



Pan-American routes: a continental planning journey between reformism and the cultural Cold War

Adrián Gorelik

To cite this article: Adrián Gorelik (2017) Pan-American routes: a continental planning journey between reformism and the cultural Cold War, Planning Perspectives, 32:1, 47-66, DOI: 10.1080/02665433.2016.1192002

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2016.1192002>



Published online: 13 Jul 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 44



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Pan-American routes: a continental planning journey between reformism and the cultural Cold War

Adrián Gorelik^{a,b}

^aCentro de Historia Intelectual, Departamento de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, Bernal, Argentina;

^bCONICET, Argentina

ABSTRACT

This article proposes a framework for the relationship between Latin American countries and the USA in the field of urban and regional culture during a particularly rich period from the mid-1930s to the mid-1970s – a period of maximum global expansion of a North American planning style as well as the emergence of a network of Latin American urban thinking in direct connection with this style and with a number of North and Pan-American institutions. This relationship is thought of as a metaphoric *back-and-forth journey* between the north and south – a process of movement and transmigration of ideas, people, and institutions that can be seen schematically as a cycle with two phases. The first one of expansion of new forms of Anglo-American urban thinking in the region (through the ideas of modernization and development), went from the late-1930s to the mid-1960s. The second phase, one of retraction, rejection, and pursuit of alternative paradigms in Latin American thought (replacing development with dependency), went from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s in a process of increasing radicalization. Within this general picture, the article tries to underline the paradoxical character of the relations between the USA and Latin America, and the way in which the field of urban culture can illuminate this in new ways.

KEYWORDS

Latin America; United States; planning; modernization; development; dependency

Crossed perspectives

Over the past two decades, the classic area of study into the relationship between Latin American countries and the USA has been reinvented by a new set of approaches.¹ If in political, economic, and especially cultural terms some of these approaches have tried to rethink these relations within a broad framework, this is not exactly the case in the field of urban and regional culture. It is easy to recognize that a new wave of studies involving these relations has also been undertaken in this field, introducing new knowledge in such a strategic subject, but this is generally done through case studies, focused on particular examples which generally involve the experience of a foreign figure or institution in a single city or country without an overall framework from which to generate wider debate.² In this paper, I review certain questions that outline a general picture of inter-American relations during a particularly rich period, running from the mid-1930s to the mid-1970s: a period of maximum global expansion of a North American style of planning and the emergence of a network of Latin American urban thinking, which was constituted in direct connection with this North American style and a number of related North and Pan-American institutions.

The name of the translator is Hayley Henderson.

CONTACT Adrián Gorelik  adrian.gorelik@gmail.com

© 2016 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

The title, 'Pan-American Routes', is simply a metaphor for the communication of technical and political cultures across the American continent. Nonetheless, it is a metaphor laden with implications, referring to one of the most illustrative initiatives of material and institutional building representative of this communication. The idea of a highway to link the diverse parts of the continent from north to south emerged at the First Pan-American Conference in Washington in 1889–1890, one of the earliest attempts to constitute the inter-American system. It became a concrete proposal at the fifth Conference in Santiago, Chile in 1923, but it was only adopted by most countries in 1937 amidst new strings of cooperation facilitated both by the world context of imminent war and the expansion of the idea of planning. The layout of the highway finally began in the 1940s when this cooperation was bolstered by greater resources from the USA and when the Pan-American Union was reconstituted as the Organization of American States (OAS). This paper will not address the specific history of the Pan-American Highway, but it suffices to say that its conception and realization accompanied the various institutional stages of inter-American relations, giving the metaphor of connection its full meaning: inter-American connections were anything but lineal – just like the road they were full of obstacles, contradictions, and misunderstandings – and they did not result in a simple two-way street, but in an open and problematic network.

The problematic nature of this network in planning can be exemplified through an anecdote. In 1958, the Chilean architect Hernán Larraín Errazuriz refused to join the Inter-American Planning Society (SIAP, according to its acronym in Spanish), which had recently been established in Puerto Rico, arguing that all inter-American policy was a mere façade for the infiltration the USA's interests in Latin America.³ For him, this was what underlay the scholarships, study tours, and technical assistance programmes that were sustained through institutions such as the Housing and Planning Section of the Pan-American Union, the Inter-American Housing and Planning Center (CINVA in Spanish) opened in Bogota by the OAS, the SIAP or the Ford and Rockefeller foundations. Indeed, the substance of the dispute was typical of Pan-American relations during the Cold War: Larraín Errazuriz accused the president of the SIAP, the Puerto Rican planner Rafael Picó and at the time Minister of Finance of Puerto Rico, of operating as a puppet of the USA; in fact, given the unique institutional situation of Puerto Rico as a Commonwealth, an insular area of the USA, its officers used to act indistinctly as delegates of both nations in the inter-American meetings. At the same time, however, the Board of the SIAP comprised very well regarded figures of urban and regional Latin American reformist modernization, such as Peruvian Luis Dorich or Venezuelan Luis Lander, who had also undertaken postgraduate studies and had professional experience in the USA, and whom even Larraín Errazuriz considered prestigious technicians, although in his opinion they remained entangled in the web of Picó's tactical interests.

This anecdote is significant because conceivably the real dilemma in thinking about technical and intellectual relations between Latin America and the USA is to consider that the anti-American suspicion of Larraín Errazuriz was not unjustified (in this regard, a few years later the Camelot Project scandal broke out in Chile to prove even the wildest of suspicions), but also to realize that neither Dorich or Lander were so naïve, as demonstrated by the subsequent trajectory of the SIAP, an institution that put considerable effort into Latin American critical thinking. This dilemmatic character of the relations between Latin America and the USA colours the entire period focused on herein: relations were always marked by suspicion and distrust, but they also generated episodes of high-intensity cultural contact.

The anecdote also introduces the central role of Pan-American institutions in this relation and particularly the role played by Puerto Rico – a role poorly known or little appreciated, probably due to the complex cultural and political place the island occupies for both Latin Americans and

the USA. Finally, the complexity of the roles played by North American technicians or intellectuals can also be comprehended in relation to the problematic character of such interchanges. How can we understand the multitude of figures that since the 1930s have moved around Latin America to intervene with ideas and actions in the process of urban-territorial transformation? The cast of actors is more than heterogeneous: from Robert Redfield to Francis Violich, from John Friedmann to William Mangin, from Nelson Rockefeller to Anthony and Elizabeth Leeds, from Rexford Tugwell to Richard Morse, the list included anthropologists, historians, economists, planners, politicians, and businessmen. Without doubt, some of them could easily embody the *quiet American* Graham Greene introduced in his celebrated novel about the war in Indochina; according to it, it is possible to conclude that when it comes to international relations, the well-meaning are often the worst. When operating with this mix of American naiveté, arrogance, and ignorance, Greene seems to say, it is impossible for things to go worse.⁴ On the other hand, many of these technicians or intellectuals were able to establish committed and strong links with the region, which enabled them to legitimately form part of the most original and creative sectors of Latin American thought.

None of these trajectories will be specifically analysed over the following pages, instead some of the general issues will be addressed in order to understand the continental journey of planning throughout this period as a metaphoric *back-and-forth journey* between the north and south: a process of movement and transmigration of ideas, people, and institutions of North American planning in Latin America. This circulation can be seen schematically as a cycle that has one phase, between late 1930 and mid-1960s, of expansion of new forms of Anglo-American urban planning and urban thinking in the region, and a second phase, between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s, of retraction, rejection, and pursuit of alternative paradigms in Latin American thought, which was becoming increasingly radicalized. They are two very different stages, no doubt, but both are part of the same cycle: in the replacement of reformist-developmental paradigms by radical-dependency paradigms, it is possible to recognize the persistence of common problems, and of the leading roles of the same institutions and actors both in the north and south.

