psychological theory and methods.⁵ The development of existential ego psychology, particularly the theoretical contributions of Erik Erikson, holds special theoretical significance for Latin Americanists.

At the core of Erikson's developmental theory is his focus on the interaction between individual (soma, ego) and the group (social context). The Eriksonian model provides a psychological setting for the interaction between the individual and society. Individual development and the crises of each stage of life are determined by the social and cultural environment. For although psychosexual development is universal, the ego qualities peculiar to each stage, as well as the nature of the transition, are culturally determined.⁶ Erikson's key psychosocial concepts (ego identity, group identity, the relations of ego development to social organization and changing historical reality) let us see the causal interconnectedness between the individual and society beyond the primary institution of the family.

To study personality and its relationship to elements of society, even in a relatively small and undifferentiated segment of society, still represents an enormous methodological task. It involves all the usual sampling and procedural problems plus the difficulties of obtaining and analyzing personality-relevant material. Extensive study of a large sample increases our ability to generalize, but limits the number and depth of the variables that can be investigated. Intensive, clinical study of a small sample permits a psychologically more significant and complex analysis but does not establish the generality of its findings.

Though the "extensity-intensity" dilemma has by no means been resolved, a number of lines of compromise and partial solution have been attempted. One major development is the use of brief clinical assessment procedures, which reduce the amount of time required for each case and thus permit investigation of at least moderate-sized samples. With a few notable exceptions (Erich Fromm, Michael Maccoby, and Oscar Lewis included), Latin Americanists have not used these "projective" techniques, relying instead on survey-type questionnaires and their own observations.⁷ Among the projective devices which the Latin Americanist can utilize are the Rorschach Test, the Thematic Apperception Test, word association tests, sentence completion tests, and a host of others. This approach elicits the subjective reality of the informants, without artificially separating aspects of personality from their cultural and psychological context, in a way impossible with objective-type scheduled questionnaires.⁸ Moreover, the Latin Americanist's background and experience in the culture of the area serve to mute the impact of cultural differences in testing and interpretation, giving the trained Brazilianist, for example, an advantage over the visiting social psychologist.

Latin Americanists who are interested in the possibilities of a social psychological approach to their work will not be beating on a closed door. Anthropologists of the "personality and culture" school (also known as "psychological anthropology" or "cultural psychology") have been utilizing social psychology in their studies of the

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

area since the 1930s.⁹ Latin American psychologists and philosophers have probed the relationship between personality and society in their countries.¹⁰ Social scientists have raised and answered questions of a psychological order, though their social psychological interests are peripheral to other concerns, for example, political culture.¹¹

We have the precedents and we have the cultural expertise. Now, this essay suggests, it is surely time to lay at rest the notion that social science has no business investigating how people think and feel, what they worry about, argue over, fear, enjoy, or expect. Interdisciplinary approaches to Latin American studies are common. Social psychology provides us with another way of thinking about culture, and a unique mode of inquiry. It deserves to be included in the Latin Americanist's interdisciplinary repertory.

II

In suggesting research directions for using social psychology in Latin American studies, I focus here on two broad areas: socialization, usually considered the central focus of cross-cultural research on personality; and attitude formation, probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary social psychology.

In the area of socialization research, there is a high degree of overlap and inter-relatedness among the theories and methods developed in the fields of social psychology, sociology, and anthropology. The concepts of "social role" and "values" are of importance to all three disciplines. All three disciplines, together with psychoanalytic theory and learning theory, accept the importance of early childhood experiences to the socialization process.

Despite the substantial bases of interdisciplinary agreement, we have only limited knowledge of Latin American family dynamics, including the encouragement or discouragement of self-reliance, self-assertion, and achievement. We know little of the way and the degree to which Latin American parents control, punish, reward, indulge, or excite their children's behavior, and less still of the development of internalized controls (guilt, conscience, superego). Even something as relatively simple as an examination of (say) Brazilian children's stories, tales, and humor, as outward projections of cultural values and behavior patterns, has not been done.

