

Journal of Family History

<http://jfh.sagepub.com/>

Argentine Mothers and Fathers and the New Psychological Paradigm of Child-Rearing (1958-1973)

Isabella Cosse

Journal of Family History 2010 35: 180

DOI: 10.1177/0363199010363352

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jfh.sagepub.com/content/35/2/180>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Journal of Family History* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jfh.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jfh.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://jfh.sagepub.com/content/35/2/180.refs.html>

Argentine Mothers and Fathers and the New Psychological Paradigm of Child-Rearing (1958-1973)

Journal of Family History
35(2) 180-202
© The Author(s) 2010
Reprints and permission: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>
DOI: 10.1177/0363199010363352
<http://jfh.sagepub.com>



Isabella Cosse¹

Abstract

This article examines how mothers and fathers in Argentina dealt with the shift in child-rearing paradigm that occurred in the 1960s, drawing on the views of the parents themselves. The analysis is based on 1,100 questions posed by audiences in a series of conferences delivered by two renowned experts in the field, who championed the new parenting paradigm that advocated the psychologization of childcare. It also makes use of other sources, including books, articles, reports, and letters. On the one hand, the study reveals the complexity of the cultural change that affected ideas on child-rearing and family relations during that period. On the other, it shows that parents were key actors in this process and that they acted based on their own interpretations and experiences.

Keywords

family, sexuality, 1960s, Argentina, child-rearing

Introduction

Child-rearing advice has been a privileged source for researchers of family and women's history. Not only has such advice been used to understand the strategies of doctors, educators, and authorities involved in shaping the behavior of mothers and fathers, it has also been useful for the study of families and family dynamics. Recent research has linked these two concerns, with the aim of focusing instead on the interaction between parents and experts. This new approach assigns an active role to mothers and fathers and puts into question the role of experts, positing a more complex view of the power such experts wielded over parents.¹ These assumptions are particularly interesting for the study of the changes in child-rearing practices, gender roles, and family relations that occurred during the 1960s, and which, beyond any debates, are considered part of a cultural revolution that took on transnational proportions.

The few studies on Latin America in the 1960s have for the most part been centered on analyzing the political dimension, without looking into the changes in family dynamics and the way

¹Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas/Universidad de San Andrés

Corresponding Author:

Isabella Cosse, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas/Universidad de San Andrés Bulnes 1690 2E,
C1425DKG, Argentina
Email: isabella.cosse@gmail.com

people lived their everyday lives. The studies in that sense that do exist, however, show the importance of the family dimension. They point to changes in two directions. On the one hand, some countries experienced changes in family behaviors. This is the case of Mexico and Brazil, which underwent a demographic transition in a process marked by the peculiarities of the region. It was characterized most notably by the diversity of family structures that existed in line with the profound social, cultural, and ethnical differences that cut across Latin American societies, and by the influx of contraceptive measures implemented by the state or by civil-society or international organizations, following the dictates of the birth control policy promoted by the United States.² On the other hand, the conventional family and sexual morality of the time began to be questioned, in particular by young people, and especially among the middle class.³

Argentina, like other countries in the region, has been characterized since Colonial times by the coexistence of various forms of family organization, in which indigenous, Spanish, and Creole traditions converged, and which countered Catholic morality, as was reflected in the high proportion of households headed by women, the great number of children born out of wedlock, and the frequency of common-law couples. Such patterns were especially prevalent among the lower classes.⁴ However, in contrast to other countries of Latin America, during the first decades of the twentieth century Argentina saw a rapid and early demographic transition that affected birth rates for the whole nation (the number of children per woman dropped from 6.8 in 1869 to 5.3 in 1914 and to 3.2 in 1947), despite the fact that numerous segments of the population (among which there was a high proportion of out-of-wedlock births and a scarce presence of the state) maintained their high fertility rates. Buenos Aires led this trend in increasingly lower birth rates, bringing the number of children per woman from 3.4 in 1914 down to 1.5 in 1947.⁵

Simultaneously, those decades saw the height of the nuclear-family model based on a limited number of children, intensity of affection, and gender-based roles in which the wife was the homemaker and the husband the breadwinner. This model, called here the model of "domesticity," defined social norms.⁶ It seems to have been shaped by a unique convergence of state policies, religious dictates, regulations, the ideas of the upper classes, medical views, and the aspirations of respectability of new upwardly mobile sectors of society.⁷ As a result, domesticity was merged with the identity of the middle class, whose importance in the mid twentieth century was unquestionable, with sociological assessments placing it at 40.3 percent of the country's population.⁸

This family model achieved the rank of a natural and universal standard, becoming a normative benchmark against which all other forms of family organization were measured and stigmatized when they did not conform to it. However, family diversity remained unchanged. Many families did not, in fact, conform to the standards of domesticity: in 1960, 24 percent of all children were born out of wedlock, with the proportion dropping to 12 percent in the city of Buenos Aires. In the capital, moreover, there was a 27 percent discrepancy between available housing and the number of family units, which points to the difficulties of conforming to the nuclear pattern.⁹

Against this backdrop, the 1960s and the early 1970s have been seen as a time of cultural changes, a "turning point" from the height of the domesticity model to the consolidation of patterns of family organization based on new notions, such as divorce, the participation of women in the labor market, and the legitimization of common-law unions and out-of-wedlock births, which were all part of contemporary society.¹⁰ These changes included the consolidation of a new model of parenting or child-rearing that, while not completely unprecedented, as of the 1960s became more and more widespread. As will be discussed below, the new paradigm of child-rearing was influenced by psychology, strengthened the centrality of the child's individuality and autonomy, and rejected authoritarian disciplining practices.¹¹

Prior research has emphasized that the transformations in family values and practices were linked to a generational dimension and that they primarily affected segments of the middle class

that were open to modernization. More recent studies, however, have included sectors of the working class that were also open to change.¹² The position adopted with respect to this modernization divided Argentine society, where advances in this sense coexisted with significant moral and traditional crusades, which gained force under the democratic government of Arturo Frondizi (1958-1962) but were particularly strong during the dictatorship of General Juan Carlos Onganía (1966-1970). This repressive atmosphere did not emanate from the state alone, it was also fueled by numerous Catholic organizations, with a significant middle-class membership, that pushed for measures aimed at halting the changes in customs.¹³

These studies have for the most part prioritized the analysis of the groups who embraced cultural modernization, or of activists from leftist and feminist organizations, and from there have gone on to examine traditional actors. Few studies have focused their attention on the subjects that were targeted by the strategies of these elite groups and activist organizations. That is, the people who did not occupy positions of power but who unquestionably played a major role in this cultural change.¹⁴

The aim of this article is precisely to understand how mothers and fathers dealt with the shift in the child-rearing paradigm by drawing on testimonies from the parents themselves. This approach provides insight into the process of cultural change from the perspective of the very subjects targeted by the cultural and political elites. To do this, it examines questions posed by parents who attended the conferences and courses delivered by the experts Florencio Escardó and Eva Giberti, and which were preserved by Giberti in her files, along with other sources, such as letters, notes, articles, and books. Together, these two experts formed a couple who became an indisputable authority on the new method—much like Dr. Benjamin Spock in the United States—as their ideas spread to a very wide audience. The reason their ideas became so widespread is to be found in the importance they attributed to dissemination efforts, using both the mass media and conferences and talks, where they dealt not only with the subject of child-rearing but also with family relations and sexuality. A key element of the dynamics of such activities was the questions, which were posed by the audience in writing and gathered by the speakers to be answered later. They were then also used by the experts to evaluate the talks, learn what the public's problems were, and prepare future talks and articles for the general public.

Eva Giberti's file contains 975 notes with questions written by such participants. These notes are arranged in thirty-six envelopes, each presumably corresponding to a different event which dealt with various specific topics connected with child-rearing, sexuality (not just child sexuality), and family relations, and held between 1958 and 1973 (although the date on the envelopes in most cases appears to be an estimate).¹⁵ In all likelihood, this body of notes does not cover all the talks delivered by the two experts. But from the analysis of the material it is evident that the questions were not intentionally filtered to preserve a specific selection. Rather, what remains is a result of a filing that was done randomly, and the assortment of questions that was preserved is also a product of the effects of the passage of time. Some fifteen years later, the handwritten notes were entered into computer files by demographer Cecilia Añaños on request of Giberti herself, who originally intended to analyze the material. This study uses the computerized lists, which were first checked against the content of each set of physical notes, to verify, in particular, that the order, text, and original spelling had been maintained. Based on that comparison, the lists were completed with some envelopes with questions that had been left out.

The first step in the analysis of the questions was to draw up lists of different partial issues addressed by the questions. The questions were then processed statistically, applying a closed set of variables that systematized, when possible, the information pertaining to the event (place, date, subject), the person who posed the question (gender and relationship with the subject of the question), and the question (type of question, subject, and spelling). As some of the notes contained more than one question, they were considered individually, so that every question would

correspond to only one case. As a result, the 975 notes gave way to 1,100 cases, which indicates that the vast majority of the participants posed only one question at a time.

