

Itineraries of the discourses on development and education in Spain and Latin America (circa 1950–1970)

Gabriela Ossenbach^{a*} and Alberto Martínez Boom^b

^a*Departamento Historia de la Educación, UNED, Madrid, Spain;* ^b*Doctorado Interinstitucional en Educación, Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Bogotá, Colombia*

(Received 30 April 2011; final version received 29 June 2011)

The rise during the 1950s of a discourse centred on *development*, together with the elaboration of the concept of *human capital*, led to an altogether new paradigm of economic modernisation. The expansion of education and professional training was now viewed as a key strategy for those countries wishing to join the developed world. As a result, educational systems, especially in the more “backward” countries, began to pursue objectives of a decidedly economic and social nature. The different theories of development were all in agreement that one of the most important tools for achieving these objectives, and one that would have a profound influence in the realm of education, was the implementation of planning policies.

The goal of this article is to approach the history of the relationship between development, education, and planning in Latin America between 1950 and 1970. After the Second World War, Latin America provided especially fertile ground for innovating and experimenting with a great variety of development strategies. We pay special attention to what was known as “integral planning of education”, a technique which later would spread, through the mediation of “experts”, from the periphery towards the centre, in other parts of the world. As a case study, we analyse the way in which the discourse on planning of education that emanated from Latin America at the end of the 1950s was the determining factor in the gestation of educational reform in Spain, which culminated with the General Law of Education of 1970.

Keywords: Latin America; Spain; planning of education; expert; development/underdevelopment

Introduction

In the 1950s, the emergence of discourses on *development* gave way to the creation of a representation of Latin America defined by deficiencies, misery and irrationality; in other words, by *underdevelopment*. Asia, Africa and even some of the more “backward” countries of Europe were also positioned within this new thinking.

It was within this complex situation that the theory of *human capital* was elaborated. This new paradigm of economic modernisation made educational expansion and professional formation one of the central strategies for transcending underdevelopment. Consequently, the educational systems, especially those in

*Corresponding author. Email: gossenbach@edu.uned.es

“backward” countries, were subservient to objectives, which were markedly economical and social.

The implementation of policies of planning was one of the most important instruments in which the theories of development coincided, and also affected education in a very significant way. It was the origin of an understanding of the underdeveloped countries as *raw material* which should be incorporated into certain processes of organisation and rationalisation. To that end, a series of mechanisms, organisms, and plans were created, as well as a complex network of experts and institutional consultants charged with the execution of policies and reforms. The pretension of planning development with similar criteria or indicators in different contexts generated great optimism about the possibilities for underdeveloped countries to come out of their backwardness. The planning was a technocratic-type discourse capable of creating consensus in all kinds of political regimes. In many countries of Latin America the name that was given to all these prospective strategies of planning was “planeación” or “planeamiento” – probably a way to distance themselves from the concept of planning known as “planificación”, which was a reference to the economies under Soviet influence.¹ The structural idea of this article is to approach the history of the relationship between development, education, and planning in Latin America in the period 1950–1970, during circumstances in which the processes of globalisation of the economy, communications and systems of schooling were being initiated. The starting point for our study is the ascertainment that after the Second World War, Latin America constituted a space for the origin of and experimentation with a great variety of strategies for development.² We will carefully study the so-called “integral planning of education”, a technique which later would spread from the periphery towards the centre, in other parts of the world. In other words, with regard to education we will try to follow the itineraries of the discourses of development and planning, to shed light not only on the vertical imposition on the part of the *metropolis* towards the *underdeveloped world*, but also especially on those processes which make a “round trip” and through which a collection of techniques of direction and mechanisms of power enter into a continuous circuit of recognition, analysis, rationalisation and production. We want to qualify and debate the positions which affirm that Latin America is a mere *invention* of the developed world, by demonstrating how much of the analysis and how many of the strategies of development emerged from the Latin American countries, not from a process of mere imposition, but through self-recognition of those values in Latin America. In this article, the excessive resolve of the proclaimed centre over the periphery is questioned, and we try to show the potential for reaction and the capacity for production of the Latin American countries.³

To corroborate our hypothesis we have chosen to study the way in which the discourses for planning of education generated at the end of the 1950s in Latin America were the determining factor in the gestation of the Spanish educational

¹Alberto Moncada, *La crisis de la planificación educativa en América Latina* (Madrid: Tecnos, 1982), 72 and 96.

²Joseph Hodara compares Latin America to a laboratory and affirms that “there is practically no subject on development [...] that can’t be studied, with reasonable benefits, in that laboratory”. Joseph Hodara, *Prebisch y la CEPAL. Sustancia, trayectoria y contexto institucional* (México: El Colegio de México, 1987), 15.

³We take the idea of “the potential for reaction against the imperial construction” from M. Hardt and A. Negri, “Lección 1: Del método histórico. Causalidad y periodización”, in *Guías. Cinco lecciones en torno a Imperio*, ed. A. Negri (Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós, 2004), 48.

reform which culminated with the General Law of Education of 1970, when the Franco dictatorship still subsisted. We take as our starting point the verification that in that period Spain and other Mediterranean countries were considered to be developing countries within the European context, and hence were the addressees and recipients of strategies for cooperation which were produced in very similar terms to those which were implemented in Latin America. In this sense, the policies of development initiated in Europe by the OECD, among other institutions, and the strategies for development generated in Latin America and other underdeveloped countries of the world converged in Spain in the 1960s. This was due to the actions of diverse international organisms and certain central characters which, in their roles as international experts, circulated between the centre and periphery proposing very similar “recipes” to conduct the processes of modernisation.

The creation of spaces for the circulation of the discourse on education and development

The situation in which discourse on development and underdevelopment arose, both in Latin America and in Europe, was characterised by the intensification of networks of international relations between the different political, social, and economic agents who interacted. At times they competed among themselves for similar goals or to recruit the same experts, generating interchanges and transferences which profoundly affected the educational systems of the whole world.⁴ The diffusion of a “semantics of modernisation”⁵ was possible thanks to the wide range of international organisations which became spaces for the production and circulation of discourse and interventions in the sphere of education. These interventions were based on knowledge and diagnosis produced with a declared vocation towards generalisation in the same international organisms.⁶ The intention of:

reproducing the characteristic features of the advanced societies of the era, high levels of industrialization and urbanization, bringing technology into agriculture, rapid growth of material production and standards of living, and the generalized adoption of education and modern cultural values all over the world⁷

sums up what was considered as “development” from that time on. Theories on economic growth and human capital, which began to circulate with great intensity in the decade of the 1950s, meant imbrications between education and economy by the explanation that the nations’ growth was partly due to technological changes, to

⁴See Eckardt Fuchs, “Networks and the History of Education”, *Paedagogica Historica* 43, no. 2 (2007): 185–97 about the concept of “network” and its usefulness for research in history of education.

⁵Cf. Jürgen Schriewer, “Sistema mundial y redes de interrelación: la internacionalización de la educación y el papel de la investigación comparada”, in *Globalización y descentralización de los sistemas educativos*, ed. Miguel Pereyra et al. (Barcelona: Pomares-Corredor, 1996), 28.

⁶As M. Caruso points out, the “intrinsic tendency of modern social systems to overcome boundaries removes spacial and political barriers and allows the emergence of common patterns of meaning across the world”. Marcelo Caruso, “World Systems, World Society, World Polity: Theoretical Insights for a Global History of Education”, *History of Education* 37, no. 6 (2008): 832.

⁷Arturo Escobar, *La invención del Tercer Mundo: construcción y deconstrucción del desarrollo* (Bogotá: Norma, 1998), 19–20.

the accumulation of knowledge, and to job qualification. The productive capability of the individual was designated by the concept of “human capital”, and incremented by a series of elements, among which education stood out.

