The final publication is available at

Educational Reform, Modernization and Development. A Cold War Transnational Process.

Óscar J. Martín García and Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla

Approach and Objectives

The objective of this book is to analyze the set of external factors that intervened in the processes of educational reforms that took place in Spain and several Latin American countries during the 1960s and 1970s. The book pays special attention to the role played in such processes by the United States, by non-state actors, international organizations and the theories of modernization and human capital. A collective approach is used that includes contributions by several international history scholars and historians of education, who examine programs of educational modernization in various case studies resulting from the interaction between international and domestic elements in the context of the cultural Cold War.

The origin of this book was a research project on the international dimensions of educational and scientific modernization in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s. The initial focus of the research was therefore on Spain. However, in the course of the project, we found that there were obvious analogies with other educational reforms in that period in the American subcontinent. For this reason, we thought it would be relevant to incorporate into the present volume several studies on Latin America that complemented the Spanish case. Such an approach would allow the educational transformations that occurred in Spain to be contextualized in a more global framework. However, it is not our purpose to make a systematic comparison between Spain and other Latin American countries, but rather to analyze each of the cases included in the book in a concrete way and try to establish connections between both sides of the Atlantic. In this sense, this

volume does not claim to be comprehensive. There is a good number of significant Latin American cases and educational experiences that are not included here. Instead, the book is intended to open up new perspectives for debate and to deepen existing ones in order to encourage further research that gives priority to a comparative approach and integrates new case studies.

The methodological approach adopted in this volume is not intended to apply central concepts and approaches as unitary axes with which to endow the chapters with methodological homogeneity. It is not the goal of the book to reflect a particular methodological approach as a whole. Indeed, one of its strengths is the rich variety of analytical tools used by the different authors. Thus, there are chapters that organize and analyze their content around concepts such as "private diplomacy", "public diplomacy" and "academic dependency"; others put the focus on the United States and the spread of its influence through a mix of demand factors and supply of educational assistance. There are also contributions that adopt a transnational perspective and focus on non-state actors, as well as those that inquire into the influence of educational discourses and practices sponsored by various international operators. In summary, regarding the selection of chapters, the book speaks with different voices and approaches on a coherent and common theme: the study of the external dimensions of educational modernization within the framework of the Cold War.

United States, a Leading Force in the Modernization of Developing Countries

The educational reforms described in this book represent an unprecedented advance in attempts to modernize the educational systems of countries such as Spain, El Salvador, Chile, and Brazil. In the case of Spain, Mariano González and Tamar Groves consider that the process that led to the General Education Law of 1970 was the "most important

reform in the history of Spanish education in the twentieth century."[1] Likewise, in the chapter on El Salvador, Héctor Lindo-Fuentes argues that the educational reforms initiated in 1968—which ended in July 1971 with the promulgation of the so-called General Law of Education—constituted "a deep and comprehensive overhaul of the nation's public school system," an ambitious educational plan aimed at transforming the Central American country "into a modern, urban, industrialized nation."[2] For his part, Colin Snider, in his contribution, points out that the university reform of 1968 "marked a transformational moment that dramatically changed the development of higher education in Brazil in a myriad of ways."[3]

The United States was a leading force behind these processes of educational reform. From the beginning of the 1960s, the U.S. government began to show greater interest in the role of education in its relations with the countries of the periphery and global semi-periphery. In September 1961, a report entitled "International Educational and Cultural Policies and Programs for the 1960s" collected the proposals of several working groups assembled by the John F. Kennedy administration in order to elaborate "a philosophy and objectives for educational, cultural and scientific activity for the decade of the sixties as they relate to both governmental and private sectors." According to this report, education was a basic ingredient of the early stages of economic development. The take-off towards the modernization of backward countries would involve training through modern educational systems to create human capital with the necessary technical capacities to solve the problems of underdevelopment. Therefore, according to the aforementioned document, "an increased effort in international programs in education, culture and science is as important as any effort our country may undertake, and that without it, our efforts in the areas of politics, of military assistance and of economics can never be truly effective." [4]

In that same year and in a similar vein, President Kennedy highlighted in the following terms the importance of education for United States foreign policy towards the Third World:

> "As our own history demonstrates so well, education is in the long run the chief means by which a young nation can develop its economy, its political and social institutions and individual freedom and opportunity. There is no better way of helping the new nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia in their present pursuit of freedom and better living conditions than by assisting them to develop their human resources by education." [5]

The U.S. government saw education as a development factor at a juncture where the socio-economic growth of poor nations became a fundamental objective of the Kennedy administration's foreign policy. Washington's interest in promoting education and development in the Third World was also part of the U.S. response to the international challenges arising from the interaction between decolonization, the Cold War and the expansion of communism in many regions of the planet. With such an international panorama, facts like the launching of Sputnik (1957), the Cuban revolution (1959), the support of Nikita Khrushchev for anticolonialist movements (1961) and the increasing economic, technical and military aid of the Soviet Union to newly independent nations, all elevated communism as an alternative model of modernization to U.S. capitalism in the Third World.

According to the U.S. Deputy National Security Adviser, Walt Whitman Rostow, such events had high potential to project "an image of communism as the most efficient method of modernizing underdeveloped regions" (Simpson 2008: 8). Even more so considering

the interest and admiration of post-colonial leaders for the rapid industrialization experienced by the USSR, which, in a few decades, had gone from being a backward and agrarian country to becoming one of the world's main economic powers (Engerman 2004: 51-2).

Given this challenge, the government of President John F. Kennedy created the Agency for International Development (USAID) in 1961 and promoted initiatives such as the Decade of Development in order to expand the U.S. vision of modernization in the periphery and global semi-periphery. According to this vision, democracy, capitalism and technocratic reform represented the pillars of an ideal of progress that ran counter to the class struggle and the Marxist utopia embodied by the USSR. Within this liberal conception of modernization, education could contribute to promote development in a framework of order and stability. In other words, education could help foster the economic growth necessary to face revolutionary threats in places like Cuba, the Congo, Laos or Vietnam, where ignorance, poverty, frustration and political instability were fertile breeding grounds for radical ideas and movements (Gilman 2003: 48-9; Latham 2003: 3-4). As we will see in the following pages, this notion of education was adopted enthusiastically by the governments of many developing countries. For example, Hector Lindo-Fuentes points out that in 1962, in the inaugural address of Colonel Julio Rivera, the new Salvadoran president, education was presented as a way for his country to both modernize its economy and defeat communism.

The U.S. emphasis on educational issues was also closely related to a series of internal and external factors that gained intensity during these years. First, the educational expansion at the domestic level was one of the priorities of U.S. leaders from the arrival of John F. Kennedy in the White House. Interest in the stimulus of education continued and was accentuated with the Great Society of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Second,

decolonization generated new dynamics of global social transformation, whose repercussions were more accentuated in a growing youth sector desperate for change and education. Likewise, there were the effects on the Third World of the economic boom experienced by all the capitalist First World countries that also reached the Second Communist World, with the consequent emergence of an incipient society of mass consumption in some parts of the southern hemisphere. As a result, several countries in the periphery and semi-periphery global witnessed the growing role of an urban middle class with expectations of economic growth and increased purchasing power. These new intermediate social strata demanded the expansion of education and a rapid modernization of their countries, thus influencing domestic and international politics.[6] Immersed in this epoch of a "revolution of expectations", the foreign actions of the United States had to confront this "combination of hope and urgency."[7]

The confluence of all these processes caused an explosion of demand for education in Third World countries, as well as in others that were at an intermediate stage of development. As stated in another official report in 1961, from the beginning of this decade the "passion for education" became a "rising tide in the newly developing nations."[8] As a result of this sharp increase in popular aspirations for education ─and encouraged by the theories of modernization and educational development, and the progressive importance of technology and demographic growth─ between the 1950s and 1970s there was a dramatic global upsurge in demand for education. Consequently, during these years there was a remarkable educational expansion, clearly observable in the increase in the number of students. A palpable example of this phenomenon was Latin America, where the student population (at all levels) went from 30.5 to 78.7 million between 1960 and 1977.

The enormous expansion of educational demand in the postwar period threatened world stability and provoked what Philip H. Coombs called a "world educational crisis" (Coombs, 1968; Arnove, 1980: 48; Meyer, Ramirez, Robinson and Boli-Bennet 1979, 37–56). [9] As a consequence, educational reform went from being a primarily domestic issue to an international one. It became a central component of North-South relations and East-West competition.

Thus, from the beginning of the 1960s, educational modernization became a battlefield in the struggle between the Americans and the Soviets for winning the hearts and minds of the inhabitants of post-colonial and developing societies. In fact, in 1965, President Johnson announced - along the lines already initiated by the Kennedy administration - the call for a special task force on international education to recommend a broad and long-range plan of world-wide educational endeavor. Based on the recommendations of that task force, the International Education Act of 1966 would be prepared, in charge of coordinating its activities at the Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs (CIECA). This agency included all government agencies with significant programs in this field: Department of State, USAID, the Peace Corps, Department of Defense, Department of Health Education and Welfare, and the U.S. Information Agency (USIA).

An Antidote Against the Cuban Revolution. United States and Latin America in the Development Decade

For the analysts and strategists of the U.S. Department of State, the situation in Latin America clearly illustrated the capacity of the international communist movement to exploit political and social instability in the underdeveloped areas of the planet. The Latin American region became a hot zone in the ideological competition of the Cold War in the

second half of the 1950s. From this time onwards, the political situation south of the Rio Grande attracted increasing attention from U.S. foreign policy-makers. They viewed with concern the hostile reception and anti-Americanism that accompanied the official tour of Richard Nixon in several Latin American countries in 1958. The visit of the then US Vice President to countries such as Uruguay, Peru and Venezuela raised numerous student protests, which in some cases resulted in serious incidents (Black 2007: 356-63).

