

Higher education in Management in Brazil in the 1940s and 1950s: a discussion derived from the cooperation agreements between Brazil and the United States of America

Ensino superior em Administração entre os anos 1940 e 1950: uma discussão a partir dos acordos de cooperação Brasil-Estados Unidos

Amon Narciso de Barros¹

Alexandre de Pádua Carrieri²

Abstract

This study aims to discuss the development of higher education courses in Management in Brazil in the 1940s and 1950s based on the cooperation agreements made between Brazil and the United States of America. The study begins with a brief discussion of the methodology used to collect the data. This is followed by a discussion regarding the bilateral relations between the two countries. This is followed by considerations on the higher learning courses in Management that were made possible by support from the United States and a reflection on the agreements themselves. The conclusion reached is that the so-called "Americanization" of Management in Brazil is deeply rooted and that to build more self-awareness and strengthen it, it is necessary to reflect on the constitution of the field and how foreign models are received and articulated. The study ends with suggestions that future studies could further the discussion included in this article and that specific studies on the history of higher education courses in Management in Brazil should be conducted, especially that involving agreements with other institutions.

Keywords: Americanization. History of Management. Agreements between Brazil and the United States.

Resumo

O presente trabalho tem como objetivo discutir o desenvolvimento dos cursos superiores em Administração no Brasil entre os anos 1940 e 1950 a partir dos acordos de cooperação entre Brasil e EUA. Inicialmente discutimos brevemente a metodologia utilizada para coleta dos dados e, em seguida, apresentamos uma discussão sobre as relações bilaterais entre os países. Posteriormente tecemos considerações sobre os cursos superiores em Administração que contaram com o apoio estadunidense, além de refletirmos sobre os próprios acordos. Concluímos que a dita "americanização" da Administração no Brasil tem raízes profundas e que, para que um saber mais autoconsciente seja construído e fortalecido, devemos refletir sobre a constituição da própria área, sobre como as influências de modelos estrangeiros são recebidas e articuladas. Por fim, sugerimos que futuras pesquisas poderiam aprofundar as discussões realizadas, ao fazer estudos específicos sobre a história dos cursos superiores em Administração brasileiros, especialmente os que participaram de acordos com outras instituições.

Palavras-chave: Americanização. História da Administração. Acordos Brasil-Estados Unidos.

Paper submitted on October 30th, 2012 and accepted for publication on May 8th, 2013.
This version corresponds to the translated text of the original paper in Portuguese.

¹ Doctor of Management - CEPEAD/UFMG; Professor at the Una University Center; Researcher at NEOS. Address: 6627 Antônio Carlos Avenue, Pampulha, Zipcode: 31270-654, Belo Horizonte - MG, Brazil. E-mail: amonbarros@gmail.com

² Doctor of Management, CEPEAD/UFMG; Professor at CEPEAD/CAD, UFMG. Coordinator of NEOS. Address: 6627 Antônio Carlos Avenue, Pampulha, Zipcode: 31270-654, Belo Horizonte - MG, Brazil. E-mail: Alexandre@face.ufmg.com

Introduction

The aim of this text is to discuss the development of higher education courses in Management in Brazil in the 1940s and 1950s through cooperation agreements signed between Brazil and the United States of America (USA). Through documents and literature concerning technical agreements for the transfer of knowledge from Brazil to the United States, we held a discussion seeking to relate the development of Management in the context of the Cold war to the external relations between Brazil and the USA, focusing on technical support programs to disseminate managerial knowledge and models.

Our starting point was the idea that Brazil was not only a passive actor in these exchanges, having actively sought technical cooperation from the USA to provide the country with the conditions to accelerate Brazilian economic development. Another important starting point was the text of Machado (1966), which identifies that with the exception of courses in Minas Gerais and Pernambuco, all the higher education courses in Management that either already existed or planned to begin before 1960 had received support from the United States. This led us to some agreements signed by the two countries for the transfer of managerial knowledge, techniques and models from the United States to Brazil. We found that the courses offered by the Faculty of Economic Sciences (FACE) at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG) also received American support, although, along with the Federal University of Pernambuco, it was not included in the 1959 agreement between Brazil and the USA for the dissemination of managerial knowledge.

The period of time under study is the 1940s, especially after the end of World War II, and the 1950s. In 1959, an important agreement for the support of higher learning in Management was signed. The agreement involved the São Paulo School of Business Management (EAESP) and the current Brazilian School of Public and Business Management³ (EBAPE), both linked to the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV). The purpose of the agreement was to create or consolidate courses at four federal universities (Bahia, Rio Grande do Sul, Minas Gerais and Pernambuco). However, only the first two remained in the program. The universities of Minas Gerais and Pernambuco withdrew. The reasons for their withdrawal were partly due to their position being subordinate to the two schools of the FGV, in the case of the former, and opposition from the student body to the participation of the USA in the case of the latter (see TAYLOR, 1968).

In this sense, an assumption of the study is that while technical knowledge of Management was arriving with the promise to aid Brazilian development, this knowledge was also expected to aid and consolidate the positions of both countries in bilateral relationships. Thus, the request for support and the acceptance of help is a form of recognition, albeit taciturn, of Brazil's position as subordinate to the USA. The obvious hierarchy in terms of the material wealth of both nations is strengthened (not determined) by the nature of these agreements that mostly aim to transplant certain institutional models and forms to the countries that receive support (for more on this matter, see DWIVEDI and NEF, 1982; COOKE, 2004; 2010).

This work is part of a study conducted for a doctoral thesis. It aims to bring together two branches of knowledge, i.e., organizational studies and history, which have become increasingly important, both in Brazil and other countries (see, for example, ÜSDIKEM and KIESESER, 2004; JACQUES, 2006; COSTA, BARROS and MARTINS, 2010; VIZEU, 2010; CORAIOLA, 2012). Focusing specifically on works that center their attention on relations between Brazil and the USA in the transmission of managerial knowledge, this study can be added to the works of Alcadipani and Cooke (2011; 2010) Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a; 2012b), focusing on the São Paulo School of Business Management (EAESP), and Fischer (1985), which is more wide-ranging, but concentrates on Public Management. Other works on the history of Management, in a more general sense, are those of Barros (2011), Fischer, Waiandt and Fonseca (2011), Vizeu (2008), Mattos and Carvalho (1992), Covre (1991) and Martins (1989).

³ Now known as the Brazilian School of Public and Business Management (EBAPE), the institution used to be known as the Brazilian School of Public Management (EBAP). Throughout this article, the current acronym is used.

It is important to point out that in this theoretical and empirical study, we opted to articulate the data analysis with the discussion through a review of the literature. This is not only a choice of style in order to improve the flow of the discussion, but also to show that it is not possible to discuss theory and data separately. Therefore, we also wish to emphasize the character of narrative regarding the history that this work studies. Thus, we take a stance on how history should be written. A discussion on this matter can be found, for instance, in Leblecici and Shah (2004) and Lawrence (1984).

