

Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) Research Reports Online is an ongoing publication of the RAC under the general direction of James Allen Smith, Vice President and Director of Research and Education. This series of reports is intended to show the richness of the RAC's archival holdings and to foster scholarly networks in the diverse fields of research conducted here.

Research Reports are submitted by all RAC grant recipients and many others who have done research at the Archive Center. They are presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's express consent. The ideas and opinions expressed in these reports are those of the author and not of the Rockefeller Archive Center.

**Adaptations, Organizations, and Intermediaries:
Philanthropy and the Reception of Max Weber in Spanish-speaking Countries (1939-1973)**

Álvaro Morcillo Laiz, CIDE, Mexico City

Please do not cite without permission
Comments welcome!

No idea has ever made much headway without an organization behind it.
Samuel H. Barnes

The hypothesis I wanted to explore when I arrived to the Rockefeller Archive Center was as straight-forward as this: The reception of Max Weber's *oeuvre* in the Spanish-speaking world could only be explained by the activities of the foundations and the SSRC committees. In certain countries the involvement of the foundations the social science enterprise decisively contributed to make US interpretations of Max Weber predominant. The readings of the most crucial for post-war social science that the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundations propounded superseded local, pre-existing interpretations. The main reason is that support from foundations made possible for specific intermediaries to wield enormous influence in the local scene. One main cause is that the foundation chose protégés that were extremely apt individuals and that they managed to establish superior academic bureaucracies. As a response to different difficulties in the large, patrimonial, and cash-strapped bureaucracies in Latin American public universities bureaucracies, foundations moved their protégés to establish new organizations more similar to the ideal type of legal authority with an administrative staff, full-time positions, provisions of the means of production, and appropriate training. Of course, this hypothesis does not purport to claim that the foundations and the SSRC were the *only* factors in Weber's reception, but it aims to assign these actors their appropriate place in our understanding of how certain adaptations of Weber became so prominent outside the U.S. Apart from the drawing the attention of the

researchers towards the part played by the philanthropic foundations and the SSRC in Weber's reception in the Americas, the article fills a gap in the scholarship on these organizations. Authors interested in philanthropies have reconstructed the impact of these organizations on broader intellectual trends, but not on how they shape the interpretation of individual, but crucial authors like Weber. Despite their significance for the current outlook of both political science and sociology, how these adaptations altered local agreements on what social science should consist of is scarcely known.

In the first section of this paper, I compare the circumstances in which these two adaptations were devised. The available scholarly contributions to our understanding of Weber's reception are discussed in the second section. Section three explores different Weber receptions in Spanish-speaking countries. The conclusion includes both the implications of the results and some suggestions for further research.

Organizations, Adaptations, Intermediaries, and Local Traditions

According to Edward Shils, the institutionalization of sociological ideas is a consequence of the work of intermediaries, organizations, publications, translations, adaptations, and new academic degrees (1970). Each of these explaining factors deserves a minimum of attention, not only because of Shils' decade-long concern with the sociology of ideas, but also because Shils developed his theory with the more or less open intention of understanding Weber's reception in the U.S. and, to a lesser extent, in Europe. In fact, Shils' theory has guided the most thorough attempt to reconstruct the reception of Weber in the U.S. (Scaff, 2004, 2005, 2011). In sum, the scholarship on the US reception offers an opportunity to identify influential variables that could be relevant for other cases.

Arguably, the academic institution that shaped most Weber's reception in the U.S. is Harvard University, although others such as the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin, Columbia, and the New School are also significant (Vidich, 2000; Scaff, 2011, pp. 199–200). Ideas need to be institutionalized by a powerful organization before they can become spatially influential and stable across time (Shils, 1970, p. 782). As a result of the decade-long presence of Talcott Parsons, Harvard played this role for Weber's ideas. Parsons, the most influential U.S. sociologist of the postwar age, used his position at Harvard to transmit his own ideas and, most importantly, his interpretation of Weber to hundreds of graduate students

(Vidich, 2000). Parsons began to act as an intermediary in the early 1920s, when he took advantage of his acquaintance with Marianne Weber to become the translator of Weber's *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, arguably the most influential single translation of Weber, second only to Hans Gerth's *From Max Weber* (Weber, 1930, 1946).

Even if prestigious institutions and the availability of translations contribute to the reception of an author's ideas, his work will only have a perdurable influence if young scholars are acquainted with them. The introduction of Weber in social science curricula began in the late 1930s at the University of Chicago and later at Harvard and Columbia (Scaff, 2006).¹ Presence in the curriculum implies that those ideas become *compulsory* reading for students and instructors in universities, but these organizations contribute to the reception of an author in other, most significant ways. By providing intermediaries, such as Parsons (and Shils), with professional stability, universities allow them to translate an author, if necessary, as in Weber's case, and to write interpretations that adapt his ideas to the local public. However, universities are not the only organizations that intervene in the reception of an author. As I have mentioned, the U.S. foundations supported the reception of a *certain* interpretation of Weber. They constituted what Shils called an "exogenous, nonintellectual" stimulus (Shils, 1970, p. 809). In addition to universities and foundations, a third type of organization that will receive attention here are the SSRC committees that represented an exogenous intellectual stimulus for Latin Americans (Shils, 1970, pp. 803–5).

The scholars interested in Weber's work paid limited attention to the foundations' involvement in the social science in the 1940s and 1950s. At the time in which Weber's reception gained momentum, foundations were active in supporting the social sciences. In the case of the Rockefellers, the promotion of social science began in the 1920s, both in the U.S. and abroad (Berman, 1983; Cobbs, 1992; Fisher, 1993; Pereyra, 2006; Morcillo Laiz, 2008, pp. 162, 170–1; Bullock, 2011; Ortoll & Piccato, 2011). In addition, a specific of their activities was crucial for Weber's reception, the refugee program of the RF. Many scholars at the New School and throughout the entire country benefitted; some of the grantees were former Weber associates, like Emil Lederer, Arthur Salz, and Paul Honigheim. This link between the foundations, in particularly the RF, and the Weber reception is the most frequently mentioned in the literature, but the topic deserves more attention. Despite the crucial importance of the New School and of

¹ See *Some Notes on Max Weber in America*, Edward Shils Papers, University of Chicago, Series I, Box 46.

these individuals, the RF already made a decisive contribution to the Weber reception a decade earlier, by funding the research stays of future intermediaries such as Max Rheinstein², Alexander von Schelting³, and Arvid Brodersen⁴. The last two contributed to keep alive Shils' lifelong interest in Weber.

Although it is widely known that the SSRC committees diffused different adaptations of Weber, almost nothing on this subject can be found in the literature on Weber's reception. This may be a consequence of the Weber scholarship having focused on a small circle of influential authors, mainly concerned with sociological theory, like Parsons, Shils, and C. Wright Mills, rather than on the adaptations commonly used in other subfields like comparative politics and international relations. Compared with the excellent publications available on the importance of academic institutions, intermediaries, and translations for Weber's reception, the contribution made by the RF and other non-university organizations remains scarcely known. There are, however, two groups of literature directly relevant for my own work, which respectively deal with the foundations operations in Latin America related to social science, and science more generally and with local traditions of inquiry.

Philanthropy specialists have made valuable contributions to our understanding of how foundations shaped social science in America in the 1940s and 1950s, but not specifically to Weber's reception (Berman, 1983; Cobbs, 1992; Fisher, 1993; Cueto, 1994; Pereyra, 2006; Guilhot, 2011c). Since 1920, the foundations and the SSRC decisively influenced modern social science but this clout would be particularly decisive for the institutionalization of a form of sociology in the postwar years – the so-called of *sociología científica* – and for the misconceptions of how social science could contribute to eliminating backwardness and to formulating the U.S. Government's development policy. Accordingly, Parsons' interpretation of Weber stands prominently in the accounts of modernization theory, which the Rockefeller and the FF helped boost.