Nevertheless the true turning point in this regard occurred with the Cuban revolution in 1959 (Rabe 1988; McPherson 2003). As Thomas Wright points out, such an event "embodied the aspirations and captured the imagination of Latin America's masses as no other political movement had ever done" (Wright 2001: 1). The victory of the guerrilla forces over the regime of Fulgencio Batista served as an example of inspiration for many other revolutionary movements from the Andes to the Southern Cone (Gleijeses 2009). This was the reason why Fidel Castro's assault on the established powerbase ignited all the alarms in Washington. Especially when the approach of the new Cuban authorities to the USSR triggered the fears of the U.S. leaders regarding a possible spread of the Castro virus to other poor societies of the hemisphere (Latham 2000: 75-7). A threat that lasted throughout the following decade, as indicated by information prepared by the Department of State in 1968: "the Latin American countries remain a prime target of direct and indirect subversion by Cuba, the Soviet Union, and, to a lesser extent, Communist China."[10]

To contain this threat, the Kennedy administration launched the Alliance for Progress (AfP) in 1961. This initiative was aimed at ending poverty, illiteracy, instability and authoritarianism in the Latin American subcontinent by carrying out reforms in the fields of education, health, housing, agriculture and the distribution of wealth. It was a matter of carrying out, under the aid and tutelage of the United States, a peaceful revolution from

above, that fostered economic growth and constrained communism in the region (Rabe 1999; Darnton 2012).

The start-up of the AfP was accompanied by a whole informative, propagandistic and cultural offensive orchestrated by the USIA, aimed at presenting the United States before Latin American public opinion as an advanced and benevolent leader, committed to development aid in a region burdened by the legacy of Spanish imperialism and by the influence of communist and Castroist ideas (Latham 2000: 70-72; Taffet 2007; Field 2012). The emphasis on concepts such as democracy-in-action, self-help, and cooperative-effort accompanied the deployment of an important package of economic aid, mostly in the form of loans. The final result would be very different from the initial purpose outlined by Kennedy to modernize Latin American societies, taking as a reference the United States model. In general terms, the AfP has been described as "a remarkable policy failure of the Cold War" (Rabe 2012: 90).

Support for education occupied an important place in this endeavor. The United States government encouraged the establishment of bilateral and multilateral programs of educational assistance considering this field "a critical factor in the social and economic development of the region".[11] Under this impulse, some of the educational programs analyzed in this book were launched and implemented, such as the educational reform in El Salvador, the *Reforma Universitária* in Brazil and the agreement between the University of Chile and the University of California. These last two countries, also received, together with Colombia, "the bulk of US assistance to Latin America."[12]

Also, throughout the decade of the 1960s, the university students and youth media "were singled out for special treatment as key targets for USIA/USIS personal and media contacts."[13] As in the Spanish case discussed in this book, students constituted a strategic sector in Latin American countries. The limited educational opportunities in this

subcontinent made them a "vulnerable" sector for communist infiltration and subversion. In addition, in the universities - the extraction quarry of future national leaders - there was a growing critical attitude towards the United States, which contributed to identifying student leaders as a "target group of critical importance".[14] As an official memo in the summer of 1968 said "the danger is that the students, in their desperate search for a way out of the morass of underdevelopment, may swing toward a sweeping, destructive, ideological solution." [15] To avoid such a threat, U.S. leaders stimulated cooperation with national governments and international organizations in order to modernize education systems, promote development and end the structural causes of student discontent

Programs like the AfP and organizations like USAID rested on a vision of the United States as a bulwark of modernity and as the benevolent leader of the "Free World." As such, the American superpower had a moral obligation to share the concepts and methods that would encourage the economic and political development of backward countries and inoculate them against communism. According to this narrative, the American experience could provide a "historical guide" for nations that, like Brazil, Chile and El Salvador, faced the challenge of modernization, in such a way that contact with the North American experience would help pull these countries' "malleable" societies out of their state of political immaturity and economic backwardness.

Starting from the international context described above, this book includes several chapters that analyze the role of the United States in educational reforms that were carried out in some Latin American countries with the support of USAID and AfP. The book also contains chapters on the U.S. influence on the educational modernization of Spain. As pointed out by the work of Lorenzo Delgado and Patricia de la Hoz, the American superpower was the main source of both direct and indirect economic aid and technical advice for the educational reforms that took place in Spain at the end of the 1960s. All

these contributions pay attention to the work of the United States government and state agencies that operated in the field of education at the international level. However, as we will see below, U.S. assistance in this field was not limited to the efforts made by official institutions and agencies.

Other International Agents and Non-State Actors

The transnational shift experienced by historiographical research has increased the interest in non-governmental organizations as actors in international relations. In recent decades, a body of research has gone beyond the state-centered approaches in the study of international politics and has expanded the spectrum of agents involved in cultural and educational practices abroad, including non-government actors such as private foundations, think tanks, universities, research institutes, informal networks and particular individuals.[16]

Much of this literature has followed an approach similar to that of Sarah Snyder, for whom transnationalism is not a "separate field of historical inquiry," but rather an "approach or methodology that enables international historians to study new actors" (Snyder 2003: 100-02). From this perspective, although without forgetting the influence of the U.S. state, this book includes two chapters, those of Francisco Rodríguez-Jiménez and Fernando Quesada, on the educational work of the Ford Foundation in Spain and Chile, respectively. Other works, such as that of Colin Snider, also examine the educational work of non-state actors, for example, Houston University, which developed an intense transnational work within the framework of the reform of higher education in Brazil in the 1960s. The chapter of Héctor Lindo-Fuentes also pays attention to the role of Harvard University in the introduction of educational television in El Salvador.

Moreover, it is also worth noting that the United States was not the only official actor that participated in educational programs in Latin America and Spain. In the field of development, the AfP, USAID and other U.S. government agencies did not act alone. The work done in this regard by the governments of countries such as Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain or France should not be forgotten, and the following pages focus on activism in the educational sphere of international institutions such as the United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization (UNESCO), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank (WB).

These entities constituted the backbone of the "international development community" as denominated by Hector Lindo-Fuentes and Erik Ching (2012: 10-2). This community was formed between the 1950s and 1960s in the context of the Cold War. It was composed of national governments, official agencies, multilateral institutions and non-state actors. The objective of this conglomerate of international operators was to promote economic growth and political stability in backward countries. Throughout the 1960s, this community also devoted important efforts to the dissemination of Western visions of development in areas such as education, in which international communism projected an increasing influence (Dorn and Ghodsee, 2012). Organizations such as UNESCO, the OECD and the WB functioned as forums for the circulation of educational discourses that echoed the theories of modernization and human capital elaborated in Western universities, mainly in the United States.

The Regional Conference on Free and Obligatory Education in Latin America, organized by UNESCO in May, 1956 in Lima, marked the beginning of the enthusiastic commitment of various international bodies towards modernization and educational reform. Another important subsequent step was the Conference on Education and

Economic and Social Development in Latin America, promoted in 1962 by UNESCO and other international entities. Also at that time, the OECD launched the Regional Mediterranean Project, aimed at analyzing the needs of human resources to promote economic development in several southern European countries, including Spain (OECD, 1965). Through these types of conferences and projects, transnational circuits of aid and knowledge dissemination in the education field were created. Such networks materialized throughout the 1960s with the aim of 1) promoting and institutionalizing, at a global level, a concept of education associated with economic growth and social progress, and 2) using education and development as antidotes to the expansion of communism in developing nations (Jolly, Emmerij, Ghai and Lapeyre, 2004; Frey, Kunke and Unger 2014; Stokke 2009; Sharma 2017).

Therefore, during the 1960s and 1970s, the external influence on the educational reforms carried out in Spain and Latin America was the result of cooperation between the U.S. superpower and other international actors and institutions. In the educational field, Washington established fluid collaborative relationships with international entities over which it exercised a certain ancestry, as can be seen in David Corrales' chapter on the World Bank. A similar approach is glimpsed in the contribution of Hector Lindo-Fuentes. This author highlights the similarity of interests, visions and practices in the field of development between the United States and UNESCO led by René Maheu between 1962 and 1972. Not in vain, during that period the Executive Board of that organization openly endorsed the AfP sponsored by the United States government.

 On this issue, it is worth remembering, as did a report by the U.S. delegation to UNESCO at the height of 1967, that the United States had been one of the founding members and main contributors to this organization since its creation after the World War II. As such, the U.S. superpower had "played a major role in shaping UNESCO's policies and

programs." This document suggested retaining such a position of influence as UNESCO offered "a multilateral base of support for the pursuit of U.S. policies on behalf of international education and development aid." Thus, if, on the one hand, the entrance in this institution of a good number of new independent nations had generated certain distortions for the United States, on the other, it had caused the main concerns of the UNESCO to become aligned with priority issues for the US foreign agenda, such as the development and the training of human capital.[17]

In addition, the international organizations working in the educational field offered a multinational umbrella that allowed U.S. modernizers to apply their educational notions in countries where direct American intervention could meet with rejection from students, teachers and other social and political groups. International institutions such as UNESCO allowed the U.S. government to have some capacity for maneuver, where political circumstances made educational intervention "counterproductive or, at best, ineffective."[18] On this question, U.S. officials recognized that the aforementioned bodies "can proceed with a freedom of action frequently impossible for a single nation, and they can often count upon a warmer reception than a single nation, with its capacity to stir up fears, would enjoy."[19] Likewise, the educational programs endorsed by such institutions enjoyed a modernizing prestige that facilitated their acceptance by the technocratic elites of developing countries "as a mobilizing mechanism to 'catch up' in the modern world, as well as a way to obtain legitimacy in the international community" (McNeely 1995: 502).