One of the aspects which played a fundamental role in the origin of the discourses on development was the reconstruction of Europe after the Second World War. The creation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in 1944, as well as the Marshall Plan of 1947, were an answer to the necessity of creating mechanisms to guarantee a framework for stable and sustainable economic development in order to avoid a new world war. In the 1950s both the World Bank and the IMF, whose creations represented the beginning of the economical multilateralism of the post-war era, began to reorient their activity toward financing policies of development in the countries of the so-called underdeveloped world. Countries whose decolonisation started in the mid-1940s were also included.⁸ Toward similar ends, the United Nations, created in 1945, entrusted its Economic and Social Council to be vigilant about the economic and social progress of its members. In general, the need to resolve the backwardness in some way was one of the reigning preoccupations of the circles of economic power after World War II. In his inaugural speech as President of the United States on 20 January 1949, Harry Truman set off the alarm. According to him, half of the world’s population lived in conditions of poverty and misery. The North American dignitary considered that their “primitive and stagnant” economic life was “a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas”. Truman proclaimed himself benefactor of “peace-loving peoples”, and put all “benefits of the store of technical knowledge” of the United States at the disposal of those who aspired to a better life.

What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair-dealing [...] Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge, he added.⁹

UNESCO, created in 1946 in the heart of the UN, was the only international organism created immediately after the war with the purpose of carrying out specific policies of intervention in the field of education. Nevertheless, the proliferation of the theory of human capital paved the way for many other international organisms, in time, to include strategies in the educational field among their objectives, while at the same time UNESCO collaborated with other international organisms committed to policies of economic and social development. UNESCO designed its

⁸See Aina Tarabini, “El Paper del Banc Mundial en Educació: la Història d’una Creixent Hegemonia”, *Educació i Història. Revista d’Història de l’Educació* 13 (2009): 74–6.

⁹Harry Truman, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States* (Washington: General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Service, Office of the Federal Register, 1964). Available at <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=1030&st=&st1> (accessed 8 November 2010). Cited by Arturo Escobar in *La Invención del Tercer Mundo*, 19.

policies of support for underdeveloped countries with regional characteristics and established specific plans for Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Arab countries.¹⁰

Nevertheless, in Latin America the discourses that had a bearing on the unequal relationship between the developed and the underdeveloped worlds had had their own expressions prior to the Second World War, when the worldwide economic crisis of 1929 spoiled the style of economic growth based on the export of raw materials and the import of goods manufactured by the industrialised countries. The policies of “substitution of imports” and the processes of industrialisation implemented in some Latin American countries from that time on gave way to a severe questioning of the reigning neoclassical economic theories and to the construction of alternative theoretical interpretations of the economic development of Latin America, as well as the first usages of the concepts of “centre” and “periphery”. The Argentinian economist Raul Prebisch (1901–1986), who held the position of Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America (CEPAL) between 1950 and 1963, was the most influential theorist in this line. Prebisch coined the term “dependent or peripheral capitalism”, which was considered a model for Latin America by many specialists of the time, and which enjoyed widespread international circulation and an important reception from the international organisms.¹¹ From CEPAL, the organism which accorded Prebisch the legitimacy and the resources of the United Nations, he encouraged the awakening of a new discipline or field of study that came to be called “political economy of development”, and which recruited a notable number of Latin American economists and social scientists and promoted the creation of some of what came to be the most influential organisms, like the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the Latin American Institute of Social and Economic Planning (ILPES), created in 1962. The approaches made fertile in CEPAL became universal, especially in the space of the Third World, through the Conference of the United Nations on Commerce and Development (UNCTAD), of which Prebisch was the first General Secretary, between 1964 and 1969.¹²

¹⁰The policies that UNESCO undertook were the cause from the start of obstacles, resistance and contradictions, due among other things to the differences in cultures and language, as well as a lack of knowledge of the needs, interests and most adequate methods for acting in the countries which were the recipients of its programmes. J. Watras’ critical article “UNESCO’s Programme of Fundamental Education, 1946–1959”, *History of Education* 39, no. 2 (2010): 219–37, contrasts with the hagiographic version of the work of UNESCO that M. Omoleva offers in “UNESCO as a Network”, *Paedagogica Historica* 43, no. 2 (2007): 211–21, as Omoleva doesn’t even address the complex problem of “imposition” in the “underdeveloped” countries of educational strategies conceived in more developed countries. From J. Watras see also “The New Education Fellowship and UNESCO’s Programme of Fundamental Education”, *Paedagogica Historica* 47, nos. 1–2 (2011): 191–205.

¹¹In 1948 Prebisch gave a famous speech to the Economic and Social Council of United Nations about “The Development of Latin America and some of its Principal Problems”, which thrust him into the position of director of CEPAL in 1950. This speech has been considered his “doctrinaire manifesto”, a pronouncement in which Latin America “intended to reveal a long desired intellectual independence [...] especially with respect to North American hegemony” (Joseph Hodara, *Prebisch y la CEPAL*, 13). For Anibal Pinto the projection of CEPAL throughout Latin America produced a knowledge and unprecedented rapprochement among all the countries in the region, a “Latin Americanisation” that created a radically new panorama. Cf. “Exposición del Profesor Aníbal Pinto a raíz de la concesión del Premio Iberoamericano de Economía Raúl Prebisch”, *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Revista de Economía Política*, 20 (1991): 314–5.

¹²See F. Alburquerque (ed.), *Raúl Prebisch* (Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica, 1989), 18–19.

The economic reconstruction, the fight against poverty and backwardness, and the questioning of relations between the centre and the periphery of the world were not, however, the only leitmotifs of the international organisms determined to apply the theories of development in the 1950s and 1960s in Latin America. We cannot help but mention the creation of some other networks with initially different aims, in which the discourse of development also circulated. The Cold War and the will of the United States to maintain its influence over the countries of Latin America were crucial factors in the region, especially after the Cuban Revolution of 1959, whose expansion over the continent was to be avoided at any cost. The Organization of American States (OAS) which had been created in 1948 according to the principles of Pan Americanism, but with the important hegemony of the United States – and especially the programme *Alliance for Progress*,¹³ promoted by the Kennedy Administration from 1961 in the heart of the OAS – advocated decisively for development policies that were meant to halt the spread of socialism on the continent through strategies of economic and social modernisation.

Finally, another framework of relations that cannot be underestimated was that which was established thanks to Spain's eagerness to strengthen the ties of *Hispanidad* and the Iberian community as elements of great importance for the ideological discourse of national affirmation of the Francoist dictatorship. The celebration in Madrid in 1949 of the I Inter-Iberoamerican Congress of Education and the creation in 1951 of the Office of Iberoamerican Education (OEI), adhered to the Institute of Hispanic Culture, were the beginning of a series of international actions in which the discourse on education and development ended up becoming installed in a dominant way.¹⁴

For its part, the theories of development became increasingly widespread in Europe through the Organisation for Cooperation and Economic Development (OECD), which began to function in 1961 and which, as part of its goals for the expansion of worldwide commerce, also carried out policies of cooperation with underdeveloped countries under the conviction that "to transmit knowledge and experience, acquired in Western countries, to developing countries is one of the means for obtaining economic expansion".¹⁵ For our study it is relevant that at the beginning of the 1960s the OECD initiated plans directed at the less developed countries in Europe which were the object of a diagnosis based on statistical criteria which was similar to that implemented by the other international organisms for the

¹³The *Alliance for Progress* was a 10-year plan for economic aid (1961–1970) approved in August of 1961 at the Conference of Punta del Este (Uruguay) and adhered to by all the member states of the OAS, with the exception of Cuba, who abstained during the voting. The United States would contribute half of the total aid, while the other half would be contributed by international financial institutions, member countries of OECD, and the private sector.

