

The specialization and internationalization of studies on books and publishing in Argentina

Gustavo Sorá and Paula Molina Ordoñez¹

The goal of this article is to analyze the current situation of studies on books and publishing in Argentina. There are risks involved with writing a comprehensive review of the research community of which we form part, but we will aim to avoid these risks. It would be short-sighted, for example, to attempt a theoretical interpretation of the models of analysis used by researchers. The choices of authors, concepts, perspectives, and themes could be disputed, dissected, and classified; they can be the subject of controversy and endless arguments. In contrast, the sociology of science enables us to observe a given set of researchers as a social group like any other, with its inherent divisions, hierarchies, rituals, and forms of expression.

This paper will analyze studies on books and publishing by using the characteristics drawn up at the *Coloquio Argentino de Estudios sobre el Libro y la Edición* [Argentine Colloquium of Studies on Books and Publishing; hereinafter CAELE], a national academic event held twice, in 2012 and in 2016. To prevent the nationalist biases typical of research methodology, this paper also seeks to give an objective view of some dimensions of the internationalization process that are inexorably at the core of all experiences in specialization, in terms of academic production in particular and symbolic goods in general.²

Academic events represent institutional rituals: they fulfill an inclusive function, regulate channels of exchange and establish evaluation criteria about specialists and their “knowledge.” Colloquiums, seminars and congresses enable us to observe who chooses to attend based on their interest in researching the world of books and publishing. Events that are described as “national” or “international” foreground their collective claims of empowerment and their separation from other overlapping fields of

1 Cultural Anthropology and History Program – *Instituto de Antropología de Córdoba* [Anthropology Institute of Córdoba] – CONICET [*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas*; National Scientific and Technical Research Council of Argentina] – *Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* [National University of Córdoba].

2 The point of view constructed in this study is informed by the framework of knowledge we have shared through our participation in the project “INTERCO – SSH: International Cooperation in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Comparative Socio-Historical Perspectives and Future Possibilities.” This project took place between 2013 and 2017, led by Gisèle Sapiro (EHESS – CNRS) and financed by the European Commission (FP7-SSH-2012-2. Proposal no. 319974).

specialization (e.g. cultural studies) or their forerunners (e.g. intellectual history). They proclaim the right to be recognized as a legitimate subject and become part of the academic and scientific realm. To this end, this article will use the CAELE colloquiums as a means of interpreting the origins and differentiation of studies on books and publishing in Argentina, and as an arena for academic specialization. This involves two central activities: firstly, understanding that these events are viable, having derived from a process of accumulation and growth. The colloquiums took place as a result of an intellectual, academic, and social history. Secondly, we will explore how this community differs from other communities of specialists, because international relationships tend to be mobilized nationally. Specialization involves internationalization, not only in science, but in all systems that produce symbolic goods. It is expressed through the appropriation of ideas conceived in other countries and by the mobility of players across linguistic and cultural borders. This dimension – generally rejected and therefore revealing – prevents methodological nationalism, a cognitive incentive which must disengage from the very world that embraces and conditions it in order to showcase local or national events and figures.

Specialization

In Argentina, papers on presses, bookshops, and publishers are found as early as the 1940s. Some contributions, such as those by Domingo Buonocore (1944; 1955) and Guillermo Furlong (1947; 1953), are very rich in sources, raw data, and iconography. Developing in parallel to the internationalization of the book market, which started in the 1950s,³ we can find a few studies with a statistical basis, demonstrating the efforts of Argentine publishers to stimulate professional policies in their own markets (Bottaro 1964; Garcia 1965). In 1980 and then 1990, the first papers were published offering a broad view of the history of books in Argentina. In the first half of the 1980s, literary critic Jorge Rivera devoted four studies to the professionalization of writers and the evolution of the publishing industry (Rivera 1985). His work, illustrated with abundant visual material, assembles statistical series and proposes a periodization for the evolution of the Argentine book market. In 1995, *La edición de libros en la Argentina. Una empresa de cultura* [*Book publishing in Argentina. A cultural enterprise*] by

3 The Frankfurt Book Fair, as an event and ritual of the institutionalization of the international publishing market, clearly encompasses in its evolution the process of internationalization described herein. Regarding the globalization of cultural production, the synergy generated by UNESCO starting in the 1950s and the effects of neo-colonialist and imperialist policies in the context of the cultural cold war must also be considered.

