

SOCIAL SCIENCE IN PERU

APUNTES. Año 1, número 1 (1973); año 1, número 2 (1974); año 2, número 3 (1974). Published by CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN, UNIVERSIDAD DEL PACÍFICO. Lima, Peru.*

Apuntes, a new Peruvian journal of the social sciences, should be of special interest to all those concerned with the fate of the "peculiar revolution" in that country. Its clear emphasis on socioeconomic reform makes *Apuntes* especially pertinent in this time of awakened academic preoccupation with political economy generally and with Peru's ostensible quest for a different development model. For these reasons, the journal deserves a readership beyond Peruvianists, and, judging from its first three issues, it is praiseworthy for its relevance and its scholarship.

Apuntes has been published biannually, since 1973, by the Research Center of the Universidad del Pacífico in Lima. The general format, under the guidance of a coordinating editor and a six-man editorial board, is five substantive articles; notes from a recent conference, roundtable, or poll; a bibliographic essay; and two or more book reviews. Each article is preceded by a succinct précis advising prospective readers of content and approach.

The earnest tone of *Apuntes* is reflected in its bibliographical essays. On Peru's renowned political philosopher (poet, anarchist, and positivist!) Manuel González Prada (1848–1918), Bruno Podestá (no. 2) includes 184 sources that deal either exclusively or partially (pages indicated) with him. An essay on multinational corporations by Folke Kafka (no. 3) brings forth no less than 386 citations for the period 1970–73; included are works in Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, and German, all available in Peru. Book reviews emphasize studies either by Peruvians or about Peru, but also include interesting reactions to more general works such as *Limits to Growth*.

The substantive articles show *Apuntes'* faithfulness to its purposes as stated in the front matter of each issue. These are to encourage interdisciplinary and interideological discussion, and to promote "a questioning of the interpretations of [Peru's] reality and a solution to its contradictions." Of the first twenty-one articles published (excluding book reviews), twelve deal specifically with Peru; most others focus on the Third World, Latin America, or some problem of particular concern to Peru. The articles are difficult to classify by discipline—a good indicator of interdisciplinary directions. At the risk of gross simplification, eleven might be categorized as economic, five as sociological, three as politically theoretical, and two as historical. Most of the articles concern themselves with socioeconomic issues; if they discuss economics they tend to

**Apuntes* is still appearing regularly, and we have just received año 2, número 4 (1975) and año 3, número 5 (1976). Those interested should contact Bruno Podestá, Editor, Centro de Investigación, Universidad del Pacífico, Av. Salaverry 2020, Jesús María, Lima 11, Perú.

focus on distribution rather than growth. In fact, nine deal primarily with redistribution of wealth or property.

Empirical political science is neglected, which really is not surprising. Also neglected, and here there is cause for surprise, are anthropology and history. The last is especially baffling since one author deems history Peru's "in" discipline.¹ It would seem from *Apuntes*, however, that economics—especially economics based on distinct social values—is *de moda*. Despite the normative emphasis, a number of the articles are empirically based. That the majority of such articles are authored by Peruvians in their twenties and early thirties is noteworthy.

Nearly half the contributions come from scholars at the Universidad de Pacífico itself, another quarter from Peruvians at other institutions, and the rest from foreigners. Apparently, all the articles appear for the first time; *Apuntes* is not a second-hand journal. Unless the Pacífico scholars can be unusually prolific, *Apuntes* will broaden its base. This would be a positive change. At present too many authors draw disproportionately on works by immediate colleagues, seasoning these citations with sporadic references to a few "classics," but neglecting too much current literature of comparative and theoretical interest. Given the seriousness of a number of the entries on redistribution, for example, it is unfortunate that little reference is made beyond Peru and Marx.

The system of values that seems to lie behind much that is published in this journal may be classified as "academic populism." Inspired by Mariátegui's emphasis on social change, many of the contributors to *Apuntes* inveigh against ivory-tower academics and objective social science. They repeatedly pledge not to "marginalize" themselves on issues affecting the masses; instead, they seek suitable new models of development.

At first glance it might appear that *Apuntes* has little to offer the political scientist not preoccupied with political economy. Indeed, the absence of liberal freedoms does limit discussions of traditional concerns such as *aprista* or other party activity, political participation, voting behavior, student and labor politics, etc. What the reader can gain from *Apuntes*, however, is a much fuller understanding of the bounds of political criticism in Peru. Academic freedom is generally a good indicator of regime authoritarianism—in this case, of how strongly Peruvians can criticize the junta.