In the analyzed cases, educational cooperation between governments, non-official actors and international organizations was also often mediated by a series of individuals such as Ricardo Díez-Hochleitner, Joaquín Tena Artigas, Robert J. Alexander, Rudolph Atcon, Kalman Silvert, Frank Tiller, Joseph Lauwerys, Wilbur Schramm, Philip H. Coombs, and

Peter Fraenkel, among others. These individuals were affiliated to Western universities, private foundations, professional bodies, government agencies, and multilateral institutions. They were part of a community of knowledge professionals, or an "epistemic community" (Haas 1992; Adler 1992), composed of international experts, social scientists and intellectuals. Its members played a key role in the processes of production and transnational circulation of the "semantics of modernization," which led to the educational reforms implemented in the countries of the southern hemisphere during the 1960s and 1970s.[20]

Among these experts, the figure of Rudolph Atcon, whose advisory work on the modernization of university systems in Brazil and Chile, is analyzed in the chapters of Colin Snider and Anabella Abarzúa, respectively. At the beginning of the 1950s, this doctor at Harvard supervised, as an international expert, various educational projects in Brazil. Later, at the end of that decade, he carried out consultancy functions at the service of international entities such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and UNESCO in several Latin American countries (Venezuela, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mexico and Argentina). In the realization of this effort, he collaborated and established contacts with various U.S. actors, both with official agencies for development, and with foundations and universities in that country. Later, during the second half of the 1960s, Atcon played an important role in the university reform approved in Brazil in 1968. As a result of work in different areas of the region, he published influential studies such as "The Latin American University" in 1963. However, his advisory work was not without controversy, as shown by the criticisms made by students, professors, academic authorities and even colleagues of UNESCO, due to the political nature of some of his recommendations.

Despite the rejections aroused on some occasions, the studies and publications of these experts became reference works for international missions and local technocrats who participated in the design of educational programs in developing countries. In this respect, the work of Wilbur Schramm analyzed by Hector Lindo-Fuentes, "Mass Media and National Development" (commissioned by UNESCO), is a good example of the important role played by these experts in the intersection between Western social sciences, the agenda of international development organizations and the Cold War.

Sometimes, the members of this transnational expert and discourse community took on important roles as "informal" or "private" diplomats. That is, these individuals acted as part of a "parallel diplomacy" that complemented the official diplomatic channels, even reaching into areas where the latter did not. The study of the figure of Ricardo Díez-Hochleitner as mediator between the Spanish dictatorship and the U.S. authorities or the WB is illustrative in the sense of the maneuverability of these actors integrated into epistemic communities and with strong international contacts. This position allowed them to develop a work of interlocution sometimes more decisive than that of the state mechanisms themselves.

The works of David Corrales, Lorenzo Delgado and Patricia de la Hoz describe different aspects of this mediating activity, which turned these experts into *informal governance actors*. This concept was coined by Dino Knudsen with the purpose of overcoming the dichotomy between state and civil society that until recently predominated in historical studies of international relations (Knudsen 2016: 8-9). The approach of these and other historians reflects the influence of the cultural and transnational turns in the New Diplomatic History, which have led to a line of inquiry that seeks "to introduce new layers of investigation by focusing on what can be termed the informal or unofficial realm of diplomacy" (Scott-Smith 2014: 1–7). It also highlights the importance of tracking the

itinerary of these communities of experts, formal and informal, and their training and interaction circuits.

Finally, these international experts established close links of cooperation and advice with social scientists and local academic authorities. This was the case, for example, of the professor of Political Science at the University of New York, Kalman Silvert. As can be seen in the chapter by Fernando Quesada, this specialist in Latin America and a consultant for the Ford Foundation, established contacts with a good number of prestigious Latin American academics and joined the main intellectual networks of the region. In fact, Silvert was the first president of the Latin American Studies Association created in 1966 with the support of the aforementioned philanthropic foundation.

Also worthy of note is the good harmony between these international experts, U.S. foundations and the members of the technocratic elites of developing countries. Among these modernizing elites were, for example, the education ministers of countries such as Colombia (Gabriel Betancur), Ecuador (Walter Béneke), Brazil (Flávio Suplicy de Lacerda), Spain (José Luis Villar Palasí) and Chile (Juan Gómez Millas). The latter was, according to Fernando Quesada, held in very high esteem by officials of the Ford Foundation, who considered him a figure committed to the modernization of Chilean universities. Indeed, all these ministers showed a favorable attitude to the technocratic reform of the educational structures of their countries, under the guidance of U.S. consultants and international organizations. From their positions of influence in the governments of developing nations, these technocratic leaders supported the primacy of technical-scientific knowledge above ideologies and politics, which put them in harmony with the principles that international experts and U.S. social scientists had been articulating ever since the 1950s. Like these, the technocrats were also fervent defenders of order and reforms from above as an antidote to the Marxist revolution.

During the 1960s, the U.S. ideas of modernization often fitted right in with the institutional and political priorities of the technocratic leaders of the developing countries, who constituted an audience eager to listen to the international consultants and U.S. modernization theorists and apply their recipes. Although they sometimes rejected the recommendations of certain international experts when the local political circumstances so advised, the technocratic elites of countries such as Spain, Brazil, Chile and El Salvador used to share the views on the education of their counterparts in international organizations and in U.S. development agencies.

Such technocratic sectors, often trained in the West, acted as the primary interpreters of U.S. foreign policymakers and other international actors in their plans for the countries of the global periphery. Their leadership represented an assurance of order and development in the face of the possible destabilizing effects of modernization. From Washington and other Western capitals, they were seen as rational, modern, pragmatic, active, and efficient forces, whose countries, like those studied here, needed to get on board the development train (Simpson 2008: 6). These technocratic elites would come to identify themselves with those whom Federico Romero (2014: 694-95) calls the "political entrepreneurs" of developing countries, who used Cold War discourses such as modernization to shore up their internal power based on a new language of developmental legitimization

US Involvement in the Global Semi (Periphery). From Political Development to Authoritarian Modernization

In the last two decades an influential body of research has presented the Cold War as an ideological struggle between two visions on the nature of global social change and the definition of modernity (Latham 2000; Engerman 2004; Cullather 2004b). From this perspective, the East-West conflict is seen as a competition to "engineer the developing world's transition to modernity – and in the process, attempting to win the 'hearts and minds,' or the ideological loyalties of its population" (Van Vleck 2009: 4).

On the American side, Modernization theory occupied a central place in the competition between two opposing models of development, each aspiring to transform the Third World into its image and likeness (Westad 2000: 554–57). This theory provided the conceptual framework that articulated a series of precepts about the American capacity to end underdevelopment, instability, and the revolutionary threat in the Global South (Latham 2000: 4–5). It worked as an ideological device, whose main principles were used by U.S. officials as a political instrument, analytical model, rhetorical tool, explanatory framework, and value system in the exercise and legitimization of US global power (Simpson 2008: 7).

Although its historical roots can be found in the Enlightenment, in imperialist ideologies, and in the Keynesian reforms of the interwar New Deal period (Shibusawa, 2012; Ekbladh 2009), Modernization theory represents a specific phenomenon of the Cold War in the middle decades of the twentieth century. It was the U.S. response to the political and intellectual challenges imposed by decolonization, global social change, and international communism in the Third World. As such, modernization was used, on the one hand, as a tool for scientific analysis and political control of the profound transformations being produced by the decolonization processes. On the other, it fulfilled a normative function, which prescribed how "traditional" societies should evolve towards a modernity epitomized by the American model.[21]

However, Modernization theory was not an exclusively U.S. phenomenon. It was global and transnational in scope. In fact, it provided the general cognitive framework used by the "international development community" when interpreting and addressing the problems of the nations of the Global South. Both as an intellectual theory and as a political instrument, modernization described and prescribed for these countries a linear and liberal path towards the ideal of progress, as opposed to the promises of social justice and material equality promoted by the dialectical and revolutionary model proposed by communist forces (Latham 2003: 721–22).

The paradigm of modernization was based on a series of principles and assumptions that served as a reference point for the intervention of the United States and other international actors in the newly emerging nations during the 1960s (Del Pero 2009: 21). Throughout that decade U.S. scholars and intellectuals, such as Lucian Pye, Daniel Lerner, Max Millikan and Walt W. Rostow, among others, connected such principles with each other, reinforcing them and forming a coherent and attractive body of doctrine that permeated the formulation of the US foreign policy towards developing countries. In synthesized form, such a mold involved the following assumptions:

> (1) the difference and the hierarchy between modern and traditional societies;
>
> (2) a vision of the latter as societies lacking cultural maturity and political sophistication, weighed down by an archaic mentality and, therefore, tending toward radical political behavior;
>
> (3) the conviction that contact with the West would speed up the development of traditional societies towards modernity;
>
> (4) the view of the political, economic, and social system of the United States as the ultimate expression of modernization; and

> (5)   the belief that economic and socio-cultural development would serve as the foundation for political epiphenomena such as democratization.

In reference to the last of these five points, U.S. social scientists and modernizers believed that developing nations would enter into political modernity when they reached certain levels of industrialization, urbanization, education, and expansion of communications. In their opinion, the economic development of traditional societies would be followed by a transition to more sophisticated, modern political forms similar to those of the Western democracies.[22] This vision, which closely linked economic and political development, was routinely incorporated into U.S. diplomacy's analyses of the socio-economic and political evolution of backward countries. For instance, U.S. officials considered that a "viable democracy in Spain" would only appear "through gradual evolution, accompanied by improved living standards and considerable growth of the middle class."[23]

Consequently, modernization was presented at the end of the 1950s and early 1960s as an altruistic, pluralist, and reformist solution to the risks posed by decolonization and underdevelopment. In 1961, the USIA included modernization as one of its five long-term priority themes based on the "US conviction that the Modernization of newly-developing nations could best be achieved through democratic, pragmatics, means."[24] However, as the decade of the 1960s progressed, that same theory soon became a framework through which to legitimate U.S. alliances with the authoritarian regimes of the Third World, or with countries, like Spain, that were at an "intermediate" stage of development.

