

A Researchers' Mecca: The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies and Its Protégés

By Servando Ortoll

Research Professor
Instituto de Investigaciones Culturales-Museo of the
Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, Mexicali Campus

ortoll@msn.com

© 2012 by Servando Ortoll

During the eight days I spent working at the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) prior to my submitting a research grant proposal, I was puzzled by a number of questions related to the functioning of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) during the WW II period. How did its members justify their dual policy of supporting certain scholars' research on Latin America, while training others to pursue "intelligence" work on the region? Were both concerns part of the same academic endeavor, or was the SSRC merely a government agency promoting intelligence work through the work of its fellows? If, however, the SSRC was essentially a research-sponsoring institution, at what point in time did it become interested in Latin America? If this moment arrived while war was imminent, did the SSRC's interest subside *after* WW II, and if it did, what form or forms did it take?

Additional research was required to answer, albeit partially, these questions. Having been a RAC fellow in the past, and as such interested in these issues, I went back in time and delved into the origins of the SSRC. I wanted to uncover what its original goals were, and how Latin America fit into these goals. I also wanted to know to what extent the original aims of the organization were maintained, and, if changed, how this affected the development of Latin American Studies.

With the aid of additional published documents now available through the non-profit organization Jstor, I will present a general overview of my research findings. Then I will focus on the war period to show how the SSRC sought to aid government agencies, and that this required training people who would actually work in the Latin American field during WW II. I will conclude by outlining some general ideas about how the SSRC, together with other organizations, became a mecca for researchers who worked on Latin America and needed financial assistance to conduct such research.

The SSRC during the 1920s

There seems to be a general agreement regarding what influenced the creation of the SSRC: the existence of the National Research Council, created to develop the natural sciences. There also seems to be a consensus about who first presented the idea in public, and at what moment and in what place: William A. Dunning, in December, 1921, at the meeting of the American Political Science Association.¹ As to the ideological background and needs of such an organization, historian Roy F. Nichols, says the following:

At the close of the First World War the scholarly world was endeavoring to adjust to the new demands for scientific knowledge produced by the exigencies of that conflict. Even before the entrance of the United States into the war the scientific disciplines had organized the National Research Council. The American Council of Learned Societies came into being shortly after the dawn of peace. It was almost inevitable that social science should seek some similar organization.²

The SSRC concerned itself with four issues during its 1923 meetings, held in April, May and November of that year:

- 1) the conducting of “A survey of the scope and method of existing social science research agencies ...”
- 2) the publication of “An abstract of social science literature ...”

3) the “Publication of an annual index and digest of [state] session laws ...”, and
4) “The study of human migration,” a study that was to be conducted together with the National Research Council.³

Regarding the first of these points, to the organizations that formed the SSRC it was “urgent” to have a thorough “survey of the most important agencies of social science research now in operation ...” in order to “uncover” and “organize” the materials of these agencies which were “unknown” and “often unused or duplicated.”⁴ In this sense and following the second point of interest of the SSRC, it was important to publish a periodical bulletin that would provide a “findings list,” such as already existed in sciences such as chemistry, which would be of use to researchers.

The third point was intended to satisfy the needs of political scientists: the “Students of all branches of social science have been without a guide in the great field of state laws,” and therefore the purpose of the Council was “to obtain the annual publication of an index and digest of state session laws through the agency of the Library of Congress.”⁵ As to the fourth point of the agenda, the SSRC was “asked by the National Research Council Committee to form a committee on Human Migration, to consider the social aspects of the problem.”⁶

The SSRC was comprised of twenty-one members “representing the seven national organizations in the United States chiefly interested in social science research.” These organizations, according to SSRC President, Professor Charles E. Merriam,

were brought together by a common feeling that close cooperation in dealing with related or overlapping problems was eminently desirable. The policies of the Council ... are to bring together scattered or isolated workers upon similar social problems; to avoid needless duplication of effort; to foster the cooperation of research workers; to stimulate and encourage research in important fields not now covered; to emphasize the development of increasingly scientific methods of inquiry in social studies, and *occasionally to undertake research directly through its own committees*; to aid in the

process of developing scientific social control, and, where that is not possible, more intelligent and constructive theory about the processes involved in social relations.⁷

To the newly formed SSRC it was important to have a model that it could follow. Such a model was the National Research Council, with which the SSRC had strong ties. “We stared out during the [first] war,” remembered Professor Arnold Bennett Hall,

with the organization of the National Research Council dealing with what is more generally known as the material sciences. Shortly after that, there was a feeling among some of the leading social scientists of the country that we needed an organization dealing with the problems of research and scientific methods in the social sciences, and with that in mind a movement was started for the purpose of organizing a Social Science Research Council.⁸

While the SSRC was to retain its autonomy, it was obvious that, for at least its first few years of work, it was to follow the model of the National Research Council.