Significantly, no mention is made of the suppression of political freedom. Still, readers may be surprised by the relatively harsh criticism of political-economic policies. In a number of ways interesting comparisons can be drawn to the Mexican case, certainly one of the less authoritarian in contemporary Latin America. Academic populism in Peru, as in Mexico, aligns itself with the government's proclaimed progressive values; criticism tends to center on pace rather than direction of reform. An ambiguous critique emerges because it is often not clear if the author feels that the government is trying hard but faces powerful obstacles, or that the government is not really committed to social justice since it puts priority on stability and growth.² As in the Mexican case, it is often hard for the reader to know whether the author conceives of the govern-

ment as a well-intentioned David facing a Goliath of traditional obstacles, or whether he merely uses this image to legitimize his evaluation of extant problems.

Some articles directly attack government policies. One author deems it "almost a contradiction in terms" to undertake a program of *propiedad social* by starting with "a few experimental businesses"; within the given overall structure, such experiments are doomed to failure.³ Most often, however, academic populism blends with regime populism, and criticism is less direct. While real, it tends to be offered in the spirit of joint endeavor with the government against the fundamental obstacles to reform.

On one level, *Apuntes'* authors see the obstacles as structural. These include maldistribution of wealth and power, private rather than government control of the economy, dependence on foreign investment, low educational and technical levels, etc. With neo-Marxist emphases, these writers eschew easy solutions to problems rooted in the very nature of the system. As Einaudi and Stepan have written, the junta shares this perception of profound structural obstacles, and it is one rationale for the doctrine of extended rule.⁴ On a related level, some authors identify the obstacles more subjectively: the exploiting classes, domestic and foreign, are accused of terrible excesses. Many articles refer to the subtle methods used by these interests to evade social responsibilities. No doubt; but little insight is offered as to *how* this is done. The articles written from the structural perspective have been more edifying.

In sum, we find in *Apuntes* political criticism that: (1) is not directed against government suppression of political rights; (2) is directed against its political-economic policies; (3) tends to be more strongly directed against structural obstacles and private and foreign enterprise than against the government; (4) is rendered more in the spirit of populist cooperation than ideological confrontation with the government; (5) sometimes hints at the government's lack of commitment to reform by noting its priorities on other factors; (6) often criticizes the pace of government reform; (7) does not go beyond criticizing certain policies to questioning the nature of the regime. Thus, the reader can appreciate not only the content, but the extent of criticism. It would be interesting to assess possible changes in the bounds of permissible criticism in the post-Velasco period.

Perhaps the best way to introduce the journal is simply to describe rather than analyze its content.

Using data from English consular reports, Heraclio Bonilla (no. 2) examines domestic and international economic forces at work from 1780 to 1840, with special focus on the growth induced in southern Peru. Felipe Portocarrero (no. 3) analyzes the Peruvian economy in 1973 and concludes that the stage of reform is over and that it accomplished less than generally thought; now emphasis is on new methods of capital accumulation, in which the government is "allied and subordinated to imperialist capital." David Sobrevilla (no. 1), treating a familiar but always interesting problem in Latin American social thought, ultimately rejects the thesis that a dominated country (in this case, Peru) neither has nor

could have an authentic culture and philosophy. Eight collectively-presented commentaries (no. 3) on the role of social science in Peru, while not forming one coherent statement, do agree on the importance of explaining and helping to change Peruvian reality. Marcial Rubio (no. 3) praises but suggests alterations of Article 17 of the Constitution, which holds all foreign companies subject to Peruvian law.

Three articles consider the effectiveness of the 1972 law on *propiedad social*. Luis Bustamante (no. 1) finds that the judicial order still supports private enterprise since it is based on classic liberal conceptions, e.g., limits to private property are conceived of as exceptions. Yugoslav scholar Ichak Adizes (no. 2) compares his country's worker-control law to Peru's, finding many similarities and warning against repeating the major Yugoslav error of "idealistic and mystical" reliance on social consciousness rather than administrative responsibility. Notes from a roundtable discussion (no. 1) emphasize the lack of clarity in conception and especially implementation of the law.

Undoubtedly, the most salient question raised about Peruvian politics since 1968 is whether it has been socioeconomically reformist. Nordlinger stated flatly that no ruling military would be reformist, and the majority of studies on Peru lend support to his thesis.⁵ Perhaps sector or reference-group analysis could account for Peru's intrasectoral rather than intersectoral reform.⁶ For example, should the military focus on industrialization, urban workers, but not peasants, could benefit greatly. Still others have regarded the Peruvian as truly a new type of reformist military government.⁷ Redistribution of the wealth is a vital indicator of reformist authenticity.

