

# **Making Experts, Sustaining Families: The Rockefeller Foundation's Mexican Fellowships as a Social Program for the Middle Class**

*by Rachel Grace Newman*

*Colgate University*



© 2023 by Rachel Grace Newman



## **Abstract**

Drawing from a sample of forty fellows sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation's Mexican Agricultural Program, with case studies coming from dossiers on ninety-one individuals in several different fellowship programs, this report looks at the families left behind and brought along by the Mexican experts whose training was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). Alongside uncovering geopolitical subtexts and intellectual legacies left by US philanthropic foundations, historians can also scrutinize what is arguably the most tangible impact made by the RF in countries like Mexico: namely, the consequences of its educational investment in young people's material and social worlds. This report contends that the RF's philanthropic efforts to form highly-skilled human capital for the Global South also functioned as a kind of family welfare program for up-and-coming Mexican experts. RF officers closely scrutinized not just their fellows but their wives and children, and the RF expended considerable resources on both financing whole families and in monitoring their collective well-being. However, there are also important differences in terms of the support available for men and women due to RF officers' beliefs about the impossibility of married women being professional experts.

The Rockefeller Foundation (RF) was proud of its efforts to train experts from developing countries, funding advanced training abroad for thousands of young scientists over the middle decades of the twentieth century. As the RF sought to spur structural transformation in the Global South through philanthropy, its avowed focus was to direct resources toward the brilliant individuals who could make those changes happen in their native lands.<sup>1</sup> In Latin America alone, over 1,700 budding scholars enjoyed fellowships during the period 1917-1962.<sup>2</sup> In Mexico, historians have noted, the RF has turned out to be a crucial player in the histories of various fields of expertise. Its initiatives crucially shaped the development of the field of public health, the course of the Green Revolution, and the growth of important centers of learning such as the Colegio de México.<sup>3</sup>

Alongside uncovering geopolitical subtexts and intellectual legacies left by US philanthropic foundations, historians can also scrutinize what is arguably the most tangible impact made by the RF in countries like Mexico: namely, the consequences of its educational investment in young people. This report considers how Rockefeller dollars shaped the everyday life of experts-in-information, called “fellows,” pursuing graduate education in the United States, particularly attending to fellows’ use of stipends to support their families. I contend that the RF’s philanthropic efforts to form highly-skilled human capital for the Global South also functioned as a kind of family welfare program for up-and-coming Mexican experts.

Fellows, despite their youth and fledgling professional status, had dependents of various kinds, from spouses and young children to elder parents and extended family members. This meant, as one RF scientist lamented privately in 1954, that the actual cost of forming individual experts exceeded the RF’s expenditures on that person’s education, travel, and living expenses. Speaking of the young Mexican agronomists he was responsible for selecting for study abroad, this scientist regretted that candidates so often supported members of their extended families, including parents and “grandmothers, aunts, etc. left behind.” These candidates looked to the RF to help them take care of these family obligations, requesting additional stipends. Ultimately, fewer Mexican

experts would be trained if the RF had to finance each expert's kin. It was inconvenient and expensive that Mexico's next generation of experts happened to be family members as well as human repositories of disciplinary knowledge. The RF officer complained that "it does not seem either logical or reasonable" for the RF to take responsibility for anyone beyond the immediate family, or wife and children, of the expert being trained.<sup>4</sup> The RF was reluctant (although not totally unwilling) to assign extra resources for the support of fellows' extended families, but RF officials accepted and even embraced responsibility for male fellows' immediate families.

The Rockefeller Foundation's modernizing mission did not explicitly extend to the social realm, and yet the RF's bylaws and customs, as well as the biases of its officers, produced social consequences for the families of experts. As Marcos Cueto has pointed out, the RF's efforts in Latin America aimed broadly to modernize, to replace "traditional" practices and ideas with a different "set of values" rooted in "Western science" and US-dominant culture. Cueto notes that this hegemonic project was subject to negotiation on the ground and that it was not necessarily an unwelcome imposition for all Latin American collaborators, many of whom shared "the modernizing goals of the foundation."<sup>5</sup> But before RF support produced US-style experts or transfigured these young Mexicans into loyal US intellectual allies, the RF was already intervening in these individuals' private lives.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the RF allocated family allowances, entertained fellows' requests for additional financial help in supporting families, and kept careful track of its fellows' family situations. Following Inderjeet Parmar's claim that the most concrete achievement of these foundations in the twentieth century was not, in fact, reducing global poverty but in creating "sustainable elite networks" around the world, I seek to show how, on a micro scale, foundations like the RF cultivated individuals by providing them with their daily bread.<sup>6</sup> As historians Andra Chastain and Timothy Lorek have recently argued, it is crucial to study experts in light of "the complex mix of personal, professional, and political motives that conditioned the work" they performed.<sup>7</sup>

