The term “political science” was first used in Brazil to denote a discipline specializing in the analysis of public space in 1965. In that year the Department of Political Science (DCP) was created at the College of Administration and Economic Sciences (FACE) of the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG). Prior to this, political studies in Brazil were part of schools of Law, Philosophy, and Sociology. In contrast, UFMG had located studies in political sociology at FACE since the beginning of the 1950s. The FACE had the support of businessmen, bankers, and political leaderships who intended that the institution should supply the State of Minas Gerais with professionals equipped to face the challenges posed by Brazil’s expansion and the growth of the economic power of the State of São Paulo.¹

The academics of the new department relied on financial support from the Ford Foundation to establish a claim to be foremost in their field, and
even to an exclusive right to analyze and interpret politics in the field of Brazilian Social Sciences. Ford Foundation programs, which were devised in response to the confrontations of the Cold War, supported the diffusion of an empirical culture in social sciences which could be applied to the study of forms of government and political behaviors in an international framework (Gaither 1949). In addition to the founding of the DCP, the Foundation also provided grants to academics at UFMG to obtain doctorates in this discipline at leading universities in the United States. In addition, the Foundation promoted visits to Brazil by American academics. Hence, the Ford Foundation’s endeavors, in a way, supported and continued the efforts initiated by the political and economic élites of the State of Minas Gerais who had patronized FACE.

Upon returning to Brazil after finishing their graduate courses in the USA, armed with newly acquired tools for the systematic study of empirical data and the statistical analysis of large data sets, the representatives of the new discipline achieved prominence owing to the debates they engaged in with the various factions found in the more traditional departments of political studies. They denied that those of their academic competitors who had been trained in schools of law or philosophy were qualified to engage in academic political science and, with the support of the Foundation, they set up the first doctoral program in political science in the country at the University Research Institute of Rio de Janeiro (IUPERJ) in 1969. They also succeeded in transforming Dados: Revista de Ciências Sociais into the main Brazilian journal in this academic field. In 1977 they worked to create the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences (ANPOCS). Following on from this, they acquired seats on the principal Brazilian scientific commissions, gained influence in State institutions and in private sector consultancy, became prominent in national and international forums, and established a constant presence in communication media (Canêdo 2009 and 2013; Forjaz 1997).

With these attributes, and with the specific social science theories learned in the USA, the political scientists from Minas Gerais produced new models to interpret the national situation (Schwartzman 1975; Carvalho 1980). These models were very different from those anchored in law or sociology bequeathed by the disciples of the French mission in São Paulo, and this created strong tensions in regard to the production
of the knowledge hierarchy. In the politicized environment of the 1960s, even though the battle between the models was perceived as a confrontation between the heirs of traditional Minas Gerais political families and a “new and true intelligentsia” (Castro 2016: 53), which belonged to layers of society distant from political power, the fact is that the political science paradigms imported by them brought a new perspective to the handling of social problems and public policies. Years later, in the 1990s, this transformed the majority of the academics supported by Ford into key players in the restructuring of the Brazilian political domain.

The place occupied by the Ford Foundation in social sciences is known and recognized by those who analyze the competition between American philanthropic foundations in national academic markets during the Cold War years (Gemelli 1995, 2003; Hauptmann 2012; Holmes 2013; Parmar 2012; Boncourt 2015, 2016). This was especially decisive in the promotion of disciplines attempting to transgress disciplinary borders, as in the case of anthropology (Garcia 2009) and politics (Miceli 1993; Canêdo 2009).

One area of this research paper examines how the Ford Foundation, through its interventions in academic knowledge at a national level in Brazil, stimulated scientific competition in the field of social sciences, seeking to restructure power fields at a national level, while building in parallel a space for [influencing policy arenas in] international governance (Dezalay 2004). This international dimension in Brazilian national practices has been made explicit by recent research dealing with the interactions and negotiations among rival college deans and Ford Foundation agents (Garcia 2009; Boncourt 2015). This unveiled social, institutional, professional, and intellectual dynamics that contributed to enable the Foundation beneficiaries, who held significant institutional positions in the Brazilian scene, to adopt ways of doing science elaborated at important North American research centers. They help us to comprehend the complexity of the space of academic competition with which the Foundation had to contend in seeking to influence the conception and organization of the new intellectual field: replacing traditional political theory with comparative international studies of forms of government and political behavior.