In the course of the 1960s, instability and sociopolitical chaos spread in the postcolonial regions. This situation, coupled with the growing communist threat over these parts of the globe, led U.S. officials to give greater weight to the counterinsurgency aspects of

their foreign policy towards newly independent nations. The initial reformist liberal approach to the decolonization and modernization of the Third World was giving way to support for authoritarian and military options. The strategic need to combine anticommunism and modernization led American foreign policy makers to help strong anti-liberal regimes to the detriment of weak representative governments, which were considered susceptible to falling into the hands of radical forces. Consequently, the maintenance of order and stability, rather than the promotion of democracy, became the main objective of United States policy towards the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America throughout the 1960s (Field 2014; Simpson 2008).

At the same, as the 1960s progressed, more prominent US academics watched with concern as the fragile postcolonial nations faced turbulent modernization processes, some of whose ramifications (erosion of authority, rising popular expectations, social conflict, and political instability) could be exploited by the communists. Walt W. Rostow saw the communists as the "scavengers of the modernization process," who sought to take advantage of the conflicts and social pressures unleashed by rapid development. For this renowned theoretician of modernization, the new states that were going through accelerated and convulsive processes of social change were "highly vulnerable" to subversion fomented by revolutionary forces (Rostow, 1961).

Based on this type of approach, various U.S. academics and intellectuals believed that it was therefore necessary that the "take off" towards the modernity of these nations be led by strong authorities, capable of promoting the development of their countries under conditions of stability and order that would close the doors to communist opportunism. The aim, in other words, was to ensure the necessary social discipline to carry out modernization from above so as to block the way of revolution from below. Over the course of the 1960s increasingly modernization theorists and U.S. social scientists began

to see in military and dictatorial governments the best guarantee to impose the authority needed to preserve the anticommunist status quo during the chaotic modernization of traditional societies. According to this approach, by promoting economic development within a framework of social order, these autocracies would help to put their nations on the road to democracy. American social science establishment thus came to see right-wing authoritarian regimes as an effective vehicle for boosting economic growth, containing communism and, as a result, facilitating the establishment of pluralistic systems in their countries in the long term (Latham 2012: 153).

As a consequence, in a context in which social science, geo-strategy and U.S. national interests were closely linked, the normative priority of Modernization theory went from "democracy" to "stability" as the political and moral ideal for developing countries (O'Brien 1972: 351–53). This orientation was expressed by numerous academic works that appeared during the first half of the 1960s (Bienen 1971: 9–21). In general terms, these contributions presented the military dictatorships allied with the United States as the ideal agents to promote a stable modernization that would lead to the future democratization of traditional societies that at that time tended toward turmoil and could be easily manipulated by the "delusions of communism" (Herman 1995: 136).[25] As a memorandum sent to the State Department from a conference held in 1961 at the Brookings Institution explained, from the late 1950s, American political theorists and academics had begun to see the reactionary and militaristic forces "as a sort of panacea for the ills of underdeveloped countries," on account of their ability to steer development "under non-Communist auspices."[26] Thus, an emerging academic consensus was built around an authoritarian version of modernization that conceived anticommunist dictatorships as a temporary necessary evil in defense of long-term freedom (Schmitz 2006: 2-3).

Such ideas were used by U.S. diplomats to justify the American superpower's support for authoritarian governments in developing countries, such as some of those included in this book. In this regard, the dictatorship of General Franco in Spain and the military regimes of El Salvador, Brazil and, subsequently, Chile as of 1973, were seen from Washington as agents of development and important bastions in the struggle against international communism. The U.S. government channeled substantial amounts of economic, technical, and military aid to these autocratic regimes in order to promote the "healthy" and "stable" development that would close the way to communist subversion in two areas that held great geo-strategic value in the Cold War: Southern Europe and Latin America. In the discourse of the U.S. leaders, democracy used to be conceived as a final goal of the modernizing process, always situated in the medium-long term. The immediate geostrategic needs ended up turning that discourse into a litany with dubious effects on reality, as evidenced in the Spanish case (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 2015a). However, the support of the U.S. Department of State for anti-Communist dictatorships was not always shared by its partners in the "international development community." This was the case of the Ford Foundation in Chile. As Fernando Quesada says, the Foundation did not share the policy of the Nixon administration towards the government of Salvador Allende and the subsequent dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet.

Human Capital and Education

In addition to its structural aspects, Modernization theory, as an expression of liberal-internationalist ambitions for social engineering, also had a social-psychological and cultural dimension that has been little explored. In the 1960s, prominent social scientists, such as Walt W. Rostow, Daniel Lerner, David McClelland and Alex Inkeles thought that

modernization was not only an economic, social and institutional process, but also a cultural and mental one. These authors considered countries like the ones studied in this book to have one key feature in common, despite their different historical trajectories and their diverse geographical, economic, and political circumstances: the level of psychological and cultural evolution in their societies was not comparable to that of the Western First World, which was made up of the rich, modern nations that shared a cultural heritage and similar political institutions compatible with those of the United States.

From this perspective, the democracies of the "Free World" were characterized by the socio-cultural hegemony of values related to empiricism, rationality, science, efficiency and political moderation. On the contrary, traditional societies were seen as "people afflicted with a sense of fatalism, debility of mind as much as material condition" (Latham 2003: 7). In other words, the aforementioned authors substituted the biological racism of social Darwinism for cultural and anthropological approaches. Such a vision associated the ideal of modernity with the cultural patterns of the Western world, while contrasting it with the irrational customs and habits characteristic of underdeveloped societies.

Unlike the developed nations, traditional societies suffered—according to the view of the U.S. social scientific establishment—from a cultural backwardness that, on the one hand, hindered economic growth and, on the other, made them vulnerable to radical and communist ideologies. From this perspective, the irrationality and the superstition inherent in underdeveloped societies were the origin of such problems as inequality, poverty, corruption, radicalism and underdevelopment. In the same vein, some of the most renowned proponents of modernization cited in this book, such as Wilbur Schramm and Max Millikan, considered that change in mentalities, beliefs, and cultural habits was one of the basic requirements for the promotion of progress in the countries of the Global South.

According to this ethnocentric and paternalistic notion of modernization, developing nations were not genetically inferior but culturally backward. The stagnation of these societies was not due to biological reasons but to the perpetuation of traditional ways of life. These were the causes of a state of prostration that could only be overcome by adopting the methods and ideas that had fostered prosperity in Western democracies. This approach was also shared by sectors of the technocratic elites of the countries of the world's semi-periphery. For example, Laureano López Rodó, a technocrat leader influenced by the ideas of Walt W. Rostow, well connected with the United States and responsible for the Development Plans that were made in Spain between 1962 and 1973, considered the decisive element for modernization of this country was the acquisition of a "development mentality". In statements to the press in October 1965, he stated that "structures cannot be transformed if mental attitudes are not modified before and the old atavisms are banished."[27]

According to this thinking, the progress of backward nations depended not only on Western development aid programs, but also on contact with the values and rational attitudes of the "modern man". That is to say, the "minor" nations must emulate the most advanced nations, which in turn had a moral obligation to guide the underdeveloped peoples towards maturity.

This view led the United States and its allies in the global mission of modernization to place great importance on the dissemination in developing societies of modern concepts, values, and practices upon which the advances of the Western world had been based. Thus, modernization was not only a "normative vocabulary" in the hands of the U.S. *Cold warriors*, but also a cultural good that could be transmitted through different channels, such as technology, technical assistance, mass communications and education (Isaac 2007: 741; Cullather 2004a: 227).

Philanthropic officials, technocrats, social scientists and modernizers linked to Western governments and institutions viewed education as one of the main instruments to instill in these societies a "new sense of rationality, efficiency, and respect for empiricism in contrast to native passivity" (Latham 2003a: 3). For them, education was considered an instrument of socio-cultural transformation that would shape Third World societies in the image and likeness of Western powers and end traditional habits that hindered their development. As mentioned in 1966, an OECD report on the Spanish case stated that the construction of modern and efficient education systems in developing nations was a necessary condition for "breaking the stereotyped schemes of a mentality excessively attached to the traditional."[28]

From this perspective, education –and the incorporation in it of advances in fields such as mass communication - represented an essential instrument to disseminate to "backward" societies the attitudes, methods, and modern ideas—efficiency, productivity, pragmatism, moderation—necessary to: (1) promote economic growth compatible with the transatlantic security agenda, (2) prevent the spread of revolutionary ideas among sectors such as students and the future elites, and (3) neutralize the revolutionary potential in these societies and get them closely linked to the Western world. From this conception of education as an instrument for development and as a weapon in the Cold War, projects emerged such as educational television analyzed in Hector Lindo-Fuentes' chapter. Educational television was an initiative promoted for the whole of the American subcontinent as part of the promotion of technological education. [29]

This approach to education was in line with the Chicago-School human capital theory propounded since the late 1950s by a number of economists—Theodore Schultz, W. Arthur Lewis, Fred Harbison and Gary Becker, among others. In 1960, Theodore Schultz popularized the term "human capital theory" during a conference of the American

Economic Association over which he presided. This theory held that training the workforce was crucial to "the productive superiority of technically advanced countries" (Schultz 1968: 135-36). In 1964, the standard reference work in this field appeared: "Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education," written by Becker. This scholar, who would later receive the Nobel Prize in Economics, highlighted the central role of education and human resources in the promotion of economic growth (Dorn and Ghodsee 2012: 383–85).