On October 24, 1924, SSRC Chairman Charles E. Merriam announced the creation of “a Committee to outline a plan for Research Fellowships in Social Science *somewhat similar* to those now awarded by the National Research Council.”⁹ In private, Merriam confided that “the establishment of such fellowships as are here proposed would be very effective in stimulating research interest in providing opportunities for exceptionally qualified students and in raising the level of method and achievement in social research.”¹⁰ To the wider public, Merriam announced that the purpose of the fellowship was “the development of available personnel for the prosecution of studies in the field of social research.” Further, they were “designed for more mature persons of post-doctorate type or of equivalent intellectual maturity. *They correspond roughly to the fellowships awarded by the National Research Council in the field of natural science.*”¹¹

As outlined in “A Plan for Research Fellowships in Social Science” that Merriam attached in his letter to Beardsley Rumml, the “Difficulties in the Way of Social Science Research”

had to do with the fact that there was no established method or technique that was adequate; that “Competent Research Men”—i.e. those with “a more elaborate and effective training in scientific method ... [and] who have a real genius for research”—required financial assistance; and that “*Social Science Research [was] more Difficult to Finance than Research in the Natural Science.*”¹² Regarding the second of these points, the Plan stated:

A good many men are now giving all the time they can, compatible with earning their livelihood. By a system of post-doctorate fellowships, it would be possible to select men of genius and free them from teaching and other diverting activities in order that all of their energy and time might be directed to the problems of research. Money thus expended to support able young men engaged in research projects, approved by the Social Science Research Council would greatly facilitate the growth of scientific method and the adequate ... training and development of the men of real genius in the problems of research.”¹³

The SSRC of the 1920’s was after rescuing the “geniality” of young scholars. True: the SSRC organized very successful academic reunions where famous senior scholars talked about their work. The so-called “Hanover Conferences,” because they took place in Dartmouth, had evening sessions which were very popular. However, despite this interest in having the young listen to those with greater experience, there were individuals inclined to support the young. “If the social sciences are to grow and develop into somewhat more firmly established sciences,” wrote Lawrence K. Frank,

it is obvious that this progress will be more largely the work of the younger generation who are to carry the work of the seniors, but with the insight and altered conceptions which they as younger people alone can bring to bear upon these subjects Experience in every science has shown that what we call scientific progress comes about very largely through re-formulation of problems and the supersedure [sic] of older conceptions and ideas by newer conceptions more congruous with the actual evidence. Therefore ... the future of social science lies largely in the hands of younger students who have yet to make their contributions.¹⁴

The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, and U.S. Involvement in World War II

According to one source, the “Joint Committee” dated back to 1933 when “a group of scholars engaged in research on Latin America” and submitted to the SSRC “a proposal for support of a general meeting of qualified Latin Americans, and two such meetings were held in 1934.” During the first of the two meetings the participants set up two objectives:

- 1) to organize “research studies in the Latin American field,” and
- 2) to promote “all scholarly activities leading to a better understanding of Latin America.”¹⁵

Eventually there was a “tri-Council committee” formed by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the National Research Council (NRC). The general objectives of this committee were

- 1) to promote “Latin American studies in all fields of knowledge by planning and encouraging research and publication, developing tools of research, and working toward the improvement of education and training in Latin American fields;” and, in war times,
- 2) to render “all possible service to government agencies in the promotion of inter-American intellectual and cultural relations and the planning of projects.”¹⁶

The year 1942 was historic in more than one sense. It was a year of revelation: In spite of earlier attempts to study Latin America, it became apparent that not enough information was available for researchers and the general public about the region. More important, it was evident that researchers knew close to nothing about the people who lived there. It became the task of the Committee on Research Planning and Personnel, a section of the Joint Committee, to outline the bases for a “Study of Contemporary Culture Patterns in Latin America.” “Ignorance,” it was thought, was what “obscures our relationships with Latin America at this critical time.” It was a

dangerous ignorance, because public opinion determined “matters of policy” in a democracy. The situation was serious, particularly because many of the men living in the U.S. who had studied Latin America could not, or would not, begin research on the subcontinent anew.

