CAROLYNE R. LARSON*

"Noble and Delicate Sentiments": Museum Natural Scientists as an Emotional Community in Argentina, 1862–1920

ABSTRACT

This article explores the emotional community of museum natural scientists in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina, a context in which the growth of museum natural sciences and nation-state formation became closely intertwined. Influenced by powerful nineteenth-century notions of civilization and modernity, Argentine scientists and statemakers sought to create a distinctively Argentine science, which would emulate European science in form but also retain a uniquely national character. A small group of influential museum administrators and scientists consciously strove to strengthen science's influence in Argentine national society by creating communal norms among scientists that resonated with narratives about civilization and modernity, and that guided proper behavior and emotional expression. Scientists also challenged the expectations of their community, testing the strength of central emotional tenets such as patriotism and objectivity. This article uses emotional communities as a framework for exploring the push and pull between social patterns and individual choices in this critical moment in Argentina's history, when new and powerful ideas about science—as a modern, objective, and national practice—emerged in tandem with nation-state formation. In particular, this article explores museum natural scientists' emotional concerns with objectivity and patriotism through a small group of Argentine museum natural scientists: Francisco P. Moreno, Juan B. Ambrosetti, Hermann Burmeister, and Florentino Ameghino.

*Assistant Professor of Latin American History, University of Wyoming, Dept. 3198, 1000 E. University Ave., Laramie, WY 82071-2000, cryan9@uwyo.edu

The following abbreviations are used: AGN, Archivo General de la Nación, Buenos Aires, Argentina; BCN, Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional, Buenos Aires, Argentina; MEA, Museo Etnográfico "Juan B. Ambrosetti," Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires; *OCCC*, *Obras Completas y Correspondencia Científica*, Correspondencia Científica, ed. Alfredo J. Torcelli (La Plata: Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1935).

Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences, Vol. 47, Number 1, pps. 42–75. ISSN 1939-1811, electronic ISSN 1939-182X. © 2017 by the Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Reprints and Permissions web page, http://www.ucpress.edu/journals.php?p=reprints. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/hsns.2017.47.1.42.

KEY WORDS: museums, natural science, Argentina, Latin America, cultural history, history of emotions, emotional communities

INTRODUCTION

In 1907, Argentine naturalist Francisco P. Moreno wrote that "without its own science, there is not a strong Nation."[1] This sentiment captured a prevailing current of thought in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina. Contemporary scientists, statesmen, intellectuals, journalists, and others described nation-state formation and scientific development—and especially the growth of scientific institutions like natural science museums—as mutually reinforcing processes in the creation of a "modern" Argentina. Powerful nineteenth-century notions of modernity and civilization, objectivity and progress, became shared languages that linked nation-state development and scientific institution building in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina. The close affiliation between museum natural science and national development also contributed to strong practices of European cultural modelling in Argentina, as elsewhere in the Americas.[2] For many Argentine state makers, to be European was to be civilized, and they envisioned a national future in which Argentina would be recognized by European countries as a peer among advanced nations. In this vein, they sought to create national scientific institutions on par with those of Western Europe and the fast-modernizing United States.

1. Draft of a speech written by Francisco P. Moreno, 15 Oct 1907, AGN, Fondo Moreno, Legajo 3099, Folios 11–13.

2. Select examples from this wide and valuable literature include Jens Andermann, *The Optic of the State: Visuality and Power in Argentina and Brazil* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007); Steven Conn, *Museums and American Intellectual Life 1876–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Raymond B. Craib, *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Shelley E. Garrigan, *Collecting Mexico: Museums, Monuments, and the Creation of National Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); Greg Grandin, *The Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Maria Margaret Lopes and Irina Podgorny, "The Shaping of Latin American Museums of Natural History, 1850–1990," in "Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise," special issue, *Osiris* 15, (2000): 108–118; Mark Overmyer-Velázquez, *Visions of the Emerald City: Modernity, Tradition, and the Formation of Porfirian Oaxaca, Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Julia Rodriguez, *Civilizing Argentina: Science, Medicine, and the Modern State* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Patience A. Schell, *The Sociable Sciences: Darwin and His Contemporaries in Chile* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

However, this tendency toward European modelling was also balanced in Argentina by a desire for national distinctiveness; Argentine scientists and state makers strove to build a "national science" that would not be seen as derivative of other countries, but rather as uniquely Argentine.[3] They prided themselves on descriptions like that given in 1889 by American naturalist Henry A. Ward of the Museo de Ciencias Naturales de La Plata (La Plata Museum of Natural Sciences), in which Ward enthused that "above all, this is an *Argentine Museum*; and it is this distinctive characteristic that gives this collection special interest for the foreigner who visits the country, just as it also constitutes its principal importance for this nation."[4]

Within Argentina's burgeoning sphere of professional museum natural science, a small group of influential individuals played a particularly powerful role in shaping museums of natural science and their relationship with the nation-state. Museum administrators and leading scientists consciously strove to create a meaningful space for natural science museums and museum natural scientists in Argentine society as well as social rules for how scientists ought to behave—in other words forging what has often been called a "persona" for museum natural scientists in their historical context.[5] This article, rather than using the idea of a scientific "persona," will employ Barbara H. Rosenwein's notion of emotional communities to explore the creation of museum scientists' identities and social expectations about how scientists ought to behave.[6] In particular, this article will examine objectivity and patriotism as deeply held tenets of museum scientists' emotional community, guiding both professional work and personal conduct. Scientists also challenged the expectations of their emotional community by exerting strongly individual claims against the collective identity and norms of the community, even as they helped to create

3. See Carolyne R. Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors: A Cultural History of Museums, Science, and Identity in Argentina, 1877–1943* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015), especially Chapter One, "Magic in the Desert: Indigenous Bodies on Display in the Museo de La Plata, 1877–1906," 27.

4. Henry A. Ward, "Los Museos Argentinos," *Revista del Museo de La Plata*, Tomo I (1890–1891): 148. See also Andermann, *The Optic of the State* (ref. 2), 49.

5. Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum, "Introduction: Scientific Personae and Their Histories," *Science in Context* 16, no. 1/2 (2003): 1–8.

6. I have adapted Rosenwein's concept in various ways to fit the historical context of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina; readers interested in Rosenwein's original use of the term should read Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

them.[7] This article seeks to understand museum natural scientists as members of a self-defining, emerging emotional community, in order to explore the push and pull between social patterns and individual choices in this critical moment in Argentina's history, when new and powerful ideas about science—as a modern, objective, and national practice—emerged in tandem with nation-state formation. In other words, this article explores how scientists framed themselves as messengers of national progress, as truthful and reliable experts distinct from other kinds of "gentlemen" (to borrow Steven Shapin's very useful idea).[8]

Demonstrating the tension between social norms and individual actions that challenged these norms will not surprise historians of science.[9] This tension is, however, foundational to this article, and applying emotional communities as an analytical framework in this context can help reveal the importance of scientists' internal community within the more often-discussed interplay between individual scientists and their broader social expectations. Emotional communities are a useful way to understand how natural scientists in Argentine museums behaved and responded to one another, in that emotional communities allow for particular emphasis on the agency and experiences of scientists as individual members of a self-selecting collective, whereas ideas like the "persona" often underscore the constraining effects of broader

7. A vast literature explores powerful scientists and their individual impact in Argentina, including Sara Graciela Amenta, *Carlos Rodolfo Schreiter (1877–1942): Notas Biográficas y Epistolario de un Naturalista* (San Miguel de Tucumán: Centro Cultural Alberto Rougés, 2008); Patricia Arenas, "Alfred Métraux: Momentos de su paso por Argentina," *Mundo de Antes*, no. 1 (1998): 121–136; Néstor Tomás Auza, "Germán Burmeister y la Sociedad Paleontológica, 1866–1868." *Investigaciones y Ensayos* 46 (1996): 137–155; María del Pilar Babot, "La Arqueología Argentina de fines del Siglo XIX y principios del 20 a través de J.B. Ambrosetti," *Mundo de Antes* no. 1 (1998): 165–192; Máximo Farro and Irina Podgorny, "Frente a la Tumba del Sabio: Florentino Ameghino y la 'Santidad' del Científico en el Plata," *Ciencia Hoy* 8, no. 47 (1998): 28–37; Elena Perilli de Colombres Garmendia, "Alfred Metraux y la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán," in *Actas del Primer Congreso sobre la Historia de la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán*, ed. Florencio Gilberto Aceñolaza (Tucumán: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, 2006), 145–153; Irina Podgorny, "El Museo Soy Yo: Alfred Marbais du Graty en la Confederación Argentina," *Ciencia Hoy* 7, no. 38 (1997): 48–53.

8. Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), especially "The Argument Summarized," xxv–xxxi.