Notwithstanding the preceding, important aspects remain unclear, despite the quality of this literature (Latham, 2000, pp. 21–68; Gilman, 2003, pp. 72–112). Although these authors

² Rockefeller Archive Center/Rockefeller Foundation/RG 1/1.1 - Projects/216 S/Box 22/Folder 312 - Max Rheinstein.

³ Rockefeller Archive Center/Rockefeller Foundation/RG 1/1.1 - Projects/200/Box 324/Folder 3861 - Alexander von Schelting - 1936-9.

⁴ Rockefeller Archive Center/Rockefeller Foundation/RG 1/1.1 - Projects/200/Box 48/Folder 558 - Brodersen Arvid - 1940-1942.

regret the intellectually impoverished interpretation of Weber, which is the basis of the adaptation, they failed to conduct an appropriate study of the differences between Parsons' and Almond's understanding of development and modernity, on the one hand, and Weber's notions on these two problems, on the other hand. Such an undertaking would require a deep understanding of Weber rather than of Parsons, which is impossible to achieve "in translation." In addition, intellectual historians should undertake the more sociological attempt of establishing the elective affinities between the dominant ideas at the RF, the FF, and the influential SSRC Committee on Comparative Politics on the one hand, and Parsons' adaptation on the other hand. It could be that the *ethos* of those organizations in the 1950s and 1960s were incompatible not only with Weber's nationalist excesses but also with his idea of development, but this would only make an exploration of the reasons for this aversion even more worthy of attention. In the case of IR theory and realism, the connections between Morgenthau and Weber's epigones such as Carl Schmitt are reasonably well known (Turner & Mazur 2009; Guilhot 2011: 144–152; Mirowski 2011). However, these accounts are interested, respectively, in philanthropy, in modernization, in IR theory, in Morgenthau, and in Schmitt, but not in Weber, who was in some respects their forerunner. Therefore, to include Weber in a history of IR would not only help in the comprehension of his reception in the Americas but also in the intellectual roots and political agendas of the international relations discipline and of the social sciences in general.

The influence wielded by the foundations not only in the US, but also abroad attracts scholars of philanthropy and international history. In addition, local traditions of inquiry summon even larger numbers of scholars. Historians and sociologists interested in their own countries pay attention to the topic because these activities are closely related to the production of social knowledge and the definition of new professions (see, for instance, the contributions in Altamirano, 2010). In particular, cultural historians and sociologists interested in the history of the discipline also conducted research on local traditions of inquiry (Villas-Bôas, 2006; Blanco, 2007a). In contrast to the abundant scholarship on local traditions and on prominent individuals, the interaction between these local variables and external ones, such as the foundations and the native adaptations of classical, were rarely discussed, although important exceptions exist for law (Dezalay & Garth, 2002), history (Ortoll & Piccato, 2011), and sociology (Pereyra, 2004). Additional insights into Weber's reception in the entire continent may also be found among some of the most outstanding scholars of Latin American social science history (Tenorio Trillo, 1989; Morse, 1996; Moya López & Morales Martín, 2008).

Although I have benefitted enormously from authors, I would like to specify here how my research departs from their own scholarship. Regarding the U.S., scholars emphasized how the scarcity of the translations of Weber's work into English shaped this reception (Scaff, 2011; Cohen et al. 1975). Whereas other variables were crucial to the north and the south of the U.S.–Mexico frontier, in the Spanish-speaking world in which the whole of *Wirtschafts und Gesellschaft* was available, translations were much less determinant. The reason is that the older parts of the book – the second and third parts – provided ample evidence of Weber not being the sociologist that Parsons wanted to make out of him. Whereas on the first page of his *Max Weber. An Intellectual Portrait* Bendix regretted the difficulties of interpreting Weber created by the dispersion in different volumes of the fragments from *Economy and Economy* available in English, Spanish-speaking public had access to the *Economía y sociedad* as early as 1944 (Weber, 1944, 1946, 1947, 1954, 1963; Bendix, 1960, pp. xiii–xiv, xix). In my opinion, the prestige and stability of institutions such as Harvard and Columbia, as well as the clout of the SSRC committees and of the foundation money, are the determining factors that permitted intermediaries such as Parsons to wield such a vast influence. On the other hand, in Spanish-speaking countries' organizations comparable with Harvard and the SSRC were nonexistent, an absence that thwarted Weber's reception despite the availability of translations (Morcillo Laiz, 2008).

According to my hypothesis, the foundations' support, or the lack of it, is the most influential factor in the reception or the neglect of Weber's *oeuvre*. In addition to this explanatory variable, local traditions of exegesis should also be considered. More specifically, the interaction of both of them, as shown in Figure 1, seems to account for certain characteristics of Weber's reception, such as the intermediaries or carriers (*Träger*), the type of bureaucracy in which Weber's thoughts were institutionalized, and the predominant adaptation of Weber in a discipline or subfield. In order to better understand the interaction of the foundations and the local traditions, I propose the following three hypotheses.

Figure 1: Independent Variables

		Foundation support	
		No	Yes
Rival Traditions	Yes	Outsider failed Intermediary as a scholar Bureaucratic failure Weber as a political economist	Outsider succeeded Intermediary as organizational talent Rational-legal bureaucracies Weber as a modernization theorist
	No	Insider succeeded Intermediary as a political entrepreneur Patrimonial bureaucracies Weber as theorist of charisma	Outsider failed Intermediary as an organizational talent Patrimonial bureaucracies Weber as a realist

- a) In countries in which the U.S. foundations had a strong presence, sociologists and political scientists read Weber as a structural-functionalist sociologist and as a modernization theorist, whereas IR theorists considered him a realist politician. In other words, Weber was interpreted as part of the U.S. intellectual traditions formulated and propagated by the SSRC committees, rather than as a German liberal interested in *Sozialökonomie*.
- b) In addition to shaping the *content* of his reception, the consequence of the foundations' involvement also had an organizational aspect. Initially, Weber's adaptations were institutionalized in smaller, elite academic organizations with full-time positions that focused on producing specialized knowledge for the projects financed by the foundations. Since the protégées of the foundations were not exposed to the political conflicts and the requirements imposed upon the staff of the large public universities, they could easily orientate toward the requirements of the foundations in terms of accounting, predictability, reliability, and separation of competences, as stipulated in the agreements with the foundations.
- c) Similarly, certain individuals were chosen as intermediaries. This decision depended less on their academic credentials than on their organizational skills, contacts with the local community, ideology, and familiarity with the work of the SSRC committees. As a

result, the legal-rational organizations financed by the foundations continued to advance the US adaptations of Weber. These organizational talents in touch with U.S. interpretations (and foundations) displaced the individuals with the best scholarly qualifications. Such carriers probably made Weber less relevant for Latin American problems than the adaptations developed by local scholars in the late 1960s and 1970s would have (Cardoso & Faletto, 1969; O'Donnell, 1972; Cardoso, 1977; Gilman, 2003, pp. 234–40; Morcillo Laiz, 2010, pp. 359–61).

Two Adaptations: SSRC Committees and the Rockefeller Foundation

In some respects, the history of Max Weber's reception in the U.S. is well known. Despite an early interest among economists like Chicago's Frank Knight who produced the first translation of Weber into English (Weber, 1927), it was Harvard's sociologist Talcott Parsons who delivered the two most influential Weber texts in English (Weber, 1930, 1947). Even more importantly, Parsons first assigned Weber a central place in his *The Structure of Social Action* (1949, pp. 500–694) and then turned him into a structural-functional sociologist. According to Parsons, Weber *would* have developed a theory of social systems, but he failed to do so (Parsons, 1947, p. 14). However, this was not Weber's but Parsons' ultimate goal. In a similar fashion, Parsons confuses his own ideas with Weber's, even in translations (Tribe, 2007, 2008, p. 9). The enormous distance between Parsons' adaptation and Weber has been brought to light by a number of outstanding contributions produced in the last four decades. Rather than the sociologist concerned with modernization and social order, the best publications from the *Weber-Industrie* reconstructs him as a scholar interested in the social – particularly religious – and institutional preconditions of modern capitalism and in their impact on our civilization and on how individuals conduct their lives. Trained as a legal historian, Weber became a professor in political economy and finance whose last intellectual project was *Sozialökonomik*, an exceedingly ambitious approach with a remote similarity, but a far wider scope than institutional economics. Weber wrote eloquently about the tragedy of modernity and the constraints brought on us by capitalism and wage labor. As an expert on Roman economy – and its decay –, Weber was most skeptical about any evolutionary understanding of development and progress. Nevertheless, Parsons and Shils—relied on him to propose an idyllic postwar modernity, epitomized by the U.S. of the 1950s (Gilman, 2003).