North American planning style

Not only in Latin America but around the world, the North American planning style became more and more dominant from the 1930s onwards and was consolidated after the Second World War. It is widely known that North American social and urban thought were based on European traditions (especially the British survey and continental social theory), but were processed in the USA in an original way by proposing a very successful combination of theory and praxis, recognized since then as 'scientific method' proper, which mainly after functionalist systematization produced a decisive impact on both the intellectual and institutional renewal of social sciences in all the Western world. Finally, it is also widely known that in thinking about the city and the region, this style of planning had a double centre of irradiation in the ideas of the Chicago School, which in the 1920s and 1930s elaborated an approach of socio-ethnographic study and interpretation of the modern city, and in the experience of river basin planning developed by the Tennessee Valley Administration in the 1930s – an institution that became emblematic of the New Deal and of a conception of planning that expanded its reach from the city over the whole region. In this way, the North American planning style is characterized by a programmatic type of relationship (intellectual and institutional) between urban–regional issues, social thought (which was consolidating its scientific corpus), and a regionalist ideology. The expansion of this mode of dealing with the socio-territorial

issue signified a novel process of spatialization of social thought in Latin America, between the regional reformism of the 1930s and the developmentalism of the 1960s.

Of course, it is very difficult (in relation to this subject or any other) to unify the experiences of Latin American countries with respect to their relationship with the USA. For example, the Latin American political and intellectual elite north of the equator began to go to the USA from the end of the nineteenth century: it was customary for them to live in exile there; they studied at universities there and were more open to North American norms of modernization. In contrast, in the greater part of the Southern Cone of Latin America, North America represented a fairly exotic place until the 1930s, due to traditional links with Europe, which have remained strong over time, generating a series of conflicts between these diverse traditions of thought (although North American ideas have tended to become more and more dominant). Nonetheless, it is also possible to find some early North American references in the urban culture of the Southern Cone, like the rise of decentralized forms of urban development in Montevideo since the beginning of the century, the attention paid by the public urban culture of Buenos Aires in the 1920s to the City Beautiful Movement, or the introduction of common municipal patterns in Brazilian urban administration as from the early 1930s, with direct guidance by North American institutions, which Sarah Feldman uncovered by showing the long-established practice of zoning in Brazilian urbanism.⁵ However, it was not until the end of the 1930s, at the juncture of the war and in the framework of international expansion of North American urban planning, that the conditions were ripe in all of Latin America for establishing fruitful links in the region. It was a very unique situation in which mutual discoveries were fostered because the already rooted *Americanism by belief* (the idea that the American continent embodied an alternative to European decline) started to overlap with a new *Americanism by necessity* (traditional European travel was closed off for all in both hemispheres).⁶ Additionally, there was the unquestionable reality of the new global power (technical and economic) of the USA, which forced Latin America to reconcile the recognition of common belonging to the 'New World' with the growing certainty of forming a subordinate part of its 'sphere of influence' (or in more pejorative but accurate words, its 'backyard'). This uncomfortable position added to a much larger tradition of Latin American 'anti-imperialism', which had begun at the end of the nineteenth century as a reaction to North American expansion in Central America.⁷

On the one hand, then, North American modernization could be represented simultaneously with admiration and disdain: the greatness and heavy-handedness of civilization, an ambiguity already implicit in the European notion of *Amerikanismus* which became more powerful in Latin America from the early-twentieth century due to the synchrony between spiritualist and anti-imperialist reactions. On the other hand, Latin American 'backwardness' would encourage vocations of redemptive transformation in the USA (often followed by symmetrical frustrations) as well as successive Edenic revelations in which the continent's poverty became its most precious treasure in facing the dehumanization of the modern world. One of the most studied experiences in recent years which richly depicts some of these nuances is the role of Nelson Rockefeller as coordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA) in the 1940s, who in contributing to the policy of opening up the USA to Latin America was able to audaciously combine philanthropy, propaganda, and business. Usually, cultural studies have focused on the picturesque-romantic productions of the OIAA (Disney movies like *The Three Caballeros* and others), showing a stereotyped view of Latin America, while architectural studies have underlined its modernist moves of immense cultural sophistication (like the *Brazil Builds* exhibition at MOMA in 1942). Both views, however, have tended to see the indisputably manipulative connotation of North American

propaganda at the time of the war. While this is undoubtedly an aspect to be considered, there is another substantial feature which should not be overlooked: these policies were produced in a context of ‘mutual seduction’ between the USA and Latin America – as Sol Glik put it – with a ‘two-way magnetism’ that explains, among other things, the fascination of the North American popular culture with a figure such as Carmen Miranda.⁸

The Rockefeller example demonstrates another shift from the 1930s with the beginning of a flow of resources devoted to inter-American relations. Announced with President Roosevelt’s ‘good neighbour’ policy and intensified during President Truman’s Point Four in 1949 establishing technical assistance for underdeveloped regions of the world as state policy, this shift was extended during the Alliance for Progress, launched in 1961 by President Kennedy. And to see the importance given to this shift at the time, despite its apparently weak impact on Latin American thought, one should not forget, for example, that the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL, according its acronym in Spanish), as one of the strongest independent think-tanks that the region has ever had, placed a great deal of confidence in the Alliance. The important point here is to realize that it was during this period, as previously noted, that the continental network of urban thought was constituted, turning Latin America into a field of debate and allowing the emergence of the ‘Latin-American city’ as a dynamic figure of the international intellectual horizon of the times, with the assistance of influential ideas, individuals and institutions of North American planning.⁹

Interpretations

Historically, there have been two ways to view this relationship: as either a pastoral interpretation that emphasizes the selfless action of North American actors (in line with the self-representation that some agencies have, especially foundations), or through a critical interpretation, highlighting that everything undertaken by individuals and institutions from the north reinforces imperialist strategies and becomes their mere rational justification. These two ways were shaped by the Cold War climate, and this is precisely why they have to be challenged, even to understand the Cold War itself.

It is certainly impossible to avoid the wider connotations of the North American actions in Latin America even when they involved agents who were deeply committed with the fate of the subcontinent, since these actions were part of the institutional, ideological, and political nets that were turning USA into a new world power. As Mark Berger points out in studying the field of Latin American studies in the USA, the discourses and social practices that produced the object of ‘Latin America’, despite the intentions of many of its actors, have actively worked towards the creation of institutions and mechanisms that together have supported the hegemonic expansion of North America.¹⁰ However, this support does not deplete its cultural significance: it has shaped the concrete historical experiences of a dynamic and multifaceted encounter. This is one of the most inspiring features offered by a new wave of specialists, who have produced a remarkable transformation in the approaches to the subject: the will to assume the ambivalences and conflict in each of the varied aspects of the relations between the USA and Latin America.

There are some classic references, of course, like Jules Benjamin’s work, which offer a general framework, very influential in my research, within which to understand inter-American relations.¹¹ Nevertheless, the research on inter-American relations has had a revival over recent years, especially in regards to the cultural Cold War. As Gilbert Joseph has pointed out in one of the best attempts to rethink these relations,

Turning away from dichotomous political-economic models that see only domination and resistance, exploiters and victims, [the new approaches] are suggesting alternate ways of conceptualizing the role that the USA and other foreign actors and agencies have played in the region.¹²

In this regard, these approaches revise some classical assumptions of dissident paradigms:

the centripetal nature of imperialism and dependency, which risks conceiving of Latin America solely as 'peripheral societies', intelligible only in terms of the impact that centre nations have on them; the idea of penetration; the reflexive indictments of complicity; the bipolarity of the North-South relationship; and the subsidiary role accorded to culture.¹³

From this kind of interpretations a double transformation of the approaches has emerged: their decentralization, in order to break down that 'centripetal nature of imperialism and dependency', but also to focus on local perspectives regarding the relationship with the USA; and their distancing from the narrow ideological framework established by the polarity of the Cold War, which has also implied the need to take seriously (i.e. not as a mere ornament hiding true intentions) self-representations of North American actors in the period of their expansion.¹⁴ A suitable starting point for that may involve recognizing the existing ideological differences between the various intellectual currents that prevailed during our cycle: for example, between the classically ethnocentric positions that constituted the Latin American 'other' as the good savage who needed to be civilized, and the currents that supported the idea of a common reality and history between the two Americas, which inspired a host of American intellectuals and institutions to pursue a cultural recognition of Latin America.¹⁵