9. See Christina Bueno, "Forjando Patrimonio: The Making of Archaeological Patrimony in Porfirian Mexico," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 90, no.2 (2010): 215–245; Craib, *Cartographic Mexico* (ref. 2); Susan Sheets-Pyenson, *Cathedrals of Science: The Development of Colonial Natural History Museums During the Late 19th Century* (Kingston/Montréal: McGill/Queen's University Press, 1988).

social patterns on individuals.[10] Emotional communities are also useful in this analysis because they stress how scientists saw themselves and their work. Museum natural scientists in Argentina believed their own actions—individually and collectively—to be responsible for science's rise to national prominence. In other words, they did not see themselves as primarily constrained by a social role imposed on scientists by external forces; rather, they described themselves as imposing their own collective and individual notions of what it meant to be a scientist on the wider community around them. We can identify the internal shape and limitations of this emotional community by examining the ways in which museum natural scientists cultivated their own objectivity and patriotism through their interactions with fellow scientists and others; these everyday interactions reveal prevailing expectations of how a scientist should behave. This article will show that museum natural scientists made conscious decisions about their compliance with the terms of their emotional community, and that scientists used these expectations to enhance their own prestige and to undermine their adversaries.

In particular, this article explores museum natural scientists' emotional concerns with objectivity and patriotism in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina through a small group of prominent Argentine museum scientists: Francisco P. Moreno, Juan B. Ambrosetti, Hermann Burmeister, and Florentino Ameghino. These scientists knew and worked together between the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Rather than drawing full, cradle-to-grave biographical sketches of these scientists, this article focuses on their participation in their scientific emotional community, incorporating biographical information as needed to provide context.[11] In shaping this community, these individual museum natural scientists played an unexpectedly large

10. The strengths and limitations of scientific "persona" are fruitfully discussed in Daston and Sibum, "Introduction" (ref. 5) and in the essays in *Science in Context* 16, no. 1/2, to which Daston and Sibum's essay serves as an introduction.

11. For a discussion of historians' various uses of biography, see the *American Historical Review*'s Roundtable on biography, 114, no. 3 (June 2009), "AHR Roundtable: Historians and Biography," and especially Judith M. Brown, "'Life Histories' and the History of Modern South Asia," 587–595. Also see Lloyd E. Ambrosius, ed., *Writing Biography: Historians and Their Craft* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Pres, 2004); Peter France and William St. Clair, eds., *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). An older but very useful volume is Marc Pachter's anthology, *Telling Lives: The Biographer's Art* (Washington, DC: New Republic Books, 1979). For a classic and still refreshing, thought-provoking essay on biography, see Virginia Woolf, "The Art of Biography," in *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1942), 119–125.

role in nation-state development in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina. Finally, the nexus in Argentina between nation-state formation, museum natural science building, and national preoccupations with modernity, civilization, and objectivity also makes this a useful case study for understanding similar processes across the Americas, where national scientific communities emerged over the course of the long nineteenth century in response to comparable calls for national progress and modernity. I hope that the Argentine case will prove useful to historians of science less familiar with Latin America, and facilitate comparative work across the Americas, and beyond. This article will first lay out some necessary historical background, then briefly explore the internal workings of Argentine museum natural scientists' emotional community, and finally look at the limits of that emotional community in practice.

ARGENTINE NATION-STATE FORMATION AND MUSEUM SCIENCE

In nineteenth-century Argentina, museum natural scientists crafted social prestige for their profession and for scientific knowledge, building on the prominence of ideas such as progress, modernity, and civilization within narratives of Argentina's national development. Understanding the linkages between nation-state formation and scientific institution-building in this period calls for a brief foray into Argentina's nineteenth century, to outline the general shape of Argentina's nation-state formation process and how science fit itself into this landscape.

Before 1862, Argentina's politics were dominated by conflicts between *unitario* (or centralist) forces in Buenos Aires, who championed the right of the port city to control the political and economic fortunes of the country, and *federales* (federalists) who fought—politically and often militarily—for other provinces' rights to self-governance and equality with Buenos Aires. The shifting networks of political alliances and tensions between federalist leaders in the provinces and unitarian Buenos Aires led to the creation of a federalist Argentine Confederation in 1852. Buenos Aires refused to join the Confederation, resulting in a decade-long conflict between Buenos Aires and the Confederation that combined economic blockades with occasional military confrontations. In the early 1860s, as the Confederation began to crumble under its own economic instability and political factionalism, Buenos Aires was able to declare victory and create a Liberal centralist Argentine

Republic.[12] Republican state makers now set about consolidating their control over a deeply fractured national territory, and establishing their reputation within an international sphere of "civilized nations."

In the midst of Argentina's midcentury political upheaval, intellectuals and statesmen like Juan Bautista Alberdi and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento championed identifiably Liberal narratives of progress and civilization as necessary prerequisites for national advancement.[13] In his landmark 1845 text *Facundo*, Sarmiento framed Argentina's national destiny as balanced precariously between two possible paths: one path leading upward toward civilization, and another tumbling downward into barbarism. His book focused on the life of *caudillo* (or militaristic political leader) Juan Facundo Quiroga, whose example of rural backwardness and unthinking violence, as Sarmiento described him, modelled the path toward barbarism, while emulation of progressive European nations like Britain and France would lead, Sarmiento argued, toward civilization and modernity. Alberdi reinforced this notion in his 1852 *Bases y puntos de partida para la organización política de la Republica Argentina* (Bases and starting points for the political organization of the Argentine Republic), writing famously that "gobernar es poblar" ("to govern is to populate"), referring to the beneficial influence of European immigrants who could "civilize" the as-yet contested margins of the nation-state. Alberdi also championed the important civilizing effects of Western infrastructure like roadways and railroads, schools and universities.[14] Museum natural scientists of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would capitalize on this vision of a European-modelled and progressive nation to demonstrate their importance to national advancement.

Museum natural science played an important role in national knowledge-building projects in nineteenth-century Argentina. Collecting knowledge

12. For more on the broad-strokes history of Argentina during the mid-nineteenth century, see Leslie Bethell, ed., *Argentina Since Independence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); David Rock, *Argentina 1516–1987: From Spanish Colonization to Alfonsín* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

13. Juan Bautista Alberdi was a leading intellectual of the Argentine Confederation in 1852–1862, and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento served as President of the Argentine Republic in 1868–1874. For more on Argentina's political and cultural concerns about civilization and barbarism, see Ariel de la Fuente, *Children of Facundo: Caudillo and Gaucho Insurgency During the Argentine State-Formation Process (La Rioja, 1853–1870)* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Nicolas Shumway, *The Invention of Argentina* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

14. For a discussion of Alberdi's ideological influence on nineteenth-century Argentina, see Shumway, *The Invention of Argentina* (ref. 13).

about the natural world became a critical part of gaining political control of the nation-state through activities like scientific exploration and mapmaking. Maps and scientific surveys of natural resources gave national governments throughout Latin America greater knowledge of the territory they claimed, and this knowledge translated, in a very concrete sense, into power.[15] Beyond such practical concerns, this scientific knowledge also provided details about an untamed natural world, uniting the state's domain into a coherently national landscape. The identity markers that natural science could provide often proved, as they did in Argentina, highly attractive to state makers, intellectuals, journalists, travel writers, and others. Within this state-building model, museums and natural science played an important role in the projects transforming Argentina into a modern and civilized nation. As in other national settings, natural science museums in Argentina served as platforms for the exploration and expression of national cohesion by submitting the natural landscape to scientific scrutiny, thereby controlling and possessing it.[16] It should be remembered, also, that during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Argentina was an economically prosperous and politically stable country, often favorably compared with Western Europe and the United States. Thanks to export economies in wheat, beef, and wool, Argentina's state makers often had considerable resources with which to support projects like museum building, which displayed the advancement of Argentine society.

Museum science attracted significant state funding, and support for science and museums became coded as overtly patriotic, wrapped up in knowledge making about the Argentine nation and its heritage. The Argentine Republic demonstrated its commitment to natural science and to museums in the late nineteenth century by funding multiple scientific institutions and activities, including the revitalization of the Museo Público de Buenos Aires (Public Museum of Buenos Aires) in 1862; the creation of the Academia Nacional

15. For an outstanding analysis of this connection, see Craib, *Cartographic Mexico* (ref. 2).

16. For good examples of this transnational context, see Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995); Conn, *Museums and American Intellectual Life* (ref. 2); Flora E. S. Kaplan, ed. *Museums and the Making of "Ourselves": The Role of Objects in National Identity* (London: Leicester University Press, 1994); H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Sheets-Pyenson, *Cathedrals of Science* (ref. 9); Wendy M. K. Shaw, *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, History of Anthropology, vol. 3. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).

de Ciencias (National Academy of Sciences) in Córdoba in 1869; the creation of a Museo Antropológico y Arqueológico de Buenos Aires (Anthropological and Archaeological Museum of Buenos Aires) in 1877; the transformation of the Museo Público de Buenos Aires into a Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (National Museum of Natural Sciences) in 1880; the creation of the Museo de Ciencias Naturales de La Plata (La Plata Museum of Natural Sciences), which opened in 1884; the dedication of numerous monuments and commemorative plaques to famous natural scientists in Argentina; and the regular allocation of funding for translating scientific works into Spanish.[17]

The Argentine state's ideological and financial dedication to growing natural science museums and other scientific institutions in this period revealed the essential importance of scientific knowledge and institutions to Argentina's contemporary nation-making process. On one hand, the Argentine Republic sought to create natural science museums that equaled those in Europe and North America, in an effort to gain membership among "civilized" nations. On the other hand, Argentine museum scientists and the state makers funding their museums also strove to craft a "national" science that would be uniquely Argentine and recognized internationally as offering distinctive and autonomous contributions to scientific knowledge. In other words, Argentine natural scientists, even as they modelled their institutions after the civilized centers of Europe, also hoped to catapult Argentina from a colonial periphery into membership within the center itself. Argentina strove to develop scientific institutions and communities that were on par with European countries, but also distinctly Argentine, and therefore not an obsequious imitation of Europe, but an independent equal.

