

Rangil, Teresa Tomas

Working Paper

The politics of neutrality: UNESCO's Social Science Department, 1946-1956

CHOPE Working Paper, No. 2011-08

Provided in Cooperation with:

Center for the History of Political Economy at Duke University

Suggested Citation: Rangil, Teresa Tomas (2011) : The politics of neutrality: UNESCO's Social Science Department, 1946-1956, CHOPE Working Paper, No. 2011-08, Duke University, Center for the History of Political Economy (CHOPE), Durham, NC

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/155443>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

THE POLITICS OF NEUTRALITY:
UNESCO'S SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT,
1946-1956

TERESA TOMAS RANGIL

CHOPE Working Paper No. 2011-08

April 2011



CENTER FOR THE
HISTORY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

The Politics of Neutrality:
UNESCO's Social Science Department, 1946-1956

Teresa Tomas Rangil

tomasrangil@gmail.com

Economix

Université de Paris X Ouest Nanterre La Défense

April 2011

Draft

Abstract of

The Politics of Neutrality: UNESCO's Social Science Department, 1946-1956

By

Teresa Tomas Rangil

tomasrangil@gmail.com

Economix

Université de Paris X Ouest Nanterre La Défense

This essay analyzes the construction of “neutral” knowledge by the scholars (mostly psychologists, anthropologists and sociologists) who were members of UNESCO's Social Science Department between 1946 and 1956. Making use of recent literature on the politics of knowledge and using archive material, we try to clarify the postures between what we call “universalists” and “pluralists” in three of the major research projects that shaped the Department: the Tensions project, the race statements of 1950 and 1951, and the program of technical assistance. We make the case that both “pluralism” and “universalism” involved a great deal of political maneuvering and strategy to advance national or professional purposes, and that therefore, neutrality could only be apparent.

Acknowledgements

I am most grateful to the UNESCO archives staff especially to Jens Boel, Mahmoud Ghander and Alexandre Coutelle. I would also like to thank Avi Cohen, Evelyn Forget and Tiago Mata for useful comments on previous drafts. More generally, I am also grateful to the participants of March, 18th 2011 History of Political Economy seminar at Duke University where I had the opportunity to present an earlier version of this paper. The usual disclaimer applies. All correspondence should be sent to: tomasrangil@gmail.com.

Jel classification: B29 and Z13.

Keywords: International organizations, UNESCO, social science, OSS, wars, technical assistance, post-colonial world, development, race studies, culture and personality studies, India, Japan, neutrality, and the politics of knowledge.

Introduction

In the last six years, the number of papers and books on the history of UNESCO has increased significantly. The publication “boom” is partly due to the attention received by the institution following the celebration of its 60th anniversary.¹ Indeed, in 2005, a Symposium entitled “60 years of UNESCO” on the history of the organization was held at the UNESCO House in Paris to which many historians were invited to reflect on the successes and failures of this Specialized UN agency charged of the promotion of education, science and culture among member states.² Several “types” of historical narratives were represented in this Conference: world history, cultural and social history, race, gender and subaltern studies history, and natural science history. However, unfortunately few historians of the social sciences were then represented. Since, only two historians, Chloé Maurel (2010) and Perrin Selcer (2009), have focused on the origins of the Social Science Department as a whole at UNESCO.³ In her 2010 book entitled *Histoire de l'UNESCO*, Maurel painstakingly described the thirty first years of the organization, from an institutional history perspective. Making an extensive use of archival material, she situated the history of UNESCO within the more general history of international relations during the Cold War, and related changes in the Departments to general changes in the international arena. Selcer's 2009 paper approached the history of the Social Science Department from a sociology of knowledge perspective, asking how the subjectivities of different social science scholars were coordinated to produce objective social knowledge at UNESCO, a coordination that he labeled the

¹ Sunil Amrith and Glenda Sluga (2008) review new directions in the recent historiography of the United Nations system and what has been called the “transnational turn” among historians.

² From 1946 to 1958, UNESCO's Commission and Secretariat were housed in the Hotel Majestic, 19, avenue Kléber, not far from the Avenue des Champs-Élysées and the Arc du Triomphe. The house had been originally the residence of Queen Isabel II of Spain from 1868, then after reconstruction a hotel from 1908. It was used during World War II by the German army, then by the American Army and finally it became an international conference center of the French Foreign Ministry when UNESCO moved in 1958 to its new UNESCO House, Place de Fontenoy.

³ In the following Conferences organized by UNESCO's archives, the choice of topics has taken the perspective of global and transnational history more than a history of social sciences, i.e. “Towards the Transnational History of International Organizations: Methodology/Epistemology” in April 2009, “UNESCO and Issues of Colonization and Decolonization” in April 2009, and “UNESCO and the Cold War” in 2010.

“view from everywhere.”⁴ However, in Maurel and Selcer’s accounts, little was said about the actual interactions within the Social Science Department and the consequences for choice of the theories and methods used by its staff. This essay aims at completing their work.⁵

Historians of the natural sciences who, unlike historians of the social sciences, were well-represented at the 2005 conference primarily showed their concern with UNESCO's myth of neutrality and political detachment, depicting this institution either as a handmaiden of US strategic interests, as a powerless actor in the East-West confrontation of the Cold War, or as a scene in which new and old Great Powers restaged rivalries in the “new clothes” of arguments over education and science in postwar societies (Elzinga (1996), Petitjean (2007), Hamblin (2007), Bocking (2007), Toye and Toye (2010)). Sharing this angle of approach, this essay is concerned with UNESCO's construction of neutrality and its impact in the social sciences as they were developed and applied at UNESCO's Social Science Department. Since a comprehensive history would be impossible, therefore, this essay will focus on the construction of neutrality in three major projects that took place in the Department between 1946 and 1956: the Tensions Project, the studies on race and racial prejudice and the studies on technical assistance.

Most UN agencies (as well as other international organizations) had at their constitution the principle of “neutrality.” In the context of UNESCO, neutrality could be understood as the separation between the scientific results produced and disseminated by the organization and the promotion of interests of particular national powers. As sociologists and historians of science have recorded the conventional understanding of neutrality requires depolitized researchers, disconnected from the world, “discovering”

⁴ Even if unquoted in the paper, Selcer is obviously making a reference to Mannheim’s idea of a “socially unattached” or “free-floating” (*freischwebende*) intelligentsia producing a “view from nowhere” (Mannheim (1985), p. 155).

⁵ Peter Lengyel’s 1986 book *International Social Science: The UNESCO Experience* offers an insightful and colorful insider perspective of the “life” of this organization, however, no archive work was done.

the basic principles of nature and society. The ideal was hardly attainable, but the *appearance* of neutrality remained a crucial resource for the public legitimation of science, and in the present context for the legitimation of UNESCO. The institution's staff members knew they had to respect two non-verbal rules: the “non-offend rule,” according to which, scientific results should not offend the sensibilities of communities related to UNESCO (whether other scientists, social workers, politicians or NGOs), and the “diversity rule,” according to which, researchers from many nationalities should be involved at some stage of the production or diffusion of the scientific knowledge and practices. Obviously, the respect of these rules did not guarantee neither good scientific practices or results nor perfect independence from states but, at least, researchers could “keep up” appearances. The violation of one of these two rules was likely to provoke the hostility of some member state or community and paralyze or at least slow down work significantly.

In obedience to neutrality, researchers working for UNESCO's Social Science Department adopted two different approaches in the period between 1946 and 1956. The first approach that I call “universalism” was characteristic of the first years of the Department (roughly from 1946 to 1950) and it rested on the idea that to achieve neutrality, social scientists had to find a body of consensual, universal scientific practices and knowledge (facts, laws, prescriptions) that social scientists from all nations might recognize, share and apply. The second approach that I call “pluralism” gained ground, but did not become exclusive, after 1950 and was based on the notion that neutrality could be attained if the social sciences could encompass all national varieties of scientific practices and knowledge, and if all could be equally respected and accepted, thus preventing the emergence of an hegemonic framework, theory, method or prescription.⁶ It is our argument that both approaches to appear neutral were equally political

⁶Morgan and Rutherford (1998) make a similar use of the term “pluralism” to describe the state of US economics in the interwar period. “Pluralism meant variety, and that variety was evident in beliefs, in ideology, in methods, and in policy advice” (p.4). We are aware of other more political connotations of the word as described by Timothy Brennan (2003) regarding creole nationalism in 19th century liberation movements in Latin American countries; however, like Morgan and

since both required management, shaping and camouflaging of national interests to make them convincing and palatable in an international context. This “politics of neutrality” was necessary since both approaches very soon demonstrated their limits: the tenants of universalism could be perceived as an elite imposing standardization and uniformity of thought, the supporters of pluralism could be accused, among other things, of contenting themselves with a “soft consensus” or a *status quo*.

Both scientific outlooks, “universalism” and “pluralism”, related to more general ideas about UNESCO's philosophy and mission. Historians have named “cosmopolitanism”, “idealism” and “one-worldism” the atmosphere that prevailed at the very beginning of the organization (Sluga (2010), Toye and Toye (2010), Maurel (2010)).⁷ Although these terms and our word “universalism” do not have the same meaning, there is nevertheless some overlap between them. Indeed, there are some affinities between the ideas that all humans shared a single destiny, that nations could merge into a world government, and that the universal principles of human and social behavior could be uncovered. In the same way, while the terms “multiculturalism”, “realism” and “cultural relativism” that historians have used to describe new directions in UNESCO's philosophy and principles in the 1950s (Lentin (2005), Maurel (2010)) and our definition of “pluralism” do not match; there is still a common flavor between the positive celebration of difference in the cultural sphere, the resistance towards a world government and a pattern of research marked by the respect of diversity in conceptions of science.⁸ Historians have pointed at similar contradictions between cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism that existed in the UN system which served as “simultaneous arbiter of the universal and defender of the particularism of the nation-state” (Amrith and Sluga (2008), p. 260). They have also insisted on the difficulty for UN

Rutherford, we use the word in a purely scientific context.

⁷ In the last twenty years, cosmopolitanism had become a major topic of study among historians of transnational and world history. It would be impossible to summarize the diversity of definitions that this word has acquired, however, in its most common and recent uses, it represents “a way of being in the world”, a social and cultural practice, a theory of world government and citizenship, and a “cosmopolitics”: a new form of domination. Historians have opposed “cosmopolitanism” to internationalism (Brennan 2003) and nationalism.

⁸ However, it is interesting to note that, as we will see in Section 4, some kinds of universalism (in the definition that we have offered) can be compatible with some kinds of cultural relativism.

agencies and specially UNESCO to make compatible both visions in the early 1950s when “new nationalisms” were flourishing in Africa and Asia following the decolonization movement and the balance of forces had been altered in the UN system (Wong (2008)).

Save for the above mentioned exceptions (Selcer 2009, Maurel 2010), the early years of the Social Sciences Department at UNESCO have been neglected and obviously so has the study of neutrality strategies in the creation of the Department. Within the scarce literature, our essay might help explain some contradictions and, notably, why: while some historians have put forward that the idealist, universalistic ambitions of US social scientists promoted a generous internationalization of US resources in the quest of universal truths in the context of a world-minded and selfless organization such as UNESCO (Selcer 2009); others have insisted in the internal conflicts that the imposition of US social science generated within the Department and the distorted scientific results this produced (Maurel 2010).

Of the hundreds of scholars who were associated to the Department in its first ten years of existence, we have chosen to focus on the permanent staff based at the UNESCO House in Paris. While in the first 5 years, the staff included less than a dozen of people, in 1952, there were 24, including 15 in the professional category. In 1955-56, with the Statistical Division incorporated into the Department, the staff was 48 (6 in the Office of the Director, 12 in the Division of International Co-operation, 15 in the Division of Applied Social Sciences and 15 in Statistics). Finally, the approved Program and Budget for 1959-60 foresaw 53 established posts in the Social Science Department. Here we should say a few words to explain knowledge production in this international organization and more particularly in the Social Science Department. To borrow a metaphor very often used by UNESCO administrators, UNESCO Departments worked like a “clearing house” for knowledge. That meant that the staff in

Paris outlined the job and often participated in its detailed planning but then the work was done by an external scholar or academic team. The work was delegated to individuals and institutions through a “fee contract.” During the course of the research UNESCO could advise and guide scholars but the job itself was done externally. Also, when the research design called for comparative studies in several countries, there were often analysis and integrative functions to be performed at the end. This could be either done by a member of Departments staff or left in the hands of an expert consultant engaged for a limited time. In terms of the diffusion of science, the completed study could be published by UNESCO or, if it was one that had wide appeal, by a commercial editor. If possible, publication was in both French and English, and sometimes in another language (Angell (1950), p. 286). At every stage of the production and dissemination of knowledge which included pure theory, methods and policy making ideas the question of neutrality appeared and had to be dealt with.

In comparison to other departments, the Social Science Department was more “interventionist” since, after World War II, very few bodies gathering social scientists existed at the international level.⁹ However, the Department's budget was very modest compared to that of other departments and it increased slowly during the first ten years: in 1949, the budget was \$286,500. In 1953 it stood at \$540,600, in 1956 at \$761,400 and it was not until 1959 that it rose to just above \$1 million (Lengyel 1966: 568). From 1946 to 1950, the Department main project was a collaborative inquiry into the “Tensions affecting International Understanding.”¹⁰ The project was aimed at finding the causes of wars. In the language of UNESCO's officials, “it will seek to deepen scientific understanding of the factors which create and lessen hostility among human beings.” The project was quite exceptional since

⁹The Social Science Department participated in the formation of the International Sociological Association (1949), the International Political Science Association (1949), the International Economic Association (1949), the International Committee of Comparative Law (1950) and the revival of the International Union of Scientific Psychology (1951). It also contributed to the creation of the *International Social Science Bulletin* (1949) and participated in the establishment of many regional information centres and regional social science institutes.

¹⁰ The title of project changed from the original title “Tensions conducive to War,” to “Tensions crucial to Peace,” then “Tensions dangerous to Peace,” and finally “Tensions affecting international understanding.”

most research work for it was produced in-house, only after 1950, did the knowledge produced externally become more abundant.¹¹ After 1950, the Department changed its orientation, the Tensions project was split in several subprojects which gained autonomy and other programs on social tensions such as research on racial prejudice or work on technical assistance to less-developed countries were included.