The article is divided into five sections in addition to this introduction. In the first section, we present the methodology used and how the data were grouped. Then we draw a general picture of the relations between Brazil and the United States in the mid twentieth century to provide the reader with a general view of the scenario in which the agreements between the two countries developed. This is relevant because the agreements made were a part and effect of the relationship between the countries. We then turn to the agreements between the countries, especially focusing on a discussion concerning Point IV, which played an important role by serving as an “umbrella” for technical cooperation between Brazil and the United States. We then have a brief discussion of the interaction of managerial knowledge and how it was formed in the environment of the Cold War, with an emphasis on the schools that received American support in this context. Finally, we present our final considerations with the conclusions we formed and pointing out potential paths for future studies.

Methodology

The documents used in the preparation of this work were found mostly with the help of internet search mechanisms. It is interesting to note that the growing facilities for storing information and making it available for access have increasingly broadened the scope for historical research. At the same time, it opens up questions regarding the different notions concerning “file” and “collection”, as discussed by Featherstone (2006). The myriad of information found in each search creates difficulties in that it is necessary to filter the search results to increase the accuracy of the searches. In this study, we gave priority to files available on the internet, although some documents were obtained through the Law of Access to Information (and thus, also without the need to delve into physical files).

The data were found in searches restricted to virtual files available on websites linked to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Brazilian government, the American government and the United Nations Organization (UN). Resources were used that restricted the study to one site at a time, with a mechanism that also makes general searches of the internet. A set of key words was used for each search for the purpose of restricting the results obtained, at the same time covering a wide range of terms. The data obtained from the searches were saved and analyzed in greater detail. At least 115 documents were obtained and read one by one. They were categorized according to the search words that led to them (e.g., EAESP and Ford Foundation) and their object of reference (financial reports, analyses, speeches, laws, etc.)

We understand that the exclusive use of official sources should be viewed with caution (see PIERANTI, 2008), and that the documents are also monuments to the past and should also be viewed with caution (see LE GOFF, 2003). According to Rago (1995, p. 78, emphasis in the original), “[w]orking with documents as *monuments* will mean refusing to believe in the transparency of language and the old certainty of finding it as such in the texts of the past”. Every document can be considered a monument. “Taking what is said as a monument and not as a document means that it is not there in the place of something deeper and more essential, requiring interpretation” (ARAÚJO, 2008, p. 58), but that it already has meanings that were attributed to it by its creators.

The information regarding relations between Brazil and the United States was obtained from a review of the established literature on the subject, especially in the field of historical studies. In this sense, the following

section dwells on this relationship, highlighting important elements in order to paint the backdrop of the agreements that were made concerning the transfer of managerial knowledge and models.

Relations between Brazil and the United States

Throughout the period under study, which stretches from the end of World War II until the late 1950s, Brazil had a dubious relationship with the USA. The country often took a stance that was considered opportunistic and with pragmatic purposes. A striking aspect of the backdrop of the relationship between the two countries was that the Brazilian government felt “betrayed” because they had not enjoyed a special place in American foreign policy after World War II, complaining that they had not received from the USA the “special treatment” that they felt they deserved (HILTON, 1981; DALIO and MYIAMOTO, 2010).

Alcadipani and Caldas (2012) point out that combating the Nazi and fascist appeals was important when it came to stimulating the first agreements between Brazil and the USA, even while the War was still being waged, because the Brazilian government had been taking a dubious stance in relation to which side to take in the war. According to these authors, at that moment, the fight against Nazism had priority over the fight against communism on the American agenda, although the latter became a priority once again soon after the War had come to an end.

In the post-War period, the military and economic hegemony of the USA became more evident, rivaled only by the Soviet Union. The United States definitively extended its influence to a considerable part of the globe, with agencies such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Institute, the Carnegie Foundation and the European Recovery Plan, also known as the Marshall Plan (KIESER, 1994; LOCKE, 1996; FRENKEL and SHENHAV, 2003; ÜSDIKEM and WASTI, 2009; KHURANA, KIMURA and FOURCADE, 2011; KHURANA and SPENDER, 2012).

Kieser (1994, p. 93) points out that the Marshall Plan dedicated a great deal of effort to winning over practitioners of Management while it founded institutions to train new family administrators with approaches developed in the United States. After World War II, the Marshall Plan became the platform from which the United States attempted to transform the structures of the European economies and the behavior of their actors. The main goal of the Marshall Plan was the economic recovery of Europe in alliance with anti-communism.

The plans for cooperation between Brazil and the United States were important for the Brazilian governments and their technicians when formulating their long-term plans. However, it is interesting to note that these agreements in the field of Management were for Development which, according to Motta (1972), aimed to make countries considered underdeveloped to emulate the development of so-called developed countries, without taking their specificities into accounts.

This support also grew from the context of the USA’s growing involvement in Latin America. After 1940, the acts of the United States in the southern hemisphere of the American continent became more coordinated, in an attempt to overshadow the Nazi and fascist influences in the region (TOTA, 2005). This change was marked by the creation of the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the Americas, under the direction of millionaire Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller. In 1941, this institution was renamed the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA). In 1945, it became known as the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA) (USA, 1945). Tota (2000) referred to it as a “factory of ideologies”.

Moniz Bandeira (2007) points out that in 1948 the Dutra Government approved the establishment of the Joint Brazil-United States Technical Commission to set out a development program for the company. In the view of USAID (1986), the “Abbink/Bulhões” mission was responsible for a good part of the long-range

projects developed by Brazil. It was also considered a success because its leaders had taken on important roles in the scenario of Brazilian economic discussions.

For Brazil, the proposals made by the American member of the Joint Commission, under the command of John Abbink, basically revolved around greater Brazilian openness to private capital (HILTON, 1981). The report prepared by this commission, known as the Abbink report, served as a guideline for the discussions between the countries (DALIO and MIYAMOTO, 2010). However, although the Brazilian government accepted the support program, it was clear that it did not meet the demands of the Brazilians, who were faced with serious problems concerning their balance of payments in the early 1950s (MONIZ BANDEIRA, 2011; RIBEIRO, 2006).

Therefore, in the 1950s, relations between Brazil and the USA were tense. The Americans wanted Brazil to be content with technical support in fields that were considered sensitive and strategic. The interests of Washington were focused on guiding and monitoring Brazilian industrial development in order to benefit American corporations and adapt Brazil to its own regional plans (HAINES, 1989, p. 115). It was in this context that the technical cooperation agreements between Brazil and the USA that brought the first consultants and professors of Management to Brazil in the early 1950s were signed. This is the case of the Basic Agreement for Technical Cooperation and the Agreement on Special Technical Services Program (BRASIL, 1953). Furthermore, the United States came to adopt “good neighbor” policy, with a kind of pan-Americanism, aiming to replace the direct intervention policy known as the Big Stick (GALDIOLI, 2008).

Nevertheless, in addition to technical support, Brazil demanded American resources to finance the country’s economic development (MONIZ BANDEIRA, 2011; 2007; RIBEIRO, 2006; HAINES, 1989; HILTON, 1981). However, the Eisenhower administration showed little willingness to be flexible and extend credits to Brazil. It demanded reforms to free the market and it did not want any loans to be made from government to government. It preferred incentives for the private sector in the economy. This interpretation is consistent with the USAID’s own report (1986). USAID (1986) pointed out that business schools were used to promote private companies.