MUSEUM NATURAL SCIENCE AS AN EMOTIONAL COMMUNITY

This article adapts emotional communities as an analytical tool for understanding how museum natural scientists saw their own professional and personal actions, and how the values that these scientists framed as being intrinsic to their own community affected museum science's relationship with the emergence of a modern Argentine nation-state. Barbara H. Rosenwein has described emotional communities as "groups in which people adhere to the same norms of emotional expression and value—or devalue—the same or

17. *Congreso Nacional* records, 1862–1915, BCN.

related emotions."[18] Emotions, as understood by historians of emotion, include a wide array of affective responses to the external world that are culturally shaped and are therefore variable from one human group to another, from romantic love to homesickness, from nostalgia to fear.[19] In other words, whereas some scholars emphasize the neurological constants that govern human beings' physiological responses to external stimuli, historians like Rosenwein focus on the socially governed expression of affective responses, which alter in different cultural contexts. Grief, for example, may trigger similar chemical reactions in human brains across space and time, but the lived experience of grief is shaped by cultural context and the accepted norms of one's emotional community; thus, humans have understood and expressed grief very differently in various historical contexts.

Moreover, Rosenwein argues that emotional communities "are not constituted by one or two emotions but rather by constellations—or sets—of emotions. Their characteristic styles depend not only on the emotions that they emphasize . . . [but also] the ones that they demote to the tangential or do not recognize at all."[20] Among museum natural scientists of Argentina's late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, one of the most important emotional "styles" that demonstrated one's belonging to the community was an ability to behave objectively, or to demonstrate a civilized and rational ability to *control* one's emotions, especially in one's professional work and life. Museum natural scientists unquestionably experienced the range of subjective emotions common to their historical context, such as romantic love, grief, anger, or disgust; but they were expected to put those emotions aside whenever they threatened the objectivity of their scientific work. The central tenet of objectivity overwhelmingly colored museum scientists' code of expected emotional conduct, with rare and telling exceptions. Museum scientists used languages of objectivity to code

18. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities* (ref. 6), 2.

19. Recent studies of the history of emotion include Nicole Eustace, Eugenia Lean, Julie Livingston, Jan Plamper, William M. Reddy, and Barbara H. Rosenwein, "*AHR* Conversation: The Historical Study of Emotions," *American Historical Review* (Dec 2012): 1487–1531; Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History: Lost and Found* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011); Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns, eds. *Doing Emotions History (*Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014); Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford Unviersity Press, 2015); William M. Reddy, "Historical Research on the Self and Emotions," *Emotion Review* 1, no. 4 (2009): 302–315; Carolyn Strange, Robert Cribb, and Christopher E. Forth, eds. *Honour, Vioence, and Emotions in History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Chris Walsh, *Cowardice: A Brief History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014).

20. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities* (ref. 6), 26.

themselves as consummate experts and dispassionate truth tellers, while vilifying their rivals and outside intruders to their scientific sphere as unrestrained and even hysterical slaves to their own personal feelings. A second central "style" of this emotional community was patriotism, or a deliberate linkage between one's scientific work and proud service to the nation. As Moreno so frankly stated in 1907, museum natural scientists collectively viewed their scientific work and their nation as inextricably intertwined. Within this community, to be accused of a failure in patriotism effectively undermined one's scientific credibility. Scientists' efforts to be both objective and patriotic, emotional styles which simultaneously demanded detachment and passion, reveal the variable dynamics of this community, as well as how others in Argentina viewed scientists.

Finally, Rosenwein contends that emotional communities coexist within and beside one another, defining one's belonging to both larger and smaller groups. In late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina, museum natural scientists belonged not just to their own, very specific emotional community, but also to larger groups "tied together by fundamental assumptions, values, goals, feeling rules, and accepted modes of expression."[21] Museum scientists like Moreno, Burmeister, Amebrosetti, and Ameghino, whose lives and careers took place largely in and around Buenos Aires, operated inside of larger emotional communities within that Europhilic capital city, to which a nineteenth-century adaptation of Shapin's model of "gentlemanly" behavior can be fruitfully applied. The insistent narratives of modernity and civilization written about by Sarmiento and Alberdi helped to create a *porteño* (meaning "of the port," referring to Buenos Aires) emotional community among the city's socioeconomic elites in which European emotional modelling matched the city's contemporary campaigns to remake the urban landscape, cuisine, musical tastes, fashion, and other phenomena in a civilized European image. Elite *porteños* were to be metropolitan, sophisticated, and rational, enjoying the finer things in life (e.g., European luxury goods), and only passionate in socially licit contexts such as in praise of the nation, or in the *milongas* where the city's elites increasingly danced the tango as the twentieth century progressed.[22] The members of this social group saw themselves as the cultured

21. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities* (ref. 6), 24.

22. For studies on the terms and limits of *porteño* society during this period, see Donna Guy, *Sex and Danger in Buenos Aires: Prostitution, Family, and Nation in Argentina* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991); Mariano Ben Plotkin, *Freud in the Pampas: The Emergence and Development of a Psychoanalytic Culture in Argentina* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001); Rodriguez, *Civilizing Argentina* (ref. 2). For studies on the tango in Argentine culture, see

vanguard of a civilized Argentina then in the process of emerging, and included politicians, business barons and large landowners, intellectuals, financiers, and artists, as well as museum natural scientists.

Within this larger emotional community, museum natural scientists distinguished themselves from others by treating science as a professional and personal calling. Museum natural scientists often underscored their distinctiveness as a social group by contending that science was a kind of knowledge that required natural talent, and which profoundly transformed a person and the way they saw the world. Scientists often described themselves, and praised their colleagues, as having been drawn to science at an early age, foregoing other life opportunities to follow the call of scientific knowledge. Francisco P. Moreno, for example, recalled his childhood fascination with collecting "curious things."[23] In adulthood, Moreno proudly remembered the prizes of his early collection:

> two fractured glyptodont vertebrae; three plates from the shell of the same animal, some insects from Paraguay, a bow with six arrows, a weapon from the Indians of the Chaco, and a famous "idol from a Chinese pagoda," a figure so baptized by us [Moreno and his brothers] and which was the credit of our collection.[24]

Moreno's enthusiasm only deepened as he grew (his childhood nickname was *fósil*, "fossil"), presaging his destined career. Natural science was not just a profession, in this sense, but a vocation, an internally referencing community that saw itself as distributing a unique and proprietary kind of knowledge to the rest of society. In this vein, scientists often behaved like doorkeepers to

---

Brian Bockelman, "Between the Gaucho and the Tango: Popular Songs and the Shifting Landscape of Modern Argentine Identity, 1895–1915," *American Historical Review* (June 2011): 577–601; Donald S. Castro, *The Argentine Tango as Social History, 1880–1955: The Soul of the People* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1990); Simon Collier, "The Popular Roots of the Argentine Tango," *History Workshop*, No. 34, Latin American History (Autumn, 1992); Beatriz Dujovne, *In Strangers' Arms: The Magic of the Tango* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2010); Florencia Garramuño, *Primitive Modernities: Tango, Samba, and Nation* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011); Marta E. Savigliano, *Tango and the Political Economy of Passion* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995).

23. Francisco P. Moreno to Minister of Public Works, Dr. Don Manuel Gonnet, dated 1890. Reproduced in Irina Podgorny, *El Argentino Despertar de las Faunas y de las Gentes Prehistóticas: Coleccionistas, estudios, museos y universidad en la creación del patrimonio paleontológico y arqueológico nacional (1875–1913)* (Buenos Aires: Gráfica L'Aiglón, 2000), 58.

24. Francisco P. Moreno, *Viaje a la Patagonia Austral*, Primera Edición, 5a Reimp. (Buenos Aires: El Elefante Blanco, 2004), 10.

objective truth, dismissing the ideas or actions of outsiders on the grounds that they *were* outsiders, uninitiated in the ways of science. This conscious self-identification among scientists as a separate group helps to identify them as a viable emotional community; as Rosenwein argues, "emotional communities are not coterminous with just any group. . . . An emotional community is a group in which people have a common stake, interests, values, and goals. Thus it is often a social community."[25]

Historians of emotion employ many different sources in search of emotional experience in the past. Peter N. and Carol S. Stearns famously proposed the term "emotionology" in the 1980s to describe the "attitudes or standards that a society, or a definable group within a society, maintains toward basic emotions and their appropriate expression," which are particularly visible in "public" sources such as etiquette manuals, legislation, newspaper advice columns, and other documents that outline social expectations for emotional expression.[26] Meanwhile, historians also use "private" or archival documents such as "private papers, biographical records, and bureaucratic correspondence" to understand how individual people conformed to and departed from the emotional norms of their community.[27] To briefly explicate the "emotionology" of museum natural scientists' emotional community, I will analyze a series of eulogies published in Buenos Aires newspapers upon the 1917 death of Juan B. Ambrosetti. Eulogies offer a valuable window into the emotionology of museum natural scientists' emotional community as it existed within and beside *porteño* society, because they highlight the qualities of the deceased that his scientific peers and *porteño* journalists deemed most laudatory, and because they attempt to explain or soften less desirable traits and behaviors. Ambrosetti's commemorations, written by unnamed journalists, succinctly reveal how scientists were seen by a wider slice of *porteño* society, as well as demonstrate scientists' success by the 1910s in establishing the form and validity of their emotional community, insofar as the emotional norms articulated inside

25. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities* (ref. 6), 24–25.

26. Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (1985): 813–836.

27. Reddy, "Historical Research on the Self and Emotions" (ref. 10), 311. For more on these sources and methodologies, see Stearns and Stearns, "Emotionology" (ref. 26); David Thorley, "Towards a History of Emotion, 1562–1660," *The Seventeenth Century* 28, no. 1 (2013): 3–19; Eustace et al., "The Historical Study of Emotions" (ref. 19), 1487–1531; "Forum: History of Emotions," *German History* 28, no. 1 (2010): 67–80; Matt and Stearns, *Doing Emotions History* (ref. 19).

of this community appeared virtually unadulterated in these popular press eulogies. Ambrosetti's example is an effective, but by no means unique, demonstration of this community's shape and impact in Argentina.

Ambrosetti, a naturalist who focused his later career on American anthropology, died unexpectedly in 1917 at the age of 52. He was the founder and director of the Museo Etnográfico (Ethnographic Museum), attached to the Universidad de Buenos Aires, a museum that dramatically raised the profile of anthropological study in the capital, and that also promoted Buenos Aires as an internationally known metropolitan center for scientific research.[28] The eulogies published by *porteño* newspapers in the days after his death portrayed Ambrosetti as a model scientist, whose selfless dedication to scientific work radiated the ideals of objective expertise and patriotism that defined his emotional community.

The newspaper *El Diario*, in a brief eulogy published on May 28, 1917, presented Ambrosetti in the canonical imagery that typified these accounts. *El Diario* described Ambrosetti as "one of the most outstanding figures in Argentine science, to which he dedicated the most profound study since his youth." In other words, Ambrosetti had followed the call of science, dedicating his life to both science and to the nation, here inextricably linked. The article also listed Ambrosetti's many professional posts, affiliations, and a selected set of his publications, and declared that "his life, dedicated entirely to study, especially to the natural sciences, has been a model" to the nation.[29] The prominent newspaper *La Nación* also underscored the primacy of science in Ambrosetti's life in a eulogy published the following day, as well as his dedication to a nationally specific science. "Argentine science and society lost in [Ambrosetti] a good man and a useful man, who was an elevated example of knowledge among us and a man who left a vast and valuable work." Ambrosetti's "goodness," *La Nación* continued, could be measured by "his austere patriotism and his ample and generous spirit," and by his truly vocational dedication to scientific knowledge. "Since his youth, his dominant passion was science," the article contended, a youthful predilection that led to "a truly intellectual life that can serve as an example to the young." In *La Nación*, Ambrosetti's devotion to science was enhanced by his personal qualities, and especially his "caring and honorable soul." These personal qualities, however,

28. See Carolyne R. Larson, "The Ashes of Our Ancestors: Creating Argentina's Indigenous Heritage in the Museo Etnográfico, 1904–1930," *The Americas* 69, no. 4 (2013): 467–492.

29. *El Diario*, 28 May 1917, MEA, Recortes V.

did not interfere with his core, scientific self. "The [personal] affection he inspired was mixed with appreciation for the man of science, the admiration for the indefatigable worker," as *La Nación* carefully noted.[30]

Ambrosetti's eulogy in the newspaper *La Razón* expanded upon an image of his personal feelings existing in harmony with his essentially objective and scientific self, describing him as a "distinguished" and "patient" scholar, driven by his "passion for old things." This kind of passion—gusto for science, for knowledge, for one's subject—was a telling loophole within a general rule about objective and dispassionate conduct among museum natural scientists. To be made enthusiastic by one's research, as eulogies like Ambrosetti's demonstrate, was a mark of true scientific vocation, so long as that enthusiasm did not admit the insidious influence of bias or blind one to the true importance of one's work. Mindful of this distinction, *La Razón* painted Ambrosetti as an ideal balance between enthusiasm for his subject and a temperateness of spirit that allowed him to focus on the quest for objective knowledge. The newspaper praised "the tranquility of his spirit," his "simplicity and goodness," and his self-sacrifice in the pursuit of truth. It was through Ambrosetti's great devotion to the Museo Etnográfico, *La Razón* contended, that "in silence, without significant funds, little by little, with effort and personal sacrifice, [these] enormous riches were accumulated and organized with admirable scrupulousness." Even in his home, *La Razón* saw Ambrosetti as a scientist, first and foremost, rather than as a husband and a father of two children. "The house of the archaeologist was a true museum, in which appeared valuable objects he collected in his travels throughout the Republic." In other words, Ambrosetti surrounded himself with the material accoutrements of this scientific work even at home, thus revealing "his love of the work, to which he dedicated his best energies."[31]

The popular illustrated magazine *Caras y Caretas* later celebrated Ambrosetti's life in a July 1917 article entitled "Un sabio silencioso" ("A Silent Sage").[32] Ambrosetti, the magazine frankly stated, "was the ideal silent sage, whose spirit was not disturbed by the torment of passions, because like the mountain peaks he was beyond the reach of clouds." He "neither loved applause, nor clamored for it," and worked in what the magazine described

30. *La Nación*, 29 May 1917, MEA Recortes V.

31. *La Razón*, 28 May 1917, MEA Recortes V.

32. The word *sabio* is subject to a variety of meanings and interpretations in this context. For a detailed analysis of this term in Argentine science, see Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors* (ref. 3), Chapter 4.

as a "correct" silence, valuing the work rather than his own fame. *Caras y Caretas* used Ambrosetti as an opportunity not only to highlight the correctness of his behavior, but also to criticize an opposing trend in Argentina; the article noted,

> Contrary to what ordinarily happens in this idiosyncratically exhibitionist country, he worked without flagging in obscurity and in silence, working with determination to bring together all the elements demanded by a superior study of the prehistoric past, holding absolutely to rigorous scientific methods.

In other words, Ambrosetti reminded Argentines—scientists and otherwise, it seems—how a true gentleman and scientist ought to behave: objectively and rigorously, selflessly and modestly.[33]

AMEGHINO

If sources like eulogies can show the emotional behaviors deemed acceptable by members of an emotional community, it is also possible to track the shape of an emotional community through sources that show breaches in those expectations. The career of Florentino Ameghino offers a unique opportunity for this kind of analysis, because Ameghino—among the most prominent and internationally regarded Argentine museum natural scientists of this period—was also unsurpassed in his chronic and even willful defiance of the behaviors demanded by his emotional community. Ameghino, a prolifically published and internationally recognized naturalist who also directed Argentina's Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (National Museum of Natural Sciences) in 1902–1911, played an unusually prominent role in challenging and reshaping Argentina's museum natural science emotional community over the course of this career and even posthumously. Ameghino's personal correspondence, accounts of his behavior written by other scientists, and his posthumous eulogization in the *porteño* press all offer windows into the push and pull between the expectations of museum natural scientists' emotional community and Ameghino's individual reactions to those expectations. The remainder of this article will explore the boundaries of this emotional community through a series of pivotal moments in Ameghino's career, seeking to understand how and why Ameghino defied the expectations of his peers, how he steered the

33. "Un sabio silencioso," *Caras y Caretas*, 28 Jul 1917, MEA Recortes VI.

course of Argentine museum science, and the light that Ameghino's career can shed on the nexus between nation-state formation, museum science professionalization and institution building, and the quest for modernity and civilization in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Argentina.

Knocking on the Door of Science

Ameghino began his scientific career in direct personal conflict with another prominent museum scientist of Argentina's late nineteenth century, Prussian naturalist Hermann Burmeister. Ameghino would later claim, in fact, that it was Burmeister's antagonism that had prompted him to become a scientist in the first place. In 1873, Ameghino was a schoolteacher in Luján, Buenos Aires province. As a self-taught naturalist, Ameghino pursued an interest in paleontology during walks across the pampas. During these walks, Ameghino uncovered a series of fossil beds that he believed to be of scientific importance, and decided to present Burmeister—then director of the Museo Público de Buenos Aires—with the information, inviting him to visit the site himself for confirmation. "Without doubt," Ameghino remembered his own thoughts at the time, "Dr. Burmeister was the most competent person in the Republic to judge this question." When he presented himself to Burmeister at the Museo Público, however, Ameghino did not receive the treatment he had expected from a fellow devotee of science. "Here in a few words is what he said to me," Ameghino paraphrased Burmeister's response: "Such discoveries do not inspire my confidence much; I do not believe in them; and even supposing that it was as you tell me, they are not very important and for me they lack interest." Ameghino's reaction displayed the size and force of his own domineering personality:

> How else could I have proceeded? What more could I have done? I knocked on the door of science not to deal in commercial questions or things that were strange [to science], not to forcefully assert my own personal opinions, but without pretension of any kind, asking only that science bring the truth to light, and its representative closed the door on me.