Our main argument is that the core task of the Social Science Department staff based in Paris was to plan studies which could be presented to UNESCO's clients (scholars, social workers, national communities) as being "neutral." We present our case in three parts: Section I explains the initial dominance (1946-1950) of "Culture and Personality studies" in US psychologists and social psychologists' plans for the Social Science Department by its capacity to present itself as universal. Second, Section II shows how, in the early 1950s, when the activities of the new Department started flourishing, the artificial consensus imposed by a small clique of US psychologists was replaced by the acceptance of a more divided community composed of a more diverse academic background and including a number of non-Anglo-Saxon scholars. What then came to prominence at the Social Science Department was the more plural study of social and racial problems. It is our claim that the displacement of the study of "psychological tensions" by "social and economic tensions" was due to the partial shift from universalism to pluralism. Section III nuances the shift away from universalism since technical assistance remained an endeavor of a qualified universalism nature. Section IV offers some concluding remarks.

¹¹ While UNESCO's staff was not hired to undertake research, the Tensions project was conceived as a "demonstration and a pilot project" stimulating cooperation among social scientists on a common undertaking. "The test of success would not be wholly in terms of substantive findings but likewise in terms of the experience gained in cooperative effort at an international level among research men." Anonymous Memo. April 21, 1949. "Unesco and the Social Science." p.3 Folder X 07.55 SS Programme Budget and Organization Department of Social Science. Part II. UNESCO Archives.

I. The Politics of Universalism – Planning the Social Science Department, 1946-1950

Historian, John Krige, in a recent article on Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace Initiative at the UN, has argued that, in the Cold war context, the appeal to scientific internationalism and the promotion of national scientific leadership in international organizations were – paradoxically - inherently tied: "The first pushed back the frontiers of security restrictions and mutual distrust, enabling scientists to build together a shared body of public knowledge. The second exploited that trust to learn what [other scientists] were doing, to establish the limits of what they could speak about freely, and to assess the dangers that may lurk behind what they left unsaid" (Krige (2006), p. 167).

At the beginning, UNESCO as many UN agencies was immersed in a spirit of universalism and scientific internationalism.¹² UNESCO's early documents from at least 1945 to 1950 were written in the language of "cosmopolitanism" and "world citizenship" and the philosophical foundations of UNESCO rested on the "Enlightenment premise that humanity was evolving socially, politically, technologically and even psychologically toward a "World community" (Sluga (2010), p. 393). Its Director-General, the British biologist Julian Huxley, a "consummate world citizen" (Sluga 2010, p. 396) very often expressed his universal views about culture, philosophy and science: UNESCO was meant to produce a common universal framework overcoming national particularities to think about the main problems of humanity. Huxley's universalism was contagious and was imprinted in many early official documents and adopted by many departments. For instance, the Natural Science Department had as an objective to provide universal laws for the study for nature (Elzinga 1996). These laws were supposed to overcome

¹²Historian Emma Rothschild ((2008), pp.378-79) has described the project of the United Nations Organisation as "the expression of a distinctively North American ideology of international and even "antinational" institutions."

the tensions between the Eastern and Western blocks and provide a “view from nowhere.” In the same way, in the Department of Culture, the idea was to use mass media to vehicle shared ideas about universal values and cultural productions.¹³

Until 1949, most of the work done for the Social Science Department was of a planning nature: the Department’s activities had barely started and apart from the Tensions project, the only other research areas developed in the Social Science Department were: a minor one concerned with surveys of political science articles and another led by Walter Sharp on the technique of international conferences. However, it is evident that the planners of the Social Science Department initially embraced this universalism. The Tensions project, the flagship program in the early years, was launched with the aim to discover universal laws of behavior that ultimately generated conflicts. It was mostly initiated by US psychologists and social psychologists and the main approach was “Culture and Personality studies.”¹⁴ This approach was part of a larger wave of “Neo-Freudian psycho-analysis” or “neo-Freudianism” that pervaded US postwar social science discourse until the 1960s and that privileged psycho-cultural explanations for contemporary events (and particularly wars) over other more economic or political explanations (Gitre 2011).¹⁵ Interestingly, this perspective put an emphasis on cultural diversity within a basic human universalism based on the acknowledgement of common physiological and psychological characteristics of all human beings. In the 1940s and 1950s, Neo-Freudianism spread in many disciplines adopting different names such as “Culture and Personality Studies,” “studies in national character” or “cultural anthropology”. In psychology, the main representatives of the Neo-

¹³Historians have debated about the origins of cosmopolitanism and one-worldism in the UN system. As Amrith and Sluga (2008) have pointed out most of them agree on a Western genealogy starting either during the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, or the internationalist debates of the Interwar era. Benedict Anderson (2007) has suggested more exotic origins: the work of Filipino radical nationalists and specially Isabelo de los Reyes.

¹⁴US ascendancy in the department was obviously also partly related to the vacuum left in continental Europe by totalitarianisms which forced scholars to emigrate to the US and the UK where their ideas flourished in unexpected ways like in the case of Freudian psychology.

¹⁵In a recent paper, Gitre (2010) has shown how while psycho-cultural studies were already present in the USA in the 1930s, they really flourished after 1945.

Freudian School were Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson and Karen Horney, in anthropology, American cultural anthropology was represented by the Boasian tradition of scholars which included Margaret Mead, Geoffrey Gorer or Clyde Kluckhohn. In spite of their disciplinary differences, Neo-Freudians agreed on the underlying unity of humankind, and therefore shared the conviction that dynamic psychology proposed a useful body of theories and methods that could be used to study the functioning of all human societies. For the tenants of “Culture and Personality” studies, this approach was perceived as a way for anthropologists to curb the pretensions of rival social scientists to advise policymakers on international affairs. With that purpose, Margaret Mead organized during World War II a seminar in Washington to maximize the impact of Culture and Personality studies in policymaking after the war (Mandler (2009): 152-153).¹⁶

The Psychological Dimension in the planning of the Social Science Department

It is worth reflecting on why did psychology and “Culture and Personality” studies had such an impact in the planning of the Social Science Department and particularly in the Tensions Project over competing approaches to conflict in disciplines such as political science or economics? And how does this reflect the political manipulation of the planners? First, as many historians of psychology have shown, after WWII, psychology as a discipline had reached a privileged status among the social sciences (Herman 1996). Since the 1900s, the discipline had undergone major transformations towards professionalization and scientific rigor, which had made her a key discipline in the social sciences (Finison (1986), Harris (1986), Nicholson (1997), (1998b), Harris and Nicholson (1998a)). WWII reinforced this status since psychological ideas were used for military purposes in warfare and to cure war-related psychological diseases in the aftermath of the conflict. During the war, many psychologists

¹⁶According to Mandler, besides Mead, Gregory Bateson, Ruth Benedict, Geoffrey Gorer, Claire Holt, Philip Mosely and Rhoda Métraux (wife of Alfred Métraux, the future head of the race studies division at UNESCO) participated in those seminars (Mandler 2009: 153).

were involved in the study of the “culture and personality” of other societies, for instance assessing the morale of the Japanese population or measuring the effect of the strategic bombing on the morale of the German population. Hence, psychology had won a lot of prestige and managed to attract funding from universities and foundations increasingly interested in the promotion of the “behavioural sciences.” Alva Myrdal, the director of UNESCO's Social Science Department from 1950 to 1956, pointed at the fact that psychologists’ approach to peace was “most congruent” with the “behavioural sciences” movement that came to the fore after 1945 (Myrdal (1972), p.266). Many justified the new status of psychology in the social sciences and at UNESCO in terms of theoretical superiority. For instance, in his talks with the planners of UNESCO’s Social Science Department, the President of the International Psycho-analytical Association stated that “sociological and political research is not sufficiently advanced to achieve anything fundamental without taking psycho-analysis into account.” These kind of statements were not infrequent and obviously reinforced the planners’ interest for psychological factors. Another explanation for the predominance of psychology in the Social Science Department was institutional. The importance of this discipline at UNESCO was eloquently specified in the Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO adopted in London on 16 November 1945. In it, it was stated the well-known opening: “That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed,” but also a less well-known sentence the fact excluded the study of political science and economics from the missions of UNESCO: “That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.” The implicit idea was that only psychology could minimize or eliminate wars and build the bases for harmonious human relations.¹⁷ Julian Huxley himself in his essay, *UNESCO, its purpose and its philosophy*, wrote:

¹⁷This emphasis on the individual is isomorphic with the initial individual definition of human rights that pervaded the Universal Declaration adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1948. It contrasts with later

“There is, however, a general point which I should like to make, namely the importance of psychology to every branch of social science (as well, of course as to education). Admittedly both deep analytic psychology and social psychology are in their infancy. But the one is revealing in the Unconscious a new world just as unexpected and important as that new world of the invisible revealed by the microscopists of the seventeenth century; while the other is indispensable as a basis for any truly scientific sociology as well as for the successful application of the findings of social science.”
(Huxley, (1946) p. 41)

Another determinant element for the dominance of US psychologists in the planning period was due to the rise of “peace psychology” movements emphasizing the importance of psychology in the diagnosis and resolution of conflicts ((Dunn 2005)(Kelman 1981)(Kelman 1991)). Also one cannot overlook the importance of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the UNESCO US National Commission¹⁸, in which psychologists and social psychologists played an essential role, in the shaping of the program and the selection of candidates. The connection of the several of the future directors of the Social Science Department with the president of the SSRC (Pendleton Herring from 1948 to 1968) was constant. The SSRC was very often consulted and asked to submit lists of possible candidates to be recruited for different tasks in the Tensions Project and the Social Science Department. Also any invitation to US scholars not consulted with the SSRC or the US National Commission was likely to be

definitions of human rights lying on economic development and national self-determination (see Amrith and Sluga (2008): 257 and Roland Burke(2008)).

¹⁸ The National Commissions referred to advisory bodies, provided for in the Constitution of UNESCO, to be set up for the purpose of bringing together the principal bodies in that country interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters.

frowned upon and require a lot of justification from UNESCO officers. But perhaps, the work of three men was the most influential in the early development of “culture and personality studies” in the Tensions Project and the Social Science Department: the sociologist Edward Shils and the psychologists Nathan Leites and Hadley Cantril. All of them shared a common background in agencies specialized in psychological warfare during World War II such as the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the precursor of the CIA, (for Shils) and the Office of War Information (OWI) for Leites and Cantril.¹⁹

The role of Edward Shils, Nathan Leites and Hadley Cantril

Shils studied at the University of Pennsylvania as an undergraduate. Although he never obtained a doctoral degree, he did graduate work in sociology at the University of Chicago, where he remained as a faculty member for more than six decades. During his graduate work he was introduced to the German tradition in sociology and he specialized on the study of higher education and intellectual life. He was sent to England during World War II and did his service in the military unit of the Psychological Warfare Division's Intelligence Section of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the precursor to the CIA, with responsibility to interview German prisoners of war. This assignment utilized Shils' expert knowledge of the German language as well as his sociological skills. His wartime research focused on the impact of mass communication with the aims of improving propaganda design. His 1948 well-known paper co-authored with the Chicago sociologist, Morris Janowitz, on the *Wehrmacht* explained the indifferent reaction of German soldiers to massive Allied propaganda pointing at the importance of “primary groups” (families, neighborhoods, religious communities, etc.)

¹⁹While it is difficult to assess the role of former OSS in the creation of UNESCO, in a recent article, Chloé Maurel has emphasized the importance of the officers who worked for the OSS Psychological Warfare Branch in Europe during World War II, such as Sandy Koffler who was to become the editor of UNESCO's inhouse newsletter, *Le Courrier de l'UNESCO* (Maurel (2010), p.5). We can also mention the case of the Indian scholar Sripati Chandrasekhar, who was a member of the OSS before joining UNESCO.

to sustain or undermine soldier's morale (Janowitz and Shils (1948)). He was recruited at Chicago's Sociology Department as an associate professor in 1947 and as a professor in 1950 and he had a joint appointment at the London School of Economics and Political Science in the Sociology Department from 1946 to 1950. Shils' influence in the profession setting the agenda for many postwar institutions (he was a cofounder of the Committee on Social Thought in Chicago, he participated in the planning of the MIT CIS, and later founded the Committee on the Comparative Study of the New Nations at Chicago) and launching many academic initiatives (such as the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* and *Minerva*) is now well documented (Gilman (2003), p. 140, Pooley (2006) and (2007)). However, his early influence in the creation of UNESCO's Social Science Department and the Tensions Project has remained unnoticed.

In 1946 and 1947 Shils, acting as a special consultant in the social sciences, was charged of writing a 22 pages memo describing the purposes, theoretical framework and methods for the Tensions Project (Shils (1947)). From the beginning the universalistic outlook of the project was laid down, since “[B]y providing a common focus of attention and helping to bring about the acceptance of a common conceptual framework, it will bring the scientists of the world closer together” (p.1). The predominance of psychology was also set from the beginning since “tensions” were defined as “psychological conditions in the individual personality (e.g. anxiety, fear; bewilderment, aggressiveness, hunger, etc.) causing stress or dissatisfaction in the individual and necessitating some activity which will release, and thus reduce, the tension.”(p.3) Objective material situations for conflict were also mentioned but only as catalysts for conflict since it was understood that political and economic factors only “precipitated tensions into violence, even though the ultimate predispositions towards hostility are generated outside those spheres.” (p.3) Following a common assumption in “Culture and Personality” studies, Shils borrowed Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict's vocabulary and posited that psychological

predispositions to conflict were transmitted through the “patterns of culture (p.4)” and that personality and particularly hostile drives were formed in the early infancy and childhood. Among the techniques that he singled out as useful for future research at UNESCO: studies of personality structure using observation and techniques of dynamic psychology (psychodrama, sociodrama, and group techniques), but also intelligence tests and public opinion surveys. Of the initial 19 potential interesting topics he identified for investigation under the Tensions Project, he only maintained 8 in the final draft. The reason for this narrow selection was that the research lines on economic and political factors such as “Compatibility of socialism and capitalism and international tension”, or “Differences in living standards and inter-group tensions” were suppressed from the final version for diplomatic reasons. Shils’ aim was to concentrate on production of knowledge that could be appear as relevant to social engineers and instigate research on what kind of upbringing in childhood and adolescence predisposed adults to international understanding, on techniques of attitude change elaborated in communication studies, psychiatry and clinical psychology and on the study of national characters.²⁰ The literature on “national character” was developed in war-related agencies during World War II by psychologists such as Franz Alexander, Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan and by cultural anthropologists such as Gregory Bateson, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Geoffrey Gorer and Edward Sapir who wanted to delineate regularities in culture patterns and in the character structure of members of a culture in order to understand how to crack the morale of the enemy or how to induce friendly feelings in populations towards Allied powers (Herman (1996)).²¹ In the late 1940s and 1950s, the study of the enemies’ “morale” and their “national character” pervaded US communication and intelligence studies in the 1940s and 1950s.