This paper is situated in this area of research. Its main focus is on the sociological analysis of the agents (Bourdieu 2002), seeking to understand the strategy employed by the Ford Foundation and its officers to target
specific social groups in countries where they wanted to intervene. It explores the encounter of a group of young Minas Gerais academics with two Ford Foundation program officers at a time when the Brazilian political space was being restructured, following the civilian-military coup in Brazil in 1964. It then analyses the recruitment practices of Foundation agents including how they selected scholarship recipients. The analysis links family organization, basic education, college degrees, and scholarships with careers paths and the investment in professional development. Finally, it situates those political scientists in the competition for national hegemony among political elites in the different States of the Federation.

This paper stems from two thematic projects directed by myself with researchers from Brazilian, French, and Argentinian universities between 2001 and 2012. These projects studied the transnational circulation of Brazilian scholarship recipients, and their subsequent role on institutional, cultural and scientific innovation in the country. The chapter also relies on my personal research on the Minas Gerais political elite. In addition to the literature pertaining to the Ford Foundation in the field of social sciences, I also made use of documents selected from archives: the Ford Foundation, the United States State Department, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), as well as interviews published in scientific report (Loureiro and Bastos 2008) and scientific journals (Pesquisa FAPESP, Estudos CEBRAP, Teoria e Sociedade, Estudos Históricos), and testimo- nies made by Brazilian social scientists deposited in the archives of the Oral History Program of the Center of Research and Documentation of Contemporary History of Brazil (CPDOC) of the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV). I also interviewed Shepard Forman (04/28/2015; 05/03/2015) and two political scientists who are FACE alumni (Lucia Avelar, 13/04/2005 and Renato Boschi, 28/10/2009).

The Involvement of the Ford Foundation in the Formation of an International Paradigm of Social Sciences

As soon as I joined the Foundation in September of 1964, at the beginning of the authoritarian regime, we began to finance research and graduate courses in social sciences. We believed, like our Brazilian colleagues, that
social scientists could assist in exploring and clarifying the political and social dimensions of development. (Peter Bell, cited by Werneck and Sturm 2012)

This statement made by the first program officer at the Ford Foundation working in Brazilian social sciences, helps us to understand the decision to support a political science project at the College of Administration and Economic Sciences of UFMG – FACE which was taken despite a different recommendation from David Trubek, USAID General Counsel at the Embassy in Brazil. Trubek hoped for support to found a Center for Studies and Research on Legal Education (CEPED) at the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV). He intended to develop a pilot graduate studies program in economic law, based on the Law and Development Program initiated by USAID in the 1960s (Trubek 1996: 223–226). The project looked promising in the light of the “caliber of the Brazilian leadership of CEPED and by the intelligence, interest, and energy of the young law graduates whom they identified for study abroad” (Bell 2010: 11). However, in Bell’s opinion, the program envisioned by Trubek would impose models of law and methods of work excessively removed from local legal thinking. As he explains in the passage quoted below, it would be hard to convince Brazilian lawyers of the merits of a new model of knowledge even though it could equip them to keep up with a changing business world. With firmly fixed ideas about the State inherited from the Iberian model, they would feel their local power structures were threatened by the new model (Engelmann 2012; Mota 2006).

As with housing, it can be easier to build from scratch than to restructure a pre-existing but outmoded building. Reforming legal education meant changing well-entrenched institutional practices and cultures – no easy task, as the Foundation and CEPED would discover. […] I had some inkling of how difficult it might be for a small center – outside of any law school and without strong university support – to bring about the far-reaching reform of legal education; but in retrospect we failed to appreciate what a slow, uphill climb it would at best be. (Bell 2010: 13)

Bell did approve a donation to CEPED in 1966 because of the Foundation’s interest in supporting projects to bring law and development closer together. But the decision to support the multi-year development of
a graduate program in political science in Minas Gerais, drawing students from around the country, prevailed. The fact is that the program officer, viewed development less in terms of increases in per capita income per se and more in terms of increases in some measure of control – or at least participation – in important decisions affecting people’s lives, whether at the level of the individual, family, community or nation. (Bell 2010: 5)

The decision to support a “built from scratch” political science program, capable of competing in the academic and government arenas with locally-defined understandings of legal thinking, and which promoted new élites by channeling donations to research and graduate courses, so as to “assist in exploring and clarifying the political and social dimensions of development,” was not taken quickly. It developed little by little, starting with the opening of the Foundation office in Rio de Janeiro in 1962, a period of great political instability.³

The Brazilian office was established in the same year as similar offices elsewhere in Latin America (Chile and Mexico) and in Africa (Kenya). It marked the shift of the Foundation’s international philanthropy to regions bordering on territories with communist governments, a change which had already been foreshadowed by the opening of an office in Istanbul in 1960. The repercussions of the Cuban revolution in various countries of the region initially led the Foundation to support institutional programs of an essentially technocratic nature in higher education, spreading ideas of modernization, development, and democracy in line with the thinking of the Kennedy government’s Alliance for Progress (Kennedy 1961).