The workers in North America who have made significant contributions to the Latin American field are few. A hasty canvass of the fields of economics and geography suggests that in both together, the number of scholars writing on Latin American topics is little over thirty. Of these, a majority are men ... who would not be available in the present instance to undertake specific investigations. Others have only a minor and passing acquaintance with Latin American problems and would need further training, especially in language, and also would benefit by guidance.¹⁷

What, then, was to be done? Who were the appropriate candidates to replace professors and who would be willing either to learn a new language or to receive additional training to conduct better research in Latin America?

The Committee on Research Planning and Personnel had an answer: “To carry out anything like an adequate program, it will probably be necessary to make use of graduate students who have the necessary technical training in their own disciplines, and the necessary command of Spanish or Portuguese. The work of these people would require definite supervision in the field.”¹⁸ Graduate students rather than postdoctoral students or professors would account for most of this group. These would receive special training in order to become acquainted with part of the large kaleidoscope that was Latin America.

Given the impending participation of the U.S. in the war, the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies sponsored two main projects:

the establishment of training centers to give government workers language facility and background information relevant to their work, and [the] presentation of a broad view of this field to universities through the rotation of visiting professors. The first [project] has received support from [Nelson A. Rockefeller], the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and a center is in operation in Washington.¹⁹

In terms of education, the use of visiting professors in American universities to further the acquaintance of students in the field of Latin American Studies had the additional purpose of identifying young graduate candidates who would be willing to undertake “projects of conceivably immediate ‘war’ importance,” such as the “composition, organization, and operation of various types of political parties in countries selected in terms of democratic vs. non-democratic processes;” “The role of the Army and of the Navy in the formation and control of public policy in selected countries” or, to cite but a third example, “The methods of authoritarian government in such countries as Brazil and Peru; e.g. how opinion is controlled, ... how political opposition groups are manipulated, etc.”²⁰ Because of the “war emergency,” many of the research projects on Latin America were of immediate applicability to diverse users, among others, the military. Of particular importance, the training of young people had less to do with researching major political or sociological problems, and more to do with whether they would be available to serve the needs of specific government agencies.

An example of this was what the American Hemisphere Division of the Board of Economic Warfare sought to achieve with respect to young men and women trained in specific centers and universities. At a confidential meeting of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of October 17, 1942, Dewey Anderson of the Board of Economic Warfare spoke of the efforts which his office “had made to secure and to train personnel for executive positions in Latin America.” Anderson “stated the expectation that his Division will require between 250 and 500 ... men and women for service in Latin America, as well as a staff in Washington, during the duration of the war”²¹ From the reaction of those present at the meeting, it seems obvious that the Board of Economic Warfare was not the only agency that was looking for trained young men

and women, but also that the members of the Joint Committee still expected to have young men and women trained in academic endeavors.

The members of the [Joint] Committee expressed their willingness to cooperate with the Board of Economic Warfare in training selected candidates [sic] in the languages and the political and social backgrounds of Latin America [...] and explained the functioning of their facilities through the establishment of centers for special training projects, but admitted their perplexity in making available their training facilities in their fullest extent to governmental agencies, because of the apparent lack of a centralized personnel agency with authority and because of seeming intra-office competition within the agencies of the government.²²

There was no centralized body that could control the flow of young men and women and deploy them to the right positions. While this was an organizational problem, to me it was also important to uncover just how the “selected candidates” were to be chosen if a way was found for allocating them to the right agencies.