Scholars have rightly bemoaned the conversion of Weber in the U.S. into a Parsonian sociologist, who in his structural functionalist disguise contributed to the “eclipse” of history from postwar social theory and, as a consequence, from sociology and political science (Cohen et al., 1975a,b; Parsons, 1975; Zaret, 1980). Furthermore, an outcome of Parsons’ *success* as an interpreter of Weber and as a social theorist was that, for most U.S. sociologists, Weber became what Parsons did of him, despite the existence of other alternative readings of Weber, such as Reinhard Bendix (1960; Bendix & Roth, 1971), Hans Gerth (Weber, 1946; Gerth & Mills, 1953; 1964), or Alfred Schutz (1970, 2011; Schutz & Parsons, 1978), and adaptations devised for other purposes, such as Hans J. Morgenthau’s realism (1946, 1948, 1951). U.S. sociologists sincerely believed that Weber, embodying the insights of European social thought, represented the shoulders on which Parsons stood. In short, Parsons delivered an adaptation of Weber that became the blank form for the empirical study of societies.

Irrespective of their intrinsic qualities, Parsons’ ideas and his adaptation of Weber as a modernization theorist could have gone unnoticed unless an organization and a few individuals had supported them. The SSRC and some U.S. philanthropies, such as the Rockefeller and the Ford foundations were the most consequential organizations active in the social sciences (Sibley, 1974; Berman, 1983; Fisher, 1993; Cueto, 1994; Latham, 2000; Worcester & Sibley, 2001; Pereyra, 2006). Without the involvement of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) in the social sciences, which goes back to 1920, some extremely influential academic organizations would not exist, such as the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research (Rutkoff & Scott, 1986) and El Colegio de México (Lida et al., 2000; Ortoll & Piccato, 2011). Likewise, without the SSRC and the FF, an intellectual undertaking such as modernization theory would be unthinkable (Berman, 1983; Gilman, 2003). During the postwar years, the RF, the FF, and the Carnegie Corporation funded the SSRC, whose CCP placed structural functionalism at the core of its work. Parsons and Shils’ distillation of Weber, which could only have been brewed at Harvard, benefitted decisively from other powerful organizations such as the U.S. philanthropies.

Led by Gabriel Almond, the CCP placed Parsons’ and Shils’ *Towards a General Theory of Action*, with their adaptation of Weber, at the core of the Committee’s development theory. Almond’s work “virtually defined the study of [...] development” (Lockhart, 2002, p. 7), and his colleagues at the CCP aimed at understanding entire societies both in the West and in developing countries (Latham, 2000, pp. 21–68; Gilman, 2003, pp. 72–112). Interestingly enough, and despite the centrality of Parsons’ *oeuvre* for the CCP, Almond’s ultimate aspiration was to apply

Weber's ideas; fifty years later, he was still convinced that "the formulation he [Parsons] offered with [Edward] Shils and in his early theoretical work was extremely productive. He assimilated Weber" (Almond, 2007, p. 76, emphasis mine). Their most crucial publication, *The Politics of Developing Areas*, opened with Almond's *A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics*, a chapter that delivered the "paradigmatic assumptions" for the following decade (Gilman, 2003, p. 151). According to Google scholar, this text – inspired by the Parsonian Weber – has been cited more than 1,500 times. At any rate, the adaptation of Weber that orientated the work of the CCP became the theoretical horizon for the most influential empirical research conducted by political scientists in the following decade.

The influence of the CCP and its political development theory were well received beyond the ivory tower of elite universities. One of the most prominent CCP members, Lucian Pye from the MIT Center for International Studies, blended all of these ideas into a mix apt for the needs of foreign policy makers in Washington, who eagerly consumed it (Gilman, 2003, pp. 174–190). Access to power centers is widely considered as sign of an idea becoming influential, and it may also reinforce the *scholarly* impact of an idea. In fact, this privileged access to U.S. foreign *policy* makers is probably part of the explanation of why some development theorists became very influential within the social sciences, as the names of the committee members suggest. Among them were Pye, who became "widely known for major contributions in [...] the politics of modernization..." (Blackner, 2002, p. 331), and James Coleman, "widely considered one of the most outstanding sociologists of the second half of the twentieth century" (Lindenberg, 2004, p. 111), in addition to Almond. In other words, with the support of the RF and the FF, the CCP served as a powerful instrument to diffuse Parsons' structural functionalism, his own adaptation of Weber.

As important as Weber's ideas were for the CCP and for modernization theory, they played an almost equally crucial role in the theory of international relations. After the SSRC Committee on International Relations disbanded in 1950, the RF supported an attempt to create a theory of international relations (IR), distinct from the increasingly dominant behaviorist approaches to politics (Guilhot, 2011a, pp. 16–21). IR theory should constitute an alternative to the legalistic liberal study of international relations that the RF supported since the 1920s. Three decades later, the foundation accumulated substantial experience in scientific planning, which resulted from its decade-long involvement in social science in the U.S. (Fisher, 1993), Argentina (Pereyra, 2004), Brazil (Cobbs, 1992), and Mexico (Ortoll & Piccato, 2011), among other

countries (Berman, 1983; Gemelli & MacLeod, 2003; Bullock, 2011). After supporting a cycle of Council of Foreign Relations conferences and the drafting of the so-called Kirk and Wood reports, the RF decided to encourage IR as an autonomous field of inquiry. In the 1954 conference, the RF brought together like-minded individuals who could define the substantive and institutional aspects of the IR project (Guilhot, 2011b, pp. 141–144, 147–152). This way, the RF decisively contributed to the establishment of IR as a subfield with certain distinguishing traits, such as the emphasis on power and on advice to foreign policy makers.

By taking power as an intrinsic feature of social life among individuals and nations, realism reveals not its Schmittian but its Weberian descent. In fact, noted Weberians such as Hans J. Morgenthau set the tone in the 1954 conference (Turner & Mazur, 2009; Guilhot, 2011b). Among those speaking with “a thick German accent” was Waldemar Gurian, a disciple of Schmitt, who underlined the importance of IR studying not only states, but also other associations, such as the Catholic Church (Gurian, 1946, p. 281). In doing this, he is following Weber, who emphasized the similarities between a state and a church because he conceptualizes both as a compulsory organization, an *Anstalt* ref. Despite the subsequent penetration of IR by behaviorist methods and a liberal ideology that Morgenthau and other initiators of IR theory fervently opposed, the committee had a lasting effect on the subfield, which encompasses both the realist, power-centered approach to IR and the institutionalization of IR as one the four main subfields in political science.

The main ideas from the 1954 conference participants—IR as a power-centered discipline differentiated from liberal, behaviorist political science—were also heard outside the U.S. Just as the blend of Weber and Parsons embodied by CCP modernization theory changed the way in which foreign social scientists understood the “problems” of their countries, IR theory included an understanding of power in which Morgenthau’s reading of Weber was condensed. One of the most significant examples of the export of IR theory is the *Centro de Estudios Internacionales at El Colegio de México*, whose degree in International Relations was designed under the supervision of Kenneth W. Thompson; its earliest members were trained abroad with the assistance of RF grants (Ochoa Bilbao, 2011, pp. 62, 66, 68). Thompson, who was in the best terms with the director of *El Colegio de México*, Daniel Cosío, had written his thesis under Morgenthau’s supervision; he had been the mastermind behind the attempt to create a discipline of international relations with realism at its core (Guilhot 2011c, 144, 146, 156).