However, Brazilian economic development meant that there was a need for a balance between foreign investments and the actions of the State to optimize the development process (MONIZ BANDEIRA 2007; 2011), although the action of the Brazilian State was against the interests of American private companies, such as oil and mining interests, and also the American government (MONIZ BANDEIRA, 2007; 2011; HAINES, 1989).

The American government also tended to consider all the stances that deviated from liberalism as a threat (HAINES, 1989; MONIZ BANDEIRA, 2011; 2007; HILTON, 1981). However, it is plausible to believe that the accusations of “communism” were simply a smokescreen to defend the interests of multinationals with branches in the USA. Moniz Bandeira (2011, p. 123) affirms that “The profound differences mattered little to the United States since nationalism or communism were all the same to them as both were against the interests of private capital overseas”.

Dalio and Miyamoto (2010) and Ribeiro (2006) point out that the administration of Dwight Eisenhower administration (1953-1961) was a period of latency in American support initiatives between 1953 and 1960. Eisenhower sought to change the form of relationships between his country and the countries of Central and South America and intended to propose loans instead of funds for developing countries.

The joint support programs between the United States and Brazil

Fischer (1985) points out that technical and financial cooperation between Brazil and the USA began in 1945, although the first scholarships for Brazilians had been awarded in 1942, according to this author. The

date given by the USAID (1986) for the first contracts of assistance for Brazil coincides with that of Fischer (1985). The document also states that the Agency for International Development operated in the country only between 1961 and 1974, having embarked on large-scale programs to support the development of the country starting in 1962. Fischer (1985) affirms that, dating back to 1946, the first agreement between Brazil and the USA aimed to equip technical schools in different states around the country. Other agreements, however, succeeded these and allowed American technical staff to come to Brazil and provided training for personnel in Brazil and scholarships to study in the USA.

The period under study, for which we are analyzing the technical support to transfer managerial knowledge and models to Brazil ranges from the early 1950s to the mid 1960s. It can be said that the initial step for these transfers was made prior to the establishment of the Brazilian School of Public Management (EBAP) in 1952, which was the first to approve a higher learning course in Management in Brazil, followed by the FACE/UFMG. This is because the aid from the USA and United Nations for the creation of this graduate course dates back at least to 1951, with a special course. However, the creation of the EBAP was planned beforehand. In 1949, in Lake Success (USA) a meeting was held by the United Nations to discuss the establishment of the school (FUNDAÇÃO GETULIO VARGAS, 1974a; 1974b).

The American support programs took place in the context of Point Four, established by American President Harry Truman. The Point Four program was responsible for breathing new life into the bilateral cooperation between the USA and Brazil and was designed for a scenario of scarce resources that would be compensated by the offer of technical support. This is clear from a document of the US State Department (DEPARTMENT OF STATE, 1951) that explains the program:

The Point 4 program, which is operated under the direction of the Technical Cooperation Administration, is a relatively low-cost, long-term undertaking. It is designed to take American experience and know-how directly to the peoples of underdeveloped countries. We are proceeding at a moderate pace, while we feel our way with care. Techniques must be developed and suitable technicians found for widely different conditions

The president of the United States at the time, Harry Truman (1951), in a speech on the program in 1951, claimed that: “The Point Four program is part of the defense of the free world”. In other words, the main interest of the United States was not only promoting the development of the countries that were receiving support but also to dampen the appeal of communism in countries within the American sphere of influence: “communism cannot be stopped by arms alone. One of its most dangerous weapons is its false appeal to people who are burdened with hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance” (TRUMAN, 1951).

Within the Point Four program, Brazil signed a number of agreements, among them the Basic Agreement for Technical Cooperation (BRASIL, 1950) and the Agreement on Special Technical Services (BRASIL, 1953b) that complemented it. Professors and technicians were brought to Brazil to help with, among other things, the creation of Public Management courses in Brazilian institutions (FISCHER, 1985). According to Fischer (1985), this occurred before these agreements had been promulgated by Congress, which would only take place in 1959 (SENADO FEDERAL, 1975; BRASIL, 1959a; 1959b; 1961). The author states that “from 1950 onwards, the agreements for technical cooperation had been defined and were now included in higher education” (FISCHER, 1985, p. 166).

In the program of the Commission that was set up to specifically handle questions concerning Public Management, the Consulting Committee for Public Management (BRASIL, 1953a), presided by Luiz Simões Lopes, president of the Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV) with the help of Orlando M. Carvalho, from the University of Minas Gerais (UMG, now known as the Federal University of Minas Gerais, UFMG) – it is stated that both institutions would benefit from the agreement:

The Consulting Committee for Public Management, (C.C.A.P.) composed of Brazilians connected to governmental agencies and educational institutions, aims to improve public

management in Brazil at all levels of government. [...] The Commission works in close collaboration with the Joint Brazil-United States Commission for Economic Development and the administrative authorities of all government agencies that wish to use its services.

The Joint Commission set up at the end of the Dutra government only started to work in 1951 (BRASIL, 1951). The Commission was responsible for bringing a professor/consultant to FACE/UFMG in 1953, to analyze the situation and suggest changes to the Higher Education Course in Public Management, which was paired with the Sociology and Politics course at the university (MAUCK, 1954). The course was implemented based on the EBAPE course, as described by Cunha (1953).

Mauck was possibly one of the first foreign professors to come to Brazil, and his arrival was the fruit of a request from the director of the university at the time, Yvon Leite de Magalhães Pinto, with the aid of Professor Orlando M. de Carvalho (CUNNINGHAM, 1954), who was a member of the Joint Commission. According to J. Lyle Cunningham, head of the Public and Business Management division, the request was made in 1952, when he began his negotiations with the director of the university at the time. It is interesting to note that in his report, Elwyn Mauck points out that the support for the course was also given to encourage the development of the field in other Brazilian universities.

In 1954, the FGV received support through the Point Four program to set up the EAESP (ALCADIPANI and BERTERO, 2012a). Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a) report that:

The Point Four also played a preponderant role in directing the school and its strategic decisions during its first ten years because it had an equal share of power with the FGV in the Council. This all points to the American interest in creating a management school capable of standing on its own feet but adopting the American model and, furthermore, a school that prepared teachers and trained them to think of development and modernization based on the American point of view (ALCADIPANI and BERTERO, 2012, p. 296).

Therefore, as we can see, the first higher education courses in Management in Brazil had the direct support of the USA, who actively sought to export not only American theories but also the same teaching model. Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a) point out that the EAESP was meant to serve as a model for other schools in Brazil and Latin America. At the same time, the EBAPE from the outset offered courses to people from other Latin American countries and helped to influence the development of schools in these nations. It is worth highlighting, however, that the support given to the EBAPE was mediated by the United Nations, which had a program for spreading Management schools, although not necessarily in higher learning, to aid the potential for economic development in countries that were viewed as developing countries (UNITED NATIONS, 2008; WU, 1969).

Along the same lines, it is interesting that in the *Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program* (WHITE HOUSE, 1955), among other forms of support, there is a mention of the growing interest on the part of Latin American republics in Public Management programs, and that in 1955 applications had been received from 15 countries. The same document also mentions the recently established course in Business Management at the Getulio Vargas Foundation in São Paulo. Although this document mentions only some general aspects of the course, it is significant and leaves little room for doubt that the technical aid mentioned in this report was also, perhaps especially, linked to defense.

