

American organizations and the development of sociology and social research in Argentina. The case of the SSRC and the Rockefeller Foundation (1927-1966).*

Diego Ezequiel Pereyra.**

Introduction

One of the most interesting aspects of the history of disciplines is the dissemination of science, including the study of influences on the direction of research through financial help. One can easily see that scientific norms and values spread in one direction - from Europe to America and the rest of the world - during the five centuries since the Renaissance. During the twentieth century, the contribution of American science altered the direction of the propagation of ideas and funds for research. However, this trend is not unilateral, since the internationalization of the scientific debate changed the American social sciences, too (Prewitt, 1980).

Thus, American foundations played an important role in the development of the social sciences in many countries during the last century (Fisher, 1993). For instance, the Rockefeller Foundation contributed to the development of the social sciences in France and England in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and in Germany after the Second World War (Bulmer, 1982; Mazon, 1985; Staley, 1995). After 1920, those organizations tried to export two basic ideas: first, the increasing importance of empirical social research, and second, the need of training specialized social scientists in certain research skills. However, some scholars have seen this influence as part of American foreign policy. According to this vision, the foundations have played a critical role in the promotion of ideas that would encourage American power (Berman, 1983).

Latin America represents an important case study. Although it may be thought that it is only after the 1950s that American academic institutions started to take serious interest in Latin America, there was significant activity before then that bears directly upon later actions. For example, the Rockefeller Foundation supported rural development studies in Latin America beginning in the 1930s. In addition, the Institute of International Education (IIE) established contacts with economists and social researchers in Argentina in the late 1920s and the 1930s. As part of this, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) established a Committee on Latin American Studies (1942-1947), which was recreated in 1958.

* This article is the report of my research activities at the Rockefeller Archive Center, (RAC), Sleepy Hollow, New York, which was visited in March 2004 as part of my ongoing dissertation on the role of international networks in the institutionalization of sociology in Argentina from 1940 to 1963.

** PhD. Candidate, University of Sussex at Brighton, United Kingdom. José A. Estenssoro, Fundación YPF/ British Council Scholarship (2002-2005).

Hence, the increasing development of the social sciences in the Latin American region from 1930 to 1960 can only be fully understood in relation to the role of funding organizations and the course of the internationalization of social sciences that began in the 1920s. Nevertheless, this important process of the production of knowledge and the establishment of international networks in the social sciences has not attracted enough attention by researchers, and there has been a marked lack of research on the activities of sociologists within those networks, such as Gino Germani, who played an important role in building modern Argentine sociology. Many scholars who have studied the development of the social sciences in Latin America have focused only on the local situation (Poviña, 1959; Verón, 1974; Miceli, 1995). Where historians have investigated the Rockefeller files in relation to Latin America, they have only researched the cases of medicine and agriculture, not the social sciences (Cueto, 1994; Vessuri, 1994).

The archives of the Rockefeller Foundation and the SSRC provide useful information on the conflicting institutionalization of sociology as a discipline in Argentina and the establishment of international networks among local and foreign sociologists and institutions before, during and after the Peronist Era. Therefore, I will reconstruct in this paper the record of the activities of the SSRC, through the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies (JCLAS), and the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) in Argentina, trying to understand the role of both bodies in the promotion of sociological research in that country and their task in the organization of technical cooperation in the social sciences. This investigation could be articulated with my ongoing research about international networks in sociology. Hence, I could study the possible integration and competition among the American links and diverse international networks in sociology, such as the Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología (ALAS) [Latin American Sociological Association] or the International Sociological Association (ISA). Also, the data could illustrate the key role of Gino Germani in promoting the development of sociology in Argentina. I will then consider that information to reconstruct a possible profile of Germani from the logic and actions of the studied international networks.

THE FIRST STAGE: EARLIEST CONTACTS

Just a few years after the establishment of the SSRC, the primary connections between that body and Argentina emerged when Luther Lee Bernard went to South America to study the development of the social sciences in Argentina. He was awarded an SSRC scholarship in 1925, funded by the RF, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the General Education Board

(SSRC, 1951: 31-32).¹ Bernard's research intended to initiate a study of the relationship among social sciences and the culture of various South American countries. Bernard studied then the history of sociology in Argentina and traced its historicist and nationalistic trends, remarking on "the absence of statistical generalization" in part by "the dominant influence of the philosophy of history orientation." (1927: 25). He also stated that a then fresh reaction against the scientific method in the social sciences could affect the development of sociology in Argentina. In addition he advised that local researchers typically did not like to investigate contemporary facts and conditions (pp. 26-27). This last statement generated a vision of an anti-positivistic tradition in Argentine sociology previous to the 1950s. This idea has been present in the local narration into the present.

Additionally, during the 1930s, there was an increasing interest about Latin America in the United States. Some scholars started discussing the need to increase research in that area and organized two meetings in 1934. These meetings established two goals: a) the planning of investigations about Latin America and b) the promotion of scholarly activities leading to a better understanding of the region. A subsequent conference was organized "to enable specialists in several disciplines to become personally acquainted with one other and their respective activities and to suggest steps by which closer coordination may be achieved among them to the advantage of research in the general field of Latin American culture." That academic group drew closer to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), which incorporated it formally into the body and established in 1936 a Research Committee in that field. The main result of this last experience was the publication of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*.²

At the same time, the RF was also concerned about the promotion of cultural relations between the South American countries and the US. It sent Irving Leonard to the region in 1937 to research the possibilities of international cooperation. He recommended the financial support of the Instituto Cultural Argentino- Norte Americano (ICANA). This institution had been established during the 1930s through an exchange program sponsored by the IIE that allowed many local scholars to travel to the US. Risieri Frondizi was probably the most famous among them. Following Leonard's suggestions, in 1940 the RF awarded ICANA a grant and financial help. Furthermore, RF approved in 1941 a fund of \$50,000 to finance U.S. social scientists who wished to conduct research in Latin America. That plan "would offer advantages to Latin American universities where

¹ Also see *Annual report of the chairman*, SSRC, 1926, p. 4.

² ECB, "Minutes of Committee on problems and policy", circa 1948, p. 12, Folder 534, Box 101, Subseries 14, Series 1, Accession 1, SSRC Archive, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York; and "JCLAS and Joint Committee on the Foreign Area Fellowship Program Report of Activities 1959- 1970", American Council of Learned Societies, SSRC, New York, 1971, p. 2, f. 3153, B. 269, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC.

these competent scholars would work and would increase interest in and contacts with Latin American institutions and scholars.”³

THE STAGE OF TRAVELERS AND DATA APPROPRIATION

The attention given to Latin America in American universities developed further during the 1930s and early 1940s. The focus on that region was not new. Since the declaration of the Pan-Americanism in the nineteenth century, American academic bodies, the press and the official agencies participated in the debate to place the Latin American matter on the agenda of the US government. Before the First World War, the Pan-American vision was only an official rhetoric about hemispheric integration, but after 1920 it was transformed into a vast collective image of the region as a big market for U.S. products. In addition, the creation of the Pan American Union (PAU) in 1907 and the warfare conditions later led American policy to support a political and ideological integration of all the countries in the continent. (Barriga Ledesma, 1956; Salvatore, 2002). For that purpose, detailed knowledge and data on Latin American social reality were extremely necessary.

