

## Latin American Research Review

forma Agraria." Dr. Peña Andrade was born in Cuenca, Ecuador, in 1933, and attended the University of Cuenca, the Central University of Ecuador, and Michigan State University. He directed and participated in numerous investigations and in conferences on agrarian reform and communications, and served as technical advisor in several countries. Dr. Peña Andrade was also the author of various publications in his field.

Ralph L. Roys, noted for his studies of Mayan anthropology, died in Seattle in December 1965 at 86. He was a corresponding member of the Academy of American Franciscan History and a member of the department of historical research at the Carnegie Institute of Washington. Roys was associated with the Mayan research program of Tulane University and was later Wade research professor of anthropology at the University of Washington. His published works include *The Ethno-Botany of the Maya* (1931), *The Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel* (1933), and *The Indian Background of Colonial Yucatan* (1943). His last publication was *Ritual of the Bacabs* (1965).

Carlos Vega died in Buenos Aires at the age of 68 after a career in Argentine musicology. He made a systematic collection of Argentine folk music, which includes more than 6,000 recordings and is the most important

collection of folk music in Latin America. Among his other principal works were "La música de un códice colonial del siglo XVII" (1939); "Danzas y Canciones Argentinas" (1936); "Panorama de la música popular argentina" (1944); "Las Ciencias del Folklore" (1960); and "Las Canciones folklóricas argentinas" (1965).

Arthur Bernardes Weiss, Instituto Rio Branco, Rio de Janeiro, and a visiting professor of history at the University of Florida, died on February 7, 1966, at the age of 32. Weiss received his *licenciado* at the Universidade do Brasil in 1966, and taught social sciences there, at the Instituto Rio Branco, the Colégio Pedro II, the Escola Nacional de Ciências Estatísticas, and the Pontífica Universidade Católica. He served as a consultant to the Ministry of Education on teacher training and teaching methods in history and geography and produced monographs on those subjects as well as contributing articles on Brazilian history and geography to *Boletim de História*, *Boletim Geográfico do Conselho Nacional de Geografia*, *Escola Secundária*, and the *Enciclopédia Barsa*. Arthur Weiss was the liveliest, friendliest, and most likable of persons, an excellent and immensely popular teacher, and a most promising young scholar. He left many friends and admirers in Gainesville, where news of his tragically premature death was received with deep sorrow.—AH

## FORUM

A letter from James D. Cockcroft of the Department of History, the University of Texas, informs LARR's editor of a Declaration of Latin American Economists printed in *Desarrollo*, volume 1, number 1 in Barranquilla, Colombia. The substance of the declaration (which is signed by more than 70 economists from Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru, El Salvador, Mexico and Venezuela) is stated at the outset: "The theory of development formulated in industrialized Western countries cannot serve as a basis for a strategy and a policy for Latin American peoples."

---

Joseph A. Kahl of Washington University, St. Louis, forwarded a copy "of the collective letter which has recently been sent to Dr. Silvert as President

of the Latin American Studies Association.” At Kahl’s request we print the letter in its entirety.

May 19, 1966

The Presidents:

American Anthropological Association,  
 American Economic Association,  
 American Political Science Association,  
 American Sociological Association,  
 Latin American Studies Association

Dear Sirs:

It is now almost a year since Project Camelot blew up in public. Since that time, there have been a few letters of protest by individuals to the editor of the *American Sociologist* (Vol. 1, Nos. 1 and 2), interpretive articles by Kalman Silvert (American Universities Field Service Reports, West Coast South American Series, Vol. XII, July 1965), and Irving Louis Horowitz, *Transaction* (November/December 1965); articles in the May 1966 issue of the *American Psychologist*; and brief statements in *Science* (September 10, 1965) and *Behavioral Science* (September 1965). Some inquiries are underway in various professional groups, but it appears likely that these will be abstracted towards a general analysis of the relationships between government support and social science (the task, for example, of a new committee of the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council).