The empirical base of this report consists of dossiers on Mexican fellows, or scholarship recipients, sponsored by the RF from the early 1940s to the late 1960s. During this era, hundreds of Mexican agronomists, as did many dozens of other young people studying topics ranging from medical research to economics and playwriting, spent anywhere from a few months to several years abroad, earning degrees, making contacts, and building their careers with a monthly RF stipend. Fellows' files offer an unusually detailed glimpse into the personal finances of middle-class Mexicans, such as how much they earned, how much they remitted to relatives, how much they paid in rent, how much they spent on medical procedures, and other such details.

The methodology used here involves both quantitative and qualitative approaches. For the former, I analyze data drawn from a sample of forty individuals who received fellowships for studies in agronomy to discuss patterns of their family structure, dependent kin, previous salaries, and stipend amounts, among other details.<sup>8</sup> To complement these findings, I recount the experiences of individual fellows in this sample as well as individuals from the RF's other disciplinary programs in Medical and Natural Sciences, along with the Humanities and Social Sciences. In all, I consulted ninety-one dossiers for one hundred Mexicans who studied abroad in the United States. Of these individuals receiving RF fellowships whose files were consulted for this study, just eight belonged to women. This makes it challenging to identify about what was particular to women's experiences as fellows in quantitative terms, having neither dozens of potential case studies nor a representative sample as I could draw from for the stories of young men. What I sketch out here is to illustrate some ways that the RF treated its men and women fellows distinctly so far as the available cases allow. The RF was evidently willing to include women in its fellowship programs, although they seem not to have made any particular effort to seek out women candidates or cultivate a diverse pool of fellows. Rather, the women discussed here came to the RF's attention because their mentors, inevitably men, presented them as candidates.

## **Experts' Families in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives**

Broadly speaking, in Mexico, study abroad was an exclusively elite phenomenon in the nineteenth century that became accessible to small, though growing numbers of middle-class youth over the course of the twentieth century. The reasons for this shift, which certainly did not make study abroad a mass phenomenon, was the increasing availability of scholarships combined with the dramatic expansion of Mexico's own university system.<sup>9</sup> With scholarships, such as those granted by the RF, middle-class Mexicans had the opportunity to access foreign education, previously accessible only to the wealthiest Mexican families. The RF's fellows, chosen using highly personal procedures that emphasized merit and some subjective criteria, came from the middle classes.<sup>10</sup> Although they were privileged in national terms, these middle-class Mexicans still lived with uncertainty.

Their privilege was fragile, subject to vicissitudes even during the tremendous economic growth of the mid-twentieth century Mexican economy. This helps us understand the appeal of RF fellowships. For those who could access such resources, the pursuit of education, typically conceived as a middle-class touchstone because of its link to political socialization and the middle-class desire for cultural capital, constituted an immediate income-generating opportunity.<sup>11</sup> There were tangible incentives for youth to study abroad, precisely because their study abroad granted access to Rockefeller dollars for themselves and for their families. The RF certainly had no explicit aim to intervene in Mexico's class structure, but as we will see, their scholarship-granting regime had the potential to remake the economic possibilities of middle-class families. The notoriously "mediocre" economic possibilities of mid-century middle-class Mexican families, described by contemporaries and historians alike, are meaningful not just because that uncertainty produced a vague anxiety or dissatisfaction driving middle-class political activism in public arena.<sup>12</sup> Thinking about politics in a broader sense, the dynamics of power that structured interactions among budding experts, their dependents, and a US

philanthropic institution illuminate what economic precarity signified in terms of personal, everyday choices.

