

---

# RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

---

## A TALE OF TWO TRANSLATION PROGRAMS

Politics, the Market, and Rockefeller Funding for  
Latin American Literature in the United States  
during the 1960s and 1970s\*

*Deborah Cohn*

*Indiana University, Bloomington*

*Received 11-4-2004; Revise and Resubmit 2-11-2005;  
Revised Received 3-30-2005; Final Acceptance 4-5-2005*

We don't want to see the artistic and intellectual life used as a weapon in a cold war struggle, but we do feel that it is an essential part of the whole democratic spirit. . . . The artist necessarily must be a free man.

President John F. Kennedy to the founding  
members of the Inter-American Committee<sup>1</sup>

\* I am grateful to the Rockefeller Archive Center for the fellowship that allowed me to conduct research on this project, and to Erwin Levold for his assistance. I am also indebted to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for the fellowship that has given me time to conduct my research; any views, findings, or conclusions expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the NEH. I am also grateful to the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities at Vanderbilt University and to its director, Mona Frederick, for a fellowship that has been invaluable to my work on this project. Thanks to Suzanne Jill Levine, Alfred Mac Adam, Sophia McClennen, Dan Shapiro, Jon Smith, and Steve Stowe for their comments and other assistance with this essay.

1. Cited from The Inter-American Committee, Inc., founding documents, n.d., Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) Archives, series 3, box 271, folder 1, held by the Rockefeller Archive Center (henceforth RAC).

*Abstract: In the 1960s, the Cuban Revolution sparked great interest in Latin America throughout the United States. Not coincidentally, the promotion and translation of literature from Latin America increased dramatically during this period. This essay explores the interplay of market and political forces in the promotion of Latin American literature in the United States through an examination of two programs funded by Rockefeller family philanthropies during the 1960s and 1970s: a translation subsidy program supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and administered by the Association of American University Presses; and the Translation Program of the Center for Inter-American Relations, which was funded by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. I trace both programs' efforts at working the U.S. market to promote works and authors. I also study the political motivations fostering these efforts, exploring the extent to which these programs both sought to promote cross-cultural understanding and tried to further U.S. foreign policy interests.*

In the 1960s, the Cuban Revolution sparked great interest in Latin America throughout the United States, which was then dominated by cold war politics. During these same years, authors such as Julio Cortázar, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel García Márquez, and Mario Vargas Llosa rose to prominence in Spanish-speaking countries and throughout the West as part of the literary movement known as the “Boom.” The movement was both a literary and a marketing phenomenon that was characterized by a dramatic increase in the publication, translation, and distribution of Latin American literature and by the rise to power of professionals such as literary agents and editors who worked closely to maximize authors’ success in the market. The Boom was also notable for its ideological coherence, which was grounded in support for the Cuban Revolution; many Latin American writers supported the Cuban government during its first decade, and the island quickly became a center of intellectual activity. Scholarship on the Boom has traditionally focused on the innovative and modernist qualities of the new literature, as well as on the roles of the market and of authors’ politics in bringing the movement to a wide audience.<sup>2</sup> More recently, critics have begun to explore the extent to which the U.S. promotion and reception of Latin American literature during this period were driven by cold war politics.<sup>3</sup> While the growing interest in this literature was boosted by agents’, publishers’, and others’ calculated efforts to increase its visibility, it was also fueled by a cold war political climate that sought to counter Cuba’s influence on Latin American intellectuals by making U.S. cultural activity attractive to them and creating alternative centers of literary activity.

2. See, for example, works by Donoso (1972), Guibert (1972), Harss and Dohmann (1967), and Rodríguez Monegal (1972), as well as essays by Pope (1996) and Swanson (1990).

3. See, for example, works by Franco (2002), Levinson (2001), Rostagno (1997), and Williams (2002).

Despite the official cold war clampdown on politics and culture, U.S. publishers, philanthropies, and other organizations worked to establish cultural exchanges and to facilitate the dissemination of work by authors who were openly committed to the Cuban Revolution and, often, anti-United States as well.

This paper explores the interplay of market and political forces in the promotion of Latin American literature in the United States through an examination of two programs funded by Rockefeller family philanthropies during the 1960s and 1970s: a translation subsidy program supported by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and administered by the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) from 1960 to 1966; and the Literature Program of the Center for Inter-American Relations (CIAR; now, the Americas Society), which first received funding from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) in 1967. After an overview of the history and scope of each program, I study the efforts of each at promoting works and authors and creating bestsellers. Next, I examine the political motivations fostering these efforts at promotion. I demonstrate how these programs were sometimes implicated in conflicting aims, seeking to promote cross-cultural understanding throughout the Americas on the one hand and, on the other, to further U.S. foreign policy interests, many of which had generated hostility towards the United States and fueled the pro-Cuban sentiment of the region's writers. The programs' histories reflect one of the great paradoxes of the period: official cold war efforts to neutralize the communist threat motivated public and private support for the cultural production of regions of great political interest to the United States—support that created and sanctioned a space for the expression and study of the ideology that the State was trying to eradicate.

The 1950s and 1960s were an era of government funding of cultural and educational projects such as the (clandestinely) CIA-funded Congress for Cultural Freedom<sup>4</sup> and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. These and other projects were inspired by the liberal belief that greater understanding and mutual respect for the cultural production of other countries would directly benefit national security. Michael Bérubé has observed that

in a perverse yet entirely unremarkable sense, the years of the Cold War were the good old days for American artists and intellectuals—the days when . . . “the CIA was the NEA.” Imagine . . . a time when the work of abstract expressionists and twelve-tone composers was considered vital to national security, a time when the establishment of the pax Americana required the funding and nourishment of a noncommunist left with high-modernist tastes in arts and letters. It is hard to tamp down a sense of nostalgia. (Bérubé 2003, 107)

4. See Coleman (1989) and Saunders (1999) for the history of the Congress.

During this period, support for the promotion of Latin American studies and literature alike was similarly motivated by a concern for the national interest. As Mark Berger details, in the 1960s, Latin American studies benefited from an influx of funding that stemmed from the interest in the region generated by the Cuban Revolution (Berger 1995, 86, 92 ff.).<sup>5</sup> This support came from government programs and agencies (e.g., the United States Information Agency, State Department, and CIA), as well as from organizations with anti-communist inclinations such as the Rockefeller and Ford family philanthropies. Kathleen McCarthy has observed that “the events of the Second World War combined with [a] new sensitivity to contemporary international concerns to raise the humanities from the vacuum of personal interest to the center of the policymaking arena” (McCarthy 1985, 5). In the 1950s in particular, the Ford Foundation’s “international arts and humanities grants were cast in ideological terms, weapons in the Cold War quest for the hearts and minds of men” (McCarthy 1987, 93). As philanthropic agencies enjoyed tremendous prestige in Latin America during a period when anti-Americanism was otherwise on the rise, their programs were less likely to be seen as ideologically suspect by intellectuals who were often suspicious of cultural activities sponsored by U.S. government programs. Foundation grants and projects thus frequently targeted intellectuals, who, it was hoped, would use their prestige as public figures to influence their compatriots’ attitudes towards the United States.