This question I was unable to answer by looking at the SSRC collection alone. However, because of the war situation, I was led to conclude that the selected candidates who were to work in government agencies were not necessarily committed to major academic pursuits, or at least not to working at an American university setting. Many of these young trainees, I would venture, were being prepared to conduct intelligence work inside different Latin American countries.²³ To my surprise, however, this did not contradict the principles of the Joint Committee which was “prepared and willing to serve as an advisory agency, within its competence, to the various agencies of the government, and assist such agencies ... in the planning and execution of projects.”²⁴

The actual problem of having effective instruction on Latin America was solved through what became known as the Inter-American Training Centers. While the information on these centers is scant, I was able to retrieve a document that speaks about two of them: one in Philadelphia; the other set in Washington, D.C. In a “Policy Board” meeting of February 12,

1943, at the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C., a group of individuals—representing mainly the Joint Committee and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, plus the directors of both the Philadelphia and Washington centers, as well as the General Director of the Centers—discussed the “question of the continued operation of the Philadelphia Center for an eight week intensive session” the following summer. At that time, and against all expectations, there were problems assembling enough trainees so as to “justify the expenditure of time and money” in the Philadelphia Center. This was not the case with the Washington Center:

The total enrollment during the current cycle was about 1,331, including 500 Army officers and 100 Navy officers. Mr. [Henry G.] Doyle [director of the Washington Center] felt that the ceiling of expansion had about been reached since virtually every government agency interested in Latin America was now using the services of the Center. The Policy Board approved a shift of emphasis from general training to special training for those about to go to Latin America The Policy Board also approved of concentration on regional and topical courses in place of the general survey type. In this connection, Mr. Doyle suggested that the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs might consider a general lecture series by specialists as part of a program for adult education.²⁵

Perhaps the best example of how the war was affecting the development of social science research was a proposal for the study of Mexicans residing in Los Angeles.

From the time of the Hanover conferences of the 1920s, U.S. interest in finding out more about Mexicans had developed. A Professor Cole, for instance, while speaking in general about the “lack of knowledge” Americans had about “alien peoples” and about “the conditions under which they [had] been raised,” spoke thus about Mexicans.

We now have coming to us in considerable numbers the Mexicans. We know very little of the Mexican peasant; we do not know his economic life, his social, religious and moral ideas, his folk-lore and amusements, his likes and dislikes; and all those things which to go to make up his culture. We know his whole background is different, and that this must affect his reaction to American life, but it is exceedingly difficult to learn of this background from the Mexican in America. The fact that he is a stranger, that he has been made group conscious, that he realizes he is looked upon as an inferior, all tend to make him suspicious and uncommunicative.²⁶

In spite of this early interest on Mexican immigrants, and how their presence affected the U.S. economy, the proposed study of Mexicans in Los Angeles during the WW II period had a twist that—in normal circumstances—would most likely have excluded it from the type of research that the SSRC would have supported at a different time. I quote extensively the first two paragraphs of the unsigned project “Acculturation and Conflict in the Mexican American Community of Los Angeles”

The Mexican problem in the Southwest has its focus in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the seventh or eighth largest Spanish speaking city in the Americas. With the war, [sic] ignorant and repressive police measures taken against gangs of Mexican youths have crystallized Mexican resentment to long continued social, political, and economic discrimination. This condition extensively used by Axis propagandists, creates one of the most delicate spots in the whole structure of Inter-American relations.

Recognizing an outstanding opportunity for research serving war needs, [sic] members of the University of California staff prepared a research program designed to provide quickly the data needed for the Mexican population to increase its participation in the war effort, [sic] to lessen the conflict between the Mexican and American communities, to combat Axis propaganda, and to improve Inter-American relations. Furthermore, the program will accumulate data needed for a longer range study of the problem of acculturation.²⁷

While admittedly this type of research comes close to what is usually considered “scholarly,” it had a political angle that responded to specific war-time circumstances, and which paid little or no attention to the long-range implications of the presence of Mexicans in the Southwest. Nevertheless, it is evident that such an interest—to prevent Mexicans from siding with Axis propagandists, to have them side with the U.S. during the war—eventually gave way to more scholarly concerns. Of these I will speak in the last part of this report.

The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies after the War

A part of the ACLS and the SSRC, the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies in the late 1950s, moved from “overseeing a fellowship program for American scholars conducting

research on Latin America,” to supervising and participating “in a wide-ranging yet integrated array of activities aimed at generating greater understanding of Latin American societies and cultures,” striving particularly to encourage “international scholarly collaboration.” The program developed by the committee consisted of two types of fellowships, “Postdoctoral Grants for Advanced Research on Latin America and the Caribbean,” and the “International Doctoral Research Fellowship Program for Latin America and the Caribbean;” as well as a Research Planning component.