Though nominally committed to merit-based selection, the RF's methods for deciding who was promising and worthy of investment were quite imprecise. The officers, particularly in the Mexican agricultural program, consistently referred to fellows as "boys" and more particularly, as "their" boys, in their internal correspondence; women candidates could also be called "girls."<sup>13</sup> Fellows were dependents of the RF, and the nature of this paternalistic dependency shaped their abilities to secure additional funding. As I have written more about elsewhere, RF officers were frankly nosy about the emotions, struggles, and personal crises of fellows they supported.<sup>14</sup> Many fellows had families of their own: wives, children, parents, and other kin whom they supported, and these individuals, too came under scrutiny.

RF officers were preoccupied with fellows' family situations. Ostensibly, the reason for this interest was that the fellows' academic successes rather depended upon the happiness of their home life. Perhaps the most significant factor was the emotional state of fellows' wives. "Mrs. A is an attractive girl from Sonora and appears to adjusting herself quite well to life in Lincoln [Nebraska] although she still does not speak English," wrote one officer in his diary following breakfast with the fellow and his unnamed wife. "Fortunately," he continued, the couple was lodging with a local family that was "trying to keep Mrs. Acosta from becoming too nostalgic about Mexico."<sup>15</sup> The unstated concern here was that a lonely wife might eventually pull her husband back to Mexico before the completion of his studies, and this was a possibility that officers quite actively monitored. RF officers, as well as many students' advisors, viewed fellows as very much part of a marital unit whose stability could make or break a career trajectory.

One unusual case suggests the extent to which RF officers could become involved in their fellows' family politics while also revealing the active role that so-called "dependents" might play in shaping the everyday lives of fellows. Jesse P. Perry, an RF officer who supervised many of the fellows discussed in this

report, first met the wife of Celio Barriga at a dinner party in Mississippi in 1963. Barriga was studying at Mississippi State, and his wife accompanied him. Perry seemed more taken with Mrs. Barriga than with her husband: the woman “seemed very pleasant and is an attractive person,” unafraid to speaking the English she was still learning, and “she fitted in well with the other ladies present, and I believe that Barriga will be able to count on her help and support during his graduate program.”<sup>16</sup> Perry, and perhaps RF officers in general, seemed to think that a supportive wife was a real asset to the Mexican scholars in whom the RF invested. But later on, it turned out that Celio Barriga’s greatest academic obstacle seemed to be his wife. After spending some time in Mexico, where she gave birth to their first child, Mrs. Barriga returned to rejoin her husband in Mississippi and was most unhappy. Barriga revealed to his advisor that “his wife speaks practically no English and she doesn’t like to be alone while he is at the library or Experiment Station studying,” and moreover, she was worried about her own mother, ill back in Mexico.<sup>17</sup> The Mississippi State agronomist supervising Barriga relayed these details to Perry. As Mrs. Barriga transformed from an asset to a source of trouble, her importance to shaping Barriga’s own future prospects was never in question.

A few months later, Perry and Barriga’s advisor found themselves drawn into the couple’s disputes in a rather dramatic way. Now Barriga, and his wife were on the verge of divorcing. Mrs. Barriga wanted to return to Mexico and file for divorce there. She took the remarkable step of directly contacting both her husband’s advisor and Perry to solicit their approval, to be indicated in a signed document, for her plans to end the marriage. Barriga did not wish to get divorced nor to return to Mexico and had no wish to cease his doctoral studies. Barriga’s advisor made a long-distance call to Perry about the matter, and the two discussed how to keep the couple from separating or leaving Mississippi without compromising themselves or signing any documents.<sup>18</sup> Mrs. Barriga had the potential to effectively scuttle the RF’s investment in her husband, and while that power did not help her scheme to get support from Perry or her husband’s advisor, it did mean that her threats caused them alarm. Ultimately, the couple worked things out for themselves within a few months. Barriga’s advisor was “elated” to report to Perry that the couple, who had remained



together after all, now seemed much happier. The Mexican agronomist now had “a brighter light in his eye,” and his advisor felt confident that he would improve academically.<sup>19</sup> It was abundantly clear to Perry and Barriga’s advisor that the young man’s potential as a future expert depended upon the stability of his home situation.