Several aspects were considered of key importance toward interpreting the material correctly, namely, putting each question into context by identifying the situation in which it was posed, evidencing the existence of a complex relationship between the content of the questions and reality, and detecting possible omissions and implicit content in each question. It was also useful to learn that some of the questions had been asked in courses and conferences for which no records were kept. Although this gap is irreparable, certain information was reconstructed from other sources that reveal—albeit from the speakers' perspective—the dynamics of the conference, how it was convened and the position of the authors on the issues discussed. These interpretative strategies proved useful to address the challenge of listening to the voices of mothers and fathers who were not in the center of the public eye, but who in their own way played a role in the changes in child-rearing practices, family dynamics, and everyday life that shook Argentine society in the 1960s.

Toward that end, the rest of this article is divided into four sections. The first section presents the experts Florencio Escardó and Eva Giberti, emphasizing their dissemination activities and the huge prestige they earned among the mass public. The second section describes the dynamics of the talks and courses, focusing on the role played by the questions and the different ways in which the audience worded their questions, as well as the social, cultural, and family characteristics of the audience. The third section examines the questions posed by mothers and fathers against the conceptualization of children's behavior in psychological terms. The last section deals with concerns regarding sexual education, one of the issues that most disturbed Argentine society at the time.

The questions evidence the confusion that the new paradigm caused parents by demanding that they modify their common sense regarding what constituted good parenting and the best way to raise their children.¹⁶ These parents adopted a range of attitudes, although overall they all tried to understand the new paradigm and use it to help them decide what was best for their children, while also taking into account their personal experiences. But the questions also shed light on a much wider reality. They show a society revolutionized by changes in values, and they allow for an approximation to the way in which people in general face cultural changes.

Escardó and Giberti in the Transformation of Child-Rearing Models

In 1962, Julio V., a father living in the capital, wrote Eva Giberti, telling her that in her articles published in *La Razón*, a mass circulation newspaper, he saw:

. . . reflected with crystal-clear clarity the image of my childhood, where there was a lack of understanding, affection and, shall we say, wisdom in my parents' efforts to bring up their child . . . which is why I'm very interested and excited to be able to use your articles as a guide and source of advice for the complex task of raising my three children.¹⁷

The letter has certain features that are typical of the time: the writer is a father who is active in his children's upbringing, convinced that he can raise them differently than his parents raised him, and attracted by the idea of mutual understanding between parents and children proposed by the new child-rearing model, which he had learned about through the media.

These ideas shook the foundations of a long-standing child-rearing model. In the 1930s, predominant childcare notions were based on eugenic views of child-rearing drawn from the field of medicine, which were promoted through the books of Emilio Coni and Gregorio Aráoz Alfaro.

But there were also other theories, such as the new school, that called for an active role of children in their own learning process, as well as a respect for individuality, and posited the existence of the child's innate goodness. However, as suggested by Marcela Borinsky, a new paradigm in which children were no longer considered from a Darwinian "biological" determinism and were instead understood in light of a "psychological" determinism, did not crystallize until the 1960s. With this approach, the new model assigned greater importance to the individuality and autonomy of children and rejected discipline based on authoritarianism.¹⁸

The consolidation of the new model was framed by the spread of psychoanalysis in the 1960s, which would turn Buenos Aires into one of the cities with the highest ratio of analysts per inhabitant, thus heightening the importance attributed to children's experiences in the shaping of their personality. Also key was the expansion of sociological interpretations, which diagnosed that the transition to modern societies was inevitable and produced strong tensions in family relations. This led to a revalorization of expert advice. Moreover, what these experts had to say had such a strong impact on society because of the journalistic renovation experienced by the media and because of the transnational scope of the cultural changes of the time. These two factors enabled a complex dynamics of appropriation and resignification of phenomena that originated in other parts of the world.¹⁹

Florencio Escardó was one of the leading figures behind this change in child-rearing model that occurred in the 1960s. A pediatrician with ties to the Socialist Party, by the 1960s Escardó had achieved great experience in the dissemination of new ideas to the mass public. As early as the late 1930s, he began contributing pieces to magazines such as *El Hogar* (The Home), *Hijo Mío* (My Child), and *Viva Cien Años* (Live to Be a Hundred), which catered to women and families. His public activity took on a political tone when, during the Peronist government, he sided with the opposition, resigning his university chair in 1946 and becoming actively critical of the government's health policy. With the demise of the Peronist government came the most important stage in his career. He occupied the posts of Dean of the School of Medicine (1958), Vice President of the University of Buenos Aires, and Head of the Seventeenth Ward of the "Dr. Ricardo Gutiérrez" Children's Hospital, which included the Second Professorship of Pediatrics and Child Care. Around that time, a new edition of his successful book *Anatomía de la familia* (Anatomy of the Family, first published in 1954) came out, followed by *Sexología de la familia* (Sexology of the Family, 1961). The two books, which were quickly sold out, showed the greater receptivity to interpretations from the fields of psychology and social sciences, in particular psychoanalysis and functionalism, which he incorporated into the new child-rearing methods.²⁰

Based on these interpretations, Escardó denounced that children were not considered full human beings and were seen instead as "provisional beings, who would one day become men and women," and that adults did not include them in their organization of the world. He called on parents and society to respect children's autonomy and their needs and rights (which included the rights to receive affection, play, and explore). He stressed, in particular, the differences that existed among children; underlined their specific ways of acting, thinking, and learning, which were dependant on their age; and censured the use of physical punishments and threats as methods of education. These ideas were articulated in a straightforward and challenging tone, which was supported by medical and scientific knowledge, and contested pre-established common sense notions, by, for example, minimizing the importance of tidiness and cleanliness in the home or criticizing the use of figures such as the "bogeyman" or other imaginary monsters to scare children into obedience.²¹

In the second half of the 1950s, Eva Giberti—a social worker trained in the University of Buenos Aires who also had an interest in journalism—worked for a brief period at the Children's Hospital, where she met Escardó, whom she would later fall in love with. By that time, the idea of a Parenting School had already been disseminated by the media, as is evident by the fact that a column under that name was featured regularly in the weekly publication *Veá y Lea* for several months in the year 1950. But the idea was truly popularized with the publication of a column signed by Giberti. She

started contributing to the newspaper *La Razón* in 1958, more or less on her return from a stay abroad, after completing a scholarship from the Pan American Sanitary Bureau at the International Children's Center. This was also around the time when she moved in with Escardó.²²

Giberti believed that her mission was to help parents raise their children to become socially adjusted and mentally healthy persons. Toward the end of the 1960s, this goal was incorporated into the much larger aim of changing society, as the transformation of the models of family relations was seen as a "domestic" revolution conceived as the essence of the "great transformations," which did not stem from "social upheaval" but rather from gradual changes occurring in each individual home. With this idea in mind and in line with Escardó, she proposed a psychologically centered program for raising children, based on the acceptance of each child's individuality and autonomy and the rejection of violence and authoritarianism in family relations, but which also maintained the gender-based roles of the homemaker mother and the breadwinning father.²³

With a flowing and appealing journalistic style, Giberti's column was a huge success that paved the way for the creation of a Parenting School. This was the term used to designate courses offered to mothers and fathers, such as those implemented in the United States and France that had been coordinated with family-centered policies of the 1940s that were further expanded when they were included in the recommendations issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).²⁴ In her travels, Giberti came into contact with the Parenting School in Paris, where she was able to observe the experience firsthand, allowing her to later develop a similar experience in Argentina.²⁵ She did so from her institutional position at the Seventeenth Ward and the Pediatrics Chair in the Children's Hospital, which, under Escardó's direction, pioneered the institutionalization of psychological care in medicine. The school's "mission was to serve the community through guidance and insight and by providing health care, understanding by health care the treatment of any physical, psychological and social deficiency, deficit or deterioration." Toward that end, courses for parents, practitioners, teenagers, and medical students were organized; medical and psychological care was provided through clinics; and instructive literature was published for distribution through the media.²⁶

The Parenting School was thus conceived as an instrument for spreading the new child-rearing paradigm, and was coordinated with its promoters' intense dissemination efforts in the media. In addition to her contributions in the newspaper *La Razón*, which were published until the year 1962, Giberti also wrote for women's magazines (such as *Para Ti* and *Vosotras*) and child-rearing magazines (*Nuestros Hijos*). The articles featured in these magazines were later published as the compilations *Escuela para padres* (Parenting School), in 1961, and *Adolescencia y educación sexual* (Adolescence and Sexual Education) in 1968, which sold a combined total of approximately 250,000 copies, not counting nonauthorized editions. During that time, Escardó was also active in the media, with both regular and sporadic contributions in such diverse publications as *Para Ti*, the traditional women's magazine, and *Primera Plana*, a magazine that imposed a new style of journalism with a modernizing discourse. The couple also made appearances in radio and television. Their greatest success was a program called *Tribunal de apelación* (Court of Appeals), where real-life cases were discussed and dramatized. In 1968, the program aired daily and in 1969 it gave way to a spin-off, *Tribunal para mayores* (Adults' Court), which was meant to deal with adult issues.²⁷

According to Escardó, journalism opened the door to thousands of homes that it would otherwise have been impossible to reach through clinical work. Similarly, on several occasions Giberti defended the importance of the multiplying effect of the media. They both repeatedly noted how their commitment to the media discredited them in the eyes of the medical and psychoanalytical communities, and explained that this was so because, as a result of their dissemination efforts, patients acquired certain knowledge that allowed them to question what their therapists said, thus undermining such therapists' authority.²⁸

The media boosted the attraction irradiated by the Escardó–Giberti couple, who, united at both the professional and personal levels, seemed to mutually complement each other, in line with the new ideals they promoted. Giberti would appear to the public photographed in a quarter profile that underscored her youth and beauty. She personified the modern woman, who prided herself in battling social prejudices and who achieved her full professional potential, but whose work, following the established ideal, was devoted to children and family care. Escardó's fame and prestige enhanced Giberti's reputation. The pediatrician challenged common sense and established norms, combining the restrictive style of a medical professional who is convinced of his truth with the expressions of a sensitive man. In that way, he was capable of waging a long battle so that mothers would be allowed to remain with their children when they were hospitalized, and of giving a class standing on his desk to represent the distance that separated children from grownups and the difference in perspectives that such distance created, as a way of explaining to his students what it was like to be a child.²⁹ In short, the couple itself symbolized the foundations of the new method and the new style of family relations that they advocated.