There was always some kind of tension regarding American support to so-called “developing” countries. If on the one hand the development was considered as a necessary element in order to avoid “losing” countries to communism, on the other hand it could lead to internal and external competition with American products and in the future lead to the countries that received the support becoming more independent. In this sense, it is interesting to note that there are recurring references to the importance of spreading American

values through the courses. A point in question is the report of Storm and Markey (1959) regarding the technical support given to the EBAPE.

The Cold War, managerial knowledge and the first Brazilian higher education courses in Management

The fifteen years following World War II were a time of consolidation of the characteristics that managerial knowledge would acquire, punctuated by the publication of reports on the teaching of Management by the Ford Foundation and Carnegie Foundation in 1959 (KHURANA and SPENDER, 2012). The report sponsored by the Ford Foundation is entitled *Higher Education for Business* and the authors are Robert Aaron Gordon and James Edwin Howell (the report is also known as the *Gordon-Howell Report*). Zimmerman (2001) points out that the Ford Foundation was interested in encouraging Management in the USA and its teaching during the Korean War. It wished to see these stimuli serving as a means of fighting communism by strengthening the ideas and notions of Management. The text sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programmes in Business Administration*, was written by Frank Pierson (KHURANA and SPENDER, 2012).

It cannot be denied that the Cold War was part of the scenario in which management was shaped. The influence of that time in the construction of management theory in its “formative moment” (RUNTÉ and MILLS, 2006) led to a number of theories, such as that of Abraham Maslow, in the field of human resources, or Igor Ansoff, in the field of strategy, being directly influenced by the USA and the countries of the Warsaw Pact (COOKE, MILLS and KELLEY, 2005).

The context of the Cold War influenced the structuring of Management and all the American intellectual environment of the day (COOKE and MILLS, 2008; GRANT and MILLS, 2006). At this time Management strengthened its ties with academia, with broader and more sophisticated theories. This was achieved either by incorporating theories from other fields of knowledge or through the development of more thorough studies in the field (KHURANA and SPENDER, 2012; MARCH, 2007; AUGIER, MARCH and SULLIVAN, 2005; LOCKE, 1996). Theories also arose that are still among the most diffuse in this field, such as the systems theory and the contingency theory, which remain central to contemporary discussions (KELLEY, MILLS and COOKE, 2006).

At the time in question, there was growing intolerance of anything connected to communism or, which is almost the same thing, anything that was anti-American (LANDAU, 2006). Despite its internal contradictions, the American Way of Life was embraced by the government, creating the image of a specific “American” culture that excluded everything else as “anti-American” or un-American. This classification was used to form a hierarchy of people and even entire cultures (COOKE, MILLS and KELLEY, 2005). At the same time, any elements that were considered as being to the “left” tended to be expunged from theories (COOKE, 1999).

In our understanding, when higher education courses in Management were created, it would be inevitable that they were influenced by the ideological struggle of the day. As mentioned above, the courses at the FGV (MACHADO, 1966) and FACE/UFGM were created with American support, although they were created differently, with EBAPE being supported by the United Nations and the EAESP mainly by scholars and technicians with connections with the University of Michigan. Both schools also received scholarships to better prepare their staff. FACE/UFGM, on the other hand, only had the support of American consultant Elwyn A. Mauck (MAUCK, 1954).

Therefore, support to implement the EBAPE from the United States and the United Nations was the first initiative to introduce higher education courses in Management in Brazil. The initiative was part of a more general program agreed on by the USA and UN to promote the teaching of Management (WU, 1969). In 1948, with Resolution 246 (III) by its General Assembly (UN, 1951), the UN created a technical support

program to export management practices especially to “developing” countries. In 1949, the first scholarships were awarded to civil servants of some member nations for the purpose of spreading technical knowledge and prepare for future local training centers. The United Nations Programme on Public Administration, Finance and Development or United Nations Programme on Public Administration or the Programme remains active until today.

One of the major activities of the United Nations Programme on Public Administration has been the establishment of public administration centres, mostly for training purposes, at the national and regional levels. During the first half of the 1950s, several national and regional training centres and institutes of public administration were created. Some examples of this type of United Nations technical assistance projects include the help given from 1951 to 1956 to the Government of Brazil in the establishment and management of the Brazilian School of Public Administration (in Rio de Janeiro) [...]. By the end of the 1950s, over 40 national institutes of public administration were already active worldwide, and at the beginning of the 1960s, their number had already doubled to almost 80. The United Nations provided assistance to 24 of the 80 institutes, roughly one third of those in existence. (UN, 2008, p. 47-48, loose translation).

Therefore, it was not only in Brazil that higher education in Management was marked by American knowledge, often exported with the aid of the United Nations. This can be seen, for instance, in the models of school that they wished to replicate in the training of professors and the authors used to prepare “scientific” arguments and which generally had a concept of science channeled by American academia. Despite appeals for the specifics of each country to be shown in some documents concerning the export of knowledge, it is possible to see, for example, the notion of W. Rostow’s stages of development.

From the beginning, the EBAPE of the Getulio Vargas Foundation was used to spread techniques that had already been implemented in other countries in South America. The first experimental course given in 1951 was attended by students from other countries. Bertrand (1952, p. 740) pieced together a panorama of the earliest activities of the EBAPE with support from the United Nations, listing the provisional courses given between November of 1951 and March of the following year. Of the five professors who taught the courses, four were supported by the technical assistance agreement between Brazil and the USA and had been sent by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Therefore, it is interesting to note that the United Nations was also actively involved in exporting managerial knowledge. This was confirmed in the organization’s report, attesting that UN funds to disseminate knowledge of public administration were allocated together with assistance to aid economic development (UN, 1952). According to a report prepared by USAID (1968), the Getulio Vargas Foundation received report from the UN from 1951 to 1958. In 1959, this was substituted by the American agency (USAID, 1967).

During this time, the EBAPE was offered scholarships for students from around the country so that they could qualify and develop their skills in the USA. Of the eight selected in 1952 for training overseas at the University of Southern California, most were from the field of law (STORM and MARKEY, 1959). According to the contract, the financial reports had to be sent to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, showing that the institute also coordinated this partnership between the FGV and the American university.

According to Bertero (2009, p. 6), “[t]here was no doubt that management came to Brazil during a time of expanding American influence, be it directly or through American ability to decisively influence international agencies”. Maranhão (2010), in the same sense, points out the influence of Americans as an important element for understanding the development of higher learning in Brazil. Storck (1983, p. 58), claims that “Management came to Brazil as the most American of disciplines.”

Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a, p. 297) go further still:

The aspect that is not approached in the literature is the American perspective of the interests of the USA in creating the development and propagation of the teaching of management in Brazil. The Cold War is a fundamental point here. The fact that Point Four was a program created to satisfy the needs of the USA in the Cold War and also the fact that it had a crucial influence of the conception, creation and development of the EAESP shows that the Cold War context greatly affected the creation of the main center of management in Brazil and all Latin America in the late 1950s and mid-1960s.