This story helps us understand why the RF was willing to offer flexibility and additional funding to help alleviate family challenges. Fellow Gabino de Alba, for example, enjoyed the support of the RF and his advisor at the University of Wisconsin to transfer to a doctoral program in a warmer climate, after a physician advised that such a move would be better for his wife’s health. “Understandably,” wrote his Wisconsin advisor, “Mr. de Alba [believes] it would be inappropriate, in view of his obligation to his family” to continue his studies alone with his wife and young daughters living elsewhere.<sup>20</sup> By allowing for change in his academic trajectory, the RF aimed to serve their ultimate goal of making sure de Alba finished his training and went on to the career prospects desired by the RF. Ultimately, this meant those invested in de Alba as a budding agronomist were understanding about his familial responsibilities.

As an RF representative declared in 1952, “We can provide funds for fellowships, but it is the high quality of the work of the fellows themselves which measures the contribution to the well-being of mankind.”<sup>21</sup> Accordingly, as dependents of the RF, fellows were subject to close scrutiny of their academic progress, personal comportment, financial choices, and mobility in ways that scholarship recipients sponsored by other institutions were not. RF officers’ supervision often veered into armchair psychology or social work as officers reckoned familial well-being. One officer documented his efforts to determine whether a fellow’s two-year-old son, described by his father as “a little devil!” was a normally or pathologically difficult toddler.<sup>22</sup> The RF itself spent considerable sums on this kind of supervision – think of the salaries and travel expenses of touring officers and the secretarial labor required to maintain so many dossiers. But this outlay was in the service of protecting their investment in the future contributions expected from its fellows. As youthful dependents in the eyes of the RF and its officers, fellows were promising but very much in

formation, deserving of support (financial and otherwise) and also needing discipline and even surveillance. When Gabino de Alba tarried in submitting his Ph.D. dissertation, the fellowship officer articulated his “clear responsibility” in terms of a personal more than a monetary obligation, warning de Alba that “both the Rockefeller Foundation and your sponsoring institution would be very disappointed if you do not know move ahead with the necessary steps to complete your Ph.D. requirements.”<sup>23</sup>

There is no doubt that fellows were keen to the fact that officers considered their family situations pertinent. They wrote to the RF to let them know of a new child just born or to send along a medical bill that the RF might cover. In such notes, fellows made clear that they were not spending on luxuries or frivolous items, presenting narratives of middle-class frugality and provision for the future. One fellow, writing in 1958, began by explaining that he was “pressed” to request some reimbursements only because his expenses had increased. “I do not want to give you the impression that I am interested in increasing my own income,” he clarified. His expenses were academic (professional books and journals, research trips) and family-related (he was sending his daughters to school to learn English, ostensibly not at the local public school).<sup>24</sup> Another fellow even requested help paying for his wife to study English, an expense that he justified as support for his own research since she could then help him with clerical work upon his return to Mexico, but the RF declined.<sup>25</sup> The RF did not always, or even usually, grant such requests. Still, it only cost fellows the price of postage to rule out the possibility of aid.

The intimacy of RF vigilance was remarkable, but fellows’ subjective experiences of this surveillance are difficult to ascertain from the documents. Perhaps occasional visits from meddling representatives of the RF were a small burden to bear in exchange for the steady income and additional benefits the institution made available to them. Whether they wanted guidance was another matter. In one case, a fellow asked an officer for advice on a private family matter which was apparently sensitive enough to merit exclusion from the report; this omission is notable given the patent sensitivity of many well-documented crises to be found in the RF’s archives. Was it the sort of problem

that more money might alleviate? Did the fellow actually trust his fellowship officer enough to seek nothing more than interpersonal advice? The file only tells of the counsel given: “to consider the geographical distance between [the fellow] and his family as an advantage to his maintaining a completely ‘hands-off’ attitude.”<sup>26</sup> Family entanglements, financial and otherwise, were not convenient for the RF, whose officers certainly preferred that fellows not have such ties. But fellows were almost inevitably bound up in family webs of dependency, meaning that as they studied, they also navigated domestic issues within their own households in the United States, and problems in their extended family networks in Mexico. Not inclined to take such a “hands-off” approach, many fellows used their RF stipends and their ability to request additional funds from the institution as a way to meet their obligations to kin.

There are of course many intrafamilial dynamics that did not directly pertain to money and that escaped the nosy notice of the RF’s officers. Thus, some of the oft-remarked tensions and transformations that rocked Latin American middle-class families in the era under study, such as changing gender roles, new models of parenthood, and shifting norms for intergenerational relations, are difficult to see here.<sup>27</sup> The story of Mrs. Barriga’s threat to divorce her husband is exceptional in what it reveals about this young woman’s priorities: she did not wish to be isolated from family and lonely in a foreign land as she raised her first child, and she did not view her husband’s academic preparation as more important than her own happiness, at least initially. Still, it seems significant that neither divorce nor departure occurred, but rather Mrs. Barriga, for reasons we do not learn, made peace with the situation. Ultimately, the breadwinner’s interests, in this case perfectly aligned with those of the RF, prevailed.