Leandro de Sagastizábal, professional editor and historian, was published. Although brief, his study built on the history of some outstanding publishers to consider the key stages in the development of the Argentine book market in the twentieth century.

In the 1990s, Argentine researchers including Graciela Batticuore (2005) and Gustavo Sorá (2010) started to carry out research closely related to the international history of books. However, isolated studies and names cannot be considered to constitute a branch of academic specialization. In 2006, the results of the first collective research finally came out, edited by José Luís de Diego (2006) as part of the literary studies degree at the Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP). *Editores y políticas editoriales en la Argentina (1880-2000)* [*Publishers and editorial policies in Argentina (1880-2000)*] represents the genetic threshold of the current system which delineates this field of academic research.⁴ As a sign of a more extensive differentiation process, José Luís de Diego brought together a “national” community at the first CAELE event, held in La Plata in November 2012. After a series of conversations at the Confeitería París in La Plata, capital of the Buenos Aires province, de Diego and Sorá – both La Plata natives – invited colleagues with a research interest in publishing studies from academic institutions across the country to join the CAELA planning committee. Its members were José Luis de Diego (UNLP); Gustavo Sorá (Written Culture, Printed World and Intellectual Field research program – *Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* – CeMiCi-UNC); Horacio Tarcus (*Centro de Documentación y de Investigación de la Cultura de Izquierdas en Argentina* [Center for Documentation and Research on Leftist Culture in Argentina] – CeDInCI); Margarita Pierini (Department of Social Sciences – *Universidad Nacional de Quilmes* – DCS-UNQ); Ana Wortman (*Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani* – *Universidad de Buenos Aires* – IIGG-UBA); Leandro de Sagastizábal and Ana Mosqueda, professors at the Degree in Publishing Program at the UBA’s Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. The debates stimulated by the organization of the colloquium led to the choice of a name that deliberately avoided putting history at the center of the discipline. It was also decided that studies on the reading and publishing of journals, which already had a certain tradition in specific disciplines such as educational sciences and intellectual history, would be excluded.

4 The international framework for this study includes the meeting organized by SHARP at the 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences (IHS) in Sydney, where national models were debated internationally in an attempt to extend the worldwide geography of cases providing information on the worldwide expansion of publishing markets and the models for studying empirical reference. Sorá (2011) is a broad study of the history and historiography of books and publishing in Argentina, in which he frames his reflections in that context of academic internationalization.

For the first CAELE program it was decided to invite specialists rather than issue an open call for papers. The event also included four special presentations, including two conferences led by the French researchers Gisèle Sapiro and Jean-Yves Mollier, both invited by Sorá. In all, fifty-six presentations were given by sixty-five participants. Among these, 60% were senior researchers over the age of 40 with a slight majority of women (57%). Although the colloquium's title defined it as a national multidisciplinary event, eleven foreign researchers also presented their work, representing 17% of the total, mainly Brazilians and Uruguayans. The discipline most represented was History (38%), followed by Letters (23%).

Table 1: Affiliation and distribution of disciplines for participants in the first CAELE

DISCIPLINE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
History	25	38%
Letters	15	23%
Sociology	8	12%
Publishing	5	8%
NIA	3	5%
Social Sciences	2	3%
Political Science	2	3%
Anthropology	2	3%
Social Communication	2	3%
Library Science	1	1%
GENERAL TOTAL	65	100%

NIA: No information available

Given the variety of subjects addressed by the participants, the presentations were held in several thematic panels on the publishing industry (12 studies in total covering three periods: the nineteenth century, 1920–1930, and 1930–1970), left-wing publishers (11 presentations in 3 sessions), and independent publishers (7 presentations, 2 sessions). There were also specific single-session panels on the geopolitics of publishing

(4 presentations), university publishers (4 presentations), the theory and history of books (4 presentations), fairs and exhibitions (3 presentations), canon, standards, and value (3 presentations), reading and consumerism (3 presentations), and materiality (3 presentations). There was one panel dedicated to studies from other countries, with presentations on Uruguay, Mexico, and Cuba, which focused on studies that did not compare data with Argentina or were transnational in scope.