These pioneering attempts to be involved in the field of social and political development became a feature of the work of the Rio de Janeiro Foundation office from 1964 onwards. The procedure was the same as that adopted at the Harvard University International Summer Seminar, led by Henry Kissinger in the 1950s and heavily financed by the Ford Foundation from 1954 to 1971: to expand “American values” internationally, by means of promoting encounters with potential leaders, using social problems as challenges to normative concepts. The first step was to recruit academics in the social sciences and to integrate them into the
strategies promoted by the patron in hope that they would later develop teaching and research programs in their countries of origin without further direct intervention by the Foundation. Subsequently, it was intended that the Foundation would assist the academics they sponsored to create and develop centralized scientific agencies in their respective countries to coordinate national scientific research (Parmar 2012; Rose 2003; Holmes 2013; Bernstein 2013). In summary, the objective was to reach conceptual and technical uniformity in the social sciences by erasing national differences in the production of social scientific knowledge.

Enabling the emergence of a community of social scientists not territorially circumscribed and which could engage in dialogue with North American empirical sociology – the relationship model between social research and political and economic agents elaborated by Paul F. Lazarsfeld at Columbia University (Lazarsfeld 1969; Pollack 1979) – would bring an important change in the established hierarchies in social sciences in Brazil. It meant supporting empirical studies developed by academics on the fringes of Brazilian social sciences, thus weakening the intellectual legacy of the French mission in São Paulo (Garcia 2009: 57–92).

The first Foundation agent responsible for promoting political science in Brazil was Peter Bell, who resided in the country from 1964 to 1969. A second part of the project, which dealt with the co-ordination of scientific research, was completed by Shepard Forman at ANPOCS, the most influential scientific association in the field, created in 1977.

**Peter Bell and the Ford Foundation Program Implementation**

Peter Bell arrived in Brazil six months after the coup on March 31, 1964. He was 22 and his selection for the implementation of the Foundation project conformed to the Gaither Report recommendations for the choice of agents who would guarantee the success of the philanthropic program: a particular emphasis on interpersonal abilities, imagination, broad experience, and general interests, rather than on age, specialization or reputation. The report also recommended experience in traveling and “ability to
deal with all kinds of people, and a deep conviction with respect to the fundamental objectives of the program.” Those qualities would be “necessary to change the content of the program from time to time to meet new conditions” (Gaither 1949: 133–136).

When he was hired by the Foundation, Bell had just received his diploma from the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs at Princeton, but from early on, and thanks to scholarships abroad, he had been sensitized to the “opportunities to resolve conflict, to make peace, to bring about justice, to protect the vulnerable, and to support the poor and disadvantaged,” (Bell, cited by Chambers 2004). He was among a group of high school students who visited Nagasaki after the Second World War and, when at Yale, he engaged in the civil rights movement and took part in Operation Crossroads Africa, working in the Ivory Coast. Following that, he became familiar with the sensitive area of external policy of the American government working as an intern in international security affairs at the Department of Defense, where he learned enough about the American involvement in Vietnam to be “deeply troubled.” A year later he accepted an invitation to join the International Division of the Ford Foundation.

Among the various institutional programs Bell backed while in Brazil, in addition to the DCP in Minas Gerais in 1965 – which included scholarships at the principal American universities (Harvard, MIT, Stanford) – was the first doctorate in political science. It was located at the IUPERJ, a private institution supported by Cândido Mendes College (Lamounier 2013: 19–22). In São Paulo, he invested in a think tank – the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP) – led by the sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso (President of Brazil from 1995 to 2002) who was interested in implementing new scientific methods, promoting changes, and influencing Brazilian society. In those three institutions, most scholars supported by Bell were social scientists, came from various specialisms, held degrees from foreign universities (mostly American), did not belong to Brazil’s establishment, and had been purged from their university posts by the military regime.