Women fellows with spouses were effectively excluded not just from the family allowance granted to so many men fellows, but in fact from being granted fellowships in the first place. Pointedly, there was no space for a “husband’s name” on the application form, which only asked for the name of a wife. As candidates for a fellowship, women were asked about their marriage plans to confirm that these were nonexistent. Reporting on his interview with Estela

Sánchez Quintanar, a prospective fellow studying chemistry, an officer noted that she professed to be “not interested in marriage and cited the fact that she was a little old to consider matrimony.”<sup>28</sup> It is likely that young women knew that their chances of getting a fellowship hinged upon their assurances about a lack of marriage plans, for other women candidates made similar promises.<sup>29</sup> Marriage was clearly no significant impediment to a male fellow’s candidacy. But women faced an added layer of scrutiny even if they were single because the logic of RF investments in human capital presumed that women generally ceased to be viable scholars at the moment they were married.

Grooming women for their human capital, then, constituted a high-risk investment because any change in their marital status could make them effectively useless as knowledge producers, at least in the eyes of the RF. When Minerva Morales Morales, a student of international relations, got married shortly after the conclusion of her RF fellowship in 1965, both her former advisor and her RF officer treated her new union as the *de facto* end of her professional career. Her advisor described the shared loss of her academic potential. “I suppose that one always takes a substantial risk in investing in the scholarly development of teaching prospects of an attractive, intelligent woman like Miss Morales,” he observed, adding that he still thought “the risk was worth taking.”<sup>30</sup> The RF’s fears that Morales would leave academia were eventually realized. As her husband wrote in his memoirs, “in the years that followed our marriage, Minerva moved in the opposite trajectory of many women of her generation—from successful professor to accomplished homemaker,” withdrawing completely from her professional work after the birth of her first child. As he remembered things, his wife (who died in 1985 in a car accident), “enjoyed every moment of her ‘traditional’ life” and had not liked “the academic rat race” to begin with.<sup>31</sup> Of course, it was not actually impossible to combine motherhood and scholarship. Sánchez Quintanar, despite claiming to have no interest in marriage, did later marry another Mexican student at the University of Wisconsin. She went on to raise children and make a long career at Mexico’s National University.

Of the women fellows whose cases I consulted, I did find one with children, though her story seems to confirm the impossibility of combining graduate training with motherhood. Catalina Sierra Casasús was 40 years old, several years older than the average RF Fellow, and she was divorced and the mother of two adolescent children. She studied sociology at Columbia University in 1956-1957, evidently leaving her children behind in Mexico; Sierra Casasús received no family allowance for her children. It is possible she contributed to their maintenance from her basic stipend of \$225, which exceeded her previous salary of \$175 monthly as a social researcher at the Nacional Financiera, Mexico's development bank.<sup>32</sup>

She started her fellowship with the RF as a rather reluctant sponsor. After interviewing her, Social Sciences fellowship officer Montague Yudelman believed that Sierra had only been recommended "as a humanitarian act" rather than "one of purely promoting the advancement of a good scholar."<sup>33</sup> Once Sierra began her studies, Yudelman made "inquiries" during a visit to New York City that "dispelled" his "doubts as to [her] lack of qualifications."<sup>34</sup>

But after making a good academic record, Sierra's parental duties interfered with her study plans. Though her teenage son had enjoyed "excellent" health at the time she began her fellowship, he had since fallen "seriously ill" and as she wrote, her son's doctor had advised her that she could not return to her studies in the United States. Sierra, having spent the summer with her son in Mexico City, therefore withdrew from her fellowship, evidently having struggled with the decision. In her letter to the RF, she pointed out that her most recent grades at Columbia were "really very good and that only proves I worked very hard during that time," as if she anticipated criticism for a lack of dedication. And the final line of her letter was unusually frank and despondent: "Really I don't know in this moment in what way [to] organize my academic life."<sup>35</sup> Her responsibilities as a mother and as a fellow came into direct conflict, leaving her little room to maneuver.