A more detailed look at the abstracts and presentations enables us to refine the quantitative interpretation of topics covered. With regard to time period, most of the studies focused on topics and problems from the middle of the twentieth century to 2012. The studies devoted to the period from 1945–2000 represented 40% of the total. With regard to empirical examples, 43% of the studies analyzed publishers (58% specialist and 48% general publishers). This group included broad studies of the history of publishers or specific aspects of topics including book collecting. The remaining 57% covered diverse topics, with studies on the book market as a whole in first place (33% of this subset), followed by events (15%), the history and historiography of books (15%), and reading (12%).

In terms of geographic coverage, Argentina represented 71% of the total, with more than half regional in nature and focusing on Buenos Aires (38%), suggesting the capital occupies a hyper-central position. Indeed, more than 80% of the country's editorial output is concentrated in Buenos Aires. Most studies fail to problematize the effects of restricting their observations and analysis to Buenos Aires, paying scant attention to the question of how representative the city is of the national market. Less than 8% of the presentations referred to Argentina's interior. On the other hand, 19% of the studies were transnational in scale and 10% were about another Latin American country. Half of the former and one of the latter had Argentine authors.

Table 2: Thematic distribution of the studies presented at the first CAELE

SUBJECT	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Publishers	25	43.10%
Other	33	56.90%
GENERAL TOTAL	58	100.00%

PUBLISHERS	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Specialist	14	58.33%
General	10	41.67%

GENERAL TOTAL	24	100.00%
---------------	----	---------

PUBLISHERS ACCORDING TO GENRE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Politics	8	50.00%
Literature	6	37.50%
Social sciences and humanities	2	12.50%
GENERAL TOTAL	16	100.00%

OTHER	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Book market	11	33.33%
Events	5	15.15%
History and historiography of books	5	15.15%
Reading	4	12.12%
Written/printed culture	3	9.09%
Translation	2	6.06%
Materiality	1	3.03%
Publication of periodicals	1	3.03%
Libraries	1	3.03%
GENERAL TOTAL	33	100.00%

Four years after the first meeting, the Second CAELE took place. The event, held at the *Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* in September 2016, was organized by three of the five groups involved in the 2012 meeting: the group from La Plata chaired by José Luis de Diego; the group from Buenos Aires chaired by Horacio Tarcus; and the group from Cordoba chaired by Gustavo Sorá, Ana Clarisa Agüero, and Diego García. Additionally, planning committee also welcomed the *Núcleo de Estudios del Libro y la Edición del Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social* [Center for Studies on Books and Publishing of the Institute for Economic and Social Development] (NELE-IDES), founded that same year by Alejandro Dujovne, whose career had begun with the group from Cordoba. This time an academic committee was established, with representatives from the planning teams and foreign researchers from France, Brazil, and Mexico. This demonstrated the organization's willingness to connect the nascent national field of study in Argentina with international research.

The first CAELE having demonstrated the existence of an emergent national field, the second was planned along the lines of a typical scholarly conference. Its program, drawn up through an open call with the evaluation of abstracts, featured 87

presentations, with 98 researchers taking part as presenters, commentators, panelists, and keynote speakers. Like the meeting in La Plata, two keynotes speakers were scheduled – Jean-Yves Mollier again and Horacio Tarcus. Two new panels were also included, one presenting collective projects from the research programs involved in organizing the event, the other summing up the event at its closure, given by members of the academic committee and colleagues from Brazil, Mexico, and Spain.

The growth and vitality of the field was reflected in the fact that 60% of studies were now presented by junior researchers under the age of 40. The gender balance remained the same, with slightly more women than men. The most-represented disciplines also stayed the same, with History at 37% and Letters at 23%. These were followed by the Social Sciences, which, as a group, had a greater presence than had been the case at La Plata, and 6% of the participants were categorized under Publishing. The last category deserves a brief commentary. The undergraduate degree program in Publishing was created at the UBA’s Faculty of Philosophy and Letters in the 1990s, and for many years it was the only degree program of this type in the world, as professional training degrees in publishing tend to be postgraduate courses. Despite its professional slant, professors in the program, such as Leandro de Sagastizábal and Ana Mosqueda, have sought to develop interest in the historical and social aspects of publishing among students and graduates. From 2006 to 2012, Mosqueda edited the journal *Páginas de Guarda*, specializing in print culture. She then founded her own publishing house, Ampersand, in 2012. Much of its catalog focuses on studies of the book world, including translations of authors at the forefront of the international scene, such as Jean-Yves Mollier, Martyn Lyons, Armando Petrucci, and Frédéric Barbier.