Fischer (2001, p. 124) highlight that:

On 9 March 1959, a very important agreement in the field of management was signed in the form of the Agreement of Special Technical Services between Brazil and the United States signed in 1953 and designated PBA-1. The resulting project was named the Program for the Teaching of Public and Business Management, creating management school as the Getulio Vargas Foundation (in São Paulo, strengthening the school that already existed in Rio de Janeiro), the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) and the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA).

The agreement signed in 1959 brought professors from the University of Michigan and the University of South Carolina to teach at the FGV schools. Both centralized their resources and served as a model for the other universities to follow. The hierarchical relationship between the schools of the FGV and the other courses was clear, and this troubled the director of FACE/UFGM, who alleged that his school was being punished for not adhering to the agreement.

The University of Pernambuco was also selected but did not sign the agreement. According to Taylor (1968) and Siegel (2010), this university did not sign the agreement due to pressure from students, a factor that may have contributed to the exit from courses established at the UFGM (BARROS, 2013). Regarding the course in the capital of Pernambuco, Machado (1966) claims that at the time of writing the school was negotiating with SUDENE and USAID for the course, which was founded in 1959, to receive support from both institutions. One should not disregard the change in the scenario provoked by the military regime and which probably had an influence on the internal scenario of the course.

Concerning the other courses at the Universities of Bahia, Rio Grande do Sul the EBAP and EAESP, Siegel (2010, p. 389) claims that:

Eight professors were to be provided for service in Brazil and they were to be stationed as follows: The Brazilian School of Public Administration (EBAP) in Rio de Janeiro which served as the national training Center for public administration (four professors); the School of the Administrative Department of the Public Service (DASP), Rio de Janeiro (two professors); the Universities of Bahia [today UFBA], Salvador, and the University of Rio Grande do Sul [now UFRGS], Porto Alegre (one professor each). The University of Recife in Fortaleza [sic] [the correct form would be the Federal University of Pernambuco, in Recife] was selected, but was eliminated by AID due to a resistive student body.

Resistance from the students and even some of the teaching staff to the agreements stuck between the Brazilian and American institutions is mentioned in the Taylor report (1968). Apparently, both the schools of the FGV and the others, especially in Fortaleza where the agreement was not accepted, according to the authors, there was a strong feeling of rejection to associations with the United States. At FACE/UFGM it is quite plausible that resistance from the student body was another element that led to the university abandoning the agreement.

However, the effectiveness of the American strategy could not be put in check. Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a, p. 256) claim that “In reality, Point Four used the EAESP as a base for providing support to the creation of management schools (providing technical assistance) in the north-east (UFBA) and the south of Brazil (UFRGS).” Bertero (2009) points out that the USP, by creating the course in the late 1950s and early 1960s, set its project in the same source as the EAESP. By analyzing the documents that we found, we also saw that the USP had received resources from American sources since 1954 and these helped to establish its management course (USAID, 1986). Taylor (1968) claims that the goal of the USA was achieved, in that the schools were directly or indirectly influenced through the EAESP, UFRGS or UFBA, in the creation of their courses in management. At the same time, another agreement that was struck with France in 1959 to exchange experiences and knowledge in the field of Management, especially public management, apparently had less of an impact (BRAZIL, 1959c).

The dominant position of the EAESP, especially, afforded it greater legitimacy in the national scenario and placed it at the center of higher education in Management in Brazil, as shown by Wolgan Schoeps, in an interview given to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the school (SCHOEPS, 2004). The institution operated actively to be seen as a model in the establishment of the minimum curricular directives of the Management course (TAYLOR, 1968). Furthermore, the EAESP also created the first post-graduate course in Management in Brazil, promoting new forms of graduation at the school. In this sense, Martins (1989, p. 667) points to the connection between the schools of the FGV and foreign institutions already established in the United States:

A hegemonic center that plays a central role in the production and circulation of knowledge in the field in question, it helps to supply an academic guarantee to these schools above all in their early stages, enabling them to occupy, over time, a dominant position in the functioning of management courses in Brazilian society.

The authors of the report of the technical support program offered by the University of Southern California point out an interesting item of information regarding the perception of cultural proximity between Brazil and the United States:

The Brazilian program was enhanced by the fact that Brazil is a western nation with a cultural heritage similar to that of the United States. There is a marked tendency in Brazil to admire U.S. culture patterns. This cultural familiarity was at the same time a value and a limitation. Teaching and personal relations were facilitated, but the significance of cultural difference was minimized (STORM and MARKEY, 1959, p. 14).

However, although there was a certain degree of cultural proximity between the two countries, one of the factors analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of the course was the change in values and attitudes resulting from Brazilian culture. We noted this in the documents that report the experiences of implementing the schools in Brazil. We also recalled that at this time, the American Way of Life, despite its internal contradictions, guided government efforts, creating the image of a specific and clear American culture that served as a product for export (PARMAR, 2002).

The “exceptionalism” of the USA, which helped to form the body of administrative knowledge (JACQUES, 1996), was also an element used to strengthen a “creed” in Management. Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a, p. 295) point out that “The different examples show the alignment of the EAESP with the idea of progress and development that was related, at least in the USA, as a way to fight communism. In this sense, the reports show that the agreement to help to create the EAESP appears as an instrument that forms a positive image of the USA in Brazil.”

The technical support programs, as show, for example, in the report of Storm and Markey (1959), aimed to transfer knowledge but also to provoke changes in the image of the USA and the equality of its institutions.

For instance, students were given tests when they entered and left the course to gauge how much their positions had changed on certain subjects.

Final Remarks

The aim of this study was to promote a discussion on how relations between Brazil and the United States influenced the establishment of higher education courses in Management in Brazil. Focusing on the agreements that sought to implement and consolidate higher learning in Management in Brazil in the 1940s and 1950s, our intention was to make it clear that as an instrument of bilateral policy between the countries, the agreements that propelled the development of higher education in Management in Brazil brought with them a logic that cannot be ignored. However, we know that the direct effects of each of the courses must be established by specific studies, such as those conducted by Alcadipani and Bertero (2012a; b) and Barros (2013).

At the same time, we point out that the knowledge included in these courses was undergoing a time of reformulation and suffered a profound influence from the intellectual environment of the United States at the time. In this sense, the Cold War not only stimulated the implementation of courses that could help Brazil to “develop” in order to free itself from the communist threat, but also had an indelible influence on the very elements that constituted Management as a field of knowledge. In Brazil, this possible influence was already being noted by Durmeval Trigueiro (1966), who reported on the Minimum Curriculum of the discipline, which was established in 1966, the period after the focus of this study:

American influence has been very significant, including its reflections on the Brazilian experience [...] In the case of Management, we run the risk of settling on hypotheses transplanted here from overseas. The psycho social sciences in the curriculum of Management that are destined to link it to the conditions of each country, would have an opposite effect if it imposed on us models inspired by contexts other than our own. Only the research method, as a creative means of creating and forming a bibliographic repertoire of its own can impede the distortions that the technical and material assistance of information from overseas, especially the United States, would be capable of provoking in our country (TRIGUEIRO, 1966, s. p.).