To date, relatively little attention has been paid to government- or philanthropy-sponsored efforts to promote Latin American literature (the exception, of course, is the journal *Mundo Nuevo*, edited by Emir Rodríguez Monegal from 1966 to 1968, which was stigmatized for having received covert funds from the Congress for Cultural Freedom). The translation programs that are the subject of this study, which were the most systematic efforts of their time to support the translation and dissemination of Latin American literature in the United States, have likewise received little attention.<sup>6</sup> It is no coincidence that Rockefeller family philanthropies supported both. The Rockefeller family has long been

5. See Berger (1995) and Needler and Walker (1971) for discussions of the development of Latin American studies in the U.S. university during the cold war.

6. Discussions of the AAUP project date primarily from the 1960s. See for example, Clements (1965), Frugé (1964), and Kerr (1964). The Center, in contrast, has been discussed more recently by Jean Franco (2002), Ilona Katzew (2002), Suzanne Jill Levine (2005), Alfred Mac Adam (2000), María Eugenia Mudrovic (2002), and Irene Rostagno (1997). Rostagno devotes almost an entire chapter to the CIAR. While our works both study the translation program, she focuses more on the role of individual affiliates (directors, translators, etc.) in the program’s development and on the Center’s relationship with specific authors; she also devotes less attention to the political implications of the Center’s work.

involved with Latin American politics, business, and culture. As Darlene Rivas details, Nelson Rockefeller in particular was drawn to Latin America not just by business but by his interest in Latin American culture and the region's importance to U.S. foreign relations and security. During World War II, he headed the Office of Inter-American Affairs, which sponsored cultural exchange programs and developed (often propagandistic) programs to disseminate knowledge of U.S. culture in Latin America and cultivate cultural goodwill (see Rivas 2002, 45–48; and Miller and Yúdice 2002, 38–44). As Toby Miller and George Yúdice have observed, “Rockefeller’s labors established a pattern of overseas cultural policy that dominated for fifty years and set the organizational tenor for domestic activities from the 1960s” (38).

Scholars of philanthropic agencies have noted the complementarity—or, for some collusion—of the programs and priorities of private sector organizations with those of the government.<sup>7</sup> The AAUP translation program and the Center for Inter-American Relations represented significant investments on the part of the RF and the RBF. This paper explores the extent to which the foundations’ interests in promoting Latin American literature and fostering positive relations with the region’s intellectuals coincided with the cold war foreign policy interests of the U.S. government. I ask whether these political interests worked with or against the programs’ efforts to foster inter-American understanding, and I assess the extent to which the two programs were able to maintain their autonomy in the face of the political agendas of the agencies from which they received funding. I argue that the cultural “value” motivating the creation of these programs was rooted in the potential political use value of Latin American literature, even though the image of the region presented in the works, and the politics of the authors themselves, often deviated from (and, on occasion, rejected) official U.S. cold war ideology.

#### THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES AND THE LATIN AMERICAN TRANSLATION PROGRAM

RF involvement with Latin American literature took off when John Harrison, who had a PhD in Latin American history, joined the Humanities Division in 1956. Harrison immediately began to lend his support to projects that studied and/or sought to redress problems of translating and publishing Latin American literature in the United States. From the 1940s on, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. was the principal publisher of Latin American literature in the United States. Most commercial publishers were hesitant to risk publishing books from a region whose literature

7. See, for example, Arnove (1980), Berger (1995), Haines (1977), McCarthy (1985; 1987), and Miller and Yúdice (2002).

was virtually unknown: the cost of translating from Spanish or Portuguese was a significant impediment to developing a list of Latin American literature, and there was a limited potential market. In 1956, a consultant suggested developing a program that would grant subsidies to publishers to assist with the cost of translation to help remedy the situation, and Harrison actively pursued the idea. In 1957, he met with the heads of several university presses (UP's) to discuss this possibility. In early 1960, Frank Wardlaw, director of the University of Texas Press, in conjunction with August Frugé, director of the University of California Press, and two others, proposed a program that would be overseen by the AAUP, which viewed a translation program as a natural extension of its interest in scholarly publishing throughout the Americas. The proposal called for individual UPs to propose works appropriate for their lists to a national committee set up by the AAUP's executive officers, which consisted of three Latin Americanist scholars and two university publishers. Subsidies were initially expected to run approximately \$3000 each, and the Association hoped to authorize grants for approximately fifteen books per year. Recent and canonical texts in the humanities and social sciences were eligible for the subsidies.

In April 1960, the RF awarded the AAUP \$225,000 to be disbursed over five years. Starting in October 1960, the committee met semiannually to consider applications. From the beginning, there was no shortage of applications to consider: the committee approved subsidies for fifteen titles during the first year of the program, and thirty-five—more than twice the annual goal—during the second.<sup>8</sup> As the end of RF funding for the program approached, the grantees requested a renewal of support for \$240,000. The proposal urged continuing funding because most of the titles approved to date had been published at a loss, and sales income alone was insufficient to sustain a program of publishing in the field. It further argued that “the value of the program to scholarship and international understanding has been far greater than sales and monetary returns would indicate.” As the writers published under the program become better known, “other publishers will become interested. If the effort can be continued for another four years, we believe that the North American view of Latin American literature can be transformed.”<sup>9</sup> Current and past members of the committee sent along letters of support. Their assessments spoke to the program's success in

8. Report on the Latin American Translation Program (April 1, 1960–March 31, 1962), Rockefeller Foundation (henceforth RF) Archives, record group (henceforth RG) 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2741, RAC.

9. “A Proposal to the Rockefeller Foundation for Renewal of The Latin American Translation Program,” 4 February 1966, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2743, RAC.

creating a market for books on Latin America, to its contributions to inter-American relations, and to its effects on intellectuals. Harrison, who left the Foundation in 1962, also lent his support to the request, stating that “even in literature, with the notable exception of Knoff [sic], all of the Latin American works that have been published in English translations in the U.S. were introduced through the AAUP program”<sup>10</sup> or through RF grants to journals for issues on Latin American literature. An audience was growing, but, he argued, continued support for translation was still needed for presses to be able to publish Latin American works regularly. William Sloane, then chair of the program’s executive committee, was the only insider who voiced doubts as to the program’s prospects. “Speaking personally, the chairman does not believe that without such a further grant-in-aid the publication of Latin American works in translation will appear appreciably more attractive in the future than it now does. The commercial and the scholarly markets for such works are almost always small, and they are a long way from having grown to the point where, in a publishing sense, they can be expected to sustain themselves.”<sup>11</sup>

In weighing the decision of whether or not to renew funding, Gerald Freund, an associate director at the RF, observed that the program was not in keeping with the Foundation’s current priorities; also, it was not self-sustaining, and there was no guarantee that it could become so with continued support. However, he noted that “the program has demonstrably served the academic and intellectual institutions of Latin America directly and indirectly,” as well as at relatively low cost. Additionally, he warned of “the possibility of adverse public reactions to a Rockefeller Foundation declination.”<sup>12</sup> Robert West, another associate director, was more skeptical, however. West believed that the program did not fit in with contemporary Foundation goals, and he was not convinced by the argument that “six years of subsidizing publication of Latin American literature has not succeeded in making this program self-sustaining by the economic standards of university presses but that six more years and 30 more titles will make it unnecessary to obtain a \$3,000 per volume external subsidy. . . . After they have skimmed off the best 105 titles, why should we expect the 106th to command an adequate market so that the \$3,000 subsidy would not be required?”<sup>13</sup> In June 1966, the proposal was turned down because,

10. Harrison to Robert West, 14 October 1965. RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2742, RAC.

11. William Sloane, “Report of the Latin American Translation Program Committee,” May 1965, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2743, RAC.