Table 3: Affiliation and distribution of disciplines for participants in the second CAELE

DISCIPLINE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
History	36	37%
Letters	23	23%
Sociology	7	7%
Social Sciences	6	6%
Publishing	6	6%
Anthropology	4	4%
Communication	4	4%
Arts	3	3%
Library Science	3	3%

Philosophy	2	2%
Educational Sciences	2	2%
Philology	1	1%
NIA	1	1%
GENERAL TOTAL	98	100%

NIA: No information available

There was a greater relative presence of foreigners at the 2016 meeting compared to the first CAELE (21% in 2016; 17% in 2012). This was undoubtedly the result of efforts by the event organizers and, from a sociological perspective, shows how the differentiation of a field of national symbolic production emphasizes communication relationships and international competition (Thiesse 1999). Among the foreigners, Brazilian participation was the highest (13%), more than twice the participation of nationalities with the next highest representation (Colombians, 5%; Mexicans, 5%, Uruguayans, 4%), thus suggesting a close relationship between Argentina and Brazil. This can also be seen from the presence of three Brazilians in the academic committee, Eliana de Freitas Dutra of the *Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais* (Federal University of Minas Gerais), Gabriela Pellegrino Soares, and Nelson Schapochnik both from the *Universidade de São Paulo* (Sao Paulo University). There was a slight increase in the range of university and research unit affiliations resulting from the open call.

Studies on publishers represented almost 50% of the presentations, with a slight predominance of studies dedicated to specialist publishers (55%) compared to general publishers (45%). In terms of the genres published, a greater number of studies focused on publishers of Literature (35%) and Social and Human Sciences (32%) compared to Politics (18%). Studies were also presented on Educational publishers, Art and Children's and Young Adult Literature. The 52% of other studies included the book market as a whole (13%), periodical publications (16%), libraries (13%) and translation (11%). These subjects were brought together at specific panel discussions.

In chronological terms, studies dedicated to the twentieth century again dominated the second CAELE, with a relative decrease in the period 1945–2000 (33%). There were also fewer studies on the present day, while research papers devoted to the first half of the twentieth century increased to 13%. Moreover, there were fewer presentations relating to the nineteenth century (8%), and a small number of studies on previous eras (colonial 2%; European seventeenth century 2%).

Table 4: Thematic distribution of the studies presented at the second CAELE

SUBJECT	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Publishers	42	48.28%
Other	45	51.72%
GENERAL TOTAL	87	100.00%

PUBLISHERS	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Specialist	23	54.76%
General	19	45.24%
GENERAL TOTAL	42	100.00%

PUBLISHERS BY GENRE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Literature	14	37.84%
Social sciences and humanities	12	32.43%
Politics	7	18.92%
Education	2	5.41%
Art	1	2.70%
Children's and Young Adult Literature	1	2.70%
GENERAL TOTAL	37	100.00%

OTHER	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Publication of periodicals	7	15.56%
Libraries	6	13.33%
Book market	6	13.33%
Translation	5	11.11%
Materiality	4	8.89%
Written/printed culture	3	6.67%
Public policies	3	6.67%
Reading	3	6.67%
History and historiography of books	3	6.67%
Circulation of ideas	2	4.44%
Events	2	4.44%
Marketing	1	2.22%
GENERAL TOTAL	45	100.00%

The subjects and frameworks of analysis were again national in scope, both in the studies on Argentina (60%) and on other Latin American countries (23%). Only in two cases did Latin American authors present studies on Europe, with one study on England and another on Portugal. Compared to the first CAELE, there was also a decrease in transnational studies. In 2012 they represented 19%, while in 2016 they dropped to

15%, half by Argentine authors and the rest by foreigners. These percentages enable us to conclude that an increase in the international profile of the scholars⁵ did not necessarily translate into a change in the scale of analysis. In other words, studies on Argentina maintained the same proportion; there was no increase in transnational studies or in Argentine researchers studying the world of books in other countries.