Generally speaking, all of these authors regarded education as representing a valuable productive investment to train a qualified workforce that could respond to the needs of global capitalism (Jones and Coleman 2005: 31). Such a modernizing and technocratic conception of education as an engine of national development formed the basis of a "developmental educational ideology," which attained a high degree of academic and institutional prestige during the 1960s. Its principles shaped the paradigm that dominated the educational debate and permeated the policies in this field of governments and international organizations such as UNESCO, the WB, and the OECD (Fiala and Gordon 1987: 318-19).

These organizations saw in the training of human capital the main resource with which countries like Brazil, Spain, Chile and El Salvador could reach the First World (Ossenbach and Martínez Boom 2011). An economicist approach to education that had a decisive influence on the education policies implemented by developing countries during the 1960s. For instance, the three Development Plans promoted by the technocratic sectors of the Spanish dictatorship between 1962 and 1973 conceived education as a fundamental part of economic growth (Milito and Groves 2013: 137). In a similar vein, the aforementioned OECD report attached great importance to education and the training of human capital to respond to the "needs of skilled labor that economic development

implies." Likewise, in 1965 the Director of the Analysis Division of the Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO pointed out that investment in the "training of manpower and human resources in an economic and professional sense" was vital for developing countries to "break the vicious circle of poverty and social systems that impede development." (UNESCO 1965: 22)

The U.S. propaganda and public diplomacy agencies also invested considerable effort in disseminating the human capital approach to education among academic authorities, teachers and students of semi (peripheral) nations.[30] A good example of this was the presentation given by the U.S. Ambassador in Spain, Angier Biddle-Duke, before a young audience at the Institute of North American Studies of Barcelona in November 1965. On this occasion, the U.S Ambassador remarked that "in advancing industrial societies, where productive requirements relate directly to education, a growing faction of unskilled citizens has little to offer to community."[31]

Similar opinions could be found in articles collected in journals - such as *Noticias de Actualidad*, *Atlántico* y *Facetas* - distributed by the U.S. Information Agency among the cultural, intellectual and educational elites of Spain. For example, the last issue of *Noticias de Actualidad* in 1961 included an article entitled "Education and Economics." The text emphasized that the progress of any "modern economic society" needed the training of technical, scientific, economic and administrative personnel. The progress of the United States, itself, and other advanced nations had been based, according to the article, on educational opportunities and investment in human resources.[32] Through this type of articles and other channels -such as exhibitions and documentary screenings- U.S. public diplomacy disseminated in Spain the technocratic, depoliticizing, and developmental vision of education apropos to the human capital theory.

However, it must be emphasized that although this educational ideology provided a general outline that guided the conceptions and methods of action of international experts and institutions, within this framework there was still room for varied and heterogeneous educational discourses, such as those expressed by U.S. specialists in the Brazilian university reform, as studied by Colin Snider. This case highlights the different U.S. approaches that, based on a technocratic and modernizing conception of education, participated in guiding educational reform in that South American country. As such, Snider's contribution questions the vision of the U.S. superpower as a homogeneous imperial power, which spoke with a single voice on issues related to development.

The Spanish Case: Development and Dictatorship.

This book pays special attention to Spain. The literature on Cold War modernization has selectively focused its interest on the impact of the narratives and practices of modernization in societies that were decolonized after the World War II. There are also a number of works on nations that, despite having achieved independence much earlier— most notably Latin American countries—faced the challenge of postwar development in a context of instability and potential communist threats. The emphasis on U.S. discourses and programs of modernization in postcolonial and Third World societies has seemed to obviate the investigation of other cases such as Spain, which does not fit into an interpretive framework mainly built around the Third World-postcolonial axis limited to Asian, African, and Latin American experiences. Although modernization was a global and transnational project in character and scope, research is scarce on those countries which, like Spain, occupied an intermediate position between the First and the Third World based on their level of economic development and their social structure.

In September, 1953, the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower and the dictatorship of General Francisco Franco concluded a military pact that began a long period of collaboration between the United States and Spain. This agreement allowed the superpower to establish, under very advantageous conditions, military bases of high strategic value on Spanish soil while giving Spain economic, technical, and military aid (Liedtke 1998; Calvo 2001; Viñas 2003; Puig and Álvaro 2004; Álvaro 2011; León Aguinaga and Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla 2018). From then, and until the death of Franco in 1975, matters of security occupied a high priority in US foreign policy towards Spain. As an official report put it in 1960, "Spain plays a strong role in our worldwide defensive strategy and our policies toward that country are, in a sense, dictated by our security interests."[33]

The strategic relationship established with the United States contributed to breaking the international rejection that the Franco regime suffered on account of its affinity with the Axis powers in the World War II. Even so, at the end of the 1950s, U.S. diplomacy still regarded Spain as an isolated and underdeveloped country, at a great distance from its Western European neighbors. As an official report pointed out in 1959, throughout its recent history, Spain had "lagged behind as neighboring countries modernized themselves," their standard of living being the lowest of any Western European country except Portugal.[34]

However, after the Stabilization Plan of the Spanish economy that was launched that same year, this country went through an unprecedented phase of economic expansion between 1960 and 1973. During this period, the Spanish economy grew at an annual rate of more than 7%, only surpassed within the OECD by Japan. The accelerated industrialization and tertiarization of the economy provoked deep demographic and social changes that led to a rapid urbanization of the country. At the same time, an incipient mass consumer society

emerged and new habits and more open and plural forms of lifestyle appeared. Factors such as tourism, television, the decline of the rural population, the increase in per capita income and the emergence of new middle classes helped to foster secularization and modernization of Spanish attitudes and behaviors (Townson 2007).

Due to the important economic advances achieved by Spain in these years, in 1962, the country ceased to be a recipient of aid from the U.S. Agency for International Development. Around the same time, U.S. diplomacy began to describe Spain "as the most developed of the underdeveloped nations."[35] For U.S. analysts, Spain was a country midway between the North and the Global South. This characterization referred not only to its geographical position at the southern border of Europe, but also to its intermediate socio-economic and cultural status with the Atlantic Community, comprising the affluent nations that shared political institutions similar to those of the United States, and Third World societies. Such a position, a "bridge" between the center and the periphery of the world economy, along with its important strategic location, makes Spain an interesting focus of study for evaluating the incidence of Cold War modernization.

U.S. diplomats favorably received the new socio-economic dynamics set in motion in Spain, since they converged with their defensive objectives in the Iberian Peninsula. For this reason, they hailed the fast and robust economic development of Spain as "a necessary concomitant to the US joint-use of Spanish [military] bases and facilities".[36] Likewise, in the summer of 1963, a report of the U.S. Policy Planning Council enthusiastically stressed that "Spain, economically, has now very nearly reached the take-off stage," which would definitively put the country on the path towards modernization.[37] Similar optimism could be detected two years later in another memorandum, which highlighted that Spain was "undergoing a rapid economic and social transition which is breaking down the decades of isolation."[38]

However, the profound social and economic transformations witnessed by the country during the 1960s also gave rise to strong protest movements, especially in sectors such as the universities, which weakened the dictatorship of General Franco and jeopardized the defensive priorities of the United States in this country. In 1960s' Spain there was no threat as powerful and imminent as that projected in Latin America by the Cuban revolution and the spread of insurgent movements in various parts of the hemisphere. However, U.S. diplomats still viewed with some concern the increase in discontent and conflict in a context of sweeping and chaotic social change. In addition, Franco's aging and the weakening of his regime were occurring in parallel. All these factors could complicate a future succession of the dictator that was favorable to the geo-strategic interests of the U.S. superpower (Martín García 2013).

In the face of such danger, U.S. government promoted and assisted various modernization programs in different fields, such as the economy, agriculture, education, science, the Armed Forces and public administration. In general, the U.S. involvement in these programs had a double purpose. In the first place, it was about promoting an orderly capitalist development that, in turn, underpinned the political stability required for the maintenance of U.S. military bases in Spanish territory. Secondly, it was intended to create the economic, social and cultural conditions necessary to prepare a future post-Franco transition that would be peaceful, moderate and compatible with the military objectives of the United States (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 2010).

Thus, the assistance of the superpower with the educational reforms that took place in Spain at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s must be understood within this context. That is, it was part of the U.S. modernization effort that sought to create the human capital necessary for the promotion of economic development which, in turn, would pave the way for an evolutionary and favorable regime change to Western defense

interests in the Iberian Peninsula. In this sense, in addition to reducing conflict on university campuses, U.S. assistance to educational reform tried to encourage economic growth, which would contribute to "expand and strengthen the social basis for the evolution of a popularly-based political system and to provide an element of stability during the crucial transitional period following Franco's demise."[39] But in the educational reform, the Americans collaborated and assisted the Spanish authoritarian technocrats, who did not intend to democratize the country, but to safeguard the survival of the Franco regime.

In any case, though the United States encouraged and intervened in educational reform in Spain as part of its international political agenda in the framework of the Cold War, it did not take the simple form of external imposition by a hegemonic power. In fact, Spanish government officials and academic authorities showed great interest in U.S. assistance in the modernization of the obsolete and archaic educational system of their country. As Lorenzo Delgado and Patricia de la Hoz show, in the context of the negotiation that led to the renewal of military agreements between the two countries in 1969-1970, the Spanish dictatorship actively sought American aid to launch an educational reform that would consolidate the path of economic growth and contribute to prop up its political survival.