It is very well known how complicated it is to study relations between different cultures or different bodies of ideas and intellectual traditions. This is made evident by the diverse figures of speech used in an attempt to explain those relations once the limits of traditional diffusionism have been surpassed: circulation of ideas, transculturation, transfers, migrations, cultural contacts, and so on. But the political, ideological, and cultural high voltage which has always characterized the specific kind of relations we are analysing here produces a more urgent need of new figures to name them: the 'contact zone' of Mary Louis Pratt, or the 'close encounters' of Joseph.¹⁶ Figures able to escape not just from diffusionism, but from less traditional but very firm Manichean accounts of dependency, which have been remarkably updated in the last decades – especially in North American academia. It seems as if the end of the Cold War has cancelled the pastoral way of interpreting North-South relations, while the critical way has renewed its legitimacy by modifying theoretical references, but maintaining an almost paranoid vision of imperial power and by reintroducing the kind of ideological Manichaeism that had been superseded in the Latin American cultural environment at least since the seventies (since the emergence of a series of proposals that identified the limitations of dependency perspectives when thinking about cultural issues on the 'periphery').¹⁷ A sort of neo-dependency perspective that appears clearly in various works, such as those by João Feres Jr on the history of the term 'Latin America' in the USA, or by Inderjeet Parmar on the international activity of the three major US foundations (Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller), both represent a larger trend of what some academics understand today as radicalism (whether they draw inspiration from subaltern studies or deconstructionism), meaning the notorious return to a restrictive notion of ideology as false consciousness laden with concealed interests, to be exposed by the historian; and both also representative of a more common type of theoretical operation: the misleading use of innovative notions and lines of inquiry that originally helped to understand the links between intellectual productions, social representations, and economic or political interests, which is precisely the kind of complexity that is eliminated in these works.¹⁸

Reformism

According to the characterization made here of the North American planning style, I hypothesize that its expansion is part of a reformist cycle of thought on urban–regional questions, but that it is a very peculiar kind of reformism as it coincides with the worldwide expansion of North American power and, particularly, of its model of social science (its theories, practices, and institutions). In this respect, it becomes crucial to understand the very different meanings that reformism has taken on during this period. According to the thorough work of David Ekbladh, the global expansion of North American power was driven by the unyielding conviction about the virtues of a liberal society, by the idea that the USA was the most advanced model of this (therefore it should be generalized), and by a naive confidence that a ‘modern’ world (urban, industrial, and democratic) would be more appropriate for its implementation and development.¹⁹ It is a set of beliefs that explains the emergence of a powerful idea for the whole period: the salvationist idea that the USA can (and should) *remake other societies*, as Benjamin indicates, thereby transforming this enterprise into *reformist expansionism*, with all the paradoxes and aporias that this formula implies (especially in the minds of those who drove it forward, who many times developed individual positions that were antagonistic with the general ideological assumptions). Moreover, this reformism – always believing itself unchanged – was influenced by vast transformations in the twentieth century that inverted its ideological character: North American reformism was proposed as a militant alternative (certainly of a radical Democratism) against monarchies, empires, and European totalitarianism during the 1930s and especially as the Second World War progressed, however it also stood as the militant stronghold in the fight against the socialist revolution.²⁰

This conceptualization of the *reformist cycle* sets up a framework to support general reflection; however the specificity of urban related questions requires further details. Urban and spatial thought permits a different perspective on the entire process of cultural contact because *planning* – this worldwide keyword from the 1930s onwards – tests the limits of the liberal matrix that is at the heart of North American *reformist expansionism*. This was clearly felt within the USA, where social and political forces would periodically appear to place strict limits on any planning experiment precisely because it involved increasing state participation and control of economic activity and social life. This paradox was central, not only because it opened an ideological divide within the expansionist enterprise, but because it turned many of its actors into quasi-pariahs, accused of being ‘Reds’ in their own country and, especially by the end of the 1950s, of being imperialists abroad. Thus, as shown by Ekbladh, there was widespread displacement of the New Dealer teams during the years of McCarthyism and the Cold War, from the offices of the USA government to private foundations, which comprised a central channel of *reformist expansionism*. North American technicians and intellectuals circulating in Latin America throughout the 1950s and 1960s can also be thought of as ghost battalions of reformists in search of new territories to implement a New Deal that was impossible to put into practice in their own country.

Three notions

There are three key elements of the ideological language of the period that work as a single doctrine, though they are often used descriptively as technical terms. They are *modernization*, *development*, and *planning*. Interestingly, beyond all that has been written about these concepts separately, during the deployment of the reformist expansion all three suffered peculiar refractions in each specific field of application (in relation to each national culture, for example, or more specifically, each

professional culture) and, especially, an analogous mutation of meanings; mutations that should be historicized, in order to understand what was meant by these elements in each moment and to evaluate the way in which the whole cycle became embodied in their changes.

As Jürgen Habermas sustained, *modernization* was itself, to begin with, the product of a mutation – a functionalist elaboration that enabled the Weberian notion of modernity to break away from its modern-European roots ‘in order to stylize it and turn it into a pattern of social evolution processes neutralized in terms of space and time’.²¹ It is meaningful for our subject that the work of Redfield in México has been signalled as a source of such mutations.²² However, as all the recent literature on development has shown, the alleged ‘neutralization’ was contradicted time and again by experience itself (so full of history and geography) as well as by the functionalist proposals themselves (so full of ideology). In this regard, it is interesting to consider all the implications of the title of one of the gospels of modernization theory, Walt W. Rostow’s *The Stages of Economic Growth, a Non-Communist Manifesto* (1960). This text represents a treatise on the Cold War, a gesture that shows the author’s awareness of the deeply ideological level in which social research was undertaken. Furthermore, the idea of a ‘non-communist manifesto’ (an expression which the editors of the Spanish version decided to leave off the cover) shows that modernization was also a substitute for the revolution, a liberal-reformist way to pursue the same objectives.²³

Development is an intrinsic element to the concept of modernization and it suffers an analogous mutation for the reason that, as Nick Cullather suggested, its contemporary constitution supposes a ‘transitive meaning’: development ceased to be the contingent process that unfolded within a specific national history with its own rules and time, to become a technical-economic procedure ‘performed by one country upon another’.²⁴ This was true basically starting in 1949 with President Truman’s Point Four. But if the Cold War was, among other things, a war of symbols, the paradox is that development became a universal symbol and, therefore, in such a markedly ideological period, it underwent a process of rapid ideological depletion when shared by both sides (even for those who wanted to stay out of the confrontation, thinking they could take advantage of it to build a third way ... to develop, of course). Thus, in such a fundamental aspect (i.e. who could demonstrate better and faster results in the transitive application of development), the ideological battle of the Cold War became a purely instrumental battle.

Lastly, *planning* embodies many of the implications of the previous two concepts. It is very well known that the mark left by planning in the twentieth century is not only North American: already in the 1930s similar socio-spatial premises of thought could be found in the Soviet Union, Britain, Italy, and Germany. (In fact, the crisis of 1929 institutionalized the changes that some of these countries had implemented pragmatically during the first World War.) Latin American countries were well aware of the similarities between these diverse experiences as well as of their differences. However, the very use of the word in Latin America points to the impact of North American ideas. In fact, following the progressive replacement of the word *urbanism* (of Latin origin and with modern meanings translated from French) by the word *planning* as from the 1930s allows us to trace a fragmented and discontinuous map of the new Anglo-American ‘conquest’ of the continent, even though the notion of planning would have to share the stage to varying degrees in each country with European figures, and trends of thought (which, for certain, were also beginning to be affected by North American ideas and practices).²⁵ As previously mentioned, this concept of planning, however, suffered a lexical mutation in the context of the postwar period that directly connected with the ambiguous ideological status of liberal thought: in the West it became ‘democratic planning’ for reasons that were less sophisticated than Karl Mannheim thought when he proposed the formula; it was simply to differentiate it from the ‘other’ planning in the context of the Cold War (for this reason as well, the

CEPAL would go on to use the notion of ‘economic programming’ in its first documents, trying to escape possible ideological suspicions of communist sympathies).