Internationalization

One of the greatest obstacles to the evolution of intellectual practices in general and in the social sciences and humanities in particular is the inertia of the frameworks of thought focused on the geographic and symbolic limits of the nation (Elias 1989, p. 27; Sapiro 2017, p. 20 ff). Providing an objective analysis of the current state of studies on books and publishing in Argentina would be pointless without looking at the international relations underlying the establishment and transformation of this field of national academic production. The indicators of internationalization can be quite varied in nature (Heilbron *et al.*, 2017), such as the international mobility of specialists, the reception and translation of foreign authors, and an interest in the study of “non-national” subjects, to name but a few. By looking at individual trajectories, these indicators can become numerous and diverse in terms of disciplines, countries and thematic frames. To provide an objective analysis of the specialization of studies on books and publishing in Argentina, we will refer to how these national events are matched by events abroad in which organizers of the Argentine scene have taken part. We will focus on events at which Argentine researchers crossed paths abroad, which undoubtedly streamlined synergies of regional internationalization. Noteworthy among these is the effect of internationalization achieved at the conferences and other events organised by the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing (SHARP).⁶

5 By using a national event’s increased internationalization as a piece of data, we can affirm the hypothesis that it can be generalized to other indicators: Argentine researchers’ experiences in international mobility; the ever-increasing use of bibliographic references by foreign specialists; an increase in the translation of principle works; an increase in the frequency of foreign specialist visits, etc.

6 There have been two regional SHARP meetings in Latin America, at Rio in 2013 and Monterrey in 2015. In 2016, SHARP had around 1,000 members (mainly researchers, with some students and institutions) from forty countries (United States, 60%; Canada, 15%; Europe [predominantly the United Kingdom], 10%; others, 15%), including 29 individuals and 23 institutions that operate as “regional liaisons,” whose aim is to strengthen ties with other academic fields, especially in Latin America, Asia, and Oceania.

We would first like to draw attention to the SHARP twentieth annual conference, which took place in June 2012 at Trinity College, Dublin. This event was the first annual SHARP conference at which the participation of three Argentine researchers can be verified. Geraldine Rogers (UNLP), who at that time was the only Argentine member of SHARP, was named regional liaison by the Transnational Affairs representative in 2012.⁷ Sorá (UNC) and Dujovne (IDES) presented a study on geopolitics in publishing, based on their ethnographic and socio-historical research on the Frankfurt Book Fair.⁸ Dublin further served as a meeting space for Latin American intellectuals and academics, just as many European capitals have historically. This was evident by the way in which the Argentine participants interacted with their Brazilian colleagues Nelson Schapochnik, Gabriela Pellegrino Soares, Giselle Venancio, and Eliana das Freitas Dutra, who did not present papers, but who traveled to the conference to work with SHARP executives on a project for the first regional SHARP conference in Latin America. In Brazil, the field of studies explored in this article underwent differentiation earlier than it did in Argentina, and Brazil was a country of reference for Argentine scholars in terms of training and internationalization. Since the late 1990s, Jean-Yves Mollier has played an important role in internationalizing Latin American researchers, acting as broker and promoting their professionalization and internationalization.⁹ It was Jean-Yves Mollier who proposed the idea of approaching SHARP and, according to accounts from Brazilian colleagues, who encouraged them to organize SHARP Rio 2013.

“*A cidade das letras – SHARP Rio*” [A city of letters – SHARP Rio] was the name of the conference held at the *Universidade Federal Fluminense*, located in the city of Niterói, State of Rio de Janeiro, in November 2013. As shown in the table below, it brought together the entire community of Brazilian specialists and attracted colleagues

7 Geraldine Rogers (UNLP) presented the paper “Against the avant-garde poets in ‘the people’s newspaper’: A battle led by the cultural left in 1920s Argentina,” at Session 2.5: Counter Cultures.