Consequently, in 1942 the SSRC established the JCLAS with the ACLS and the National Research Council (NRC) “to promote Latin American studies in all fields of knowledge.” In addition, it was prepared “to plan, assist and encourage research and publications, to encourage the preparation of necessary tools of research, such as works of reference, to promote and improve education and training in the Latin American fields, especially at the upper academic levels.” The SSRC received a grant from the RF to fund that research plan, the clerical expenditures and an editorial program that included the continuation of the *Handbook*. Thus, the committee aimed to “make substantial contributions to the furtherance of research on Latin American problems” (Worcester, 2001: 46-47). The JCLAS’ main goal was to establish international contacts among scholars from both North and Latin America and to promote scientific research in the social sciences on Latin American reality, especially cultural studies. The creation of the committee expressed not only the idea that the region was important politically and scientifically, but also the assumption that information on Latin America was largely available in the U.S. or in the countries. The committee planned thus to collect and assemble that data. Hence, many scholars traveled to the

³ The local committee of the IIE in Argentina was formed by important politicians and scholars such as Carlos Saavedra Lamas y Alejandro Bunge. Its activities deserve a better investigation. ICANA received a \$ 15,000 grant to support its activities and later a teacher exchange scheme with \$ 4,000-. For Leonard’s survey, see f. 53, B. 8, Series 300. For grants and ICANA’s activities, see f. 67-71, B. 6, S. 301, RG 1.1. For RF grants, “Resolution of special grant in aid fund- social sciences”, February, 4th, 1941 and “Memo from JHW to RBF”, March 31st 1941, f. 1, B. 1, S. 300, Record Group 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives (RFA), RAC.

region for fieldwork and research, including Wilbert Moore, William Rex Crawford and Carl Taylor.⁴

The Joint Committee discussed many research projects. For example, the ACLS requested in 1943 an evaluation of a sociological study in Argentina, which aimed to understand the cultural feeling of that country as a nation. That project was finally rejected, though there is no record of the reasons. Moreover, during the same year, the “humid pampa” was designated by the body as a possible interesting area of research. Also, the committee analyzed a report on the situation of social sciences in Mexico. That account regarded both the importance of the editorial project of the *Fondo de Cultura Económica* and the quality of the *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, though the report author distrusted its Mexican staff. Diversely, the report remarked the on weakness and mediocrity of the Social Research Institute at the Mexican National University. Although financial help was recommended, none was awarded.⁵

Furthermore, the JCLAS sponsored the Regional Resource Development Project from 1943 to 1945. That plan sought to develop a complete collection of data on the regional conditions and situations of the principal countries in Latin America. In the case of Argentina, the body sent David Efron, an Argentinian researcher, to study the availability of information on North-western Argentina in the American libraries. When Efron determined that the data was biased, he suggested the compilation of extra records in Argentina. Consequently, the program sent him to that country, where he spent five months in 1944 collecting statistical information, maps and data. He reported, for example, having got “four tables on population by departments... (that) have been especially prepared for us by the *Dirección General de Estadística* on the basis of provincial reports in his files (sic).” Efron did exhaustive fieldwork in Buenos Aires, Salta and Tucumán, receiving assistance from many local statistical officials and scholars, such as Pedro Escudero and Miguel Figueroa Román. Also, some provincial governments provided the use “of a car, a chauffer and a government official to accompany Dr. Efron.” The goal of the research trip was certainly plain: the search for data on population and regional resources. The report writer was joyful to declare that the information, which included data “considered as confidential in nature by the Argentine government,” was so qualified that it was extremely useful to understand the problems of the area.⁶

⁴ ECB, “Minutes of Committee on problems and policy”, c. 1948, op. cit, pp. 17-19, 37 and the same document, pp. 115-117, f. 537, B. 101; Ralph Beals, “Social sciences in Latin America. A survey”, 1956, p. 2, f. 520-521, B. 98, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC. Wilbert Moore, Wilbert Ellis Moore, “Current sociological theories in Argentina,” MA Thesis, University of Oregon, 1937; William R. Crawford, *A century of Latin American thought*, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1944); and Carl Taylor, *Rural life in Argentina*, (Louisiana State University, 1948).

⁵ ECB, “Minutes of Committee on problems and policy”, c. 1948, op. cit, pp. 22, 171-189, 224.

⁶ “First Quarterly Report of the Director of the Latin American Regional Resource Development Project”, February 5th-6th, 1944, p. 5; “Second Quarterly Report...”, c. October, 1944, p. 3-5; “Third Quarterly Report...”, c. January, 1945, p. 3-6, f. 2985, B. 253, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

In addition, Efron was invited by local authorities to visit the Chaco Area and to make recommendations about the problem of colonization of the region. These meetings with the officials led him to think about creating a National Planning Association in Argentina, which could cooperate with the government in preparing an analytical framework for regional development. Thus, he submitted a project draft to the national authorities, which was enthusiastically welcome by government and unofficial groups and individuals. The program outlined the chance of setting up a centralized official planning board and a civilian planning body, which would be similar in structure to a national association and was promoted by Adolfo Dorfman, a local Guggenheim fellow who was interested in the home industrialization process. No records at the RAC document the outcome of that plan. Its possible failure could be explained by the political changes that took place in Argentina after the emergence of Peronism. Nevertheless, it is necessary to remark that social planning was particularly functional to the Peronist strategies, which required a long plan of its economic policies, and, additionally, to note that planning was central in the sociological research project established during the 1940s and 1950s at the University of Tucumán, mainly under the direction of Miguel Figueroa Román.⁷

Later, in 1948, the SSRC funded a research trip to survey the status of personnel and institutions interested in the social sciences in Latin America. Hence, Ralph Beals traveled to the region and reported on the situation of local social sciences. In his first account in 1950, he noted the suitable and profound influence of the Sao Paulo School over South American sociology. He reported too that sociology in Argentina “was always somewhat European in viewpoint with little interest in empirical research,” adding that the orientation was increasingly Thomistic or Durkheimian, and that the discipline was considered philosophical and normative. “Although the economic situation of university faculties in Argentina have improved,” he concluded, “it seems doubtful that the present orientation will result in extensive development of research in social science fields.”⁸

In the final report, dated 1956, Beals made some general comments on the situation of the social sciences in Latin America, emphasizing that local scholars had little understanding of the basic problems of research and the need of rigorous training both in methods and techniques. Beals remarked that local universities were in very bad condition and lacked resources and full-time professorships. He reported on three weeks of fieldwork in Argentina, but the RAC records showed he was there only six days in November 1948. During that time, he collected information about

⁷ “Third Quarterly Report...”, c. January, 1945, op. cit, p. 6. For the research at the University of Tucumán, see Figueroa Román (1950).

⁸ “Letter from Pendleton Herring to Ralph Beals”, July 27th, 1948, f. 2985, B. 253, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC; ECB, “Minutes of Committee on problems and policy”, c. 1948, op. cit, p. 49; Ralph Beals, “The social sciences in South America”, *Items*, SSRC, New York, IV, 1, 1950, pp. 1-5.

local social sciences. He recognized that “sociology was perhaps more developed in Argentina than in most Latin American countries.” However, the data he collected seemed to be almost biased. He first mentioned that the “former program of sociology in the Facultad de Derecho (Law School) has been abolished.” Nevertheless, he broadly made a mistake because it was true that the course of lectures of sociology in that institution ceased in 1919, but it was reorganized precisely in 1948 at the time he was in Buenos Aires.⁹

Also, he described the PhD program at the School of Economics in Buenos Aires as five-year training in sociological tasks. Although Beals was right in describing the catholic and nearly anti-liberal orientation of teaching, he misunderstood the organization of the school because its teaching structure was set up by economics undergraduate programs of three years, and sociology was only taught at the final two years as part of the doctoral program. The five-year course described by Beals was really one-year lecturing classes, and optionally one additional year of research practice. He also disregarded the presence of institutes of sociological research at both schools, which were established in 1948. On the other hand, Beals rightly pointed out that the Institute of Sociology at the local School of Philosophy and Literature had been dismantled after its director’s resignation in 1947. However, he apparently was mistaken again when he reported that “in the first lecture given... (at the School of Philosophy) by the new incumbent it is reported by a student that the statement was made that ‘there is no sociology in the United States’ (sic).” This latter assertion enclosed with quotations marks by Beals seems to be almost doubtful, since the course of lectures of sociology at that school in 1948 was delivered by Alfredo Poviña, an internationally recognized professor, who was the first in the country, and probably in Latin America, to include the well-known work of Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, in the reading list of his 1948 course. In addition, he suggested that his students read the American sociological journals.¹⁰

Evidently, Beals’s survey in Buenos Aires could have been partial and incomplete, and he also did not include the sociological activities at the universities from the interior of the country. He probably received information from erroneous local informants or he could have had limited access to the studied institutions. In each case, his task led him to misread some data. However, he recognized that future cooperative work could be initiated in the University of Buenos Aires, since the government had created a favorable situation for research. The teaching salaries were increasing and the universities established full-time positions for professors. At the same time, however,

⁹ Ralph Beals, “Social sciences in Latin America. A survey”, 1956, op. cit, pp. 13-21; 141; “Itinerary Ralph Beals”, August 17th, 1948, f. 521, B. 98, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC; *Elementos para la historia de la enseñanza del derecho y las ciencias sociales. Catedráticos de sociología*, Museo y Archivo de la Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales, Buenos Aires, undated.