To sum up, there are no doubts about the significance that U.S. organizations such as the

RF, the FF, and the SSRC committee placed on the diffusion of these two adaptations of Weber – structural functionalism and realist IR theory. However, the consequences thereof for the reception of Weber among Spanish-speaking social scientists and the later development of the discipline outside the U.S. remained almost unexplored.

Three countries, four cases

To include the different combinations of the independent variable, the case studies encompass four attempts to adapt Weber in the three countries of Argentina, Mexico, and Spain, as shown in Figure 2. This most similar system design employed here facilitates the equivalence of conditions such as language area and other background conditions. Arguably, this selection includes all crucial cases because Argentina, Mexico, and Spain are the largest and culturally most significant Spanish-speaking countries. In addition, the choice of these three main countries places the focus of my research on the two most influential individuals for Weber’s reception in the Spanish-speaking world: José Medina, who translated and published *Economy and Society* during his tenure as the social science editor for the FCE (see below); Gino Germani, who shaped not only the understanding of Weber among generations of Latin American social science, but also the very idea of social inquiry. The four selected cases deal with different adaptations that also had a disparate fate in the history of social science, including the Mexican non-reception in the 1940s as a negative case, which increases the variance of the dependent variable. This and some other relevant features of the selected cases are summarized in the four preliminary portraits as follows.

Figure 2: Case Selection

		Foundation support	
		No	Yes
Rival Traditions	Yes	Mexico 1940s	Argentina
	No	Spain	Mexico 1960s (IR)

In Argentina, the reading of Weber supported by the foundations and the SSRC overrode local

interpretations and turned comparatively marginal figures into dominant ones. In the early 1950s, Weber's name had already been known for decades, mostly because of the prestige and the visits to this country paid by José Ortega y Gasset. His publishing house, *Revista de Occidente*, had issued in Spanish several books by Weber's contemporaries like Georg Simmel, Werner Sombart (1928), Ferdinand Tönnies (1932), and Alfred Weber (1932), but only a small piece by Max Weber (1926). During the 1950s, Argentinian sociology was poorly institutionalized or, to be more precise, its institutionalization suffered under personal conflicts (Pereyra, 2006), and was ridden beset by methodological discussions in which Weber played a prominent role (Blanco, 2007a). By the begin of the decade, Gino Germani could already write about "Max Weber's well-known concept of the ideal type" (Germani, 1950, p. 309). On-going commentary on Weber benefitted from the Spanish translations published in Mexico (Weber, 1942, 1944; Blanco, 2007a). However, serious discussions of Weber's oeuvre were limited because of the humanistic, erudite style of work dominant at the time in Argentinian universities among those who were interested in sociology. Scholarship and teaching consisted primarily of old-school lawyers and scholars on the history of social thought commenting on European authors.

The dominant personalities, such as Ricardo Levene and Alfredo Poviña, were seriously challenged after 1950 by the scholars that propagated the so-called *sociología científica* (Germani, 1952; Blanco, 2007b, 2008). The most prominent among them was Germani, an accountant who lacked the legal training of the other influential individuals in this intellectual milieu. In several respects, Germani was an outsider because he was not Argentinean by birth but arrived there as a young Italian immigrant, he was widely believed to be of Jewish descent (Blanco, 2006; Pereyra, 2006). However, thanks to the support he received from the U.S. foundations, Germani eventually became the dominant figure in Argentinian sociology (Pereyra, 2004). The foundations' support, however, was linked to a specific understanding of sociology:

The end result may be no great scientific achievement [...] will, however, indirectly reinforce Germani's positivist inclinations. For better or for worse he appears to represent sociology in the Argentina and for this reasons should merit support.⁵

The breakthrough came when, in view of the problems at the Universidad de Buenos Aires, the Ford Foundation consented Germani to move with his research project to a small

⁵Erskine McKinley, diary entry, November 20, 1959; filed at RG 1/1.2/301R/Box 10/Folder 81 - U Buenos Aires - Gino Germani, José Luis Romero - 1961-4, 1958-60.

private organization, the Instituto di Tella (Cassese, 2008). Germani was considered politically left, but was nonetheless preferred by the foundations because of his academic credentials and because of such organizational skills as fundamental as being able to operate according to productivity indicators, to fulfill contracts, and to use funds appropriately (Pereyra, 2004). In other words, he responded to the bureaucratic logic of the foundations better than the large, patrimonial public universities and their own patrons could do. With the foundations supporting him, Germani boosted structural-functionalism in Argentina (Blanco, 2003). In South America, autochthonous readings of Weber did not appear until the late 1960s, but then became very influential at home and in the US (F.H. Henrique Cardoso & Faletto, 1969; O'Donnell, 1972, 1973; F. Henrique Cardoso, 1977). Cardoso and Faletto's dependence theory was devised under the aegis of Medina at a UN think-tank in Santiago de Chile and O'Donnell's work was its scion, as he has openly acknowledged. With similar frankness, O'Donnell admitted the spell of Weber on his own work, which was both a consequence of Juan Linz's influence and of the Spanish translation of *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (O'Donnell, 2007, pp. 285, 299–300). O'Donnell was among the founders of CEDES (1975), a private research center that also received grant from the Ford and the Andrew Mellon Foundations. To resume, by contributing to the institutionalization of the Parsonian interpretation of Weber, Germani became instrumental in erasing the preexisting, autochthonous readings favored by his rivals, a development that delayed the formulation of local adaptations until the 1970s. Germani's success seems to be the result of the foundations' support, as suggested by the fateful events around José Medina Echavarría in Mexico.

Whereas the foundations and the SSRC relentlessly supported specific individuals and understandings of social science in Argentina, in other countries they neglected the discipline as a whole, as occurred in Mexico in the mid 1940s. Medina, a Spanish scholar trained in Germany, arrived in Mexico as an exile in 1939 (Moya López & Morales Martín, 2008; Morcillo Laiz, 2010). He was the obvious candidate to become the carrier of both Weber's ideas and of the modernization of social sciences and political science in Mexico. As a result of several decades of scientific exchange between Germany and Spain, Medina and his collaborators in Mexico firmly placed Weber as a member of the Historical School, although the clout of Parsons was already perceptible in Medina's reading of Weber in the early 1940s (Morcillo Laiz, 2012). In addition to his training in Germany, Medina became familiar with U.S. sociology because of,

among other reasons, his interest in the empirical research methods being developed in the U.S. at the time (Morcillo Laiz, 2008, pp. 158–9). A testimony to his ability to identify the influential social scientists in the U.S. is his correspondence as an editor for the FCE and *El Colegio de México* during the 1940s, which includes the very best of U.S. social scientists: William Ogburn, Paul Lazarsfeld, Sigmund Neumann, Otto Kirchheimer, Franz Neumann, Robert Merton, and, of course, Talcott Parsons, among many others. Acquainted with both the German and the U.S. traditions, Medina contributed as a translator and editor for the Mexican publisher *Fondo de Cultura Económica* in the publication of German sociological classics (Tönnies, 1942; Sombart, 1946), of the younger talents in exile (Borkenau, 1941; Mannheim, 1941, 1942, 1946; Neumann, 1943; Kirchheimer, 1945), and of U.S. social science (Merriam, 1941; MacIver, 1942, 1949; Barnes, 1945; Brogan, 1945; Kardiner, 1945), including IR authors from the Yale Institute of International Affairs (Fox, 1944; Spykman, 1944). These publications became the core of the graduate degree in social science that Medina organized at his *Centro de Estudios Sociales* within *El Colegio de México* from 1943 to 1946. The curriculum included the study of political institutions, social theory, democracy, and training in statistics and empirical research methods (Moya López, 2007; Morcillo Laiz, 2008).