12. Memo from Freund to Joseph E. Black, 24 March 1966, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2743, RAC.

13. Inter-office correspondence from Robert West to Freund, 15 January 1965, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2742, RAC.

despite its merits, the issue of translation was “too tangential” to the Foundation’s current programs and goals.

Between 1960 and 1966, the program approved the publication of eighty-three books.<sup>14</sup> Twenty presses were involved; Texas and California alone were responsible for fifty books, including most of the literary ones sponsored by the program. Titles included numerous important works of literature, some of which had been fundamental to the development of Spanish America’s “new narrative” of the 1950s and 1960s, as well as to the Boom (see table 1).

#### THE TRANSLATION PROGRAM OF THE CENTER FOR INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The Center for Inter-American Relations began in 1962 as the Inter-American Committee (IAC),<sup>15</sup> which was founded by a group of community leaders and businessmen led by Rodman Rockefeller, Nelson Rockefeller’s oldest son. The Committee originally sought to bring together Latin American and U.S. intellectuals, scholars, journalists, and publishers, giving the Latin Americans an opportunity to obtain both contacts and contracts in the United States. Committee members drew on their connections to get public officials such as Richard Goodwin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Arthur Schlesinger, historian and special assistant to President Kennedy, to attend the IAC’s symposia, and participants also met with President Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and numerous other White House and State Department officials.

The Committee first proposed a translation subsidy program in 1963, but none materialized before 1964, when the IAC became the Inter-American Foundation for the Arts (IAFA). The goals of the Foundation’s fiction program were more ambitious than those of the AAUP program: in addition to funding translations, the IAFA also wanted to set up commercial representation for the authors, bring their works to the attention of publishers, and encourage U.S. publishers to become more proactive in seeking out and publishing Latin American literature. Again, though, before the translation program made significant headway, the IAFA merged with the Center for Inter-American Relations, a non-profit corporation established in 1965 by David Rockefeller and other businessmen to “become for North Americans a prime catalyst and coordinator of private endeavors related to Latin America and inter-American relations . . . [and] to develop the goodwill and respect of leading Latin Americans as the sensitive interpreter in the United States of their

14. Not all of the titles proposed, however, made it into print.

15. This committee is not to be confused with the eponymous Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, which was a separate, official organization.

Table 1 Selected Literary Works Published through the AAUP Program\*

<i>Author</i>	<i>English Title</i>	<i>University Press</i>	<i>Date of English Publication</i>
Juan José Arreola	<i>Confabulario and Other Inventions</i>	Texas	1964
Adolfo Bioy Casares	<i>The Invention of Morel</i>	Texas	1964
Jorge Luis Borges	<i>Dreamtigers</i>	Texas	1964
	<i>Other Inquisitions, 1937–1952</i>	Texas	1964
Elena Garro	<i>Recollections of Things to Come</i>	Texas	1969
Martín Luis Guzmán	<i>Memoirs of Pancho Villa</i>	Texas	1965
J.M. Machado de Assis	<i>The Psychiatrist and Other Stories</i>	California	1963
	<i>Esau and Jacob</i>	California	1965
José Carlos Mariátegui	<i>Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality</i>	Texas	1971
José Martí	<i>Martí on the U.S.A.</i>	Southern Illinois	1966
Ezequiel Martínez Estrada	<i>X-ray of the Pampa</i>	Texas	1971
Octavio Paz	<i>Selected Poems</i>	Indiana	1963
	<i>The Siren and the Seashell</i>	Texas	1976
Graciliano Ramos	<i>Barren Lives</i>	Texas	1965
Juan Rulfo	<i>The Burning Plain</i>	Texas	1967
José Vasconcelos	<i>Mexican Ulysses</i>	Indiana	1963
Agustín Yáñez	<i>The Edge of the Storm</i>	Texas	1963
	<i>The Lean Lands</i>	Texas	1968

Source: "Projects Approved," 1 April 1966, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2743, RAC.

desires for understanding and recognition, both of themselves and of their countries' problems and aspirations."<sup>16</sup> The Center's mandate was far broader than that of the IAFA: starting in 1967, it both picked up the Foundation's literature program and developed new programs on policy and public affairs, as well as art and music. Over the years, the RBF, individual Rockefeller family members, and the Ford Foundation were its greatest supporters.

16. "Center for Inter-American Relations Purpose and Program," n.d., RBF Archives, Series 3, box 181, folder 2, RAC.

The literature department thrived under the aegis of the Center, quickly becoming a nexus for networking and support of all aspects of the translation, publication, and promotion of Latin American literature; it “recommend[ed] new books, commission[ed] objective critical commentary and sample translations, act[ed] as informal agent for the author in question if needed, and help[ed] a young author establish the necessary contacts which in many cases lead to translation and eventual publication” (Center for Inter-American Relations 1969, 14–15). The centerpiece of the literature department was the translation program, which defrayed translation costs of literary works and assisted with the preparation of a number of scholarly works and textbooks; it also connected translators with publishers and assisted in the training of translators. The program supported the translation of several books per year, as well as the publication of special issues of journals focusing on Latin American literature.<sup>17</sup> The Center generally split the cost of translation with publishers, contributing up to \$2500 per work. It sought to use its resources to create reputations for authors who were often well known in Latin America but not yet in the United States, which perhaps explains why the Center never subsidized any works by Fuentes, who had already begun to establish a solid reputation for himself in the United States by the time the program started up. The Center’s greatest success came with Gabriel García Márquez’s *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. *No One Writes to the Colonel*, an English translation of *El coronel no tiene quien le escriba*, had been published in 1968, but had had little success. In contrast, *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, which was already a runaway bestseller throughout Spanish America, cemented the author’s reputation in the United States: it landed on both the *New York Times* and the *Publisher’s Weekly* bestseller lists in April 1970 and was named one of the year’s Notable Books by the American Library Association (ALA). Although *One Hundred Years of Solitude* was the only work subsidized by the Center to make the *New York Times* and the *Publisher’s Weekly* bestseller lists, three novels by Manuel Puig supported by the Center—*Betrayed by Rita Hayworth*, *Heartbreak Tango*, and *Kiss of the Spider Woman*—also made the ALA Notable Book lists for the years in which they were published (American Library Association 1996). Between 1967 and 1983, the literature department subsidized more than fifty translations, including many important contemporary literary works (see table 2), as well as a number of critical works, journal issues, textbooks, anthologies, and bibliographies of works in translation.

17. Letter from David Bronheim to James Hyde, 17 February 1970, RBF Archives, series 3, box 182, folder 1, RAC. The latter ultimately included issues of journals such as *Tri-Quarterly*, *Mundus Artium*, *Books Abroad*, and *Hudson Review*.