Talks, Audience, and Questions

The experts' focus on dissemination not only led them to an intense activity in the media, but to deliver numerous talks, conferences, and courses, developing a communication style that spread in the early 1960s, generating a back-and-forth interaction with the changes that permeated family relations.

These activities were conducted in the institutional framework of the Children's Hospital, one of most prestigious health centers in the city, where parents with few resources could turn to, and the Pediatrics Chair of the University of Buenos Aires' School of Medicine, where courses were of a formal nature but were also coordinated with a broad range of organizations, which, even in 1960, included the Liga de Padres de Familia (League of Parents), a body created by the Catholic Church to defend family and Catholic morality, and the Club de Rotarios (Rotary Club), the well-known charity and social institution, among others. In this diversity, Jewish organizations played a particularly important role, as is shown by the fact that most institutions identified in the questions belong to that religious denomination. An aspect that points to the diversity of the audience is the fact that two of the conferences for which there are questions were held in factories, although no other information on these conferences was preserved in the files.³⁰

To a large extent, the success of the talks was because of Escardó's and Giberti's popularity. In some occasions they worked together, while in others they worked individually or accompanied by other educators, such as Marta Bocaccio, Silvia Zeigner, and T. Perussi, who gave some classes or performed support tasks. Activities varied depending on the work dynamics and length of the course. There were medium-length courses, which, at least when they were sponsored by civil society organizations, could be paid courses, whose dynamics consisted in lecture-format classes (where students could interrupt with questions or comments, but dialogues were not encouraged), followed by discussions in groups, which in some texts were referred to as "working" groups. Based on a method by Enrique Pichon Rivière, a renowned psychoanalyst, these groups were conceived simultaneously as a teaching and a therapeutic instrument, although they only moved on to psychological interpretation if and when the group worked for more than three months. There were also talks that involved the presentation of a specific topic, followed by questions from the public, without any working groups being formed.³¹

The questions from the public were of utmost importance in these activities. In the talks, they represented the only space opened for participation from the public. After the speaker finished delivering the lecture, there would be a ten-minute break in which sheets of paper would be passed around for the audience to write questions in. This meant that it was assumed that participants

could write well enough to articulate their questions in writing, and was thus a form of exclusion for anyone who could not. According to Giberti, this exercise prevented interruptions that might disrupt the presentation by generating tensions or debates that could not be adequately solved because of the time constraints of these talks, which were limited to a single meeting. This, she felt, would leave the audience confused or distressed. In the “working groups,” instead, participants were expected to play an active role, not only by posing their own questions, but also by expressing their opinions and giving their own interpretations. In both cases, the questions were analyzed by the experts to reflect on the dynamics of the activities and to understand the problems and needs of the parents. There is, in fact, a significant connection between the issues dealt with in the journalistic pieces and the questions from the public. The readers of the newspaper *La Razón* and other publications also sent in their questions, writing directly to Giberti and asking her to respond through an article. This was the case, for example, of a young girl who wanted help convincing her parents that they needed to respect their children’s love choices, or of a woman who sought help in explaining to her future husband that she was not a virgin.³²

The public varied in line with the sponsoring institution, the type of activity, and the venue where it was held. While the talks could attract dozens of people, the working groups could be formed with as little as three married couples or half a dozen mothers. Although there were unmarried couples who participated in some of the talks, according to a question from the public, on at least one occasion single persons were excluded from participating. This exclusion was consistent with the censure that prevailed in such media as the cinema and the traditionalistic impulses that ran parallel to the movements of cultural modernization in Argentina, as indicated above. The activities privileged the involvement of women, who were considered the true artifices of any transformation as it was taken for granted that they had a maternal nature, an idea that they themselves had incorporated to the point that they signed their letters “mom.” Women were the most involved participants and probably made up the bulk of the public, as is revealed by the fact that 230 of the 288 questions in which the writer’s gender is identifiable were posed by women. This does not mean that fathers took no interest in the rearing of their children, but rather that they played a different role: they participated in the important decisions and left it up to their wives to put the new method into practice.³³ It should not come as a surprise that in some cases their participation was the result of the women’s insistence, as is suggested by the following question from a mother: “What can I do to bring the kids’ dad to a conference like this? I came alone this time, but in the future I’d like to come with him.”³⁴

According to Giberti, her public came from different social backgrounds. However, the images she chose to use as examples in her books were fairly uniform in terms of family organization and social status, and the public was meant to identify with these pictures. Although Giberti spoke of working mothers, the typical situation that was expected was that of a couple with two or three children, in which the woman was the homemaker and the man the breadwinner, and whose needs were sufficiently covered, but who had to make efforts to save, as is indicated by frequent references to the smallness of the house and the difficulties to go on vacation. But Giberti established a difference between this social universe and that of the “villas miseria” (the term used for shantytowns in Argentina), with their “brown-skinned” children, which were portrayed as the Other, who nonetheless was not to be discriminated against, an attitude that the author considered widespread.³⁵ In sum, the aim was to portray a family that was far from being affluent but who was also far from being poor, situating it instead in an intermediate level of the social pyramid. Interestingly enough, this view excluded the numerous families that lived outside the family pattern of domesticity, which, as seen above, was reflected in the high proportion of illegitimate births nationwide, or in the disproportion between the number of houses and the number of families in the city of Buenos Aires. The fact that Giberti omitted these realities suggests that she did not feel it was necessary to mention them to achieve the public’s identification with the proposal, thus

revealing the hegemony of the nuclear model in terms of social norms, but also, perhaps, in terms of the ideal concept of family that she believed her target public had.

An analysis of the questions to determine the social makeup of the public reveals a more complex panorama. Many families were in a good enough financial position to send their children to double-shift private schools (of the institutions identified, five were Jewish schools of this kind) and others were able to pay for foreign language courses and physical activities in private gyms, as can be gathered from the questions. It was also possible that they had domestic help, as is revealed by concerns over their children's relationship with the "maid" or "domestic," and there were even some who announced plans to travel to such places as Paris. But there were also working-class families (again, at least two of the talks were organized in factories), married couples who had to sleep in the same room as their children because of a lack of space, and mothers who worried about the effects that an absent father would have on their children.³⁶

Given this diversity it is surprising that only 7 percent of the questions had spelling mistakes or were poorly written (with most mistakes being minor, such as lack of agreement in plurals, omitted accents, and awkward expressions) and that 10 percent even used terms taken from psychological jargon, which is a significant proportion even allowing for the possibility that the participants could have heard them at the conference itself. But naturally the fact that the questions had to be written down was in itself a form of exclusion. In any case, the exercise probably could not have been conducted with an audience that was mostly illiterate. Thus it is safe to assume that the public would have to have known how to read and write relatively well and be articulate enough to pose questions about the new system of ideas proposed by psychology (but as will be seen below, that did not mean it was easy for them to incorporate such system). The segmentation was also produced by the very possibility of being able to think about that dimension of child-rearing, as—returning to Julia Grant's idea—many mothers and fathers could only concern themselves with the most primary issues of their children's well-being.³⁷ But it is also true that to learn about the new child-rearing methods, Escardó's and Giberti's public had to attend a conference or take a course, as opposed to coming into contact with it through individual therapy or by reading specialized literature, which at the time was abundant, at least in the country's most important cities. That is, it was a public open to cultural modernization but that did not belong to the sectors that were spearheading such process. Moreover, the public's profile seems to have varied over time. Indeed, of the twenty-five events conducted prior to 1970, only one was identified as taking place in a factory and none outside the capital, while of the nine that were held after that year, one was held in a factory—which in this case represents a higher proportion—and two were held outside the capital, thus suggesting a broader social and geographical scope.³⁸

The questions also show that families were organized differently. With respect to their makeup, many married couples lived alone with their children, but there were also others who shared their home with a grandparent or another relative. It is nonetheless revealing that 98 percent of the questions that describe specific family situations dealt with children or the couple and only 2 percent referred to a relationship with other family members, such as grandparents or mother-in-laws. There were also concerns regarding dynamics outside the established family model, as is revealed by the questions on divorce, separations, and new unions (2 percent), and on absentee fathers and orphans (3 percent), which at that time were often ways of referring to households headed by women. Particularly telling of the atmosphere inside the home are the questions that describe specific situations of violence, authoritarianism, and mutual undermining of authority between parents (2 percent), absence of love and communication (4 percent), concerns over the woman working and changes in the couple's gender roles (2 percent).³⁹

This shows that the public had different family situations. However, they all had a common denominator: their interest in the new views on child-rearing and family. Also, the fact that only 4 percent of the notes contained open criticism or personal opinions suggests that the authority

of the speakers was not easily challenged and that the most critical participants probably preferred to avoid a confrontation, even shielded by anonymity, with those who, from their position on the podium, vehemently discredited the old methods of child-rearing, grounded in science and modern ideas. But, again, this did not prevent some members of the public from voicing their disagreement.