Ameghino's feelings of outrage—and perhaps especially his feeling that Burmeister had responded with a conspicuous lack of proper objectivity and had treated Ameghino as an intrusive, excitable outsider—soon crystallized into rivalry. Ameghino became a central and eventually larger-than-life figurehead in attempts to topple Burmeister from his position at the Museo Público, which he directed between 1862 and his death in 1892. As Ameghino confided to

Moreno years later, "this disgrace served a purpose; if when I presented myself to Dr. Burmeister, he had examined the humble fruit of my amateur efforts, I would have been satisfied, and no longer occupied with such objects, and would be still today only a modest schoolteacher."[34]

History could hardly have cast a more complete foil to Hermann Burmeister than Florentino Ameghino. Ameghino was not educated at the university level, and his was therefore a self-taught natural science based on observation and personal collecting. Ameghino was also an outsider to the socioeconomic elite of Buenos Aires and was therefore not, strictly speaking, a "gentleman naturalist"; Ameghino funded his own, independent scientific work by occasionally selling his personal collections of carefully amassed and organized fossils, as well as running a series of shops with his brothers. Ameghino was an "outsider" in nearly every sense of the word to the academic world that Burmeister, recipient of two doctorates from European universities before the age of thirty and a student of Alexander von Humboldt, valued so highly. Moreover, Ameghino clashed with Burmeister because they both specialized in paleontology, but espoused very different scientific theories. Ameghino saw South America's ancient living landscape in Darwinian terms, full of constantly mutating and emerging species (dozens of which he named himself and, at times, after himself). Ameghino was also an active player in the international *fin-de-siècle* debates over humankind's origins, and dedicated a good deal of his scientific work to exploring the antiquity of animal and human life on Argentine soil. Burmeister was a reluctant evolutionist, and the extent of his willingness to embrace Darwin's theories has formed the center of some debate among historians.[35] Ameghino's scientific thinking clashed markedly with his own, and their personal enmity only intensified the conflict.

Ameghino clearly viewed Burmeister as an elitist and exclusivist, barring the entry of new voices into scientific debate. Burmeister was, Ameghino argued, a "representative of 'official' science," against which Ameghino stood as an outsider, denied an equal right to study the natural patrimony of his own country. In his critique of Burmeister, Ameghino drew a distinctive line between the "nation" and the "state." He understood Burmeister as a fixture of the Argentine state, whereas he saw himself as having emerged organically from the ranks of ordinary Argentines, and thus representing the true Argentine nation. Museum science in

34. Florentino Ameghino to Francisco P. Moreno, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 107–113.

35. See Adriana Novoa and Alex Levine, *From Man to Ape: Darwinism in Argentina, 1870–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 64–69.

Argentina was, in Ameghino's interpretation, not only happening *in* Argentina, but was distinctly *Argentine*, belonging intrinsically to the nation. In this vein, Ameghino attacked Burmeister's proprietary tendencies over the Museo Público's collections as "un-Argentine," and complained of "the spirit of '*extranjerismo*'" (fondness of foreign things) invading the country.[36] In this critique, Ameghino contended that, in addition to objective behavior, patriotism was an essential emotional "style" within museum natural scientists' emotional community. Although connections between nation and science were undoubtedly important as the nineteenth century progressed, Ameghino here proposed an unusually strong and proprietary connection between *being* Argentine and *doing* Argentine science. The strong European modelling of Argentina's nineteenth century tended to manifest itself—among other ways—in state-driven recruitments of European scientists to staff Argentina's scientific institutions. Burmeister himself was recruited in this way to direct the Museo Público. Ameghino's contestation, then, that Burmeister was an un-Argentine scientist effectively sought to overturn important ideas about who belonged inside of this emotional community, and the terms of belonging within that community. Moreover, the rising acceptance of patriotism as a necessary correlate of science by the early twentieth century revealed that Ameghino, although certainly not the originator of this idea, had found an effective foothold for his argument with Burmeister.

The rivalry between Burmeister and Ameghino outlived them both and shaped their scientific legacies, reappearing in Argentine newspapers and magazines, for example, well into the twentieth century. In 1920, Argentine politician and scientist Estanislao Zeballos reminisced in *La Razón* about his youthful studies at the Museo Público under Burmeister's direction. Zeballos, one of the fortunate few who Burmeister had admitted as a student in the Museo, recounted a conversation in which he had asked Burmeister for his thoughts about Ameghino's controversial human evolutionary theory.[37] In response,

> Doctor Burmeister fixed his small green sparkling eyes upon me, and launched his favorite insult at me, with hoarse and punctuated voice:
>
> Ig . . . no . . . r . . . amus! . . .
>
> The discovery of Ameghino was, thus, discredited.[38]

36. Sheets-Pyenson, *Cathedrals of Science* (ref. 9), 32.

37. See Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors* (ref. 3), Chapter 4, for a discussion of Ameghino's ideas about human evolution, and their reception in Argentine society.

38. "El hombre fosil de Miramar. Recuerdos y notas de turista," *La Razón*, 7 Apr 1920.

Neither Ameghino's theories nor Burmeister's rebuttals were explored in the article. The anecdote stands alone, a glimpse into the lifelong antagonism between the two scientists as well as the impact of emotional repsonses on the path of broader scientific questions and institution building. Here, Burmeister's evidently emotional outburst clashed with the insult itself, which painted Ameghino as an ignorant interloper in the world of true science. The story was meant to amuse readers, not least because it showed a scientist losing proper control over his emotions.

A National Museum

Ameghino also challenged the boundaries of his emotional community in his campaign to create a National Museum of Natural Science in the early 1880s. The federalization of Buenos Aires as Argentina's capital city in 1880 required the disentanglement of provincial from state institutions, including museums. After federalization, it was decided that the national state would support only one national natural science museum in the capital. Burmeister's Museo Público competed against Moreno's much smaller and younger Museo Antropológico y Arqueológico de Buenos Aires for this title. To strengthen his claim, Moreno joined with Ameghino to propose a new museum on the basis of Moreno's anthropological and Ameghino's paleontological collections. The ensuing struggle for nationalization is extremely revelatory in understanding how museum natural scientists expressed their importance to the city of Buenos Aires and to the Argentine nation, as well as the battles that underlay their publicly stated objective and patriotic motivations. In this protracted campaign, Burmeister defended his museum's longevity and tradition, playing the role of the incumbent against Moreno and Ameghino. Ameghino's correspondence provides the clearest record of this, and illuminates the many facets of this process—national, scientific, and emotional.

On October 30, 1881, Florentino wrote to his brother Juan with the news that he and Moreno were moving against Burmeister:

> I have come to an agreement with Moreno to found a great Museum in the city of Buenos Aires, and the project has already been accepted by the Government and the [Congress] Chambers, such that within a few days it should be a done thing.[39]

39. Florentino Ameghino to Juan Ameghino, 30 Oct 1881, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 219.

In his optimism, Ameghino believed that he and Moreno would make short work of Burmeister's opposition to the project. "The Museum," he wrote with confidence, "will be national; and the public Museum that Dr. Burmeister directs will be overcome or will leave for the countryside." A significant part of the triumph of creating his imagined museum, for Ameghino, was quite transparently the emotional pleasure of besting the Museo Público and its director. His enthusiasm also carried Ameghino into an exaggeration of the facts; at the time he wrote this letter, the project had *not* been accepted by both Congressional chambers, but only by the upper chamber of Senadores. The project still waited for full Congressional approval, though Moreno and Ameghino were confident that such approval was quickly forthcoming.

Given the enthusiasm for their project in the Senate, Moreno and Ameghino's optimism is perhaps understandable. The original project was presented to the Senate on September 12, as an executive project submitted by Argentine President Julio A. Roca himself.[40] In addition to presenting an opportunity for Argentine scientists to contribute to discussions among European and North American museums—within which, Roca pointed out, specialists in South American archaeology, anthropology, and geology were noticeably absent—the National Museum project offered a particular service to the nation itself. Roca's proposal was assigned to Buenos Aires Senator Aristóbulo del Valle for further research and consideration.[41]

Del Valle returned to the Senate on October 23, and delivered an impassioned defense of the project. He praised Moreno for dedicating his life "to a science that has already shown to the world the progress it has made, and its importance," and suggested not only that the government transform Moreno's museum into the proposed National Museum, but also that they consider relocating the institution to a more comfortable venue, "if the Nation does not order the construction of a building especially for the museum, in the future, because the grandness of this Capital and the civilization that we strive for calls us to it." In the depth and variation of Moreno's collections, del Valle argued, Argentines could discover surprises about their own national past:

> It is possible to see, señor Presidente, among the curiosities that this museum houses, found in Patagonia and in other parts of the Argentine territory, some beads, for example, of perfectly smelted glass that correspond to Egpytian civilization and that figure among the adornments of the

40. Sesiones, Cámara de Senadores, 12 Sep 1881, 713, BCN.
41. Ibid., 714.

> pharaohs, . . . manufactures that reveal a degree of culture and civilization truly surprising and that cannot be attributed to barbaric peoples, whom we supposed were the only inhabitants of these lands. Today these materials are an object of investigation and study that claim the attention of the public powers of the country and of men who, like señor Moreno, have the self-denial to dedicate their lives to this profession [that is] so little lucrative.