Table 2 Selected Literary Works Published through the CIAR Translation Program

<i>Author</i>	<i>English Title</i>	<i>Publisher</i>	<i>Date of English Publication</i>
José María Arguedas	<i>Deep Rivers</i>	U of Texas P	1978
Miguel Angel Asturias	<i>Strong Wind</i>	Delacorte	1968
	<i>The Green Pope</i>	Delacorte	1971
Adolfo Bioy Casares	<i>Plan for Escape</i>	Dutton	1975
	<i>Asleep in the Sun</i>	Persea	1978
Jorge Luis Borges	<i>The Book of Imaginary Beings</i>	Dutton	1969
	<i>Selected Poems 1923–1967</i>	Delacorte	1972
	<i>Three Trapped Tigers</i>	Harper & Row	1971
Guillermo Cabrera Infante	<i>Three Trapped Tigers</i>	Harper & Row	1971
Julio Cortázar	<i>62: A Model Kit</i>	Pantheon	1972
	<i>All Fires the Fire</i>	Pantheon	1973
	<i>A Manual for Manuel</i>	Pantheon	1978
José Donoso, Carlos Fuentes, and Severo Sarduy	<i>Triple Cross (three novellas)</i>	Dutton	1972
José Donoso	<i>The Obscene Bird of Night</i>	Knopf	1973
	<i>The Charleston and Other Stories</i>	David R. Godine	1977
	<i>Sacred Families</i>	Knopf	1977
	<i>The Boom in Spanish American Literature</i>	Columbia UP	1977
	<i>Paradiso</i>	Farrar, Straus and Giroux	1974
Pablo Neruda	<i>Selected Poems</i>	Delacorte	1972
Juan Carlos Onetti	<i>A Brief Life</i>	Grossman	1976
Nicanor Parra	<i>Emergency Poems</i>	New Directions	1972
Octavio Paz	<i>Eagle or Sun?</i>	October House	1970
	<i>Eagle or Sun?</i>	New Directions	1969
	<i>Configurations</i>	New Directions	1971
Manuel Puig	<i>Betrayed by Rita Hayworth</i>	Dutton	1971
	<i>Heartbreak Tango</i>	Dutton	1973
	<i>The Buenos Aires Affair</i>	Dutton	1976
	<i>Kiss of the Spider Woman</i>	Knopf	1979
	<i>On Heroes and Tombs</i>	David R. Godine	1981
Luis Rafael Sánchez	<i>Macho Camacho's Beat</i>	Pantheon	1980
Severo Sarduy	<i>Cobra</i>	Dutton	1975

## CREATING BESTSELLERS

Studying how the works published through the AAUP and CIAR programs fared offers critical insights into the development of the market for literature from Latin America in the United States. In contrast to what Harrison claimed when lobbying to extend the AAUP program, the program and Knopf had not been solely responsible for publishing Latin American literature in the United States up to that point. Even the AAUP proposal for renewal of funding noted that the program had inspired some UP's to begin publishing works without subsidies. And as the 1960s progressed, Latin American literature received tremendous publicity throughout the West, leading commercial presses, including Dutton, Harper & Row, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, and Pantheon to sign authors such as Borges, Cortázar, Fuentes, García Márquez, Neruda, and Paz. Also, by 1968, John Macrae at Dutton was working on putting together a series that would publish Borges's canonical and new books.<sup>18</sup> Although publishing Latin American literature was not yet a profitable enterprise, it was on the rise, and the number of Spanish American translations alone published in 1963 and 1964 doubled the highest figures for the 1950s.<sup>19</sup> The market for these works was increasing rapidly in universities, where the number of courses offered in Latin American literature doubled between the late 1950s and the late 1960s (Needler and Walker 1971, 133). And in 1970, the high profile of *One Hundred Years of Solitude* brought the Boom to the attention of the general public, opening up a new market and ushering in a new wave of translations.

The AAUP program spanned the 1960s, but ended before the Boom had received significant attention in the United States. The program boosted the production and profile of Latin American literature in the United States, but was not itself a financial success. Information provided by the University of California Press and the University of Texas Press—who between them published almost half of the books supported by the program—indicates that sales were modest at best.<sup>20</sup> Martín Luis Guzmán's *Memoirs of Pancho Villa*, Yáñez's *The Edge of the Storm*, and Francisco López de Gómara's *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by His Secretary* were the top sellers; perhaps not coincidentally, *Memoirs of Pancho Villa* and *Cortés* had benefited from the highest promotion and advertising budgets. However, with the sole exception of *Cortés*, which posted a

18. Dutton eventually published ten works by Borges between 1969 and 1977.

19. This information was compiled from Bradley A. Shaw's *Latin American Literature in English Translation* (1976).

20. The directors of these presses, Frugé and Wardlaw, provided confidential sales figures for first printings and information on advertising and promotion budgets for fourteen of their publications in order to assist with the proposal requesting renewal of funding of the program.

gain of \$1301, as of early 1966, these two presses had published their books at a net loss, for manufacturing costs, overhead, and editorial and other expenses significantly increased the presses' investment in each book.<sup>21</sup> Nor did the program keep up with contemporary literary currents. It subsidized very little fiction from the 1960s: only one novel (Garro's *Recollections of Things to Come*), and none of the canonical Boom works was published through it.

What might account for the program's low sales, or for its neglect of contemporary fiction? Perhaps the very factors that kept the university presses' risks down—including smaller editions, lower costs, and, as nonprofit organizations, the fact that they received subsidies from endowments and were not as driven by corporate pressures to show large annual profits—and thus made them a good initial vehicle for building an audience for Latin American works ultimately rendered them unsuitable to the "bestsellerism" that defined the Boom. As one observer noted, "University presses must dedicate themselves to the task of bringing out prestige works which trade publishers are not obligated to handle" (Clements 1965, 61). Also, rather than proposing works representing contemporary trends, the UP's participating in the program instead sought support for innovative and influential literary works from the 1950s and earlier that were currently being taught in university courses. Perhaps, though, the AAUP's inability to benefit from the growing popularity of Latin American literature may also be ascribed to another contemporary phenomenon: the increasing professionalization of the Latin American writer, a process that the Center played a key role in furthering. Starting in the 1960s, authors such as Fuentes, who opened numerous doors for his colleagues in the United States, relied increasingly on networking, literary agents, and, later, the Center to publicize their work. The UP's may thus have missed out on the opportunity to publish Boom novels because mediators had begun to market them to commercial publishers. The AAUP program may also have suffered because academics such as Ronald Christ, Alexander Coleman, Suzanne Jill Levine, Alfred Mac Adam, Gregory Rabassa, and Rodríguez Monegal became involved with publicizing these authors through their affiliation with the Center and, in some cases, their work as translators. Otherwise, university-based academics have tended to be less involved in promoting literature, and not all would have been fully apprised of the latest literary trends. As UP's relied on academics' recommendations for their lists, those participating in the AAUP program may not have received proposals to translate the latest literature.

21. "A Proposal to the Rockefeller Foundation for Renewal of the Latin American Translation Program," Appendix 1, 4 February 1966, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 293, folder 2743, RAC.