These three concepts formed the basis of the technical language adopted by Latin American planners of the period. Despite being taken up quite naturally, they were a permanent source of conceptual crisis and ideological criticism from the very beginning of their generalization. On the one hand, the fate of these three concepts through the entire period shows that the expansion of new instruments of planning was not a mere diffusion of exotic ideas acclimatized without conflict in foreign lands. On the other hand, it demonstrates that the retreat of these concepts was indeed the end of this cycle, whereby the same problematic questions remained reemphasized.²⁶ From the very moment when the expansion of the functionalist creed began to settle in the 1950s, it is possible to clearly identify a process of internal critique of modernization and development notions – a critique that would initially try to find adequate categories for local processes, understanding that a series of expressions applied from outside to ‘developing countries’, like ‘urban explosion’ or ‘primate city’ implicitly converted Latin American cities into anomalous cases, as pathological aberrations from the norms of western urbanization. After the mid-1960s, this critique becomes radicalized, understanding that *modernization* amounted to a kind of *Westernization* to be avoided (the modern city therefore came to be seen as a cause of the lack of development, as opposed to its remedy), and *development* amounted to a veil covering *dependency*.

With the concept of planning, however, something quite different happened: it characterized the whole period of expansion and it was not weakened during the time of radical criticism because of a belief that the obstacles to successful implementation of planning were in politics, not in the technique itself. This meant that it remained unquestioned (notice, e.g., the unproblematic coexistence in the literature of the era of the most passionate ideological positions with the neutral scientism of the spatial economy, whose centre of irradiation was without doubt in the USA). By the seventies, this was illustrated with examples in Chile (where the reform process was interrupted by a military coup) and Cuba (where the revolution embraced the same principles being proposed everywhere), in a way that would show that planning was obviously the correct path, but could not be implemented within the capitalist system: political change needed to precede the change in society’s relationship to space. This led Latin American urban planners to retain the misunderstanding for decades that, according to Manfredo Tafuri, had characterized the architectural avant-garde of the interwar years: total trust in the harmony between the Plan and Socialism.²⁷

Latin America on an Island

The idea of the *reformist cycle* therefore allows us to speak of an ongoing relationship with the USA, which begins in the 1930s and 1940s with the creation of Latin America as a field of development and experimentation of new socio-urban theories (as exemplified paradigmatically by the cases of Robert Redfield and Oscar Lewis, who with their respective research endeavours in Mexico establish one of the classic debates of anthropology and theories of development, opposing the notions of ‘folk-urban continuum’ and ‘culture of poverty’).²⁸ The relationship continues in the 1940s and 1950s with river basin plans, following the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) model that spread internationally through intense promotion campaigns, during which the 1944 book of the TVA’s director, David Lilienthal, *TVA, Democracy on March*, played an important role.²⁹ River basin plans still however formed part of a culture of planning for emergencies and catastrophes typical of the New Deal and the war, while the consolidation of the North American planning style was produced through the journey to a new culture of *planning for development* that not only points to the expansion of

North American planning in Latin America, but also was a product of the North American presence on the continent, specifically in Puerto Rico.

The experience that takes place in Puerto Rico in 1940 should effectively be seen as a pivotal moment of change, capable of affecting what was being done both in the north and south of America. It should, of course, be situated in the context of early *reformist expansion* being undertaken in the Philippines and Korea. However, if these two experiences were part of the attempt by the USA to understand Asian society (thought of as key to the new world coming out of the war), Puerto Rico, for North American planning, became a first direct lesson from the closer region of Latin America (*closer* not only in geographical terms, but also in conceptual terms, given its place within the evolutionary line of the 'folk-urban continuum' formula: although explosive urbanization was being experienced throughout the continent, the long history of the 'Latin American City' permitted understanding this phenomenon as a case closer to the modern pole than the rest of the developing world). Additionally, the experience in Puerto Rico led to a radical renewal of technical tools and theoretical postulates within the USA.

Rexford 'Red Rex' Tugwell was the last North American governor of the island between 1941 and 1946, before Puerto Rico obtained Commonwealth (a USA insular area) status. During his term, the transformation of the plantation economy to a modern manufacturing economy began – which would later be strengthened by the Popular Democratic Party of Luis Muñoz Marín with Operation Bootstrap – and by the 1950s, the country overcame indices of extreme poverty in favour of one of the highest growth rates of Latin America.³⁰ Modernizing populism was, without a doubt, the point of contact between the North American governor and the local reformist elites who led the successful transition: Tugwell was a typical New Dealer, a seasoned economist who occupied some of the key institutional positions of the reformist ideology during the Roosevelt era (Undersecretary of Agriculture, head of the Resettlement Administration and president of the New York Planning Commission) and who, as governor in Puerto Rico, undertook a radical experiment of agricultural and industrial development as well as territorial reorganization, implementing a range of self-help housing programmes and the modernization of sanitation, education, road, and tourism infrastructure with notable social redistribution effects.³¹ One of the main strategies was to establish the basis for integrated and coordinated planning at all levels (from then on called 'comprehensive planning'), articulating federal, national, regional, and municipal programmes (in 1942 the Planning Board of Puerto Rico was created with powers granted by law to direct the entire process).³² This showed a degree of coherence and institutional centralization that could only occur in a small country with an unsophisticated and relatively isolated State, such as the case of Puerto Rico during this period: the ideal laboratory to implement all of the New Deal's ambitions of radical and technocratic reform that had been very difficult to carry forward in North America itself.³³

Puerto Rico's peculiar institutional situation (a distant part of the Union, not affected by the political struggle in the North American Congress given that it still depended on direct federal decisions) allowed North American planning to utilize it as an ideal 'microcosm' to experiment with 'the problems and aspirations [...] of overpopulated and underdeveloped regions' in Harvey Perloff's terms. (Perloff was barely 25 years old when Tugwell brought him to the island, which provided an essential training experience to a key figure who would leave a mark on the course of international planning over the following decades.)³⁴ Within this 'microcosm', the maturation of the first generation of local experts occurred (all with postgraduate studies from North American universities, just like the majority of the next generation of planners across Latin America). Furthermore, this transformation of planning thought was enabled in the USA, given that after Tugwell's term he and Perloff were responsible for a postgraduate programme between 1947 and 1956 at the University

of Chicago which placed emphasis on interdisciplinarity and a combination of research and practice implicit in the regionalist ideology, which had great impact in the academic and professional world. Indeed, for John Friedmann – one of the planners educated in this programme who devoted a significant amount of time to the Latin American question – planning theory and philosophy were introduced for the first time in Chicago as a systematic element of teaching, and the idea of *development* became the axis of a new disciplinary paradigm, a shift from the more traditional approaches to *city planning* that had prevailed in postgraduate studies in the USA until the 1940s, exclusively concentrated on land-use control.³⁵

As anticipated by the opening anecdote, Puerto Rico was always a controversial topic in Pan-American relations due to, among other things, the USA's insistence that the experience of the island be seen as a model for the rest of the continent. Hirschmann, with his keen sensitivity to Latin American reasons, explained the rejection of that model reminding his North American partners that 'it can never be irrefutably proved that economic development has not been bought at the price of an amount of independence that other countries are not willing to pay'.³⁶ However, the terms of the debate of the time should not hide the fact that Puerto Rico effectively constituted a key link (an 'admirable bridge' as President Kennedy defined it) during the entire reformist planning period, which runs from the New Deal to the Alliance for Progress on both sides of the Rio Grande (and it is no coincidence that Kennedy placed Teodoro Moscoso, the jack of all trades of Operation Bootstrap, as the Alliance's director, and Harvey Perloff as one of its main advisors.) Above all, Puerto Rico was the laboratory of a generation of North American technicians of great prestige in Latin America (Violich and Friedmann particularly) and Latin American planners who fulfilled central roles in the establishment of the institutional network of planning (such as Picó or Lander).

Moreover, Puerto Rico was a hotbed for the Pan-American institutions of urban and regional planning that emerged during the postwar period, such as the CINVA created in Bogotá that trained dozens of Latin American experts in mutual self-help housing programmes (one of the signatures of a Puerto Rican experiment), which was successfully implemented throughout Latin America over the following decades, and the SIAP, which was constituted in Puerto Rico in 1956 and established one of the principal platforms for a network of urban thought in the continent with its periodic meetings and publications.³⁷ The SIAP is an excellent case to observe how fast and how hard the new theoretical and political paradigms were being consolidated in the second part of this cycle, when the North American presence in Latin America would be firmly rejected.