¹⁴Instituto de Cultura Hispánica, *Estatutos de la Oficina de Educación Iberoamericana* (Madrid, 1951), 11. The initial goals of the OEI, in which Brazil, Portugal and the Philippines also participated, were, among others: participate as a regional organism in other institutions of international character such as UNESCO or OAS, create systems for convalidating studies among the countries of Iberoamerica and carry out comparative studies of the educational systems of the member countries. Cf. OEI, *Acta Final del Segundo Congreso Iberoamericano de Educación (Quito, Octubre de 1954)* (Madrid: Secretaría General de la OEI, 1954); OEI, *Balance de Actividades durante el quinquenio 1964–1968* (Madrid: OEI, 1969), mimeo.

¹⁵OECD, *Problemas de planificación de recursos humanos en América Latina y en el Proyecto Regional Mediterráneo: la previsión a largo plazo de las necesidades de mano de obra y las políticas educacionales. Trabajos del Seminario realizado en Lima en marzo de 1965 y documentos complementarios* (Paris: OECD, 1967), 2.

analysis of the situation of the so-called underdeveloped world. The Regional Mediterranean Project is one example. It was developed in 1963 and designed for Spain, Portugal, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey, “a group of countries with relatively similar problems, who are members of the Organization”.¹⁶ The project proposed doing a study of the necessities of qualification of labour in each of these countries, which would permit them to be able to undertake a better preparation of “human resources” for the benefit of economic and social development. The discourse on development and the “methods of international confrontation” were then totally assumed by this European organism. It would also become important in Latin America by collaborating with the financing of the *Alliance for Progress* programme and sharing its advances in policies for training human resources in Mediterranean countries.¹⁷

Development and planning: the creation of a need and the emergence of the function of “expert”

Since the 1950s the history of development has also been the history of the institutionalisation of, and the increasingly penetrating deployment of, planning.¹⁸ For development theorists and strategists, it was a question of configuring a type of society whose objectives would be linked to a rationality oriented towards the future in a scientific-objective manner. Planning meant believing that social transformations could be produced at will; hence, they could be manipulated, directed and controlled.¹⁹ Thanks to this idea, statistics and research supported by same became the principal sources for establishing the truth as verified by data: “[O]ne of the aspects of greatest importance in planning is that which refers to the surveys and statistics, the true starting point for all planning”.²⁰ It would seem correct to assume

¹⁶Each of the countries participating in this project drew up a national report, which was published by the OECD, *Le Projet Régional Méditerranée: rapports par pays* (Paris: OECD, 1965), 6 volumes. The report on Spain was published in Spanish by the Ministerio de Educación Nacional and was titled *Las necesidades de educación y el desarrollo económico social de España. Proyecto Regional Mediterráneo* (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional-OECD, 1963).

¹⁷Cf. OECD, *Problemas de planificación de recursos humanos en América Latina y en el Proyecto Regional Mediterráneo*, 23.

¹⁸Cf. Alberto Martínez Boom, *De la escuela expansiva a la escuela competitiva. Dos modos de modernización en América Latina* (Barcelona: Ed. Anthropos/Convenio Andrés Bello, 2004), 63.

¹⁹CEPAL believed that Latin American governments should become actively involved in assuring the application of the necessary resources for industrial growth, by means of appropriate public policies and development programmes. This doctrine was outlined in an important analysis published by CEPAL in 1953 titled *Introducción a la técnica de programación (Introduction to programming technique)*. See F. Albuquerque (ed.), *Raúl Prebisch*, 18 and Celso Furtado, “Transnacionalización e Monetarismo”, *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Revista de Economía Política*, 1 (1982): 20. In 1962 CEPAL created the Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES) in Santiago de Chile, which included a section for planning for education. The ILPES was a consequence of the *Alliance for Progress*, and was headed by Raúl Prebisch from 1969 to 1973. CEPAL and ILPES were “the first promoters of planning policy and the new planning spirit”, holding meetings, publishing documents and giving courses “for the benefit of this movement” (Alberto Moncada, *La crisis de la planificación educativa en América Latina*, 81).

²⁰Gabriel Betancur, *Documentos para la historia del planeamiento integral de la educación* (Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 1984), vol. 1, 25.

that the discourse on development was based on the discourse of planning because, in fact, both discourses converged in such a way that it was impossible to think that development was unplanned: naivety, improvisation and governmental spontaneity had to be eliminated at any cost. Planning was the instrument through which development became useful, and was linked directly to politics and to the State.

Consequently, the establishment of so-called “national plans of development”, with their corresponding bureaucratic structures, was a strategy that spread worldwide, and planning became a necessary prerequisite for the financing of all types of activities of international cooperation.²¹ The international organisms were entrusted to set off this regime of proven principles, and international technical cooperation gave way to an enormous proliferation of institutions, procedures, and agencies whose goal was to propose investigations, diagnosis, solutions and formulas for financing. In this way, a thick network of experts and consultants was established – a sort of institutional architecture which built knowledge, which generalised its analyses, and which unified the rationalisation of the problems and solutions.²² At the same time, all these “expert” interventions contributed to generalise far-reaching transformations which put the emphasis on “learning” and not on “education” or “teaching” as the strategy for the solution of the problems of development. The knowledge, the competence and, in short, the employable learning results were defined as the central capital which should be obtained through the educational systems. This new paradigm, which characterised the expansion of schooling, became a strategic objective of government policies which were able to also substantially modify the way in which the self-realisation and self-government of individuals was understood.²³

The expert, as the intermediary who circulated the discourses of planning, learning and development on a worldwide scale, should be understood as a faceless function or a position. Although it is possible to track down the presence of many names and faces of international experts who reappeared constantly in different

²¹The *Alliance for Progress*, for example, was an agreement that helped to promote and encourage planning in Latin America, made possible by the United States’ pledge – formalised in Punta del Este in 1961 – to provide a generous flow of loans to countries that came up with wide-ranging development programmes. This led several countries to establish planning offices whose main purpose was to draw up these plans. The *Alliance for Progress* adopted much of CEPAL’s philosophy, while ILPES took charge of providing personnel training, preparing people in different countries for the tasks of carrying out diagnoses, creating projects and plans, developing programmes for different sectors and performing other work necessary for obtaining resources. Cf. E. García d’Acuña, “Pasado y futuro de la planificación en América Latina”, *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Revista de Economía Política*, 2 (1982), 17.

²²“While it is true that on the one hand international governments provide individual state governments with a pre-established framework of continued dialogue, facilitating the voluntary cooperation between its members, it is also reasonable to expect that the circumscription/inscription of international relations within the system of a predetermined network would encourage the expansion and control of specific strategies at an international level”. M.R. Breitman, “El impacto de los organismos internacionales en la escolarización: el campo de las políticas para la educación primaria en Brasil”, *Revista de Estudios del Currículum*, 1 (1998): 115.

²³Concerning the paradigm of “learning” see, among others, Alberto Martínez Boom, *De la escuela expansiva a la escuela competitiva*, and M. Simons and J. Masschelein, “The governmentalization of learning and the assemblage of a learning apparatus”, *Educational Theory* 58, no. 4 (2008): 391–415.

places, organisms and positions during the period that we are studying, we wish to emphasise the viewpoint of that function. Only by depersonalising the expert can one derive analyses of this order: prior to his arrival, the expert already knows what the diagnosis will be; he has no need to observe the diversity of the territories – the diagnosis will create the problem and he will declare that he has discovered it. It is not an exaggeration to point out what remains of this technology in the field of knowledge: a broad comparative order that involves the taxonomy of countries with similar diagnoses and solutions operating in diverse ways.