The books subsidized by the AAUP program accounted for approximately half of the Latin American translations in any given year during the 1960s. The program thus significantly and single-handedly increased the number of literary works on the market. At the same time, though, commercial publishers were becoming more active in the field, even when subsidies were not available. And it was the latter that sought out the “stars” and critically acclaimed works. Although the AAUP program laid the groundwork for developing a market for Latin American translations in the United States, it was commercial presses and the Center’s translation program, rather than university presses, that were able to take advantage of the publishing momentum. The Center further benefited from the high quality of the books, authors, and translators that it supported, and from its deft use of market forces to promote them. And whereas the AAUP program was limited to subsidizing the translation of titles put forth by individual UP’s and was not involved with the promotion and sale of the works, the Center’s literature department was a full-service, centralized networking and publicity program committed to stirring up interest in the region’s literature among commercial publishers and building an infrastructure that would maximize the public visibility of Latin American writers and their work.

Directors of the literature department carefully planned book reviews and ensured their placement in major periodicals, often working in conjunction with publishers. As Richard Ohmann (1983) has noted, “the single most important boost a novel could get was a prominent review in the Sunday *New York Times*” (202). Accordingly, Center affiliates such as Christ, Coleman, Levine, and Rodríguez Monegal were frequently picked to do reviews for the *Times*; well-known U.S. writers and critics such as William Kennedy, Mark Strand, and Michael Wood, some of whom had connections to the Center, were also tapped to lend authority to high-visibility reviews. In general, reviews of Center-sponsored books appeared in a timely fashion in the journals that “carried special weight in forming cultural judgments” among elite intellectuals and cultural leaders (Ohmann 1983, 204), namely the *New Republic*, the *New York Review of Books*, the *New York Times*, the *New Yorker*, *Partisan Review*, and *Saturday Review*, as well as in *Choice*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Kenyon Review*, *Library Journal*, *Nation*, *Publishers Weekly*, and *Time*. Prose works were frequently reviewed in anywhere from ten to twenty periodicals.<sup>22</sup> Books by rising authors and those that the Center was particularly interested in promoting received even better coverage: Borges’s *Book of Imaginary Beings*, for example, was reviewed in thirty-one periodicals;

22. This information was compiled from the ten volumes of *Book Review Index: A Master Cumulation 1965–1984*.

Donoso's *Obscene Bird of Night* in twenty-four; and reviews of the first edition of *One Hundred Years of Solitude* appeared in thirty-three magazines and journals. The latter novel marked the program's breakthrough in the United States. Its success essentially opened up a market for the Boom, which the program fed by ensuring the publication of more works with its support.

In contrast, literary works published through the AAUP program, where marketing was left to individual UP's, did not fare nearly as well. For the most part, each book only received between one and seven reviews. Even Borges's *Dreamtigers* and *Other Inquisitions, 1937–1952*, both published by the University of Texas Press, only received two and three reviews, respectively, in their first editions. (Both works were later picked up and reissued—with the same translation and copyright—by New York commercial publishers,<sup>23</sup> at which point *Dreamtigers* was reviewed in seven periodicals and *Other Inquisitions, 1937–1952* in five.) There was only one literary work published through the AAUP translation program that received publicity comparable to what was regularly afforded the Center's works: Machado de Assis's *Esau and Jacob* (1965) was reviewed in nineteen periodicals, including popular ones such as the *New York Times*, the *New Yorker*, *Newsweek*, *Saturday Review*, and *Time*. Otherwise, the AAUP-sponsored books were reviewed primarily in trade and academic journals such as *Choice*, *Hispania*, and *Library Journal*, which reached smaller and more specialized audiences, and only occasionally in more popular periodicals. Finally, as some of the academic journals had slow turnaround times, some reviews did not appear until two to four years after a book was published. (AAUP-sponsored books in fields other than literature fared no better.)

The Center also carried out numerous other publicity-related duties for Latin American authors. Its journal, *Review*, performed a key role in publicizing new works by Latin American authors. As Irene Rostagno has written, "By making available in English articles written for Latin [sic] audiences . . . and by encouraging U.S. critics to write about Hispanic authors . . . *Review* reached out to a wider American audience, showing that readers did not need to know Spanish to appreciate Latin American culture. . . . It communicated with the larger American intellectual community and advanced the idea that Latin America was producing genuinely innovative literature" (Rostagno 1997, 109). Additionally, while some authors began to use professional agents for contracts and publicity matters during this period, the Center also acted as an informal agent, regardless of whether an author's works received

23. *Dreamtigers* was published by Dutton in 1970 and *Other Inquisitions 1937–1952* by Simon & Schuster in 1968.

support from the translation program. Thus the Center created a high-profile space for Latin American literary activity in New York City and throughout the United States: it introduced writers to North American critics, writers, publishers, and scholars; it placed shorter works and excerpts in the *New Yorker* and other literary journals; and it sponsored receptions and press conferences. The Program's budget also included funds for bringing Latin American authors to the United States.<sup>24</sup>

The literature department also supported a new wave of translators, which both played a role in the success of the works that it subsidized and improved the quality of translation available overall. Whereas university presses often hired graduate students in order to keep costs down, the Center matched experienced translators such as Rabassa and Alastair Reid with authors; it also assisted with the development of younger translators such as Levine and Eliot Weinberger, and, over the years, supported the training of new translators through its programs. Translators affiliated with the Center brought a new style to the table. From 1950 until her death in the late 1960s, Harriet de Onís was Knopf's translator of choice for works in Spanish or Portuguese. Despite the poor reception of some of her projects<sup>25</sup> and the fact that she played fast and loose when translating regionalisms and experimental prose alike, as the primary translator at the principal publisher of Latin American literature, she exercised a great deal of power over the field for many years; Alfred and Blanche Knopf's confidence in her—they often ran new titles and authors, as well as names of other translators by her for approval—only helped to consolidate her position. Although she championed experimental and difficult writers such as Borges (whom the press rejected), Alejo Carpentier, Donoso, and Clarice Lispector, her tastes leaned primarily toward the regional and folkloric, which meant, ultimately, that Knopf's lists reflected similar biases. The translators connected to the Center, in contrast, were more open to the cosmopolitan and playful inclinations of modern writers, and often worked closely with authors to best capture the spirit of the original texts. The public and critics alike recognized the quality of the translations: Rabassa, for example, received the first National Book Award for Translation granted for *Hopscotch*, and Cortázar himself was so satisfied with the result that he urged García Márquez to wait until Rabassa was available to work on *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. Along with agents and editors, then, many of these translators also became power brokers and advocates who used their positions to lobby both the Center and publishers to take on new authors.

24. Enclosures from Rodman C. Rockefeller to James N. Hyde, 19 May 1965, RBF Archives, series 3, box 271, folder 1, RAC.

25. For example, Brazilian writer João Guimarães Rosa's *The Devil to Pay in the Backlands* was criticized by numerous scholars and reviewers for being sloppy and simplistic.

As Mac Adam has noted, the Center's subsidies frequently supported the translation of books "that were already bestsellers in the Spanish-speaking world," essentially making the Latin American Boom possible in the United States (Mac Adam 2000, 186). Over the years, the Center's translation program contributed significantly to, and greatly accelerated, the ongoing transformation of conditions for publishing Latin American literature in the United States: publishers such as Doubleday; Dutton; Farrar, Straus and Giroux; Grove; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich; Harper and Row; New Directions; and Pantheon, among others, built strong Latin American lists. The number of editors who could read Spanish increased significantly, and an infrastructure for communication between authors and publishers, and for publicizing the work of the former, was established. The Program targeted the general public, the academic community, and policy makers. The Center was absorbed by the Americas Society in 1985, and to this day its Literature Program remains a powerful force for publicizing Latin American literature.