Alcadipani and Bertero (2012b) point out that the EAESP, despite having received widespread support from the USA when it was established, developed a hybrid model adapted by the Brazilian professors to local reality. In this sense, it would be interesting to conduct other studies seeking to investigate the realities of the different universities that receive support, such as the argument that gave rise to this discussion. However, we would like to point out that in our opinion this work contributes to the macro approach to the themes in question, highlighting the need to understand the local contexts in the light of the broadest context in which it is embedded.

Therefore, although the study gives only a panoramic view of a relatively short time, we believe that it makes a relevant contribution to academia. This is also because there are not many other works using the same bases of discussion and approaching the same themes. At the same time that it flirts with the debate on the importance of history to help us understand modern times, it also brings a set of documents that can be analyzed in order to create new discussions. The fact that almost all of these documents are available on the internet opens up space for new studies on the influence of the USA to establish higher education in Management in Brazil.

There is also the matter of future studies on the most detailed was of analyzing the resistance that emerged to the agreements between Brazil and the United States. The information that we gathered shows that there were negative reactions among the students at the schools of the FGV, the UPE and, possibly, the UFMG.

Some of this resistance was offered by associations of economists who feared that they would lose out to the new professionals who would graduate from the new courses (see, for instance, ALCADIPANI and BERTERO, 2012a and ANDERSON, 1987), but others were specifically against the support given to these institutions by the United States.

As shown by works such as that of Stoller (2009), a fundamental aspect of the domination and colonization of countries is the formation of its institutions. We cannot ignore the possible effects of the actions taken by the graduates from these schools that would result in the conformity of the country's institutions. They were certainly not the only ones to have an influence on the institution environment of the country, but it seems clear that they are an element to be taken into consideration. In this sense, as we have shown, one of the objectives of the USA when exporting its knowledge and practices, was to help create an environment more favorable to the ideologies that it supported.

At a time when discussions are focusing on the need to develop perspectives from the south (WANDERLEY and FARIA, 2012; ALCADIPANI, KHAN, GANTMAN et al, 2012), it is important to put our own knowledge under analysis from a historical point of view to understand how it appeared and developed. In this way, we believe that it is possible to establish a more adequate look at the local development, revealing processes that are often hidden in that they only replicate knowledge developed outside, ignoring local processes such as those discussed by Curado (2001), Zanetti and Vargas (2007) and Frenkel (2009). By doing this, we open up opportunities to advance our understanding of the local realities and think of new practices (and knowledge) for them.

Finally, we understand that this consideration is more pertinent if it is used to question our academic, which recurrently complains of a "lack of originality" and its "Americanization". These aspects are rooted in the formation of Management as a field of knowledge, not only in this country but all over the world. To face it, it is necessary to take a stance that makes the structure, production and diffusion of knowledge clear, as shown in works such as Ibarra-Colado, Faria and Guedes (2010). For more self-aware knowledge to be constructed and strengthened, we must reflect on the constitution of the field itself and how foreign influences and models are received and articulated.

References

ALCADIPANI, R.; BERTERO, C. O. Guerra Fria e ensino do management no Brasil: o caso da FGV-EAESP. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 52, n. 3, p. 284-299, maio-junho, 2012a.

_____; _____. Uma escola norte-americana no Ultramar? Uma historiografia da Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo na Fundação Getulio Vargas. In: Encontro da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração, 2012, Rio de Janeiro. **Anais do EnANPAD**, 2012b.

_____. CALDAS, M. Americanizing Brazilian Management. **Critical Perspectives on International Business**, v. 8, n.1, p. 37-55, 2012.

_____; COOKE, B. Microcosm of Americanization: writing text books at the Sao Paulo School of Business Administration (FGV-EAESP), Brazil. In: EGOS Colloquium, 2010, Lisboa. **EGOS Colloquium Proceeding**, 2010. v. 1.

_____; _____. The Case of the Missing Textbooks or The Textbook Case? Americanization in Microcosm. In: Academy of Management Meeting, 2011, San Antonio. **Proceedings...**, 2011.

_____ et al. Southern voices in management and organization knowledge. **Organization**, London, v. 19, p. 131-143, Mar., 2012.

ANDERSON, D. **Management education in developing countries: the Brazilian experience**. Boulder: Westview Press, 1987.

ARAÚJO, I. **Foucault e a crítica do sujeito**. Curitiba: UFPR, 2008. 2ª Ed.

AUGIER, M.; MARCH, J.; SULLIVAN, B. Notes on the evolution of a research community: organization studies in Anglophone North America, 1945-2000. **Organization Science**, v. 16, n. 1, p. 85-95, 2005.

BARROS, A. N. O Desenvolvimento das Escolas Superiores de Administração: os saberes administrativos brasileiros no contexto de hegemonia estadunidense. In: XXV Encontro da Anpad, 2011, Rio de Janeiro. Anais do XXXV Encontro da ANPAD. **Anais...** Rio de Janeiro: ANPAD, 2011. p. 1-17.

_____. **Uma narrativa sobre a história dos cursos de administração da FACE-UFMG: às margens do mundo e à sombra da FGV?** Tese, doutorado em administração. Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, 2013.

BERTERO, C. **Pesquisa e ensino em administração**. São Paulo: EAESP/FGV, 2009. 115p. (Relatório de pesquisa 11/2009).

BERTRAND, A. The International Seminar at Rio de Janeiro on Public Administration Problems. In: Unesco. **International Social Sciences Bulletin**. v. 4, n. 4, p. 739-744, 1952. Disponível em <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0005/000596/059694eo.pdf>>. Acesso em 18/10/2012.

BRASIL. **Acordo Básico de Cooperação Técnica Entre o Brasil e os EE. UU. América**. 19 de dezembro de 1950. Disponível em <http://dai-mre.serpro.gov.br/atos-internacionais/bilaterais/1950/b_39/> Acesso em 24/10/2012.

_____. **Diário Oficial da União**. Seção 1, página 8. 19 de julho de 1951. Disponível em <<http://www.jusbrasil.com.br/diarios/2620233/dou-secao-1-19-07-1951-pg-8/pdf>>. Acesso em 19/10/2012.

_____. **Acordo Sobre Programas de Serviços Técnicos Especiais entre o Governo [sic] dos Estados Unidos da América e o Governo [sic] dos Estados Unidos do Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro, 30 de maio de 1953. Disponível em <http://dai-mre.serpro.gov.br/atos-internacionais/bilaterais/1953/b_17/>. Acesso em 24/10/2012.

_____. Comissão Consultiva de Administração Pública. **Programa da Comissão Consultiva de Administração Pública no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro. 1º de março de 1953, 35p.

_____. **Decreto nº 45.660**. 30 de Março de 1959. Disponível em <<http://www2.camara.gov.br/legin/fed/decret/1950-1959/decreto-45660-30-marco-1959-384928-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>>. Acesso em 08/10/2012.

_____. **Diário Oficial da União**. Página 8, seção 1, 20/11/1959. Disponível em: <<http://www.jusbrasil.com.br/diarios/3076951/dou-secao-1-20-11-1959-pg-8/pdfView>>. Acesso em 08/10/2012.

_____. Coleção de Atos Internacionais. N.º 448. Brasil – França. **Acordo Sobre Cooperação Técnico-Administrativa**. Rio de Janeiro, 7 de outubro de 1959. Disponível em <http://dai-mre.serpro.gov.br/atos-internacionais/bilaterais/1959/b_9/>. Acesso em 24/10/2012.