A back-and-forth journey

It is possible to follow the itinerary of ideas of the North American planning style based on the Puerto Rican experience, with the spread of institutions, experiences, projects, and diverse debates, passing through Bogota, Caracas, and Guayana City, the SUDENE (Superintendência do Desenvolvimento do Nordeste), the *favelas* of Río, the *barriadas* of Lima, and the *villas miseria* of Buenos Aires.³⁸ And it would be also possible, in light of this far-reaching deployment, to consider other experiences that concurrently took place, such as Brasilia: an unparalleled emblem of the developmentalist era, which nevertheless had little to do with the type of urban planning that was promoted by development theories.³⁹ The expansion of the North American planning style has left in its wake the incentives to create a Latin American field of urban thought since the late 1950s. In order to understand some of the coordinates of the journey from the North and the consequent (radicalized) return from the South, it needs to be noticed that one of the central stages of this itinerary was

Santiago de Chile, the ‘Geneva of America’, as it was called during this time due to the amount of continental institutions that it housed.⁴⁰

Since the late 1950s, an assistance programme created by Point Four had been underway in Chile, providing resources and expertise for the Chillán Plan (an agricultural development plan in the southern-central region of the country) through the United States Operations Mission (USOM). Between 1959 and 1962 USOM also commissioned three studies on the state of planning in Chile and devised ways to improve it. Chile had an uninterrupted culture of public planning since the late 1930s with the creation of the Production Development Corporation (CORFO in Spanish). In fact, CORFO was the first of a long list of public corporations that were created over the following two decades in Latin America; as Sonia Barrios suggested, corporations are the first institutional arrangement that facilitated planning in Latin America, and should also be studied as an institutional translation of the management models of North American urban and regional transformation.⁴¹ Thus, Chile was one of the first countries to reorganize its political divisions through the creation of planning regions in 1954. The liberal-conservative government of Jorge Alessandri (1958–1964) then launched an agrarian reform as a modernizing measure to rebalance internal production and population. And here we have another lexical mutation, given that since the rural research plan that the Rockefeller Foundation developed in Mexico in the 1930s with explicit support of the Cardenist agrarian reform, this expression stopped being exclusive to the revolutionary imagination to become a technical device of developmental planning – the other face of urban reform – carried out by governments of different colours, even though this difference has led to variable conviction in applying agrarian reform and varying degrees of efficacy and radicalism in its application.⁴²

All this explains the exceptional concentration of public and private institutions in Santiago engaged in planning, beginning with the CEPAL (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), which created the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES in Spanish). Here, several groups of social scientists from across the continent became integrated as a community, cultivating the feeling of being part of a mission (the building itself that CEPAL built in 1963 in Santiago, designed by Emilio Duhart, with its ascetic horizontality against the backdrop of the Andes, is strong evidence of the belief in the possibility of alternative Latin American thinking). Besides, the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO, in Spanish) and the Latin American Board of Social Sciences (CLACSO, in Spanish), with their respective urban and regional development commissions; the Latin American Centre for Economic and Social Development (DESAL, in Spanish), which harboured many of the initiatives of religious activism on urban and territorial issues; the Institute for Housing, Urbanism and Planning at the Faculty of Architecture, University of Chile; the Centre for Research in Urban and Regional Development (CIDU, in Spanish), in the School of Architecture at the Catholic University, among many others.

In this context, in 1964 the Ford Foundation set up the Urban and Regional Development Advisory Program in Chile (URDAPIC) under the direction of John Friedmann (who had received prior education in Chicago with Tugwell and had worked in Korea and Brazil as a member of a US AID Programme, and who was then part of the MIT-Harvard team that worked in Guayana City). URDAPIC decisively contributed to the creation and specification of content at the CIDU, and advised the Christian Democrat government of Frei on the renovation of the national planning system, with the creation of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MINVU) and the National Planning Office (ODEPLAN). The principal guidelines of the Ford Programme proposed a radicalization of agrarian reform in conjunction with urban reform, in the context of a regional development policy that carried forward the Friedmann–Hirschmann hypothesis on ‘unbalanced

growth': decentralization of the public administration and regionalization of the national budget, establishment of incentives to spread private investment, for which a new national division was proposed in specialized regions through 'growth poles' in each of its major cities.⁴³ This experience seemed to culminate in a maturation process in USA–Chile relations with the consolidation of political reformism and a culture of development planning; but it was actually an extreme situation bordering on anachronism. In order to understand this point, it suffices to mention that shortly after the Ford Programme started, the Project Camelot scandal broke out in Chile, which cast doubt on the entire technical assistance programme of the USA.

The well-known Project Camelot was a social science research plan funded by the US Army to investigate conditions of social disorder and rebellion in 'sensitive areas' in the developing world. The participation of the Army in this project was kept secret, both due to the sensitivity of the areas studied and the very problematic nature of the link between the USA's military interests and scientific knowledge in those countries. The true character of the project became known in Chile in 1965 following a leak, which prompted strong political rejection and an international scandal that forced the Project Camelot to be dismantled (in the context of a strong domestic crisis in the USA between the various government departments involved). It was the beginning of a wave of protests against all kinds of US technical and financial assistance to Latin American social sciences, behind which the strategic interest of imperialist penetration began to be seen. As in the novels of John Le Carré, the Latin American suspicion was confirmed by a ludicrous conspiracy of the US military, leading to the anticipation of more ill-fated interventions in Chile.⁴⁴

Perhaps of more interest here, however, the Camelot affair is proof by absurdity of the depth of the liberal-reformist roots of North American expansionism (even when it was up to its neck in Cold War marshes), at a time that expresses the changes that had been occurring in the roles of the North American expert. This was wisely noticed by Robert Nisbet, whose conservatism made him distance himself from the whole enterprise of American expansionism and reform, thereby allowing him room to point out its blind spots. Given that it was none other than the progressivism in American academia that was engaged in political and scientific contradiction, such as Camelot, Nisbet ironically explained both the disoriented reformist voluntarism (which sought to turn the social sciences into a tool) and the intrinsic change experienced in the field of social research in the USA throughout this period: a change of scale was occurring in the reach of North American academia across the world, from the study tours of the first researchers in the 1930s, who were artisans of social science, to the moment when the 'American knowledge industry [began] to mass produce for foreign markets.' In a clear provocation of the progressive culture that had embarked on expansion, Nisbet called this new phase 'the imperialist phase of the [North] American research industry', cautioning on the greater entanglements that would occur when multitudes of well-meaning young scholars were to delve into the social and political life of every corner of the planet.⁴⁵

Thereafter, the *retreat from the south* would be explosive, given the sheer pace with which it produced and extinguished stages of theoretical and political radicalization. It is almost always the same planners and the same institutions trained with North American funds and ideas who led political change (from developmentalism to dependency) and theoretical change (from functional-structuralism to Marxist structuralism), which strained dealings to the point that any relationship with the USA became unworkable.⁴⁶ In the SIAP's own publications, there was already evidence of change: the first issue of the *Revista Interamericana de Planificación* in 1967 began with an article by Brazilian political scientist Helio Jaguaribe (then in exile in the USA) who, at the height of the Alliance for Progress, denounced the retarding effect of the USA's technical assistance in the development of Latin American countries.⁴⁷ At the same time, the collection of SIAP books that started to come

out in 1970 in Buenos Aires (under the direction of Jorge Enrique Hardoy and the editorial management of Martha Schteingart), focused on publishing authors who proposed new theoretical-ideological positions between dependency and Marxism, like the Spanish Manuel Castells (who during his stay in Chile at the end of the 1960s elaborated a large component of what would become his star book, *The Urban Question*, in which he dedicated a central chapter to discrediting the 'culturalist' approaches of the Chicago School of Sociology); the Brazilian Paulo Singer, Peruvian Aníbal Quijano, and Colombian Emilio Pradilla, were among the many authors who made the collection one of the principal stages of leftist debate at the time.