Yudelman, her fellowship officer, had in fact learned about this situation several months prior to her resignation. At first, Sierra had asked for permission to return to Mexico over the summer for research reasons, not mentioning the

family health situation.<sup>36</sup> When she went to explain her request in person, she divulged her son's illness. As Yudelman reported, he "expressed his sympathy, but suggested that [she] weigh alternatives rather carefully." Following general fellowship policy, her stipend was suspended during the months she spent with her son in Mexico City.<sup>37</sup> But after offering only forbearance while she attended to her parental duties and no financial help, Yudelman regarded her choice to leave the program as a personal failing. Several years later, when Sierra requested research funds from Yudelman, he chastised for having left her fellowship.<sup>38</sup> The RF was unwilling to provide flexibility for an already-unusual fellow, one of the few women sponsored during this era. By contrast, male fellows accompanied by their wives and children certainly also experienced delays or setbacks, whether minor or catastrophic, as a result of their children's poor health, but these fathers generally enjoyed the sympathy and financial support of the RF. In this sense, the RF's general toleration and support for fathers did not extend to mothers.

There was one way in which women fellows could support families nearly as well as men fellows could: by remitting money to members of their extended families back home in Mexico. Further research is needed to understand how gendered expectations for income contribution shaped obligations within middle-class families. But it seems that Mexican families did expect young professional women to dedicate at least part of their salaries to family maintenance. Minerva Morales, for example, was single when she began her fellowship in 1964, and for her, the choice to study abroad meant a pay cut that adversely affected her parents. While teaching at El Colegio de México in the early 1960s, she earned \$380 monthly, and her stipend while studying at Columbia University in 1964 was \$300. For this reason, Morales asked for her stipend to be raised to match her former salary so that she could send \$50-80 to her parents. She explained that prior to her fellowship, she allocated half of her salary to supporting her parents. In other words, as a young, single professional woman, she was clearly a crucial contributor to the household income (she also lived with her parents prior to her study abroad). The RF officer who reported on this conversation registered disapproval of Morales'

parents, writing “it seems that upon her obtaining a regular income her father slackened off in his own [work].”<sup>39</sup> Morales did not obtain a stipend increase.

Even though she did not enjoy a family allowance, Sánchez Quintanar sent \$100 dollars, or 40 percent of her stipend, home to her family each month in the early 1960s. But as with the case of Morales, the need for Sánchez Quintanar’s contributions to her parents were rationalized in terms of who was failing to live up to their responsibilities: her married sisters, and by extension their tight-fisted husbands, did not provide any income to their ailing father.<sup>40</sup> In both cases, RF officers took for granted that only men were rightful providers and that women’s income was a kind of supplement or awkward substitute to take the place of invalid or shirking men. Nevertheless, as Sánchez Quintanar proved, her ultimate power to decide how she spent the base stipend she did receive allowed her to make a sizable contribution to her family each month. In this sense, having been included in the mostly-male group of fellows, women were able to play a similar role as income contributors via remittances in their extended families.

## **Conclusion**

As we have seen, financial and interpersonal problems involving kin shaped the conditions of expert formation, for both men and women, whether their families were near or far. The history of experts, this report has suggested, is also a history of families. Exploring the interface between a foreign, private institution and the middle-class Mexican family, I have shown how US middle-class norms about gender, age, work, and family structured the Rockefeller Foundation’s explicit and tacit rules for its fellowship programs. If the RF wanted to cultivate the best talent, chosen by its own officers and their trusted Mexican intermediaries, the RF had to set aside funding to maintain the families of its experts-in-formation. Its varying willingness to take on this task reflected the values of gender and family held by the RF’s officers. Ideal experts formed in the RF mold were not only acquainted with US forms of knowledge and imbricated in US scientific networks, but also conducted their family lives in a

particular way that the RF encouraged through the resources it made available, or not. RF's methodology for funding experts allocated more resources to certain experts, and to particular configurations of Mexican middle-class families, than to others.

These kinds of rules kept the growing cadres of Mexican experts homogenous. However, the RF's preferences and allocations did not wholly determine the ways that fellows spent their RF dollars, and the RF could not prevent its fellows from using their income to sustain family members even without permission or extra allowances. The resources it disbursed, earmarked for family maintenance or not, clearly shaped the lives of many more individuals than the fellows themselves.