It is, however, symptomatic that the vast majority of the notes contained a question. On the one hand, there were questions posed in abstract terms (53 percent), and on the other there were questions that described a specific situation involving the person who was asking the question (42 percent). In this case, 6 percent of the questions referred to problems that exclusively affected the asker, 33 percent had to do with the asker's children, 4 percent referred to the relationship between children and their parents, and only 2 percent dealt with problems affecting the couple (unrelated to the children), and another 2 percent referred to problems with other relatives (mother-in-laws, grandparents, etc.). Not surprisingly, the proportion of abstract questions increased in the talks about sexuality, although it is possible that they may have been suggested by their personal life experience, as was the case with somebody who asked why "in order to achieve the level of arousal necessary for ideal intercourse many people had to resort to morbid images," or someone who asked "if it was in any way harmful for a woman, now or in the future, to refrain from having sex until she was, say, 25 or a little older."⁴⁰ In contrast, the questions regarding children were open, direct, and full of details. These questions were asked from a position of belief in the advantages offered by the new method. But behind this conviction, there was a host of uncertainties, doubts, and fears, among which the most revealing were those referring to children's behavior and sexual education.

Children: A Riddle Waiting to Be Solved

The new child-rearing paradigm embodied by Escardó and Giberti was presented as a drastic rupture from previous conceptions of childhood. Psychology had discovered that whatever a person experienced during the first five years of life was imprinted "permanently into the psyche" and that such experience explained disorders, such as failure to adjust socially, neurosis, and criminal tendencies. For children to become "well-adjusted," "self-fulfilled," "balanced," and "happy" human beings, their parents not only had to provide a "happy," "healthy," and "fertile" home life (without "authoritarianisms" or "aggressions") but they should also be able to understand the special needs, languages, and demands of children. Parents should also be aware that their own imbalances had serious consequences for their children as, in line with Pichon Rivière's ideas, psychological (and often physiological) problems are the product of unhealthy family dynamics.⁴¹

These ideas demanded a change in the way children's behavior was valued. The notions of "good" or "bad," "obedient" or "disobedient," and "well-behaved" or "bad-mannered" had to be discarded in favor of an evaluation that determined a "normal" or "pathological" nature, based on a psychological interpretation. Using examples from Giberti herself, this meant understanding that children did not misbehave "just because," but rather that their behavior expressed the problems that they experienced at a certain stage of their development: behind their "tantrums" there could be a need for maternal love; their refusal to eat could be because of their mother's smothering attention; bad grades in school could be a result of violent intra-family relations.⁴² As noted above, the new paradigm presupposed the idea that children are human beings with special needs, rights, and their own ways of acting and thinking, which varied according to their age.

Parents reacted differently to these ideas. As these were forums presided by figures who championed these transformations, there were not many in the audience who dared to speak against the innovations, much less categorically and directly. Rather, any objections that arose

took the form of a query regarding specific aspects that highlighted the errors, inconsistencies, and limitations of the new paradigm. Three examples illustrate the different ways in which such criticism was expressed. In one case, a mother or father wrote to Escardó posing the following dilemma:

Doctor, you say that we must let teenagers be. If they want to sleep till noon, we have to let them; but behind letting them be there's something anarchic. And my question is, how do you maintain discipline and order in the home when there are also younger children in the family?

The question is evidently rhetorical, a way of arguing against the importance given to autonomy in the new paradigm, from the perspective of the form of discipline upheld by the established common sense. Different was the position of another parent who, regarding the idea that children should not be allowed to play with toy guns, asked Giberti to what extent one should apply "the idea of the influence of the environment," immediately clarifying that he or she referred to the problems that children could encounter if they "felt they were the weird kid on the block." The question reveals the typical opinion of a mother or father who dared to doubt if it was indeed a good idea to forbid their children from playing with toy guns. However, the parent was not against the idea of forbidding children from playing violent games, but was rather wary of the effects that such prohibition could have on children in terms of their relationship with their peers and in terms of their social segregation. In this case, the writer also clearly hesitates when articulating the idea, thus revealing the difficulties parents had in contradicting the speaker.⁴³ Lastly, this form of challenging what the experts said through queries regarding specific aspects was also used to criticize from the opposite standpoint. Instead of calling for more moderate changes, these critics demanded a more radical stance from the speakers. They noted, as will be seen below, contradictions within the system of ideas, and between the system and the practical guidelines given by the experts.

There were also mothers and fathers who were convinced of the need to understand the new paradigm. This conviction opened up a whole range of problems that were expressed through contradictions, hesitations, and fears felt by parents toward the changes. It is revealing that the contradictions were not always conceived as such, as is evident from the fact that parents often used their own common sense to evaluate or filter any new ideas or aspects, or tried to merge the two paradigms. This is evident, for example, in a parent who asked if it was right to physically punish a child when there was a "justified reason," or if it was possible to shield children "from all their parents' neuroses by sending them away to boarding school."⁴⁴ Both questions reveal parents who were receptive to the new ideas (such as the rejection of physical violence and the importance of the mental well-being of the parents), but who combined them with the prevailing common sense (which these ideas challenged) that was based on the idea of a punishment-based discipline and on violence and confinement as a way of applying it. This shows that parents incorporated the new paradigm's ideas from the prevailing common sense and that they tried to reconcile both models, without fully perceiving the contradictions between the two.

Other parents, instead, were fully conscious of just how radical the innovation was. That situation awakened strong doubts over the complexities that were involved in raising children under the new model. Mothers and fathers discovered that it was not enough to provide adequate living conditions and raise children with affection and firmness, but that they also needed to consider the psychological aspects of such guidelines and be capable of decoding their children's behavior from that perspective. As was revealed by the possibility—however infrequent—of sending a child off to boarding school so that he or she would not be affected by their parent's neuroses, the

idea that the future of children depended on their parents' psychological stability was a scary thought. These fears were exacerbated when they realized that changing the conditions prevailing in the home was not easy. This is evident in the following note:

With two-year-olds, whose independence and liberty are almost completely restricted, is a solution possible without totally changing the primary group, the family, grandparents, etc.?⁴⁵

That is, the task of raising their children opened these parents up to an introspection into their own lives and their relationship as a couple, which was extended to the way they themselves had been raised and to their relationship with their own parents.

At the root of these concerns was the absolute conviction that a change in paradigm was both necessary and inevitable, which is why such fears led many of these parents to try to understand the new concepts. It is interesting, then, to reflect on what the effort to incorporate them meant for parents. In the first place, the behavior of children became for them a riddle that needed to be solved, which is why they observed their children—sometimes to the point of obsession—with the aim of obtaining information to evaluate their conduct. But the problem was that they lacked the parameters to do it. As one mother or father explained in one of the talks: “innovators are almost always misfits, which is why they create change,” so we need to ask ourselves “where the limit between a pathological misfit and an innovator is.”⁴⁶ The lack of parameters to identify the nature of their children's behavior explains the repeated use of certain expressions (“Is it normal?”; “What does it mean?”; “How would you explain this?”; “Why?”) that evidence confusion over a wide variety of situations, reactions, and behaviors that ranged from difficulties in convincing a child to take his medicine, weaning a toddler off the pacifier, or dealing with a bed-wetter, to what it meant when a five-year-old girl told her mother that she was going to “throw her away like a rag” or when a fourteen-year-old boy refused to study because he did not want to be like his parents.⁴⁷ The confusion was directly related to the existence of interpretative keys of a psychological nature, which had to be discovered to be able to understand children and react appropriately. In this way there were concepts, like neurosis or psychosis—commonly heard by parents as a result of the spread of psychoanalysis—that were important for them to be able to assess how normal their children were.

What does it mean when a two- or three-year-old takes all the wheels off his toy cars? Does it have some psychoanalytical meaning?

What do you make of a child who, like a psychopath, holds on to his friends so that they'll do what he wants, even if it's not necessary something evil?⁴⁸

The questions were thus aimed at understanding what to do when faced with specific issues (and in some cases at settling an argument between parents with the help of an expert opinion) by figuring out the interpretative keys of the new paradigm and the possible effects of the attitude they adopted and the atmosphere at home. But, above all, they were aimed at determining whether a child's behavior was normal or pathological, by asking two of the most renowned authorities on the subject. They held a truth that parents believed they needed to grasp, as is evident from the few disagreements and the many doubts contained in the questions.

Secondly, the request for a diagnosis was linked to a desire for clear and concrete guidelines. Giberti was not wrong when she said that her audience wanted to be told what to do with their children. There are phrases that are repeated over and over again (“How would you react?”; “What can be done?”; “What would your advice be?”), used, once again, to refer to a wide

range of aspects that were all mingled together, as can be seen in the following query posed by the same person all at once:

What's the best moment to toilet train a child and take away the pacifier? What's the best attitude? Does a working mother mean trouble for the family? Are two schools a good idea? Is it necessary to give them a musical education?⁴⁹

These questions suggest that for this parent, every little aspect of raising their children had to be reconsidered in light of a common sense that was being firmly challenged, which was why they sought practical, clear, and precise guidelines in line with what Escardó and Giberti offered.