Despite his credentials, positive internal reports on him⁶, and the existence of a Rockefeller Foundation program to support refugee scholars, by 1945 Medina had not obtained the funding necessary for his *Centro* to survive a period of financial straits. Before World War II, the RF financed a Mexican Social Science Research Center (1928–1931) supported prominent philosophers at the *Universidad Nacional*, and its program in Humanities was very active in *El Colegio de México* (Lida & Matesanz, 1990). In 1943, the support granted by the RF to its protégées at the *Universidad Nacional* needed to be reduced because it became known to the public and was pilloried by Mexican nationalists; nonetheless, significant amounts of money were being transferred to *El Colegio de México*. More specifically, the RF support was attracted by a Mexican organizational talent, Daniel Cosío Villegas, the Secretary of *El Colegio de México*. This man, who had been the mastermind behind the FCE, a successful, public-founded editorial undertaking of continental dimensions, was on the RF payroll for ten years and used this to coordinate his mammoth project of *liberal* history of Mexico (Díaz Arciniega, 1994; Ortoll &

⁶ Medina “had made his reputation before coming to Mexico, and now as a Mexican citizen is presumably at the beginning of an important program”. David H. Stevens to Joseph Willits and Raymond Fosdick, May 1945, en RG 1/1.1 - Projects/323R/Box 22/179 - Colegio de México 1944-1946.

Piccato, 2011)⁷. As a grantee of the RF, Cosío directed a research seminar on Mexican history, supervised the work of a number of senior and junior researchers, obtained time and again extensions for his grant, and eventually delivered a multivolume *Historia Moderna de México* that should preempt Marxist interpretations of the country's history (Ortoll & Piccato, 2011, pp. 353–4). During this long period, Cosío was responsible for the administration of the funds, whose extension he managed to obtain both from the RF and other local donors such as the *Secretaría de Hacienda, Banco de México*, and *El Colegio de México*. At the same time as the history research seminar was expanding, Medina's *Centro de Estudios Sociales* was dying out because of the scarcity of money. Around 1945, the RF refrained support to Medina, who left the country and moved to the University of Puerto Rico. The center for social research closed down. Even though the ultimate reasons why the denied him support remain unclear, the resources Cosío managed to marshal for his *Historia moderna de México* were unavailable for the *Centro de Estudios Sociales*, the project of an émigré.

The RF decision to not support Medina and his second emigration to Puerto Rico eventually condemned Weber's oeuvre to fade into oblivion, which was previously unthinkable. During the early 1940s, broader interest in Weber seemed to exist in Mexico because Medina's local rival in sociology, Lucio Mendieta y Núñez, initiated a dispute with him on Weber's interpretation in his *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* (Mendieta y Núñez, 1941, 1946). This journal was, and still is, published by the *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales* at Mexico's largest public university, the UNAM. The director of the *Instituto* – and Medina's rival – was an old-fashioned lawyer with an influential patron, anthropologist Manuel Gamío, and a *faible* for the man who in the U.S. represented the sociological past, Pitirim Sorokin (Lins, 1942; Anon., 1952; Olvera Serrano, 2004)⁸. Unsurprisingly, when Mendieta established the first social science degree after Medina's attempt at *El Colegio de México* in the 1950s, he failed to incorporate the innovative approach that Medina had employed at his *Centro de Estudios Sociales* (Morcillo

⁷ In the early 1960s, the FCE, Fondo de Cultura Económica, was considered to be an extremely successful publisher, particularly because of its ability to distribute books across the whole continent, a feat that a RF-supported, but unsuccessful Inter-American Scholarly Book Center also tried to accomplish, see Rockefeller Archive Center/Rockefeller Foundation/RG 1/1.2/323 - Mexico 1923-1974/Box 24/Folder 169 - Inter-American Scholarly Book Center.

⁸ Such was also the impression he left on an RF functionary: "He is an elderly man who seemed to be very uninspiring; however, his illness might have made him appear so apathetic about his work and his institute. [...] MN did not ask for anything from the RF." Rockefeller Archive Center/Rockefeller Foundation/RG 12 - Officers Diaries/Yudelman 1956, May 18, 1856.

Laiz, 2008, pp. 162–9). Note that after Mendieta was taken over by Pablo González Casanova as the “caudillo sociológico” (“sociologic chieftain”) at the UNAM, a period of several decades began in which the influence of French Marxism was uncontested, a situation facilitated by the absence of an alternative theoretical tradition, i.e., Weber’s interpretation of *modern* capitalism, his understanding of both ideas and interests as the drivers of history, and the specificities of the causality problem in social sciences (Aguilar Villanueva, 1987; Pozas Horcasitas, 1994; Aguilar, 1995). Weber’s ideas found no way of entry into *El Colegio de México* at the time of Medina, and even less into the UNAM, but they reappeared fifteen years later in the form of the realist theory of international relations.

The RF again collaborated closely with El Colegio de México and Cosío in the 1960s in order to establish International Relations as an academic discipline in Mexico. This connection is embodied in the person of Kenneth Thompson, the former student of Hans Morgenthau, who became vice-president of the RF and the organizer of the 1954 IR theory conference. As seen, from this foundational event resulted the most decided attempt to establish IR as discipline separated from political science (Guilhot, 2011c; Guilhot, 2011a). An immediate heir of this disciplinary “innovation” was one of Cosío’s organizations’, the Center for International Studies at El Colegio de México established in 1960 to improve the cadres of the Mexican foreign service. Its first faculty members were trained in the U.S., France, and England as a result of RF grants (Ochoa Bilbao, 2011, p. 66). Back in their country, these Mexican students institutionalized the discipline of IR at *El Colegio de México*. Some of the traits of the original attempt still prevail in Mexico, such as the organizational separation of IR from political science departments and the IR-only undergraduate degrees. Despite the difficult negotiations between Cosío and the RF⁹, the success of this attempt is probably explained by both the support of the foundation and the lack of rival traditions advanced by Mexicans or émigrés. In contrast to Medina’s attempt in the 1940s, thanks to the RF support IR theory and realism in Mexico became a successful adaptation of Weber’s thought. The UNAM was once again excluded for different reasons and most importantly because of the absence of non-Marxist faculty and students

⁹ “This file shows the wisdom of occasional reluctance on our part. Cosío is beginning to get his feet on the ground. He seems to have backing as the “chosen instrument” in Mexico and begins to realize that he is involved in serious business.” Dean Rusk, internal correspondence, RG 1/1.2/323S - Mexico/Box 62/Folder 485 - Colegio de Mexico - International Studies - 1956-1959.

interested in political science and international relations, rather than in law:

We chose deliberately to assist Sepúlveda in introducing political science study into the Law School curriculum because of the then apparent lack of non-Marxist political science study in the University, because Sepúlveda is one the ablest younger administrators and leaders in the University [...] The international law and relations scholars whom Sepúlveda wished to invite, and subsequently did invite with RF funds, were thought to be able to play rather an important role in stimulating students also on the graduate level to think of political science as a distinct social science subject [...]. Doubtless, we should ask Morgenthau and some of the other about their experience in visiting the Law School. [...] In 1963 we felt that a second center of international relations studies in Mexico City was justified. But now that we have ceased helping the Colegio in this field, can we continue assistance to the UNAM?¹⁰

Since Spain was culturally isolated from abroad during the years after the Civil War (1936–1939), to a large extent, intellectual developments were endogenous. Although the RF was active in Spain in the 1930s, at least in the sciences, this and other foundations refrained from any form of involvement in the country after Franco's victory¹¹. Accordingly, the Weber reception drew from preexisting trends in public law, which were characterized by cosmopolitanism (Gallego Anabitarte, 1999), and driven by peremptory domestic necessities such as the construction of some form of legitimacy for the regime. Weber had no Spanish disciples despite evidence of prewar interests among noted thinkers such as José Ortega y Gasset and Fernando de los Ríos (Ruano de la Fuente, 2006; Morcillo Laiz, 2010, pp. 347–8); however, Carl Schmitt did have loyal followers in postwar Spain (Fraga Iribarne, 1962; López García, 1996). Among Schmitt's followers were Javier Conde, the author of *Contribución a la teoría del caudillaje*, and Luis Legaz Lacambra, who translated *Die protestantische Ethik* (Weber, 1955). Conde's theory is closely linked to Weber's charismatic legitimacy. In general, his ideas on this and other topics, either in Weber's own or in Schmitt's formulations, are intrinsic to most publications by Spanish political thinkers – the first fascist and later Catholic or simply liberal – in the 1940s and 1950s.