Educational planning: rationalisation of action. Its origin and development in Latin America

If at the beginning the strategies of development were marked by a perspective which was essentially based on economy, wherein the theory of human capital led to interest in education, a rapid deployment towards social concerns made it possible for education to be subject to a set of new definitions as to the order of its significance, its goals and its procedures. Education went from being a specifically national problem to becoming an essential component of the new world order. This worldwide phenomenon, which included the developed countries as well as the underdeveloped ones, materialised in the accelerated and dizzying expansion of the educational systems, propitiated by the processes of modernisation, the appearance of new educational theories, and the growing importance of science and technology, but also due to demographic increases. In Latin America, in particular, the population corresponding to basic schooling – preschool, primary, and junior high – which included children between the ages of 5 and 14, increased by approximately 19 million persons between 1960 and 1970, from almost 54 million to 73 million.²⁴ The objective of the expansion of the school systems also entered into the logic of planning, with the consequent proliferation of international experts and programmes of international cooperation in the area. In fact, the belief that education could be planned contributed, without a doubt, to solidification of the discourse on development.

The first inklings of planning in the field of education came exclusively in the sphere of the calculation of the need for labour for the incipient processes of industrialisation. Planning for school systems as a whole was a process that came later and in which social objectives played an important role, as did the creation of labourers at the service of the economy. In that way, for example, the World Bank's first prospective studies on underdeveloped countries were studies about the need for "human resources".²⁵ Colombia was one of the countries about which a mission of the World Bank (Currie Mission) made a pioneering economic report in 1951. Among its recommendations was the elaboration of a plan for technical and professional training oriented to boosting industrial development.²⁶ In the same way in Europe, the Regional Mediterranean Project promoted by OECD in 1961 proposed studying the need for preparation of human resources in the participating countries,

²⁴UNESCO-OREALC, *Evolución reciente de la educación en América Latina* (Santiago de Chile: OREALC, 1974), 5.

²⁵Cf. Aina Tarabini, "El paper del Banc Mundial en educació".

²⁶Cf. L. Currie, *Bases de un Programa de Fomento para Colombia. Informe de una Misión* (Bogotá: Banco de la República, 1951, 2nd. ed.).

while looking towards the horizon of 1975, at a moment when planning of education was admittedly still “nearly virgin territory”.²⁷

The most all-encompassing idea for educational planning emerged in Latin America at the end of the 1950s and became known as *integral planning of education*. In the words of Colombian Gabriel Betancur Mejía, who had already foreseen the postulates of the theory of human capital in his country, integral planning of education “responds to the consciousness that education is the fundamental base for the economic, social and cultural development of peoples, as it possesses the greatest cultural and economic multiplier of progress”.²⁸ The reference to integral planning alluded on the one hand to the necessity of covering the entire educational process, and on the other hand to the imperative that any educational plan must be inserted into general plans for development, as well as taking into account the exogenous factors which influence education. Betancur, one of the most important ideologues of this current of thinking, said that the study of the educational system in the face of the goals of national plans of development led him to conclude that there had been a

divorce between education and the reality of the country, which permitted integral planning of education to be conceived as a technique to link research, administration and financing, to achieve quantitative and qualitative goals which would guarantee that education be a dynamic factor in integral development.²⁹

The current of integral planning of education had its origin in Lima in 1956, where the Second Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education, convoked by the OAS, and the Regional Conference of UNESCO on Free and Compulsory Education in Latin America coincided. In this situation the “Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America” of UNESCO, conceived as a 10-year plan for the extension and improvement of primary education in the region, was developed. These international meetings held in 1956 were attended by a series of experts whom we will see appear in almost all international forums on the subject in the following decades. The needs of planning of the educational systems were proclaimed, generating a trend that would have a strong impact not only on Latin America but also on the rest of the world. The Colombian Minister of Education at the time, Gabriel Betancur Mejía, and

²⁷Ministerio de Educación Nacional, *Las necesidades de educación y el desarrollo económico-social de España. Proyecto Regional Mediterráneo*, 7. This report on Spain makes mention of the fact that the team which carried out the study regarding the needs for formation of human resources was made up of economists and statisticians (pp. 8–9). The director of the project’s Spanish team, Joaquín Tena Artigas, had been in charge of the UNESCO Statistics Division between 1954 and 1956 (Spain joined UNESCO in 1953).

²⁸Gabriel Betancur, *Documentos para la historia del planeamiento integral de la educación*, vol. 1, 13. In 1942 Betancur, who served twice as Colombia’s Education Minister in the 1950s and 1960s, studied Economics at Syracuse University (United States), where his thesis dealt with a project for financing advanced studies abroad. This project would see its fruition in the Instituto Colombiano de Crédito Educativo y Estudios Técnicos en el Exterior (ICETEX) (Colombian Institute of Educational Credit and Foreign Technical Studies), which was created in Colombia in 1950 and had Betancur as its first director. This experience proved to be an initiation in the ideas of integral planning of education for Betancur, and, in his own words, led to his promoting the idea that “education is not an expense, but rather an investment”. Gabriel Betancur, “El crédito educativo y la educación como factor esencial en la integración latinoamericana”, *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Educación* (Buenos Aires), 36 (1998): 5–10.

²⁹Gabriel Betancur, “El crédito educativo y la educación como factor esencial en la integración latinoamericana”, 8.

Carlos Lacalle, the Uruguayan representative of the OEI,³⁰ were two of the most important figures in Lima who advocated the extension of primary education on the continent according to strict processes of rationalisation and planning. They recommended that these plans be coordinated with plans for economic and social improvement. Among the recommendations that emanated from said meetings was encouragement that the participating countries should promote “public interest in education and the consciousness that the best investment that could be made by both the State and individuals, is in education”.³¹ Earlier Colombian experience with the creation in 1950 of the Institute for Credit for Education and Technical Studies Abroad (ICETEX), as well as the elaboration of a plan for technical and professional training recommended by the World Bank, were key to the creation of the idea of integral planning for education, according to Spaniard Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, who had collaborated on these Colombian initiatives between 1952 and 1955:

As a consequence of [the elaboration of a plan for technical and professional education in Colombia] I could perceive the urgent necessity that existed to study the situation of other levels and methods of teaching in order to simultaneously program and aid the expansion and improvement of education together with the administration and financing of the educational system, related not only to economic development, but also to the social progress of the country. Consequently, I also recommended [...] general planning of the development of education in Colombia, in tune with the proposal of the ex Secretary of the Presidency of the Republic, Gabriel Betancur Mejía, and influenced no doubt by the thesis of the President of the Economic Commission of the United Nations for Latin America (CEPAL), Raul Prebisch, who in those years advocated economic planning for the Western countries.³²

It is not surprising that after that meeting in Lima, the Colombian experts would become major protagonists of all the international forums dedicated to questions of planning in education, nor that the first pilot experience of integral planning of education (I Five-Year Plan of Education, supported by UNESCO) was initiated in Colombia just one year later (1957). Díez Hochleitner also held positions of great responsibility in this first five-year Colombian plan.³³

³⁰The OEI became a member of the Consulting Committee of the First Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America. Cf. D. Albizua, *La OEI en el contexto de la educación para el desarrollo en Iberoamérica, I Reunión Iberoamericana sobre Educación para el Desarrollo. 22–26 November 1982 (SISBER-82)* (Madrid: Oficina de Educación Iberoamericana, 1982): 10, mimeo.

³¹“Declaración de Lima. Recomendaciones aprobadas por la Segunda Reunión Interamericana de Ministros de Educación. Lima, mayo de 1956”, in *Documentos para la historia del planeamiento integral de la educación*, ed. Gabriel Betancur, vol. introductorio, 15.

³²Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970. Datos para una crónica”, *Revista de Educación* (Special Issue: *La Ley General de Educación veinte años después*, 1992): 262.

³³The framers of this five-year plan were aware of what a pioneering effort it was from an international perspective. “In launching this first Quinquennial Education Plan – a huge undertaking, both in terms of its content and its scope – Colombia is providing the world with a decisive example of how to effectively approach educational problems and come up with solutions. The plan also demonstrates for the first time how economic planning techniques may be applied to a field as complex and delicate as is the realm of education”. Cf. G. Betancur, *Documentos para la historia del planeamiento integral de la educación*, vol. 1, 13. See also Ministerio de Educación Nacional, *La planeación educativa en Colombia, 1950–1986. Vol. II: Planes Nacionales de Desarrollo de la Educación* (Bogotá: Programa de Planeación Educativa Regional – PLANER, 1986).