In part, the lack of such research reflects the numerous risks of such studies, including that of linking specific childhood experiences to specific adult character traits, without adequate consideration of the intervening, complex, developmental sequence. Another problem in socialization research, particularly in highly heterogeneous societies such as Brazil's, comes about with the addition of the class variable. It is likely that very few of the statements which one might make concerning the socialization of lower class children would hold for the upper-middle, even in the same city. Nevertheless, these difficulties should not blind us to the real possibilities of this type of work. The family is the reproductive mechanism of the social organization, of sex roles, and even of other (for example, occupational) role expectations. As the prototype of every association among people—political, economic, religious, recre-

Latin American Research Review

ational, and social—family studies form a bridge between social psychology and society.

With regard to sex roles, Betty Freidan returned from a lecture tour in Brazil in late 1971 describing middle and upper class Brazilian women as “dead from the neck up.” Regardless of the accuracy of this statement, a majority of societies put great pressure on girls toward taking nurturant attitudes (rather than achievement activity) and toward obedience (rather than self-reliance). Studies of socialization of Latin American girls may reveal much about the power-authority assumptions which underpin all of society.

On the other hand, we should not ignore the development of matrifocal subcultures, such as those found in lower class or marginal occupational segments of modern Brazilian cities, and symbolized by the dominant role of the *mãe de santo* in religious ritual. Social scientists have noted differential treatment of boys and girls related to the effects of slavery as well as to social structural variables associated with the absence of the father.¹² Of equal importance might be the lack of work for unskilled men in Brazilian cities, where women can easily find subsistence labor as *empregadas*.

Indeed, the general role of men in submerged class segments of stratified masculine-dominant cultures raises psychosocial questions. So do paternal absenteeism and/or female dominance of the family at all levels of Brazilian society. The *machismo* syndrome, which includes the deprecation and isolation of women, may in fact have some of its roots in an unconscious fear of identification with ubiquitous female figures.

Although family dynamics constitute a primary determinant of personality formation and socialization, there are other important sociocultural influences worthy of study. Institutional, ecological, and structural conditions also impinge upon the individual's experience and affect his personal development either directly or indirectly. Catholic parents often invoke the authority of omnipotent supernatural figures and religious values, symbols, and fantasies to discipline the child's impulses. Folk Catholicism of the Brazilian interior, as Emanuel de Kadt notes, reinforces the *patrão-peon* social syndrome by inculcating the practice of *pedidos* to supernatural *padrões*. The latter (*santos*) will take care of the individual's short term needs in return for the fulfillment of certain (spiritual) labors.¹³ *Macumba* and *candomblé* are open to interpretation as psychochemical processes activated as the result of prolonged stress, acute societal change, and acculturation difficulties, which produce trance behavior and hallucinations in a religious attempt at psychological resynthesis.

Personality differences stem too from socialization practices indirectly related to the subsistence economy. Studies show that societies that accumulate food supplies by gathering crops are more prone to pressure the individual to internalize feelings of responsibility, conformity, and obedience.¹⁴ The demographic factors of massive health, nutritional, and material deprivation should lead the social scientist to apply theoretical and clinical knowledge of the long-term effects of deprived childhoods

on behavior. Abram Kardiner's adaptational theory is useful for studying the congruence (or lack of it) between personality and other variables.¹⁵ He starts with a condition (e.g. water scarcity) that exists in a segment of society (e.g. the North-eastern *sertão*), and traces its consequences on the behavior of the members of that society (e.g. apathetic withdrawal or fearfulness), and the institutions they devise to adapt to it (e.g. folk Catholicism). Other personality configurations (mistrust, passivity, emotional constraint) may be traced to the effects on role behavior of an atomistic social structure caused by the low density of population and isolation, as for example among the scattered peasant populations of the Latin American interior.

Not all persons are effectively socialized. The individual may rebel as well as conform to social tradition. If the prohibitions of society are excessive in proportion to its rewards, or if the person does not have the ability to find satisfactions within the framework of society (ego weakness), or if socialization has not proceeded sufficiently because of some failure of identification with the representatives of the culture, especially parents (superego weakness), then the person's tendency to rebel against society increases. Attention paid to the socialization process and its weaknesses may further our understanding of criminals, bandits, guerrillas, revolutionists, and the processes of rebellion and apathy.