In addition to the activities of such an influential intermediary as Conde, the reception of Weber as a charismatic theorist in Spain resulted from other causes. A major one was the presence of Schmitt in Spain, a country he continued to visit even after the end of World War II; others were the translations published both before and during the Civil War (Schmitt, 1931, 1934,

¹⁰ Internal correspondence, August 25, 1965, RG1, 1.2, 323, box 63, folder 490, University of Mexico - Law, 1962-1966.

¹¹ See Rockefeller Foundation/RG 2/1947/795/Box 391/Folder 2639.

1938, 1943, 1962). However, the diffusion in Spain of Weber was not only based on Schmitt but also benefitted from the “made in Mexico” translations. According to the testimony of Juan Linz, the students and Conde’s collaborator, he distributed mimeographed copies of *Economía y sociedad* during his classes at the Universidad Central de Madrid. Linz was one of the young men who stood intellectually more closely to Conde at the *Instituto de Estudios Políticos* (IEP), the think tank where the Spanish Schmittian adaptation of Weber was produced and institutionalized by the late 1940s. A few more individuals around the IEP were interested in other readings of Weber and aspects of his work, i.e. the legal-rational domination rather than the charismatic one. In fact, the most prominent among these potential intermediaries, Manuel García-Pelayo (1974, 1977, 1986), declared Weber as his most important intellectual influence during and after the 1940s (1991, p. 11). However, García-Pelayo, a former officer of the Spanish Republic army, could produce no adaptation of Weber for Spanish readers because, deprived of any perspective to obtain a university position, he began a three-decade South American exile in 1950. Despite Weber’s early institutionalization at the IEP, this proposal was eventually superseded by Parsons, as Conde recognized at the beginning of the transition (1974, p. 13). The realist reading of Weber as a theorist of charismatic leadership eventually faded away as Franco’s regime changed, scholars established contact with U.S. universities, and leftist students became more politically active (Campo Urbano, 2001). At any rate, an autochthonous Schmittian reading of Weber prevailed for decades in the absence of foreign involvement and rival, non-authoritarian interpretations.

To summarize the preceding paragraphs, in Argentina and in Mexico, US adaptations of Weber were more successful than the local versions, which emphasized power, conflict, and the mixed blessings of a modernity that was not readily available for all new nations but was the product of the Western development. The adaptations by Parsons and Morgenthau became more prominent in these countries in which foundations got involved. In contrast, Medina, deprived of any foundation support, unsuccessfully fought old-fashioned proposals for social research such as Cosío’s and Mendieta’s. In postwar Spain, no rival interpretation of the Schmittian reading of Weber could resist the civil war and the subsequent repression of liberal intellectuals under the authoritarian regime.

Concluding Remarks

As it appears, Weber's reception across the Spanish-speaking world varied significantly depending on the involvement of the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundations via SSRC. According to preliminary evidence drawn from Argentinean, Mexican, and Spanish cases, the foundations affected not only whether Weber was institutionalized or not, as it happened in Mexico in the 1940s, but also *the* specific Weber scholars abroad would read. The fact that in Argentina Weber was read as a structural-functionalist can only be explained by referring to the substantial support an apt intermediary like Germani and his research center at Instituto di Tella received. In Mexico in the 1960s, the Weber adaptation that became commonplace was Morgenthau's realist theory of IR. In other places, the lack of foundation support appears associated to a non-reception, as Medina's proposal for *El Colegio de Mexico*, or to a completely different Weber, both in political and intellectual terms.

A number of important issues should be further explored if we want to fully understand the reception of the Parsonian and the other adaptations of Weber. Most importantly, the characteristics of the organizations involved in the reception of Weberian ideas should be carefully established, in particular the "elective affinities" between the agendas of the foundations and certain adaptations of Weber. The sociology of organizations and Weber's sociology of ideas could be useful in explaining to what extent in the realm of social sciences the foundations can be considered as *Herrschaftsverbände*. While in this essay I have pointed to this aspect in a number of occasions, the explanatory power of rule should receive closer attention. The role of coercion in the reproduction of economic and other policies has been pointed out by the literature on diffusion, but it remains a relatively marginal concern for this scholarship. Thus, an interesting dialogue could possibly be established. The sequence of the reception process raises at least two additional, important questions. We have seen how the involvement of the foundations led to the reception of a US adaptation, disappearance of traditional interpretations of Weber, and, eventually, to the formulation of autochthonous, extremely successful adaptations in local academic organizations like Cardoso and Faletto's dependence theory (F.H. Henrique Cardoso & Faletto, 1969; O'Donnell, 1972, 1973; F. Henrique Cardoso, 1977). Was the delayed appearance of local adaptations an unintended consequence of the foundations involvement in the social sciences? A most intricate related question is to what extent were Cardoso and Faletto's and O'Donnell's adaptation made possible by the resort to the Spanish translations of Weber rather than Parsons' versions? A final suggestion for further research is the inclusion in the analysis of

two crucial organizations for the history of social science in South America, the *Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política de São Paulo*, where Cardoso was first trained, and the *Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social*. Right after his arrival, Cardoso wrote a paper containing the gist of dependence theory, drawing from publications penned by Medina (1964) and by Medina and Faletto (Secretaría de la CEPAL, 1963; Reyna, 2007, p. 4). O'Donnell would later praise the dependence book as “an unusual combination of Weberian and neo-Marxist themes” (2007, p. 284). Further research anchored in the sociology of ideas and the theory of diffusion is needed in order to explain why this and O'Donnell's adaptations of Weber, but not others benefitted from a widespread reception in the Americas, even though nothing comparable to the Parsonian Weber.

References

- Aguilar, L.F. (1995) El Estado Actual De La Investigación Sociológica En México, *In: Leal y Fernández, J.F., Andrade Carreño, A., & Girola Molina, L. eds. Estudios de teoría e historia de la sociología en México*, Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México y Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Azcapotzalco, pp.205–214
- Aguilar Villanueva, L.F. (1987) Recepción De La Sociología En México (una Aproximación), *In: La sociología dominante: crítica a la sociología contemporánea*, México: UNAM, pp.129–162
- Almond, G.A. (2007) Structural Functionalism and Political Development, *In: Munck, G.L. & Snyder, R. eds. Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*, Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp.63–85
- Altamirano, C. (2010) *Historia de los intelectuales en América Latina.*, Buenos Aires: Katz.
- Barnes, H.E. (1945) *Historia Del Pensamiento Social*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bendix, R. (1960) *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Bendix, R. & Roth, G. (1971) *Scholarship and partisanship; essays on Max Weber.*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berman, E.H. (1983) *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Blackner, C. (2002) Pye, Lucian, *In: Utter, G.H. & Lockhart, C. eds. American Political Scientists: A Dictionary*, Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, pp.331–333
- Blanco, A. (2003) Política, Modernización y Desarrollo: Una Revisión De La Recepción De Talcott Parsons En La Obra De Gino Germani. *Estudios Sociológicos*, XXI (63): 667–699.
- . (2006) *Razón y Modernidad. Gino Germani y La Sociología En La Argentina*, Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno.
- . (2007a) La Temprana Recepción De Max Weber En La Sociología Argentina (1930–1950). *Perfiles Latinoamericanos*, 30: 9–38.
- . (2007b) Ciências Sociais No Cone Sul e a Gênese De Uma Elite Intelectual (1940-1965). *Tempo Social*, 19 (1): 89–114.
- . (2008) Karl Mannheim En La Formación De La Sociología Moderna En América Latina. *Estudios Sociológicos*, XXVI (3): 393–431.