8 Gustavo Sorá (UNC) and Alejandro Dujovne (IDES) presented the paper “The Frankfurt Book Fair and other structures of power in the international publishing market: perspectives from the South,” at Session 1.7: International publishing I.

9 This also applies to Gisèle Sapiro, even though she has not been involved to the same extent as Mollier at the institutions and events referred to in the present article. Her presence, however, is significant in terms of the consolidation of studies on the sociology of publishing, translation, and other areas of brokering between markets of symbolic goods transnationally.

from various countries in Latin America.¹⁰ 164 presentations were made by researchers from 11 countries at the event.

Table 5. Country of origin of the presenters at SHARP – Rio 2013

COUNTRY	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
Brazil	120	73.17%
Argentina	19	11.59%
Mexico	10	6.10%
Portugal	4	2.44%
Spain	2	1.22%
Uruguay	2	1.22%
France	2	1.22%
USA	2	1.22%
Colombia	1	0.61%
Holland	1	0.61%
Australia	1	0.61%
GENERAL TOTAL	164	100.00%

Among the nationalities with a lower representation at the CAELE, our Portuguese colleagues have cultural and historical ties in the Lusophone community, while representatives from the United States (Jane Griffin from Bentley University and Nicolas Kanellos from the University of Houston), Australia (Martyn Lyons) and Holland (Lisa Kuitert) join Leslie Howsam and Susan Pickford as renowned researchers with a distinct institutional commitment to the internationalization of SHARP. Table 6 below shows the distribution of speakers according to institutional affiliation, including those with three or more agents:

Table 6. Institutional affiliations of the presenters at SHARP – Rio 2013 (institutions represented by 3 or more agents)

INSTITUTION	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	%
<i>Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro</i> (Brazil)	17	10.37%
<i>Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais</i> (Brazil)	13	7.93%

¹⁰ In Brazil, several colloquiums have been organized since the end of the 1990s, thus fostering the institutionalization of studies on books and publishing. Two events were organized in 2004 and 2009 with “national” aspirations, called the 1st and 2nd “*Seminário brasileiro sobre livro e história editorial*” [Brazilian workshop on books and the history of publishing]. The fact that this series of events was discontinued may be indicative of dissent regarding the origins and profile of these events. However, this would be a subject of future analysis on an academic community that continues to grow and is the primary reference for all our colleagues in Latin America.

<i>Universidade Federal Fluminense</i> (Brazil)	12	7.32%
<i>Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro</i> (Brazil)	11	6.71%
<i>Universidade de São Paulo</i> (Brazil)	10	6.10%
<i>Universidad Nacional de La Plata</i> (Argentina)	6	3.66%
<i>Universidade Federal do Piauí</i> (Brazil)	5	3.05%
<i>Universidade Federal de São Paulo</i> (Brazil)	4	2.44%
<i>Universidad Nacional de Quilmes</i> (Argentina)	4	2.44%
<i>Universidad de Buenos Aires</i> (Argentina)	4	2.44%
<i>Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro</i> (Brazil)	4	2.44%
<i>Universidade Estadual Paulista</i> (Brazil)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto</i> (Brazil)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidade Estadual de Campinas</i> (Brazil)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidade Nova de Lisboa</i> (Portugal)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidade de Santo Amaro</i> (Brazil)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidad Nacional de Córdoba</i> (Argentina)	3	1.83%
<i>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México</i> (Mexico)	3	1.83%
<i>Instituto Mora</i> (Mexico)	3	1.83%

Four Argentine institutions are represented in the table above. They are, by order of importance, UNLP, UBA, UNQ, and UNC. There are also three researchers from the *Instituto Mora* in Mexico and three from UNAM, as well as two researchers from the *Instituto Tecnológico de Monterrey*, who went on to organize the second SHARP meeting in Latin America in Monterrey, Mexico in 2015.