Finally, although a good deal of valuable research has been done already in the sub-discipline of political socialization, these works generally have failed to draw on developmental psychological theories.¹⁶ Children are not mini-adults. For them, as David O. Sears points out, "affect precedes information. Children express strong positive affect toward leaders, and only later acquire supporting rationalizations."¹⁷ Yet much of the political socialization research conducted with children, often very young children, proceeds without reference to child and developmental psychology.

The most challenging problem facing the investigator is to penetrate the child's world view and understand the development of political attitudes, not in adult terms, but in terms of the child's perceptions, fears, and fantasies. While survey research questionnaires are adequate for gathering data on the aggregate attitude response of children, it is essentially an insensitive tool for investigation of the nature and dynamics of the political socialization *process* and of the results of this process on the child's perception of his relationship to society (helpless, autonomous, influential).

III

The term "attitudes" is elastic enough to apply either to the dispositions of a single individual or to broad patterns of culture (common attitudes). Attitudes order an otherwise chaotic environment. They are necessary for the individual before he can make any but the most primitive, reflex type of response.¹⁸ Attitudes, in William James' words, "engender meaning upon the world." This concept has been so widely adopted that it virtually forms the keystone in the edifice of American social psychology.

Whether attitudes are as important as other more "deep-lying" parts of the per-

Latin American Research Review

sonality is a theoretical and empirical issue not easily resolved. In any event, there is no reason why attitudinal studies of Latin American groups, and by this I mean not merely samples of the statistical distribution of a particular attitude, but also studies of the confluence of psychological and social factors which form the attitude, need yield thin or impoverished descriptions of personality and society.

Margarita Gangotena, for example, has elucidated the connections between individual and social attitudes in her examination of upper and middle class Ecuadorean family attitudes towards their peasant servants. She demonstrates how the self-esteem of children is threatened when individuals whom they love and with whom they have identified (servants who raise them) receive little respect from other, more powerful adult figures (parents, aunts, uncles). Hostility towards the peasant class from which their servants come partially results from a displacement of the child's feelings of rage against his parents for forcing the denial of servants. This rage cannot be expressed directly against parents without engendering intense guilt. Consequently, it manifests itself as a hostile attitude toward socially approved targets—"indios" and "cholos." Paternalism, on the other hand, can be seen as a reaction formation, the development of attitudes in conscious life which are the antithesis of repressed impulses. Thus, the peasant objects of hostility are treated not as threats but as inferiors.¹⁹

It is interesting to note that paternalistic and hostile attitudes toward peasants and, in general, the non-European populations of Latin America, carry over to the institutional level too (Church paternalism, destruction of Indian communities in the service of the Trans-Amazonian Highway, etc.) Paradoxically, however, much of the peasant attitudinal heritage (familism, fatalism) survives on the institutional level in the form of graft, nepotism, *parentelas*, and lack of cooperation in community projects.

The most popular use of social psychology in Latin America studies to date has been to explicate the personality-politics connection. This approach has been particularly successful in biographies and leadership studies. Many social scientists have constructed political personality "models" on the basis of their individual case studies.²⁰ In a sense this is a natural outcome of perceiving the resemblances between particular research subjects and other political actors. However, many questions pertaining to political groups remain unasked and unanswered.

What conjunction of political and social circumstances renders a particular "type" of leader (e.g. authoritarian) appealing to large numbers of people? To what extent do personal psychological variables explain political attitudes and, consequently, political behavior? Do persons experiencing the same sort of emotional conflicts hit upon the same or different outlets, channels, or ideologic solutions? Do similar political attitudes serve the same psychological functions for different individuals?

In 1968, I interviewed a dozen former Integralist leaders and several leaders of the São Paulo-based Tradição, Família, Propriedade (TFP) movement. The Integralists defended their past political stance in terms of the Communist menace of the

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

1930s.²¹ Similarly, TFP leaders channeled their energies against the “false idea” of coexistence with evil (communism, socialism).²² In both cases, it would seem that projection served the truly economic function of helping canalize libidinous energy. Integralist and TFP leaders transferred the bogies of international communism (and international Judaism) into a receptacle for all kinds of hostile projections—and based their political authoritarianism on these.