One of the conclusions arrived at during the Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education held in Lima affirmed “that the American countries currently have quantitative and qualitative problems in the field of education, which can only be resolved in various stages and in a certain length of time”. The ministers recommended that all countries of the region prepare

an integral plan of education which would cover all educational levels, and in which teaching would be adapted at each level to the reality of the country. In addition, new facilities in terms of training for technical personnel would be foreseen.³⁴

The Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America would be incorporated into the programme of the General Conference of UNESCO meeting in New Delhi in 1956 at the end of the same year.³⁵ It would have subsequent repercussions in other regional spheres, which were also seeing the drawing up of programmes seeking to promote the development of primary education and the idea of educational planning in relation to economic and social development. (To this end, UNESCO organised a conference in Karachi in 1960 and another in Addis Ababa in 1961, which dealt with the Asian and African continents, respectively).

Another important consequence of the agreements reached at the meetings held in Lima in 1956 was the celebration in Washington of the First Inter-American Seminary on Integral Planning of Education, organised in 1958 by the OAS and UNESCO. At this seminary, the necessity of establishing educational planning in a broader framework wherein it would be linked to processes of development was reaffirmed. The need for the countries of the region to create national offices of educational planning was insisted upon, and the necessity of training specialists in planning was emphasised.

The yarn that began to be spun around the planning of education was more or less of the following warp: for each problem a solution, and for each solution a new set of problems. The basic principle was that improvisation could be resolved through planning, and this implied a problem for the staff member in charge of planning. The solution to this problem was consulting an external expert or one from the international community of technical cooperation, since “in some countries of Latin America there is a lack of personnel specialized in the field of financing education” or “to organize indispensable services of academic and professional services”.³⁶ The First Inter-American Course of Integral Planning was held in Bogota in 1959 for this task.

All these initiatives in favour of integral planning of education were reinforced by the plans for development in education created in the framework of the *Alliance for Progress* programme, which began in 1961. One of its most important manifestations took place during the Conference on Education and Economic and Social Development held in Santiago de Chile in 1962, organised by UNESCO, OAS, and CEPAL, which began at that time to collaborate closely with these organisms, expanding their concerns to the educational area and dealing in depth with the idea of the integration of educational plans with those of economic and social development. José Blat

³⁴“Declaración de Lima. Recomendaciones aprobadas”, 13.

³⁵UNESCO, *Records of the General Conference. Ninth Session, New Delhi, 1956. Resolutions* (Paris: UNESCO, 1957), 14–5.

³⁶“Conclusiones y recomendaciones del Primer Seminario Interamericano sobre Planeamiento Integral de la Educación. Washington, 1958”, in *Documentos para la historia del planeamiento integral de la educación*, ed. Gabriel Betancur, vol. introductorio, 79 and 97.

Gimeno, a UNESCO expert who was at that time Secretary for UNESCO's Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America, pointed out that this conference "gave a great doctrinal and pragmatic impulse, to orientation, priorities and the actions which educational policies in the region should follow", thanks to, among other things, the fact that for the first time the Ministers of Education and Economic Planning of Latin America met, opening the door to "dialogue... between educators, economists and sociologists (that) has established the basis for collaboration that already has gone uninterrupted".³⁷ The enthusiasm that the integral planning of education inspired at the time is reflected in the following words of another UNESCO expert in those years:

At this time the birth of a new style for the analysis of educational problems on the Continent took place; here a new pedagogy, based on the purest objectivity in the analysis of facts based on indicators, was born with the goal of formulating a diagnosis of the situation and so be able to plan the phases of development on a firm foundation. It was a sustained, systematic, silent, and coherent labour, without prejudices, propaganda or slogans; the scientific method applied to the analysis of the educational systems was the birth of Pedagogy of Integral Planning of Education.³⁸

Our purpose, however, is not to enumerate the numerous international meetings and groups of experts that tackled the need for planning the development of education in Latin America during the 1950s and 60s. In this period one can observe how many international organisms pursue the same goals and coincide in the themes of their meetings or training courses, and how a relatively small group of experts who carried out tasks for one or another organism circulated both within and outside of Latin America, which made the circulation of these ideas on a worldwide scale possible. At the same time, the countries of Latin America were creating a series of organisms and government bureaus (offices, sub secretaries, departments, directions, etc.) with the aim of diagnosing the conditions of the educational sector, registering statistics, coordinating consultancies, studies, and proposals, elaborating plans, evaluating policies, exercising control of schools, designing budgets, and finally, optimising and improving the quality of education. All of this gave way to a "wave" of educational reforms all over the continent.³⁹

By 1960, UNESCO had internationally established the idea and the necessity of extending integral planning of education worldwide. In its 11th International Conference, held in Paris, it invited the Member States:

to pay special attention to the requirements of overall planning and administration of education, embracing school and out-of-school education, within the framework of national social and economic development plans, and to this end to provide for the

³⁷José Blat Gimeno, *La educación en América Latina y el Caribe en el último tercio del siglo XX* (Paris: UNESCO, 1981), 29–32.

³⁸Alejandro Covarrubias, *Proyecciones de la pasión de enseñar* (Santiago de Chile: Editorial J. Almendros "Orbe", 1975), 41.

³⁹Ferrán Ferrer, "Planificación del sistema educativo", in *Planificación, financiación y evaluación de los sistemas educativos iberoamericanos*, ed. L. Pereyra, F. Ferrer, and S. Pérez (Madrid: OEI, 1998), 43. See also Alberto Martínez Boom, *De la escuela expansiva a la escuela competitiva*, and Gabriela Ossenbach, "Génesis histórica de los sistemas educativos", in *Génesis, estructuras y tendencias de los sistemas educativos iberoamericanos*, ed. J. L. García Garrido, G. Ossenbach, and J.M. Valle (Madrid: OEI, 2001), 13–60.

establishment or improvement of adequate national machinery and for the proper training of personnel concerned with educational planning and administration.⁴⁰

At the same time some of the most outstanding promoters of integral planning of education in Latin America began to hold directive positions in international organisations, which served as a platform for them to spread these new strategies for educational development. The Colombian Gabriel Betancur was named Subdirector General of Education for UNESCO in 1962, at a moment when this international organism had initiated a programme of educational planning on a worldwide scale, sending numerous missions of technical aid to help develop primary and secondary education in Asia, Africa and the Arab countries.⁴¹ Spaniard Ricardo Díez Hochleitner was named head of this programme. Together with Gabriel Betancur Mejía, he had been one of the main persons responsible for the organisation in Latin America of two events of great importance mentioned previously: the First Inter-American Seminary on Integral Planning of Education (Washington, 1958) and the First Inter-American Course on Integral Planning (Bogotá, 1959). In 1963 the World Bank also created a Department of Investment in Education, where Díez Hochleitner introduced ideas about educational planning which he had helped develop in Latin America.⁴²

In Paris in the same year, UNESCO, together with the World Bank and with an economic contribution from the Ford Foundation, created the International Institute for Planning of Education (IIPPE), which aimed to aid Member States of UNESCO in finding methods that the Ministries of Education could apply in close relation with the services of economic planning and training experts in educational planning. As its first activity, in 1964, the Institute realised a seminary on the general problems of planning for education that were being presented in Latin America. The seminary was “an occasion to present the Latin American problems to a worldwide forum”.⁴³ Directing the Institute was Philip Coombs, advisor to President Kennedy in the sphere of education, who had, along with Díez Hochleitner, played an important role in the elaboration of the *Alliance for Progress* programme’s 10-year plan for education in Latin America. In 1965, in the notes of a meeting held in Lima to exchange experiences between the people responsible for the Mediterranean Regional Project of the OECD and various organisms of Latin American, it was recognised that:

the Latin American countries have taken, in the heart of organizations [that depend on the United Nations and the Organization of American States] a number of initiatives in the fields of educational policy and planning of labour, and it is not by mere chance of history that Latin America in 1956 has been the first to launch the idea of planning for education.⁴⁴

⁴⁰UNESCO, *Records of the General Conference. Eleventh Session, Paris, 1960. Resolutions* (Paris: UNESCO, 1961), 20.