²⁰ Nathan Leites to Arvid Brodersen. 18th June, 1947. “Activities of the Tensions Project in June, 1947.” Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

²¹ After the war, this work was continued in the US in places like Columbia University's Research in Contemporary Cultures, operating with a contract from the Office of Naval Research under the direction of Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, the Natural History Museum Studies in Soviet Culture Project with a contract from the RAND Corporation under the direction of Margaret Mead, the Coordinated Investigations of Micronesian Anthropology funded by the Office of Naval Research under the leadership of George P. Murdock, the Foreign Service Institute, or Yale's Human Relations Area Files.

Shils was also responsible for the selection of the future director of the Tensions Project. The peculiarities of the appointment process revealed how the initial community of American psychologists and social psychologists planned to keep the top posts in the Social Science Department an almost exclusive preserve of American scholars and hence to create an cohesion and a common worldview among the staff of the project through which the predominance of US social science was hoped to be maintained. In the recruitment process, Shils established a stereotypical ideal of the best candidate for the head of the Tensions project. An essential required skill was the knowledge of what he called “dynamic psychology,” i.e. “Culture and Personality” studies. For instance, many candidates were rejected because their knowledge of personality structure from a dynamic point of view was insufficient. The ethnologist Haviland Scudder Mekeel, specialist in Dakota American Indians with a PhD from Yale University, was too vague in “his applications of the principles of displacement, projection, etc. which by now have become commonplaces in sociological discussion.”²² The sociologist Robert Merton, was dismissed since according to Shils, he has “an utter lack of capacity for going beyond the generality of the prevailing better intellectual conventions (e.g. Kardiner, Parsons, et al.) of the time – he doesn’t get to the problems of personality and social structure in the way in which psychoanalytically sharpened imagination would enable one to do.” The rising psychologist, John Dollard, one of the co-authors of the famous paper on the “frustration-agression” hypothesis, was also rejected since “his psychoanalytic insight, never rich, has become vaguer and vaguer, having practically ceased to bear any relationship with psychoanalysis.”²³

Obviously, the chosen director should also have the “social graces” necessary to fit the job, and hence the appreciation of the social attributes of the candidates was an important part of Shils’ selection procedure. He advised against Leland DeVinney, the director of Social Science at the Rockefeller

²² Edward Shils. “Proposals for next steps in Tensions Project. Appendix A.” 22nd June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

²³ Edward Shils. “Proposals for next steps in Tensions Project. Appendix A.” 22nd June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives. See also (Dollard et al. 1939)

Foundation since he had “no scientific imagination, no capacity to envisage new problems, no enthusiasm to attempt to persuade others of their importance”. In the same way, Merton's “pronounced tendency to withdraw from social situations” and Dollard's “fairly aggressive chauvinism” made them very bad candidates for the position. UNESCO's flagship program needed a man with a universal outlook and social skills. Shils suggested two of his former colleagues at the OSS, Henry Murray and Henry Dicks, as possible directors. According to Shils, both shared the intellectual and social skills that were lacking to the other candidates. Murray qualified for his “great sensitivity to certain aspects of social structure when he devised “quasi-real” situations for testing and training O.S.S. agents” and he was “a sophisticated cultivated man.” Dicks showed his competence during the war “in his brilliant and at the same time very readable analyses of German military behaviour from the psycho-analytic viewpoint” and he possessed a linguistic facility and a “knowledge of the world” that were difficult to match by other social scientists.²⁴ Again, it is important to note how psychoanalysis was perceived as the most legitimate part of the theoretical framework for the explanation of wars.

A source of concern for Shils was the overrepresentation of US scholars working for the Social Science Department, which violated the “diversity rule” and could give ‘the dangerous impression that UNESCO is “selling” American goods to the world.’ He even suggested that the Tensions project should have a non-American Director, “if only because the middle and lower scientific ranks of the Tensions Project will be more predominantly American than in other sections of UNESCO – simply because it is only in the U.S. that for the time being the elements of the *right kind of social science line are being put together in the right way.*”²⁵

However, neither Dicks nor Murray were available that year, and finally, it was Hadley Cantril, a

²⁴ Edward Shils. “Proposals for next steps in Tensions Project. Appendix B.” 22nd June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

²⁵ Edward Shils. “Proposals for next steps in Tensions Project. Appendix A.” 22nd June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives. We underline. Shils' fears reproduced at the Department's scale the anxieties of American diplomats at the UN secretariat. Historian Emma Rothschild ((2008), p.389) quotes the impressions of Gladwyn Jebb, a British diplomat, on the establishment of an international Secretariat: “Americans replied that from their point of view there was of course much to be said for an all-American secretariat, but they did not want to *give the impression that they were running everything.*” (We underline.)

former member of the OWI, who was appointed as the first director of the Tensions Project. Cantril graduated at Dartmouth College with a B. S. in psychology in 1928. He studied in Munich and Berlin in 1929-1930 and received a Ph. D. in psychology from Harvard in 1931. In the 1930s, he started his career as an academic, teaching sociology at Dartmouth College (1931-32), and psychology at Harvard (1932-1935), and Columbia University (1935-36). In 1936, Cantril joined the Princeton Psychology Department where he was to remain until his death in 1969. There in 1940 he founded the Princeton Office of Public Opinion Research to analyze European radio broadcasts and diagnose Nazi psychology (Herman 1996). During World War II he served as a psychological warfare specialist for the OWI (along with Nathan Leites, Margaret Mead and Geoffrey Gorer) led by Elmer David where he was in charge of the production of survey research techniques to the task of clandestine intelligence collection, including preparations for the U.S. landing in North Africa. In 1950, Cantril authored a book called *Tensions that Cause Wars* (Cantril 1950). In his work, he shared with Shils the premise that tensions should be primarily studied from a psychological perspective. According to Cantril, « tensions are deeply rooted in economic, political and technological conditions which are, as such, largely outside the prescribed framework of UNESCO's activities. At the same time, however, the effects of these conditions in creating in the minds of men various insecurities and frustrations, loyalties and purposes, must obviously be considered as a proper field for UNESCO to take an interest in if its work is to be realistic and if it is to enlist the help of competent people in the human sciences» (Cantril (1948) p. 236). Cantril played a fundamental role in the creation of the Social Science Department along with the psychologist Nathan Leites.

Leites was charged of revising Shils' memo setting the priorities for the Tensions Project as well as presenting with Cantril the programme for the whole Department to the General Conference. The choice of Leites was consistent with previous appointments. He was at the time considered as one of the best specialists of the USSR. During the war, Leites was, like Cantril) an former member of the

OWI and he also served as a senior research assistant for Lasswell's War Communication Division at the Library of Congress doing content analysis of communist publications. In 1946, when UNESCO called him, he had just been recruited by the Social Science Department of the RAND Corporation, the well-known Californian military think-tank initially founded by the US Air Force. In his revision of Shils' memo, Leites reiterated the importance of psychological variables in the explanation of wars. He was especially interested in stimulating research in "group images" relying on intensive interviewing of representative segments of the population. He was interested in having UNESCO social programme cooperate with groups of specialists based in the US (the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, Research Laboratory of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard, Communications Institute at Chicago or the University of California Group on anti-Semitism) or the UK (Mass Observation, the Tavistock Group or the British Gallup Group).²⁶ In his correspondence, Leites explicitly exposed his concern about the violation of the "non-offend rule" and for instance, topics dealing with governmental behavior were "too delicate, in our opinion up till now, to be even merely sponsored by UNESCO" and suggested that they "would have to eliminate, instead of elaborate, the considerable part of [Shils'] Memo dealing with too delicate topics."²⁷

"Selling" Universalism: Looking for Allies

Leites and Shils were designated to make a series of visits to relevant research centers in member states with the aim of publicizing the Tensions project, making possible speedy personnel and research sponsorship arrangements and to survey the state of research relevant to the Project. In these difficult visits, they had to convince foreign academic officials and scholars to pursue the research projects set

²⁶ Nathan Leites to Arvid Brodersen. 6th June, 1947. "Memorandum," p.2. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

²⁷ Nathan Leites, "The Second Tensions Memo," 10th August 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

by UNESCO without receiving any (or very little) funding. In fact, these visits' main purpose was to pressure a more or less reluctant elite of European social scientists to use US psychology to tackle problems of peace. Obviously given the scarcity of means in most countries after World War II and the initial suspicions regarding the role of UNESCO, the reception of these visits was often lukewarm. The tour involved Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland and Belgium and the agenda included meetings with government officials, professionals and other academics in universities and firms. For instance, Leites visited the UK from the 25th September to the 5th of October 1947. He reported that most of the British social scientists contacted during the visit were skeptic towards UNESCO which seemed in their minds connected to the inefficacy of the League of Nations and with the initial difficulties of the UN and therefore they were unwilling to commit themselves. Leites also recorded the suspicion of many British social scientists that UNESCO disturbed the local research situation by withdrawing scarce research resources from national circulation or by inducing them to shift their efforts to less practical matters. Some of the skepticism towards UNESCO was related to a lack of belief in its stability. More specific about the role of the UK at UNESCO, since there were persistent rumors about British specialists walking out of UNESCO "en masse", including Julian Huxley.²⁸ The visit to Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands by Leites was more successful since many of his informants had taken courses in US universities and were conscious of the delay accumulated during the war in their research systems.²⁹ These visits also made evident the contempt of some US scholars against European sociology which was rooted in the philosophical tradition and considered more as a field of contemplation than an active research field.

In 1948, Otto Klineberg the new director for the Tensions Project continued the visits to foreign

²⁸ Nathan Leites to Arvid Brodersen, "Memo. Subject: Contacts in Britain September 25 – October 5 1947," Undated. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

²⁹ Nathan Leites, "Report on Contacts made during his mission to Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands 15th -20th October 5 1947," 22nd October 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

countries. In his mission to Geneva, he could develop further collaboration with the Mental Health Section of the World Health Organization who was making a study for UNESCO.³⁰ The agenda during these missions used to be packed with conferences, seminars and events.³¹

First Projects: The importance of “morale” and “national character”

Following the initial plans of Cantril, Shils and Leites, in April 1948, Cantril initiated a series of studies entitled “Ways of Life” in which monographs were written to a common scheme were produced in 18 countries³² comparing them in regard to family life, education, religion, among others. In Cantril's own words,

“the object of the enquiry is described as investigating the distinctive features of each country’s culture and ideals with view to promoting within each nation sympathy and respect for the ideals and aspirations of the others, and a just appreciation of their problems. Although the English title of the project is “Ways of Life,” it is concerned mainly with determining “patterns of culture” in the sense in which Ruth Benedict used the term, and its exact shade of meaning is given more

³⁰ Otto Klineberg to Gene Weltfish, August, 24th 1948, 327.5 "Tensions affecting International Understanding"PART IV FROM I/VII/48 TO 31/XII/48, UNESCO archives.

³¹For the record, we reproduce an excerpt of Klineberg's Mission to Oslo and Stockholm to give a sense of the selling abilities that were required for the job : « My first important engagement in Oslo was a lecture to the Student Association on Saturday evening, March 12 (...) On Sunday evening, March 13, I spoke to a group of psychologists at the home of Mrs. Skard (...) Monday afternoon, I lectured at the University under the auspices of the Psychology Department (...) On Monday evening I spoke at the Nobel Institute on the Tensions Project. » Klineberg to Director-General, 22 March 1949, Inactive Correspondance 1946-1956 series 327.5 "Tensions affecting International Understanding"PART V FROM I/I/49TO 31/XII/49, UNESCO Archives.

³²Among which Australia, Egypt, France, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom (see Métraux 1951).

accurately in the French equivalent “Styles de Vie.”

These monographs were used to check the validity of some of the assertions done regarding the national character of some nations. That was done by Charles Morris of the University of Chicago. According to Cantril, these monographs “may build up to a central synthesis revealing the underlying values and attitudes in which all people meet as human beings” (Cantril (1948),p. 238).

There was also a series of studies in the field of national stereotypes done mostly by Cantril and Klineberg. It involved three lines of research. One emphasized the nature of national stereotypes in 5 countries among children and the processes by which they were acquired and could be changed.³³ Another large research line involved sampling adults in eight countries by polling methods to determine their stereotypes of other nationalities.³⁴ The synthesis of these studies was done by Henry Durant of London. A third project was to bring together for several days a group of scholars to discuss the significance for international understanding of national images like John Bull or Uncle Sam. The conference was held at Royaumont in September 1949. A last group was investigating broad problems of attitude formation and change. The main assumption was often that the aggressive individual had some kind of mental illness and the type of program involved the promotion of mental health through changes in human attitudes or motivation and the specific methods recommended varied from educational program to propaganda and cross-cultural contacts. A volume written by Klineberg on *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: a Survey of Research* reviewed the literature important for social engineers interested in bringing about attitude change.

Criticism

³³Belgium, Germany, Lebanon, Switzerland and the UK.

³⁴Australia, France, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, UK, USA.