Through Research Planning the Committee identifies promising topics for innovative research and develops activities which it hopes will promote new research in these areas. These have ranged from commissioning books and single essays, to sponsoring conferences and seminars, to helping build networks of scholars, to financing small pilot research projects. These activities normally involve Committee members, either as project coordinators, or in important consultative roles. All of these activities are also monitored by Committee staff to insure budgetary control and to enhance the coherence of the Committee’s program.²⁸

As time went on, however, the Research Planning section of the Joint Committee began to proceed in unanticipated ways.

For one thing it took over relatively old projects and placed them either on a new perspective or called it “Phase II,” of the original study, except this time, a member of the Research Planning section directed the new phase of the study and began working on it by drawing funds and support from the Joint Committee. Consequently, a Committee’s sponsored project became an individual’s own research undertaking.

One case was the project on the social and cultural history of the family in Latin America, directed originally by Francesca M. Cancian (University of California, Irvine), Peter H. Smith (University of Wisconsin), and Louis Wolf Goodman (no institutional affiliation reported). This project was taken over by Larissa Lomnitz who drew support from the Committee to organize meetings in the early 1980s. Eventually Lomnitz was in charge of the

whole undertaking.²⁹ Although results of this study—plus those of others, such as the late Professor Friedrich Katz—were rather important, it was not the role of the Joint Committee to sponsor research conducted by its own members.

While the Joint Committee foresaw this situation from its founding, it did not anticipate that this would eventually become an accepted practice, nor that this sponsoring would be done at the expense of projects of similar import, but presented by outside candidates. It is inconceivable that anyone would question the fact that excellent and influential studies came out of this practice; that other projects—proposed by outside researchers—could have come out of a similar nature, will remain in the realm of speculation. Nevertheless, how this practice aided insiders in their work and careers, remains to be evaluated, and this is something I plan to examine as I write with more detail about the workings of the SSRC.

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

ENDNOTES:

¹ See, for instance, A. F. Kuhlman, "The Social Science Research Council: Its Origin and Objects." *Social Forces* 6: 4 (June 1928), pp. 583-588, at p. 583; and Roy F. Nichols, "History and the Social Science Research Council." *The American Historical Review* 50: 3 (April 1945), pp. 491-499, at p. 491.

² Roy F. Nichols, "History and the Social Science Research Council," p. 491.

³ Robert T. Crane, et al., "The Social Science Research Council." *The American Political Science Review* 18: 3 (August 1924), pp. 594-600, at pp. 595-596. The authors of this article asserted that, in 1923, "the National Research Council ... instituted a study of human migration on a comprehensive scale never before attempted." Viewing this problem from a considerable temporal distance, it seems obvious that should the SSRC have existed previously, it would have been the perfect organization to lead this project, and not the National Research Council, whose domain was the natural and not the social sciences. As part of this collaborative endeavor, the SSRC hired Mexican Anthropologist Manuel Gamio, who worked on "The Antecedents of Mexican Immigration to the United States." By looking at where they sent their money orders to, Gamio, a Columbia University graduate, laid the foundations of one of the best known works on Mexican immigration to the U.S. What he was requested to find out was "the mobility of the immigrants, their geographical provenance in Mexico; their geographic distribution in the United States; their civil or family status and ... their economic situation." Rockefeller Archive Center (henceforward RAC). Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (henceforward LSRM), Series III, Sub-series 6, Box 68, Folder 712. Letter from Manuel Gamio to Lawrence K. Frank, Mexico City, November 10, 1928.

⁴ Robert T. Crane, et al., "The Social Science Research Council," p. 595.

⁵ Robert T. Crane, et al., "The Social Science Research Council," p. 596.

⁶ Robert T. Crane, et al., "The Social Science Research Council," p. 596.

⁷ "The Work of the Social Science Research Council." *Social Science Review* 1: 1 (March 1927), pp. 100-103, at p. 100 (italics mine). The seven national organizations "chiefly interested in social science research" that Merriam mentions, were the following: American Political Science Association, American Economic Association, American Sociological Society, American Anthropological Association, American Psychological Association, American Statistical Association and the American Historical Association. See, for instance, Roy F. Nichols, "History and the Social Science Research Council," p. 491, in footnote.