Therefore, although as we have seen, educational modernization fitted in with U.S. priorities and interests, it was to a large extent the negotiating pressure of the Spanish authorities that led to the United States' commitment to its educational plans (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 2010). Thus, if the Cold War imposed on the authorities of countries such as Spain a subordinated geopolitical status, these countries also played their tricks to take advantage of the opportunities for agency opened by the bipolar competition itself

(Van Vleck 2009). In this way, the educational reform became an important space for interaction, negotiation and collaboration between Madrid and Washington.

Indeed, the Spanish government sought U.S. aid in the field of educational reform as part of their authoritarian modernization project. This project aimed to expand the dwindling social bases of Franco's regime by promoting economic growth, mass consumption, and social and political demobilization (González-Fernández, 2016). Franco's regime aspired to obtain greater consent and popular support at a juncture in which victory in the Spanish civil war in the late 1930s had lost the capacity for cohesion and social control, as highlighted by the student protests. The Spanish authorities saw in the U.S. aid for the modernization of the educational structures of the country an element of legitimization that allowed them to connect with the expectations of improvement in living conditions that were spreading in Spanish society. Likewise, the Salvadoran leaders considered that an elaborate educational reform program that enjoyed the approval and assistance of Washington and international organizations would promote economic growth, neutralize the expansion of communism and legitimize a military regime that felt threatened by the revolution in Cuba.

The main architects of the development of this re-legitimization operation sponsored by Franco's dictatorship were the technocratic leaders. During the second half of the 1950s, Spanish technocrats climbed to positions of power in the apparatus of the authoritarian state. Their goal was to undertake the economic transformations that, under the cloak of Western capitalism, would ensure the continuity of Franco's rule. The technocrats sought to achieve a "reactionary utopia" based on the promotion of economic development and social depoliticization. Both were considered as necessary conditions for the perpetuation of Franco's regime as an anti-liberal but modern state. For this, they chose to seek advice

and external support, serving as intermediaries between the international currents of the time and their adaptation to Spanish reality (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 2015b).

The links of the Spanish authoritarian technocrats with organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the OECD, the WB, and UNESCO were extremely useful, as it enabled them to serve as mediators with those who had the resources and methods that, coming in from outside, could help pull the country out of its backwardness. Spanish technocrats aspired to become the agents of a project of controlled change "from above," from the state apparatus. In the context of the 1960s, the Spanish technocratic elites—as was also the case with some of their Latin American counterparts—embraced the formulas devised by U.S. social scientists, which would branch out and become strong in international organizations (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 2015b).

Education Reform, Technocrats, and Discontents

Throughout this book it can be seen that the discourse of educational modernization was not forcibly imposed on the political, economic, and intellectual elites and societies of southern hemisphere countries. As González-Delgado and Groves explain, educational transfers do not occur exclusively as a hierarchical imposition on the part of international organizations and governments. For these authors, the introduction and development of certain educational policies under Franco's dictatorship in Spain not only occurred in response to a transnational process, but also to one in which local actors were able to wield considerable influence. For his part, Colin Snider points out that in the case of the *Reforma Universitária* in Brazil, the recommendations of U.S. experts and agencies were accepted or rejected by the military dictatorship in accordance with its own interests. As happened in the Spanish case, the Brazilian rulers adopted those U.S. notions that fitted

their own views on education, development, and social order, while rejecting those that worked against their political priorities.

Thus, it is convenient to take into consideration the interests and the agency capacity of developing countries. Although these nations were subject to U.S. hegemony, their educational reforms responded to a two-way dynamic in which, together with the influence of U.S. models, there were processes of collaboration and negotiation between the parties involved. That is to say, these educational reforms were more the result of co-production than of the domination of imperial power. For John Krige, the concept of co-production, "draw[s] attention to the creativity of both partners." It "implies that empire building is a fluid process" in which the developing nations "selectively appropriated and adapted features of the US agenda and (...) made them their own" (Krige 2006: 4-6).

Therefore, the reforms discussed in this book were not just a Western educational archetype imported and implanted artificially in developing nations and without any connection to the socio-economic and educational situation of these countries.. Rather, these reforms responded to a number of educational needs and problems of underdevelopment that had long been recognized in both the domestic sphere and international forums. For example, in Brazil, the situation of education and its contribution to national progress was a cross-cutting concern shared by different political regimes. As Colin Snider shows in his chapter on this country, both the governments that emerged from the military coup of 1964 and their predecessors elected at the polls emphasized the urgency of modernizing education as a vehicle to resolve the social and economic backwardness of that country.

However, it should be emphasized that in the middle decades of the twentieth century, educational reform in developing nations was not a matter of exclusive interest of the political elites.[40] During the 1960s, countries such as Spain, Chile, Brazil, and El

Salvador, witnessed an intense social, academic and intellectual debate on the modernization of the educational system and its implementation at the service of the needs of development. For example, as noted in a paper on the Brazilian case, the important educational reform of 1968 "did not emerge out of the bureaucratic ether," rather "it marked the culmination of a public debate between the Brazilian state and society that dated back to the late 1950s." (Snider 2013: 101).

It can be said, therefore, that the educational reforms of the late 1960s and early 1970s were preceded by a climate of public discussion about education and modernization. These reforms were the result of a wealth of social demands and expectations, public debates, and educational experiences and innovations that had been ongoing since the 1950s. For example, in Spain the approval of the General Education Law of 1970 was preceded by a series of student protests, the publication of books and newspaper articles and various pedagogical and educational modernization proposals that had been introduced since the 1950s, as Mariano González and Tamar Groves explain in this book. In order to know in depth the socio-political and cultural environment that preceded and surrounded the implementation of educational reforms, it is necessary to pay attention to the demands, mobilizations and educational and pedagogical proposals arising from the base of civil society, especially among the movements of students and teachers. In this regard, it should be noted that Cold War modernization studies have generally placed their focus on the core from which the modernization ideas emanated, concentrating on the official programs and narratives used by U.S. experts, social scientists, and diplomats. But there is also a body of historical and anthropological research that has assessed the local effects of U.S.-led modernization programs in developing nations. This literature has paid attention to the encounters on the ground between modernization and its target groups, as well as to the processes of reinterpretation and local adaptation of the

approaches disseminated by U.S. modernizers and diplomats (Escobar 1995; Scott 1999; Mitchell 2002; Adas 2006).

In this line, in the last decades, works have appeared that analyze how modernization was received, answered, or reappropriated in developing societies, as its application in different cultural and political contexts provoked widely varying reactions and results. Some of these works include theoretical proposals that combine top-down with bottom-up perspectives in the study of diverse Latin American cases. Such studies have introduced new local actors – such as youth activists, union leaders, women and peasants- in the study of modernization, thus contributing to expanding the framework of who "counts" in the international history of the Cold War (Gilbert and Spenser 2008; Field 2012; Lindo-Fuentes and Ching 2012).

Building on this literature, the works included in this book by Óscar J. Martín García and Héctor Lindo-Fuentes are interested in conflicts and social struggles led by students and teachers in connection with educational modernization. As said above, at the end of the 1960s, Philip H. Coombs pointed to the emergence of a global educational crisis. In his opinion, this crisis resided in the inability of obsolete educational systems of developing countries to adapt to the demands arising from rapid social change. One of the principal manifestations of this incongruity between the old educational structures and the new economic, social, and cultural realities was the growing frustration, discontent and disaffection of young people and students, as can be seen in the chapter by Óscar J. Martín García.

During the 1960s, these groups demanded educational reforms to solve pressing problems for the university community, such as overcrowding in the classrooms, lack of resources, and insufficient student participation in university management or limited teacher training. As Christiansen and Scarlett (2013: 6) point out "one important catalyst that

sparked social movements in Europe and the United States, as well as in the Third World, was an active concern over education and educational reform."

Faced with this situation, Western government officials and international bureaucrats considered it necessary to implement educational reforms that modernized educational systems, fostered economic growth and neutralized student discontent. According to Óscar J. Martín García, such student unrest was perceived by U.S. officials as the result of the pressures and imbalances caused by the impetuous social change over archaic educational structures. This amounted to identifying the deficiencies of the educational systems such as problems related to development and technical and administrative issues, which could be solved through the application of scientific knowledge of international experts. In some cases, such a position implied a certain disdain for the demands of students and professors, whose opinions were hardly taken into account in reforms generally conceived and implemented from above.

There were also exceptions to this rule. Anabella Abarzúa refers to the capacity of student organizations to influence educational reforms at the Universidad de Concepción in Chile. Along this line, various chapters emphasize the agency capacity of students. Fernando Quesada argues that the Ford Foundation was receptive and tried to incorporate student approaches into the modernization programs of the University of Chile. According to Colin Snider, student pressure caused Brazilian academic authorities to distance themselves from an expert as prestigious and renowned as Rudolph Atcon. In any case, the implementation of educational reforms was very often accompanied - as can be seen in the cases of Spain, Brazil and Chile - with important signs of student unrest and protest. The Salvadoran case deserves special mention, where the opposition of teachers to the *General Law of Education* approved in 1971 fueled a strong social polarization that led to civil war.

Therefore, it can be said that the educational plans promoted by local technocrats, international experts and U.S. modernizers met on more than one occasion with rejection from below, especially from students. At times, the most politicized and active student groups were considered by international experts as a force contrary to the modernization of higher education. So it was not entirely strange, as can be seen in the chapter by Anabella Abarzúa, that in some cases, these advisers recommended the national university authorities to constrain student groups. While there were also proposals, such as the one developed by the UNESCO expert Joseph Lauwerys for the Universidad de Concepción in Chile, which suggested the participation of students in the reform process through the consultation of their representative organizations.