¹⁰ Ralph Beals, “Social sciences in Latin America. A survey”, 1956, op. cit, p. 142; *Catálogo de textos para estudiantes de Ciencias Económicas*, El Ateneo, Buenos Aires, 1955; *Programas de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras*, Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), 1948, pp. 44-47.

political conditions after 1945 forced out the best university staff. Beals suggested significantly that any technical cooperation should take into account the fact that the US administration did not fully understand the local situation. Beals additionally reported that the local educational system was hostile to North Americans. He was convinced, in fact, that local actors did not welcome criticism and that they rejected any foreign guidance, particularly from the U.S.¹¹

In 1947, the RF grant ended and the SSRC reorganized the JCLAS as the Exploratory Committee on Latin American Studies (1947-1948). Its members advised the Council to include Latin American issues in the agenda of the Committee on World Area Research (Worcester, 2001: 46). This new body reported that the region offered an “excellent opportunity for the study of new and special problems, for the testing of methods and techniques and for the integration of disciplinary studies.” Another report added that there had been “an enormous amount of work” done in the area but there was still “a strong need for further clarification and enterprise”. The committee also suggested the creation of training programs and the organization conferences in specific problems such as urbanization or regional development. In addition, the Exploratory Committee asked to investigate the possibility of establishing a Society of Latin American Studies that would include the diverse Inter-American societies.¹²

The RF activities in Latin American social sciences continued after that time nevertheless. In 1949, the American Council of Education (ACE) awarded a grant to Henry Herschel Brickell, who was chief of the U.S. State Department’s Division of Cultural Cooperation for Latin America. He was sent to the region to undertake a general study of Latin American countries, particularly in relation to humanities and social sciences. That trip was sponsored by the IIE and the U.S. Department of State would pay for the travel expenses. The RF provided funds for the second stage of his research travel, which included visiting Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. Brickell traveled throughout Latin America during 1951. However, his work was far from the RF expectations. During his trip, he introduced himself as Rockefeller personnel and encouraged local scholars to work hard in order to obtain funds and institutional support from the RF in the future.¹³

Brickell’s meetings with different local institutions and with important and minor scholars, supposedly on behalf of the Rockefeller organization, proved to be a big problem in the end. That

¹¹ Ralph Beals, “Social sciences in Latin America. A survey”, 1956, op. cit, pp. 132-146.

¹² ECB, “Minutes of Committee on problems and policy”, c. 1948, op. cit, pp. 37, 51; George Taylor, “Notes on the Second National Conference on the Study of World Area”, *Items*, IV, 3, 1950, pp. 29-32, quotations from p. 30.

¹³ Henry Herschel Brickell (1889-1952) worked as news editor and book reviewer for many American newspapers. He also became assistant of Spruille Braden, who was US Ambassador in Buenos Aires during the middle 1940’s. Brickell received a \$ 6,500- grant but he delayed his trip because of illness. So, he received a larger grant to finally make that fieldwork. Also, the *New York Times* hired him to send travel letters. See *Who's Who in Ridgefield CT AF*, (<http://www.acorn-online.com/A-F.htm>), Last access, May 2004; and “Grant RF 48415”, “Grant RF H5184”, “Memo from RFE to JM and FMR”, September. 3rd, 1952 and “Memo from JM to FMR and CBE”, September 11th, 1952. f. 54, B. 8, S. 300, RG. 1.1, RFA, RAC.

attitude was considered as an aberration by the RF. Brickell, for instance, visited, among other institutions, the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo and said he could negotiate with the RF for the provision of help. Further, he also gave his word to José María Bolaño that the RF would support the activities of the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas, which he directed. The Institute of Sociological Research had been established in Buenos Aires in 1949 to promote both “the pure and applied scientific research in the sociological field.” In 1951 it launched the publication of a collection of sociological books, which aspired to introduce new sociological works in the Spanish-speaking region. The beginning of that editorial compilation after Brickell’s trip and its abrupt demise, as well as the activities of the institute itself, could be related to Brickell’s promises and misrepresentations, though this relation should be studied further.¹⁴

Hence, Brickell’s trip soon after became an institutional scandal. The RF tried to clarify the situation to the institutions and persons that were affected, and plainly stated that Brickell was not part of the institution. However, the RF did not receive any report or personal explanation from Brickell, who died at home under strange circumstances in May 1952. According to the records, the situation was perceived as an outrage. Brickell’s diplomatic relations could even have complicated the situation more. Also, his relationship with Ambassador Braden, who was attacked by the Argentine government earlier, added possible tension at the international level. Undoubtedly, the RF social sciences program in South America was affected. One could guess that the question would not be reopened for a while. This stage should be further investigated. The connections among Peronist policies, local social research and the collaborative work of certain networks during the 1940s could be exceedingly helpful to understand the technical cooperation during a time that is often seen as having been lacking in empirical research and poorly developed in sociological practice.¹⁵

AFTER AN INTERLUDE, THE STAGE OF INTERCHANGE

During the 1950s, interest in Latin America at both the SSRC and the RF seemed to be at a low ebb. In the period 1925-1951, 14% of the SSRC fellows who spent time researching abroad did

¹⁴ “Memo from RFE to JM and FMR”, September. 3rd, 1952, op. cit; “Memo from JM to FMR and CBE”, September 11th, 1952, op. cit. The institution printed in Spanish Emile Durkheim’s *Sociologie et Philosophie* as the first volume of the series. However, soon after three titles, the collection perished (Poviña, 1959: 179). Also See Bolaño (1952) and “Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Buenos Aires, Argentina”, in *American Journal of Sociology*, Chicago, LVIII, 1, 1952, p. 97.

¹⁵ According to the RF, the list of persons encouraged by Brickell also included the authorities of the Librarian School at the Museo Social Argentino in Buenos Aires and a young female psychologist from Uruguay. “Memo from RFE to JM and FMR”, September. 3rd 1952, op. cit; “Memo from JM to FMR and CBE”, September 11th, 1952, op. cit; Brickell was found lying in his garage whereas the car engine was on. See the news of his death in “Herschel Brickell is called a suicide”, *New York Times*, May 30th, 1952, f. 54, B. 8, S. 300, RG. 1.1, RFA, RAC.

fieldwork in Latin America. The same proportion maintained in the time 1948-1953. The region was then the most investigated area along with West Europe, Japan and Philippines. But, in the following years, researchers' interests moved to other issues, such as the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China. When the Foreign Area Fellowship Program (FAFP) was launched by the Ford Foundation (FF), new regions were incorporated to the research agenda and fresh funds entered the academic market, offering grants for Asian and Near East studies (beginning in 1952), Africa and Russia and Eastern Europe (1954).¹⁶

So, in the late 1950s, the American community of scholars perceived that the interest in Latin America was declining. A group of intellectuals argued for new strategies to develop the Latin American field. Meeting in Chicago in November 1958, this group concluded that a new body should be created. Therefore, the SSRC recreated the JCLAS with a \$190,000 three-year grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The previous group had been established with the belief that Latin America was an important branch in the American agenda; the commission was recreated in 1958 because academic interest in the region was thought to be low. Hence, the JCLAS set up three strategies: 1) the promotion of visits to the region by young scholars, 2) the organization of small conferences in problems of disciplinary interests such as social stratification, economic development or political modernization and 3) the planning of major conferences that would draw attention to new problems.¹⁷