Conclusion

Analysis of the *Coloquio Argentino de Estudios sobre el Libro y la Edición*, held in 2012 and 2016, provides an objective overview of the origins and evolution of this field of study within a particular academic system. The factors behind such extensive development go beyond the facts that provide visibility to academic events.¹¹ For example, the national policies that contributed to strengthening higher education and science from 2003 to 2013 (cf. Beigel and Sorá 2018) should be considered. Studies on books and publishing have been promoted not only through academic disciplines within the sphere of public universities and CONICET, but also through private research institutions such as CeDInCI and IDES and by publishers such as Ampersand. The various research groups that helped plan the CAELE meetings have also been sites of

11 In November 2017, inter-group meetings were started to plan the third CAELE in Buenos Aires.

socialization and training, before this specialization gained recognition within the academic system. A broader understanding of the current conditions for the consolidation of studies on books and publishing in Argentina potentially includes a study of many other agents, institutions, and events,¹² for example, professorships in the history of books in degree programs in library science, journals, and collections of specialist books. This would complete the overview of events, agents, and conditions that explain the strength of the foundations for studies on books and publishing in Argentina as a dynamic new academic field. Now, more than ever, the materiality of printed material, mediations between authors and readers, translation, and other subjects in this field of knowledge are being taken into account in dominant disciplines such as literary studies and intellectual history with a long trajectory in Argentina, which have traditionally favored close readings of texts and the assessment of works as pure manifestations of creative genius.

In this study, internationalization, a factor that is generally dismissed but has a structural role, both in peripheral and metropolitan cultural spaces, has highlighted some of the routes and geographies used to articulate the evolution of studies on books and publishing in Argentina. International academic fields take on different shapes and channels of communication depending on time and place. In line with the methodology used, this article has simply sought to highlight the effects of the internationalization program undertaken by SHARP. At the first regional SHARP event in Latin America, held in Niterói in 2013, Leslie Howsam and Martyn Lyons were the key mediators who promoted the internationalization of SHARP, as well as our Brazilian colleagues, who included Argentine scholars in the program to give the conference a Latin American dimension. Yet following the second regional event in Monterrey in 2015, there are no signs that these conferences will continue in the near future. Many Latin American researchers (including colleagues with representative functions at SHARP) have shared their accounts of how difficult it is as Latin Americans to connect with SHARP. Some face economic difficulties in the form of a high annual subscription and conference registration fees; others are critical of the political-academic discourse surrounding the conditions for equal participation in an international association based in the United States. For reasons related to time and social proximity it would be unwise to cite this type of critical testimony (some have been recorded). Nor have we worked on this text

¹² Among the events, it is important to mention that in addition to the CAELE, the National Library in Buenos Aires organized the first and second seminars on the history of editorial policies in Argentina and Iberian America in 2015 and 2017.

using subjective elements. To transcend the cultural judgments of actors, it is important to understand, from a sociological standpoint, the dynamics of internationalization and academic and professional practices. Yves Dezalay and Bryant Garth (2016) offer instruments for an objective analysis. Their sociology of internationalization studies the internationalization of national fields in parallel with the construction of transnational spaces. In addition to many other dimensions, they highlight that transnationalization creates a space that generates extranational instances of relationships, resources, and values that have an impact on the dynamics of national fields and regulate competition *between* national fields. The brief description of the countries and the cultural areas where SHARP is present (see note 6) leads to some hypotheses on the effects and limits of a transnationalization process promoted by an institution that should be thought of in terms of the dual process noted by Dezalay and Garth: on the one hand, interests and effects within a dominant pole (the United States) and on the other, transnational instances that bring together agents who act with unequal power, according to the interests and structures of their national spaces of origin.

If we observe the international scene according to the dynamics of Argentine researchers, their interactions with the field are predominately mediated by Brazilian and French colleagues. French scholars such as Jean-Yves Mollier and Gisèle Sapiro started a networking process with Argentines through their contacts in Brazil. While quantitative elements would serve to demonstrate the more extensive and earlier development of studies on books and publishing in Brazil, the academic relationships forged between French and Argentine researchers in the field of human and social sciences are substantiated by recent studies showing the relevance of French ancestry in the Argentine academic scene (Sorá and Dujovne, 2018). An analysis of networks and connections among colleagues from different metropolitan and Latin American academic fields would shed significant light on the effects of internationalization on studies of books and publishing, without falling victim to the reductionism of some decolonial positions that reify and homogenize realities in “the North” and “the South.” Far from resolving these “natural” tensions with ideological stances, if internationalization is generally considered to be a structural element, the more diversity there is in the sources of transnationalization, the more successful internationalization will be in strengthening different national fields. In this sense, in addition to SHARP's own policies, it is worth highlighting the achievements of international projects such as EDI-Red, a virtual archive on the history of books and publishing in Iberian America