The programs Bell implemented in the discipline of political science in Brazil testified to the value of his education and experience in fitting him to operate on the Brazilian scene at that time, a scene described by Sergio
Miceli (1993), with great appropriateness, as closer to the plot of a police movie than to the professional exercise of patronage. During his five-year stay in Brazil, Bell performed his duties amidst intimidation, bombs, threats, and provocations which ended up “contributing to the shaping of Ford Foundation’s own, risky routes to act in Brazil” (Miceli 1993: 47).

The Encounter of Social Scientists from Minas Gerais with Peter Bell and the Recomposition of Social Sciences

Two Brazilian scholars played an important role in the initial encounters between Peter Bell and political sociology academics at FACE: Antonio Octavio Cintra and Leonidas Xausa. Cintra was a FACE alumnus who had received a scholarship to the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) in Chile, where the specialized UNESCO offices were located (see Sorá and Blanco in this book). Xausa, a law professor at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), was one of the first Brazilians to study political science in the United States, at Columbia University, where Paul Lazarsfeld headed the Bureau of Applied Social Research, and where there was a group of academics interested in Brazilian studies – Albert Hirschman, Charles Wagley and Marvin Harris, who were part of the first wave of “Brazilianists.”

Xausa had plans to create a department of political science at UFRGS (Bell 2010: 6). The contact with Xausa and the Brazilianists enabled Bell to understand the landscape of Brazilian academia. This knowledge contributed to his identifying FACE – the still little-recognized school of Minas Gerais – as Ford’s main target shortly after his meeting with Cintra in his office in Rio de Janeiro. Cintra convinced him of the possibilities latent at FACE for the creation of a new way of thinking about the public arena along the lines of the political science produced in the Unites States (Reis 2004).

Created in 1941 as a modest private school of commerce, two years later FACE became a College of Economic and Administrative Sciences which, according to the president of the Federation of Minas Gerais
Industries in 1945, aimed at reaching the “standard of institutes of the American type” (Paula 2006: 330). In 1948, it was incorporated into the University of Minas Gerais (UFMG) and was headed for fourteen years by Yvon Leite de Magalhães Pinto, who belonged to the social network of leading political families in Minas Gerais. A course in sociology and politics was added in 1953, a few months after the creation of a similar course at the Brazilian School of Public and Business Administration at the Getulio Vargas Foundation (EBAP/FGV). This formed part of the Basic Agreement on Technical Cooperation between the United States and Latin America, attached to the Point Four Program of the Harry Truman Government (1949). But unlike the course at EBAP/FGV, which was oriented to qualify people for public administration, FACE’s program was more focused on rethinking State and Society, an approach closer to that of political sociology.

Running a course on political sociology together with one on public administration at a school of economics was a major innovation. However, the school faculty did not meet the “standards of the American type institutes”. It was composed of important figures from the economic, political, and cultural life of Minas Gerais, but it did not have academics specializing in political science (Paula 2006: 333; Lamounier 2013: 8–9). In addition, students had insufficient resources to be able to commit fully to their studies. An institutional environment for teaching and research was made possible only after the granting of a scholarship program created by Elwyn A. Mauck, a public administration advisor sent by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, with USAID funding, to establish a public administration training program in Brazil (Mauck 1954; Barros 2013). This financial backing bolstered material resources and brought together students and faculty who were dedicated to full-time learning and research with an interdisciplinary environment (Castro 2016: 28–36). It was the first program of its kind in Brazil based on merit, boasting an extraordinary infrastructure when compared to similar courses in Brazil.

The conditions provided by the scholarship program contributed to the consolidation of a concept of professional academic life. Furthermore, graduates were qualifications to operate in government and to reach important institutional posts in the field of social sciences. In fact, from
the approximately two hundred scholarship recipients in the years 1954–70, four became Federal Secretaries, others acted as State Secretaries, served at the Minas Gerais Development Bank (BMDG), or were among the many who nurtured political science in Brazil (Castro 2016: 67–76).

The course underwent a significant development when three FACE scholarship recipients – Simon Schwartzman, Fabio Wanderley Reis and Antonio Octavio Cintra – were selected for a specialized course at FLACSO, in Chile. This course was taught by academics from several countries (see Sorá and Blanco in this book). Schwartzman claims that he began to read American authors at this occasion, “in line with the Columbian6 tradition, then the Lazarsfeld tradition” (Schwartzman 2009: 6–7).