It is not without significance that these men used the word “pregar” (to preach) to describe their propaganda activities in the service of AIB (Ação Integralista Brasileira) and TFP. Both groups justified their political views in religious terms. Thus, the Integralists defined themselves as:

The soldiers which the Holy Gospel announced for the definitive fight which is going to separate the decrepit, vice-ridden world from the new, integral, united world vibrating with heroism, without the anarchy which the anti-Christ's preach.²³

In a similar vein, Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira writes that the Church (as represented by TFP) must lead a “total struggle, a struggle of life and death” against communism:

Catholics . . . must be mobilized into an immense falange, disposed to accept everything, even martyrdom, to avoid the implantation of communism.²⁴

At the same time, the aggressive action made possible to AIB and TFP members in the service of Nation provides(ed) a cathartic release for libidinal fantasies. Their continued loyalty to their respective *Chefes Supremos*, Plínio Salgado and Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, is enlightening in this regard. When leaders take upon themselves responsibility for aggression, even implicitly, those who carry out commands may do so without guilt. *Superego* functions will be assumed by the leader.

AIB and TFP leaders appear to have a lot in common attitudinally, yet the groups are rivals. Alex Inkeles has suggested that personality factors affect mainly the style of political action preferred by individuals, with their socioeconomic status of more importance as a predictor of ideological choices or attitudes.²⁵ AIB was a middle class phenomenon and TFP draws its membership almost solely from the upper class. Clearly, then, a study of the development of political attitudes must take the historical context, the sociological composition of participants, and the political options of the time into strict account. Exhaustive analyses of political settings and doctrines are methodologically mandatory before attempting to elucidate personality-politics connections. These connections do exist, however, and psychological awareness can help illumine the strictly characterological factors which contribute to the construction of political attitudes.

IV

No sharp boundaries demarcate social psychology from other social sciences. It overlaps political and economic science and cultural anthropology. Likewise, its ties with sociology are close. One-third of social psychology texts are written today by sociologists, although their orientation is primarily interactional.²⁶

Latin American Research Review

In spite of this apparent lack of autonomy, social psychology has its own core of theory, data, and methods and its own special viewpoint. It focuses its interest on the social nature of the individual. By contrast, the other social sciences take as their starting points the political, social, or cultural systems in which an individual lives. A complete science of social relations will embrace both the personality system and the many-sided social system.

Precisely because of this, a neat complementarity seems to exist between social psychology and Latin American studies. Taken by themselves, Latin American studies lack a theory and a methodology for the study of personal motives and capacities. Social psychology by itself cannot state cultural models to which men's motives and capacities tend to conform. It is very much to our interests to seek and use the widest possible range of materials—clinical, cultural, comparative, and quantitative. All varieties of evidence exert significant and complementary functions in generating new hypotheses, contributing new insights, and indicating new avenues of exploration.

The correct use of social psychological types of empirical evidence (based on projective tests, behavior tests, dreams, folklore analysis, biographies, etc.) requires considerable knowledge of psychodynamics. For those Latin Americanists interested in utilizing social psychology, this does not represent an unbridgeable gap. Many institutions, including the Social Science Research Council, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute of Health, offer one- and two-year grants to social scientists for "re-tooling" in an area outside one's own discipline. Universities all have psychology and psychological education departments. Interested faculty may take advantage of their curriculum and facilities. This is not to assert arrogantly that one course in Attitude Formation and Change and another in Techniques of Personality Measurement, or a year devoted to psychological training, will turn us into full-fledged social psychologists. But then, that is not our purpose. Finally, it would seem feasible for the Latin Americanist to undertake projects in collaboration with a social psychologist.

Certainly there is much work to be done. The notion of Latin American culture as a patterned continuity of some sort of static, totally integrated whole fails to mesh with the tremendous impact of social and technological change in the last two decades. The parts of a new modern society exist in Latin America. But, rather than being carefully fitted one to the other, they stand in glaring contradiction and striking incongruity beside increasingly threatened older styles. Although societies and individuals must change to live, there are limits to the adaptability of both.²⁷ Perhaps an area in which to begin work would be to examine the psychological consequences of rapid change on personality in Latin America (i.e., "adjustment," referring to the internal personality structure), alongside the structural and institutional consequences of change (i.e., social "adaptation," the relationship of individual to society).