#### THE POLITICS OF PHILANTHROPY FUNDING AND THE POLITICS OF BEING FUNDED

The AAUP and Center translation programs alike sought both to capitalize and build on the cold war surge in interest in Latin America in order to create a U.S. audience for literature from the region. I would like to examine these efforts more closely in relation to the contemporary political climate, and ask to what extent the interest in Latin America—especially on the part of the philanthropic agencies from which the programs received their funding—played a role in the origins, evolution, and goals of the two programs. In other words, what, if any, vested interests might the Rockefeller and Rockefeller Brothers Foundations have had in promoting Latin American writers and literature in the United States? Did these interests affect their support of the AAUP program and the CIAR in any way? And did the grant monies come with any strings attached?

The comments that AAUP program organizers made on the political implications of their project were equivocal. Officially, Frugé rejected any connection between the translation subsidy program and increasing tensions in inter-American relations. In his summary of member presses' responses to a 1959 survey of their interest in publishing works from Latin America, he noted that "several presses believe that books . . . should be chosen for their merit as works of literature or scholarship and not for noble reasons connected with international relations. (This is also the opinion of the Executive Committee and of all who are working on the project.)"<sup>26</sup> The proposal submitted to the RF in 1960

26. August Frugé, "Summary of Answers to the Questionnaire," 5 January 1960, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2738, RAC.

similarly declared that “there is no disposition on the part of the Association of University Presses [sic] to embark upon a translation program for the sake of international relations.”<sup>27</sup> However, it is clear that organizers were sensitive to the political arena and to what their program might mean to hemispheric political relations, for the proposal also noted that “many significant developments in Latin America will inevitably call for a reorientation of U.S. thinking . . . all of these trends are of high significance to the United States, not least of all to the role it may play in the future in cultural and intellectual exchange among the nations of the Americas.”<sup>28</sup> Wardlaw, for his part, wrote that “we are all convinced that a translation program such as this one could do enormous good in strengthening the cultural ties which bind us to Latin America and helping us as a nation, beginning on a fairly high intellectual level, to understand the complex civilization of our neighbors to the South.”<sup>29</sup> The Rockefeller Foundation acknowledged this benefit in its approval of the program by stating that one of the functions of UP’s was the exploration of new areas of scholarly need; it also echoed the proposal’s language on international relations when it observed that UP’s “now appear ready to act on the belief that significant recent developments in Latin America call for a reorientation of thought in regard to the role this area will play in the future of cultural and intellectual exchange among nations.”<sup>30</sup> Harrison himself later wrote to a colleague at the RF that “of all university organizations I dealt with during my time with the Foundation, this one was most thoughtfully concerned with the national interests and what the AAUP could do to legitimately foster this interest within their own professional framework.”<sup>31</sup>

Both RF officers and those coordinating the AAUP program were clearly well aware of its potential to improve mutual understanding and provide opportunities for exchange between the United States and Latin America, and Harrison in particular explicitly noted the program’s bearing on national interests. And yet, it would be difficult to identify instances of either AAUP or RF interference in how the program was carried out. Lawrence Schwartz has done an excellent job of detailing

27. August Frugé, “General Statement and Justification,” 16 February 1960, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2738, RAC.

28. “A Translation Program for Latin American Books Proposed by the Association of American University Presses,” 16 February 1960, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2738, RAC.

29. Letter from Frank Wardlaw to John P. Harrison, 11 March 1959, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2737, RAC.

30. “Resolution on Yale University Press-Latin American Translations,” 6 April 1960, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 292, folder 2738, RAC.

31. Letter from John P. Harrison to Kenneth Thompson, 8 October 1962, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 323, box 24, folder 169, RAC.

RF support of journals and programs (e.g., *Partisan Review*) that sought to promote Western liberal democratic and anti-communist values in *Creating Faulkner's Reputation: The Politics of Modern Literary Criticism* (1988). As a rule, RF officers paid close attention to the history and politics of the organizations and projects that they supported. In 1958, for example, when Harrison was asked about the Foundation's attitude towards including the openly communist Neruda in an issue of *New World Writing* focusing on recent Latin American literature that the RF was subsidizing, he responded that "as long as Rockefeller Foundation funds were being used to pay the translator, and not Neruda, he saw no objection, but as this small number of poems did not pretend to be an anthology it might be just as well to omit any poems of Neruda."<sup>32</sup> (Neruda's "Ode to Laziness" was, nevertheless, included in the collection.) And yet, the AAUP program's decision-making structure did not give either the Foundation or the AAUP control over the choice of book proposals that individual presses presented, and the decisions of the Latin Americanist scholars were respected. It would seem, then, that although the AAUP program was developed and funded with an eye towards improving hemispheric relations, in the end, its actions and decisions were not subject to political pressures from the RF.

It is somewhat more difficult to separate the RBF's concern with national interests from the goals of the Center in its early days, even though the Center (and its predecessors) took great pains to emphasize its autonomy. As María Eugenia Mudrovic observes, "the emphasis placed on inter-American dialogue . . . led many Latin Americans to the conclusion that the [Inter-American] Foundation was the artistic wing of the Alliance for Progress" (Mudrovic 2002, 103). It is not difficult to see how this association arose: William D. Rogers, the first president of the Center, was the deputy U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress from 1963 to 1965, and several former State Department officials, including David Bronheim (also a former deputy U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress), John Cates, and Emilio Collado, served as trustees, directors, and, in some cases, president of the organization over the years. Also, the RBF frequently consulted with government officials when deciding whether or not to fund the Center and its proposals. When the organization was first founded, RBF officer James Hyde observed that "the Cultural Affairs officers in the State Department, from [Lucius] Battle on down, feel that the proposed foundation will be helpful."<sup>33</sup> Hyde later wrote a fellow officer that the RBF should consider supporting the

32. Harrison, notes on an interview with José Vásquez Amaral, 27 March 1958, RF Archives, RG 1.2, series 200r, box 411, folder 3543, RAC.

33. Memo from James Hyde to the RBF files, 16 September 1963, RBF Archives, series 3, box 271, folder 1, RAC.

new organization financially “if our inquiry shows that there is a need for such a cultural foundation and if the project is well regarded by the State Department.”<sup>34</sup> The State Department had good reason to support the proposed organization, which was founded, if unofficially, to act as a U.S. counterweight to the Casa de las Américas, a Cuban state-sponsored foundation that was a center of cultural activity and a magnet for writers and artists in the years after the revolution. RBF officers were keenly aware that Latin American intellectuals were also politicians and public figures who had the power to sway public opinion and, potentially, lessen hostilities in the region towards the United States. As Joseph Slater of the Ford Foundation remarked, “artists and intellectuals in Latin America do not represent the cultural frosting of the community, but are an important part of the mainstream of political activity and development. Their contribution is important, and largely overlooked.”<sup>35</sup> The RBF hoped that the IAFA would offer a positive reception in the United States to these intellectuals, exposing them to U.S. culture and values, cultivating the exchange of ideas, and leaving them with a positive impression of the nation.