When they returned to FACE in the early 1960s, they were admitted as faculty members. They gave a new impulse to reflection on Brazilian politics, introducing new themes into academic research, such as the nature of party systems, electoral behavior, and the social origins of leaders. José Murilo de Carvalho, today a member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, and author of books which contributed significantly to the revision of the republican history of Brazil, studied with these three professors. He made clear the impact of the course in triggering a shift in academic thought:

There was a new style of thinking, a new orientation: American political science had arrived through FLACSO. It was not really my going to the United States that introduced me to this field; I began to read the authors in the bibliography introduced by Antonio Octavio, Simon Schwartzman and Fabio Wanderley. (Carvalho, cited by Oliveira 1998: 362)

From then on, research done at FACE was systematically published in the journal Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos, considered a pioneer in publishing work on electoral surveys and research into political parties. The journal had been founded at the Law College in 1956. Representing a bridge between two generations, the journal came to combine the philosophical and legal tradition of the once prevalent French tradition of political science with the North American slant of the young FACE-trained sociologists. It was the most international social sciences journal published in Brazil and the first to introduce empirical studies methodologically oriented by surveys.
Thus, Bell encountered at FACE a group of disciplined sociologists who sealed the alliance between politics and social research, starting with the empiricism of surveys. It was a field of study little known in Brazil and without social standing, especially little valued by the sociologists’ families, who did not have a university education and feared for the professional future of their children. Simon Schwartzman remembered:

My father always thought I had given up engineering because I was lazy and did not want to work, study for public examinations, study mathematics. He did not understand what I was doing. I mean, no one knew what that was. Indeed, it was an adventure because... it was something that seemed interesting, but... What was it? What profession was it? What was it good for? No one had any idea. (Schwartzman 2009: 6)

Along with the skepticism of the families as to the involvement of their children with political science, there was another type of insecurity that disturbed the sociologists at FACE. In the 1960s, the chance for a professional advancement was slight, indeed almost non-existent, for the social groups to which Peter Bell’s recruits for political science studies at North American universities belonged. They were largely descendants of immigrants in low-level public employment or modest trades such as tailor or carpenter.

Of the first eleven scholarship recipients, seven were selected by Frank Bonilla and Robert Packeman from the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences created by the Ford Foundation at Stanford University. They all came from a similar social background, had relatively modest social capital and no ties to the network of the influential Minas Gerais families, whose children went to law schools in order to prepare them for careers in government. (Canêdo 2009: 42)

Obtaining scholarships based on merit at important national and international institutions, however, did not conceal the fact that sociology was not then considered a prestigious academic subject in the local professional market. This is how José Murilo de Carvalho anecdotally explains the university hierarchy:
I had no professional perspectives […]. At the student dances, the distance between girls and boys was defined by the answer that one gave to the inevitable question that the girls asked from the very beginning: “What course are you taking?” If the answer was Political Sociology or another course of little prestige, the distance between the couples would increase and soon the girls would excuse themselves and return to their chairs to wait for better luck. If one wanted to have good luck, he had to answer Engineering, Medicine, Law or Economics. (Carvalho, cited by Paiva 2010: 228)

Given this situation of relative social and political marginality in the early 1960s, many of the scholarship recipients became affiliated with leftist groups and were profoundly affected by the political repression following the coup in 1964. Among the sociologists at FACE at this significant moment in Brazil’s politics, Peter Bell found favorable conditions to pursue his objectives: to foster a rigorous science of society, and to cultivate civic virtues indispensable to the building of an international market of State competence. In addition to the provision of scholarships to North American universities, he sought to create conditions for the return of the grant recipients to Brazil, which was not easy, as he stated:

The military government confused social scientists with socialists and limited their freedom of speech, discussion, and association. The Foundation understood that it was insufficient to presume ourselves “apolitical” or “technocratic.” As a transnational organization, we had the obligation to make explicit the values that governed our concession of subsidies and which were essential to the progress of social and natural sciences. At the same time, we could not be partisans. (Bell, cited by Werneck and Sturm 2012)

The Ford Foundation and the Institutionalization of Political…

The Ford Foundation and the Association of Distinct Social Scientists from Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, and São Paulo