Del Valle's description of Moreno's "self-denial" predated Ambrosetti's death (and eulogies) by more than thirty years, underscoring the enduring importance of this idea to the behavioral expectations of museum natural scientists. This "self-denial" must, del Valle concluded, be rewarded and supported in the interests of advancing Argentine civilization. "The days of our history have been long and tormented," he reminded his audience. "Today, at last, we have reached peaceful days, in which we can dedicate ourselves to these works of peace, among which figure in the first place the works of civilization, and all that corresponds to the advance of science is the work of civilization."[42] The project was enthusiastically applauded and docketed for congressional discussion in the near future.

The new museum that Moreno and Ameghino imagined together would follow the style of European museums, especially the Museum of Natural History in Paris, which both men had visited and where they had each received professional recognition and acclaim from the French scientific community. Although he had been engaged in the project for less than two months, Ameghino's imagination of the future museum was detailed, as was his projected role there. "I will take charge of the Paleontological Section," he wrote to Juan, "with the facility to travel through the entire Republic and surrounding countries in search of fossils and prehistoric objects, having, in addition to my salary, all my travel expenses paid by the Government." His collections, which had been the centerpiece of his scientific achievements and financial solvency to date, were readily sacrificed to the cause: "my Museum now contains 15,000 pieces," he wrote with pride, "enough to fill four or five rooms with them. . . . Nonetheless, all of that will pass to the Museum as soon as that establishment is founded."[43] Juan Ameghino rejoiced in his brother's newfound scientific alliance: "What I celebrate most," he wrote in a rapid reply from Luján, "is your good understanding with Moreno." The joint museum, Juan wrote, "will indisputably be called to much greater importance than the

42. Sesiones, Cámara de Senadores, 23 Oct 1881, 251–256, on 255, BCN.
43. Florentino Ameghino to Juan Ameghino, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 219.

current Provincial [Museum], whose decadence and the defeat of Burmeister will be practically certain."[44] Ameghino's crowing over Burmeister's imminent defeat certainly tested the limits of objective behavior demanded by museum scientists. Nowhere in these letters did Ameghino weigh the respective merits of the two museum projects in question, nor did he base his confidence on the objective superiority of his and Moreno's collections or scientific research. In his correspondence with his brother, Ameghino presented this as an entirely personal conflict, the question at stake not one of objective or scientific progress, but of defeating his personal rival.

Unfortunately for Ameghino and Moreno, the establishment of their museum was not settled in "a few days," nor in a few months. After being approved by the Senadores, the project stalled at the end of 1881, and was removed from the Senate agenda without explanation. From early momentum, Moreno and Ameghino descended into a quagmire of bureaucracy, from which they emerged in July of 1882 without the success they had so confidently predicted. Despite the approval and budgetary allowance of Congress, Moreno and Ameghino were overthrown by Burmeister; the Museo Público was federalized, becoming the Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, while the other museum project disintegrated and vanished. The ultimate reasons for this decision are unclear. Burmeister's protests, for example, that the collections of the Museo Público could not be moved without damage rings hollow in light of the constant transportation of natural science collections across continents and oceans for expositions and collections exchanges at this time. Argentina routinely sent scientific representation to international expositions in Europe; Ameghino had transported not only his personal collection but several others to Paris for the exposition in 1878, for example.[45]

Ameghino wrote bitterly on July 9, "I have lost here a year to the subject of the Museum and at last it has failed completely."[46] His disappointment, however, also triggered a characteristic and fiercely tenacious response:

44. Juan Ameghino to Florentino Ameghino, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 220.

45. Historians have extensively studied Latin American participation in World Fairs and international expositions. For selected Argentine analyses on the subject, see Laura Fernández, "La Utopia Oligarquica: Argentina en la Exposición Universal de 1889," *Todo es Historia*, no. 421 (2002): 58–64; Ingrid E. Fey, "Peddling the Pampas: Argentina at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1889," in *Latin American Popular Culture since Independence: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., ed. William H. Beezley and Linda A. Curcio-Nagy (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012), 61–85.

46. Florentino Ameghino to Juan Ameghino, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 237.

> The creation of the National Museum that has caused me so many headaches, failed due to the envy that certain highly placed people feel toward me, and for now there is no hope that [we will] speak of it again. But it is not important. Only the work and not intrigues or hollow words can give [one] a name; and I, although I have already earned one, will continue working; although it causes me deprivations, I make my path and my day will surely come.[47]

In the wake of disappointment, Ameghino retreated into the core rhetoric of his emotional community, casting himself as a self-denying and objective man of science, while painting his adversaries as envious schemers (without, it may be noted, any irony whatsoever).

Ameghino and Moreno Part Ways

Four years after their disappointment in the National Museum project, Moreno offered Ameghino the Vice Directorship of his new provincial natural science museum, the Museo de La Plata, and extended a post as *naturalista viajero* to his brother and collaborator Carlos on the condition that the Ameghinos bring their famous paleontological collections with them for display and study in the museum. These collections included a virtually unparalleled array of paleontological specimens, including visually impressive glyptodont and other megafaunal skeletons that Moreno immediately had mounted and installed in the museum's paleontology halls. Moreno foresaw material and also intellectual benefits for both parties in their upcoming collaboration. He wrote to Ameghino: "My intention is to make the Museo de La Plata into the first [museum] of America, and the Government will always assist me. As we are both guided by the same aspirations, we can advance together with complete liberty of action."[48] Ameghino was officially granted the post of Vice Director by government decree on July 8, 1886, and departed for La Plata, sending his collections ahead of him.

The warmth of the alliance between Moreno and Ameghino did not last, however. By October 1886, Ameghino was already directing stiffly official, intramuseum correspondence to Moreno, requesting payment for his collections, which he had agreed to sell to the museum upon his employment in July. The collections had been in the museum since that time, Ameghino complained, but he had yet to receive payment. "It is clear[ly known] to the

47. Florentino Ameghino to Juan Ameghino, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 256.
48. Moreno to Ameghino, 30 Mar 1886, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 364–365.

Director that my personal financial conditions do not permit me the sacrifice of donating [*ceder gratuitamente*] to the province a collection that has cost me so much time, money and work," Ameghino wrote carefully, "but wishing to facilitate the establishment's acquisition of that collection without being overly burdensome on the funds of the province, the Director can express to the Esteemed Government that I will accept the payment for it [the collection] in installments that it may deem reasonable."[49] Layers of such small resentments began to accumulate between the two naturalists, each of them stubborn and accustomed to a high degree of scientific and personal autonomy. Conflict was, if not inevitable, certainly not unprecedented for either man.

By January of 1888, the friendly collaboration that first bound Ameghino and Moreno together had disintegrated into bitter enmity. Ameghino left the museum in a storm of anger, leaving behind the collections that he had brought with him to La Plata. Advertently or not, however, Ameghino had his revenge for the loss of his collections to his new enemy in that he never provided the Museo de La Plata with the collection's catalogue, which identified each specimen according to provenance, associated stratigraphy, and other information. Without this context information, as Moreno lamented very publicly in his 1891 published museum report, the collection was impossible to accurately include within the catalogue that Moreno hoped to write. He wrote with palpable venom:

> [T]he unjustifiable refusal on the part of Dr. Florentino Ameghino (ex Sub Director of this establishment and who was dismissed from his post by decree of the Exmo. Gobierno, dated February 6 1888), to deliver, despite being asked for it repeatedly, the catalogue of his collection which was purchased in the year 1886 for the price of $16,5000 moneda nacional . . .

caused a serious setback in the creation of a comprehensive collections catalogue because "those objects do not have labels which indicate their origin nor conventional signs, and . . . many of them are simply plaster molds."[50] In other words, Moreno accused Ameghino of behaving unprofessionally and unobjectively. Also frustrating, no doubt, was the fact that the Ameghino collections constituted such a sizeable portion of the Museo de La Plata's paleontological collections, all of which were now significantly less useful for scientific research. This lack did not, of course, affect the specimens' exhibit value, and

49. Ameghino to Moreno, 27 Oct 1886, *OCCC*, Vol. 20, 390.

50. Francisco P. Moreno, "El Museo de La Plata. Rápida ojeada sobre su fundación y desarollo," *Revista del Museo de La Plata*, Tomo I (1890–1891), 40–41.

the Ameghinos' fossil skeletons and other finds rapidly became—and some remain to this day—iconic and popular exhibits.

Burmeister's Death

The boundaries of Ameghino's ability to challenge the terms of his emotional community came starkly to light when Burmeister died in 1892. On February 8, while climbing on a badly supported ladder in one of the Museo's exhibition halls, Burmeister lost his balance and fell into a display case, breaking the glass. In the fall, Burmeister was badly hurt. He survived the fall, but was confined to bed rest, from which he never recovered. He eventually died at home on May 2. During his long period of decline, the directorship of the Museo Público hung in the balance. And because Burmeister had always been reticent to share the work of the museum, the vacancy left by his departure offered no less than an opportunity to control—almost in its entirety—a natural science museum that was now recognized around the world. The post ultimately fell to Karl Berg, who had worked with Burmeister for a number of years before emigrating to Uruguay to organize the National Museum of Montevideo in 1890. Berg was specifically appointed by Burmeister himself, during this last autumn of his life, as his successor.

