

Film and the Making of Postwar Internationalism: Progressive Filmmaking at the Rockefeller Boards, 1934-1945

By Rob Aitken

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

raitken@ualberta.ca

© 2013 by Rob Aitken

During November 2012, I spent time at the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) in support of a broader research project entitled *Film and the Making of Postwar Internationalism*. The month-long archival research was focused on the role of the Rockefeller Boards [especially the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and the General Education Board (GEB)] in cultivating ties to international progressive documentary film networks centered around British filmmaker and bureaucrat John Grierson. In this research report, I will detail the ways in which my archival visit to the RAC helped clarify the role of the RF and the GEB in inserting a distinctively American voice into progressive film networks of the 1930s and 1940s. Most importantly, the material I researched at the RAC helped shed light on the complexity of the Rockefeller interest in progressive filmmaking.

As this report will indicate, the Rockefeller Boards pursued two overlapping, but occasionally inconsistent, programs of progressive filmmaking in the 1930s and 1940s. On one hand, the Boards did actively seek to insert themselves into the internationalizing networks that were cohering around Grierson and his conception of film as a technique of *social* citizenship. On the other hand, however, they also pursued a different conception of progressive filmmaking associated with Lawrence K. Frank and his conception of culture and personality at the ‘Film and Human Relations’ project. This project, crucially, highlighted film not as a technique that could

cultivate social citizens, but as one that could be key to conceptions of *psychological* selfhood. Although both of these programs were self-consciously progressive, they differ importantly on the kinds of individual conduct that film could help to cultivate.

This research report is divided into three sections. The first section reviews the attempts by the RF to insert itself into Grierson's progressive network of international social documentary. A second section, by contrast, highlights the "Film and Human Relations" project which emphasized not a social, but a psychological self. The conclusion briefly highlights both the affinities and tensions between these two forms of progressive filmmaking—a theme that will be picked up in future research.

Film as a Technique of Social Citizenship

In 1946, Iris Barry, the founding curator of MoMA's Film Library, penned a lengthy report commissioned by the RF on the postwar prospects for documentary film in the United States. Barry was unenthused about the possibilities that a vibrant version of the film movement could flourish in postwar America. Although there was widespread hope for an extension of documentary film sponsorship in the postwar period, Barry remained unmoved. The possibility that a postwar flourishing of the documentary movement in America, she noted flatly, "is likely to be automatically or easily undertaken, but it does not, at the moment of writing, look particularly probable."¹

The note that Barry sent to the RF in submitting this report was punctuated by an offhand proposal for a program of ten to twelve films of 'real importance' (requiring a budget of \$300,000) that could reinvigorate American documentary circles and reestablish documentary as a vital artistic form. In response to Barry's 'dream-life' fantasy, John Marshall, the Director of Humanities at the RF and one of its key film enthusiasts, scribbled a strangely cryptic marginal

note. “IB,” he notes obliquely, “knows nothing that the RF consider something of the kind.” Marshall's private record notes that the RF was seriously considering a ‘substantial’ investment in a large independent fund that would finance a documentary program capable of reenergizing the American documentary scene. Marshall made the case for such a significant investment by suggesting that it would place the RF at the heart of a revitalized documentary movement. In his words, a bold investment “at this point may be peculiarly strategic.”²

Although the kind of ‘dream like’ investment that Barry fantasized about, and which Marshall serious considered, never fully materialized. The RF did mount a ‘peculiarly strategic’ investment in American documentary and did attempt to replicate, in particular, the kind of experiments in social documentary John Grierson had constructed in the U.K. and in Canada. For Grierson, film was explicitly conceived as a practice that could dramatically alter (and expand) the geographies of everyday experience; film as a novel technology that could radically reshape the ways in which we understood ourselves and the spaces we inhabit. For Grierson, at the very core of the power associated with film is its ability to redraw the ways in which everyday populations understand and confront the world, in the broadest sense. Increasingly committed to his own variant of internationalism, Grierson understood film as a practice that could ‘widen’ the sense of space in which everyday populations located themselves, opening them in a forceful manner to the global realm beyond their own narrow lived experience.³ Film could make visible a wide and interdependent world—a medium in which everyday audiences experience the ‘stretched’ spaces which connect them to the world as a whole. Film, for Grierson, constitutes:

the mass media most capable of bringing the disparate elements of the wide world into obvious juxtaposition and association...it has done something to open a window to the wider world, and to widen and stretch men's eyes, and in the documentary film, it has, I believe, outlined the patterns of interdependency more distinctively and more deliberately than any other medium whatsoever.⁴

The RF became a forceful exponent of the documentary film movement after Grierson himself engaged with it by the late 1930s. Grierson's visits to the RF, while he headed the Film Centre in London, served, in the words of one RF officer, to stimulate “particularly formative” discussions “for developing the production and use of non-theatrical films in this country.”⁵ The attempt to emulate Grierson, and to link American filmmaking inextricably to Grierson's British movement, was explicit. Grierson's urgings “confirmed,” for the RF, “the desirability of parallel developments here,” and underscored “how ripe the time is here” for key initiatives in the documentary field.⁶ By invoking and engaging with Grierson, the RF signaled its intent to provoke an American version of his experiments in documentary film and to install itself at the center of those experiments.