The military government prevented the recipients of Ford scholarship from returning to their university posts. So, in 1969, Peter Bell backed a plan to design and implement a graduate program in political science at
a private institution in Rio de Janeiro. One reason for doing this was that
the program at DCP which he had initially supported at UFMG had
been transferred by the military government from FACE to the school of
Philosophy, which refused to rehire the scholarship recipients returning
from their studies in the United States. Therefore, Bell’s idea to offer
strong support for a graduate program in a university had to be replaced
by a program in a small institute located at Cândido Mendes College, a
traditional private institution with little recognition in academic circles.
As graduates of the scholarship program could not return to DCP, Bolivar
Lamounier, himself a former grant recipient from FACE, and who since
1968 had directed The University Research Institute of Rio de Janeiro
(IUPERJ), invited fellow graduates of Ford programs to come to IUPERJ.
With Ford Foundation support and a new mission to develop graduate
research in social science, IUPERJ welcomed the former scholarship
recipients from Minas Gerais who were able to continue the studies initi-
ated in the United States with the aim to transforming Brazilian civil
society.

Such studies offered new questions about old issues linked to Brazil’s
authoritarian tradition, among which was how to make the transition
from an unwieldy, authoritarian structure to a more agile and modern
one, creating conditions for the development of a more diversified repre-
sentative system. These questions had an effect on the militant youth
working in social sciences in Rio de Janeiro who were without a forum
for intellectual engagement after ISEB (see note ii) was shut down by the
military government. They became interested in the Ford Foundation
scholarship program, especially for the possibility it offered to integrate
North American political science with studies on the political history of
Brazil developed at the now closed ISEB (Keinert and Silva 2010).

Research into issues relating to the political-institutional aspects of
Brazilian social life using the research methods and techniques taught at
North American universities provided common ground for the nucleus
of academics associated with the IUPERJ graduate program. This research
was as decisive for the consolidation and practice of political science in
Brazil as the institutional umbrella supplied by Cândido Mendes de
Almeida that ensured space for freedom of thought, somewhat sheltered
from the repression typical of the period of military rule.
Relations between IUPERJ and the Cândido Mendes College, however, were never formalized: “There was no work contract” said Lamounier. But “on the part of the Ford Foundation, the negotiators were very capable people, with experience in this type of situation, of taking a fragile institution and making it grow with its support” (Lamounier 2013: 20–21). This institutional fragility actually helped strengthen the bond between the Ford Foundation and Brazilian political scientists. With a donation to buy a headquarters for the institute and equip it with the necessary infrastructure, the graduate program in political science at IUPERJ adopted the North American format of regular credit courses along with a methodical and systematic research model, often quantitative, which became the norm in Brazilian social sciences. The journal created in this program, *Dados: Revista de ciências Sociais*, whose eloquent name (“Data”) emphasized empiricism, became an important channel through which to promote the research developed at the Institute and was the first Brazilian journal to adopt international standards. To this day it is one of the most important journals in its field.

In 1969, Lamounier had his political rights suspended by the military government. As a consequence he moved to São Paulo where he acted as an intermediary in the negotiations between Peter Bell (with whom he “had become good friends”) and a small group of social scientists from that city, who had also been excluded from the universities during the most difficult years of the military regime. Under the leadership of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, they produced a bid for funding in order to found what became the Brazilian Centre of Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP) and which produced a journal, *Estudos CEBRAB*. The bid represented “one of the most important and gratifying funding grants conceded during my participation in the Foundation,” said Bell (Werneck 2012). The institute and the journal became reference points for research and social analysis in Brazil, and in all of Latin America, enabling a fresh association between researchers educated in the French tradition of Philosophy (brought to the University of São Paulo in the 1930s) with researchers trained in North American methods. Thus, in the 1970s, IUPERJ and CEBRAP emerged as two competing loci of research in political science, in Rio and São Paulo respectively, integrating two distinct universes of political science. Both of them had journals
of recognized academic quality and their research output was published in international journals in Spanish and English.\textsuperscript{9}

The examples of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Bolívar Lamounier, Vilmar Farias, and Simon Schwartzman show some of the outcomes of Peter Bell’s wager on pioneering measures to deal with social and political development of the country through support for political sciences. In 1985, Lamounier was invited to be part of the Afonso Arinos Commission, which wrote the preliminary draft for a new Brazilian constitution. After being elected President of Brazil in 1995, Fernando Henrique Cardoso recruited Schwartzman to coordinate reform of the statistical system of the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE). This institute was responsible for the Brazilian census. Its work contributed to the success of government programs aimed at redistribution of income, which were led by Vilmar Farias. Farias was the first Brazilian political scientist to include the systematic study of social politics in the academic research agenda of the country. In addition to his career as professor at the University of Campinas, he was president of CEBRAP and assessor to the federal government, where he acted as the necessary bridge between the Executive and technical agencies, both at national (IPEA and IBGE) and international (BID and the World Bank) levels.