A social psychological approach to Latin American studies does not purport to offer uncausal explanations of the elements of society. It is not incompatible with

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

information and interpretation supplied by sociological, anthropological, historical, economic, and political science data. Rather, it depends on these, for personality simply does not exist in a vacuum. Trained and knowledgeable Latin Americanists are in a unique position to avoid stereotyping and ethnocentrism in their attempts to include personality as a factor in the research equation.

FOOTNOTES

1. Irving Louis Horowitz, *Three Worlds of Development* (N.Y.: 1966), p. 330. Chapter 10, "The Mental Set of Developing Man," speaks directly to the question of the psychological aspects of colonialism and development.
2. Oscar Lewis, *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied* (Urbana, Ill.: 1951), pp. 428–429.
3. Florestan Fernandes utilizes the insights of social psychology to answer this question in *The Negro in Brazilian Society* (N.Y.: 1969). See especially chapter 4, pp. 187–233.
4. Gordon Allport, "The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology," in Gardner Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Reading, Mass.: 1969), v. I, p. 3.
5. The trend in personality theory, particularly in psychoanalytic personality theory, is away from the defensive functions of the ego toward studies of its synthetic, integrative, adaptive functions. Ego psychology today represents the increasing concern of psychoanalysts with ego processes, social forces, and interpersonal relations. For an elaboration on recent trends in psychoanalysis, see Calvin S. Hall and Gardner Lindzey, "The Relevance of Freudian Psychology and Related Viewpoints for the Social Sciences," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, v. 1, 2nd ed. (Reading, Mass.: 1969), especially pages 277–284.
6. See Chapter 7, "The Eight Ages of Man," in Erik Erikson's *Childhood and Society* (N.Y., 1963), and his book *Identity and the Life Cycle* (N.Y.: 1959), for a fuller explanation of his developmental concepts in ego psychology.
7. The "projective" techniques are so named because they elicit individual projections onto a series of ambiguous stimuli. The individual, in response to indeterminant stimuli, "projects" samples of behavior, revealing inner states or characteristic processes of adjustment. Gardner Lindzey, in *Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research* (N.Y.: 1961), has summarized and classified the various kinds of projective techniques that have been used. Attitudinal surveys are not new and their use continues. See for example, Maurice Zeitlin, *Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class* (Princeton: 1967).
8. The analysis of dreams, and the semistructured clinical interview also hold considerable methodological promise. Since time constraints and the unwillingness of informants to undergo intensive interviews hamper the interpretation of unconscious materials, Latin Americanists may find it more feasible to interpret the manifest content of dreams rather than deeply unconscious latent material. Dorothy Eggan proposed the use of manifest content of dreams to show personality integration and cultural attitudes in "The Manifest Content of Dreams: A Challenge to Social Science," *American Anthropologist*, no. 54, 1952. David Foulkes discusses the instability of dream research in *The Psychology of Sleep* (N.Y.: 1966).
9. Some examples include Ozzie Simmons, "Ambivalence and the Learning of Drinking Behavior in a Peruvian Community," *American Anthropologist*, no. 62, 1960; George Foster, *Tzintzuntzan: Peasants in a Changing World* (Boston: 1967); Romain and Kimball Romney, *The Mixtecos of Juxtlajuaca* (N.Y.: 1969); William Mangin, "Mental Health and Migration to Cities: A Peruvian Case," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, no. 84, 1960; Oscar Lewis, *La Vida* (N.Y.: 1965).