As many staff members pointed out, one of the problems of universalism was that it imposed forced standardization. As soon as 1947, there was increasing hostility to the idea of a possible domination of US-style social science in the future Social Science Department. Initiatives were met with lukewarm attitude and even some ideas coming from high-profile US psychologist were straightforwardly rejected by the general conference or other departments.³⁵ One of the main criticisms was that UNESCO's early universalism relied on assumptions about "human nature" such as shared reason capable of transcending every socio-historical context which became increasingly contested at the end of WWII. Therefore, criticism on political and scholarly grounds soon spread. Scholars from non-Anglo-Saxon countries resented the predominance of US scholars and the prevalence of new methods and techniques imported from American social sciences. Even the idea that there could be a social "science" sounded problematic and hard to accept for many scholars from non-Western countries. But most of the scholars consulted, even when favorable to the project; put forward the lack of balance in the study of social phenomena and wars. All of them acknowledged that since great advance in psychological techniques and therapeutic insights were made during the war, the weighing in favor of psychology was quite understandable. "But – the anthropologist Esther Goldfrank warned – these exciting results should not lead to a less refined analysis of the over-all structure – economic, social and political. Without a good foundation, personality differences or likeness can easily be misunderstood, and therefore misinterpreted."³⁶ The predominance of psychological variables to explain wars was surprising to scholars from other disciplines who had been investigating the causes of wars in the

³⁵ For instance, Rensis Lickert's idea to create an international barometer of tensions was totally dismissed, as Robert Angell explains in a letter to Stuart Dodd: "It is true that the American delegation would not be the best one to back this [a project of an international survey research on tensions], since there is much suspicion of American social research in general and particularly of « polling methods » among the intellectual élite in Europe. When Ren Likert was here in November making a proposal for a study this year of UNESCO's own operations by survey methods, he met a great deal of opposition from other Departments here in the House." Letter Robert Angell to Stuart Dodd. February 9th 1950 327.5 "Tensions Affecting International Understanding" PART VI FROM I/I/50.

³⁶ Esther S. Goldfrank to Arvid Brodersen, 25th June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

interwar period. The polymath Pitirim Sorokin pointed at the “odd alliance between cultural anthropology and dynamic psychology for the study of wars” that took place at UNESCO. Many leading scholars in US universities contested the predominance of psychological approaches to conflict and the fact that the project eschewed overt political and ideological issues. Here the reader should be reminded that after WWII, the field of International Relations was achieving independence from Political Science and was gaining ground as a discipline in US academia and that realist approaches to International Relations emphasizing the importance of systemic variables to understand conflicts as developed by Hans Morgenthau at the University of Chicago or Gabriel Almond and William T.R. Fox at Yale, were becoming increasingly visible over idealist ideas of the interwar period. This is interesting because the participation of IR scholars to the debate of the causes of war seemed more “natural” than that of psychologists. For instance, the realist theorist Klaus Knorr was charged by the US Commission of UNESCO to comment, on behalf of the SSRC, Shils’ memo. For his 44-pages commentary, Knorr consulted some of the better known scholars including many realists from Yale such as Bernard Brodie, Gabriel Almond, Frank Coker or Robert Dahl to mention a few. Among the many suggestions of change included in the report, Knorr proposed that “the entire matter of economic insecurity might be explored systematically in its relation to political and social stability and psychological tensions.”³⁷ The economist, Jacob Viner, who had come to a realist persuasion after WWII, was among the most critical “I would suggest that the project had better not start out from the conviction that wars usually or often are the result of psychological tensions but treat rather as a hypothesis itself to be subjected to investigation ... I am rather skeptical as to the degree of utility of the psychological approach to the problem of the causes of war.”³⁸ He rejected the preconception that hostile attitudes were based on “tensions” or an abnormal psychology and hence also the idea that the remedy against wars was the

³⁷ Klaus Knorr to Arvid Brodersen, 27th June, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

³⁸ Jacob Viner to Arvid Brodersen, 14th July, 1947. Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

psychiatric treatment of those displaying such hostile attitudes. Barrington Moore, a political scientist also from Yale and a former policy analyst from the OSS, complained that Shils' memo “completely neglects the structure of the international community and the distribution of power among national states as a situational factor conducive to war. The polarization of power in two centers, Moscow and Washington, and the consequent necessity for a series of self-styled “defensive” measures in the international arena is an element in the situation that certainly deserves appraisal in any scientific analysis of international affairs” (Moore 1950 687).

There were also criticisms on behalf of the communities associated to UNESCO. Historian Laura Wong (2008, pp. 354-5) describes a revealing episode of the history of the Social Science Department when, in 1949, a group of Japanese scholars protested that UNESCO had initiated a study on the causes of aggressive nationalism carried by 8 “eminent scholars” (6 of them representing North America and Europe, a Brazilian and an Hungarian) without inviting any representative of Asian or African countries.

39

However, despite the criticisms, the Social Science Department staff was very reluctant to get involved in the study of economic and political factors leading to war since public advocacy on controversial political issues was incompatible with the “neutrality” assumed to be the hallmark of the organization. For instance, Percival W. Martin, a British psychologist and program specialist of the Department, wrote a short memo warning the members of the Tensions Project against the study of the economic aspects of international hostility especially those related to economic inequalities between countries and standards of living that the SSRC had suggested. Martin put forward that rich countries (and notably he had in mind the USA) would object to those studies since it was largely in defense of living

³⁹Japan had an observer status at UNESCO since 1946 and became a full member of the organisation in 1951.

standards that the USA set up immigrations barriers and exclusion laws, and imposed heavy tariffs upon imported goods. Also, according to Martin, it was because some segments of the population found their living standards unjustifiably low in comparison with rich countries that they were likely to adopt other ideologies such as communism. Hence Martin warned against the possible diplomatic outcomes of having UNESCO studying living standards “it is sufficiently clear that any published study by an international organisation focusing attention upon Japanese Exclusion Acts, unduly high tariffs and Communist minorities in certain of the Western countries would not be within the realm of practical politics.”⁴⁰ Finally, this was coupled with the problem of action, since UNESCO did not have enough resources to solve problem in the domain of standards of living and it would have conflicted with work done at the International Labor Organization.⁴¹ Studies on standards of living were rejected because they violated the “non-offend rule” since they could upset US representatives as well as officials from another UN agency.

And indeed, in spite of the Department’s commitment to psychology, projects that were too political and diplomatically sensitive were not likely be successful even if formulated in psychological terms. For instance, in 1947, a project on the analysis of Nazi psychology planned for a small group of psychologists who were to apply psychology to manifestations in Nazi Germany was deferred since judged inopportune. In the same way, the proposed creation of an International Psycho-political institute for the application of psychology to international affairs was tacitly shelved given its political character. And another psychological project in the Social Science Department related to “devices for enabling the peoples of one country to get some insight into the psychology of other peoples” was withdrawn in view of the fate of previous projects (Martin (1947), pp. 16-20).

⁴⁰ P.W. Martin. 20th June, 1947. “Tensions Affecting International Understanding – Standards of Living.” Folder 327.5. Tensions Affecting Int. Understanding, Part II from 1/VI/47 up to 30/X/47. UNESCO Archives.

⁴¹ An undergoing debate among UN agencies existed in the early 1950s on methods of ascertaining standards of living in underdeveloped countries. The idea was to introduce social and cultural considerations in judging so-called primitive levels of living instead of using the purely statistical cost-of-living approach pursued by ILO.

II. Anthropology and Pluralism at the Social Science Department, 1950-1956

With the successive appointments of Robert Cooley Angell and Alva Myrdal⁴², two sociologists, as heads of the Social Science Department and the Tensions project, new Divisions within the Department were created, new projects initiated and a new genre of scholars recruited.⁴³ From 1950 to 1955, the Department increasingly acquired an institutionalized form within UNESCO.

The general orientation of the Department departed significantly from the original plans since, despite their sympathy toward US psychology, both directors, Angell and Myrdal felt that its focus on the individual hindered the development of other theories dealing with social and political factors. This was stressed in the general correspondence within the Department but also in the correspondence with external consultants and advisors. For instance, in a letter to Stuart C. Dodd of the Washington Public Opinion Laboratory (WAPOR) Angell wrote: *"I am not sure that I can assent to a way of handling the problem that starts with the individual at all. In the various methods you suggest, the tensions in the individual is the given from which some kind of group score is derived. I have nothing concrete to suggest, but I am skeptical of all such methods of dealing with groups. I would like to be able to find some sort of index which expresses the shared product of group interaction, not the individual contribution to this interaction. This of course, is an age-old problem in sociology and I do not expect*

⁴² In February 1949, the Director General informed the acting head of the Department, Arvid Brodersen, that he had chosen to external consultants, the economist Stuart Chase and the French sociologist Raymond Aron to appoint the following Head of the Department. The result of their deliberation was Angell. Directeur general to Arvid Brodersen, 28 february 1949, "Plan de travail pour le 1er semestre 1949" Folder X 07.55SS "Programme Budget of Organisation Department of Social Sciences, Part II." UNESCO Archives.

⁴³ It was in 1953 that the Social Science Department's structure became firm: to the Division of Aid to International Scientific Co-operation (led by the Polish Dr. Szczerba-Likiernik until his retirement in 1961) were added the division of Applied Social Sciences and the division of Statistics (led by the Chinese B.A. Liu until his retirement in 1963). In the first five years, the Division of Applied Social Sciences had a number of chiefs: Franklin Frazier (U.S.A.), Otto Klineberg (U.S.A.), Eugene Jacobson (U.S.A.), and H. M. Phillips (United Kingdom). In 1953 the division of statistics were established as a division within the Social Science Department with the responsibility of harmonizing and compiling statistics relating to education, culture, and mass communications.

that we will come up with a magic solution soon.”⁴⁴ This challenge to psychology as the unique way of accounting for human behavior increased as the Department’s interests shifted towards the analysis of less-developed countries and the implementation of technical assistance. Franklin Frazier, the Head of the Division of Applied Social Sciences in 1952 wrote to the psychologist John Dollard: “It has been my position from the beginning that the specialists employed to organize the study in Israel *should not approach the problem exclusively from the standpoint of individual psychology*. While it is important to know how individual tensions created by feelings of insecurity, frustration and traditional prejudice may provide fertile soil for social tensions, the fact should be kept in mind that these individual tensions become the source of social conflict when they appear as dynamic elements in the behaviour of organized groups.”⁴⁵ In 1955 Myrdal warned against the excessive use of psychology in social welfare planning for the less-developed countries since “[t]he psychological individualization for which American social work is justly famous will only come into its own when a certain level of development has been reached” (Myrdal (1955), p. 42, we underline).

The new appointments made by Angell and Myrdal were recruited from many disciplines and more diverse in their national origins. There still was an elite coming from Western countries, however, European academics and, more particularly, Francophone scholars came again to be regarded as important in the study of social and international conflicts. For instance, in 1950, the permanent staff of the Social Science Department included the Americans Robert C. Angell and Walter R. Sharp, the British P.W. Martin, the French J.E. Godchot, the Swiss-born American Alfred Métraux, the Belgian Pierre de Bie, and the Polish Kazimierz Szczurba-Likiernik. Among the consultants closely linked to the Department, the anthropologists, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Lucien Bernot, the Annales historian

⁴⁴Letter Robert Angell to Stuart Dodd, February 9th 1950 327.5 “Tensions Affecting International Understanding” PART VI FROM I/I/50. UNESCO Archives, we underline.

⁴⁵Franklin Frazier to John Dollard, July 25th 1952 , “327.5: 301.18 A 53 Tensions Affecting International Understanding-Community Studies PART II FROM I/XI/49.” UNESCO Archives, we underline.

Lucien Febvre, the demographer Alfred Sauvy, or the sociologist Raymond Aron proved that the social closure imposed by US psychologists was not permanent and that it was important to take account of the multiplicities of culture and tradition in social science. Actually, many of the scholars involved in the Social Science Department after 1950 had met in the late 1930s in the University of São Paulo, Brazil.⁴⁶ The shift in the origins of the Social Science Department staff was crucial: even if scholars like Métraux, Lévi-Strauss, Febvre and Bernot were knowledgeable of US cultural anthropology; their cultural relativism and their openness to further pluralism distinguished them from their American counterparts.

Anthropologists were present at UNESCO since its creation; however, they were initially affiliated to other departments such as the Natural Science Department, the Department of Education or the Department of Cultural Activities.⁴⁷ Many studies done within the Tensions Project such as the “Ways of Life” monographs which relied heavily on ideas from cultural anthropology were rarely drawn up by anthropologists but instead by psychologists and social psychologists. There are several reasons for the entry of anthropology in 1950 in the Social Science Department. From 1949, UNESCO was involved in the preparation of the well-known “statements on race” to fight against racial prejudice in the world and anthropologists because of their familiarity with other cultures were called in to study the issue. In 1949 Arthur Ramos, professor of anthropology at the National University at Rio and a practicing psychiatrist, was charged of the Head of the Social Science Department with the aim of developing

⁴⁶In 1935, the French psychologist George Dumas was charged of recruiting academics for the new University of São Paulo. Lévi-Strauss, Roger Bastide, Paul Arbusse-Bastide, Alfred Métraux, Fernand Braudel, Pierre Monbeig, Pierre Hourcade and Jean Mauguie were recruited to teach there (Wilcken (2010), Capone (2010)).