The first activity was the reorganization of a scholarship program for American researchers who wished to conduct research in Latin America. Thus, 55 fellows from the US traveled to the region from 1959 to 1963 with the SSRC financial help. Six of them visited Argentina for research in history and sociology. In 1962, when the FAFP of the Ford Foundation was transferred to the SSRC, the JCLAS decided to include the Latin American region in that scholarship program, which meant an important increase in scholarship in social sciences in the area. From 1962 to 1970, 240 American researchers passed through the region doing fieldwork; what is nearly 10% of the total fellows of the program since 1952. In addition, the budget of the JCLAS was enlarged because it received financial help from the FF.¹⁸

¹⁶ Joseph Casagrande and Elbrigde Sibley, "Fellows of the SSRC, 1925-51. Some statistics", *Items*, VI, 2, 1952, p. 13-17 and "Area research training fellowships and travel grants for area research: an epilogue", *Items*, VII, 4, 1953, pp. 37-42; "Information for foreign Area Fellows", FAFP, JC, ACLS, SSRC, New York, c. 1966, p. 5, f. 3104, B. 264, Subs. 64, S. 1. A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁷ "Minutes First Meeting", JCLAS, November 21st, 1959, f. 542, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1; "JCLAS and Joint Committee on the FAFP Report...", 1971, op. cit, pp. 4-5, 134. "Pendleton Herring to the future members of the Committee", July 16th, 1959, f. 2986; and "Financial statement under grant from Carnegie Corporation, JCLAS, 1959-1962", f. 2988, B. 254, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁸ The SSRC asked Carnegie Corp. for an increment. The request of \$ 550,000 was rejected, so the SSRC only received an extra help of \$ 50,000. So, the Ford Foundation was appealed to fund the body. Thus the budget went up to \$ 300,000 in the time 1963- 1966, that meant a quarter of the total research of the FF's budget, a figure that was only over

Until the early 1960s, the SSRC program on Latin American social sciences had been exclusively unilateral. Nonetheless, the new JCLAS rapidly recognized that the technical cooperation with the region should assume renovated integrative policies. Its members believed that local institutions and scholars could block helping US researchers if they felt they were being asked to do a lot of work for little return. A Chilean researcher expressed these tensions. “All the important economic research in this continent during the next ten years will be done by Americans,” he said. They “have the data, the time and the money, and we are all swamped answering their letters and helping them get settled and to carry out their research.” Also an official SSRC report stated that it was necessary to reinforce the cooperation because local scholars felt that American investigators did conduct research on Latin America while the native researchers were set apart from the production of knowledge about their region. This sense of frustration should be overcome by the SSRC in order to avoid risking the success of the program.¹⁹

The subsequent activities organized by the new JCLAS included a set of meetings among American and Latin American social scientists. In August 1961, a conference on training and research in sociology was held at Stanford and brought together fifteen American scholars and seven sociologists from Latin America. The purpose of the conference was to contribute, through personal contact and scholarly interchange, to the improvement of communications among sociologists on the continent. The group discussed the problem of sociology as a profession in Latin America and the possibilities of developing social research and scholarly exchanges. It was the consensus of participants that such kinds of activities would be fruitful because the “new” Latin American sociologists required the application of the most advanced research methods in their own societies. So they thought that the contact with American experience and institutions was very important (Oteiza, 1997).²⁰

During the meeting at Stanford, the Latin American group set up an institutional network to support its strategies. Hence, the visiting sociologists created the Grupo Latinoamericano para el

passed by the research on China. However, that amount increased to \$ 1,175,000 during the period 1966-1970. Additionally, the JCLAS received financial help from the Council of Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR) from 1961 to 1965 and also received extra \$ 80,000- from the FF in 1963. See *Items*, XIII, 3, 1959, pp. 31-32; “Minutes of 13th meeting”, JCLAS, February, 15th, 1964, f. 543, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1; “Information for foreign Area Fellows”, c. 1966, op. cit, p. 5; “Grant FF to SSRC for research 1963-1966”; “Letter from Pendleton Herring to William Marvel”, January 22nd, 1962; “Letter from Joseph Mc. Daniel to Pendleton Herring”, March 6th, 1963, December 20th and 22nd, 1964, F. 3105, B. 264, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁹ “Excerpt from a letter by a Latin American economist”, May 5th, 1962, f. 1988, B. 254; “Report of the Conference on Latin American studies”, Cuernavaca, December 1964, f. 4150, B. 322, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

²⁰ The Latin American sociologists who met at Stanford were Gino Germani (Argentina), Guillermo Briones (Chile), Luis Costa Pinto (Brazil), Orlando Fals Borda (Colombia), Peter Heintz (Chile), Wilburg Jimenez Castro (Costa Rica) and José Arthur Ríos (Brazil). Bryce Wood and Charles Wagley, “The social sciences: Parochial or cosmopolitan? Reflections on the Inter- American conference on research and training in sociology”, *Items*, XV, 4, 1961, pp. 41-45. “Inter American Conference on research and training in Sociology”, JCLAS, August 25th- 27th, 1961, f. 542, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC.

Desarrollo de la Sociología (GLADS, Latin American Group for the Development of Sociology), which aimed to create permanent mechanisms for the exchange of information between the professional sociologists of the region, to make use of all means to accelerate the development of sociology in the area, to establish high academic, scientific and professional standards at the international level; to establish permanent standards for the evaluation of scientific and academic work in sociology in the region, in order to guarantee a high degree of professional competence; and to facilitate the cooperation and coordination of efforts among the professional sociologists, persons and institutions of the region and outside Latin America. That group was promoted by five of the seven foreign assistants to the conference in August 1961; later they received support from another twelve Latin American sociologists so the group was less than twenty persons, but most of them had international links with the UNESCO or the ISA.²¹

Consequently, they sought financial help and support from the SSRC. Also, the GLADS suggested and planned the organization of an inter-American meeting of sociologists in Princeton in 1962, taking advantage of the World Congress of Sociology sessions in Washington. The JCLAS paid the travel expenses of certain Latin American assistants. Twenty-six sociologists (fifteen from the US and eleven from Latin America, including the original five who established the GLADS) met in September to discuss the situation of sociology in the region and to plan future actions. That meeting consolidated the position of the Latin American group as a legitimate and stable network of cooperation and communication among sociologists from the area. Also, the group strengthened the situation of their members as official representatives of local sociologists in relation with the American teaching and funding institutions.²²

However, the success of the GLADS also depended upon the basis of a clear strategy of appealing for aid and promotional reports about the requirements of the local sociologists; actions basically carried out by Guillermo Briones and Gino Germani, both of whom had constant contact with the SSRC. For instance, the latter sent a report on the communication among sociologists in Latin America, its present situation and suggestions for its improvement. It was based on a paper submitted to the IV World Congress of Sociology in 1959. Germani divided the history of sociology in Latin America into three stages, distinguished respectively by the predominance of positivism and the university status of sociology teaching, the rise of anti-positivism that marked the temporary

²¹ "Minutes of the seventh meeting", JCLAS, October 12th, 1961; "Minutes of the eighth meeting", JCLAS, December 7th-8th, 1961, f. 542, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC; "Letter from Guillermo Briones to Bryce Wood", Santiago de Chile, October 16th, 1961, f. 2979, B. 253, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC; *Boletín de la Asociación Sociológica Argentina*, Buenos Aires, 1, 1961, pp. 24-28.