To conclude, in the study of the educational reforms of the 1960s and 1970s, it is essential to go beyond the sanitized reports of local technocrats and international institutions, and pay attention to the tumultuous national and international picture of these decades. It is necessary to bear in mind that these reforms often took place in a local and international environment of social and political ferment, in which the attitudes of actors such as students and teachers acquired great importance. Sometimes, these local and grass-roots actors rejected reforms that they considered technocratic, hierarchical, and designed by neocolonial experts (such as Rudolph Atcon) to satisfy the interests of U.S. capitalism. Such resistance, in cases of dictatorial systems like the Spanish one, was accompanied by a simultaneous phenomenon among sectors of the most conservative political and social elites. Although in these countries the projects of educational modernization were pushed from above to prop up the authoritarian order, the immobilist establishment sectors were wary of the potentially liberalizing effects of the reforms. In the end, the transnational process that articulated educational reform, modernization and development failed to fill the "revolution of expectations" unleashed in the decades of the 1960s and 1970s. The

reactions it provoked were disparate, but its influence on a number of Global South societies was indisputable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adas, Michael. 2006. *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America's Civilizing Mission*. Cambridge: Belknapp Press.

Adler, Emanuel. 1992. "Conclusion: Epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program." *International Organization* 46(1): 367–390.

Álvaro Moya, Adoración. 2011. "Guerra Fría y formación de capital humano durante el franquismo. Un balance sobre el programa estadounidense de ayuda técnica (1953–1963)." *Historia del Presente* 17: 13–25.

Arnove, Robert F. 1980. "Comparative Education and World-Systems Analysis." *Comparative Education Review* 24(1): 48–62.

Becker, Gary. 1964. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bienen, Henry. 1971. *The Military and Modernization*. Chicago: Atherton.

Black, Conrad. 2007. *Richard Milhous Nixon. The Invencible Quest*. London, Quercus.

Calvo, Óscar. 2001. "¡Bienvenido Míster Marshall! La ayuda económica americana y la economía española en la década de 1950." *Revista de Historia Económica* (Special Issue): 253–275.

Christiansen, S. and Z. A. Scarlett. 2013. "Introduction." In *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, eds. Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett, 1-19. New York, Berghahn Books.

Citino, Nathan. 2012. "The 'crush' of ideologies: The United States, the Arab world, and Cold war modernization." *Cold War History* 12(1): 89–110.

Coombs, Philip H. 1968. *The World Educational Crisis. A Systems Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cullather, Nick. 2004a. "Miracles of modernization: the green revolution and the apotheosis of technology." *Diplomatic History* 28(2): 227–254.

___. 2004b. "Modernization Theory." In *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, eds. Michael Hogan and Thomas Paterson, 212–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darnton, Christopher. 2012. "Asymmetry and Agenda-Setting in US –Latin American Relations: Rethinking the Origins of the Alliance for Progress." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 14: 55-92.

De Miguel, Amando. 1976. *Reformar la universidad*, Barcelona: Euros.

Del Pero, Mario. 2009. *Eccentric Realist: Henry Kissinger and the Shaping of American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, Lorenzo, 2010. "After Franco, What?' La diplomacia pública de Estados Unidos y la preparación del post-franquismo." In *Claves internacionales en la Transición española*, ed. Óscar J. Martín García and Manuel Ortiz Heras, 99-127. Madrid: Los Libros de la Catarata.

___. 2015a. "Consistency and Credibility: Why You Cannot Collaborate with Dictatorships and Sell Democracy." In *U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain. Selling Democracy?* ed. Francisco J. Rodríguez Jiménez, Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, and Nicholas J. Cull, 201-228. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

___. 2015b. "Modernizadores y tecnócratas. Estados Unidos ante la política educativa y científica de la España del desarrollo." *Historia y Política* 34: 113–146.

Dorn, C., and K. Ghodsee. 2012. "The Cold War Politicization of Literacy: Communism, UNESCO, and the World Bank." *Diplomatic History* 36(2): 373–398.

Ekbladh, David. 2009. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Engerman, David C. 2004. "The Romance of Economic Development and New Histories of the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 28(2): 23-55.

Engerman, David, Nils Gilman, Mark Haefele, and Michael Latham, eds. 2003. *Staging Growth. Modernization, Development and the Global Cold War*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Fiala, R., and A. Gordon. 1987. "Educational Ideology and the World Education Revolution, 1950–1970." *Comparative Education Review* 31(3): 315–333.

Field, Thomas. 2012. "Ideology as Strategy: Military-Led Modernization and the Origins of the Alliance for Progress in Bolivia." *Diplomatic History* 36(1): 147–183.

___. 2014. *From Development to Dictatorship. Bolivia and the Alliance for Progress in the Kennedy Era*. London: Cornell University Press.

Frey, Marc, Sönke Kunkel, and Corinna Unger, eds. 2014. *International Organizations and Development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garfinkle, A. and A. Luxenberg. 1991. "The First Friendly Tyrants." In *Friendly Tyrants. An American Dilemma*, eds. Adam Garfinkle and Daniel Pipes, 23-41. London: MacMillan Academic.

Gleijeses, Pero. 2009. *The Cuban Drumbeat*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

González-Fernández, Ángeles. 2016. "La otra modernización: tecnocracia y 'mentalidad de desarrollo' en la peninsula ibérica (1959-1974)." *Historia y Política* 35: 313-339.

Gutteridge, William, 1964. *Military Institutions and Power in the New States*. London: Pall Mall.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination." *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.

Herman, Ellen. 1995. *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Huntington, Samuel, ed. 1962. *Changing Patterns of Military Politics*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Hanhimäki, J., and O. A. Westad, eds. 2003. *The Cold War: A History in Documents and Eyewitness Accounts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Isaac, Joel. 2007. "The Human Sciences in Cold War America." *The Historical Journal* 50(3): 725–746.

James, Scott. 1999. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Janowitz, Morris. 1964. *The Military in the Political Development of New Nations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jolly, Richard, Louis Emmerij, Dharam Ghai, and Frédéric Lapeyre. 2004. *UN Contributions to Development Thinking and Practice.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jones, P., and D. Coleman. 2005. *The United Nations and Education. Multilateralism, Development and Globalisation*. New York: Routledge.

Joseph, G., and D. Spenser. eds. 2008. *In from the Cold. Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Kramer, Paul A. 2009. "Is the World Our Campus? International Students and U.S. Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century." *Diplomatic History* 33(5): 775-806.

Krige, John. 2006. *Hegemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Knudsen, Dino. 2016. *The Trilateral Commission and Global Governance: Informal Elite Diplomacy, 1972–82*. New York: Routledge.

Landa, Ronald; Miller, James; Patterson, David; Sampson, Charles (eds.). 1993. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958–1960*, Western Europe, Volume VII, Part 2, Washington: United States Government Printing Office.

Latham, Michael E. 2000. *Modernization as Ideology. American Social Science and Nation Building in the Kennedy Era*. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press.

___. 2003a. "Modernization." In *The Modern Social Sciences*, ed. Theodore Porter and Dorothy Ross, 722–731. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

___. 2003b. "Introduction: Modernization, International History, and the Cold War World." In *Staging Growth. Modernization, Development and the Global Cold* War, ed. David Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark Haefele and Michael Latham, 1–24. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

___. 2012. *Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization and US Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Laville, H., and H. Wilford. 2006. *The US Government, Citizen Groups and the Cold War: The State-Private Network*. London: Routledge.

León Aguinaga, P. and L. Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla. 2018. "The Deployment of U.S. Military Assistance to Franco's Spain: Limited Modernization and Strategic Dependence." *Cold War History* (doi: 10.1080/14682745.2018.1492554).

Liedtke, Boris. 1998. *Embracing a Dictatorship. U.S. Relations with Spain, 1945–1953*. London: Macmillan.

Lindo-Fuentes, H., and E. Ching. 2012. *Diálogos: Modernizing Minds in El Salvador: Education Reform and the Cold War, 1960–1980*. Alburquerque: University of New Mexico.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *The American Political Science Review* 53: 69–105.

Lucas, Scott. 2003. "Beyond Freedom, Beyond Control: Approaches to Culture and the State-Private Network in the Cold War." In *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe*, ed. Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam, 40–57. London: Frank Cass.

Martín García, Óscar J. 2013. "A Complicated Mission. The United States and Spanish Students during the Johnson Administration." *Cold War History* 12(4): 311-329.

McNeely, Connie L. 1995. "Prescribing National Education Policies: The Role of International Organizations." Comparative Education Review 39(4): 483–507.

McPherson, Alan. 2003. *Yankee No! Anti-Americanism in U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Meyer, John W., Ramírez, Francisco; Robinson, Richard and Boli-Bennet, John. 1979. "The world educational Revolution, 1950–1970." In *National Development and the*

World System. Educational, Economic, and Political Change, *1950–1970*, eds. J.W. Meyer and M. T. Hannan, 37–56. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Milito, C., and T. Groves. 2013, "¿Modernización o democratización? La construcción de un nuevo sistema educativo entre el tardofranquismo y la democracia." *Bordón* 65(4): 135–148.

Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

O'Brien, Donal C. 1972. "Modernization, Order, and the Erosion of a Democratic Ideal: American Political Science 1960-70." *Journal of Development Studies* 8(4): 351–378.

OECD. 1965. *The Mediterranean Regional Project. Spain*. Paris: OECD.

Ossenbach, G., and A. Martínez Boom. 2011. "Itineraries of the discourses on development and education in Spain and Latin America (circa 1950–1970)." *Paedagogica Historica* 47(5): 679–700.

Parmar, Inderjeet. 2002. "American foundations and the development of international knowledge networks." *Global Networks* 2: 13–30

Popp, Roland. 2008. "An application of modernization theory during the Cold War? The case of Pahlavi Iran." *The International History Review* 30 (1): 76–98.