The most ambitious face of this intent was the creation of the American Film Center (AFC). Constituted directly in the wake of Grierson's visit, the AFC was an attempt to model Grierson's London Film Centre, which had been at the heart of early documentary in the U.K. As RF officials noted upon launching the AFC in 1938, “the promise of the American Film Center seems confirmed by the success of its English prototype.”⁷ Established to serve as an intermediary link between producers and filmmakers and to coordinate the work of sponsors, the AFC was funded by a RF grant in 1938 and later by a larger contribution of \$60,000 in 1939. The AFC was directed by Donald Slesinger who worked for periods of time at the University of Chicago, as well as at New York's 1939 World's Fair. Under Slesinger's leadership, and in constant dialogue with RF officers who funded it throughout the 1940s, the AFC explicitly promoted documentary film and carefully scripted its work in the language that Grierson had used in the British context.

For Grierson, documentary was most importantly a technology of citizenship; a practice which could instill “explanations of the modern world and the conditioning of the public mind to citizenship within it.”⁸ In the context of widespread social, economic and cultural change, Grierson offered documentary as a medium of communication which could address itself to the particular needs of everyday populations as they grappled with new requirements and complexities of citizenship.

Echoing Grierson, Slesinger adopted at the AFC, a conception of film as a social force deeply implicated in new modes of social being; what he described as ‘essential equipment’ for the kind of self and citizen necessary for the maintenance of democracy. Documentary film, conceived Slesinger, made visible “information essential to the equipment of the independent citizen in a democracy ... the motion picture as an instrument, not an end.”⁹ Using this language, the AFC became an important American echo of Grierson's conception of film as a practice of democratic citizenship.

In asserting this conception of film, the AFC assumed an important international role as the only meaningful American node in a broadly international documentary network consisting of filmmakers, cultural bureaucrats, critics, and academics. In the 1940s, for example, the AFC was able to support Jean Benoit-Levy, who was a key filmmaker and film writer in France, the head of France's organization of documentary filmmakers—*Les Artisans d'Art du Cinema*—and, later the first head of the United Nations Film Board.¹⁰ The AFC also sponsored international exchange and collaboration, financed research initiatives and supported filmmakers as part of its refugee-scholar programs. Most ambitiously, it also helped to found the International Film Center in 1940, a joint project with the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the United States (another longtime RF beneficiary).¹¹

Despite the investment of resources and time that the RF made in it—it received RF grants amounting to at least \$140,000 through 1941 the AFC collapsed in 1946 under serious accusations of mismanagement and failure. Its role as a serious (and profitable) link between filmmakers and sponsors never materialized, leaving the AFC unable to assert any self-sustaining momentum. Moreover, after 1945, accusations began to mount of both serious financial mismanagement and of animosity generated by Slesinger among the network of filmmakers he was charged to organize. Key members of the film community, for example, noted that Slesinger had succeeded in “antagonizing almost everyone working with films.”¹² Throughout the first half of 1946, and in the midst of acrimony, the RF removed its support and distanced itself from the AFC.

Although its work at the AFC dissolved into a strange chaos, a more unambiguously successful Rockefeller accomplishment in documentary film was constituted at MoMA's film library. The proposal for a film library was part of a much longer and sustained connection between the Rockefeller family and the institution—MoMA—that would come to lie at the heart of their cultural and artistic philanthropy. Nelson A. Rockefeller (NAR) consistently encouraged MoMA to broaden the kind of art that would fall under its purview including all variety of film, consummated in a proposal written by Barry in 1935 for a film library. The proposal noted that the “art of the motion picture is the only great art peculiar to the twentieth century. It is practically unknown as such to the American public, and as such almost wholly unstudied.” (Abbott 1995)¹³ The library, which was funded over its first three years by grants of \$180,000 from the RF, was given a complicated and creative mandate—not only to curate film as a distinctively modern art, but also to encourage the study of film by creating a large repository of significant films that would be available to film scholars and students. Key to the early

formation of film studies, the film library would mount successful film programs, curate innovative exhibits, establish a film lending circuit to extend film-use widely beyond the museum and, most importantly, launch an ambitious (eventually daily) screening program of classical and significant films that would, by the 1940s, account for over forty percent of all museum revenues.¹⁴