This illuminates the pertinence of nonstate actors, like the RF, as significant players in the history of the middling-privileged everyday, as lived within the households of intellectuals. As scholars have emphasized the role of the growing Mexican state apparatus in creating, nourishing, and empowering the middle classes, it is also worth examining how class formation could be sustained by bypassing the state and connecting with other institutions, including those located outside the bounds of the nation.<sup>41</sup>

## Notes

I thank Lee Hiltzik for accommodating me as I prepared this report. Prior to and during my archival visits, I received kind help from everyone I encountered. For those who might find this report useful, because it draws from a work-in-progress, I would gladly welcome all correspondence regarding the project and its future iterations at [rnewman@colgate.edu](mailto:rnewman@colgate.edu).



---

<sup>1</sup> Raymond B. Fosdick, *A Philosophy for a Foundation* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1963), 20–21.

<sup>2</sup> Marcos Cueto, ed., *Missionaries of Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994), x–xi. Note that these totals do not include fellowship granted after 1962 and thus do not encompass the entire period under study here.

<sup>3</sup> Anne-Emanuelle Birn, *Marriage of Convenience: Rockefeller International Health and Revolutionary Mexico* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2006); Armando Solórzano Ramos, *¿Fiebre dorada o fiebre amarilla? La Fundación Rockefeller en México (1911-1924)* (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara, 1997); Joseph Cotter, *Troubled Harvest: Agronomy and Revolution in Mexico, 1880-2002* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003); Tore C. Olsson, *Agrarian Crossings: Reformers and the Remaking of the US and Mexican Countryside* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017); Álvaro Morcillo Laiz, “La Gran Dama: Science Patronage, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Mexican Social Sciences in the 1940s,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 51, no. 4 (November 2019): 829–54, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022216X19000336>; Servando Ortoll and Pablo Piccato, “A Brief History of the Historia Moderna de México,” in *A Companion to Mexican History and Culture*, ed. William H. Beezley (Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 339–60.

<sup>4</sup> J.G. Harrar to E.J. Wellhausen, March 31, 1954. RF-1.1-323-7-41.

<sup>5</sup> Cueto, *Missionaries of Science*, xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 3.

<sup>7</sup> Andra B. Chastain and Timothy W. Lorek, “Introduction,” in *Itineraries of Expertise: Science, Technology, and the Environment in Latin America’s Long Cold War*, ed. Andra B. Chastain and Timothy W. Lorek (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020), 14, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvz939bd>.

<sup>8</sup> This sample was created by selecting every fifth individual in the Rockefeller Archive Center’s Rockefeller Foundation records for Mexican fellows.

<sup>9</sup> Rachel Grace Newman, “Transnational Ambitions: Student Migrants and the Making of a National Future in Twentieth-Century Mexico” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2019), <https://doi.org/10.7916/d8-6b27-og26>.

<sup>10</sup> E. C. Stakman, Richard Bradfield, and Paul C. Mangelsdorf, *Campaigns against Hunger* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1967), 42–43.