The problem was that these prescriptions did not always have the expected results, like in the case of a mother who, on Escardó's suggestion, had taken the glass away from her son when he refused to drink his milk, but who had been surprised to find that instead of achieving the expected reaction on the following day, which was that the child would drink his milk when it was brought to him, her son simply asked her to take it away, without making any effort to drink it. That is, the experience itself undermined the reliability of the new method and generated new uncertainties.

Thirdly, the parents' conviction of the validity of the new model combined with the difficulties of appropriating it with the speed that raising a child demanded could lead to a loss of common sense. This can be seen in the following question: "Should we leave the child entirely to his own free will, that is, to do whatever he wants?"⁵⁰ The confusion was seemingly aggravated by the fact that by rejecting violence as a strategy to correct a child's misconduct, some parents were left with no mechanisms at all to resort to, or they were even paralyzed to the point that they were willing to allow situations that were even dangerous, such as the one described by this mother:

My boy is two. Every day he climbs onto the oven door—which he lowers when the oven is turned off—and he stays for long stretches of time next to me, watching me cook. We explain to him that this is dangerous, but it's no use. How can we reconcile the risk of him being near the fire with our decision not to hit him or force him to do something against his will?⁵¹

Naturally, this situation in which loss of common sense entails risk for the child was not frequent, but it does show that for mothers and fathers willing to embrace the changes, child-rearing had become an enigma and their children a riddle waiting to be solved. The transformations had produced a profound disturbance that shook the prevailing common sense, opening up contradictions, hesitations, and confusion.

The Challenge of Sexual Education

Sexual education was especially relevant because it made parents face one of the most disturbing aspects of the new child-rearing model. This explains why the issue was a key concern for parents, as is evident from the fact that 13 percent of the questions dealt explicitly with sexual education and another 12 percent referred to specific problems of child and adolescent sexuality (such as masturbation, virginity, menstruation, nocturnal emissions, etc.) and the development of gender identity.⁵²

This high proportion is also because of the importance that Escardó and Giberti gave to these issues in their talks. The talks themselves were not transcribed into writing, but the ideas expressed

in them can be inferred from other materials and from the questions from the public. Escardó offered a comprehensive look at sexuality that included a physiological description, followed by sexology notions that established what a “healthy” sexual relation was like, and culminated in a description of the stages of a child’s sexual development (from a psychoanalytical perspective). Based on these, he explained how parents should handle their children’s and adolescents’ manifestations of sexuality and their different requests for information, according to the various forms assumed by the “libido” in each stage of development (oral, anal, and genital). In this way, for example, he held that suctioning instincts should not be repressed because they channeled sexual energy during infancy (but that they should be repressed after the child turned one, to avoid stunting their sexual maturity), and neither should sexual experimentations, provided they were a passing stage (otherwise parents should consult their pediatrician). Children’s sexual curiosity and the manifestation of their sexual instincts were considered natural and normal, then, so lying to children or forcing them to repress themselves could lead to psychological problems (in particular, neurosis), in addition to fueling social prejudices. Giberti, instead, focused more on issues that had to do with sexual education and child sexuality, to the detriment of sexology aspects or a physiological dimension. Also, at first she adopted a different view with respect to child sexuality. She initially played down the more shocking aspects of Freud’s ideas by maintaining that children made a “physical abstraction of mom’s and dad’s anatomy” and that sexual connections to their parents only existed at the fantasy level. But she eventually incorporated them, as can be seen in a 1969 compilation that included a description similar to Escardó’s, in which the psychoanalytical perspective and an openness to discuss sexuality predominated. Beyond this difference, they both agreed that sexuality should be understood as condensing the physical, mental, and social characteristics that defined one’s gender identity (then called sexual identity) and that began before birth, distinguishing it from genitality, a term that referred to the sexual act. From where it followed that the main objective of sexual education should be to guarantee that a person’s “sexual identity” (whether masculine or feminine) be in accordance with their biological sex, in addition to forming adults who were capable of responsibly giving and receiving sexual pleasure, which entailed having a stable relationship as a couple and even their union through the institution of marriage.⁵³

These ideas were apparently incorporated into the talks, as can be gathered from the questions posed by the public, for whom they were new and disconcerting. They were disconcerting for many reasons: the problems described could range from the appropriate age for putting boys and girls in different bedrooms and how to deal with masturbation, to issues of possible gender-identity confusion. The fears increased with adolescents, with the added questions regarding a girl’s virginity and a boy’s initiation. Two of these concerns will be considered here: the issue of how to explain reproduction to children, and that of how to deal with manifestations of sexual curiosity in childhood.

Most of the questions that had anything to do with sexual education revealed a consensus on how important and necessary it was. This should not come as a surprise, as it was expressed by parents who willingly came to hear two of the most renowned advocators of sexual education. But what is more, in a general context of increasing consensus over the importance of sexual education, parents could, for that very same reason, have decided to attend these talks with an open mind and an expectant attitude toward the subject. In this sense, the fact that parents felt wary about the consequences of having lied to their children on this subject or were concerned because their children had not raised any questions about it is in itself revealing. It even worried a mother of a one-year-old child, whose vocabulary could hardly be made up of more than a few words and was thus not capable of articulating such questions.⁵⁴

Now, then, it was one thing to accept the importance of sexual education and quite another to put it into practice. This problem appeared in the form of a complaint in one of the notes: “We agree that sexual education must begin with the first question a child asks, but nobody tells us

how we should do this.”⁵⁵ That is, parents needed help solving the problem of how to approach their children and what to say to them on the subject of sexuality.

Giberti seems to have gradually changed her answer to this request over time. Her initial position, according to *Escuelas para padres* (1961, first edition), was limited to the explanation that babies came from the mother’s belly and that the father planted the seed in the mommy. In 1968 she seems to have adjusted the answer she gave parents, offering a more elaborate solution. This was probably the result of increasing demands, the experience she had gained over several years and the greater consensus over the importance of sexual education. By then, according to a presentation by Giberti in a *Sexology Workshop* in Chile and Escardó’s childcare manual, they both offered a series of answers that gradually increased in complexity, each adding new details, although overall they still provided a simplified view. They explained that the first question (“Where did I come from?”) was an existential one and that the appropriate answer was to say that mom and dad had wanted to have a child, had married, lived together, and created the child together (leaving it up to the parents to decide whether to say that they had asked God for a child, if they were religious). The next two questions (“Where are babies made?” and “How do they come out?”) were of a psychological nature, and it was necessary to explain to children that babies were formed in the womb, that the baby expanded the genital orifice when it was ready to come out and that the doctor helped bring it out. The fourth question had a “sexology” connotation (“How did the baby get in?”), and the explanation that should be given was that “Daddy put a juice in mommy’s ‘girl parts’ with his ‘thing’ and together with mommy’s juice an egg was created from which a child was then formed.”⁵⁶ These instructions evidently presupposed that the natural space for reproduction was a family formed by a legitimate marriage, an idea that contrasted, as was seen above, with the experience of numerous sectors of the population, even if the questions only mentioned that aspect explicitly in reference to “others,” such as the domestic.

But beyond such considerations, the practical suggestions given did not put the parents’ minds at ease. On the contrary, they intensified their fears as they anticipated the reactions that such answers could elicit from their children. Again, many parents used different expressions to pose the same question:

According to your explanation, when our children ask us where they came from, we have to explain how the parents had sexual intercourse. So don’t you think there’s a risk that the child might want to experiment and see if he or she can make babies too?

If we were to teach a child that daddy puts his “pee-pee” in mommy’s “window” and that a drop fell there to form the baby, what happens if the boy wants to try it out with his siblings or with somebody else?⁵⁷

Escardó replied that they only needed to “think a little to realize the inconsistency of this concern”—which was quite a frequent one—because the possibility of having intercourse did not stem from information but from biological and personal maturity, which children lacked, as was evident from their “hormonal capacity.” Moreover, Giberti argued that parents were projecting their own prejudices onto their children’s reactions. But parents were not satisfied with these explanations. As will be seen below, the key problem did not lie in the possibility that their children would reproduce but in the long-term effects that the manifestations of sexuality could have on the children’s moral development, and the short-term effects they could have on the family’s respectability.

The sexual education of their children posed an unprecedented challenge to parents, as they themselves had been raised at a time in which sex was associated with the universe of the socially forbidden, concealed and punishable, so that there was a ban on addressing the

subject in open and straightforward terms, to the extent that when these parents were young, children were told by their parents that they were going to “buy” a little brother or sister or even that the stork was going to bring them a little brother or sister. For this reason the very idea of speaking to their children about sexuality entailed adopting a perspective that was radically different from the moral paradigm under which they had been brought up, as a father says in one the notes:

Is it really a good idea to explain the sexual act to a child that hasn't reached puberty yet? I mean when a kid asks questions and that way learns from his parents all about how he came into the world, is it also really necessary to be as candid about the sexual act as you suggested in previous talks?

When my five-year-old asked me where babies came from, I told him that mommy and daddy had made him and I explained to him where he'd been formed, but then he asked me how babies came out, and I changed the subject. I'm afraid he'll bring it up again and I won't know what to say!

