

---

## EDITOR'S FOREWORD

---

The locus of area studies in many countries is found in a small number of research institutes affiliated with government agencies. Other countries have attached area studies programs to their national academy of sciences. The United States has followed a different model in using limited federal subsidies to develop a network of more than one hundred complementary and competing foreign area centers at a relatively large number of universities. These centers are augmented by programs at other institutions that are not as well funded.

The U.S. model is characterized by a number of strengths and weaknesses, although not all observers would agree on what constitutes strength or weakness. This model is pluralistic and redundant. Its intellectual priorities are defined more by the culture of academia than by the priorities of government agencies. It is shaped in part by the interactions of the large community of foreign area faculty with colleagues abroad. The U.S. system has trained large numbers of foreign area specialists, not all of whom have found employment related to their training. Although federal agencies dealing with foreign areas are largely staffed by graduates of the campus-based centers, these centers have frequently been the source of criticism of U.S. foreign policies and actions. In response, government agencies have increasingly turned to non-university think tanks for policy-related research. Yet paradoxically, these think tanks in turn recruit their personnel from the university-based programs and draw on the research from the universities.

The university-based model has achieved a remarkable success in terms of its research productivity and theoretical relevance, thanks in large measure to its academic environment. At the same time, the nation's foreign area centers maintain uneasy relationships both with the universities in which they are housed and with the federal government that provides limited but essential support.

It is now clear that the end of the cold war will bring no peace

dividend to U.S. society in general or to universities in particular. The fiscal excesses of the final stages of the cold war left a hangover of deficit and debt that weighs heavily on U.S. society at all levels, whatever the administration in power. The infighting over the federal budget is echoed by budgetary conflict at state and local levels and by increasing austerity within universities.

In this draconian environment, the case for the U.S. model of foreign area studies must be made over and over again, both within universities and in Washington. Advocates of funding for other causes like to refer to area studies as “passé” or obsolete, presumably in need of replacement by programs that reflect some other “functionally” oriented agenda. Yet as the content of this and other area studies journals demonstrates, foreign area studies in the United States have achieved an extraordinary vitality. They represent an intellectual asset for academia, for the U.S. government, and for the international community.

The volume of manuscript submissions to *LARR* during the year running from June 1992 through May 1993 was virtually identical to the previous year (136 manuscripts as compared with 137 for the 1991–92 period). Twenty-three of these submissions were book review essays and 3 were comments. The remaining manuscripts entered the review process. By the end of May 1993, 8 manuscripts had been accepted for publication or accepted pending revisions, 49 had been rejected, 2 withdrawn, and the remaining 41 were still under original review or a second review following revisions. An additional 7 “old” manuscripts (from the previous report period) were accepted after having been revised. The publication rate for articles and research notes that completed the review process (those accepted or rejected) continues to be about one of every five submissions.

The distribution by discipline reflected a drop in the proportion of political science submissions to 24 percent of the total. Second place was again held by history with 22 percent of submissions, followed by sociology with 15 percent and economics with 12 percent. Anthropology submissions increased to 9 percent of the total, while language and literature submissions were in sixth place with 8 percent of submissions. Other fields such as bibliography, journalism, philosophy, education, geography, linguistics, and religious studies accounted for the remaining 10 percent of submissions.

<i>Discipline</i>	<i>June 1992– May 1993</i>	<i>June 1991– May 1992</i>	<i>June 1990– May 1991</i>
Political Science	24%	32%	37%
History	22	22	19
Sociology	15	12	12
Economics	12	15	16
Anthropology	9	5	5
Languages and Literature	8	7	6
Other fields	10	7	5
Totals	100%	100%	100%

Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian authors or coauthors, including those living in Europe and North America, submitted 41 percent of all submissions, up 16 percent from the previous year. Women authored or co-authored 26 percent of submissions, the same percentage as in the last manuscript report. Twenty-six percent of the manuscripts came from outside the United States, as compared with 20 percent for the previous period. Fifty percent of these non-U.S. manuscripts came from Latin America and the Caribbean, as compared with 67 percent in the preceding report period. Latin American and Caribbean countries represented were Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, and Peru. Other countries represented included Canada, England, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden.

*LARR* maintains its traditional policy of publishing only two categories of refereed articles: surveys of the current state of research on Latin America and original research contributions that are judged to be of general and interdisciplinary interest. The editors do not solicit articles or research reports. Hence the content of research published in *LARR* is based solely on the initiative of authors and the informed judgments of peer referees.

Gilbert W. Merkk  
Albuquerque, New Mexico