⁴⁷In 1946, the Department of Natural Science sent a botanist, Dr. Corner, and an anthropologist, A. Métraux, to Brazil to develop the International Institute of the Hylean Amazon. The same year, another anthropologist, B. Mishkin was sent to Brazil by the Department of Education to examine the possibilities of a fundamental education program in the Amazon basin. In 1948, it also sent two anthropologists, C. Wagley and Eduardo Galvao to study the modern Amazonian community. Also that year, Métraux was sent to Haiti by the Department of Education to develop a fundamental education campaign in the Marbial Valley. In 1949, the Department of Education set an Expert Committee including many anthropologists to discuss the preservation of traditional popular arts in the so-called “primitive” and “pre-industrial” civilizations. In 1950, the Department of Cultural Activities subsidized an ethnographical enquiry among the Otomi Indians of the Mezquital Valley in Mexico.

research on racial tensions.⁴⁸ His unexpected death in November 1949, just 3 months after taking the charge, instead of disrupting the initiative, gave it the character of an urgent necessity. In 1950 a Division for the Study of Racial Questions was set up within the Department of Social Sciences, with the anthropologist Alfred Métraux as a head. While two Anglo-Saxon anthropologists (the British Daryll Forde and the New Zealander Ernest Beaglehole) were initially considered to be the job, it was in the end Métraux who got the job, probably due to his prestige and his previous involvement with UNESCO programmes in other departments. Métraux was a Swiss-born American anthropologist trained in France at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes under Marcel Mauss (Prins and Krebs (2007), Rivière(2010)). In the late 1930s, he had met Claude Lévi-Strauss while the latter was teaching sociology at the University of São Paulo. Like many other anthropologists, they were fascinated by Brazil, both for the access to indigenous populations in the field and for the revival that the country was experiencing, rediscovering its folklore and its arts. During World War II, Métraux participated in the Yale Cross-cultural Survey (later renamed the Human Relations Area Files). In the last months of the war, he also joined the Morale Division in the US Strategic Bombing Survey interviewing German civilians, refugees and death-camps survivors. He then joined the United Nations in New York in 1946. While Métraux was more than familiar with American cultural anthropology (his second wife, Rhoda Métraux was a co-author and lover of Margaret Mead), he was very aware of the limits of cross-cultural social engineering. His involvement in UNESCO's failed ethnographic surveys in the Amazon and Haiti, had made him very reluctant to adopt a single line of explanation for tensions in different cultures (Krebs and Prins 2005:7). Métraux' change in style from the previous universalism of the Social Science Department, did not go unremarked. René Maheu, from the office of the Director-General, in a memo to Alva Myrdal, wrote: "while the resolution 4.52 focuses on peoples' participation in the cultural life of mankind, the project mentioned by M. Métraux rather emphasizes the right of

⁴⁸ For more information about Arthur Ramos, see for instance, Maio .

every people to maintain its own civilization.”⁴⁹

The new appointments and the increase in the importance of anthropology had many effects on the nature of the studies conducted at the Social Science Department (for instance the priority given to the study of race conflicts over other tensions) but also on the construction of a more pluralist neutrality. First and foremost, the domination of US social science became less than initially planned. Indeed, the directors of the Social Science Department and its divisions (and especially Alva Myrdal and Alfred Métraux) recruited scientists of more diverse origins (See Table 1).⁵⁰ Also, while in the early years the work for the Tensions Project was mostly produced in-house, there also was a clear movement of decentralization (and as a result de-Americanization) in the production of knowledge from the UNESCO House to national committees and national institutes in foreign countries.⁵¹ The rise of non-Anglo-Saxon, and notably Francophone, anthropologists and sociologists in the Social Science Department brought an alternative to the explanation of conflicts and to the quest for neutrality. Although French anthropologists, like American cultural anthropologists, often referred to the common humanity of all people, they generally remained fixed on a notion of “cultural difference” or “alterity” - inherited from colonial ethnology - that needed to be explained in social rather than in psychological terms. Ethnologists from the French metropolis during the colonial period had a mission of

⁴⁹“tandis que la résolution 4.52 met l’accent sur la participation des peuples à la vie culturelle de l’humanité, le projet évoqué par M.Métraux souligne au contraire le droit de chaque peuple à conserver sa propre civilisation.” (we translate, emphasis in the original) ODG/Memo-8020, 1 February 1952, from René Maheu to Alva Myrdal and Mr. Thomas, Folder X 07.55SS “Programme Budget of Organisation Department of Social Sciences, Part III – from I/I/51 upto 31/XII/52. UNESCO Archives.

⁵⁰ As suggested by Lengyel (1986), the diversification in the origins of social scientists at UNESCO in the early 1950s is not unrelated to the decrease in the prestige of American scholars following McCarthyism and the rise in prestige of scholars from neutral countries such as the Scandinavians, the Swiss, the Dutch and the French. Indeed it was felt that McCarthyism endangered UNESCO’s independence and claim to objectivity (6 US scholars were forced to resign and Alva Myrdal herself was denied an entry visa in the US owing to her former political activism. See Lengyel (1986) pp.26-7) and Maurel (2010) pp. 115-116.

⁵¹ As of 1950, the shift of interest away from the Tensions Project is evident in the letters of Angell and Myrdal since greater stress is laid on the function of dissemination of knowledge as opposed to pioneer research in the topic. It was felt that original research should be done through social sciences institutes or organizations. See, for instance, Alva Myrdal to P.W. Martin , 13 September 1950, Folder X 07.55SS “Programme Budget of Organisation Department of Social Sciences, Part II.” UNESCO Archives

preservation of “otherness” (religious rites, traditional crafts and techniques) that was absent from UNESCO’s early appeals to universality but that was to become greatly exploited in the following decades by many departments especially the Department of Cultural Activities.

In the following years, the missions abroad continued but their purpose shifted. New missions were not trying to sell UNESCO's psychological approach to conflicts anymore but instead their goal was apparently more administrative and basically focused on keeping track of the new commissioned pieces. That was done by cataloguing what had already been accomplished by the commissioned scholar or team, by determining additional requirements and by providing for the dissemination of research. And indeed one of the changes brought about by the rise of non-Anglo-Saxons social scientists was the rise of collaborations with international professional associations such as the international economics association or the international social science association or with national delegations based in foreign countries and the delegation of research lines to foreign institutes. This new research pattern obviously required establishing the standards for regulating and supervising scientific investigation.⁵² Actually, many of the transcripts of the Department meetings that took place under the leadership of Angell and then Myrdal between 1949 and 1955 dealt with the technicalities of creating regional institutes as well as international associations for the study of the social sciences. And they also gave an idea of the tensions between the scientific universalism embedded in UNESCO Charter and the plans of the founders of the department and their more pluralist understanding of international scientific collaboration with foreign institutions. The correspondence shows how consultants and commissioned

⁵² The first decisive move came in March 1952, when the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences was established in Cologne under the directorship of Professor J. J. Schokking (Netherlands). It was to function until 1959, later under the directorship of Professor Neis Anderson (U.S.A.), and was then transferred to the Political Science Institute of the University of Cologne. With its two sister institutions, for Education in Hamburg and for Youth in Gauting, respectively, it formed part of the special effort made in favour of intellectual reconstruction in the Federal Republic of Germany. A Research Office on Social Implications of Technological Change began to function in Paris in October 1953, under the directorship of Professor George Balandier (France). It later came under the aegis of the International Social Science Council, with which it was formally merged in 1961. The Research Centre on the Social Implications of Industrialization in Southern Asia, an extension of the Unesco Secretariat itself, was inaugurated in December 1956 in Calcutta. Its first director was Professor C. N. Vakil (India).

workers sometimes felt the pressure from UNESCO's administration concerning knowledge production.

Also the opening vis-à-vis pluralism did not go uncontested. Pluralist supporters were warned against taking the position too far or not far enough. Among those who believed that the commitment to pluralism was insufficient were the scholars based in developing countries and recently decolonized countries. They found it at least disturbing that the powers and responsibilities in academic organization that they had just assumed were being transferred to an international organization. For instance, in 1950, UNESCO started a series of monographs on the influence a country's ethnic structure upon its foreign policy. Memoranda were made on the role played by three main ethnic groups in Switzerland, the Flemings and Walloons in Belgium, the Italians and the Germans in Brazil, French Canadians in Canada and the Negroes in the United States. The problem with this research was that the scholars charged of the study in Brazil felt that even if the plurality of nations was respected since the sample of countries and minorities contemplated Western and non-Western populations, the research questions had "a definite United States or European angle" which did not make sense in a Brazilian setting.⁵³

Others felt that, in some cases, the pluralist commitment was exaggerated and the obsession of the institution with political correctness considerably hindered scientific investigation and the publication of results which were not considered to be neutral. On the 6th of August 1956, Métraux reported: "Our race program is being trimmed to the limits. The race question is vanishing from our future program-I am not sorry for it, because with the [UNESCO] policy of not offending anyone I felt crippled and bored" (quoted in Krebs and Prins 2005: 15). Another line of argument opposed to excessive pluralism came from scholars who had participated in the Social Science Department from the beginning and

⁵³ José Arthur Rios to Pierre de Bie, November 17th 1949, 327.5: 301.18 A 53, "Tensions Affecting Int Understanding – Community Studies Part II – from I/XI/49." UNESCO Archives.

who felt that all this attention to new countries was, in fact, the result of a misplaced generosity. They had the impression that “voice” was given to countries and populations who had nothing or not much to say because they had not yet articulated their problems in a manner that was comprehensible or interesting for the international elite of social scientists. For instance, with regard to a Conference on Mental Health organized in 1949 under the auspices of UNESCO, the President of the World Federation on Mental Health, Rees complained to Hadley Cantril: “this business of picking out the main speakers so as to give a world representation is the very devil also and it means that very many of the best known people in the States and this country [France] will never be heard, I'm afraid. It's hard to know how to get round that one.”⁵⁴

Discussions over the possibility of pluralism, however imperfect, emerged with the progressive disillusionment with universalism and the increasing realization of how value-laden and culturally charged US psychological theories and methods were. In the 1950s, the definition of neutrality became intertwined with major debates over policy-making on issues such as race relations and technical assistance. In both cases, the stability of the balance between scientific objectivity and national interests became more and more precarious as increasingly conflicting demands were placed upon the members of the Department.

Statements on Race

Among the new issues at stake, the study of race issues was under the spotlight in 1950 and 1951. The new interest resulted from a 1949 request from the UN Economic and Social Council to have UNESCO launch a series of studies to fight against racial prejudice and discrimination. The study of race

⁵⁴Letter John Rees to Hadley Cantril, 24th March 1948, UNESCO Archives.

problems at UNESCO was of a cross-departmental nature and, within the Social Science Department, it was initially thought as part of the Tensions Project but became gradually autonomous and more important than the Tensions project itself.⁵⁵ UNESCO's new interest for race problems could be seen as a response to an international public demand to study urgent problems linked to the public "discovery" of the Holocaust, the decolonization or the organization of an international civil right movement (Brattain 2007, Maurel 2010). However, the study of race relations as it was constructed at UNESCO should also be linked to the demands for the appearance of neutrality, at two different levels: theoretical and practical.

First, at the theoretical level, the study of race relations at UNESCO possessed from the beginning a diversionary component and was envisioned as an original way of responding to the increasing demand for neutrality and relevance from the member states. Among the obvious interests for the Department to privilege the study of race conflicts was the fact that it was a topical theme that could be "sold" as relevant to the international community and that fundamentally avoided touching directly other conflicts that were more diplomatically sensitive at the time such as the confrontation between superpowers in the economic or military domain or the decolonization movement. Interestingly, in 1950 and 1951, the study of race conflicts stole the limelight away from other tensions (such as the Korean War) at the Division of Applied Social Science. In other words, the study of race problems appeared as offering a more neutral perspective since it escaped (at least partially) the East-West confrontation narrative and "let in" voice of communities and populations which were to a certain extent foreign to Cold War oppositions.⁵⁶ It was in this way that Angell presented the study on races to

⁵⁵ In the 1951 Report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization from April 1950 to March 1951, the study of "Race Issues" is included in the Tensions Project (Unesco 1951: 68). However as of 1953, the Report presented the "Tensions project" and the study of "Human Rights" (including Race Issues and Women Studies) under the more general heading of "Applied Social Science" (UNESCO 1954: 119-20; UNESCO 1956: 88-9; UNESCO 1957: 97-9; UNESCO 1958: 144-5).

⁵⁶ Some have also seen in UNESCO's interest for race a reaction against Soviet critique of racism in Western countries and the

the new Mexican Director-General, Jaime Torres-Bodet, “There was expressed some criticisms of our work from the point of view that we are not tackling the most difficult problems at all – those that are involved in the cold war. It was pointed out that such problems are very difficult to deal with because UNESCO is supported by governments of both sides of the cold war. There was considerable discussion with respect to how the Tensions Project might circumvent the political implications of relations between East and West and still do an important research work.”⁵⁷ The “important research work” resulted in the historically well-documented and controversial “statements on race” of 1949 and 1950 which uncovered deep scientific disagreements on the existence and definition of race and the interpretation of results concerning racial differences.⁵⁸

Second, at the practical level, both statements on race also disclosed profound national dissimilarities in policy approaches to the treatment of racial problems and the difficulty of setting an international consensual view on policy making that could be presented as neutral and free of particular national intervention. UNESCO members shared a fundamental antagonism to all forms of racism; yet, their political and social agendas regarding policy propositions were very different. As they unfolded, debates opposed several camps. Some preconized combatting racial prejudice through education and science, and insisted on the psychological dimension of racial prejudice, an “easily transmissible” disease that could in very short time “infect millions of people” (Métraux 1950, p.387). This was the view of many UNESCO officers in the Education and the Social Science Departments planning a campaign against public ignorance in a vaster project to reform human behavior (Brattain (2007)).⁵⁹ Others insisted on the empowerment of minorities through the extension of civil liberties and rights and

USSR willingness to side with underdeveloped countries.

⁵⁷ Robert C. Angell to UNESCO General Director, November 9th 1949, Inactive Correspondence 1946-1956 series 327.5 "Tensions affecting International Understanding" PART V FROM I/I/49 TO 31/XII/49. UNESCO Archives.

⁵⁸ For a comprehensive study of these debates, see Brattain (2007).

⁵⁹ One of the most important elements of this campaign was the launching in 1953 of a series of textbooks addressed to teachers about how to teach the “racial problem” in schools (Gastaud 2007).

accounted for the existence of racial prejudice as a “democratic deficit.”⁶⁰ This was the vision of many US officials who envisioned the “end of the racial problem” as an “internal Point Four” to promote equal rights and opportunities to minorities *within* the United States. Given this difference and probably driven by the world criticism about the way the US was dealing with domestic racial prejudices, the US delegation complained about UNESCO’s treatment of the minority question in the first statement. Angell responded to an angry letter from Louis Wirth, the well-known Chicago sociologist and head of the American Council on Race Relations, “We have had information from the United States that you and Pen Herring are somewhat annoyed with us regarding the handling of the minorities’ problems here. Let me first say that your excellent memorandum is at this moment before the expert committee on race problems meeting here, as a working paper. Franklin Frazier and Ashley Montagu are here from the United States, and other Lights as Lévi-Strauss, Ginsberg, and Beaglehole are here from other nations. They are tackling a tough problem and I am sure your memorandum will be of the greatest help.”⁶¹

Beyond education and civil rights, another line of anti-racist policies emerged in the early 1950s as the result of the work done by anthropologists on Brazil. In 1951 Métraux commissioned sociological, anthropological and psychological enquiries in Brazil to obtain data on the actual situation of different populations in the country. Brazil and especially the state of Salvador de Bahia were taken as case studies of a “Western” society in which racial relations were extremely harmonious.⁶² And the study of Brazilian interracial sociability was explicitly selected to suggest new policies to combat racial prejudice (Métraux 1952). In April 1950, the Brazilian biologist Ruy Coelho, a former student of Roger Bastide in Sao Paulo, became an assistant to Métraux for the study of racial problems at the Social Science Department (Maio (2007)). Métraux also commissioned highly well-known social scientists to write

⁶⁰ For a different understanding of the links between these two policies, see Lentin (2005) p. 381.