Over the years, the RBF’s concern with courting intellectuals was assimilated by the Center, but it was also supplemented by the latter’s own growing interest in educating the U.S. general public and, in particular, political leaders about Latin America. In 1973, when John Cates, then president of the Center, requested a renewal of a grant from the RBF, he stressed the organization’s “belief that [the Latin American] countries are important to us in terms of our national security and economy, and in terms of human relationships,” as well as the fact that the Center viewed itself as instrumental in educating people in “the opinion-making sectors” who “are just plain uninterested in and uninformed about Latin America, the Caribbean and Canada.”<sup>36</sup> These related missions—educational and policy-building—were reiterated in the long-term plans presented by the Center in 1975, which stated that “Though it is not within the Center’s purview to make direct efforts to influence the course of this legislation we can take pride in having raised both public and congressional consciousness about inter-American affairs, and in having helped pave the way for constructive policy changes.”<sup>37</sup> Educating

34. Memo from James Hyde to Creel, 19 November 1963, RBF Archives, series 3, box 271, folder 1, RAC.

35. Cited in a memo from James Hyde to the RBF files, 29 October 1963, RBF Archives, series 3, box 271, folder 1, RAC.

36. Letter from John M. Cates, Jr. to James Hyde, 19 March 1963, RBF Archives, series 3, box 182, folder 2, RAC.

37. “Center for Inter-American Relations 1976–1980 Long Range Plan,” 22 October 1975, RBF Archives, series 3, box 182, folder 3, RAC.

the public and policy makers about Latin American culture was to improve relations in the hemisphere through “a gradual undoing of the negative attitudes toward neighbor nations” and the creation of “a better context in which to shape policy.”<sup>38</sup> Whereas intellectuals were initially courted as a means of influencing the politics of their compatriots, then, the focus later shifted to their work, which was considered a reflection of the region’s thoughts, opinions, and politics, and was thus viewed as an entry point for increasing intercultural understanding.

However, as much as CIAR directors and presidents, as well as a number of the funding officers at the RBF, deliberately sought to carve out a role for the Center in the sphere of contemporary political relations, the Literature Department was far from a simple vehicle of cold war politics and U.S. policy interests. It is true that on several occasions the department was subjected to pressure from above due to the leftist politics of some of the writers it supported. For example, the upper echelons offered significant resistance to putting Neruda’s name and photo on the front cover of an issue of *Review* (Spring 1974) that was devoted to his *Residence on Earth*. Ultimately, just the work’s title appeared, without the poet’s name or image. Writers’ politics also put the department and, by extension, the Center as a whole, at odds with the Council for the Americas, with which it was institutionally affiliated, and hampered fundraising efforts. In an analysis of potential funding sources for the CIAR, one consultant wrote that “A final handicap lies in the fact that many of the cultural representatives of South America are far to the left politically; one leading industrialist says ‘Why should we support these fellows who spend all their time criticizing American industry, free enterprise and the American way!’”<sup>39</sup>

In general, though, the Center sought to uphold the freedom of the individual artist as a contrast to the U.S.S.R.’s restrictions on intellectuals’ liberties. No ideological restrictions were placed on the works or authors supported by the Literature Program. Over the years, the Center subsidized numerous authors who had allied themselves with Cuba and the Left, including García Márquez, as well as Asturias, Cortázar, Donoso, and even Neruda. And on several occasions, the Center lobbied the highest levels of U.S. government on behalf of writers such as Fuentes and Angel Rama, who encountered difficulties getting visas to enter or remain in the United States due to the McCarran Walter Act, which was used to restrict visas on ideological grounds.

Mudrovic has criticized what she views as the Center’s monopoly of the production and circulation of Latin American literature for

38. Untitled document, 3 August 1976, RBF Archives, series 3, box 182, folder 4, RAC.

39. Lindsley Kimball, untitled document, 30 November 1971, RBF Archives, series 3, box 182, folder 1, RAC.

“diminish[ing] the relative autonomy of the cultural field” in the United States (2002, 138). She describes the Center as

a good proponent of the monopoly of art inherent in the system of literary patronage. As an institution, it selected the titles to be translated, paid the translation fees, provided the translators, guided its protégés through the New York publicity and editorial structure, worked to guarantee a successful reception and a good selling rate, and even paid airfare, if writers couldn't afford to travel to a promotional event. This way of doing things established a solid web of professional and nonprofessional loyalties that linked the Center to “its” writers, critics, and translators. (137)

This web of loyalties, she argues, was also one of control, resulting in the suppression of criticism of the Center because of its power over the translation market (138). Mudrovcic concludes that as a result,

It is difficult to imagine what Latin American literature in the United States might have looked like today without the Center's intervention and patronage throughout the sixties and early seventies. What would have happened, for instance, if the United States had followed the horizontal pattern of diffusion and consecration, such as the one followed in the French cultural field? . . . Arguably, the Latin American canon would likely be a more heterogeneous, diverse, and more open body of texts (and authors). It would also be a more unstable, and perhaps even more flexible canon than it actually has turned out to be for the U.S. readership. (139)

I agree that it is difficult “to imagine what Latin American literature in the United States” would be like today without the Center's involvement in its promotion, but for very different reasons than those identified here. It is unclear how Mudrovcic thinks this horizontal dissemination would have come about. The low profile of the literary works sponsored by the AAUP program belies her assertion: the program lacked a centralized publicity mechanism and individual university presses either did not have or did not commit significant resources to publicizing their translations, which for the most part received little attention in mainstream periodicals and provided disappointing sales revenues. And while from the mid-1950s on, commercial publishers were releasing works by authors who were building reputations in the United States, sales of their books were often quite low. From the early 1960s on, the Center and its precursors were instrumental in creating and promoting Latin American bestsellers in the United States both by convincing publishers to sign new authors and by establishing an infrastructure that brought their work to the public's attention. While both the Center and the AAUP program targeted academic audiences, through which books could be introduced into university curricula and thereby achieve the status of “literature” (see Ohmann 1983, 205–206), only the Center made a concerted effort to reach a broader reading public. And, as Ohmann has argued regarding the U.S. literary scene during this period, “canon formation . . . took place in the interaction between large audiences and gatekeeper intellectuals,” that is, by attaining

both high sales and “the right kind of critical attention” (207, 206). Without the Center, then, it would have been much more difficult for Latin American literature to gain the foothold that it did in the United States (And even the Center has been unable to secure, in the long term, an equal playing field for translations: a 1988 *New York Times* article observed that “big publishers whose books command the most shelf space are leaving translations of works by little-known foreign writers to small presses and university presses with far fewer outlets.” Alfred and Blanche Knopf’s commitment to bringing Latin American literature to a U.S. audience, all the while knowing that the works they published were more likely to become prestige items than best-sellers, was rare among the larger publishing houses: while several major presses still do make an effort to publish translations, the majority “look mostly for the blockbuster books from overseas, not the steady stream of novels and poetry” [Dennis Kratz quoted in McDowell 1988]).<sup>40</sup> It seems unlikely, then, that “the horizontal pattern of diffusion and consecration” of the French system would have provided the momentum that Mudrovic expects would have sufficed to create a canon of Latin American literature in the United States.