Although the film library had a wide and ambitious mandate, at the center of its inception was an attempt to connect the study and appreciation of film to larger social and sociological concerns; a link that placed progressive documentary at the heart of its work. The library cultivated strong connections to the documentary world (through both Barry and Griffith), conducted research on the documentary form, (punctuated by Barry's own postwar report) and dedicated most of its work during the war to the promotion and circulation of wartime 'films of fact.' This interest was underscored by the prominence of documentary in all of the annual screening and circulation programs and by a landmark 1945 series, *The Documentary, 1922-1945*. In supporting the film library as a center of film collection and analysis, the RF conceived of it as an institution that could be particularly strategic. "No central organization," noted an internal RF document, "is primarily interested in this aspect of cinematography and none exists ... [for] organizing the large potential audience in this country interested in seeing films not ordinarily shown in theaters."¹⁵ Punctuated by well-financed grants from the RF in 1935, 1938, 1940 and 1942, and cemented by a series of lucrative contracts for wartime work with Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the film library became a core part of MoMA's identity and helped create an inextricable link between it and the worlds of documentary filmmaking.

Like the AFC, MoMA's film library was the invention of a certain optimism in the possibility of a postwar expansion in documentary film. With deep links to Grierson and with serious intent to replicate the kind of impact and institutional presence that he was able to achieve both in London and abroad, the filmmakers, critics and cultural bureaucrats that the RF assembled imagined a progressive future for film in the postwar moment. Part of this optimism was the residue of the large public and private investments in documentary film throughout the war effort. Barry, although critical of the scope of wartime production, nonetheless was ultimately convinced of its eventual translation into postwar possibility. "Peacetime," she claimed, "will no more see the abandonment of this instrument than it will of the aeroplane.[sic]"¹⁶ Nonetheless, and despite this optimism, the postwar period witnessed, if not an abandonment, something of a disappointing constriction of documentary film, at least of the style that Grierson had envisioned.

MoMA's landmark documentary exhibit in 1945, marking the threshold to the optimistic peacetime Barry envisioned, also signaled a certain degree of uncertainty. In announcing the series, MoMA noted that the films had "been assembled and exhibited to mark the end of an important phase ... of its development."¹⁷ This note of transition seems to prefigure the larger ways in which documentary, at least in the Griersonian view, would fail to meet the expectations placed on it. On many levels, this failing was both disappointing and unexpected. John Marshall, the architect of the RF's film program, noted boldly that "the postwar boom in the field simply did not materialize ... it was indeed a general expectation ... it somehow seemed inconceivable that those activities should not continue into the period of peace."¹⁸ This unexpected demise, however, needs to be placed alongside the simultaneous Rockefeller enthusiasm for another distinctive experiment in 'progressive' film.

Film and the Internalized Spaces of ‘Culture and Personality’

Beginning at roughly the same time as their interest in Griersonian documentary, the Rockefeller Boards also experimented with film as a practice that could vitally reshape not only the social bonds of everyday citizenship but also the *psychological* selves that populated that social world. Working in partnership with the Progressive Education Association, the Rockefeller Boards launched an ambitious program designed to use film in the training of citizens as selves attentive to their own internal psychologies—psychological beings sensitive to their inner 'mental hygiene.' The culmination of these experiments was the Commission on Human Relations, an initiative funded by the GEB, but with overlapping connections to many of the personalities who were engaged in film work at the RF.

The centerpiece of the Commission's work was an ongoing project on 'film in human relations,' which produced reedited film segments from preexisting films designed to display key human relations scenarios. A larger program of intervention was shaped around these segments in which trained facilitators staged discussions in classroom or community settings, designed to encourage participants to explore issues relating to psychological development. The Commission, headed by Alice Keliher, was an innovator of both a novel way to edit and frame film segments, (ranging in duration from five to thirty minutes) as well as novel discussion techniques designed to allow participants to come to their own understanding of key themes. As one report to the GEB put it, these innovations were attempts “to use the motion picture as a constructive medium for illustrating and analyzing human behavior.”¹⁹

Beginning in 1935, the Commission produced several hundred film clips, experimented with discussion techniques in hundreds of settings, produced an impressive volume of research on the ways in which audiences reacted to and understood the clips, and recorded in long-form

all of the discussions it staged. In doing so, the Commission pioneered a technique that used film as a way of introducing to everyday populations a language which stressed their own personality and the processes through which the psychological health of that personality could be developed and maintained.