Hardoy himself is a key figure in the passage from Pan-American developmentalist optimism to the search for autonomy (theoretical, technical, and political) in planning across the subcontinent. This is a very interesting case, not only because he was one of the main players who had contributed to the network of urban thought since the early 1960s, but because throughout his journey he always maintained close ties with the North American institutional world: having studied in Harvard, Hardoy made a programmatic decision in all of the spheres of research he created in Argentina to enable members to undertake postgraduate studies in the USA. In 1965, he was forced to dismantle the Rural and Urban Planning Institute of Litoral (IPRUL in Spanish), created four years earlier at the National University of Litoral in Rosario, due to student protests in relation to the funds received from the Ford Foundation. He then created the Centre of Urban and Regional Studies (CEUR in Spanish) at the University of Buenos Aires, but one year later also had to move it for opposite reasons, due to the intervention in the University by the military coup of 1966. At this time, he was able to find a base for the CEUR at the Torcuato Di Tella Institute (ITDT in Spanish) thanks to the fact that he could use the funds that continued to come from the Ford Foundation. Then, when in his new site at ITDT he created a Postgraduate Programme in Urban and Regional Development, in 1973, Hardoy was convinced that its main role was to counter the 'inadequate theories' that were taught in North American centres of postgraduate study – where all of the ITDT professors had been.⁴⁸

It would be possible to elaborate on a number of similar cases, but it is worthwhile concluding with another example from Santiago. In presenting the final results of the Ford Programme in 1970 in Chile, Guillermo Geisse – who studied in Berkeley with Violich and was the first director of the CIDU (a research centre created at the Catholic University thanks to the programmatic collaboration and funds from the Ford Programme) – still felt obliged to advise that the work undertaken by foreign expert consultants 'does not enjoy any prestige among us'. Furthermore, just a year later he published an article in *Eure* in collaboration with Enrique Browne, also from the CIDU, where they analysed the failure of a 'foreignised education' that generated 'neutral expertise, technocratic immunity and deterministic linearity'.⁴⁹ As evidenced, the crisis in relations with North American planning demonstrated not only the political-ideological change, but also a crisis regarding the very idea of autonomy in social scientific knowledge in Latin America.

Periodization

Identifying the expansion of the North America planning style as part of a reformist cycle helps revise the conventional periodization of relations between the USA and Latin America in two ways. On the one hand, it requires a reinterpretation of the ideological framework around the US' presence in Latin America, which was always read retrospectively from Cold War evidence as the complete anti-Communist ideologization of USA's aid, with an emphasis on military assistance. While the Cold War resignified many of the ideological valences of this reformist liberalism, this

occurred in a process that has very different roots that instead fed off the New Deal and continued to fuel later ideas and practices (this is clear in the case of many institutions and North American technicians in Latin America who, true to these roots, tried to escape with varying success the Manichean climate of the Cold War). On the other hand, the idea of the reformist cycle also requires the revision of established chronologies. As is well known, the main changes in the relationship between the USA and Latin America usually date back to the Cuban Revolution in 1959. It is from this time on that the USA is said to have changed its traditional attitude towards Latin American countries focused on market liberalization by trying to control the expansion of the revolution through supporting social reform policies (which underlies the creation of the Alliance for Progress); and it is also at that time that the Latin American intellectual imaginary is said to have reoriented its focus on revolution and especially anti-imperialism.

However, planning experiences highlight a different scenario. This is because the social reformism of North American technical assistance – even with a populist hue – was born out of the New Deal, which meant that the Alliance for Progress did not represent a watershed moment but an end point. And it is also possible to see that well into the 1960s, the most advanced sectors of Latin American planning promptly took up the process of political and theoretical radicalization without having major conflicts around its umbilical link with North American planning. Paraphrasing Silvia Sigal in her study of Argentine intellectuals from the 1960s, it is possible to speak of a ‘bifrontal identity’ in relation to urban thought in Latin America, which could be politically progressive – which at that time meant Marxist, Nationalist, and Anti-Imperialist – and culturally modernizing – which meant being aware of the goings-on in North America.⁵⁰ The truth is that until the late 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, no Latin American planner who returned with a Masters or Ph.D. risked being disqualified with the type of criticism that a couple of decades earlier Carmen Miranda famously coined ‘Disseram que voltei americanizada’ (‘They say I came back [North] Americanized’).

Notes

1. This paper further elaborates hypotheses developed in the context of a longer-term research project. In this regard, it is important to mention that various stages of this paper were opportunely debated at the 15th International Planning History Society (IPHS, São Paulo, July 2012), at the 11th Foro de Historia y Crítica de la Arquitectura Moderna (Aguascalientes, August 2013) and at the II Jornadas de Arqueología de la Contemporaneidad, HITEPAC (La Plata, August 2013). I especially thank Mark Healey for the long conversations that we have had on the topic.
2. It is possible to find partial exceptions in some works which focus on transnational institutions, especially research done on housing institutions and some of their agents, like Richard Harris’ ‘The silence of the experts,’ or the work of Leonardo Benmergui about the housing policy of the Alliance of Progress in Brazil and Argentina (‘Housing development’).
3. See *Nuestra Arquitectura* (Buenos Aires, Argentina), where an extract of Larraín Errazuriz letter of rejection was published. The origins of the SIAP date back to 1956 when, thanks to Rafael Picó the then chairman of the Planning Board of Puerto Rico, a meeting was held in Bogotá during which the first Board of Directors was formed with Picó himself as president, Gabriel Andrade Lleras (Colombia) as vice president; Luis Dorich (Perú), Carlos Leonida Acevedo (Puerto Rico), Rodrigo Carazo (Costa Rica), Eduardo Montouliou (Cuba), and Miguel Figueroa Román (Puerto Rico) as directors; and as counsellors Luis Lander (Venezuela) and Ernest Weissman and Anatole Solow (experts from international organisations representing the USA). The definitive constitution occurred in Puerto Rico in 1957, from where the SIAP headquarters would function until 1971, when it was transferred to Bogotá. The checkered history of the SIAP over recent decades includes the disappearance of all files. For a brief account of its formation and development, with a list of authorities, head offices, and a quite erratic list of some activities, see the article of the historical secretary of the institution: Camacho, “Sociedad Interamericana.”

4. *The Quiet American* was published in 1955 and has been made into a film twice. The novel, of course, also speaks volumes about the disillusioned Englishman's perspective, who knows that his country no longer has any significant role to play in the postwar world.
5. Feldman, *Planejamento e zoneamento*.
6. It is notable in the autobiographical narratives of two key North American figures, Francis Violich and Richard Morse, the coincidence in pointing out the casual discovery of Latin America due to the impossibility of travelling to Europe, which until the war had been the first option. See the statements by Violich in Martín Frechilla, *Diálogos reconstruidos*; and the account of Morse in Goodwin, Hamill, and Stave, "A Conversation."
7. On this 'first' phase of Latin American anti-imperialism, see the pioneering work of Terán, "El primer antiimperialismo latinoamericano." More recent approaches in Grandin, "Your Americanism and mine" and Friedman, *Rethinking anti-Americanism*.
8. See Glik, "No existe pecado," 80. On the Brazilian case (which was together with Mexico one of the main targets of the OIAA), see Tota, *O imperialismo sedutor*. For an excellent guide on the literature of this topic and more specifically on the OIAA archives see: Cramer and Prutsch, "Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs." See also Cramer and Prutsch, *¡Américas unidas!*
9. I have presented the general outlines of this research, which explain the use of the idea of the 'Latin-American city' in Gorelik, "A produção."
10. Berger, *Under northern eyes*.
11. Benjamin, "The Framework."
12. Joseph, "Close Encounters," 4.
13. *Ibid.*, 13–14.
14. See, for example, the noteworthy study of Purcell, "El Cuerpo de Paz."
15. On the ideological currents that fed the idea of only one America, see the provocative essay by Jones, *American Civilization*.
16. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes* and Joseph, "Close Encounters."
17. For example, overcoming the limits of Dependency Theory in Latin American cultural debates is neatly presented in flagship works from the early seventies, such as the transcultural perspective offered by Ángel Rama (see *Transculturación narrativa*) and the seminal 'Misplaced ideas', by Roberto Schwarz ("As ideas fora de lugar").
18. See Feres, *A história* and Parmar, *Foundations*.
19. Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission*.
20. Benjamin, "The Framework."
21. Habermas, *El discurso filosófico*, 12.
22. See the mention in Cullather, *The Hungry World*, 47.
23. See the analysis of Rostow propositions in Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission*, 182–9. The Spanish edition was prepared by the Mexican Fondo de Cultura Económica in 1961, shortly after the appearance of the original English edition, but unlike it, the caption was not on the front cover (nor did it appear in future editions).
24. Cullather, *The Hungry World*, 40. See also Escobar, *La invención del Tercer Mundo*.
25. Indeed, this 'contamination' between various currents is the usual way in which ideas surface in the debate and practice of planning in the world. In this period in Latin America, there are several examples of influential Europeans who had already been affected by the currents of North American planning. Maurice Rotival, the urbanist designer of Henry Prosts atelier, is one such example who worked on the Plan Monumental de Caracas in the 1930s and returned in 1946, following time at Yale, to participate in the National Urbanism Commission, incorporating a series of concepts and techniques of the North American planning style (see Martín Frechilla, *Planes, planos y proyectos*). Another example is the group *Economie et Humanisme* – led by the Breton priest Louis-Joseph Lebret who had widespread impact in Brazil – whose concept of *l'aménagement du territoire* shows an adaptation of French sociology to parameters of Anglo-American regionalist culturalism. There are other well-known cases developed in the historiography of European planners who moved to the USA during the war and were involved in the preparation of plans throughout Latin America from there – such as José Luis Sert – and who were trying to turn, according to Jorge F. Liernur, from vanguardists to experts (see Liernur, "Vanguardistas versus expertos").