Latin American Research Review

10. The names of Octavio Paz, *El Laberinto de la Soledad* (México: 1950) and Samuel Ramos, *El Perfil del Hombre y la Cultura en México* (México, 1934), come to mind immediately in this regard. See also the works of the Mexican psychoanalysts Ancieto Aramoni, *Psicoanálisis de la Dinámica de un Pueblo* (México: 1960), and Francisco González Pineda, *El Mexicano: Su Dinámica Psicosocial* (México: 1961). North American analysts Erich Fromm and Michael Maccoby also have turned their attention to Mexico in *Social Character in a Mexican Village* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: 1970).
11. The focus of many of these works is political; for example, Ted Robert Gurr, "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence," *World Politics*, v. 20, January 1968, and Kalman Silvert, "Some Psychocultural Factors in the Politics of Conflict and Conciliation," in Francisco José Moreno and Barbara Mitrani, eds., *Conflict and Violence in Latin American Politics* (N.Y.: 1971). Kalman Silvert defines nationalism partially in social psychological terms in *Expectant Peoples* (N.Y.: 1963). Still other social scientists have drawn on social psychology in their treatments of aspects of modernization and economic development; for example, Joseph Kahl, *The Measurement of Modernism: A Study of Values in Brazil and Mexico* (Austin: 1968) and Everett E. Hagen, *On the Theory of Social Change* (Cambridge: 1962).
12. George A. DeVos and Arthur A. Hippler, "Cultural Psychology: Comparative Studies of Human Behavior," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, v. 4, 2nd ed. (Reading, Mass.: 1969), p. 365.
13. Emanuel de Kadt, "Religion, the Church, and Social Change in Brazil," in Claudio Véliz, ed., *The Politics of Conformity in Latin America*, (N.Y.: 1967), pp. 196–197.
14. DeVos and Hippler, p. 362.
15. Hall and Lindzey, pp. 281–282.
16. Some of the more useful general works in the field of political socialization include Fred I. Greenstein, *Children and Politics* (New Haven: 1969), Kenneth Langton, *Political Socialization* (N.Y.: 1969), and Roberta Sigel, ed., *Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization* (N.Y.: 1970). Political socialization studies in Latin America have been done by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Princeton: 1963); Robert E. Scott, "Mexico: The Established Revolution," in Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development* (Princeton: 1969), especially pp. 347–371; Patricia Kasschau, "The Development of Political Cynicism in Young Mexican Children," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Sociology, University of Southern California, 1972. Richard Fagen, in *The Transformation of Political Culture in Cuba* (Stanford: 1969), touches on political socialization issues, particularly the Cuban attempt to create an attitudinally changed "new socialist man" through strictly behavioral changes.
17. David O. Sears, "Political Behavior," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, v. 5, 2nd ed., (Reading, Mass.: 1969) pp. 415–416. This long review essay deals with all aspects of the psychology of public opinion and electoral behavior, but heavily emphasizes the literature on political change during the life cycle.
18. Allport, pp. 59–63.
19. Margarita Gangotena, "The Denial of the Peasant Heritage," unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, June 1971, p. 8. I wish to thank Professor Stuart Schwartz of the History Department, University of Minnesota, for sending me a copy of this paper.
20. This has been true since Harold Lasswell made his pioneering studies of the relationships between personality and politics in the 1930s. See his *Psychopathology and Politics* (Chicago: 1930). A recent survey article on "personality-politics" research is Fred I. Greenstein, "Systematic Inquiry into Personality and Politics: Introduction and Overview," *Journal of Social Issues*, v. 24 (1968), pp. 1–14.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

21. Including interviews of Plínio Salgado (Brasília, 4/12/68); Loureiro Junior (São Paulo, 12/1/67); Mario Sombra (Rio, 7/22/68); Geofredo da Silva Telles (São Paulo, 5/20/68); Gumercindo Rocha Dorea (Rio, 3/14/68); and João Scantimburgo (São Paulo, 4/17/68).
22. Interview, Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira (São Paulo, 12/3/67). *Catholicismo*, the group's newspaper, which sells over 25,000 copies per month, reiterates this theme endlessly.
23. Custodio de Viveiros, *O Sonhodo filósofo integralista* (Rio: 1935), p. 96.
24. Plínio Corrêa de Oliveira, *A Liberdade da Igreja no estado comunista* (São Paulo: 1964), p. 11. Over 136,000 copies of this work have been published and distributed in eight languages.
25. Alex Inkeles, "National Character and Modern Political Systems," in F.L.K. Hsu, ed., *Psychological Anthropology* (Homewood, Ill.: 1961), p. 193.
26. Allport, p. 68.
27. Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (N.Y.: 1970). See chapter 16, "Future Shock, the Psychological Dimension."