⁴¹According to the 11th General Conference of the UNESCO, this development programme for primary and secondary school was meant to come into effect in 1961–1962. *Ibid.*, 22–8.

⁴²Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 263–4.

⁴³Alberto Moncada, *La crisis de la planificación educativa en América Latina*, 100.

⁴⁴OECD, *Problemas de planificación de recursos humanos en América Latina y en el Proyecto Regional Mediterráneo*, 16.

The reception to the discourse on development and educational planning in Spain

The study of the reception in Spain to the strategies of the *integral planning for education* created at the end of the 1950s in Latin America tries to show not only the form in which the discourses of development circulated from the “periphery” towards some “central” countries, but also the importance of international influences in the gestation of the Spanish educational reform that culminated in the General Law of Education of 1970. This is an aspect that has hardly been taken into account by Spanish historiography covering the last phase of the Francoist dictatorship. Although the *technocratic* character of said reform has been underlined, the analyses have focused on questions of internal characteristics, like the emergence of a reformist group linked to the Catholic group *Opus Dei*, which, without questioning the lack of political freedoms, started a *sui generis* modernisation of the country in the 1960s.⁴⁵ We want to point out precisely how the discourses on development and planning gestated in the international forums of the era, while supposedly neutral and based on criteria or rational indicators, functioned in the modernisation of the educational system of a dictatorial regime which in the last decade of its existence entrusted its modernisation to the *technicians* or *experts* and not to the politicians.

Spain’s backwardness in relation to other European countries at the end of the 1950s was susceptible to being tackled through the development theories which emerged in diverse international forums after the end of the Second World War. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Spanish technocrats who undertook the modernisation of the country in the 1960s would look to the strategies of planning for development that were in vogue at the time. In fact, during those years the First Plan for Economic and Social Development for the years 1964–1967, which had been preceded by a report and recommendations from the World Bank, was approved.⁴⁶ This plan, which included a programme of investment in education, among others, coincided with participation in the aforementioned Regional Mediterranean Project (1961–1963), initiated by the OECD for Spain and other backward

⁴⁵See, for example, Manuel de Puelles, *Educación e ideología en la España contemporánea* (Madrid: Tecnos, 1999, 4th. ed.), 329–54; Agustín Escolano, *La educación en la España contemporánea. Políticas educativas, escolarización y culturas pedagógicas* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2002), 167–76; Antonio Viñao, *Escuela para todos. Educación y modernidad en la España del siglo XX* (Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2004), 71 and 80–81.

⁴⁶In 1959 the Spanish government initiated a Stabilizing Plan for the country’s economy that was backed up by credits from the European Organization for Economic Cooperation, the United States Government and the International Monetary Fund. As a result of this Stabilizing Plan and of the First Economic and Social Development Plan, by 1966 Spain had developed considerably, to the point where the OECD no longer considered it an underdeveloped country, but rather a country of “intermediate development”. It is worth noting that during these years the ideas espoused by CEPAL received considerable attention in Spain, where they were contemplated in the light of Spain’s particular economic problems. This is described by the Spanish economist Juan Velarde Fuertes in the first issue of the publication *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Revista de Economía Política*, sponsored by the Spanish Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana and CEPAL, whose editorial board was presided over by Raúl Prebisch himself. Cf. Juan Velarde Fuertes, “La revista desde la perspectiva española”, *Pensamiento Iberoamericano. Revista de Economía Política*, 1 (1982): 7. Regarding Spanish Development Plans from this era and the influence that international organisms had on them, see J. de la Torre and M. García-Zúñiga (eds.), *Entre el Mercado y el Estado. Los planes de desarrollo durante el franquismo* (Pamplona: Universidad Pública de Navarra, 2009).

countries of Europe with the goal of anticipating the need for human resources for their expansion of production. Through some approaches that were predominantly economical, in accordance with the theory of human capital, the Regional Mediterranean Project would contribute to putting the Spanish economy “at an equal level or, at least, one comparable to that of the most advanced countries”.⁴⁷ At the same time, those responsible for the project pointed out the necessity of close collaboration between the Ministry of National Education and the Commissioner of the Plan for Development to create services entrusted with gathering essential data on education:

data about the productivity of the system, the composition and qualifications of the teaching staff, the level of assistance, and the demand for higher level learning are essential for the planning of education. Logically, this service should work in cooperation with the National Institute of Statistics and the Commissioner of the Plan for Development.⁴⁸

Despite the Regional Mediterranean Project’s predominant emphasis on training manpower for the development of industry, the idea of integral planning for education with wider perspectives in respect to the whole of the educational system and to objectives of social character had circulated in Spain since the beginning of the 1960s. This was the result of the worldwide impulse that UNESCO began to give at that time to the strategy of integral planning of education. However, it was also produced by the effects of Spain’s participation in the Latin American forums where the idea was initially formulated, and as a result of its collaboration with the Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America.⁴⁹ The Course-Symposium on Integral Planning of Education, organised in 1962 by the Ministry of Education in collaboration with UNESCO, was greatly important to the introduction into Spain of integral planning of education. The aforementioned Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, in his post as Chief of the Planning Division of UNESCO, participated in the organisation and in the report of its conclusions. Joaquín Tena Artigas, former staff member in the Division of Statistics of UNESCO and director of the Spanish team of the Regional Mediterranean Project, was the director of the course. At that time, he held the position of General Director of Primary Education.⁵⁰ In the comprehensive document that contains the pro-

⁴⁷Ministerio de Educación Nacional, *Las necesidades de educación y el desarrollo económico-social de España*, 10–3.

⁴⁸Ibid., 16.

⁴⁹The Office of Iberoamerican Education (OEI), headquartered in Spain, was present at the international meetings held in Lima in 1956, while the Conferences of Latin American Education Ministers promoted by the OEI collaborated actively with UNESCO’s First Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America.

⁵⁰According to Alberto Moncada, Joaquín Tena had participated in the First Inter-American Seminary on Integral Planning of Education held in Washington in 1958 and mentioned above. See Alberto Moncada, *La crisis de la planificación educativa en América Latina*, 96.

gramme and a summary of the presentations and papers of this Course-Symposium, it is expressly recognised that “the idea of integral planning of education is formulated and recommended for the first time in [...] Lima in May of 1956, on the proposal of the Delegation of Colombia”, and some eloquent clarifications about the idea of the notion of planning are made:

the notion of planning can be found in the very origins of Western culture, among the efforts to subject the study of natural and social phenomena to scientific methods, in the aspiration to increase the capacity for provision of man and to deliberately contribute to the common welfare.

The old doctrine of “laissez-faire” has been surpassed by one which maintains that social progress should be favoured. This concept of accelerated social evolution contains in itself the idea of planning.⁵¹

We point out the activities of experts like Joaquín Tena Artigas, Ricardo Díez Hochleitner and José Blat Gimeno in the Spanish educational policies of the 1960s for the purpose of demonstrating how their function as “experts” played a role of fundamental mediation for the circulation and appropriation of the discourses on development and planning. A useful resource by which to investigate the itineraries of the new discourses is following the paths of these experts, through numerous “round trips”.⁵²

Ricardo Díez Hochleitner was, without a doubt, the most important figure in getting the Spanish educational reforms of 1970 started. In 1968 he was nominated the Technical General Secretary of the Ministry of Education, and shortly thereafter he became the Subsecretary for the same Ministry. Díez Hochleitner’s professional trajectory, which would consolidate his standing as an international expert in education, began in 1952 in Colombia, after which he held various positions in UNESCO, the OAS, and the World Bank, as mentioned earlier in this article. In 1954 he had his first encounter with those responsible for

⁵¹*La educación y el desarrollo económico-social. Planeamiento integral de la educación. Objetivos de España para 1970. Curso-Coloquio sobre Planeamiento Integral de la Educación* (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 1962), 191 and 193. The reference to the need for state intervention is important with regard to education, given that in the mid-1950s Spain had only just begun to overcome the *subsidiary* principle by which much of the responsibility for education had been delegated to the Catholic Church.