\section*{Shepard Forman and the Organization of the Scientific Community in Social Sciences in Brazil}

Peter Bell left Brazil at the end of 1969. By that time the private research centers he backed (IUPERJ and CEBRAP) were already organized into teams dealing with public planning as well as offering private services. These centers worked in isolation both from each other and from other institutions in the rest of the country.

There was an urgent need to gather researchers in social sciences, including the new field of political science, into a national association with an institutional structure independent of the traditional decision-making centers and not susceptible to the often-changing political
currents within the universities. The first discussion on the topic took place during the International Seminar on Social Indicators of National Development in Latin America, organized by the International Social Science Council and IUPERJ in 1972. A draft of the proposed association’s statutes was drawn up by Mario Brockmann Machado, a recipient of a Ford Foundation scholarship, and was distributed at the First National Encounter of Graduate Programs Coordinators in Social Sciences, held the following year in the State of Ceará (Machado 1993: 103). Five years later, the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences (ANPOCS) was founded as a scientific association made up of institutional partners rather than of individual researchers.

The first ANPOCS boards were comprised of former Ford Foundation grant recipients, and they aimed to promote the virtue of teamwork and to establish technical requirements for research projects. These included literature reviews, orienting hypotheses, explicit research objectives, and clarity concerning the nature of the data to be collected.

In order to reach these goals, which could supply the field with scholars capable of working independently and to ensure quality graduate training, an Assessor Committee in Social Sciences was created to adjudicate assistance for research financed by the Ford Foundation in the fields of sociology, political science, and anthropology. The FORD/ANPOCS fellowship program was thought up and coordinated by Peter Bell’s successor at the Foundation, the Brazilianist Shepard Forman.

Unlike Bell, Forman did not come to his work as a newcomer in Brazil. He had lived several years in the country as a Fulbright scholar from 1961 to 1963 and had received his Ph.D. at Columbia University for his research on the raft fishing economy in the State of Alagoas. He became interested in the Portuguese language during his graduate studies at New York University, intending to secure a grant given under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which provided finance for African and Latin American studies and “instruction in modern foreign languages” (P.L. 85-864; 72 Stat. 1580). Studying this language would provide him with a full scholarship “including maintenance. It was an easy decision” (Forman 2011: 2). Later, during the term of his Fulbright scholarship for research in Brazil, he met the anthropologist
Charles Wagley who introduced him to his research group and academic life in difficult regions of the Brazilian Northeast. Forman subsequently published two books\(^\text{10}\) on a theme, which, as he declared, had interested him since he was a child: “How a socially excluded group enters the national political, economic, cultural life” (Forman 2011: 5–6). When hired by the Ford Foundation to work in Brazil, he had just arrived from East Timor, where he had had his “first encounter with the idea of colonialism, with the idea of native populations, with the ideas of human rights, development” (Forman 2011: 5). With this background, like Peter Bell, he was well able to enter into dialogue with the Brazilian social scientists persecuted by the military regime.

Based on the principle that “the decisions should be made by the Brazilians themselves” (Forman 2011: 5–6), Forman suggested a competition for research grants in which the Assessor Committee members should be chosen “under the eyes of the researchers” who regularly met, discussed and formed opinions at the ANPOCS workgroups, seminars, and annual meetings. The aim was to value merit and method in social sciences research, which should be based on publicly agreed norms (Lopes 1993). This was another important innovation for the professionalization of the field, as expertise in developing technical research projects did not exist at Brazilian universities at that time.

The Foundation handed the entire administration of the fellowship program to ANPOCS in 1983.\(^\text{11}\) After that, the Funding Authority for Studies and Projects (FINEP) – a government agency tied to the Ministry of Planning through the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development (Decree-Law no. 719, from 7/31/1969) – took responsibility for the continuation of institutional development of the social sciences.

**Conclusion**

This case-study aims to show how there emerged in Brazil a cadre of recognized producers of political science. It aspires to propose new hypotheses capable of contributing to sharper reflections on the issue of the exportation and importation of knowledge, a phenomenon difficult to measure, as it is inscribed in double-game strategies.
It seems important to highlight two aspects. First, it is revealing that Ford Foundation investments in Brazil, which brought about decisive outcomes for social science in the country, chose to ignore, or even fight against, the dual social and political hierarchy that controlled the (re)production of academic groups in the different regions of the country. The scholars who were kept productively engaged in Brazil by the Foundation possessed great educational capital, the fruits of extraordinary investments made over years. However, their educational capital was considered inferior in comparison with that of, for example, lawyers, who dominated the most prestigious social, political, and academic positions.