Apuntes makes an important contribution to the dialogue. Aside from the articles on *propiedad social* (basically redistribution of property), the journal published three articles specifically on the redistribution of wealth (in terms of income).⁸ These are valuable both for the questions they raise and for those they answer. Among the most interesting of these questions are the following: Can a weak economy achieve redistribution while at the same time insuring sufficient growth to make it irreversible? Is the government financially and organizationally equipped to do this, or must it rely on the market system? Should redistributive efforts be conceived intersectorally or intrasectorally? Normatively, is it meaningful to speak of "redistribution" of the wealth to teachers and urban workers who already occupy relatively privileged economic status? One research problem that invites comparative insights is to establish the positions which different groups occupy in the income pyramid. This done, one could better assess whether granting a larger share of the wealth to that group were "progressive." More basically, do present redistributive efforts falsely assume an integrated economy in which financial transfers are possible, rather than a dual economy in which they are not?

Generally, as there is considerable agreement among *Apuntes'* authors that these are the important policy questions, so there is considerable agreement on policy impacts. Succinct analyses of the industrial, fishing, mining, and agrarian reform laws show that policies have been aimed at redistribution within sectors. The industrial law, for example, simply redistributed within the

top 25 percent of the income strata; the agrarian reform only affected the top level within its sector, neglecting Peru's poorest groups. According to one author, all the laws taken together affected about 45 percent of the national income, transferring about 3–4 percent of it, and almost half of that within the top 25 percent income range.⁹ This intrasectoral redistribution is seen as a continuation of the policy impacts of the civilian Belaunde government. Overall national distribution of wealth has hardly been affected.

Despite relative consensus on issues, causes, and general results, interesting differences arise over solutions. One group, hoping to transfer wealth intersectorally via fiscal and pricing policies, favors a strong government role within the present economic system. Another viewpoint casts doubt on the effectiveness of such programs and at any rate would not want to strengthen the capitalist system by integrating marginal groups. Perhaps the winning redistributive proposition was to open two windows at the Ministry of Economics and Finance, one at which people above income X would deposit, and the other at which people below income X could withdraw!

Apuntes deals with some of the most relevant questions facing Peru; those interested in such questions should be interested in the journal. Its populist tone does not lead it to be demagogic or facile with solutions, nor is *Apuntes* rendered critically sterile by political authoritarianism. In terms of relevance, style, and content, the scholastic level of *Apuntes* is more than adequate.

DANIEL LEVY

University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

NOTES

1. Heracio Bonilla, "Encuesta en las ciencias sociales," *Apuntes* 2, no. 3 (1974):137.
2. See, for example, Luis Bustamente's conclusions on propiedad social. "Consideraciones jurídicas sobre la propiedad social en el Perú," *Apuntes* 1, no. 1 (1973):44.
3. Luis Pásara, "Mesa redonda sobre propiedad social," *Apuntes* 1, no. 1 (1973):96.
4. Luigi Einaudi and Alfred Stepan, *Latin American Institutional Development: Changing Perspectives in Peru and Brazil* (Santa Monica: Rand, 1971), pp. 21–22.
5. Eric Nordlinger, "Soldiers in Mufti: The Impact of Military Rule upon Economic and Social Change in Non-Western States," *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 4 (1970):1134. See, for example, James Malloy, "Peru before and after the Coup of 1968," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 14, no. 4 (1972).
6. See Markos Mamalakis, "The Theory of Sectoral Clashes," *LARR* 4, no. 3 (1969):9–46; Robert Price, "A Theoretical Approach to Military Rule in New States: Reference-Group Theory and the Ghanaian Case," *World Politics* 23, no. 3 (1971):399–430.
7. For example, Alain Rouquié, "Changing Functions of Military Rule," in Philippe Schmitter, ed., *Military Rule in Latin America* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1973), pp. 2–57.
8. Adolfo Figueroa, "El impacto de las reformas actuales sobre la distribución de ingresos en el Perú," *Apuntes* 1, no. 1 (1973):67–82; Cesar Peñaranda, "El impacto de las reformas actuales sobre la distribución de ingresos: aspectos adicionales y comentarios," *Apuntes* 1, no. 2 (1974):73–80; "Conversatorio sobre la redistribución del ingreso en el Perú," *Apuntes* 1, no. 2 (1974):81–92.
9. Figueroa, "El impacto," pp. 73–74.