Puig, N., and A. Álvaro. 2004. "La guerra fría y los empresarios españoles: la articulación de los intereses económicos de Estados Unidos en España, 1950–1975." *Revista de Historia Económica* 22(2): 387–424.

Rabe, Stephen G. 1988. *Eisenhower and Latin America. The Foreign Policy of Anticommunism*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.

___. 1999. *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

___. 2012. *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Romero, Federico. 2014. "Cold War historiography at the crossroads." *Cold War History* 14(4): 685–703.

Ruiz Schneider, Carlos. 1994. "Educación, desarrollo y modernización." *Revista de Sociología* 9: 83–93.

Schayegh, Cyrus. 2012. "Iran's Karaj Dam Affair: Emerging Mass Consumerism, the POlitics of Promise, and the Cold War in the Third World." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54(3): 612-643.

Schmitz, David F. 2006. The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1965–1989. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schriewer, Jürgen. 1997. "Sistema mundial y redes de interrelación: la internacionalización de la educación y el papel de la investigación comparada." *Educación y Ciencia* 1: 21–58.

Schultz, Theodore. 1968. *Valor económico de la educación*. México: UTEHA.

Scott-Smith, Giles. 2014. "Private Diplomacy: Making the Citizen Visible." *New Global Studies* 8: 1–7.

Sharma, Patrick Allan. 2017. *Robert McNamara's Other War: The World Bank and International Development.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Shibusawa, Naoko. 2012. "Ideology, Culture and the Cold War." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War*, ed. Richard H. Immerman and Petra Goedde, 32–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, Bradley R. 2008. *Economists with Guns. Authoritarian Development and U.S.-Indonesian Relations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Snider, Colin. 2013 "A More Systemic Fight for Reform. University Reform, Student Movements, Society, and the State in Brazil, 1957-1968." In *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, eds. Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett, 101-115. New York: Berghahn Books.

Snyder, Sarah. 2013. "Bringing the Trasnational In: Writing Human Rights into the International History of the Cold War." Diplomacy and Statecraft 23: 100-116.

Stokke, Olav. 2009. *The UN and Development: From Aid to Cooperation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Taffet, Jeffrey F. 2007. *Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy: The Alliance for Progress in Latin America.* New York: Routledge.

Townson, Nigel. 2007. *Spain Transformed. The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959-1975*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

UNESCO. 1965. *Los problemas y la estrategia del planeamiento de la educación. La experiencia de América Latina*. París: UNESCO.

Van Vleck, Jenifer. 2009. "An Airline at the CRossroads of the World: Ariana Afghan Airlines, Modernization, and the Global Cold War." *History and Technology* 25(19): 3-24.

Viñas, Ángel. 2003. *En las garras del águila: Los pactos con Estados Unidos, de Francisco Franco a Felipe González (1945–1995)*. Barcelona: Crítica.

Weisbrode, Kenneth. 2013. *Old Diplomacy Revisited.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Westad, Odd Arne. 2000. "The New International History of the Cold War: Three (Possible) Paradigms." *Diplomatic History* 24(4): 551–565.

___. 2010. "The Cold War and the International History of the Twentieth Century." In *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, ed. Odd Arne Westad and Melvyn Leffler, 1–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiarda, Howard J. 1991. "Friendly Tyrants and American Interests." In *Friendly Tyrants. An American Dilemma*, eds. A. Garfinkle and D. Pipes, 3–20. London: MacMillan Academic.

Wright, Thomas. 2001. *Latin America in the Era of the Cuban Revolution*. London: Praeger.

NOTES

[1] See the chapter in this book by Mariano González and Tamar Groves.

[2] See Héctor Lindo-Fuentes's contribution to this book.

[3] See the chapter by Colin Snider in this book.

[4] "International Educational and Cultural Policies and Programs for the 1960s", September 1961. JFKL, Papers of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Series 10.2, Subject File 1961-64, Box WH-16. Simultaneously, an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs (Philip H. Coombs) was appointed for the first time to take charge of this initiative.

[5] Ibid.

[6] For Cyrus Schayegh (2012: 617), it is necessary to pay more attention to the demands and attitudes of these local middle classes born in the heat of developmentalism in peripheral countries. According to this author, the socio-political and cultural rise of such urban groups helps "to understand interactions between the Cold War and Third World development, and the interplay in the latter process, between societal and state actors".

[7] "The United States Information Agency during the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," November 1963-January 1969: 2-5. LBJL, Administrative History, United States Information Agency, Box 1.

[8] "The Role of the Department of State in Educational and Cultural Affairs," 18 October 1961. JFKL, Thomas Bowman Personal Papers, Research Files, 1956–1982, Box 1.

[9] Coombs had direct knowledge of such questions from his responsibility as U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Culture and later as Director of UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning. He was also a member of the International Committee appointed by UNESCO to advise on the elaboration and implementation of the General Education Law in Spain in 1970.

[10] "Latin America. Area Program Memorandum," 18 July 1968. LBJL, Personal Papers, Leonard Marks, Box 2.

[11] "The Department of State during the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," November 1963-January 1969, vol. I, part. II. LBJL, Administrative History, Department of State, Box 1-4.

[12] Ibid.

[13] "The United States Information Agency during the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," November 1963-January 1969: 5-79. LBJL, Administrative History, United States Information Agency, Box 1.

[14] "Latin America. Regional Program Memorandum," 31 August 1967. LBJL, Personal Papers, Leonard Marks, Box 1.

[15] "Latin America. Area Program Memorandum," 18 July 1968. LBJL, Personal Papers, Leonard Marks, Box 2.

[16] To cite just a few examples, see Lucas (2003); Laville and Wilford (2006); Kramer (2009) and Weisbrode (2013).

[17] "National Policy Paper UNESCO, 1967," August 1968. NACP, Record Group 353, Inter-Agency Youth Committee, General Records, 1959-1973, Box 10.

[18] Ibid.

[19] "Basic Philosophy, Objectives and Proposed Role of the Concerning US Policies and Programs in the Educational and Cultural Fields during the 1960s," 26 March 1961. JFKL, Papers of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Series 10.2, Subject File 1961-64, Box WH-16.

[20] The quoted expression comes from Schriewer (1997: 28).

[21] The scholarly literature on Modernization theory and U.S. foreign policy is quite broad. See, among other works, Gilman (2003a); Engerman, Gilman, Haefele, and Latham (2003); Cullather (2004b); Latham (2012); Ekbladh (2009).

[22] One of the main proponents of this type of explanation was Professor Seymour Martin Lipset, who in one of his most cited works established a direct relationship between political development and other socioeconomic variables. Like modernization theorists, Lipset was also advisor to the US government. See Lipset (1959).

[23] "The Outlook for Spain and Portugal," 26 September 1961. LBJL, Papers of President 1963-1969, National Security File-National Intelligence Estimates, Box 5.

[24] "The United States Information Agency during the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," November 1963-January 1969: 5-16. LBJL, Administrative History, United States Information Agency, Box 1.

[25] Among those works were Gutteridge (1964), Huntington (1962), and Janowitz (1964).

[26] "Brookings Paper on Political Development," 2 May 1961. JFKL, National Security Files, Departments and Agencies, box 283A.

[27] Quoted in González-Fernández (2016:314)

[28] Quote from an OECD report on the Regional Mediterranean Project, in De Miguel (1976: 20-21).

[29] "The Department of State during the Administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson," November 1963-January 1969, vol. I, part. II. LBJL, Administrative History, Department of State, Box 1-4

[30] According to the US official discourse, American history emphasized that human capital was an essential factor in the modernization and material advancement of societies. "International Educational and Cultural Policies and Programs for the 1960s," September 1961. JFKL, Papers of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Series 10.2, Subject File 1961–64, Box WH-16.

[31] "Visit of Ambassador and Mrs. Duke to Barcelona," 15 November 1965. NACP. RG59, Department of State (DS), Central Foreign Policy Files, Education and Cultural Exchange, 1964–1966, Box 402.

[32] *Noticias de Actualidad*, 15 December 1961, Vol. XIII, n. 20, p. 20

[33] "Comments on 'Authoritarian Regimes' Receiving U.S. Assistance (Military or Economic)," 2 May 1960. NACP, RG59, DS, Lot Files, Bureau of European Affairs (LF-BEA), 1956–66, Spain, Box 5.

[34] "Spain: a preoccupation profile," 11 November 1959. NACP, RG 306, United States Information Agency (USIA), Office of Research (OR), Classified Research Reports, Box 3.

[35] "USIS Country Plan for Spain, FY 1962," 7 March 1962. NACP, RG 306, USIA, OR, Foreign Service Dispatches (FSD), 1954–1965, Box 4.

[36] "Statement of U.S. policy toward Spain", National Security Council Report. 10 October 1960. Quoted in Landa, Miller, Patterson and Sampson (1993: 787).

[37] "The Succession Problem in Spain," 17 July 1963. NACP, RG59, DS, Policy Planning Council, Planning and Coordination Staff, Subject Files, 1963–73, Box 16.

[38] "Memorandum for the President: Visit by the Spanish Foreign Minister," 4 March 1965. NACP, RG59, DS, Central Foreign Policy, 1964–1966. Political and Defence, Box 2663.

[39] "Addendum to the CU Contribution for a Country Guidelines Paper on Spain," 1963. RG59, CU, Policy Review and Coordination Staff, Country Files, 1955–66, Box 31.

[40] As Cyrus Schayegh (2012: 618) points out, although the development programs in Third World countries were led from above by the elites of the state, it is necessary to take into account the pressure exerted on these states by rising expectations and social demands, especially of the new urban middle classes with growing political and cultural power.