Both the AAUP and the CIAR programs sought to build cultural understanding between the United States and Latin America, and concern for U.S. national interests was a factor in motivating foundation support for the two programs. And yet, while it is impossible to separate an interest in promoting inter-American exchange and other, humanistic motives from geopolitical concerns in the history of the two programs, the political interests of the RF and RBF were not, after all, the determining factors in their implementation or accomplishments, and the programs were able to maintain a high degree of cultural and intellectual autonomy, demonstrating the difficulties of manipulating them. The use of market forces seems to have played a significant role in each program’s success—or failure, in the case of the AAUP. The university presses participating in the latter program placed greater emphasis on the production of books than on their

40. It should be noted that the Center and AAUP programs subsidized very few works by women writers (although the Center did subsidize several anthologies and critical works prepared by women), who in general faced even greater hurdles than men: in addition to having their works translated, women additionally had to struggle to find publishers for their works in the original language. The feminist movement opened a number of doors to women in publishing, both in Latin America and the United States. However, while works by writers such as Isabel Allende, Laura Esquivel, and Rosario Ferré have reached wide audiences in the United States (often facilitated by movie productions and, in the case of Ferré, the decision to write in English), experimental and less “popular” writers such as Carmen Boullosa, Diamela Eltit, and Luisa Valenzuela, while occasionally picked up by major presses, are more frequently published by smaller presses, university presses, or special interest series (e.g., the University of Nebraska’s Latin American Women Writers Series).

promotion; they also were unable to tap into the works that had already been bestsellers in Latin America. As a result, the program did not ultimately capitalize on the rising tide of interest in the region, although it does seem to have contributed to the process of establishing the presence of Latin American literature in the U.S. literary scene (albeit not as much as AAUP coordinators would have liked). The Center and its predecessors, in contrast, raised the profile of Latin American literature through political, literary, and marketing channels: they used their political connections to involve high-ranking officials in their programs as well as established authors, critics, and publishers; and they helped to set up a network that assisted in finding translators, placing books with publishers, and publicizing these works in popular and academic venues. The CIAR ultimately succeeded in walking a fine line by simultaneously taking advantage of the cold war interest in Latin America, which created a favorable climate both for receiving funds from the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and for the reception of the works that it was promoting, and by supporting authors whose politics often ran counter to those of the Center's political and philanthropic sponsors.

## WORKS CITED

- American Library Association  
1996 *50 Years of Notable Books*. Chicago: Booklist Publications.
- Arno, Robert F.  
1980 "Introduction." *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.
- Berger, Mark T.  
1995 *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and US Hegemony in the Americas 1898-1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bérubé, Michael  
2003 "American Studies without Exceptions." *PMLA* 118 (1): 103-13 (January).
- Center for Inter-American Relations  
1969 *Center for Inter-American Relations Annual Report*. New York: Center for Inter-American Relations.
- Clements, Robert J.  
1965 "Latin America's Neglected Literature." *Saturday Review* 48: 60-61 (May 22).
- Coleman, Peter  
1989 *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe*. New York: The Free Press.
- Donoso, José  
1972 *Historia personal del "boom."* Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Franco, Jean  
2002 *The Decline & Fall of the Lettered City: Latin America in the Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Frugé, August  
1964 "A Latin American Translation Program." *Scholarly Books in America* April: 8-10.
- Guibert, Rita  
1972 *Seven Voices: Seven Latin American Writers Talk to Rita Guibert*. Trans. Frances Partridge. Intro. by Emir Rodríguez Monegal. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

- Haines, Gerald K.  
1977 "Under the Eagle's Wing: The Franklin Roosevelt Administration Forges An American Hemisphere." *Diplomatic History* 1: 373–88 (Winter).
- Harss, Luis, and Barbara Dohmann  
1967 *Into the Mainstream: Conversations with Latin-American Writers*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Katzew, Ilona  
2000 "A Forum for the Arts: An Introduction to the Americas Society." In *A Hemispheric Venture: Thirty-Five Years of Culture at the Americas Society, 1965–2000*, edited by John A. Farmer and Ilona Katzow, 27–87. New York: Americas Society.
- Kerr, Chester  
1964 "The World Opens Up for Scholarly Publishing." *Saturday Review* 47: 28–29 (May 30).
- Levine, Suzanne Jill (author), and (contributor)  
2005 "The Latin American Novel in English." In *Cambridge Companion to the Latin American Novel*, edited by Efraín Kristal, 297–317. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Levinson, Brett  
2001 *The Ends of Literature: The Latin American "Boom" in the Neoliberal Marketplace*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mac Adam, Alfred  
2000 "The Boom and Beyond: Latin American Literature and the Americas Society." In *A Hemispheric Venture: Thirty-Five Years of Culture at the Americas Society, 1965–2000*, edited by John A. Farmer and Ilona Katzow, 179–205. New York: Americas Society.
- McCarthy, Kathleen D.  
1985 "The Short and Simple Annals of the Poor: Foundation Funding for the Humanities, 1900–1983." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 129.1: 3–8 (March).  
1987 "From Cold War to Cultural Development: The International Cultural Activities of the Ford Foundation, 1950–1980." *Daedalus* 116 (1): 93–117 (Winter).
- McDowell, Edwin  
1988 "Publishing." *New York Times*: D9 (October 31). ProQuest Historical Newspapers (accessed March 21, 2005).
- Miller, Toby, and George Yúdice  
2002 *Cultural Policy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mudrovcic, María Eugenia  
2002 "Reading Latin American Literature Abroad: Agency and Canon Formation in the Sixties and Seventies." In *Voice-Overs: Translation and Latin American Literature*, edited by Daniel Balderston and Marcy E. Schwartz, 129–43. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Needler, Martin, and Thomas Walker  
1971 "The Current Status of Latin American Studies Programs." *Latin American Research Review* 6 (1): 119–39 (Spring).
- Ohmann, Richard.  
1983 "The Shaping of a Canon: U.S. Fiction, 1960–1975." *Critical Inquiry* 10 (1):199–223 (September).
- Pope, Randolph  
1996 "The Spanish American Novel from 1950–1975." In *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, Vol. 2: *The Twentieth Century*, edited by Roberto Gonzalez Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker, 226–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivas, Darlene  
2002 *Missionary Capitalist: Nelson Rockefeller in Venezuela*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rodríguez Monegal, Emir  
1972 *El Boom de la novela latinoamericana: Ensayo*. Caracas: Editorial Tiempo Nuevo, s.a.

164 *Latin American Research Review*

- de Rosa, Elaine  
1978 "A Decade of Translation Service." *Translation Review* 2: 37–40.
- Rostagno, Irene  
1997 *Searching for Recognition: The Promotion of Latin American Literature in the United States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Saunders, Frances S.  
1999 *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta Books.
- Schwartz, Lawrence H.  
1988 *Creating Faulkner's Reputation: The Politics of Modern Literary Criticism*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Shaw, Bradley A.  
1976 *Latin American Literature in English Translation: An Annotated Bibliography*. NY: New York UP.
- Swanson, Philip  
1990 "Introduction: Background to the Boom." In *Landmarks in Modern Latin American Fiction*, edited by Philip Swanson, 1–26. London: Routledge.
- Tarbert, Gary C., and Barbara Beach, eds.  
n.d. *Book Review Index: A Master Cumulation*. 10 volumes. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Williams, Gareth  
2002 *The Other Side of the Popular: Neoliberalism and Subalternity in Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.