⁵²A number of autobiographical accounts of the protagonists of Spanish education reform in the 1970s (R. Díez Hochleitner, J. Blat Gimeno, J. Tena Artigas, E. Lázaro) can be found in the special issue of *Revista de Educación* (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia), published on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the reform: *La Ley General de Educación veinte años después* (1992), 261–306. José Blat Gimeno is also the author of a work that provides a wealth of data and opinions regarding the Latin American education policies of international organisms during this period: José Blat Gimeno, *La educación en América Latina y el Caribe en el último tercio del siglo XX*. Another fundamental source for following the trajectory of these experts is to be found in their publications during these years in the *Revista de Educación*, the official organ of Spain’s Education and Science Ministry. Díez Hochleitner himself presided on the Board of this periodical from 1969 on. Another biographical account providing information relevant to this article can be found in the membership speech given by the Colombian Gabriel Betancur Mejía in the Academia Nacional de Educación in Argentina on 3 December 1998. Cf. Gabriela Betancur, “El crédito educativo y la educación como factor esencial en la integración latino-americana”.

policies of education in Spain, when he was a member of the Colombian delegation to the Second Ibero-American Congress of Education organised by the OEI in Quito, and in 1955–6 he briefly held the position of General Inspector of Professional Industrial Training within the Spanish Ministry of Education. The steps which led him from one institution to another represent the historical conditions which permitted him to professionalise his knowledge as an expert and the ways in which his recommendations became institutionalised practices.⁵³ According to Joaquín Tena Artigas, Díez Hochleitner was the “motor” of the Spanish educational reform that culminated in the General Law of Education of 1970. Tena Artigas considered him to be a man of “excessive zeal and prominence”, who,

utilized, in a way which some considered abusive, his immediate previous experience as Director of the Division of Planning in UNESCO in first place, and afterwards in the Department of Education of the World Bank. There is no doubt that he had contacts and international relationships which were difficult to surpass. He knew how to take advantage of them and deservedly dazzled the Minister, whom as soon as he was able to, named him Subsecretary and entrusted him with the entire operation.⁵⁴

José Blat Gimeno, another international expert from UNESCO who had a great deal of experience in Latin America,⁵⁵ also played an outstanding role in the reforms in education in Spain as he was designated General Technical Vice Secretary of the Ministry of Education, subordinate to Díez Hochleitner, with whom he had already worked with in Colombia in the elaboration of the First Five-Year Plan for Education, as well as in various posts at UNESCO.

The Spanish education reforms of 1970, whose principal achievements were the establishment of general basic and compulsory schooling till age 14 as well as the creation of a coherent educational system which permitted continuity of studies in secondary school or vocational training in a generalised way, were developed decisively, using as a starting point the principles of integral planning of education – just as UNESCO had recommended at the International Conference on Planning of Education in Paris in 1968, which Díez Hochleitner attended as chief of the Spanish delegation.⁵⁶

⁵³Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 261–5.

⁵⁴Joaquín Tena Artigas, “Contestación al cuestionario de la *Revista de Educación* sobre la Ley General de Educación, veinte años después”, *Revista de Educación* (Special Issue: “La Ley General de Educación veinte años después”): 298 and 304.

⁵⁵As mentioned above, Blat Gimeno was Secretary of UNESCO’s First Major Project on the Extension of Primary Education in Latin America. Díez Hochleitner also surrounded himself with collaborators and advisors who had worked for the UNESCO, the OECD and the World Bank, as he himself describes in Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 272–3.

⁵⁶“Recomendaciones de la Conferencia Internacional sobre Planeamiento de la Educación” (Recommendations of the International Conference on Education Planning), *Revista de Educación* 201 (1969): 60–4. See also F. Soler Valero, “Estrategia de la planificación educativa (una experiencia española)”, *Revista de Educación* 210–211 (1970): 5–11. According to Díez Hochleitner, he placed an “emphasis on the need for a global reform of the entire educational system [...] a serious study of the situation of the sector, a program of prospective studies of the probable scenarios in a new, emerging society [...] as well as an educational planning”. Cf. Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 266.

A Cabinet of Planning, a National Centre for Data Processing and a Cabinet of International Technical Cooperation were created within the Ministry of Education and Science to serve the preparation of the reforms, and they linked the department “with the international activities in the sphere of growing interdependence which the world today demands”.⁵⁷ The discourse of educational planning circulated widely in media dedicated to Spanish educational policies and impregnated the official publication of the Ministry of Education (*Revista de Educación*). Abundant articles – many of them written by Díez Hochleitner himself – in which the idea of integral planning of education was a recurring theme appeared there in those years. It was seen as a way to achieve a profound transformation “in one of those moments in history” in which “profound mutations in society and civilization”⁵⁸ are produced. At the same time, the idea of international cooperation with the countries of Latin America was continually reiterated, as this was where integral planning of education “first saw the light of day”.⁵⁹

The preparation of the General Law of Education and Financing of the Reform of Education of 1970 was preceded by a diagnosis of the existing situation of education and of the corresponding economic, social and cultural indicators, as well as by a proposal for an updated educational system (*Libro Blanco*).⁶⁰ It was a procedure which corresponded to the functions and statute of the expert, who would precisely define the steps to be followed for the production of the model. It was essential to make a diagnosis as well as a plan in its totality, which would include prospective forecasts, the definition of an alternative policy, discussion of the confidential working documents of the members of the Ministry team, an invitation to the social communications media to generate public opinion, meetings for debate and negotiation with diverse social sectors and strata, systematic compilation of documents on comparative education, statistics and recommendations of international meetings on education, etc.⁶¹ Finally, as proof of the important international connections of those administering the reform, an International Committee of experts met in March and November of 1969 to report on their points of view regarding the *Libro Blanco*. It was presided over by Gabriel Betancur (Colombia); Phillip H. Coombs (USA), acting as reporter; H. Becker (West Germany); A. Bienayme (France); M. Coulon (Belgium); C. Chagas (Brazil); El-Koussy (Egypt); G. Gozzer (Italy); V. Lipatti (Romania); J. Perkins (USA); and J. Vaizey (United Kingdom), all of them long-time colleagues of Díez Hochleitner in the sphere of interna-

⁵⁷“Se han iniciado los trabajos para una amplia reforma del sistema educativo español” (“Work has begun on a widespread reform of the Spanish educational system”). Interview given by Ricardo Díez Hochleitner to the newspaper *Ya* and transcribed in the publication *Enseñanza Media. Revista de Información y Orientación Didáctica* 194 (October 1968): 1620. Díez Hochleitner also describes the organisation of courses, in partnership with the Silver Institute of Washington, for training directors of planning and administration of Universities. Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 270.

⁵⁸Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “Tendencias actuales en la evolución del sector educativo en España”, *Revista de Educación* 206 (1969): 54.

⁵⁹“Intervención de don Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, Subsecretario del Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, ante la Conferencia de Ministros de Educación y Ciencia de América Latina y el Caribe (Caracas, 3–15 de diciembre de 1971)”, *Revista de Educación* 218 (1971): 84.

⁶⁰This diagnosis, known as the *Libro Blanco* (*White Book* or “Road Map”), appeared under the title *La educación en España: bases para una política educativa* (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, 1969).