⁸ RAC, LSRM, Series III, Sub-series 6. Box 64, Folder 690. "Hanover Conference." Professor Arnold Bennett Hall, of the University Wisconsin, presided "The first meeting of the Hanover Conference of the Social Science Research Council ... held at College Hall, Dartmouth College, at ten o'clock on Monday morning, August 9th, 1926" See *ibid*.

⁹ RAC, LSRM, Series III, Sub-series 6, Box 67, Folder 706. Letter from Charles E. Merriam, Chairman, Social Science Research Council, to Dr. Beardsley Rummler, Director of the LSRM, Chicago, October 24, 1924 (italics mine).

¹⁰ *Ibid*.

¹¹ "The Work of the Social Science Research Council," pp. 101-102 (italics mine).

¹² Roy R. Commons, E. E. Day, William F. Ogburn, and Arnold Bennett Hall, "A Plan for Research Fellowships in Social Science." Attachment with letter from Charles E. Merriam, Beardsley Rummler, Chicago, October 24, 1924 (the words in italics appear underlined in the original).

¹³ *Ibid*.

¹⁴ RAC, LSRM, Series III, Sub-series 6, Box 64, Folder 684. "Social Science Research Council." Attachment with letter from Lawrence K. Frank to Robert T. Crane, from the University of Michigan, Washington, D.C. July 13, 1927.

¹⁵ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 534. "Council Minutes," September 15-16, 1942.

¹⁶ *Ibid*.

¹⁷ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects. Box 101, Folder 535. Committee of Research Planning and Personnel, "Outline of Research in the Study of Contemporary Culture Patterns in Latin America," January 31, 1942. Outline attached with report of Confidential Meeting of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, March 29, 1942.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 534. "Council Minutes," September 15-16, 1942.

²⁰ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 535. Committee of Research Planning and Personnel, "Outline of Research in the Study of Contemporary Culture Patterns in Latin America," January 31, 1942. Outline attached with report of Confidential Meeting of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, March 29, 1942.

²¹ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 538. Confidential Meeting of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, October 17, 1942.

²² Ibid.

²³ Over twenty-five years ago I uncovered several documents at the National Archives in Washington, D.C. relating to intelligence work conducted by graduate American students portraying themselves as anthropologists in Mexico. My finding led to further research by one of my professors (Robert Wasserstrom) and two colleagues (one of them Ian Rus). Wasserstrom was able to interview Sol Tax at the University of Chicago. A long-time close collaborator of Robert Redfield (Chairman of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies), Tax told Wasserstrom that they (possibly referring to the Joint Committee) only sponsored graduate students who were willing to conduct research for their dissertation, as well as intelligence work for the U.S. government.

²⁴ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 3, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 534. "Appendix 13: Latin American Studies (Joint with ACLS and NRC) Annual Report 1942-1943, by the Executive Secretary of the Committee."

²⁵ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 539. "Inter-American Training Centers."

²⁶ RAC, LSRM, Series III, Sub-series 6, Box 52, Hanover Conference, Folder 563, n.d. Perhaps as a result from these remarks, Helen Richardson presented a research project entitled "Investigation of Mexican Immigration and Casual Labor in the United States." Among other points, Richardson justified the need for an investigation into this migration for the following reason, "Mexico is now the country sending the largest number of immigrant workers into the United States. Absolutely no accurate information is available concerning the sources in Mexico, the causes and extent of this migration; the duration of stay in [the] United States, the occupations and living standards of the migrants; and the effect of this migration upon social and economic conditions in the United States." See RAC, LSRM, Series III, Sub-series 6, Box 52, Hanover Conference, Folder 563, n.d. "Investigation of Mexican Immigration and Casual Labor in the United States."

²⁷ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Committee Projects, Box 101, Folder 538. Project 1942-1936: "Acculturation and Conflict in the Mexican American Community of Los Angeles."

²⁸ RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 14, Committee Projects, Latin America, Box 104, Folder 560. "A Proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for Three Years of Support for the Fellowship, Grants, and the Research Planning Program of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council," n.d.

²⁹ See, for instance, RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 14, Committee Projects, Latin America, Box 105, Folder 563. "Theoretical Problems in Latin American Kinship Studies: A Proposal for Phase II of the Social History of the Family Project." This proposal can also be found in RAC, SSRC, Accession 1, Series 1, Sub-series 14, Committee Projects, Latin America, Box 104, Folder 562.