This difference in educational and symbolic capital is the key to understanding the success of the investments made by the Foundation. It selected competent scholars without social influence, who held degrees in a discipline with low prestige in the local market, who had been expelled from legitimate traditional universities for political reasons, but who had undertaken graduate studies in the United States and possessed great capacity to subvert the rules that did not benefit them.

The strategy of exportation of knowledge in political science by the Ford Foundation was successful thanks to the perception and flexibility of its program officers at each crucial moment, who knew which investment strategies should be prioritized. Should they choose endowments to universities or private institutions; promote the field of law or political science; favor traditional universities or new research centers not entangled with constraints imposed by professional corporations or the intellectual heritage of the French mission? To achieve their goals, they exploited to the full the existing operational capacity, adapting it in a way that would ensure a certain continuity with earlier efforts by the traditional Minas Gerais elites, who supported FACE and funded the meritocratic scholarship program for social politics students. The Ford Foundation officers employed the same meritocratic approach to mobilize those who had been trained by the schemes put in place by Minas Gerais elites.

In this sense, a sociological understanding of the program officers, as well as that of the grant recipients, is a fundamental requisite for understanding how questions, methods, literature, and modes of validation of results were transferred, ensuring American hegemony in political science on a global scale.
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Notes

1. In the Brazilian Federation, the State of Minas Gerais (MG) is known as a training ground for politicians who go on to prominence on the national political scene The State of São Paulo is recognized as a significant economic and financial center in the country. The reputation of MG derives from the political power exercised by its bureaucratic elites in a familial network which has controlled the State’s politics since the days of the Empire (1822–1889) and, subsequently, since the establishment of the Republic in 1889. São Paulo has gained a dominance position in national political affairs since 1994.

2. In the 1960s, there were in Brazil four distinct degrees in political studies: FACE, in Minas Gerais; The College of Philosophy at the University of São Paulo (developed from the French mission in 1934, which molded the early generations of graduates); The Free School of Sociology and Politics, created in 1933 by the business elite of São Paulo. Donald Pearson is credited with introducing empirical research as the scientific model in the 1940s; The Higher Institute for Brazilian Studies (ISEB), created in Rio de Janeiro in 1955, attached to the Ministry of Education and Culture, which was an influential center for developmental ideology. It was closed by the military government in 1964 (Miceli 1989; Massi 1989).

3. The political instability generated by President Jânio Quadros’s resignation and Vice-President João Goulart’s rise to power was intensified by the civilian-military coup in 1964, which deposed Goulart, initiating a twenty-two-year military government.

4. Yvon de Magalhães Pinto was a descendant of representatives of the General Assembly of the Empire and of Federal Republican congressmen, a cousin and nephew of signatories of the Minas Gerais manifesto against the dictatorship of 1942, who were, like himself, founders of the Democratic National Union Liberal Party. His uncle was one of the creators of the Free Law College at the end of the 19th century.
5. This program of scholarships was later used by Mauck as a basis for the creation of the Departments of Public Administration in Nigeria, Taiwan, Korea, and Turkey.

6. That is, the tradition of Columbia University in the USA, not Columbia the South American state.

7. The titles of the doctoral theses developed by Ford scholarship recipients are very instructive: Carvalho, J.M. “Elite and State-Building in Imperial Brazil”; Farias, V. “Occupational Marginality, Employment, and Poverty in Urban Brazil”; Reis, E. “The agrarian roots of conservative modernization in Brazil 1880–1930”; Reis, F.W. “Political development and social class: Brazilian authoritarianism in perspective”; Schwartzman, S. “Regional cleavages and political patrimonialism in Brazil.”

8. Cândido Mendes de Almeida was a founding member of ISEB and the General Secretary of the Justice and Peace Commission in Brazil, 1972–1997. He was also one of the people responsible for denouncing cases of torture in Brazil during the military regime. He held numerous positions and appointments including Visiting Professor at Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Columbia (1965–1981) and the president of the International Political Science Association (1979–1982).


11. In 1983, the ANPOCS newsletter gave a complete list of the 38 fellowship grants approved by the Foundation, the diversity of the projects themes, and brought together research from UFRJ, PUC/Rio, USP, and UFRGS.
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