⁶¹ Robert C. Angell to Louis Wirth, 13th December 1949, 327.5: 301.18 A 53 “Tensions Affecting International Understanding-Community Studies” PART II FROM I/XI/49, UNESCO Archives.

⁶² The state of Bahia was at the time thought as an example of “racial democracy.”

booklets on race edited by him and published by UNESCO in the series *The Race Question and Modern Thought* and *The Race Question and Modern Science*. In these series, the work done by anthropologists was showcased and included Juan Comas' *Racial Myths*, Lévi-Strauss' *Race and History*, and Michel Leiris' *Race and Culture*. In the pen of these anthropologists, the explanations of race prejudice and discrimination tied up with questions concerning the advance of capitalism in underdeveloped areas, the formation of modern states and the structure of power between colonial powers and its colonies. For instance, it was suggested that racial harmony in Brazil was the result of the liberal attitude of the Iberian peoples towards the slaves which differed greatly from other colonial powers (Métraux (1952), p.6). Racism was not only a problem of ignorant or pathological individuals, it could also be seen as a by-product of the expansion of capitalism and imperialism and therefore require treatment at a more structural level. That was a dangerous statement in the early 1950s for a neutral international organization since it implicitly reintroduced the East-West confrontation in the debate as well as older quarrels between old colonies and recently decolonized areas. Anthropologists were extremely aware of the political sensitivity of these statements and were, therefore, very careful to always qualify their controversial findings. The Brazilian anthropologist Gilberto Freyre prudently advanced that “[s]ome investigators reached the conclusion that the slaves, under the patriarchal, paternalistic regime, were probably better cared for by their masters than free labourers, black and white,” during the transition from the patriarchal regime to the laissez-faire system that took place in the 19th century (Freyre (1952), p.8). Métraux suggested that, in the future, rapid urbanization and the growing competition between migrants moving into the industrial centres could destroy the “racial democracy”, were it not for the “liberal and open-hearted traditions” of Brazilian people (Métraux (1952), p.6). Roger Bastide warned that race prejudice might change into class prejudice to justify white retention of the governing or controlling positions in society “if it was not for the democratic laws of Brazil and the development

of industrialization, with the accompanying demand for more labour, are helping to improve the position of the coloured people as a whole” (Bastide (1952),p.9).

Given the risk of making such sensitive statements and also for other reasons (including that, safe for Bahia, Brazil was not the racial paradise initially imagined), anthropologists focused instead on another research lines seeking to shift away from the study of race towards the study of cultural diversity. A shining example of this was Claude Lévi-Strauss’ 1952 book, *Race and History*, in which he argued that the disproof of racialism will never succeed entirely if cultural prejudices such as a classification of cultures, ethnocentrism or the belief of the superiority of Western societies were to persist.⁶³ And responding to contemporary modernization theories, he warned against what he called a “false evolutionism” in history (Lévi-Strauss (1952),p. 18).

By the end of 1951, the general orientation of the Department was changed and there was no special resolution concentrating on race problems.⁶⁴ The commitment of UNESCO to field work and technical assistance gained ground.

III. “Classical” Field Work versus Technical Assistance Studies: Neutrality in the study of Japan and India

⁶³ Lentin (2005) has suggested that Lévi-Strauss’ anti-racism by substituting “races” by “cultures” led to a depolitization of the racialized and also avoided dealing with the inconvenient link existing between racial prejudice and the creation of the modern state. While we do not rule out this hypothesis, Lentin does not provide enough historical evidence to prove that this was an intentional process nor that it was approved by other UNESCO members. Cooper (1997) has argued that the substitution of culture by race induced an individualization of cultural change: “Africans who chose not to make the transition were seen as willfully obstructionist rather than quaintly backward” (Cooper (1997), p. 87 footnote 21).

⁶⁴ The resolution 3.22 dealing with minorities did maintain interest on methods of overcoming racial discrimination and there was under resolution 3.131 a publication of a teachers’ manual on how to deal with race questions, but these studies could not compare with the previous work done by the Department on races either in terms of the quality of the research undertaken or in terms of impact. However, in the following decades race continued to be a topical theme in other departments and as Gastaud (2007) has shown, UNESCO continued to be very involved in the combat against racial prejudice.

In the study of the construction of neutrality in the Department after 1950, it is interesting to compare the work commissioned in India in the context of technical assistance with other field work of similar nature commissioned in Japan in the same period. The comparison of research done in these two countries reveals the different shades that the politics of neutrality could take. In Japan a team of investigators were asked to work, in 1950 and 1951, on a detailed survey of the mentality of the young in the post-war period, indicating the differences found in relation to age, sex, social standing and standard of education. The research was carried out by a French sociologist, Jean Stoetzel, director of the French Institute of Public Opinion Research, and a Dutch expert on Japan, Fritz Vos, working in close consultation with the Japanese Association of Cultural Science. Making intensive use of the interview technique, the investigators brought to light the main types of attitudes towards institutions-in particular, the family and marriage, the professions, the public authorities and the various embodiments of State power. Initially, this study attempted to replicate the war-related research done by Gregory Bateson, and Margaret Mead in the 1940s at the Council on Intercultural Relations (Bateson (1942), Bateson and Mead (1941)). However, the conclusions reached were very different. The research led to the publication of *Without the Chrysanthemum and the Sword*.⁶⁵ In it, Stoetzel wrote about the inadequacy of Benedict's and Mead's studies on cultural patterns that gave the impression of a pattern of behaviour common to the whole Japanese people. "The use of psycho-analysis and ethnography in combination might produce brilliant syntheses at little cost, for instance under the heading of "basic personality structure", but in the last resort, all reasoning depends on the weight of experience behind it; this kind of cultural psychology of the individual is little more than another way of presenting sociological data already available elsewhere and consequently *conveys in a different language the same misleading impression of universality* that is a weakness of synthetic sociological interpretations." (21, we underline) Reflecting on their own limited awareness of Japanese culture and society, they

⁶⁵ Ruth Benedict's famous 1946 book on Japanese culture was entitled *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Benedict 1946).

acknowledged that “[i]n the case of Japan we are dealing with a society quite outside our ordinary experience so that its philosophy of life, its hidden motives and its emotions and intellectual mechanisms (its “logic”, if you prefer the term) are liable to be profoundly alien to us” (p. 30). The interesting thing about Stoezel's dismissal of psycho-cultural explanations and the pretense to universalism of cultural anthropologists is that, he made it rely on another view of neutrality, that he called “an ascetical approach on the part of the research worker” and that he carried out “in a spirit of unqualified respect for the right of the Japanese to think and behave as Japanese” (13). Classical fieldwork done in Japan was therefore very much influenced by this shift towards pluralism, and its emphasis on the impracticality of a unified international social science and the impossibility of a neutral transfer of theories and methods across borders that characterized the shift away from universalism.

The case was very different regarding technical assistance in less-developed countries. In 1950, the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance aimed to help the economically less-developed countries of the world, at the request of their governments, and to increase their agricultural and industrial production, enlarge and improve their social services, and raise their living standards through an international sharing of technical skills and knowledge. To provide such aid on a co-ordinated basis, the United Nations and seven of the Specialized Agencies participated in the Expanded Program and shared its funds.⁶⁶ After the Montevideo and New Delhi Conferences, following the guidelines set by Luther Evans, UNESCO's new Director-General, the work at the Social Science Department became more practically oriented and lent increasing support to technical assistance

⁶⁶ The Specialized Agencies initially involved in technical assistance programs were the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

programs.⁶⁷ Broadly speaking UNESCO's aid program provided for assistance in technical, elementary and fundamental adult education; advice on the production and use of materials for education; the training of teachers and other specialized personnel; planning and organization of scientific research and training laboratories; and help in the development of local cultures.⁶⁸ As part of the longer term commitment of UNESCO to technical assistance, an independent Department of Technical Assistance saw the light in 1952. In the Social Sciences Department, the main contributions were made in area studies, community-development studies and evaluation studies.

As of 1951, a resolution had authorized UNESCO to help some Member States which had gained independence (in collaboration with them) by sending missions of specialists to study methods to reduce internal social tensions. The objective was to investigate ways and means of making harmonious and conflict-free the transition to an independent and modernized condition. Angell and Myrdal had different views on technical assistance and its implementation. Angell thought of technical assistance projects as part of social scientists duty and responsibility. More specifically he thought that “social scientists have a duty to formulate the implications of the democratic way of life so that all technical assistance personnel going into an underdeveloped area may be indoctrinated and serve as missionaries more or less. This could tie up with the Rights of Man program.”⁶⁹ Myrdal was also very

⁶⁷ It is interesting to note the almost absolute absence of economists at UNESCO's Social Science Department in the first ten years of its existence. Even the appointment of Alva Myrdal, wife of then UN consultant and future 1974 Nobel Prize winner in economics, Gunnar Myrdal, did not change the pattern of appointments. We suggest it might be related to the division of labor within the UN system. Just to give an example, when in September 1952, the UN recommended that UNESCO hire an economist to take responsibility of the study of methods of measuring standards of living at UNESCO, Alva Myrdal responded: “It would, however, seem more appropriate that UNESCO be responsible for the invitation of the anthropologist. I also suggested to the UN group which I met (Julia Henderson and Gustavo Duran, Director and Division Chief respectively in charge of this work), that it would be preferable if the economist had a certain relationship to the Economic Affairs Department of the UN, which otherwise might object to being excluded.” SS/Memo. 52/ 2765, 9th October 1952, Alva Myrdal to the Director-General, Mission to New York and Washington 22 September-4 October 1952, X07.83 Myrdal “Missions of Mrs. A. Myrdal,” UNESCO archives.

⁶⁸ The United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, was created in 1949 (by a great enlargement of a former program) after US President Harry Truman had recommended a large effort to transfer Western technical knowledge to the underdeveloped countries. At the 1954 session of UNESCO General Conference at Montevideo, Evans proposed a technical assistance operation within the regular budget of UNESCO (Evans (1963), p. 79).

⁶⁹ Robert C. Angell to Alva Myrdal, 13 September 1950, Folder “X 07.55 SS. Programme Budget of Organization Department

favorable to a shift towards technical assistance but her arguments were very different. Prior to her arrival to UNESCO, Myrdal had been a prominent member of the Swedish Social Democratic Party involved in the creation of the Swedish welfare state, she had co-authored a book on the decline of birthrate in Sweden with her husband Gunnar Myrdal (Myrdal and Myrdal 1934) and she had been a director of the Social Division in New York (1949-1950). She conceived UNESCO's social science program as serving as a sort of think-tank to give intellectual support to the Economic and Social Council of the UN (ECOSOC). Her ambition was to make planning in developing countries less economicsy and more oriented towards the protection of the values and the culture of the populations. She was particularly concerned with the fact that no international body had taken much trouble studying "to what extent technical knowhow in the social welfare field is exportable or importable at all" (Myrdal 1955, p.12). And she signaled the need of "a powerful storehouse of knowledge of social welfare techniques from the whole world," a role that UNESCO's Social Science Department or a related institution could play. In terms of neutrality, she believed that "every country ought to study itself" (p.47) and suggested that an international social science could only exist under the aegis of the UN. "Because who else would be interested in being the arbiter in the struggle for prestige which undeniably is involved when one country or another believes in the exportability of its own welfare prescriptions?" (Myrdal 1955, p.50).

Despite Myrdal's fears that a single perspective imposed by a unique country or a few number of countries became dominant, technical assistance programs presented a great opportunity for US Culture and Personality scholars who wanted to export their techniques and theories abroad. In those programs, as Métraux explained: "cultural anthropologists [were] deemed essential for exploratory and advisory missions, the aim of which [was] to provide the necessary background for any development project"

(Métraux, (1951) p. 420).

India was the first country to require technical assistance from UNESCO.⁷⁰ At the time, many international and national institutions such as the FAO, the ILO, or the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundations were involved in modernizing the country by putting an end to poverty, famines and overpopulation, while, at the same time, undermining the attraction of communism.⁷¹ The focus of UNESCO on India was not accidental, since, as Peter Lengyel observed in the organization “[f]or long, the expression underdeveloped or developing evoked India as a prototype. It was often assumed that certain specifics of Indian life, such as the caste system or five-year economic planning under a parliament democracy, were integral attributes of backward societies struggling to modernize, and that the profound ambiguities of Gandhian philosophy deserved to be carefully unraveled for the secrets they held for any poor community” (Lengyel (1986), pp.28-29). In the case of “community development,” there was a clash between the Gandhian approach to development and rural welfare (“village swaraj”) using a minimum of capital and aiming at self-sufficiency and the often US-endowed “community development schemes” carrying further dependence on capital and aiming at industrializing the country. Angell commissioned US anthropologist Gardner Murphy of City College to write a study on tensions in India. Murphy coordinated a series of monographs done by Indian scholars who had been previously introduced to US psychology by Murphy himself or other members of the Social Science Department staff.⁷² The direct involvement of UNESCO members not only in the assessment but also on the planning and organization of the study of tensions in India was regarded as

⁷⁰ Initially, the requests for technical assistance to UNESCO’s Social Sciences Department came from India, Israel, Lebanon and Philippines.

⁷¹ American philanthropic foundations such as Rockefeller and Ford were also involved in international development aid in the 1950s. Ford started its Overseas Development Program in 1951. Rockefeller’s first development programs began even earlier since in 1920s and 1930s, the Foundation devoted large sums to public health and agricultural projects in Africa, China, and Latin America. See Rotter (2000) for US influence in Indian economic and cultural development.