The reasons for Berg's appointment did not lie exclusively, however, with his scientific merit. Perhaps as much as he wanted Berg *to* take the job, Burmeister was determined that Florentino Ameghino should *not* have it. Their career-long feud culminated here. From his bed, an ailing Burmeister stipulated specifically and forcefully that under no circumstances should Ameghino succeed him as Director. Ameghino, however, did not back down. He wrote a letter to Berg on April 1, 1892, as Burmeister lay on what would become his deathbed, explaining that upon hearing that Burmeister had intended to pass the directorship to some "unknown person, without sufficient merits to be preferred above others who had acquired [their merits] through long years of work," he had taken it upon himself to travel to Buenos Aires, intent upon "undoing Burmeister's latest singularity [*uniquidad*]." Ameghino had then suggested to various well-placed friends that "you [Berg] desired to return to Buenos Aires and occupy the post that Burmeister abandoned." It was thus with "true pleasure"—and no small amount of self-congratulation—Ameghino wrote, that "I heard that the Ministry had given you their approval, and I congratulate you on this distinction."[51]

51. Florentino Ameghino to Karl Berg, *OCCC*, Vol. 21, 417–419.

Having made the none-too-subtle suggestion that he was the reason that Berg was successful in obtaining the directorship, Ameghino proceeded to his true purpose in writing. Even as he was certain that Berg would "convert the Museo Nacional into the true scientific center of the country," Ameghino also felt that his own presence on the museum's staff was indispensable to the success of this project. "With the elimination of Burmeister, I am the only man in the country who is occupied in the study of vertebrate fossils, and the particular materials at my disposal, as collections [meaning his personal collections], are much superior to the [collections] of the museums of La Plata and Buenos Aires combined." "I am interested," he concluded, "in filling the Sub-Direction of the Museum, and I have spoken with the Minister of Public Instruction, who has expressed that he would have the greatest pleasure in [seeing] me occupying the post."[52] Professionally speaking, Ameghino was eminently qualified for the post, being a prolific and well-known scholar in Argentina and abroad. Nonetheless, Berg refused, writing to Ameghino that "after what has passed between you and Dr. Burmeister, on one hand, and between you and Dr. Moreno, on the other, I would not be a worthy successor of the first, nor a loyal friend of the second, if I accepted you as Vice Director. If you are a man of noble and delicate sentiments, you will understand this perfectly; in my place you would proceed in the same way."[53] Berg referred here not to scientific disagreements, but to personal and strongly emotional conflicts. Berg's references to "friendship" and to "noble and delicate sentiments" reveal that the expectations of museum scientists' emotional community could and did steer scientific decision making and institutional development in nineteenth-century Argentina.

Berg's response succinctly deflated Ameghino's hopes not on the basis of scientific qualification but rather because Ameghino had shown himself to lack the objectivity and self-control that defined a true scientist, and Berg, as a member of this community, could not ignore the scale of Ameghino's infraction. This exchange opened a flurry of correspondence, in which Ameghino addressed increasingly furious letters to Berg, Estanislao Zeballos, and the Ministry of Justice, Culture, and Public Instruction, seeking to override Berg's decision and secure a position for himself in the Museo Nacional. He copied the text of Berg's letter to Zeballos on April 11, testifying to his "true stupefaction" at receiving it. "Dr. Berg goes under evil auspices to the

52. Ibid.

53. Florentino Ameghino to Estanislao Zeballos, *OCCC*, Vol. 21, 420–421.

Direction of the Museum," he wrote wrathfully. "This is to say, even after the departure of Burmeister from the Museum the same tradition of exclusion and alienation will continue for me, all for having committed no crime more serious than occupying myself with the same studies and having done that which he was incapable of doing!"[54] In the end, however, Berg's decision held, and Ameghino was not invited to join the staff of the Museo Nacional. Retrospectively, however, this furious jousting only delayed the inevitable. Berg's death in 1902 left the way open to Ameghino, who then became director of Burmeister's Museo, now the Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, until his own death in 1911.

Ameghino's Posthumous Heroism

After his death in 1911, Ameghino's fellow scientists and the *porteño* popular press eulogized him in much the same format as Ambrosetti (who died six years later). The primary difference in Ameghino's commemorations lay in the efforts of journalists, scientists, politicians, schoolteachers, and poets to reconcile and even praise Ameghino's notoriously fractious behaviors in violation of his emotional community. In fact, after his death, Ameghino became an unlikely national scientific hero, and his emotional deviance—which had made him frankly unpopular in life—now emerged as a laudable trait that challenged the boundaries of his community. Florentino Ameghino died after a slow decline from diabetic complications on August 6, 1911. At his civil funeral on September 18, José Ingenieros captured the incipient tide of Ameghino fever when he declared, "Glory and death lay in wait together to compete over the body of Florentino Ameghino. Few tombs have seen like his the cypress and the laurel blooming and intertwining at once, as if in the flickering twilight of his physical existence one would have lit an offering lamp to the eternal glorification of his genius."[55] The combined cypress and laurel, horticultural symbols of mourning and of victory or academic achievement, captured in Ingenieros' florid address the very specific nature of Ameghino's emerging celebrity.[56] Posthumously, Ameghino became a symbol for scientific and national glory; he was not, however, cast as a "silent sage" or a self-denying and mild-mannered soul like Ambrosetti. Instead, Ameghino's commemorations

54. Ibid.

55. "La santidad moderna," *La Nación*, 19 Sep 1911.

56. See Farro and Podgorny, "Frente a la Tumba del Sabio" (ref. 7), 28–37; Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors* (ref. 3), Chapter 4.

celebrated his emotional quirks and his eccentric behavior, alongside his patriotism, as marks of a man absorbed by passion for national scientific knowledge, and who did not bow to idle social convention.

In the years that marked Ameghino's height of posthumous celebrity, the 1910s–1930s, Argentine politics and national culture began to tilt away from the Europhilic progressivism of the early Republic, and toward an increasingly pointed celebration of "authentic" *argentinidad*. The civilizing promise of European immigration became tarnished by urban overpopulation, immigrants' poverty, and the crisis of Europe's cultural superiority in the face of World War; national politics was opened to mass participation through the Sáenz Peña law of 1912; radicalism rose to national political power, shaking the ascendency of the traditional oligarchy; and the Argentine tango hit the global stage as an authentically Argentine musical form, eclipsing the popularity of other, foreign music in the *milongas* and dance academies of Buenos Aires.[57] This atmosphere bred increasing distrust in foreigners, and in an exclusivist European academia that did not connect with the lives of everyday Argentines.[58]

Ameghino's posthumous celebrators often described him as a quintessentially Argentine scientist, a native son of Argentina who had taught himself to understand his homeland scientifically, without corrupting foreign influences. Ameghino's natural connection to Argentine soil became a subject of controversy, however, when writers in the popular press suggested that he was actually an Italian immigrant who had come to Argentina as a very small child with his parents. *La Razón* printed a report on the debate on September 8, 1916, along with interviews from a number of Ameghino's former colleagues denouncing the allegation as unfounded and politically motivated. The author contended that a false Italian birth certificate had been produced by a priest in Luján (Ameghino's claimed Argentine birthplace), in defense against "the attacks of liberal elements who had adopted the name of the sabio like a flag." The article printed an image of an Argentine birth certificate as Ameghino's true record, and asserted that Ameghino was Argentine indeed, and that to suggest otherwise was slanderous politicking.[59] Ongoing controversy over

57. See Bethell, *Argentina Since Independence* (ref. 12); Rock, *Argentina 1516–1987* (ref. 12); Nicola Miller, *In the Shadow of the State: Intellectuals and the Quest for National Identity in Twentieth-Century Spanish America* (London: Verso, 1999).

58. Dora Barrancos, *La Escena Iluminada. Ciencias para Trabajadores 1890–1930* (Buenos Aires: Editoral Plus Ultra, 1996); Susana V. García and Irina Podgorny, "El Sabio Tiene una Patria: La Gran Guerra y la Comunidad Científica Argentina," *Ciencia Hoy* 10, no. 55 (2000): 24–34.

59. "La nacionalidad de Florentino Ameghino," *La Razón*, 08 Sep 1916.

Ameghino's place of birth, despite a shared acknowledgement that Ameghino had lived virtually his entire life in Argentina in either case, revealed a jingoistic strain within Argentine nationalism during these years; to be Italian by birth would be less desirable than to be Argentine, and would undermine Ameghino's ability to represent Argentina.

Monuments to Ameghino, and calls to action made in his name, proliferated in the years immediately following his death. As the Argentine congress debated the merits of legislation to nationalize archaeological and paleontological remains in September of 1912, one supporter in the Buenos Aires newspaper *La Nación* characterized it as a "firm continuation of the work of Ameghino," which "affirms the personality of the country in the scientific world."[60] Others honored Ameghino even more concretely; a bust of Ameghino was erected in Buenos Aires' zoological park, a fitting place, one newspaper article explained, as scientists generally preferred spaces conducive to quiet contemplation over the hustle and bustle of teeming metropolitan plazas (these sites, the article mused, were better suited to military heroes, who would enjoy marshaling the urban masses).[61] Such general reflections on the preferences of scientists in itself suggests cultural engagement with scientists as an identifiable group or community in Argentina by the 1910s, in the author's assumption that these categorical traits would be recognized and appreciated by newspaper readers at large. The city of Mar del Plata constructed an even more prominent memorial to Ameghino. An enormous carving of Ameghino's face, shown in a photograph of an inauguration ceremony tentatively dated 1936 (which places this ceremony 25 years after Ameghino's death), provides a sense for both the longevity and the intensity of feeling behind commemorations of Ameghino.