- Borkenau, F. (1941) *Pareto* (N. Dorantes, Tran.), Mexico: Fondo de cultura economica.
- Brogan, D.W. (1945) *Genio y Figura Del Norteamericano*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bullock, M.B. (2011) *The Oil Prince's Legacy: Rockefeller Philanthropy in China*, Washington, D.C. & Stanford, Calif: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Stanford University Press.
- Campo Urbano, S. del (Ed.). (2001) *Historia De La Sociología Española*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- Cardoso, F. H. (1977) The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States. *Latin American Research Review*, 12 (3): 7–24.
- Cardoso, F.H. & Faletto, E. (1969) *Dependencia y Desarrollo En América Latina: Ensayo De Interpretación Sociológica*, México D.F.: Siglo XXI.
- Cassese, N. (2008) *Los Di Tella: Una Familia, Un País*, Buenos Aires: Aguilar Altea Taurus.
- Cobbs, E.A. (1992) *The Rich Neighbor Policy: Rockefeller and Kaiser in Brazil*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cohen, J., Hazelrigg, L.E. & Pope, W. (1975a) De-Parsonizing Weber: A Critique of Parsons' Interpretation of Weber's Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 40 (2): 229–241.
- . (1975b) Reply to Parsons. , 40 (5): 670–674.
- Conde, F.J. (1974) *Escritos y Fragmentos Políticos*, Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos.
- Cueto, M. (1994) *Missionaries of Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America*, Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Dezalay, Y. & Garth, B.G. (2002) *The Internationalization of Palace Wars: Lawyers, Economists, and the Contest to Transform Latin American States*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Díaz Arciniega, V. (1994) *Historia De La Casa: Fondo De Cultura Económica, 1934-1994*, México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Fisher, D. (1993) *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fox, W.T.R. (1944) *Las Superpotencias Estados Unidos, Inglaterra y La Unión Soviética. Su Responsabilidad Ante La Paz*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Fraga Iribarne, M. (1962) Carl Schmitt: El Hombre y La Obra. *Revista de estudios políticos*, (122): 5–18. [Accessed: 28 January 2013]
- Gallego Anabitarte, A. (1999) La Influencia Extranjera En El Derecho Administrativo Español Desde 1950 a Hoy. *Revista de Administración Pública*, 150: 75–114.
- García-Pelayo, M. (1974) *Burocracia y Tecnocracia y Otros Escritos*, Madrid]: Alianza Editorial.
- . (1977) *Las Transformaciones Del Estado Contemporáneo*, Madrid: Alianza.
- . (1986) *El Estado De Partidos*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- . (1991) Autobiografía Intelectual, In: *Obras completas*, Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, pp.1–18
- Gemelli, G. & MacLeod, R. (Eds.). (2003) *American Foundations in Europe: Grant-giving Policies, Cultural Diplomacy, and Trans-Atlantic Relations, 1920-1980*, Bruxelles ; New York: P.I.E.-Peter Lang.
- Germani, G. (1950) El estudio integral de las comunidades. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 12 (3): 307–332.
- . (1952) Una Década De Discusiones Metodológicas En La Sociología Latinoamericana. *Boletín del Instituto de Sociología*, 10 (6).
- Gerth, H.H. (1964) Max Weber: A Man Under Stress. *Sociological Quarterly*, 5 (4): 305–309.
- Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C.W. (1953) *Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Social Institutions*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. [Accessed: 21 June 2012]

- Gilman, N. (2003) *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Guilhot, N. (2011a) Introduction. One Discipline, Many Histories, In: Guilhot, N. ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.1–32
- . (2011b) The Realist Gambit. Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory, In: Guilhot, N. ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.128–161
- Guilhot, N. (Ed.). (2011c) *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gurian, W. (1946) On the Study of International Relations. *The Review of Politics*, 8 (3): 275–282.
- Kardiner, A. (1945) *El Individuo y Su Sociedad La Psicodinámica De La Organización Social Primitiva. Prólogo y Dos Informes Etnológicos De Ralph Linton. Versión Española De Adolfo Alvarez Buylia*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kirchheimer, O. & Herrero, V. (1945) *En Busca De La Soberanía*, México: El Colegio de México. Available from: <<http://gso.gbv.de/DB=2.1/PPNSET?PPN=466724721%W> Gemeinsamer Bibliotheksverbund (GBV) / Verbundzentrale des GBV (VZG)> [Accessed:]
- Latham, M.E. (2000) *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and 'Nation Building' in the Kennedy Era*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lida, C.E. & Matesanz, J.A. (1990) *El Colegio De México: Una Hazaña Cultural, 1940-1962*, México, D.F.: El Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Históricos.
- Lida, C.E., Matesanz, J.A. & Vázquez, J.Z. (2000) *La Casa De España y El Colegio De México. Memoria, 1938-2000*, México: El Colegio de México.
- Lindenberg, S. (2004) Coleman, James, In: Ritzer, G. ed. *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp.111–115
- Lins, M. (1942) La Sociología en el Concepto de Sorokin. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 4 (1): 117–123.
- Lockhart, C. (2002) Almond, Gabriel, In: Utter, G.H. & Lockhart, C. eds. *American Political Scientists: A Dictionary*, Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, pp.6–7
- López García, J.A. (1996) La Presencia De Carl Schmitt En España.
- MacIver, R.M. (1942) *El Monstruo Del Estado*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . (1949) *Causación Social*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Mannheim, K. (1941) *Ideología y Utopía. Introducción a La Sociología Del Conocimiento* (S. Echavarría, Tran.), México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . (1942) *Libertad y Planificación Social* (R. Landa, Tran.), México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . (1946) *Diagnóstico De Nuestro Tiempo*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Medina Echavarría, J. (1964) *Consideraciones Sociológicas Sobre El Desarrollo Económico En América Latina*, Buenos Aires: Solar/Hachette.
- Mendieta y Núñez, L. (1941) Ensayo Sociológico Sobre La Burocracia Mexicana. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 3 (3): 63–111.
- . (1946) Ensayo Sociológico Sobre Los Partidos Politicos. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 8 (2): 265–299.
- Merriam, C.E. (1941) *Prólogo a La Ciencia Política*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Mirowski, Philip, N. (2011) Realism and Neoliberalism: From Reactionary Modernism to