As a mother I was put off by the explanation of how children are made. Is there any other way to explain it? And what common terms can I use to call the female genitals?⁵⁸

These difficulties arose even if the parents accepted the importance of talking about sexuality in straightforward terms and of obtaining information to do so. Thus, for example, the mother who asked if there was another way of explaining “how children are made,” because she was “put off” by the explanation offered. The same thing happened to a mother who read Giberti's articles and said they had helped her avoid “all those lies that children are often told, like the stork fable,” but that she “couldn't find a way” to talk to her nine-year-old girl about menstruation, despite having heard and read about how to do it.⁵⁹ As these mothers revealed, the problem did not only lie in their lack of knowledge, but also in the difficulties of crossing the threshold of the ban on sexuality.

To make matters worse, many parents discovered that the formulas proposed did not necessarily work. On the contrary, personal experience told them that it could lead to new problems as they faced their children's insatiable curiosity and had to deal with new questions that arose from their children's line of reasoning. A mother, for example, said:

Doctor, I explained to my little nine-year-old girl more or less what you said we should tell her about giving birth (and) it scared her so much that she declared she's never going to have children because it would be too painful. Why is that?⁶⁰

In sum, the simple guidelines given by Escardó and Giberti often turned out to be useless for parents. This was in part because of the fact that these were instructions meant for parents to give answers that required a grasp of a number of complex ideas and information, which would enable parents to react for themselves independently and quickly in the face of unpredictable situations posed by children. And it was in part because of the fact that they imposed on parents the obligation of talking about a subject that, when they were socialized, had been associated with sin, the forbidden, and the secret, a situation that they had only began to question recently; but, also, because the new ideas did not take into account the cultural context in which these parents and children lived.

The core of the problems that had to do with handling children's manifestations of sexuality brought to the surface deeper difficulties. In fact, as Escardó and Giberti explained, parents could impart sexual education explicitly or implicitly in their reactions to everyday situations involving

their children's sexuality, which ranged from awareness of their genitals to the development of their gender identity. Again, the issue opened up a huge range of problems for parents, among which the most interesting were those involving auto-eroticism, sexual games, and nudity.

The idea that repressing sexual curiosity could lead to psychological disorders implied a complete shift in established ideas. As a mother explained:

I have two girls, who are three and four years old, and one time some boys came over to play with them. They're five and I noticed that when they go to the bathroom they feel curious and want to see each other. Do you think this is normal or should I try to prevent it?⁶¹

This question shows that the new paradigm of sexual education made them uncomfortable and that they felt it could threaten their social respectability. The complexity of the situation is evident in a letter from a reader, Héctor S., to Eva Giberti. Hector S. lived with his family (formed by himself, his wife, two daughters, and the grandmother) in Saavedra, a remote neighborhood of the capital, in a two-room apartment, which meant that the couple had to sleep in the same room as the girls. He says in the letter that they were in the process of building their own house, a clarification meant to indicate that they were taking steps to solve "the problem of promiscuity that so worries me." Although he used the term "promiscuity" as synonymous with overcrowded quarters, this line of reasoning echoes the well-known association between poverty, promiscuity, and immorality. The clarification was relevant because the letter was motivated by accusatory insinuations made by their neighbors, a married couple for whom the fact that they shared a room with their girls explained why they had found the older one (aged about seven) "pulling up her pants" in front of their own daughter. Interestingly, the year before a similar situation had occurred, with the "accusing" couple's seven-year-old boy pulling down the underpants of the daughter of the "accused" couple. But on that occasion, the girl's parents had merely asked the boy's parents to watch the kids when they played and had only cautioned their own child mildly and "without malice." That is, Hector S. and his wife only worried when this second episode occurred as the initiative had come from their daughter, who had shown a curiosity that could be considered boyish (a fear that seems to be betrayed by the phrase "pulling up her pants"), and had given way to accusations of the family's immorality. Regardless of Giberti's answer, the letter shows the interconnection between sexual manifestations, gender perceptions, respectability, and social status. With the letter, the father was looking for a confirmation that his daughter was normal and that she had behaved correctly, but, above all, he wanted the expert to exonerate them from the accusations that were triggered by their daughter's sexual curiosity, which seemed to discredit the couple morally and socially.⁶²

According to the questions from the public, parents were not only worried about such extreme situations, but were also concerned about other, more mundane situations. Particularly relevant in this sense are the questions regarding children seeing their parents naked or vice versa, or children seeing each other naked. Mothers and fathers both asked, for example, until what age was it appropriate for brothers and sisters to sleep in the same room, or if parents should show themselves naked in front of their children.

The problem took on particular importance as Escardó and Giberti had contradictory opinions on the subject. On the one hand, they recommended that from an early age children be made aware of their genitals (which they should identify with simple names that would sound familiar to the children) and of the differences that existed between a boy and a girl. They suggested that children should watch when a baby's diapers were changed, that they take baths with their siblings of the opposite sex, and that when they were about eight or nine, they be allowed to see their parents naked. But on the other hand, they warned that joint baths should be

suspended at the age of three or four and that parents should not intentionally show themselves naked, rather that the child should “walk in on them” naked, that is, stumble on them naked by chance. What is more, they claimed that it was negative for parents to be naked in front of their children because such exposure went against the notions of modesty that prevailed in Argentina and hurt the (innate) “sensitivity” of children. Nudity could only be accepted if it was a “philosophy of the family,” because, otherwise, according to Giberti, it was a “dangerous psychological avant-garde idea.”⁶³

This position raised questions among parents, which evidenced the difficulties they had in preventing their children from seeing them naked, as occurred, for example, in the changing rooms at the gym, and revealed the contradictions that banning nudity had with respect to the very foundations of the new child-rearing model, such as the rejection of hypocrisy and prejudices in favor of a candid and open attitude. One parent asked if such an attitude would not give children the idea that their father was doing something wrong in the bathroom, and another parent refuted as follows the reasons for not letting children see their parents naked:

You say that when children see their parents naked they don't see naked bodies, they see mom and dad. So then, what is the problem of seeing precisely that: their mom and dad naked? After all, parents see their kids naked. Wouldn't it be ideal to show children that genitals are no different than an arm or a leg, say, and so there's no reason to hide them?⁶⁴

These questions show that parents had a different attitude. They had incorporated the idea that nothing should be concealed from children, that sexuality was a central part of life, and that they had to combat prejudices. That stood in stark contradiction to the recommendation of preventing children from seeing their parents naked. Thus by following the very logic of the arguments, parents could be led to radicalize their position, hold independent opinions, and confront the authorized voice of the speaker.

Conclusions

The questions from the public speak of a limited universe: mothers and fathers who, interested in the new child-rearing model, had doubts that they felt the need to solve and thus decided to attend conferences delivered by such renowned authorities on the subject as were Escardó and Giberti, whose reputation had been firmly established in the media. Precisely because of this, the questions reveal the challenges posed by the changes in child-rearing practices, and how these were incorporated in 1960s Argentina.

The challenge for these mothers and fathers was in the distance that separated the new method of parenting from the established common sense and their own personal experience. The need to understand the new interpretative keys was particularly distressing as they believed that the physical and mental health of their children depended on their grasping such concepts. The new method involved interpretations, reactions, and behaviors that needed to be incorporated in such a way as to be applied naturally and quickly, as was required by the very dynamics of child-rearing. That is, the method demanded that parents own a new system of ideas and a common sense that was not easy to adopt based on their own criteria. Escardó and Giberti offered simple explanations and instructions—like the sequence of answers for a child's questions on sexuality—but they also led to a multiplication of the problems faced by parents. Many parents felt incapable of putting them into practice, others were afraid of the consequences they may have, and still others had tried them out without obtaining the expected results.

How did these parents deal with such problems? They did not all act in the same way. Many took on the new paradigm from the perspective of the established common sense, without a clear

awareness of the contradictions that existed between the old and the new. Others were aware of just how radical the innovations were, and this confused them enormously, leaving them helpless in the face of the many situations that arose in everyday life. Some were even paralyzed by the challenge they faced, as a result of seeing old methods—such as physical punishment—discredited, or the impossibility of resorting to strategies learned in their own childhood and of drawing from a firm and established cultural background. Overall, however, these parents did not just attend the talks, they also observed their children constantly, put the experts' suggestions into practice, and drew their own conclusions, which they used to rethink the new system of ideas from the perspective of their own personal experiences. This often led them to feel new uncertainties, but also to detect contradictions within the system of ideas of the new model, and between the new model and the suggestions given by Escardó and Giberti. Thus, some parents even questioned the speakers' contradictions and the limitations in their points of view, in a reversal of the dynamics presupposed in the texts of both authors and, certainly, in the conferences.

The questions examined enable an understanding of what the new child-rearing model meant for these parents, who had many differences among them (income, religion, ethnic group), but they were all connected by their decision to attend a talk and put their questions in writing, a fact that revealed a social and cultural segmentation, as is evident from their having free time to go to such an event, their proficiency in the written word and their willingness to change. They approached their parenting duties with the conviction that they needed to learn how to perform such duties and that learning to do it required that they realize that their children had a radically different nature than what they had been taught to believe.

But the questions also shed light on a much wider reality. They show that Argentine society in the 1960s was shaken by changes in the values that shaped everyday life, and that it was possible to have doubts about what was wrong or right and what was normal or abnormal in family relations, children's education, and sexuality. This disruption was so great and had such a degree of legitimacy that it questioned the common sense that had molded the socialization of previous generations. This paved the way for the development of a new common sense, marked by an unprecedented receptiveness toward experimenting with new ideas applied to family relations.