⁷² In one occasion Murphy asked Angell, then director of the Department, if UNESCO could provide Indian universities which cooperated in the study with “kits” of books and research studies to help them in training research personnel. SS Memo 1502 of Robert C. Angell to the Director-General, 25th January 1950, “Visit to the United States 7-23 January 1950,” Folder “X07.83 Angell. Missions of Mr. R.C. Angell.” UNESCO Archives.

necessary since the early efforts of the Indian government to coordinate such efforts looked unpromising to American eyes. In March 1949, Klineberg approached the Director-General in the following terms: "It seemed to me that the survey as originally planned [by the Indian Ministry of Education] would not give all the desired results, because psychologists and sociologists at various universities had been asked to report on tensions in neighbouring communities, without any general plan or organisation of the investigation. (...) I therefore suggested that it would be advantageous to have an expert in the field of sociology or social psychology set up the investigation as a whole, with the collaboration of *young well-trained Indian sociologists who could then carry out the programme as planned*. The purpose of such an investigation would be not merely to report on existing tensions, but to make specific suggestions to the Indian Government regarding remedial measures than might be taken."⁷³ Given the scarcity of resources and the limited number of US specialists, a number of Indian scholars were recruited and trained by UNESCO. Radha Kamal Mukerjee and Kali Prasad of Lucknow University, and C. N. Vakil of Bombay University were charged of producing technical monographs in which cutting-edge psychological tests (such as Bogardus scale of social distance tests, thematic apperception tests or Rorschach tests) were applied to evaluate Hindu-Moslem and inter-caste attitudes without a real warning about how much the methods embedded within them distinctly Western hypotheses about human behavior (Valien (1954), p.223).⁷⁴ The result was very much in the line with the "Culture and Personality" type of work and had very clear universalist inspiration.

Along with the technical reports done by his Indian colleagues, in 1953, Murphy published a more personal book entitled *In the Minds of Men*, in which he recollected his impressions during his 6-month

⁷³ Otto Klineberg to Office of the Director-General, 31 March 1949, Inactive Correspondence 1946-1956 series 327.5 "Tensions affecting International Understanding" PART V FROM I/I/49 TO 31/XII/49. UNESCO Archives, we underline.

⁷⁴ The research teams carried six different lines of research: the attitudes towards Moslems and refugees in the Bombay area, and in Lucknow, the attitudes of the Hindu native towards refugees from East Bengal and Adibasi aborigines in Bihar, a systematic study of personal outlooks of Moslems and Hindus in connection with the communal difficulties they had experienced, an investigation of the sources of distress and hostility among textile workers and the attitudes of the people of West Bengal towards East Bengali refugees and vice versa.

stay in India as a UNESCO worker. This work was not so much a travel book as it was a “road map” for social scientists involved in technical assistance to less-developed countries. In it he described the “difficulties and joys of working at the same time as a typical member of one's own national group and as a servant of an international organisation” (Murphy (1953), p.10). The book revealed the tensions of an American social psychologist confronted with the well-meaning task of providing technical aid in an atmosphere of suspicion among the Indian population and government, and his efforts to *appear neutral*. Many of his chapters attempted to provide a “sympathetic” and “delicate” overview of some of the many social and religious tensions between Muslims and Hindus in India from a psychological perspective, balancing his sometimes negative observations with praises to the forces and strengths of the Indian population as a whole and to the richness of its history and culture. However, the most instructive (as well as most speculative) part of Murphy's book in terms of neutrality was his discussion of “Prospects of Social Health,” an effort to solve the sensitive question of what constituted “acceptable and unacceptable help” from foreign countries and hence to define “neutral” social science in international organizations involved in technical assistance.

“International social science, *the dream of all those who attempt to formulate scientific problems in a manner independent of the prejudice of any particular national group*, will inevitably depend largely for a long time on those national groups which have been so lucky as to experience in their own bodies and their own training the development of the social science ways of thinking and acting. *It must be frankly recognized that this is something that America can give*” (p. 287, we underline).

However committed Murphy was to accommodating Western ideas to Indians needs, in practice, he believed that technical assistance had to be carried out by an élite of Western and preferably American social scientists since Indians were not ready yet to develop neither their own social sciences nor their own ways of viewing social problems (p.287). If it was to happen at all, Indian development would come from the emulation of the United States and no serious alternative was provided.⁷⁵

Alva Myrdal raised a cautious voice about the eagerness to apply new techniques, that often resulted in the techniques applied “without due preparatory work to test out their validity and applicability in new social surroundings.”⁷⁶ She thought that US scholars’ impulse to universalize their methods and theories had to be qualified and adapted to the new environment. She was worried that some solutions to specific problems of development at the local level were spreading far outside the initial area and taking the character of “an almost international gospel.” For instance, concerning the studies on “community development” she wrote, “I cannot help but feel a certain apprehension that through this popularization, what is fundamentally a project for economic development runs the risk of losing its economic character and tends to become too much a matter for do-gooders. At the same time it risks losing its reliance on indigenous forces and becomes an experimental field for outsiders.” And she felt there had to be a middle path between the Gandhian way to modernization “tending towards cultural protectionism and even isolation”, and “its most “engineered” form [that] risks breaking some of the cultural forces.” In her mind, UNESCO’s social scientists had to establish in India an international

⁷⁵ In the late 1950s, the MIT economists Walt Rostow and Max Millikan as well as Senator (and future US President) John F. Kennedy expressed their confidence in India’s economic maturity for a major “take-off” (Rotter (2000), p. 82).

⁷⁶ SS/Memo. 53/3251, 4 February 1953, Alva Myrdal to the Acting Director General, X07.83 Myrdal “Missions of Mrs. A. Myrdal,” UNESCO archives. This attitude must have marked the relations between Indian authorities and UNESCO’s officials. For instance, when in 1952, Myrdal visited Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to discuss UNESCO’s work in India, then Minister of Education, she is stricken by the formality of the audience, and “not least by the fact, that the Minister, who is a Moslem scholar of world eminence, is not willing to speak any Western languages.” SS/Memo. 53/3251, 4 February 1953, Alva Myrdal to the Acting Director General, X07.83 Myrdal “Missions of Mrs. A. Myrdal,” UNESCO archives.

center for research on the social effects of industrialization that would encourage intellectual cooperation and would be very different from the “one-way traffic of cultural influence” of the projects led by the US government and the Ford Foundation.⁷⁷ In that sense, as historians have noted, “Myrdal anticipated later critiques of postwar technical assistance” (Amrith and Sluga, (2008) p. 265). However, Myrdal’s attitude was quite exceptional in the Department and most members and consultants to the Department were torn concerning how much local populations should be given a voice in their development process.

Margaret Mead’s edited book on technical assistance commissioned by UNESCO, *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*, was very evocative of these contradictions.⁷⁸ After an outline of the aims of relevant UN institutions regarding development, the book began with the description of 5 different cultures - Burma, Greece, the Tiv of West Africa, Palau in the Philippines, and the Spanish Americans of New Mexico. These examples were supposed to provide necessary evidence for the assumption that cultures were “wholes” in which a minor change in one cultural pattern might affect the entire community and to warn about the possible damage of a rapid social and economic change. Yet, they also acknowledged the necessity of change given the misery of these people, showing the deep ambivalence of Western anthropologists towards development, legitimate ethnographic authority and the possibility of applying foreign techniques in new settings. In the last two chapters, the book discussed the specific mental health ramifications of technical change and then presented a series of recommendations for anthropologists in changing countries. The book claimed that the anthropologist should “identify and describe the process which occurs that each particular individual or team charged with responsibility

⁷⁷ SS/Memo. 53/3253, 4 February 1953, Alva Myrdal to the Acting Director General, “Report on Mission to India and Egypt,” X07.83 Myrdal “Missions of Mrs. A. Myrdal,” UNESCO archives.

⁷⁸ The expansion of the technical assistance program triggered the rise in the commissioned books and articles by UNESCO reviewing the literature on the effect of technical assistance on populations. One of these literatures reviews was charged to the World Federation for Mental Health to produce a book on the effect of technical assistance on the mental health of the populations involved and Margaret Mead was charged of editing it.

for planning or executing, or adjusting to some type of change, may be able to act in terms of this process” (Mead (1953), p. 304). The [American] anthropologist could claim expertise on change processes since he was an expert in applying “the new knowledge of human behaviour, derived from the findings of psychiatry, clinical psychology, child development, cultural anthropology and sociology, to the problems of child rearing and adult functioning in such a way as to preserve and increase the mental health of whole populations” (Mead (1953), p.8). It was understood that the development path in changing countries followed the lines of personality development that neo-Freudians had identified. And therefore, ethnographical authority and the possibility of policy claims for anthropologists such as Mead emanated from their familiarity with culture and personality studies, and their claims to have found universal categories for understanding human development everywhere.

These claims opened the path for a legitimate (since universal) transfer of theories and policies from Western countries and particularly the US into developing countries through UNESCO. In particular the Social Science Department participated in the rise of an industry of academic social sciences concerned with development in which many governmental, international and private organizations were engaged (Cooper and Packard (1997)).

IV. Concluding remarks

By 1956, after the General Conference in Delhi, the Social Science Department comprised only four main research lines, none of them concerned anymore with the causes of conflicts.⁷⁹ Except for one

⁷⁹ According to the report published after the Delhi Conference, the Social Science Department's new objectives were to develop 1) research on methods of mediation for the prevention or settlement of international disputes and conflicts, 2) the circulation of information to promote the application of the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with regard to non-discrimination in respect of race, sex, religion or nationality, 3) studies on the social impact of technological change and industrialization, and problems resulting from the rapid development of local communities and the growth of towns and 4) the use of social science methods for an objective evaluation of the efficacy of certain activities undertaken either by UNESCO or by other national or intergovernmental organizations.

research line which was focused on the diffusion of information and mass education, the other three projects were concerned with technical assistance. Interestingly, in 1955, Myrdal left the Department to become the Swedish Ambassador in India and was replaced by the economist T.H. Marshall. 1956 marked the end of the establishment of the Social Science Department. The energetic leadership of Myrdal had set it on an equal footing to other departments and even if the budget resources were still scarce, the department was growing bigger and the hired staff continued increasing as well as the contacts with outside researchers.

In this essay, we have tried to clarify the relationships between pluralism and universalism as they unfolded between 1946 and 1956 at UNESCO's Social Science Department. One of our arguments is that both approaches involved a great deal of maneuvering and strategy to advance national or professional purposes, and therefore, neutrality was only apparent. Another point that we make is that while the *analysis* of social phenomena slightly opened up from universalism to pluralism, in terms of *policy prescription* technical assistance were still justified in universalist terms, especially when dealing with less-developed countries.

As for the link between universalism, pluralism and social theory, our essay also delineates the international diversity in professional practices since it points at the difference between Francophone anthropology done by anthropologists and American “cultural anthropology” practiced by psychologists and social psychologists as well as anthropologists. We have put forward how the Anglo-Saxon tradition relied on psycho-analytic ideas using Freudian ontogenetic assumptions about the unity of human trajectories while the Francophone tradition was based on an analysis of contexts and rituals emphasizing the multiplicity of human experiences.

From a larger historical perspective, the discussion of the history of the meaning of neutrality at UNESCO's Social Science Department adds some insights about developments that took place in the social sciences in the after-war period, such as the success of culture and personality studies, the debates on the race problem and the implications of technical assistance.

References

- UNESCO. 1951. *Rapport du directeur général sur l'activité de l'organisation d'avril 1950 à mars 1951*. UNESCO. Paris.
- UNESCO. 1954. *Rapport du directeur général et du conseil exécutif sur l'activité de l'organisation pendant l'année 1953*. UNESCO. Paris.
- UNESCO. 1956. *Rapport du directeur général sur l'activité de l'organisation en 1955*. UNESCO. Paris.
- UNESCO. 1957. *Rapport du directeur général sur l'activité de l'organisation en 1956*. UNESCO. Paris.
- UNESCO. 1958. *Rapport du directeur général sur l'activité de l'organisation en 1957*. UNESCO. Paris.
- Anon. 1947. Geographical distribution of UNESCO Staff. CONS.EXEC./COM.NOM./1e SESS./5. En , 13. UNESCO, Paris, Septiembere 2. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001785/178543eb.pdf>.
- Amrith, Sunil, and Glenda Sluga. 2008. "New Histories of the United Nations". *Journal of World History* 19 (3): 251-274.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2007. *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination*. Verso.
- Angell, Robert C. 1950. "Unesco and Social Science Research". *American Sociological Review* 15 (2): 282-287.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1942. "Some Systematic Approaches to the Study of Culture and Personality". *Character and Personality* 11: 76.
- Bateson, Gregory, y Margaret Mead. 1941. "Principles of Moral Building". *The Journal of Educational Sociology* 15 (4): 206-220.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Mariner Books.

- Bocking, Stephen. 2007. Lier science et pratique: l’histoire du Programme de l’UNESCO sur l’homme et la biosphère. In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*, 389-394.
- Brattain, Michelle. 2007. “Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public”. *American Historical Review* 112 (5): 1386–413.
- Brennan, Timothy. 2003. Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism. In *Debating Cosmopolitics*, ed. Daniele Archibugi, 40-50. London: Verso.
- Burke, Roland. 2008. “From Individual Rights to National Development: The First UN International Conference on Human Rights, Tehran”. *Journal of World History* 19 (3): 275-296.
- Cantril, H. 1948. “The Human Sciences and World Peace: A Report on the Unesco Project: ‘Tensions Affecting International Understanding’”. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12 (2): 236.
- . 1950. *Tensions that cause wars*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Capone, Stefania. 2010. *Searching for Africa in Brazil: Power and Tradition in Candomblé*. Duke University Press.
- Cooper, Frederick. 1997. Modernizing Bureaucrats, Backward Africans, and the Development Concept. In *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, ed. Frederick Cooper and Randall M. Packard, 64-92. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Randall M. Packard. 1997. Introduction. In *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, ed. Frederick Cooper and Randall M. Packard, 1-41. University of California Press.
- Dollard, John, Leonard W. Doob, Neil E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, and Robert R. Sears. 1939. *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dunn, David J. 2005. *The First Fifty Years of Peace Research: A Survey and Interpretation*. Ashgate Pub Co.