²² "Letter from Briones to Wood", October 16th, 1961, op. cit; "Letter from Wood to Briones", New York, November 20th, 1961, f. 2979, B. 253, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2; "Program of the Inter- American Meeting of sociologists", Princeton, September 10th-12th, 1962, f. 543, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC; "JCLAS and Joint Committee on the FAFP Report...", 1971, op. cit, pp. 134-154.

eclipse of sociology; and the beginning of scientific sociology in the region. “Great importance should be attributed to the anti-positivist accent, which has characterized a certain part of Latin-American sociology in the last thirty years,” he argued. In this way, Germani diagnosed that sociology in the region from 1930 to 1960 had been affected by limited research work, ill-defined limits, speculative teaching, shortage of specialized and full-time professorial staff, literary style, barely sufficient knowledge of the modern research techniques and methodology and inadequate university organization (Germani, 1959: 126-134).²³

Nevertheless, Germani pointed out that a new tendency in sociology had arisen in the region. That meant the emergence of sociological activities from a scientific point of view, achieving in this way an international working level (1959: 133-134). Also, in the report sent to the JCLAS, Germani remarked that local sociologists did not participate adequately in the international sociological community, so the regional organization had remained on the margins of international development, due to the lack of professional status and because their members belonged to old traditions. By describing these problems and emphasizing that regional sociology was not a professional field, he argued for the promotion of agreements and collaborative research among local and American sociologists and universities. Germani wanted to catch the interest of SSRC in the sponsorship of those activities, so he blamed its possible competitors in technical cooperation, such as the UNESCO and the Pan-American Union, of being relatively bureaucratic instances. To sum up, Germani drew a picture of a lack of resources and up-to-date sociological information that should be solved by the help of American institutions. Also he believed that a small group of scholars who represented a new orientation in the region could bring about the necessary changes to achieve the modernization of Latin American sociology.²⁴

Therefore, Germani outlined a plan for an editorial and bibliographical renovation, the reinforcement of the Centro do Pesquisas in Rio de Janeiro and the renewal of the ALAS. He argued as well for the organization of regional conferences. The JCLAS convened a new Conference on an Inter-American Organization on the social sciences in 1962. Gathering in Mexico, eight American and ten Latin American scholars suggested that the SSRC seek funds in order to provide grants to Latin American social scientists. Consequently, the JCLAS with the Ford Foundation established in 1962 a new scholarly exchange program: the United States-Latin

²³ Germani’s report, written in Buenos Aires during the previous year, was read by the JCLAS during a meeting in October 1961 as part of the account of antecedents and the origin of the GLADS. Gino Germani (GG), “Summary of the Report on the communication among sociologists in Latin America. Present situation and suggestions for its improvement”, Buenos Aires, 1960, f. 542, B. 101, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1, SSRC, RAC; “Minutes of Seventh meeting”, JCLAS, October 12th, 1961, op. cit.

²⁴ GG, “Summary of the Report on the communication...”, 1960, op. cit.

American Faculty Interchange Program (USLAFIP), which, according to the SSRC, would accelerate the development of research and training in the Latin American field.²⁵

The USLAFIP sought to strengthen Latin American studies in the US. Its purpose was the promotion of Latin American studies in American institutions and the development of higher education in Latin America. According to the Program Advisory Committee, the achievement of the latter should be part of American interests, since it would have an impact on the general education system in the US. Thus, the program expected that Latin American scholars would benefit from the personal contact with colleagues at American universities and from the acquisitions of new techniques. But it believed that the benefits would be mutual because Latin Americans would learn from the persons who have the knowledge and the Americans would obtain new data.²⁶

That program planned to send American researchers to the south and to bring Latin American scholars to teach and research in American institutions. Six universities took part in the project: the University of California at Berkeley, UCLA, Columbia, Harvard, Minnesota and Texas. These universities sent a total of thirty-four North American scholars to conduct research in Latin America, though only two of them were sociologists and just two traveled to Argentina. On the other hand, at least forty-nine researchers from the Latin American countries visited the US. Most of them were from Brazil (twenty) and Argentina (eleven). One-fifth of the total were historians and six were sociologists, including three members of GLADS: Costa Pinto, who visited Berkeley, and Florestán Fernandez and Germani, who taught at Columbia. In addition, Columbia invited two leading Brazilian sociologists – Gilberto Freyre and Octavio Ianni – and the University of Minnesota called Orlando Sepúlveda from Chile.²⁷

This interchange program was funded by the Ford Foundation, which asked for the control of decisions. The participating universities were selected among the institutions whose research departments had real interest in the Latin American region and they could potentially develop investigations in that area. The program hoped to improve the language and historical programs that

²⁵ GG, “Summary of the Report on the communication...”, 1960, op. cit; “Minutes of the Ninth Meeting”, JCLAS, April 12th, 1962; “Report of a Conference on an Inter- American organization in the social sciences”, Mexico, July 3rd-4th, 1962; “Minutes of the Inter American Conference on Research and Training in Economics”, Santiago de Chile, August 16th- 18th, 1962, f. 543, B. 1b01, Subs. 14, S. 1, A. 1; “JCLAS and Joint Committee on the FAFP Report...”, 1971, op. cit, pp. 126-132; “USLAFIP”, Incomplete document, undated, p. 5, f. 4205, B. 328, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

²⁶ “Transcription of a meeting”, Latin American Faculty Interchange Advisory Committee (LAFIAC), September 24th, 1962, 9 tapes, specially p. 24, f. 4148, B. 322, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

²⁷ This directory of Latin American visitors could not be complete but it is the only total registration available in the RAC records. The real list could be slightly different, due it could also have included for example the name of Pablo Gonzalez Casanova. The rest of disciplines included in the program were: Anthropology, Architecture, Demography, Economics, Education, Geography, Journalism, Law, Literature, Philosophy, Political Science and Psychology. “JCLAS and Joint Committee on the FAFP Report...”, 1971, op. cit, pp. 126-132, and “Memo from James Gould to Schuyler Wallace. USLAFIP statistics”, June 18th, 1964, F. 4205, B. 328, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC.

were in decline, but it focused on multidisciplinary research. The universities sent proposals and a list of candidates to the SSRC, but a Management Committee decided finally who would receive awards. Subsequently, it was remarkable that the selection process showed differences between the universities' proposals and the final decision, though it did not oppose institutions' interests.²⁸

For instance, Harvard submitted to the Committee a list of 208 young scholars who could be considered as candidates to visit the institution. Surprisingly, thirty-two of them were from Argentina, twenty-nine from Venezuela and just six from Mexico. Law led the distribution of disciplines with sixty-four persons, followed by economics (forty-three) and sociology (thirty-two). That selection of applicants was based on a survey on students' interests and wishes, but the information used by the university was almost inaccurate. The list of sociologists included a mixture of scholars from the new generation, such as Fernando Cardozo (Brazil), and older men such as Julio Ycaza Tigerino (Nicaragua). Only two of them were finally selected to visit the US (Fernandez and Ianni) but they went to another institution. Four Argentinian sociologists were included in the list: Jorge Graciarena, José Miguens, Miguel Murmis and Torcuato Di Tella. However, the data was far from complete, indicating the scarcity of knowledge on the sociological field in Argentina from that institution. The Management Committee doubted the value of student surveys as effective mechanisms of obtaining information about possible candidates. Apparently, Harvard itself learned from that experience and its later proposals included other names such as Darío Cantón, José Luis de Imaz and Gino Germani. However, Harvard received at last only two historians, two literature students and one demographer from four diverse countries, but none from Argentina or Brazil.²⁹

In addition, other universities suggested visits by other sociologists from Latin America. For instance, Minnesota's list of eleven scholars in sociology included Gino Germani. Further, Berkeley proposed Gerardo Andujar to be awarded, and UCLA unsuccessfully called Pedro David. On the other hand, the University of Texas elected two prestigious philosophers from Argentina, Mario Bunge and Risieri Frondizi, and the Committee accepted its proposals. However, the selection process also took account of the opinion of diplomats and Ford Foundation personnel from the region. The Ford representative in Argentina chose to nominate two economists. Nonetheless, the embassy in Buenos Aires included Alfredo Poviña and José Miguens among the candidates. None of them was included in the final election since the selecting body probably aspired to integrate new

²⁸ "Transcription of a meeting", LAFIAC, September 24th, 1962, op. cit.