<sup>11</sup> Louise E. Walker, *Waking from the Dream: Mexico’s Middle Classes after 1968* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013); Soledad Loaeza, *Clases medias y política en México: la querrela escolar, 1959-1963* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Internacionales, 1988); A. Ricardo López and Barbara Weinstein, eds., *The Making of the Middle Class: Toward a Transnational History of the Middle Class* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012); D. S. Parker and Louise E. Walker, *Latin America’s Middle Class: Unsettled Debates and New Histories*, 2013; A. Ricardo López, *Makers of Democracy: A Transnational History of the Middle Classes in Colombia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9781478003298>.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> For such a discussion written in the late 1960s, see Octavio Paz, *The Labyrinth of Solitude and Other Writings*, trans. Lysander Kemp (New York: Grove Press, 1985), 266–68.
- <sup>13</sup> Examples abound, but some can be found in J.G. Harrar to E.J. Wellhausen, August 13, 1952 and March 31, 1954. 1.1-323-7-41. For the use of “girl,” see “Report of Interview for Scholarship, María del Rosario Green Macías,” December 14, 1965. 10.1-323E-187-2844.
- <sup>14</sup> Newman, “Transnational Ambitions.”
- <sup>15</sup> KW [Kenneth Wernimont] diary, February 24, 1953. RF, RG 1.1., Series 323, Box 7, Folder 42.
- <sup>16</sup> JPP [Jesse P. Perry] diary extract, March 23, 1963. RF-10.1-323E-179-2749.
- <sup>17</sup> Norman C. Mervine to Jesse P. Perry, June 14, 1965. RF-10.1-323E-179-2749.
- <sup>18</sup> JPP (Jesse P. Perry) telephone conversation with Norman Mervine, October 19, 1965. RF-10.1-323E-179-2749.
- <sup>19</sup> Norman C. Mervine to Jesse P. Perry, February 21, 1966. RF-10.1-323E-179-2749.
- <sup>20</sup> N.P. Neal to L.C. Coffey, May 7, 1962. RF-10.1-323E-182-2795.
- <sup>21</sup> Cited in Fosdick, *A Philosophy for a Foundation*, 22–23.
- <sup>22</sup> See WO, Diary excerpt, March 25, 1948. RF-10.1-323E-202-3035.
- <sup>23</sup> Jesse P. Perry to Gabino de Alba, March 24, 1965. RF-10.1-323E-182-2795.
- <sup>24</sup> Rodolfo Quintana to Kenneth Wernimont, January 7, 1958. RF-10.1-323E-196-2962.
- <sup>25</sup> Victor Manuel Soria Murillo to Jesse P. Perry, June 21, 1967 and July 14, 1967, and Jesse P. Perry to Soria Murillo, July 18, 1967. RF-10.1-323E-199-3002.
- <sup>26</sup> KW [Kenneth Wernimont] diary extract, February 25, 1959. RF-10.1-323E-174-2679.
- <sup>27</sup> Isabella Cosse, “Argentine Mothers and Fathers and the New Psychological Paradigm of Child-Rearing (1958-1973),” *Journal of Family History* 35, no. 2 (April 2010): 180–202, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363199010363352>; Mary Kay Vaughan, *Portrait of a Young Painter: Pepe Zúñiga and Mexico City’s Rebel Generation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 17–22..
- <sup>28</sup> V.C. Scott diary entry, May 22, 1959. RF, RG 10.1, Series 323-E, Box 198, Folder 2990.
- <sup>29</sup> E.g. John A. Pino, “Interviews,” December 22, 1965. RF-10.1-323E-187-2844.
- <sup>30</sup> Leland M. Goodrich to Jesse P. Perry, Jr., October 22, 1965. RF-10.1-323E-193-2917.
- <sup>31</sup> Amitai Etzioni, *My Brother’s Keeper: A Memoir and a Message* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 168–69.
- <sup>32</sup> Catalina Sierra Casasús, “Personal History and Application for a Fellowship,” October 30, 1956. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717, and Sierra Casasús, Catalina Fellowship Recorder Card. RG 10.2, Mexico, Drawer 1, Discipline 6 (Humanities/Social Sciences Scholarships).
- <sup>33</sup> MY [Montague Yudelman] diary extract, May 17, 1956. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.
- <sup>34</sup> MY [Montague Yudelman] diary extract, October 19, 1956. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.
- <sup>35</sup> Catalina Sierra Casasús to Mr. [Erskine] McKinley, September 24, 1957. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.
- <sup>36</sup> Catalina Sierra Casasús to Mr. [Erskine] McKinley, June 18, 1957. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.

---

<sup>37</sup> MY [Montague Yudelman], Interview with Mrs. Catalina Sierra Casasús, June 26, 1957. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.

<sup>38</sup> The occasion for the rebuke was that Sierra requested additional research funding. See MY [Montague Yudelman], Interview with Catalina Sierra Casasús, February 25, 1959. RF-10.1-323E-176-2717.

<sup>39</sup> LG, Interview with Minerva Morales, July 8, 1964. RF-10.1-323E-193-2917.

<sup>40</sup> The officer overseeing her fellowship supported her contributions indirectly by allowing her to keep her stipend during the time she traveled back to Mexico. Ordinarily, fellows did not receive their stipends if they visited Mexico. See Henry W. Kumm, Interview Report, January 16, 1961. RF-10.1-323E-198-2990.

<sup>41</sup> For a summary of this relationship on a book focusing on state employees, see Susie S. Porter, *From Angel to Office Worker: Middle-Class Identity and Female Consciousness in Mexico, 1890-1950* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2018), 6–9.