- Elzinga, Aant. 1996. UNESCO and the Politics of Scientific Internationalism. In *Internationalism and Science*, ed. Aant Elzinga and C Landström. London: Taylor and Graham.
- Evans, Luther H. 1963. "Some Management Problems of Unesco". *International organization* 17 (01): 76–90.
- Finison, Lorenz J. 1986. "The Psychological Insurgency: 1936-1945". *Journal of Social Issues* 42 (1): 21-33.
- Gastaud, Ivan. 2007. L'UNESCO, les « races » et le racisme. In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*, 197-210.
- Gilman, Nils. 2003. *Mandarins of the Future*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gitre, E. J.K. 2010. "Importing Freud: First-Wave Psychoanalysis, Interwar Social Sciences, and the Interdisciplinary Foundations of an American Social Theory". *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 46 (3): 239–262.
- . 2011. "The Great Escape: World War II, Neo-Freudianism, and the Origins of Us Psychocultural Analysis". *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 47 (1): 18–43.
- Hamblin, Jacob Darwin. 2007. Les politiques de coopération scientifique internationale, ou l'abandon du « S » dans le sigle UNESCO. In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*, 379-388.
- Harris, B. 1986. "Reviewing 50 years of the psychology of social issues". *Journal of social issues* 42 (1): 1–20.
- Harris, B., y IAM Nicholson. 1998. "Toward a History of Psychological Expertise". *Journal of social issues* 54 (1): 1–5.
- Herman, Ellen. 1996. *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*. University of California Press.
- Huxley, Julian. 1946. *Unesco; Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*. 1946th ed. London: The Frederick

Printing Co.

Janowitz, Morris, and Edward Shils. 1948. "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II". *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12: 280–315.

Kelman, Herbert C. 1981. "Reflections on the History and Status of Peace Research". *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 5 (2): 95.

———. 1991. A Behavioral Science Perspective on the Study of War and Peace. En *Perspectives on the Behavioral Sciences: The Colorado Lectures*, ed. Richard Jessor y Herbert C. Kelman, 245-75. Westview Press.

Krige, John. 2006. "Atoms for Peace, Scientific Internationalism, and Scientific Intelligence". *Osiris* 21 (1): 161–181.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1952. *Race et histoire*. UNESCO.

Lenguel, Péter. 1986. *International Social Science: The UNESCO Experience*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, Inc.

Lentin, Alana. 2005. "Replacing 'race', historicizing 'culture' in multiculturalism". *Patterns of Prejudice* 39 (4): 379-396.

Métraux, Alfred. 1951. "UNESCO and Anthropology". *American Anthropologist* 53 (2). New Series: 294-300.

———. 1952. "An Inquiry into Race Relations in Brazil". *Le courrier de l'UNESCO* 8 (9): 6.

Maio, Marcos Chor. 2007. Un programme contre le racisme au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*, 187-196.

Mandler, Peter. 2009. One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology. En *History Workshop Journal*, 68:149.

Mannheim, Karl. 1985. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

- Martin, P. W. 1947. "Unesco and Psychology". *Journal of Social Issues* 3 (1): 10-20.
- Maurel, C. 2010. "Le rêve d'un «gouvernement mondial» des années 1920 aux années 1950. L'exemple de l'Unesco". *Histoire@ Politique* (1): 9-9.
- Maurel, Chloé. 2010. *Histoire de l'UNESCO*. Harmattan.
- Mead, Margaret, ed. 1953. *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*. World Federation for Mental Health.
- Morgan, Mary S, y Malcolm Rutherford. 1998. "American economics: The character of the transformation". *History of Political Economy From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism*: 1.
- Murphy, Gardner. 1953. *In the Minds of Men: The Study of Human Behavior and Social Tensions in India*. New York: Basic Books.
- Myrdal, Alva. 1955. A Scientific Approach to International Welfare. En *America's Role in International Social Welfare*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1972. Unesco and Peace. En *In the Minds of Men. Twenty-fifth anniversary of Unesco 1946 to 1971*, 263-278. Paris: UNESCO.
- Nicholson, I. 1997. "The politics of scientific social reform, 1936-1960: Goodwin Watson and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues". *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 33 (1): 39-60.
- Nicholson, IAM. 1998. "'The Approved Bureaucratic Torpor': Goodwin Watson, Critical Psychology, and the Dilemmas of Expertise, 1930-1945". *Journal of social issues* 54 (1): 29-52.
- Petitjean, Patrick. 2007. Les aspects sociaux des sciences : un enjeu essentiel dans l'histoire de l'UNESCO. In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*, 369-378.
- Pooley, J. 2006. "Fifteen Pages That Shook the Field: Personal Influence, Edward Shils, and the Remembered History of Mass Communication Research". *The Annals of the American*

- Academy of Political and Social Science* 608 (1): 130.
- . 2007. “Edward Shils’ Turn Against Karl Mannheim: The Central European Connection”. *The American Sociologist* 38 (4): 364–382.
- Prins, Harald, y E Krebs. 2007. Vers un Monde sans Mal: Alfred Métraux, un anthropologue à l’Unesco (1948-1962). In *Actes De Conference Internationale, Paris, 16-18 Novembre, 2005*.
- Rivière, Peter. 2010. Alfred Métraux: Empiricist and Romanticist. En *Out of the Study and into the Field: Ethnographic Theory and Practice in French Anthropology*, ed. Robert Parkin and Anne de Salles. Vol. 22. Methodology and History in Anthropology. Berghahn Books.
- Rothschild, Emma. 2008. “The Archives of Universal History”. *Journal of World History* 19 (3): 375-401.
- Rotter, Andrew Jon. 2000. *Comrades at odds: the United States and India, 1947-1964*. Cornell University Press.
- Selcer, Perrin. 2009. “The View from Everywhere: Disciplining Diversity in Post-World War II International Social Science”. *Journal of the history of the behavioral sciences* 45 (4): 309-329.
- Shils, Edward. 1947. *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: Preliminary Outline of (the) Project*. Paris: UNESCO, May 12.
- Sluga, Glenda. 2010. “UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley”. *Journal of World History* 21 (3): 393–418.
- Toye, R, and John Toye. 2010. “One World, Two Cultures? Alfred Zimmern, Julian Huxley and the Ideological Origins of UNESCO”. *History* 95 (319): 308-331.
- Valien, P. 1954. “The Status of Sociology in Independent India”. *Social forces* 32 (3): 222–225.
- Wilcken, Patrick. 2010. *Claude Levi-Strauss: The Poet in the Laboratory*. Penguin.
- Wong, Laura Elizabeth. 2008. “Relocating East and West: UNESCO’s Major Project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values”. *Journal of World History* 19 (3): 349-

374.

Table 1 List of officials (only executive staff- grade 8 and above) employed at UNESCO's Social Science Department

<p>1947 (2 September 1947) *</p> <p>Arvid Brodersen (programme specialist) Norway</p> <p>Nathan Leites (programme specialist) USA</p> <p>Percival W. Martin (programme specialist) UK</p> <p>J Havet (programme specialist) France</p>
<p>1949 (January 1949)*</p> <p><u>General Office</u></p> <p>Arvid Brodersen (acting head of department) Norway</p> <p><u>Methods of political science</u></p> <p>Max Salvadori (programme specialist)</p> <p><u>Tensions Affecting International Understanding</u></p> <p>Otto Klineberg (director of project) USA</p> <p>PW Martin (programme specialist) UK</p> <p>Sripati Chandrasekhar (programme specialist) India (USA)</p> <p>Kathleen Kehoe (programme assistant) USA</p> <p>Marie Anne de Franz (technical assistant) Switzerland</p> <p><u>Studies of International Collaboration</u></p> <p>Jacques E. Godchot (programme specialist) France</p>

Kazimierz Szczërba-Likiernik (programme assistant) Poland
<p>1950 (as established 31 March 1950)</p> <p><u>Office of Director</u></p> <p>Robert C. Angell (director) USA</p> <p><u>Aid to International Scientific Collaboration</u></p> <p>Kazimierz Szczërba-Likiernik (programme specialist) Poland</p> <p>Georges Heuse (programme assistant) Belgium</p> <p><u>Studies of Social Tensions</u></p> <p>Robert C. Angell (programme specialist) USA</p> <p>Percival Martin (programme specialist) UK</p> <p>Pierre de Bie (programme specialist) Belgium</p> <p>Kathleen Kehoe (technical assistant) USA</p> <p>Marie Anne de Franz (technical assistant) Switzerland</p> <p><u>Studies of International Co-operation</u></p> <p>Walter Sharp (programme specialist) USA</p> <p>Jacques E. Godchot (programme specialist) France</p>
<p>1951 (as established 30 April 1951)</p> <p><u>Office of Director</u></p> <p>Alva Myrdal (director) Sweden</p>

Aid to International Scientific Collaboration

Kazimierz Szczërba-Likiernik (programme specialist) Poland

Samy Friedman (programme specialist) Egypt

Jacques E. Godchot (programme specialist) France

Studies of Social Tensions

Percival Martin (programme specialist) UK

Alfred Métraux (programme specialist) USA/Switzerland

Kathleen Kehoe (technical assistant) USA

Marie Anne de Franz (technical assistant) Switzerland

1952 (as established 30 September 1952)

Office of Director

Alva Myrdal (director) Sweden

Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière (deputy director) France

Aid to International Scientific Collaboration

Kazimierz Szczërba-Likiernik (programme specialist) Poland

Samy Friedman (programme specialist) Egypt

Marie Anne de Franz (programme assistant) Switzerland

Jacques E. Godchot (Social Science Officer- Cairo) France

Jan Versluys (Social Science Officer- New Delhi) The Netherlands

Applied Social Science

Franklin E. Frazier (head of division) USA

Alfred Métraux (programme specialist) USA/Switzerland

Herbert Phillips (programme specialist) UK

Pierre Coeytaux (programme specialist) Switzerland

Arne Hermann (programme assistant) Denmark

Leonardo Diaz-Gonzalez (programme assistant) Venezuela

Statistical Division

Bangne Liu (Head of Division) China

Roman Hofman (statistician) Czechoslovakia

Colin Ewers (statistician) Australia

Gustave Zakrzewski (statistical assistant) Argentina

Kia Chi Tsien (statistical assistant) China

Jacqueline Batt (statistical assistant) Canada

1953 (as established on 30 June 1953)

Office of Director

Alva Myrdal (director) Sweden

Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière (deputy director) France

Division - International Scientific Collaboration

Kazimierz Szczerba-Likiernik (head) Poland

Samy Friedman (programme specialist) Egypt

Marie Anne de Franz (programme assistant) Switzerland

Division - Applied Social Science

E. Franklin Frazier (head of division) USA

Alfred Métraux (programme specialist) USA/Switzerland

Herbert Phillips (programme specialist) UK

M.S. Stedman (programme specialist) USA

Pierre Coeytaux (programme specialist) Switzerland

Arne Hermann (programme assistant) Denmark

Leonardo Diaz-Gonzalez (programme assistant) Venezuela

Statistical Division

Bangne Liu (Head of Division) China

J. Garnier (statistician) France

Gustave Zakrzewski (statistical assistant) Argentina

C.D. Ewers (statistical assistant)

Science Co-operation Office in Cairo:

Jacques E. Godchot (Social Science Officer- Cairo) France

Science Co-operation Office in New Delhi:

Jan Versluys (Social Science Officer- New Delhi) The Netherlands

Regional Centre of UNESCO for the Western Hemisphere:

K. Forcart

1954 (as established 22 January 1954)

Office of Director

Alva Myrdal (director) Sweden

Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière (deputy director) France

Division - International Scientific Collaboration

Kazimierz Szczerba-Likiernik (programme specialist) Poland

Samy Friedman (programme specialist) Egypt

Marie Anne de Franz (programme assistant) Switzerland

Péter Lengyel (programme assistant) Australia

Field Staff

Jacques E. Godchot (Social Science Officer- Cairo) France

Jan Versluys (Social Science Officer- New Delhi) The Netherlands

Division - Applied Social Science

Otto Klineberg (head of division) USA

Alfred Métraux (programme specialist) USA/Switzerland

Herbert Phillips (programme specialist) UK

Stedman (programme specialist) USA

Pierre Coeytaux (programme specialist) Switzerland

Arne Hermann (programme assistant) Denmark

Leonardo Diaz-Gonzalez (programme assistant) Venezuela

Statistical Division

Bangne Liu (Head of Division) China

J. Garnier (statistician) France

Gustave Zakrzewski (statistical assistant) Argentina

C. Scott (statistical assistant) UK

Jacqueline Batt (statistical assistant) Canada

1956 (as established 1 October 1956)

Office of Director

T. H. Marshall (director) UK

Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière (deputy director) France

Field Staff

Jan Verluys (Deputy director research Institute- Calcutta) Netherlands

F Benet (Social Science Officer – Cairo) Spain

Division - International Scientific Collaboration

Kazimierz Szczerba-Likiernik (programme specialist) Poland

Samy Friedman (programme specialist) Egypt

K Forcart (programme specialist) Switzerland

Marie Anne de Franz (programme specialist) Switzerland

P. Henquet (programme assistant) France

Division - Applied Social Science

Alfred Métraux (head) USA/Switzerland

Herbert Phillips (programme specialist) UK

Jacques E. Godchot (programme specialist) France

V Radchenko (programme specialist) USSR

Arne Hermann (programme assistant) Denmark

H. Richard (programme assistant) Canada

S Nehalchand (programme assistant) India

Statistical Division

Bangne Liu (Head of Division) China

H Furgac (statistician) Turkey

M Babic (statistician) Yugoslavia

H Loewe (statistician) Germany

Jacqueline Batt (statistical assistant) Canada

A Pineda Espinosa (statistical assistant) Mexico

* Before 1950, there is no official list of department staff, however, we have been able to trace at least part of the official executive members of the department in 1948, using Anon. 1947. Geographical distribution of UNESCO Staff. CONS.EXEC./COM.NOM./1e SESS./5. In UNESCO, Paris, September 2. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001785/178543eb.pdf> and the inactive correspondence files. Edward Shils is not listed since he was an special consultant for the social sciences and therefore not a member of staff.