²⁹ The data on age was amazingly completely wrong. Graciarena, Murmis and Di Tella were said to be in their early forties. Also, the biography of Miguens included mistaken data from his father, not from him. "Draft roster of Latin American professors based on a student survey", University of Harvard, c. 1963-1964, f. 4196; "Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the Management Committee of USLAFIP", New York, October 4th-5th, 1963, f. 4191, B. 327; "Letter from Ernest May to Wallace", Cambridge, June 25th and July 7th, 1965, f. 4205, B. 328, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC; "Transcription of a meeting", LAFIAC, September 24th, 1962, op. cit.

voices and emphasized the approach rather than age or fame of candidates. The election resulted, at least in sociology, in members of the group linked to the modernization of social sciences in the region.³⁰

At last, the USLAFIP was well evaluated by the member institutions. Charles Wagley, from Columbia, stated that it had “important effects upon the relationships among the participating United States universities and on the organization of Latin American studies in the United States.” He declared that it was important that the body fostered cooperation among American institutions rather than stimulating competition among actors interested in Latin America. Additionally, Harvard authorities said the program stimulated the knowledge about the region. The Ford Foundation recognized the prestige attained by the Program in Latin America since it was perceived as more independent than the universities and particular factions within academia. However, nothing was said about the impact on Latin America when the scholars returned to the region and the possible institutional development at local universities. That topic should be studied further, but the Argentine case could not be examined because Gino Germani had no time to do his activities in Argentina before his moving to the US in 1966.³¹

On the other hand, the RF already had contributed to the scientific development in Argentina before 1960. But it had not directly funded till that time any activities in social sciences at the local universities. However, a project prepared by José Luis Romero and Gino Germani represented the first opportunity for the organization to support long-range research and training in contemporary intellectual history. That enterprise was a five-year research effort on the effects of massive non-Spanish immigration into the Río de la Plata. The RF grant to the Department of Sociology in Buenos Aires meant a clear support to the modernization process of sociological activities at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA). The foundation believed that the department was “reorganized with the objective of training young sociologists in the techniques as practiced in the US for collecting and analyzing data in addition to the French theoretical sociology traditionally taught in Argentina.” Thus, it “was expected that this development would broaden the interest of the

³⁰ The records on the proposal from Minnesota are unreadable, but the name of GG is nevertheless clearly read. “Latin American Faculty Members suggested as participants”, University of Minnesota, January 15th, 1964, f. 4196; “USLAFIP”, University of California, Berkeley, f. 4191; “USLAFIP”. University of California, Los Angeles, f. 4195; “Minutes of the First Meeting of the Management Committee of USLAFIP”, October 15th, 1962, p. 2-3; “USLAFIP”, University of Texas, f. 4191, “Letter from Verne Atwater to Wallace”, Buenos Aires, January 17th, 1963; “Letter from William Grupp, Cultural Affairs Officer, to Wallace”, Buenos Aires, December 27th, 1962, f. 4196, B. 327, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC; and “Transcription of a meeting”, LAFIAC, September 24th, 1962, op. cit.

³¹ “Letter from Charles Wagley to Wallace”, New York, June 21st, 1965, F. 4205, B. 328, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC, “Letter from May to Wallace”, June 25th and July 7th, 1965, op. cit, “Memo from James Gould to Wallace...”, June 18th, 1964, op. cit.

historians and, at the same time, provide an explanation of the process of social change in terms that could be readily understood by Argentinians with their well-developed sense of historicity.”³²

J. L. Romero outlined the original research plan in 1958 when he tried to interest the RF representatives. After a discussion between Germani and RF personnel at the RF headquarters in 1959 and many corrections both in the project proposed and in the budget, introduced mainly by Germani, the foundation approved in 1960 a grant of \$35,000 to the UBA for a research and training seminar in social history and intellectual history. The investigation was outlined and organized by the Social History Chair coordinated by Romero. But, following the RF’s suggestions, he had to accept that the funds would be administered by the Institute of Sociology, what meant setting the funds in Germani’s hands. So, finally Romero and Germani jointly directed the project.³³

That support was complementary to the funds given in 1960 by Ford Foundation to the local Department of Sociology in order to support the development of sociological teaching and research (Germani, 1961: 43). However, Germani soon faced problems and decided on an alternative strategy. Although he had planned a five-year program at the UBA and received money for that, he proposed a new plan during a lunch in New York in 1961. It aimed to establish a new sociological research center outside the university. It was not strange that the Di Tella Institute, which was being funded by the RF, could be the appropriate place for the new institution. During 1961-1963, Germani organized a program to move his research activities from the UBA to the Di Tella. At that moment, students and leftist sectors argued with the director of the Institute of Sociology at the UBA, putting in question the use of external funds and the organization of the department (Verón, 1974). According to Germani, they refused any grant from abroad and disliked the idea that foreign professors were paid better than local ones. Consequently, Germani thought that the new institution could be a sample of what could be done when “irrational trammels” and “misplaced politics” are eliminated, because, according to Germani, “depolitization (in a good sense) of the scientific and academic activity continues to be the basic condition... for the development of research and training in Latin American social sciences.”³⁴

³² For instance, the RF assisted research on malaria in Tucumán during the 1920’s. Further, it funded the UBA for research aid in medical and natural sciences, assisting specially to Bernardo Houssay’s investigations. Also, it subsidized other institutions in Buenos Aires and the interior. The total financial assistance from the RF to that field in Argentina could be estimated in around \$ 250,000 (1930-1960) and \$ 200,000 (1961-1965). See f. 59-65, B. 7. For information on grant to the Department of Sociology, UBA, 1958-1960, f. 81 and 84, B. 10, S. 301, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC.

³³ Information on grant to the Department of Sociology, UBA, 1958-1960, op. cit. Also see Germani (1961: 44-46).

³⁴ “Notes on lunch with LCD, John P. Harrison (JPH) and GG”, New York, September 5th, 1961. f. 86, That meeting was in September but GG and Torcuato Di Tella had been talking on that idea since the beginning of that year, see “Diary of Charles M. Hardin (CMH)”, May 5th- 6th, 1961, f. 82. The Di Tella Institute received help to fund a Latin American Center for the Advanced Music Composition and a Center for Economic Research. See f. 86. Also see “Excerpt of a letter from GG to JPH”, November 30th, 1961, f. 86, B. 10 and “Interview between LCD and GG”, New York, January 24th and December 14th, 1964, p. 2, f. 88, B. 11, S. 301, RG. 1.2, RFA, RAC.

Thus, Germani considered that the situation at the UBA was intolerable for him and his project. Hence, he pointed out that the university was dominated “by the students to such a degree” that it was “stagnating.” So, he perceived that the situation was impossible to manage and judged that it was urgently necessary to centralize authority and reduce the power of students. The plain solution was to create a new institution where it was practical to place outside the university the total control of research and finances. In addition, his move would allow the department to choose other alternatives and would decompress the stormy situation among students as well. The RF attentively monitored the whole situation and felt entirely comfortable with Germani’s assurance that he would maintain a position in the university while he directed the new institution. The rector of the university agreed with Germani’s strategies, and the RF funded the new research institute.³⁵

Therefore, the Di Tella Institute created the Comparative Social Research Center. Its main goal was to achieve a secure base for continuous productive work for key social scientists in case of conceivable disruptions in academic work at the university. The Center received in 1963 a three-year grant of \$87,000 to cover around 54% of the institutional budget. Then, Germani became virtually the full-time director of the center. He also remained the formal director of the Institute of Sociology at the UBA but he gave up his position as chairman of the department. The institution focused his research work in demography and related aspects of social structure, working in cooperation with the University of California, Berkeley and Cornell University. Also, it collaborated with many local official bodies. Additionally, in 1964, it was supported by UNESCO to organize an International Conference on Comparative Social Research in Developing Countries. However, this transition was marred by an unusual conflict between local actors and the international links, a situation that was named “Germani’s affair.”³⁶

GERMANI’S AFFAIR

Ana Germani, who is writing a biography of his father, has described vividly the feelings of Germani and his situation of being blamed by different actors from both the right and left. He was first accused of belonging to the devilish communists, and then he was defined as a reactionary imperialist. According to him, and showing his good sense of humor, both extremes were two spirits that followed him his whole life, so he would not know how to live if either of them disappeared one day. (Ana Germani, 2004: 21) Germani’s activities were opposed not only by

³⁵ “Interview between LCD and GG”, January 24th, 1964, op. cit, December 14th, 1964, op. cit, p. 2; “Excerpt from an Interview with Risieri Frondizi”, Buenos Aires, March 19th, 1962; “Interview between CMH and GG”, Buenos Aires, March 15th, 1962, p. 1, f. 87, B. 10, S. 301, RG. 1.2, RFA, RAC.