- Postwar Conservatism, In: Guillhot, N. ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.210–238
- Morcillo Laiz, Á. (2008) Historia De Un Fracaso: Intermediarios, Organizaciones y La Institucionalización De Weber En México (1937-1957). *Sociológica*, 67: 149–192.
- . (2010) El Forastero Que Se Queda. José Medina Echavarría y La Sociología Latinoamericana, In: Castañón, A. & Morcillo Laiz, Á. eds. *José Medina Echavarría. Correspondencia*, México D.F.: Colegio de México, pp.343–372
- . (2012) Aviso a Los Navegantes. La Traducción Al Español De Economía y Sociedad De Max Weber. *Estudios Sociológicos*, 30 (90): 609–640.
- Morgenthau, H.J. (1946) *Scientific Man versus Power Politics*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1948) *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Knopf.
- . (1951) *In Defense of the National Interest. A Critical Examination of American Foreign Policy.*, New York: Knopf.
- Morse, R.M. (1996) The Multiverse of Latin American Identity, C. 1920 C. 1970, In: Bethell, L. ed. *Ideas and Ideologies in Twentieth Century Latin America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3–129
- Moya López, L.A. (2007) José Medina Echavarría y La Colección De Sociología Del Fondo De Cultura Económica, 1939-1959. *Estudios sociológicos*, XXV (3): 765–803.
- Moya López, L.A. & Morales Martín, J.J. (Eds.). (2008) Estudio Introductorio, In: *Panorama de la sociología contemporánea*, México: El Colegio de México, pp.11–76
- Neumann, F.L. (1943) *Behemoth: Pensamiento Y Acción En El Nacional-Socialismo*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- O'Donnell, G.A. (1972) *Modernización y Autoritarismo*, Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- . (1973) *Modernization and Bureaucratic-authoritarianism. Studies in South American Politics*, Berkeley: Institute of International Studies.
- . (2007) Democratization, Political Engagement, and Agenda-Setting Research, In: Munck, G.L. & Snyder, R. eds. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*, Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp.273–304
- Ochoa Bilbao, L. (2011) *La Carrera De Relaciones Internacionales En México: Orígenes y Situación Actual*, México: El Colegio de México; Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla.
- Olvera Serrano, M. (2004) *Lucio Mendieta y Núñez y La Institucionalización De La Sociología En México, 1939-1965*, México: UAM-Azacapotzalco.
- Ortoll, S. & Piccato, P. (2011) A Brief History of the Historia Moderna De México, In: Beezley, W.H. ed. *A Companion to Mexican History and Culture*, Chichester, MA.: John Wiley & Sons,
- Parsons, T. (1947) Introduction, In: *Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York & London: Free Press, pp.1–86
- . (1949) *The Structure of Social Action: A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- . (1975) On 'De-Parsonizing Weber'. *American Sociological Review*, 40 (5): 666–670.
- Pereyra, D.E. (2004) *American Organizations and the Development of Sociology and Social Research in Argentina. The Case of the SSRC and the Rockefeller Foundation (1927-1966)*, Sleepy Hollow, New York: Rockefeller Archive Center.
- . (2006) International Networks and the Institutionalisation of Sociology in Argentina (1940-1963), Brighton: University of Sussex. [Accessed: 9 February 2013]

- Pozas Horcasitas, R. (1994) El Pensamiento Social Francés En La Sociología Mexicana. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 56 (4): 301–317.
- Revista Mexicana de Sociología. (1952) La Universidad Nacional otorga el Grado de Doctor Honoris Causa al Sociólogo Pitirim A. Sorokin. , 14 (3): 463–465.
- Reyna, J.L. (2007) Enzo Faletto (1935-2003): Un Intelectual Latinoamericano. *Recuerdos de la FLACSO*, Octubre.
- Ruano de la Fuente, Y. (2006) Max Weber in the Spanish-speaking World, In: Ay, K.-L. & Borchardt, K. eds. *Das Faszinosum Max Weber. Die Geschichte seiner Geltung*, Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, pp.135–167
- Rutkoff, P.M. & Scott, W.B. (1986) *New School. A History of the New School for Social Research*, New York & London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan.
- Scaff, L.A. (2004) Max Weber and the Social Sciences in America. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 3 (2): 121–132.
- . (2005) The Creation of the Sacred Text: Talcott Parsons Translates The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. *Max Weber Studies*, 5 (2): 205–228.
- . (2006) Max Weber’s Reception in the United States, 1920-1960, In: Ay, K.-L. & Borchardt, K. eds. *Das Faszinosum Max Weber. Die Geschichte seiner Geltung*, Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, pp.55–89
- . (2011) *Max Weber in America*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schmitt, C. (1931) *La Defensa De La Constitución. Estudio Acerca De Las Diversas Especies y Posibilidades De Salvaguardia De La Constitución* (M. Sánchez Sarto, Tran.), Madrid; [Barcelona: Labor.
- . (1934) *Teoría De La Constitución* (F. Ayala, Tran.), Madrid: Revista de Derecho Privado.
- . (1938) *Nacional-socialismo y Derecho Internacional*, Ávila: Nueva Época.
- . (1943) *Cambio De Estructura Del Derecho Internacional: Conferencia Del Profesor De La Universidad De Berlín Dr. Carl Schmitt En El Instituto De Estudios Políticos*, Madrid: [s.n.].
- . (1962) *Teorías Modernas Sobre El Partisano*, Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Schutz, A. (1970) *On Phenomenology and Social Relations. Selected Writings.*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . (2011) *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences* (L. Embree, Ed.), Dordrecht [etc.]: Springer.
- Schutz, A. & Parsons, T. (1978) *The Theory of Social Action: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Talcott Parsons* (R. Grathoff, Ed.), Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Secretaría de la CEPAL. (1963) *El Desarrollo Social De América Latina En La Postguerra*, Buenos Aires: Solar/Hachette.
- Shils, E. (1970) Tradition, Ecology, and Institution in the History of Sociology. *Daedalus*, 99 (4): 760–825.
- Sibley, E. (1974) *Social Science Research Council: The First Fifty Years*, New York: The Council.
- Sombart, W. (1928) *Lujo y Capitalismo* (L. Isábal, Tran.), Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- . (1946) *El Apogeo Del Capitalismo*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Spykman, N.J. (1944) *Estados Unidos Frente Al Mundo*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Tenorio Trillo, M. (1989) Profissao: Latin Americanist. Richard Morse e a Historiografia Norteamericana Da America Latina. *Estudos Históricas*, 2 (3): 102–132.
- Tönnies, F. (1932) *Vida y Doctrina De Tomás Hobbes* (E. Ímaz, Tran.), Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- . (1942) *Principios de sociología* (V. Lloréns, Tran.), México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- Tribe, K. (2007) Talcott Parsons as Translator of Max Weber's Basic Sociological Categories. *History of European Ideas*, 33: 212–233.
- . (2008) Translating Weber, In: *Seminars in Political Thought and Intellectual History*, Cambridge: Cambridge Centre for Political Thought,
- Turner, S.P. & Mazur, G. (2009) Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15 (3): 477–504. [Accessed: 6 November 2012]
- Vidich, A.J. (2000) The Department of Social Relations and 'Systems Theory' at Harvard: 1948-1950. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 13 (4): 607–648.
- Villas-Bôas, G. (2006) *A recepção da sociologia alemã no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro: PPGSA-UFRJ: Topbooks: Capes.
- Weber, A. (1932) *La Crisis De La Idea Moderna De Estado En Europa* (J.R. Pérez Bances, Tran.), Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- Weber, M. (1926) La Decadencia De La Cultura Antigua. *Revista de Occidente*, 4 (37): 25–59.
- . (1927) *General Economic History* (F.H. Knight, Tran.), New York: Adelphi.
- . (1930) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (T. Parsons, Tran.), New York: Scribner.
- . (1942) *Historia Económica General* (M. Sánchez Sarto, Tran.), México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . (1944) *Economía y Sociedad* (J. Medina Echavarría, J. Roura Parella, E. Imaz Echeverría, E. García Máynez, & J. Ferrater Mora, Trans.), México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- . (1946) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (H.H. Gerth & C.W. Mills, Eds & trans.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- . (1947) *Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Edited with an Introduction by Talcott Parsons*, New York & London: Oxford University Press.
- . (1954) *Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society* (M. Rheinstein & E.A. Shils, Trans.), Harvard University Press.
- . (1955) *La Ética Protestante y El Espíritu Del Capitalismo* (L. Legaz Lacambra, Tran.), Madrid: Revista de Derecho Privado.
- . (1963) *The Sociology of Religion* (E. Fischhoff, Tran.), London: Methuen.
- Worcester, K. & Sibley, E. (2001) *Social Science Research Council, 1923-1998*, New York, N.Y.: Social Science Research Council.
- Zaret, D. (1980) From Weber to Parsons and Schutz: The Eclipse of History in Modern Social Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85 (5): 1180–1201.