The challenge of adopting a new common sense is a suggestive issue that enables the examination of how people in general position themselves in the face of cultural changes, toward providing insight into the historical dynamics of such processes. The specific reactions of these parents have shown that there is no single way to incorporate new values and patterns of behavior, but that, even allowing for differences, the process of change is marked by the very common sense and personal experience that innovations call into question, thus giving way to a stage marked by contradictions, dualities, and ambiguities that entail strong subjective disturbances that affect both the past and the future.

Lastly, the public that attended these conferences reveals that the process of cultural change cut across Argentine society as a whole. It involved people who were not close to the epicenter of the cultural innovations. But these people were the protagonists who turned the 1960s into an era of experimentation in which the future was marked by confidence in change, despite the hesitations that entailed sailing in uncharted waters.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Financial Disclosure/Funding

The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to Eva Giberti for allowing her to access the source material that gave rise to this article, and would also like to thank Catalina Wainerman, who opened up that possibility to her, Eduardo Míguez and Roy Hora, for discussing the ideas presented here, Carmen Haretche, for her assistance in processing statistics, and Laura Pérez, for her assistance in translating the text.

Notes

1. For pioneering studies, see Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962); Barbara Ehrenreich and Deidre English, *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978); and Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of Families* (New York: Random House, 1979). For new approaches, see Julia Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book: The Education of American Mothers* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); and Ralph LaRossa, *The Modernization of Fatherhood: A Social and Political History* (University of Chicago Press, 1997), 53-89 and 144-69.
2. Julieta Quilodrán, *Un siglo de matrimonio en México* (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 2001); and Joana Maria Pedro, "A experiência com contraceptivos no Brasil: uma questão de geração," *Revista Brasileira de História* 23, no. 45 (2003): 239-60.
3. Eric Zolov, *Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1999); Lessie Jo Frazier and Deborah Cohen, "Defining the Space of Mexico '68: Heroic Masculinity in the Prison and 'Women' in the Street," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 83, no. 4 (2003): 617-20; and Victoria Langland, "Il est interdit d'interdire: The Transnational Experience of 1968 in Brazil," *Estudios interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* 17, no. 1 (January-June 2006): 61-81.
4. For an overview, see José Luis Moreno, "Familia e ilegitimidad en perspectiva: reflexiones a partir del caso rioplatense," in *La familia. Campo de investigación interdisciplinario. Teoría, métodos y fuentes*, ed. María Bjerg and Roxana Boixadós (Quilmes: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2004), 133-70. For a view of the twentieth century, see, for example, Marcela Nari, *Las políticas de la maternidad y maternalismo político, Buenos Aires (1890-1940)* (Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2004); Donna Guy, *El sexo peligroso. La prostitución legal en Buenos Aires (1875-1955)* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1994); and Isabella Cosse, *Estigmas de nacimiento. Peronismo y orden familiar (1946-1955)* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2006).
5. Edith Pantelides, "La fecundidad argentina desde mediados del siglo XX," in *Cuaderno del Cenep No. 41* (Buenos Aires: CENEP, 1981), 3-12; Victoria Mazzeo, "Situación demográfica de la Capital Federal," in *Serie Análisis Demográfico* (Buenos Aires: INDEC, 1997), 15; and Hernán Otero, "La transición demográfica argentina a debate. Una perspectiva espacial de las explicaciones ideacionales, económicas y político-institucionales," in *El mosaico argentino. Modelos y representaciones del espacio y de la población, siglos XIX y XX*, ed. Hernán Otero (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2004), 71-171.
6. Bearing in mind the differences in cases and how it is used here, the term "domesticity" was suggested to the author by her reading of Leonore Davidoff's and Catherine Hall's *Family Fortunes. Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002) and Mary Jo Maynes's "Cultura de clase e imágenes de la vida familiar," in *Historia de la Familia Europea. La vida familiar desde la Revolución Francesa hasta la Primera Guerra Mundial (1789-1913)*, vol. 2, ed. David Kertzer and Marzio Barbagli (Barcelona: Paidós, 2003), 297-337.
7. Eduardo Míguez, "Familias de clase media: la formación de un modelo," in *Historia de la vida privada en Argentina. La Argentina plural (1870-1930)*, ed. Fernando Devoto and Marta Madero (Buenos Aires: Santillana, 1999), 21-46 and Nari, *Las políticas de la maternidad y maternalismo político*, 55-71.
8. Gino Germani, *Estructura Social de la Argentina*, 1st ed. (Buenos Aires: Raigal, 1955; Buenos Aires: Solar, 1987), 149.
9. On the subject of out-of-wedlock births, see Susana Torrado, *Historia de la familia en la Argentina moderna* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor, 2003), 341. The figure for Buenos Aires was calculated by the author with data from the Buenos Aires statistics journal, *Revista de Estadística de la Ciudad de*

- Buenos Aires* (1962), 9. On the housing situation, see Rosa Aboy, "Arquitecturas de la vida doméstica. Familia y vivienda en Buenos Aires, 1914-1960," *Anuario IEHS* 23, in press. These analyses contradict the view by Gino Germani, who posits that the nuclear model spread quickly (Germani, *Estructura Social de la Argentina*, 53). See, also, Nari, *Las políticas de la maternidad y maternalismo político*; Guy, *El sexo peligroso*; Cosse, *Estigmas de nacimiento*; and Dora Barrancos, *Mujeres en la sociedad argentina. Una historia de cinco siglos* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2007).
10. Catalina Wainerman, *La vida cotidiana en las nuevas familias. ¿Una revolución estancada?* (Buenos Aires: Lumiere, 2005); and Isabella Cosse, "Familia, pareja y sexualidad en Buenos Aires (1950-1975) Patronos, convenciones y modelos en una época de cambio cultural" (PhD diss., Universidad de San Andrés, Buenos Aires, 2008). For an overview on contemporary perspectives of the changes, see Catalina Wainerman and Rosa Geldstein, "Viviendo en familia: ayer y hoy," in *Vivir en familia*, ed. Catalina Wainerman (Buenos Aires: UNICEF/Losada, 1994), 183-231; and Elizabeth Jelin, "The Family in Argentina. Modernity, Economic Crisis, and Politics," in *Handbook of World Families*, ed. Bert Adams and Jan Trost (London: Sage, 2005), 391-413.
 11. Hugo Vezzetti, *Aventuras de Freud en el país de los argentinos* (Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1996); Mariano Plotkin, *Freud en las pampas* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2003), 169-75; Marcela Borinsky, "Todo reside en saber qué es un niño. Aportes para una historia de la divulgación de las prácticas de crianza en la Argentina," in *Anuario de Investigaciones* 2, no. 13 (September 2006): 117-26.
 12. María del Carmen Feijoo and Marcela Nari, "Women in Argentina during the 1960s," in *Latin American Perspectives* 23, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 7-27; Karina Felitti, "El placer de elegir. Anticoncepción y liberación sexual en la década del sesenta," in *Historia de las mujeres en la Argentina. Siglo XX*, ed. Fernanda Gil Lozano, Valeria Silvina Pita, and María Gabriela Ini (Buenos Aires: Taurus, 2000), 155-71; Plotkin, *Freud en las pampas*, 149-172; and Cosse, "Familia, pareja y sexualidad en Buenos Aires (1950-1975)"; and Valeria Manzano, "Blue Jean Generation: Youth, Gender, and Sexuality in Buenos Aires (1958-1975)," *Journal of Social History* (Spring 2009): 103-22.
 13. Oscar Terán, *Nuestros años 60. La formación de la nueva izquierda intelectual argentina, 1956-1966* (Buenos Aires: El Cielo por Asalto, 1993); and Valeria Manzano, "Sexualizing Youth: Morality Campaigns and Representations of Youth in Early-1960s Buenos Aires," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 14, no. 4 (October 2005): 433-61.
 14. For exceptions, see Karina Felitti, *Regulación de la natalidad en la historia argentina reciente (1960-1987). Discursos y experiencias* (PhD diss., School of Philosophy and Literature, University of Buenos Aires, 2009). See also Cosse, "Familia, pareja y sexualidad en Buenos Aires (1950-1975)," and Valeria Manzano, "Ella se va de casa: fugas de chicas 'Dolce Vita' y drama social en la Buenos Aires de los tempranos 1960" (paper presented at *VIII Jornadas Interescuelas y/o Departamentos de Historia* Workshop, September 19-22, 2007, National University of Tucumán); and Manzano, "Blue Jean Generation," 103-22; Inés Pérez, "El trabajo doméstico y la mecanización del hogar: discursos, experiencias, representaciones. Mar del Plata en los años sesenta" (paper presented at *Jornadas Descubrimiento e invención de la infancia. Debates, enfoques y encuentros interdisciplinarios* Workshop, Institute of History and Social Studies, Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, April 16 and 17, 2009).
 15. This lack of accuracy, combined with the fact that no two talks dealt with the same exact topics, hinders a diachronic analysis, which would have provided insight into the changes in the audiences' positions over time.
 16. For a discussion on how this notion of child-rearing was put into question, see Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book*, 4.
 17. *Eva Giberti File (EGF)*, Correspondence Folder (CF), Letter from Julio V. to Eva Giberti (EG), Buenos Aires, July 20, 1962. To preserve anonymity, the sender's last name (if included in the documentation) has been omitted, except in the case of institutional correspondence.
 18. Borinsky, "Todo reside en saber qué es un niño," 117-26.
 19. Nari, *Las políticas de la maternidad y maternalismo político*, 114-21; Borinsky, "Todo reside en saber qué es un niño," 117-26. Hugo Vezzetti, *Aventuras de Freud en el país de los argentinos* (Buenos Aires:

- Paidós, 1996); Mariano Plotkin, *Freud en las Pampas* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2003), 169-75; Cosse, "Familia, pareja y sexualidad en Buenos Aires (1950-1975)."
20. Ana Diamant, ed., *Florencio Enrique Juan Escardó* (Buenos Aires: Facultad de Psicología, 1993); Cecilia Rustoyburu (UBA/UNMP), "Padres extremos y niños con derechos de beligerancia. Los consejos de crianza de la Nueva Pediatría" (paper presented at *Historia de la infancia en Argentina, 1880-1960* Workshop, UnGS-UdeSA, Los Polvorines, November 18, 2008); Florencio Escardó, *Anatomía de la familia*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1954) and *Sexología de la familia*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1961).
 21. "Doctor Florencio Escardó. Médico, defensor de niños," *Para Ti*, July 17, 1967, 2349: 12-13; Florencio Escardó, *Mis padres y yo: Nueva puericultura para mamas*, 4th ed. (Buenos Aires: Roberto O. Antonio Editores, 1968), 214, 330-46; and Escardó, *Anatomía de la familia*, 11-14.
 22. Author's interview with Eva Giberti, Buenos Aires, December 12, 2004, in Isabella Cosse, "La nueva paternidad en los sectores medios porteños. Cambios y continuidades entre 1950 y 1970," *Estudios de Población, Revista de la Asociación de Estudios de la Población Argentina* 1, no. 1, in press.
 23. Eva Giberti, *Escuela para padres*, 1st ed. (Buenos Aires: Editorial Campano, [1961] 1963), 1:24-25, 52-53, 69, 259, and 262, and 2:212-14. And by the same author, *Adolescencia y educación sexual*, 1st ed. (Buenos Aires: Roberto O. Antonio Editores, [1969] 1977).
 24. On parenting schools in the United States, see Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book*, 136-200. On parenting schools in France, see Cecilia Rustoyburu, "Los niños y los padres al diván. Los consejos sobre crianza de la Escuela para Padres" (paper presented at *Primera Reunión de Trabajo: Los 60 de otra manera: vida cotidiana, género y sexualidades en la Argentina*, Universidad de San Andrés, Buenos Aires, October 30, 2008).
 25. Author's interview with Eva Giberti, Buenos Aires, December 12, 2004.
 26. On the use of a journalistic style, see Plotkin, *Freud en las pampas*, 169-75. The school's charter is available in *EGF-Parenting School Folder (PSF)*, "Estatutos de la Escuela para padres de la cátedra de pediatría de la Facultad de Medicina," (mimeographed text, 1967).
 27. Isabella Cosse, "Cultura y sexualidad en la Argentina de los 60: usos y resignificaciones de la experiencia trasnacional," *Estudios interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe*, 17, no. 1 (January-June 2006): 39-60; *EGF-News Clippings Folder (NCF)*, "TV," *Radiolandia*, Buenos Aires, December 13, 1968 and "Tribunal de Apelaciones," *Radiolandia*, Buenos Aires, March 13, 1970 (neither article is paginated).
 28. Author's interview with Eva Giberti, Buenos Aires, December 12, 2004; "Doctor Florencio Escardó. Médico, defensor de niños," 12-13.
 29. Ana Diamant, *La invención de una profesión: desde una carrera hacia las prácticas* (PhD diss., FLAC-SO Argentina, 2007), 130-32.
 30. *EGF-CF*, Letter from Orlando José Farao, secretary of the Liga de Padres de Familia, to EG, Buenos Aires, May 30, 1960; Letter from Alejandro Pujol, Club de Rotarios de Nueva Chicago, to EG, Buenos Aires, March 18, 1960. The letters also reveal a significant involvement of Jewish organizations. The institutions identified are: the Children's Hospital, SOCAM (equipment factory), ICANA, the Kraft Auditorium (possibly hired by another institution), Wobron (clutch factory), and three Jewish institutions: the Sholem Aleijem schools (in three occasions), the Hertzl school, and another unidentified institution.
 31. *EGF-PSF*, Eva Giberti, "Grupos de orientación de parejas," *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* 3, no. 2 (1971): 145-61. Enrique Pichon Rivière, in collaboration with José Bleger, David Liberman, and Eduardo Rolla, "Técnica de los grupos operativos" and "Historia de la Técnica de los grupos operativos," in Enrique Pichon Rivière, *El proceso grupal. Del psicoanálisis a la psicología social 1* (Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, [1960] 2008), 107-20 and 233-46.
 32. *EGF-PSF*-Eva Giberti, "Técnicas para la educación sexual de la comunidad," mimeographed text, circa 1967. Author's interview with Eva Giberti, Buenos Aires, December 12, 2004; *EGF-CF*, letter from Sara to EG, Buenos Aires, April 13, 1961 and letter from MM to EG, Buenos Aires, September 2, 1959.
 33. *EGF-PSF*, Envelope B2 (1962), p. 35; *AEF-CF*, Letter from Martín L. to EG, Buenos Aires, September 2, 1963. On the maternalization of women, see Nari, *Las políticas de la maternidad y maternalismo político*.

34. *EGF-Questions Folder (QF)*, Envelope 6E (1964), p. 5.
35. Eva Giberti, *Escuela para padres*, 1: 31, 61, 45, 181; 102-06, 135-44, and 91-192, and 3:121-41; Also by the same author, *Adolescencia y Educación Sexual*, 338-45.
36. *EGF-QF*, Envelope EF1E (1959), p. 1; Envelope 7E (1964), p. 29; Envelope B2 (1962), pp. 24 and 42; Envelope 6E (1964), pp. 8 and 17; Envelope B6E; Envelope B, Florencio Escardó (1965-1968), p. 2.
37. Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book*, 4.
38. One of the two activities outside the capital was held in San Nicolás (province of Buenos Aires), circa 1973, and the other in Posadas (province of Formosa), in 1971, as per *EGF-QF*.
39. *EGF-QF*. Author's own processing.
40. *EGF-QF*. Author's own processing and Envelope B10E (circa 1966), pp. 16 and 34.
41. Enrique Pichon Rivière, "Tratamiento de grupos familiares: psicoterapia colectiva," in Rivière, *El proceso grupal*, 57-74; Giberti, *Adolescencia y educación sexual*, 65-67, 97-98, and 116-18.
42. Giberti, *Escuela para padres*, 1:60; 2:10-12 and 66-67.
43. *EGF-QF*, Envelope H (undated), p. 11 and Envelope 7E (1964), p. 64.
44. *EGF-QF*, Envelope E1E (1959), p. 23 and Envelope 6E (1964), p. 30.
45. *EGF-QF*, Envelope E1E (1959), p. 2.
46. *EGF-QF*, Envelope EF1E (circa 1959), p. 23.
47. *EGF-QF*, Envelope D1E (circa 1965), p. 21; Envelope E43 (1967), p. 6 and Envelope 6E (1964), p. 39.
48. *EGF-QF*, Envelope 7E (1964), p. 35 and Envelope E4E (1967), p. 10.
49. *EGF-QF*, Envelope 6E (Sholem Alejeim 1964), p. 32.
50. *Ibid.*, 31.
51. Envelope 6E (Sholem Alejeim 1964), p. 38.
52. *EGF-QF*. Author's own processing.
53. Escardó, *Mis padres y yo*, 356-458. For Eva Giberti's views, see Plotkin, *Freud en las pampas*, 169-75, and Isabella Cosse, "Progenitores y adolescentes en la encrucijada de los cambios de los años sesenta. La mirada de Eva Giberti," *Revista Escuela de Historia* (in press).
54. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B4E (circa 1966), pp. 56, 63, 68 and Envelope E1E (1972), p. 60.
55. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B4E (circa 1966), p. 70.
56. Escardó, *Mis padres y yo*, 404 and *EGF-PSF*, Eva Giberti, "Técnicas para la educación sexual de la comunidad" (mimeographed text, circa 1967).
57. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B2E (Posadas, 1971), p. 23 and Envelope B4E (circa 1966), p. 24.
58. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B4E (circa 1966), pp. 8, 22 and 76.
59. *EGF-CF*, Letter from Dora A. F. to E. G., Buenos Aires, October 11, 1960.
60. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B4E (circa 1966), p. 43.
61. Envelope B4E (circa 1966), p. 39; Envelope B5E (circa 1965), p. 21.
62. *EGF-CF*, letter from Héctor S. to E. G., Buenos Aires, January 3, 1960. Similarly, there were questions about how to "deal with shocked reactions from other parents" or how to convince children not to tell their peers about what they had been taught; *EGF-CF*, Envelope B4E (circa 1966), pp. 10 and 38.
63. Giberti, *Escuela para padres*, 2:62-64.
64. *EGF-QF*, Envelope B10E (circa 1966), p. 23.

Bio

Isabella Cosse, PhD, is a researcher at the National Council of Scientific Research (CONICET) and a professor at the University of Buenos Aires and the Latin American School of Social Sciences, Argentina. Her area of expertise is Argentine family history. Publications include *Estigmas de nacimiento: Peronismo y orden familiar, 1946-1955* (Buenos Aires); *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* (Mexico); *Estudios interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* (Tel Aviv); *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos* (Paris); and *Revista de Literatura Hispamerica* (Maryland).