³⁶ “Interview among RF staff, GG and Torcuato Di Tella”, New York, September 14th, 1962; “Letter from Guido Di Tella to CMH”, Buenos Aires, January 30th, 1962; “Interview among Kingsey Davis, Guido Di Tella and GG”, New York, c. 1962, f. 87, B. 10; “Interview between GG and LCD”, f. 88, B. 11, f. 87, B. 10, S. 301, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC.

students but also by local actors from outside the university. Many businessmen and minor politicians wrote to the Ford and Rockefeller foundations reproving the help they were delivering to Germani. For instance, a not quite famous capitalist, Julio Nuñez, sent a letter to an American friend saying that Germani was a communist. Nuñez wrote that it was “incredible that institutions who are getting tax benefits from the US government are at the same time subsidizing pro-communist organizations abroad (sic).” The note reached the RF president, George Harrar, who ordered an institutional investigation.³⁷

That situation led to permanent consultations between the Ford and Rockefeller foundations. The American ambassador in Buenos Aires said that those kinds of things were typical in the country and were to be expected from certain local groups, especially in social sciences activities. However, Germani had no support from that embassy in Argentina. When the FAPF invited the ambassadors to nominate serious scholars to deliver courses in the US, the embassy promptly replied that Miguens and Poviña, the two key actors who opposed Germani within the local sociological field, were among the outstanding academics from Argentina who could hold their own with graduate faculties in the US.³⁸

Diversely, the director of Di Tella Institute, Enrique Oteiza, reported to the RF that there were no grounds for questioning Germani’s credentials because he was a leading sociologist. Oteiza also told RF personnel that there was a secret army report on Germani that related him to socialist activities. But, paradoxically, the RF also had reports saying that Germani had also made surveys for the Intelligence State Service. In addition, Oteiza recognized that Germani “contributed in some degree (to his critics)... because he is short-tempered and lacked diplomacy.” Surprisingly, he opposed Germani and suggested that he would not be a good director at the Di Tella Research Center. According to Oteiza, Germani had the unfortunate characteristic of finding it very difficult to share authority and responsibility with others.³⁹

For those reasons, during 1961-1963, the RF collected different reports on Germani’s reputation from local and international scholars who backed him at last. The Ford Foundation was surprised by Germani’s move from the UBA to the Di Tella but later recommended further support

³⁷ “CMH Diary with Kalman Silvert”, Santiago de Chile, May 8th, 1961; and “Letter from Julio Nuñez to John Smithies”, Buenos Aires, October 11th, 1961, f. 82, B. 10, S. 301, RG. 1.2, RFA, RAC.

³⁸ “Interview between RF staff and Atwater”, Ford Foundation, Buenos Aires, March 19th, 1962, “KWT note”, October 18th, 1961, f. 87, B. 10, S. 301, RG 1.2, RFA; “Letter from Wallace to Robert Mc. Clintock, Ambassador in Buenos Aires, December 10th, 1962, f. 4196, B. 327, S. 1, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC and “Letter from Grupp to Wallace”, December 27th, 1962, op. cit. Taking into account the diplomatic communications and Christmas time, the reply was nearly immediate. Another interesting issue is that Poviña did not understand English, but he was included in the list.

³⁹ According to Oteiza, the report charged GG to be an Italian Jew who was formerly socialist and met a lady socialist in Argentina. He was blamed as well of surveying if students like or dislike the military service; “Interview between LCD and Oteiza”, Buenos Aires, October 26th, 1961, f. 82 and 86, B. 10, S. 301, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC; “Interview between CMH and GG”, March 15th, 1962, op. cit, p. 2.

for his activities. Its representative in Buenos Aires stated that Germani “was not a communist but he is a good sociologist.” The RF recognized that Germani was probably left of center by any definition but that he was a respected and trusted sociologist. An RF officer pointed out that they were “fully satisfied with his substantial reputation among his professional peers in this country and abroad as a careful, serious and responsible scholar.” In an institutional defense, the RF declared that there was no line of reasoning that could charge Germani. Additionally, it declared that he had an American visa so it could not say anything contrary to that. Kalman Silvert introduced a personal outlook, noting that Germani was diabetic and suffered other ailments, which affected his personality and made him unpredictable and irascible, but he did not hate anyone.⁴⁰

However, Germani finally received such institutional support that the grant to the Di Tella research center was approved under the condition that he would be its director and administer the money. Further, there would be no commitment from the RF for more than one year thereafter if Germani resigned that position. Thus, although critics pressured both the RF and FF, they considered Gino Germani to be one of the most outstanding sociologists in the region. He was regarded as the key person because he was completely trustworthy, although he was on the left wing politically, and he was perceived to be a very good administrator and manager of money invested by American foundations.⁴¹

SOME CLOSING CONCLUSIONS

Latin America is the area in which the SSRC had the longest record of activity (Silbey, 1974: 90-92). Thus, the RAC files provide suitable information on the history of technical cooperation in the social sciences in Argentina from the early contacts between local and international actors. Then, a second phase can be defined in the time when the SSRC and the RF were interested in the compilation of data on Argentine society and on the situation of local social sciences. Finally, after an interlude, a final period is situated when the American organizations developed interchange strategies in order to accelerate the advance of social sciences in the region. Nevertheless, the study of that development should be placed in the context of American expansionism after the Second World War. It reflected the struggle between two different development strategies -- Soviet Communism and American capitalist democracy -- in the

⁴⁰ There is a collection of reports on GG at the RAC. See f. 86-87; “Interview between RF staff and Atwater”, March 19th, 1962, op. cit and Buenos Aires, December 19th, 1962, f. 87, “Interview between KWT and JPH”, f. 82. The quotation from RF officer could be seen in information on grants, p. 62663, f. 86, B. 10, S. 301, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC; “CMH Diary with Silvert”, May 8th, 1961, op. cit.

⁴¹ “Memo from EK to JES”, New York, April 20th, 1966, f. 89, B. 11, S. 301, RG. 1.2, RFA; “Proposal to be considered at the Management Committee Meeting. File GG”, USLAFIP, January 27th-30th, 1964, f. 4192, B. 327, S. 1, Subs. 64, S. 1, A. 2, SSRC, RAC; and “Interview between RF staff and Atwater”, March 19th, 1962, op. cit.

framework of Cold War. The interest of the US foundations in Latin America accelerated during the 1960s when the impact of the Cuban revolution threatened both the regional integration and the American influence in the region.

The SSRC concluded that scholarly exchange activities before 1970 had an important impact on knowledge of the area, changing the emphasis of Latin American studies. Thus, American research on the region changed from the typical pre-Colombian and colonial history and contemporary literature analysis to contemporary social studies with collaborative work and a comparative outlook. Additionally, the SSRC fellowship program opened the academic gates to many historians and sociologists who later developed prestigious academic careers studying the Argentine example, such as the cases of Peter Smith, David Apter, Aaron Ciccourel and Robert Potash, all of whom contributed greatly to the understanding of Argentina from a socio-historical perspective. Also, the contribution of the SSRC, the RF and the FF was fundamental for improving teaching and research at the UBA, where Germani coordinated the first sociological school in Argentina. Further, around thirty visiting and invited professors from abroad, mostly from the US, trained the first cohorts of professional sociologists in Argentina from 1957 to 1962 (Germani, 1961).⁴²

The narration of the history of sociology in Argentina had privileged the study on local factors, but the international issues were also important. Thus, the support to Germani from the American organizations implied that they accepted a program in which local actors called for the establishment of international networks, the need for information because the home sociological field lacked up-to-date sociological literature and the need for experience using statistical tools for the study of social stratification. The foundations agreed with that diagnosis because they had no alternative sources of information besides Germani's own accounts and a few previous informed reports by visitors such as Ralph Beals. The combination of Germani's diagnosis and near biased information on the situation of local sociology before 1960 conditioned the later development of the discipline and the strong support for one specific program, which was considered the only possible one, eliminating any other alternative. Also, the protagonism of the GLADS should not be disregarded either.