26. This argument, which I am only able to schematically elaborate here, was further developed in Gorelik, “A produção.”
27. Tafuri, “El socialismo realizado.”
28. I have analysed the impact of this debate in Latin America in Gorelik, “La aldea en la ciudad.” On the circulation of the notion of “culture of poverty” between México and USA, see Rosemblat, “Other Americas.”
29. On the international diffusion of TVA’s model as a fundamental piece of the expansion of North American policies, see Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission*, 159–67. Lilienthal’s book was first translated to Spanish in 1946 in Mexico and enjoyed wide circulation. Many basin plans are well known (as are various institutional creations) that were inspired by the TVA in our continent since the early 1940s, such as the plans for the River Santo Basin in Peru in 1943 and the Rio Papaloapan Basin in Mexico in 1946; some cases, for example the Valle del Cauca Development Corporation in Colombia in 1952, received direct technical assistance from TVA, but in others, like the Corporación Hídrica del Noroeste Argentino in 1946, or the Interstate Commission for the Bacía Paraná-Uruguay, developed in Brazil in 1952 for the father Lebreton group, were more autonomous.
30. On different aspects of the modernisation of Puerto Rico in the 1940s and 1950s, see Santana Rabell, *Planificación y política*, and the works compiled by Curbelo and Rodríguez Castro, *Del nacionalismo al populismo*.
31. On the Puerto Rican experiment on self-help housing, see Harris, “The Silence of the Experts.”
32. See *Una década de Planificación en Puerto Rico*.
33. On Puerto Rico as a “laboratory” see Lapp, *The Rise and Fall*.
34. Perloff, *Puerto Rico’s Economic Future*.
35. Friedmann, “100 Years.” For Friedmann, the book by Perloff *Education for Planning: City, State, Regional* (1957) was the impetus for applying *planning for development* in the rest of the North American postgraduate programmes. It would be interesting to map the history of changes in planning education in North America in relation to the successive shifts of references relating to Latin America during this period, taking into account the three most popular postgraduate programmes for Latin American planners: first is Berkeley, due to the mobilizing actions of Francis Violich; then the MIT-Harvard programme, given the weight the Joint Center for Urban Studies had in plans and consultancies undertaken in Latin America; and the Pennsylvanian programme, that in the seventies offered the most adequate version of the prevailing scientism with the spatial economy of Walter Isard.
36. Hirschmann, *Desarrollo y América Latina*, 168. On the kind of development in Puerto Rico that went from experimental planning in the 1940 and 1950 to be a seed of ‘industrialisation by invitation’ (or maquiladora capitalism) in the 1960s, see Pantojas García, *Development Strategies*. The interesting thing to note is that, at least until well into the sixties, not even the harshest critics or sceptics of the US approach to development called into question the achievements in Puerto Rico; see, for example, Morse, “La transformación ilusoria.”
37. On CINVA, see Rivera Páez, “El CINVA.”
38. See Benmergui, “Housing Development.”
39. I have analysed this (and other) paradoxes of Brasilia in Gorelik, “Sobre a impossibilidade.”
40. A general vision of the role played by Santiago in the development of Latin American social thought can be found in the first part of the book by Beigel, *Misión Santiago*.
41. Barrios, *El moderno estado*. Romulo Betancourt’s exile in Chile explains the direct impact of the experience of CORFO in the creation of the Venezuelan Corporation in 1946, with the coming to power of the Board of Governors that he presided. As early as a year before, there was a National Housing Corporation, proposed by the then deputy Belaúnde Terry in Perú, and two years after the Affordable Housing Corporation was created in Cuba, which was among the first examples of this institutional figure that seeks to coordinate State initiative with different aspects of civil society.
42. On the agrarian development projects of the Rockefeller Foundation in Mexico in the 1930s see Culather, *The Hungry World*, chapter 2.
43. See Friedmann, *Una estrategia*. On institutional building in planning in Chile, with particular emphasis on the Christian Democratic policies, see Giannotti, “Sapere tecnico.”
44. Among the dozens of texts dedicated to this issue from the era, the one compiled by Horowitz, *The Rise and Fall*, is still one of the most useful given the wide range of positions presented. Among the new good

critical revisions from Latin America, see Gil, *Las sombras* and Navarro and Quesada, “El proyecto Camelot.”

45. Nisbet, “Project Camelot,” 68.
46. On the new terms of the debate in this stage of radicalisation of urban thought, see Gorelik, “A produção” and “La aldea en la ciudad.”
47. See Jaguaribe, “La asistencia técnica,” 6.
48. “Introduction”. On the IPRUL case, see Monti, “Redes, instituciones y planificación.”
49. See Geisse, “Internal publication” and Browne and Geisse, “Planificación para los planificadores,” 20–1.
50. Sigal, *Intelectuales y poder*, 99.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Adrián Gorelik (Mercedes, Buenos Aires, 1957) is an architect and Ph.D. in History (both degrees from the Universidad de Buenos Aires). He is Full Researcher of CONICET and Full Professor at the Universidad Nacional de Quilmes (Argentina), where he leads the Centre of Intellectual History. He has obtained a Guggenheim Fellowship in 2003 and was Simon Bolívar Professor at the University of Cambridge in 2011–2012. He is fellow at the Wissenschaftskolleg in Berlin for the Academic year 2016–2017. Among other books, he has published *La grilla y el parque. Espacio público y cultura urbana en Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1998); *Miradas sobre Buenos Aires. Historia cultural y crítica urbana* (Buenos Aires, 2004), *Das vanguardas a Brasília. Cultura urbana e arquitetura na América Latina* (Belo Horizonte, 2005); and *Correspondencias. Arquitectura, ciudad, cultura* (Buenos Aires, 2011).