⁶¹Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 270–2.

tional educational activities and symbolic of those who were recognised as “experts” at the time. The creation of the Committee for International Cooperation was an activity approved by the General Conference of UNESCO of 1968 – surely due to the contacts that Díez Hochleitner had – within a programme of activities for cooperation with countries to which it did not normally concede technical assistance, due to their more advanced level of development.⁶² According to Blat Gimeno,

certain members of that Committee were of great value; however, if it is true that this type of meeting is very useful for treating certain subjects, it is of doubtful efficiency when dealing with unknown situations in sufficient depth. Today there is certain scepticism about the multiplicity of meetings which the same people continuously convene, where they interchange mutual praise, adopt general and vague conclusions and invariably finish with an agreement to meet again.⁶³

Taking into account the traditional isolation which persisted in Spain, and the position of the most conservative and nationalist sectors of the Franco regime despite the political openness of the 1960s, it is not surprising that some factions branded the new General Law of Education as foreign-sounding. In the face of these accusations, Díez Hochleitner reacted by commenting that the reform was “full of originality and adapted to the needs and specific reality of Spain”, while at the same time recognising that “the best experiences of the most developed and least developed countries” had been taken into account because it was necessary “to achieve a community of essential basic values and educational systems which would be as similar as possible [so that] nations could understand each other and not be divided”.⁶⁴ The allusion to the experiences of less developed countries was supposedly a reference to Latin America, but it also implied other initiatives with which Díez Hochleitner was familiar. These proceeded from Asia and Africa, as,

⁶²Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, *Informe sobre la Reforma Educativa en España. Documento presentado a la Conferencia de Ministros Iberoamericanos de Educación. III Reunión extraordinaria del Consejo Directivo de la OEI* (Madrid: MEC, 1970), 24. The conclusions of the Committee for International Cooperation were published under the following titles: “Informe Final del Comité de Cooperación Internacional para la Reforma de la Educación en España”, *Revista de Educación* 202 (1969): 58–64 and “II Reunión del Comité de Cooperación Internacional para la Reforma de la Educación en España”, *Revista de Educación* 205 (1969): 54–8.

⁶³José Blat Gimeno, “Apuntes sobre la elaboración y aplicación de la reforma educativa de 1968–1970”, *Revista de Educación* (Special Issue: “La Ley General de Educación veinte años después”): 292.

⁶⁴“Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, o una confesión de españolismo” (“Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, or the confessions of a Spanish sentiment”), Interview with Ricardo Díez Hochleitner by the newspaper *Arriba* and transcribed in the journal *Enseñanza Media. Revista de Información y Orientación Didáctica* 225 (December 1970): XVI and XVII. In this interview we can also find declarations that illustrate the author’s view on the function of experts, especially in the context of the final years of the Franco regime. Upon being asked ‘Do you consider yourself a technician or a politician?’, Díez Hochleitner responded: “It would be tragic for a man to have to be described as being exclusively a technician or exclusively a politician. I believe that we all have the obligation to be political. . . . There are nuances. The worst thing, and that which I would wish to avoid at all cost, is ‘petty politicking’, which I take to mean the use of political maneuvering for self-serving ends.” When asked ‘How then would you define “political”?’, he responded “It means being eager to serve your own country. And this is an obligation, a responsibility and an honour for all of us”. *Ibid.*, XX.

for example, the *Asian Model*, an economic measurement model designed in 1967 which was used in Spain to establish the flux of the population receiving schooling and the budgetary needs of the Ministry of Education, and the proposal for the creation of the National University of Distance Learning (UNED), which would be founded in Madrid in 1972, based on the experience of the National Correspondence University of Lusaka (Zambia).⁶⁵ The intensive international implication in this reform process made it possible for Spain to become a member of the Executive Committee of UNESCO in 1970, whose representative, naturally, was Díez Hochleitner.

Conclusions

The dense and extensive networks of international organisms and experts created from the 1940s through to the 1960s with the goal of the expansion of education in the world constituted a complex scenario which we have tried to penetrate, searching for a conductive thread that guides us along the itineraries that the discourses about education that emerged after the Second World War followed until becoming dominant worldwide. Their complexity, interconnectivity and internationalisation are some of the forceful ideas that we wanted to capture in this article. Our sources mostly consist of reports, recommendations, declarations, acts and a large amount of so-called “grey literature” which emanated from international organisms, as well as from the bureaucratic departments charged with the management and planning for the educational systems in Latin America and Spain at the time. We have tried to avoid making an excessive descriptive explanation of the distinct organisations or conceding undue prominence to some of the personalities who acted as experts in that period. This was difficult and perhaps was not wholly achieved. Therefore, as a conclusive synthesis, we would like to point out some of the findings which we think are worth studying in depth in subsequent investigations, which we hope will emerge from this first approach to the subject:

- (1) From 1950 to 1970, Latin America was not only the recipient of the new discourses which characterised the era, making it a privileged space for experimentation, but also generated ideas and currents which had a worldwide impact, such as those which refer to the integral planning of education.
- (2) The figure of the “expert” is a central theme for understanding this period of the history of education on a worldwide basis. Here we have defined him as the intermediary who made the worldwide circulation of discourses on development possible, and who, therefore, was a key player in the processes of expansion and reception of ideas and tendencies in all directions. Despite the fact that in our study many experts appear with their names and personal biographies present, it is possible to depersonalise the “function of expert” and study it as a characteristic and essential phenomenon of the new worldwide educational model.
- (3) Finally, a matter which has hardly been touched upon here is the form in which, in this era, new knowledge related to education was generated outside the traditional spheres of the Normal Schools and Universities. The interna-

⁶⁵Ricardo Díez Hochleitner, “La Reforma Educativa de la Ley General de Educación de 1970”, 267 and 274.

tional organisms and the new bureaucratic structures created in all countries to undertake planning for education were set up for the production and circulation of discourses and strategies that were generalised on a worldwide scale. In large part they displaced the traditional places where expert knowledge regarding education was legitimised (the academic culture). The “estrangement” of knowledge about education in respect to the empirical culture of the school became more pronounced during this period. A great part of what should occur in the schools was designed and prescribed based on indicators and statistical calculations, with the pretension of rationalising and homogenising solutions for problems in education on a worldwide level. Without a doubt, the dynamics of production and validation of knowledge proceeding from international agency services were very successful. In international congresses and through meetings of ministers, experts and intellectuals, consensus was created and documents of widespread coverage were produced which were organised as aids for administering regional and national public policies. These documents enjoyed such influence and importance that they were made out to be a system of truth about teachers, about the educational system, about rights and even about the general direction of development.

Notes on contributors

Gabriela Ossenbach is full professor of contemporary history of education at the National University of Distance Education (UNED), in Madrid. Her main research areas are the history of educational systems and school textbooks in Latin America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She is currently the director of the MANES Research Centre, based in the UNED, dedicated to the study and preservation of textbooks of Spain, Portugal, and Latin America in the last two centuries. Among her recent publications stand out the chapter “Education” in *Historia General de América Latina (General History of Latin America)*, (Vol. VII: 1870–1930) published by UNESCO (2008) and the edition of the special issue of the journal *Historia de la Educación* (Salamanca) on the theme “Education and empowerment processes in Latin America. On the Bicentennial of American Independences” (2010).

Alberto Martínez Boom is doctor of philosophy and education from the National University of Distance Education (UNED), in Madrid. He is a lecturer and a researcher at the National Pedagogical University (Universidad Pedagógica Nacional) of Bogotá (Colombia). He is also a founding and active member of the Research Group *Historia de las Prácticas Pedagógicas (History of Pedagogical Practices)* in Colombia. Among his recent publications stand out *Memorias de la Escuela Pública. Expedientes y planes de escuela en Colombia y Venezuela, 1774–1821* (2011); *Figuras Contemporáneas del maestro en América Latina* (2010); *Instancias y Estancias de la pedagogía. La pedagogía en movimiento* (2009); and *De la escuela expansiva a la escuela competitiva: dos modos de modernización educativa en América Latina* (2004).