Moreover, the information found at the Rockefeller Archive Center could be extremely useful to reconstruct a profile of Gino Germani according to the perceptions of the American foundations. Rather than his professional record, the Rockefeller and Ford foundations recognized his administrative skills. His background in economic affairs gave Germani an advantage that was valued by his sponsors. Although they recognized that Germani possibly sympathized with leftist

⁴² "JCLAS and Joint Committee on the FAFP Report...", 1971, op. cit, pp. v-vi.

ideas, none of them questioned his ideological orientation. However, they identified him as a confident person who could have occasional injudiciousness with local actors but he was always kind and responsible at international or institutional meetings. So, Germani acted as a man of “Public Relations” with the people or institutions that could help him develop a teaching program within a precarious and politically hazardous institutional space.

The question of whether Germani was able to establish appropriate alliances at the local level could be further discussed. But the RAC data illustrate that his international strategies were very successful. Moreover, the vision of Germani as a victimized or persecuted scholar likely helped in his success. This situation is even more comprehensive if the actors who blamed Germani (radical students, the Catholic church and right-wing groups that distrusted democracy) were not precisely friendly allies of the American academic institutions. Additionally, the American perception of Germani as a great scholar and researcher is not definitive. For instance, one RF report writer stated that he was a “little maladjusted professionally” because he was famous for having introduced empirical investigation in the country but he preferred teaching theory, although he demonstrated his research skills.⁴³

Furthermore, the case of Gino Germani could be analyzed from a useful model of science, in which it is a business activity rather than a battlefield where scientists look for credits and power guided by values. In that model the scientist develops science and research institutions when he or she efficiently looks for resources and uses them from an administrative viewpoint. Thus, a proficient scientist is an entrepreneur who applies managerial and marketing strategies in order to develop new rational fields (Latour and Woolgar, 1979). After the Second World War the American organizations, such as the RF, the FF and the SSRC, introduced a new administrative rationale in the international market of social sciences. Also, the expansion of governmental and semi-official agencies required the improvement of certain skills, such as managing budgets and empirical research on a grand scale. That model of institutional innovation and technical expertise was personified by Paul Lazarsfeld (Pollak, 1979). At that moment, the successful social scientists were obliged to understand that cognitive factors were inseparable from the organizational outlook. In addition, the research institutions should be thought of in terms of productivity, hierarchical structures and activities directed to fulfill contracts, use the funds rationally and satisfy the clients. Then, Gino Germani was the key person to assure the development of that rationality. However, the local universities were not sufficiently prepared to accept such types of logical changes.

Lastly, the data compiled in my research also helps in understanding the modernization of the social sciences on the basis of structural deficiencies of local institutions. The usual explanation for

⁴³ “CMH Diary with Silver”, May 8th, 1961, op. cit.

the collapse of Germani's project is related to institutional disruptions and political fights. Nevertheless, these reasons could be insufficient. On the other hand, the conflicting discussions among actors within sociology in Argentina during the early 1960s could not be exclusively reduced to ideology. Likely, local sociologists were not capable of finding shared legitimacy in their own professional field, so they looked for acceptance outside it. Accordingly, they had to look at networks from abroad in order to find channels of promoting sociological discussions, avoiding isolation and gaining institutional recognition. But that process could also be explained through the idea that the field developed so rapidly that the number of students of sociology increased faster than both the structure of the university and the size of job market. Germani was concerned about that and the American institutions took attentive notes of its possible dangerous outcomes.⁴⁴

Finally, the information found at the RAC should be contrasted with data from the Ford Foundation Archives, which contain useful information on the sociological activities in Argentina, not only at the UBA and the grant awarded by Ford, but also information on other local institutions. It covers in addition the actions of key players such as Pedro David, Bernardo Houssay, Alfredo Poviña and José Miguens. Consequently, those files could give an extra account of the establishment of international networks and the strategies and practices used by sociologists in Argentina to institute sociology as a science. Additionally, that data might provide a more inclusive explanation on how the international relationships shaped the institutional conditions in which sociology and empirical research in Argentina developed after the Second World War. Future research could supply more complete information on the "Germani affair" too. Also, the role of Houssay, who directed the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research, should be further studied, since he opposed Germani probably in a competition to be the "RF man" in Argentina. Furthermore, the data from the RF and the SSRC archives could provide an entire account of the creation and development of the Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), which Germani outlined in 1961, and after its constitution, in 1968, contributed enormously to the development of social sciences in the region (Oteiza, 1997).

References

- Barriga Ledesma, Alberto (1956) *El sistema interamericano. Su origen, evolución y reestructuración*, Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana, Quito.
- Berman, Edward (1983) *The ideology of philanthropy*, SUNY Press, Albany.
- Bernard, Luther Lee (1927) "The development and present tendencies of sociology in Argentina," in *Social Forces*, VI, 1, 1927, pp. 13-27.
- Bolaño, José María (1952) "Exposición de motivos," in Emile Durkheim, *Sociología y filosofía*, Instituto de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Kraft, Buenos Aires, 1952, pp. 8-13.

⁴⁴ "Interview between CMH and GG", March 15th, 1962, op. cit, p. 2.

- Bulmer, Martin (1982) "Support for sociology in the 1920's. The Laura Spelman Memorial," *The American Sociologist*, XVII, 4, 1982, pp. 185-192.
- Cueto, Marcos (1994) *Missionaries of science. The Rockefeller foundation and Latin America*, Indiana University Press, Indianapolis.
- Figuroa Román, Miguel (1950) *An Argentinian stand on integral planning*, Paper submitted to the National Planning Conference, American Society of Planning Officials, Los Angeles, 1950.
- Fisher, Donald (1993) *Fundamental development of the social sciences, Rockefeller philanthropy and the US SSRC*, University of Michigan Press, Michigan.
- Germani, Ana Alejandra (2004) "Algunos apuntes biográficos sobre la obra," in Gino Germani *Autoritarismo, fascismo y populismo nacional*, Temas, Buenos Aires, pp. 17-24.
- Germani, Gino (1959) "The development and present state of sociology in Latin America," in *Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology*, International Sociological Association, I, pp. 117-138.
- Germani, Gino (1961) *Departamento de sociología. Una etapa (1957-1962)*, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires.
- Latour, Bruno and Steve Woolgar (1979) *Laboratory life. The construction of scientific facts*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2nd edition, 1986.
- Mazon, Brigitte (1985) "La Fondation Rockefeller et les sciences sociales en France, 1925-1940," *Revue Française de sociologie*, XXVI, 1985, pp. 311-342.
- Miceli, Sergio (1995) *História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil*, Idesp, Sao Paulo, 2 Vols.
- Oteiza, Enrique (1997) *30º Aniversario de Clacso. Una experiencia latinoamericana de investigación colaborativa en ciencias sociales*, CLACSO, Buenos Aires, Mimeographed.
- Pollak, Michael (1979) "Paul F. Lazarsfeld Fondateur d'une multinationale scientifique," *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, Paris, 25, 1979, pp. 45-59.
- Poviña, Alfredo (1959) *Nueva historia de la sociología latinoamericana*, Assandri, Córdoba.
- Prewitt, Kenneth (1980) *The impact of the developing world upon US social science theory and methodology*, Conference on strengthening social science capacity in the developing areas, Bellagio.
- Salvatore, Ricardo (2002) "Early American visions of a hemispheric market in South America" in Berndt Ostendorf (ed) *Transnational America. The fading of borders in the Western Hemisphere*, Univertatsverlag, Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 45-64.
- Silbey, Elbridge (1974) *SSRC. The first fifty years*, SSRC, New York.
- SSRC (1951) *Fellows of the SSRC, 1925-1951*, New York.
- Staley, David (1995) "The Rockefeller foundation and the patronage of German Sociology, 1946-1955," *Minerva*, 33, 1995, pp. 251-264.
- Verón, Eliseo (1974) *Imperialismo, lucha de clases y conocimiento. 25 años de sociología en Argentina*, Tiempo Contemporáneo, Buenos Aires
- Vessuri, Hebe (1994) "Foreign Scientists, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Origins of Agricultural Science in Venezuela." *Minerva*, 32, 1994, pp. 267-296.
- Worcester, Kenton W. (2001) *Social Science Research Council, 1923- 1998*, SSRC, New York.