Argentines also celebrated Ameghino with public galas and festivities, such as the "soirée" that, as *La Nación* announced on the second anniversary of Ameghino's death, "was held last night in the teatro Argentina, in La Plata," attended by "a large crowd from that city and many persons from this capital." The newspaper's correspondent reported that the event's combination of scientific papers and musical performances, which lasted until after midnight, "proved very interesting" to its audience. Particularly noteworthy was Ernesto

60. "Las antiguedades del suelo argentino: su conservación," *La Nación*, 14 Sep 1912. This newspaper article is referring to Law 9080; for more on this legislation and its importance to linkages between science and nation, see Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors* (ref. 3), Chapter 2.

61. "Los pequeños monumentos a proposito de Ameghino," *La Nación*, 28 Oct 1912.

Nelson's "long lecture on the scientific work undertaken in his productive life by doctor Ameghino, which address was ably illustrated by close to one hundred illuminated projections."[62] The image of a public audience, sitting through multiple scientific lectures, "ably illustrated" by scores of glass plate slides, in the semi-darkened baroque grotto of La Plata's Teatro Argentino, illustrates the genuine intensity of Ameghino enthusiasm as the 1910s progressed, and the transformative impact of posterity, as the scientist's accomplishments in life were cast in an ever brighter, gilded light.

Through the veneer of his posthumous heroism, even Ameghino's cantankerous personality quirks were remembered with a fondness bordering on reverence by friends and acquaintances, and reported on in newspapers for a broad readership. It is perhaps revealing that, as Ameghino gave such an overwhelming proportion of his time over to solitary professional pursuits, many of these personal reminisces took place on the commuter trains that carried Ameghino daily between his work in Buenos Aires and his home in La Plata between 1902 and 1911. In these years, during which he was Director of the Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales in Buenos Aires, Ameghino was well known to take the same train in the morning and in the evening, and he was evidently surrounded by a faithful entourage of colleagues for whom the daily commute constituted valuable social time with Ameghino, as recounted in later newspaper and biographical accounts. One such account, written by Rafael di Yorio for *El Hogar*, remembered these as precious moments, and related stories Ameghino had shared with di Yorio, including a tale from his time in Paris that the newspaper embellished with an illustration for its readers. As di Yorio narrated it, upon leaving the opera one night, Ameghino discovered the city of Paris blanketed in snow. Passing a café as he walked, Ameghino decided to stop for an espresso. He had a strong aversion to changes in ambient temperature, believing that they had an adverse impact on one's physical constitution. Therefore, rather than entering the hot café from the snowy street, Ameghino opened the door and called to a waiter, asking for an espresso and remaining in the open doorway while the waiter prepared it. Naturally, di Yorio explained, the other patrons of the café took objection to this, shouting "close that door!" and mocking Ameghino's odd behavior. As soon as the espresso was ready, Ameghino took it out onto the snowy sidewalk, "where the waiter, slave to his duty, was forced to follow."[63]

62. "Ameghino—2a aniversario de su fallecimiento," *La Nación*, 06 Aug 1913.
63. Rafael di Yorio, "A un paso de Ameghino," *El Hogar*, 01 Dec 1918.

Ameghino's defiance in the face of convention, even in a case so trivial and humorous as the case of the wintry espresso in Paris, became through such newspaper stories a kind of testament to his personal strength, a proof of his strength of character and his inherent *argentinidad* that made him a worthy role model. The story had little to do with his scientific accomplishments and yet somehow it added to his prestige as an eccentric scientific rogue. This kind of story in particular, in which Ameghino appeared as the enigmatic outsider to academic and social conventions, sculpted a heroic Ameghino who constantly challenged accepted scientific social norms. In a speech given at the inauguration ceremony of Ameghino's bust at the zoological park on October 26, 1912, the park's director, Clemente Onelli, painted a similar picture:

> Few, very few, knew Ameghino; the *sabio* was not popular; popularity is not always glory. But Ameghino, this Argentine glory, at least after death should be known and his effigy popularized among the generations who follow and who, in waves of millions, happy and educated [will] parade and pass through this park.[64]

It was precisely in bucking the conventions of genteel academic sociability, Onelli and others claimed, that Ameghino rose from unpopularity in life to unique prominence in death.

In casting him as a challenger to social conventions, Ameghino's supporters united a number of familiar threads from Argentine nationalist lore, and found an effective approach to mobilizing broad-based support for Ameghino's theories and legacy long after professional science had turned away from them. Ameghino was not a gentrified member of the social aristocracy, nor was he a highly polished conversationalist. He was unpopular, uncouth, and eclectic. This kind of rugged individualism and nonconformity evoked comparisons with the gauchos and frontier heroes of Argentina's nineteenth century, especially apt comparisons in the first decades of the twentieth century, as the bloom was coming off the European rose in the crisis leading up to and following the first World War, and as socialist and anarchist political crisis rocked Argentine politics, prompting nostalgic calls for a return to traditional Argentine values, wherever they might be found.

64. "Homenaje al Doctor Ameghino—inauguración de un busto del sabio," *La Nación*, 27 Oct 1912.

Ameghino's legacy, however, remained hotly contested. In the 1910s, the international scientific community declared Ameghino's best-known theory—that humankind had originally evolved in Argentina—to be wholly unsupported and in fact contrary to the existing evidence. In the wake of this very public debunking, scientists and other Argentines began decrying the "embarrassment" that Ameghino had brought down upon Argentine science. In the face of this opposition, a camp of loyal proponents calling themselves *Ameghinistas* defended Ameghino and his theories as a proud example of national science. The Museo Nacional, directed after Ameghino's death by his brother Carlos, continued excavations at a coastal excavation site called Miramar, where *Ameghinista* scientists claimed to be uncovering evidence that supported Ameghino's original theory. The debate, both in the popular press and among scientists, was heated and emotional, based strongly in languages of objectivity and patriotism. As an editorial in *El Diario* on April 19, 1920, noted, "it is necessary for the honor of the country that the farce of this find finish." To continue believing that humankind had evolved in Argentina, and that finds of Miramar were genuine, the author contended, was contrary to the dictates of science, and anathema to national pride:

> It is necessary to reflect that the country cannot be at the mercy of this scientific misery, because it weakens us. . . . The country cannot meekly witness the destruction of our cultural process, without leaving record of their protest; and we say this, because these errors have been spread even in teaching texts.

In other words, the article exhorted Argentines to stand up to this distortion of their own national scientific heritage, and show themselves worthy of their own national legacy.[65] Nonetheless, a decade later North American paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson captured the enduring feeling of *ameghinismo* during a visit to Buenos Aires: "Twenty years after that death [Ameghino's] not only were children singing his praises but also, as I soon learned, among nonscientists in Argentina any suggestion that Florentino had ever been mistaken was met with unbelief and resentment."[66]

65. "El hombre terciario de Miramar: es necesario para honor del país que termine la farsa de su hallazgo," *El Diario*, 19 Apr 1920.

66. George Gaylord Simpson, *Discoverers of the Lost World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 76.

CONCLUSION

During the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, museum natural scientists in Argentina collectively crafted an emotional community that defined how scientists ought to behave, emphasizing the importance of objectivity and patriotism as twin emotional styles that demonstrated a proper approach to scientific behavior. In emphasizing these elements within their own emotional community, museum natural scientists collectively and individually praised their peers for adhering to proper behavior, and disparaged their adversaries in terms that placed them beyond the pale. The emotional styles embraced by museum natural scientists also positioned them to play a central role in Argentine nation-state formation. The confluence in Argentina between a growing museum science world and national preoccupations with progress and civilization allowed museum natural scientists like Francisco P. Moreno, Hermann Burmeister, Juan B. Ambrosetti, and Florentino Ameghino to play an unexpectedly large role not only in the cultivation of museum natural science and the emotional norms of this community, but also in the broader path of Argentine national development. By the early twentieth century these ties became so close that when Moreno wrote in 1907 that "without its own science, there is not a strong Nation," few Argentines would have been surprised.[67]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Christina Bueno, Alexander Dawson, Julie Gibbings, Paul Jenkins, Florencia E. Mallon, Jorge Nállim, Lynn Nyhart, Francisco Scarano, Steve J. Stern, Bruno J. Strasser, Sarah Walsh, Adam Warren, an anonymous reviewer for *Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences*, the Latin American research cluster at the University of Manitoba, and the Café Ethnohístorique at the University of Saskatchewan, who all read or participated in conference panels in which I presented earlier versions of this work, as well as the Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies, where this work was first presented. Their feedback has been essential to writing this article. Any remaining shortcomings are entirely my own. This article draws in part on material that is presented differently in Carolyne R. Larson, *Our Indigenous Ancestors: A Cultural History of Museums, Science, and Identity in Argentina, 1877–1943* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015). My thanks to Pennsylvania State University Press for their permission to reframe this material here.

67. Moreno, 15 Oct 1907, AGN (ref. 1).