_____. **Decreto nº 50.420**. 7 de Abril de 1961. Disponível em: <<http://www6.senado.gov.br/legislacao/ListaPublicacoes.action?id=113284>>. Acesso em 08/10/2012.

COOKE, B. Writing the Left out of Management Theory: The Historiography of the Management of Change. **Organization**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 81-105, Feb. 1999.

_____. The Management of the (Third) world. **Organization**, v. 11, n. 5, p. 603-629, 2004.

_____. Managerialism as knowing and making Latin America: International development management and world bank interventions. In: FARIA, A.; GUEDES, A. (Eds.). **International Management and International Relations A Critical Perspective from Latin America**. London: Routledge, 2010. p. 161-184.

_____; MILLS, A. J. The right to be human and human rights: Maslow, McCarthyism and the death of humanist theories of management, **Organizational History**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 27-47, 2008.

_____; _____; KELLEY, E. S. Situating Maslow in Cold War America: a recontextualization of management theory. **Group & Organization Management**, v. 30, n. 2, p. 129-152, 2005.

CORAIOLA, D. M. Importância dos arquivos empresariais para a pesquisa histórica no Brasil. **Cad. EBAPE.BR**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 10, n. 2, p. 254-269, junho, 2012.

COSTA, A. M. da; BARROS, D. F.; MARTINS, P. E. Perspectiva Histórica em Administração: novos objetos, novos problemas, novas abordagens. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 50, n. 3, p. 288-299, jul./set., 2010.

COVRE, M. L. M. **A formação e a ideologia do administrador de empresas**. 3 ed. São Paulo, Cortez, 1991.

CUNHA, R. de A. A universidade ao tempo de seu jubileu de prata. **Revista da Universidade de Minas Gerais**, n.10, p.7-11, maio, 1953.

CUNNINGHAM, J. L. Preface. In: Elwyn A. Mauck. **The Establishment of a Public Administration Training Program in the School of Economic Sciences U.M.G.** under a project agreement between The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the University of Minas Gerais, Brazil. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs, 1954.

CURADO, I. B. Pesquisa Historiográfica em Administração: uma proposta metodológica. ENCONTRO ANUAL DA ANPAD, XXV. Campinas, 2001. **Anais...** São Paulo: ANPAD, 2001.

DALIO, D. J.; MIYAMOTO, S. O Governo Vargas e a Comissão Mista Brasil-Estados Unidos, momento formativo. **Ideias**, v. 1, p.151-181, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE. **Point 4**: what is and how it operates. Washington, July, 1951. 20p. Disponível no site: <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACR484.pdf>. Acesso em 20/09/2012.

DWIVEDI, O. P.; NEF, J. Crises and continuities in development theory and administration: first and third world perspectives. **Public Administration and Development**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 59-77, 1982.

ESTADOS UNIDOS DA AMÉRICA (1945). Franklin D. Roosevelt. **Executive Orders**. Disponível em: <<http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/executive-orders/1945-roosevelt.html>>. Acesso em 25/10/2012.

FEATHERSTONE, M. 'Archive', **Theory Culture Society**, v. 23, p. 591-596, 2006.

FISCHER, T. O ensino de administração pública no Brasil: da tutela estrangeira à autonomia necessária. In: Reunião nacional da Anpad, Belo Horizonte, 1985. **Anais...** Florianópolis-SC: 1985. Ed. da UFSC, 1985. p. 165-170

_____. A Difusão do conhecimento Sobre Organizações e Gestão no Brasil: seis propostas para o decênio 2000/2010. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, Edição Especial, p. 123-139, 2001.

_____; WAIANDT, C.; FONSECA, R. L. A história do ensino em administração: contribuições teórico-metodológicas e uma proposta de agenda de pesquisa. **Revista de Administração Pública**. v. 45, n. 4, p. 911-939, jan./ago., 2011.

FRENKEL, M.; SHENHAV, Y. From Americanization to Colonization: the diffusion of productivity models revisited. **Organization Studies**, v. 24, n. 9, p. 1537-1561, 2003.

FUNDAÇÃO GETULIO VARGAS. **O que é, o que faz, como funciona**. FGV: Rio de Janeiro, 1974a.

_____. **Fundação Getulio Vargas, 30 anos a serviço do Brasil**. FGV: Rio de Janeiro, 1974b

GALDIOLI, A. **A Cultura Norte-Americana como um Instrumento do Soft Power dos Estados Unidos**: o caso do Brasil durante a Política da Boa Vizinhança. Dissertação (Mestrado em Relações Internacionais). UNESP/UNICAMP/PUC-São Paulo: São Paulo, 2008.

GRANT, J. D.; MILLS, A. J. The quiet Americans: formative context, the Academy of Management leadership, and the management textbook, 1936-1960. **Management & Organizational History**, v. 1, n. 2, p. 201-224, 2006.

HAINES, G. K. **The Americanization of Brazil**: a study of U.S. cold war diplomacy in the third world. Wilmington: SR Books, 1989.

HILTON, S. The United States, Brazil, and the Cold War, 1945-1960: end of the special relationship. **The Journal of American History**, v. 68, n. 3, p.599-624, 1981.

IBARRA-COLADO, E., FARIA, A.; GUEDES, A. L. Introduction to the special issue on Critical international management and international critical management: perspectives from Latin America. **Critical Perspectives on International Business**, v. 6, n. 2/3, p. 86-96, 2010.

JACQUES, R. **Manufacturing the employee**. London: Sage Publications, 1996.

_____. History, historiography and organization studies: the challenge and the potential. **Management and Organizational History**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 31-49, 2006.

KELLEY, E. S.; MILLS, A. J.; COOKE, B. Management as a Cold War phenomenon? **Human Relations**, v. 59, n. 5, p. 603-610, 2006.

KHURANA, R. KIMURA, K.; FOURCADE, M. **How Foundations Think: the Ford Foundation as a dominating institution in the field of American Business Schools**. Working Paper. Disponível em: <<http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/11-070.pdf>>. Acesso em 10/01/2013. 2011.

_____; SPENDER, J. C. Herbert A. Simon on what ails business schools: more than 'a problem in organizational design'. **Journal of Management Studies**, v. 49, n. 3, p. 619-639, 2012.

KIESER, A. Why Organization Theory Needs Historical Analyses – and how this should be performed. **Organization Science**, v. 5, n. 4, p. 608-620, Nov., 1994.

LANDAU, O. Cold War political culture and the return of systems rationality, moment formative. **Human Relations**, v. 59, n. 5, p. 637-663, 2006.

LAWRENCE, B. S. Historical Perspective: using the past to study the present. **Academy of Management Review**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 307-312, 1984.

LEBLEBICI, H.; SHAH, N. The Birth, transformation and Regeneration of Business Incubators as New Organisational Forms: understanding the interplay between organisational history and organisational theory. **Business History**, v. 46, n. 3, p. 353-380, July, 2004.

LE GOFF, J. **História e Memória**. Campinas: UNICAMP, 2003, p. 1-171. 5ª Ed.