coordinated by the Spanish scholar Pura Fernández, or the *Red Latinoamericana de Cultura Gráfica* [Latin American Network of Graphic Culture] by Marina Garone, Nelson Schapochnik, Geraldine Rogers, Ana Utsch, Sandra Szir, and colleagues from several other countries in the region. The effects of these initiatives are already visible in terms of consolidating new spaces for (inter)nationalization, sometimes intensely so, such as in Colombia. The *Instituto Caro y Cuervo* and the *Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano* in Colombia will hold the *Encuentro Latinoamericano del Libro la edición y la lectura* [Latin American Meeting on Books, Publishing, and Reading] in July 2018. Some months later, the third CAELE conference will take place in Argentina.

In addition to analyzing a specific national case, we hope the hypotheses and examples from this study have helped to promote a program of reflexive understanding on the academic practices inherent in it. These collective histories should be considered as factors that explain the conditions that shape all objects of knowledge. If these parameters for reading are accepted, we will have contributed to the enrichment of studies on books and publishing, not just in Argentina, but internationally.

Translated by Maureen Shaughnessy

References

- Batticuore, Graciela, *La mujer romántica. Lectoras, autoras y escritoras en la Argentina: 1830-1970*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2005.
- Beigel, Fernanda and Gustavo Sorá. "SSH in Argentina: cycles and circuits." In Christian Fleck and Victor Karady, eds., *Diversities of institutionalization of the social sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018 (forthcoming).
- Bottaro, Raúl. *La edición de libros en Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Troquel, 1964.
- Buonocore, Domingo. *Libreros, editores e impresores de Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1944.
- . *El mundo de los libros*. Santa Fe: Castelví, 1955.
- Dezalay, Yves and Bryant Garth. *Sociología de la internacionalización*. Villa María: Eduvin, 2016.
- de Diego, José Luís. *Editoriales y políticas editoriales en Argentina (1880-2010)*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2006.
- Elias, Norbert. *El proceso de la civilización. Investigaciones sociogenéticas y psicogenéticas*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989.

- Furlong, Guillermo. *Orígenes del arte tipográfico en América*. Buenos Aires: Huarpes, 1947.
- . *Historia y bibliografía de las primeras imprentas rioplatenses (1700-1850)*. Buenos Aires: Guaranía, 1953.
- García, Eustacio. *Desarrollo de la industria editorial argentina*. Buenos Aires: Fundación Interamericana de Bibliotecología Franklin, 1965.
- Heilbron, Johan, Thibaud Boncourt, Gisèle Sapiro, Gustavo Sorá, Víctor Karady, Thomas Brisson, Laurent Jeanpierre, and Kil-Ho Lee. “Indicators of the Internationalization of the Social Sciences and Humanities.” *Serendipities, Journal for the sociology and history of the human sciences*, no. 2 (1), (2017): 131–47.
- Rivera, Jorge. “El escritor y la industria cultural.” Buenos Aires: CEAL, 1985.
- de Sagastizábal, Leandro. *La edición de libros en la Argentina. Una empresa de cultura*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 1995.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. *Los intelectuales: profesionalización, politización e internacionalización*. Villa María: Eduvim, 2017.
- Sorá, Gustavo. *Brasilianas. A Casa José Olympio e a gênese do mercado editorial brasileiro*. São Paulo: Edusp, 2010.
- . “El libro y la edición en Argentina. Libros para todos y modelo hispanoamericano.” *Políticas de la Memoria*, no. 10–12 (2011): 125–35.
- Sorá, Gustavo, and Alejandro Dujovne. “Translation of Western social and human sciences in Argentina. A comparative study of translations from French, English, German, Italian, and Portuguese.” In Johan Heilbron, Gustavo Sorá and Thibaud Boncourt, eds. *The Social and Human Sciences in Global Power Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018 (forthcoming).
- Thiesse, Anne-Marie. *La création des identités nationales. Europe XVIIIe -XXe siècles*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.