Bibliography

- Álvarez Curbelo, Silvia, and María Elena Rodríguez Castro, eds. *Del nacionalismo al populismo: cultura y política en Puerto Rico*. Rio Piedras: Huracán, 1993.
- Barrios, Sonia. *El moderno estado intervencionista en Venezuela. El caso de la Corporación Venezolana de Fomento*. Caracas: CENDES, 1998.
- Beigel, Fernanda, ed. *Autonomía y dependencia académica. Universidad e investigación científica en un circuito periférico: Chile y Argentina (1950–1980)*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos, 2010.
- Beigel, Fernanda. *Misión Santiago. El mundo académico jesuita y los inicios de la cooperación internacional católica*. Santiago: LOM Editores, 2012.
- Benjamin, Jules. “The Framework of US Relations with Latin America in the Twentieth Century: An Interpretative Essay.” *Diplomatic History* 11, no. 2 (1987): 91–112.
- Benmergui, Leonardo. “Housing Development: Housing Policy, Slums, and Squatters Settlements in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1948–1973.” PhD thesis, University of Maryland, 2012.
- Berger, Mark. *Under Northern Eyes. Latin American Studies and United States Hegemony in the Americas, 1898–1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Browne, Enrique, and Guillermo Geisse. “¿Planificación para los planificadores o para el cambio social?” *Eure* 1, no. 3 (1971): 11–26. Santiago de Chile.
- Calandra, Benedetta, and Marina Franco, eds. *La Guerra fría cultural en América Latina. Desafíos y límites para una nueva mirada de las relaciones interamericanas*. Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2012.
- Camacho, Luis Eduardo. “Sociedad Interamericana de Planificación, SIAP, 50 años. Vida institucional y programática.” *Bitácora Urbano Territorial* 1, 11 (2007). Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Cramer, Gisela, and Ursula Prutsch. “Nelson A. Rockefeller’s Office of Inter-American Affairs (1940 – 1946) and Record group 229.” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 86, no. 4 (2006): 785–806.
- Cramer, Gisela, and U. Prutsch, eds. *¡Américas unidas! Nelson A. Rockefeller’s Office of Inter-American Affairs (1940–46)*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2012.

- Cullather, Nick. *The Hungry World. America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Escobar, Arturo. *La invención del Tercer Mundo Construcción y deconstrucción del desarrollo*. Caracas: Fundación El perro y la rana, 2007.
- Eklbladh, David. *The Great American Mission. Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Feldman, Sarah. *Planejamento e zoneamento: São Paulo - 1947-1972*. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2005.
- Feres, João. *A história do conceito de 'Latin America' nos Estados Unidos*. Bauru: EDUSC, 2005.
- Friedmann, John. *Una estrategia de urbanización deliberada*. Santiago de Chile: CIDU, 1967.
- Friedmann, John. "100 Years of Planning Education in North America." *City Planning Review*, no. 2. (2005): 23-26.
- Friedman, Max, *Rethinking Anti-Americanism: The History of an Exceptional Concept in American Foreign Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Geisse, Guillermo. *Internal Publication from the URDAPIC (Mimeo)*. Santiago: Ford Foundation, 1970.
- Giannotti, Emanuel. "Sapere tecnico e cultura cattolica. Politiche della casa e della città in Cile, 1957 - 1970." PhD thesis, IUAV, 2007.
- Gil, Gaston Julian. *Las sombras del Camelot. Las ciencias sociales y la Fundación Ford en la Argentina de los '60*. Mar del Plata: EUDEM, 2011.
- Glik, Sol. "No existe pecado al sur del Ecuador. La diplomacia cultural norteamericana y la invención de una Latinoamérica edénica." In *La guerra fría cultural*, edited by B. Calandra and M. Franco, 79-95. Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2012.
- Goodwin, Paul, Hugh Hamill, and Bruce Stave. "A Conversation with Richard M. Morse." *Journal of Urban History* 2, no. 3 (1976): 331-356.
- Gorelik, Adrián. "A produção da 'cidade latinoamericana'." *Tempo social. Revista de sociología da USP* 17, no. 1 (2005), 111-133. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Gorelik, Adrián. "La aldea en la ciudad. Ecos urbanos de un debate antropológico." *Revista del Museo de Antropología* 1, no. 1 (2008), 73-96. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba.
- Gorelik, Adrián. "Sobre a impossibilidade de (pensar) Brasília." *Serrote* no. 10 (2012), 213-239. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Moreira Salles.
- Grandin, Greg. "Your Americanism and Mine: Americanism and Anti-Americanism in the Americas." *American Historical Review*, 111, no. 4 (2006): 1042-1066.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *El discurso filosófico de la modernidad*. Buenos Aires: Taurus, 1988. Translated by Manuel Jiménez Redondo from German edition: *Der Philosophische Diskurs der Moderne*. Frankfurt Am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1985.
- Hardoy, Jorge Enrique. "Introduction of the Postgraduate Program in Urban and Regional Development." Mimeo. Buenos Aires: CEUR, Instituto Torcuato di Tella, 1973.
- Harris, Richard. "The Silence of the Experts: 'Aided Self-help Housing', 1939-1954." *Habitat International* 22, no. 2 (1998): 165-189.
- Hirschmann, Albert. *Desarrollo y América Latina: obstinación por la esperanza*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship Between Social Science and Practical Politics*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1967.
- Jaguaribe, Helio. "La asistencia técnica extranjera y el desarrollo nacional." *Revista Interamericana de Planificación* 1, no. 1 (1967): 4-11.
- Jones, Charles. *American Civilization*. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2007.
- Joseph, Gilbert M. "Close Encounters. Toward a New Cultural History of US-Latin American Relations." In *Close Encounters of Empire. Writing the Cultural History of US-Latin American Relations*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. Legrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, 3-46. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico. *Una década de Planificación en Puerto Rico*. San Juan: Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico, 1952.
- Lapp, Michael. "The Rise and Fall of Puerto Rico as a Social Laboratory, 1945-1965." *Social Science History* 19, no. 2 (1995): 169-199.

- Liernur, Jorge Francisco. "Vanguardistas versus expertos." *Block 6* (2004). Buenos Aires: Universidad Torcuato Di Tella.
- Martín Frechilla, Juan José. *Diálogos reconstruidos para una historia de la Caracas moderna*. Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela, 2004.
- Monti, Alejandra. "Redes, instituciones y planificación. El caso del Instituto de Planeamiento Regional y Urbano del Litoral (1955-1965)." Master thesis, Universidad Torcuato Di Tella, 2013.
- Morse, Richard. "La transformación ilusoria de Puerto Rico." *Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 4, no. 2 (1960). Rio Piedras: Centro de Investigaciones Sociales.
- Navarro, Juan José, and Fernando Quesada. "El proyecto Camelot (1964-1965). La dependencia académica entre el escándalo y el mito." In *Autonomía y dependencia académica*, edited by F. Beigel, 145-167. Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2010.
- Nisbet, Robert. "Project Camelot: An Autopsy." *The Public Interest* no. 5 (1966). New York.
- Nuestra Arquitectura* 352 (1959): 47-48. Buenos Aires.
- Pantojas, García, E. *Development Strategies as Ideology: Puerto Rico's Export-led Industrialization Experience*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990.
- Parmar, Inderjeet. *Foundations of the American Century. The Ford, Carnegie, & Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Perloff, Harvey. *Puerto Rico's Economic Future*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Pratt, Mary Louis. *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writting and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Purcell, Fernando. "El Cuerpo de Paz y la guerra fría global en Chile (1961-1970)." In *La guerra fría cultural*, edited by B. Calandra and M. Franco, 167-180, Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2012.
- Rama, Ángel. *Transculturación narrativa en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 1982.
- Rivera Páez, Jorge Alberto. "El CINVA: un modelo de cooperación técnica, 1951-1972." Undergraduate thesis, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2002.
- Rosemblat, Karin Alejandra. "Other Americas: Tansnationalism, Scholarship, and the Culture of Poverty in Mexico and the United States." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 89, no. 4 (2009): 603-641.
- Santana Rabell, Leonardo. *Planificación y política durante la administración de Luis Muñoz Marín*. San Juan: Análisis, 1984.
- Schwarz, Roberto. "As ideas fora de lugar." *Estudos CEBRAP*, n° 3 (1973), São Paulo.
- Sigal, Silvia. *Intelectuales y poder en Argentina: la década del sesenta*. Buenos Aires: Puntosur, 1991.
- Tafari, Manfredo. "El socialismo realizado y la crisis de las vanguardias." In *Socialismo, ciudad, arquitectura. URSS 1917-37*, edited by Alberto Asor Rosa, Bruno Casetti, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario de Michelis, Rita di Leo, Kurt Junghanns, et al., 47-92. Madrid: Comunicación, 1973.
- Terán, Oscar. "El primer antiimperialismo latinoamericano (1898-1914)." In *En busca de la ideología argentina*, edited by O. Terán, 85-97. Buenos Aires: Catálogos, 1985.
- Tota, Pedro Antonio. *O imperialismo sedutor*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.