The professional societies are in the vast majority composed of social scientists who do not themselves work in Latin America, and therefore may not feel any great sense of outrage or urgency about the particular details of Camelot. The undersigned are specialists on Latin America, and do feel such outrage and urgency. We are in favor of general analyses of the long-term implications of government financial support for social science research, but while we are waiting for such investigations, we wish to protest the philosophy which appeared to be underlying Project Camelot. Failing to do so implies either acceptance or indifference, and our Latin American colleagues are looking for a public debate before judging the degree of widespread complicity among North Americans in the perspectives toward research which Camelot symbolized. Until large numbers of U.S. social scientists, preferably through their regular professional associations, explicitly reject Camelot as such, we all will suffer from its consequences. Our scientific integrity has been compromised, and we must act to redeem it.

The most immediate consequence of Camelot has been to place all U.S. social scientist who venture into the field of Latin America under suspicion. Each one must now carry the burden of proof that his mission is not a “cover”

for some agency of the government. Secondly, it is apparent from many reports that our Latin American colleagues have been affected in doing their own locally-designed and locally-financed projects by the general doubt about empirical social science research stimulated by Camelot. Many efforts, including student dissertations, have had to be cancelled. Such doubt about research was latent before—it is now overt and fierce. Thirdly, the reputation of U.S. universities as institutions has been brought into question. The extent to which they are independent of the government, and able to engage in free scientific inquiry, is a matter of concern.

In view of this deplorable situation we feel that Camelot itself must be debated, and the lessons it contains for the future must be learned. Basing ourselves on the articles which have been published—and which have not been substantially challenged—we tend toward the following conclusions:

- 1) Project Camelot appeared to be scientifically irresponsible:
  - a) The merging of policy goals (political stability, the avoidance of or successful repression of revolutionary violence) and scientific questions (study of the social processes that produce tensions and violence) made objective research unlikely.
  - b) The Project conveyed the impression that a crash program of research could uncover the causes and cures of the social tensions which lead to violence and revolution, and provide practical measures of “prophylaxis.” It seems clear that, in the present state of knowledge and of research methodology, the Project could never have led to empirical conclusions of validity on such a broad scale.
  - c) The Project appeared to make the assumption that the research would automatically become a neutral scientific endeavor if it were carried out openly, with promises that the results eventually would be published for all to see. On this basis, it expected to obtain the cooperation of leading Latin American scholars, and believed that their participation would make the research non-controversial within the context of local politics. Such a chain of assumptions is incompatible with expert knowledge of Latin America.
- 2) Project Camelot appeared to be ethically irresponsible:
  - a) It proposed to develop social science knowledge as a guide for future interference in the internal political processes of other countries.
  - b) It assumed that the currently defined goals of the United States government of “stability” and “counter-insurgency” in other countries were self-evidently appropriate and beyond debate.
  - c) A few individuals seemed to have made the naive assumption that they could “educate” the United States Army in such a way as to make its intervention in other countries more intelligent and benign,

and that such a goal justified their participation in a Project paid for by the Army.

- d) A few individuals accepted participation in the hope of gaining sums of money for the study of large-scale social processes, both historical and contemporary with the cynical belief that the results would be so abstract as to be useless to the sponsor, the United States Army, and that therefore they need not worry about the potential use or misuse of their work in counter-insurgency operations.

These charges are explicitly or implicitly made in the articles cited. It would appear that many, if not all, contain sufficient truth to warrant an expression of condemnation of the Project by the relevant associations of U.S. scholars, and we request that the President of each association appoint a committee to initiate such condemnation.

We do not believe that individuals should ever be condemned without the most detailed inquiry, including adequate opportunity to present their own testimony. Lacking institutions to carry out such an inquiry, we leave it to the individuals involved to reflect upon their own actions, and to face up to the harm they have caused others, despite the absence of intention to do so.

Finally, we call for a dialogue with our Latin American colleagues. Let North Americans first clear the air by admitting the serious blunders carried out by Project Camelot under the guise of social science, and then work together with Latin Americans to set up guidelines for international and cooperative research in the future. Such research should be a two-way street, and might well include investigations initiated by Latin Americans on various aspects of U.S. society.

Munro S. Edmonson (Anthropology)

David Felix (Economics)

Daniel Goldrich (Political Science)

Joseph A. Kahl (Sociology)

Henry A. Landsberger (Sociology)