LOCKE, R. **The Collapse of the American Management Mystique**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

MACHADO, M. **O Ensino de Administração Pública no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Fundação Getulio Vargas, 1966.

MARANHÃO, C. M. **Indústria cultural e semiformação**: análise crítica da formação dos administradores. 2010. 249f. Tese (Doutorado em Administração) – Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2010.

MARCH, J. The study of organizations and organizing since 1945. **Organization Studies**, v. 28, n. 1. p. 9-19, 2007.

MARTINS, C. B. Surgimento e expansão dos cursos de administração no Brasil. São Paulo: **Ciência e Cultura**, v. 7, p. 663 -676, jul., 1989.

MATTOS, P. L. C.; CARVALHO, E. O currículo do curso de graduação em administração da UFPE: reparando sequelas da reforma universitária. In: XVI Encontro da Associação Nacional dos Cursos de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Canela. **Anais...**, v. 3, p. 90-104, 1992.

MAUCK, E. A. **The Establishment of a Public Administration Training Program in the School of Economic Sciences U.M.G.** under a project agreement between The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the University of Minas Gerais, Brazil. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs, 1954.

MONIZ BANDEIRA, L. A. **Presença dos Estados Unidos no Brasil.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2007.

_____. **Brasil-Estados Unidos: a rivalidade emergente, 1950-1988.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2011. 3ª Ed.

MOTTA, P. R. Administração para o desenvolvimento – a disciplina em busca da relevância. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 6, n. 3, p.39-53, jul./set., 1972.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS. Special Comitee on Public Administration Problems. **Standards and techniques of public administration** – with special reference for under developed countries. Disponível em <<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015015206868>>. Acesso em 27/09/2012. New York, p. 67, fev. 1966.

_____. **Yearbook of the United Nations.** Economic and Social Questions. 1952. Disponível em: <<http://www.unhcr.org/4e1ee76e0.pdf>>. Acesso em 27/09/2012.

_____. **Contribution of the United Nations to the improvement of public administration** – a 60 –year history. United Nations: New York, 2008. p. 85.

PARMAR, I. American foundations and the development of international knowledge networks. **Global Networks**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 13-30, 2002.

PIERANTI, O. P. A metodologia historiográfica na pesquisa em administração: uma discussão acerca de princípios e de sua aplicabilidade no Brasil contemporâneo. **Cad. EBAPE.BR**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 6, n. 1, março, p. 1-12, 2008.

RAGO, M. O efeito-Foucault na historiografia brasileira. *Tempo Social*. **Revista de Sociologia da USP**, São Paulo, v. 7 n. 1-2, p. 67-82, outubro de 1995.

RIBEIRO, R. A. **A Aliança Para o Progresso e as relações Brasil-Estados Unidos.** (Tese, doutorado em ciência política). Departamento de Ciência Política, Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 2006.

RUNTE, M.; MILLS, A. J. Cold War, chilly climate: exploring the roots of gendered discourse in organization and management theory. **Human Relations**, v. 59, n. 5, p. 695-720, 2006.

SCHOEPS, W. Decanos da FGV. Entrevista concedida a Françoise Terzian. **GV Executivo**, v. 3, n. 3, ago./out. 2004. Disponível em <<http://rae.fgv.br/sites/rae.fgv.br/files/artigos/3483.pdf>>. Acesso em 25/10/2012.

SENADO FEDERAL. Subsecretaria de Anais. **Decretos Legislativos.** Volume IV, 1956-1959. Brasília. Pp. 707-715. Disponível em <<http://www.senado.gov.br/publicacoes/anais/pdf/Decretos/1956,%201957,%201958%20e%201959.pdf>>. Acesso em 08/10/2012. 1975.

SIEGEL, G. The school of public administration involvement in international education and institution building programs. In: CLAYTON, R.; NELSON, E. K.; NEWLAND, C.; JENSEN, C. **Futures of the Past: collected papers in celebration of its more than eighty years** University of Southern California's School of Policy, Planning and Development. Bloomington: Iuniverse, 2010. p. 371-400.

STOLLER, A. L. **Along the archival grain: epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense.** Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009.

STORCK, V. Notas para a história da administração brasileira: origens e desenvolvimento. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**. São Paulo, v. 23, n. 3, p. 57-62, 1983.

STORM, W. B; MARKEY, B. **Technical Assistance in Public Administration. The Domestic Role II**: a report on the Brazilian program. University of Southern Carolina 1952-1954. January, 1959, p. 68. Disponível em: <<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015081239066>>. Acesso em 25/09/2012.

TAYLOR, D. A. **Institution Building in Business Administration**: the Brazilian experience. Michigan: Institute for International Business and Economic Development Studies, Michigan State University, 1968.

TOTA, A. P. O Imperialismo sedutor: a americanização do Brasil na Segunda Guerra. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.

_____. **Cultura e Dominação: relações culturais entre o Brasil e os Estados Unidos durante a Guerra Fria. Perspectivas**. São Paulo, v. 27, p. 111-122, 2005.

TRUMAN, H. **Inaugural Address**. Disponível em <<http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres53.html>>. Acesso em 26/10/2012, 1951.

TRIGUEIRO, D. **Sobre o currículo mínimo dos cursos de Administração**. Parecer para o Ministério da Educação e Cultura. Documento n. 45, p. 80, fev. 1966.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. A. I. D. Mission to Brazil (USAID). **Report on examination of Getulio Vargas Foundation Construction**. Grant agreement n°. 512-31-660-263.1 and counterpart cruzeiro release for the period December 3, 1964 through June, 30. Disponível em <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDAAT086.pdf>, acesso em: 26/10/2012. 1967.

_____. **A Study of USAID Assistance to Brazil: 1961-1974**. Final Report. Washington, June 2, 1986.

ÜSDIKEM, B.; KIESER, A. Introduction: history in organization studies. **Business History**, v. 46, n. 3, p. 321-330, July, 2004.

_____; WASTI, S. Preaching, Teaching and Researching at the Periphery: academic management literature in Turkey, 1970-1999. **Organization Studies**, v. 30, n. 10, p.1063-1082, 2009.

VIZEU, F. **Management no Brasil em Perspectiva Histórica**: o projeto do IDORT nas décadas de 1930 e 1940. Tese (Doutorado em Administração). 254f. EAESP/FGV. São Paulo: 2008.

_____. Potencialidades da Análise Histórica nos Estudos Organizacionais Brasileiros. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 50, n. 1, p. 37-47, jan./mar., 2010.

WANDERLEY, S.; FARIA, A. The Chandler Furtado Case: a Decolonial Reframing of a North South (dis)Encounter. **Management & Organizational History**, v. 7, p. 219-236, 2012.

WHITE HOUSE. **Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program**. Disponível em <http://www23.us.archive.org/stream/reporttocongress1955unit/reporttocongress1955unit_djvu.txt>. Acesso em 18/10/2012. 1955.

WU, C.Y. L'administration publique pour le developement national: analyse du Programme de l'Organisation des Nations Unies en matière d'administration publique. In **Revue Internationale des sciences sociales**. v. XXI, n. 1, p. 132-152, 1969.

ZIMMERMAN, J. L. **Can American Business Schools Survive?** p. 1-31. Disponível em <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=283112>. Acesso em 15/12/2012. 2001.