Like Grierson, the architects of this project nurtured expansive ambitions regarding the possibilities of film and progressive social change. For Keliher, the film project was both an antidote to global political-economic upheaval and an attempt to open a channel through which everyday populations could participate in the reconstruction of social and cultural order. The project, Keliher noted, was a direct response to “catastrophic negative behavior ... on a world-wide scale ... [motion] pictures provide a central focus ... that makes it possible ... to have shared the same experience and to have reacted to human emotion and feeling,” a process, she implored, that constitutes “the only real hope of enduring peace.”²⁰ For Keliher, the 'aesthetic experience' generated in film—its unique ability to mobilize emotion and to plunge its audience directly into experiences it could not otherwise encounter—was so powerful it could serve as the basis for fundamental cultural and social change.²¹

Moreover, Keliher conceived film as a practice that could dramatically alter the ways in which everyday populations experience space. Unlike Grierson, however, who linked film to the *widening* of personal geographies in the largest possible—global—setting, the geography pursued in the human relations project was decidedly internal. Keliher was keen to address the same kinds of pressures which animated Grierson's concern for social reform—global geopolitical instability, economic change not well contained by old laissez-faire sensibilities, a world gripped by technological and social changes, out of step with traditional conceptions of

state and citizen. For Keliher, however, these were problems fundamentally related to the inner geographies that governed individual personalities.

Keliher relocated the pressures leading to macro-level conflict and change onto the level of individual psychological practice. “We now know,” she asserted, “that much of what we have thought unmanageable about human behavior, much of what we thought [was] controlled by forces outside ourselves, lies in the emotional behavior of the individual.”²² In this formulation, film becomes a method of inserting individuals not into the world as a whole, but into the spaces of their own internal psychology. In words which both echo and invert Grierson's conception of film as a stretching technology, film is sketched as a practice that can open up 'vast horizons' to audiences. These are horizons, however, which not so much frame the world of an emerging internationalism, (as Grierson would have it) but offer a novel glimpse into—a penetration of—the 'motive forces' which lie inside of individual consciousness. To open these horizons requires:

... films to explain the *internal* relationship of man to his world, to explain man to himself ... the visual interpretation of man's invisible [inner] world—opening up vast and exciting horizons ... to face the needs of a changing era in which man's understanding of himself as an individual, not only as a member of a community, is increasingly recognized as vital to the development and welfare of mankind as a whole ... the unique power of [film] lies in its ability to present reality in such a way as to penetrate beneath the conscious mind to the motive forces of life: emotions, instinct, desires, ambitions, frustrations, inhibitions, humor, love, pride, wonder, courage ...²³

This catalogue of emotional forces maps an internal geography particularly accessible to, and made governable by film; an inner space of individual personality brought into focus by the aesthetic experience made possible in film.

In experimenting with this kind of psychological view, the Rockefeller Boards were deepening their own particular commitment to the 'culture and personality' movement. Culture and personality was an intellectual vision shaped by Lawrence K. Frank; a key figure at the GEB, (where he served as Director) as well as other philanthropic foundations. Of particular

importance for Frank was emerging research which emphasized the ways in which the chaotic disorderliness of the social world was tamed by culture.

For Frank, culture imposes patterns of human conduct and, by extension, constitutes *social order*.²⁴ 'Culturalization', as Frank intends it, is the complex process in which the transmission of cultural expectation is 'distorted' as each individual refracts the requirements of culture through their own experiences and emotions.²⁵ For Frank, "every situation, person, and event is fitted into the patterns which the official culture ... [has] prescribed, but always with that bias and distortion, that selective awareness, and peculiar feelings that our individual life experience has made the basic dimensions of our private world."²⁶ These 'distortions' that result as personalities are formed, are critical to the processes of 'social adjustment' through which individuals reconcile themselves with the requirements of cultural values.

At its core, the GEB film project reflected this view of culture and personality as an educational intervention which provided individuals with the opportunity to integrate their own personalities with broadly accepted cultural and social norms and to remove psychological barriers to that process of 'adjustment.' In Keliher's terms, this entailed a "genuine search for personal adjustment in a social universe ... Recognition that personal motivations have their roots in the social universe, that personal convictions arise in a social setting."²⁷

Film, Personality, Human Relations

If Frank's work was marked by a certain kind of abstract urgency—a frenzy of writing and theorizing about the conceptual basis of culture and personality—it was Keliher's Commission which gave him an opportunity to pursue those forces in more concrete terms. Encouraged by Frank's preoccupation with the psychological power of aesthetic experience, Keliher launched the film project as an intervention aimed at young adults in high schools and in

other settings. The project, funded by the GEB, involved the creation of film clips for teenage audiences as a way to encourage students to become more aware of the complex ways in which personalities became 'adjusted' to their own cultural and social context.

A 1940 list of 'focus points' for group discussion highlights a series of 'personal issues' in film segments edited by the Commission that could be used to assist teenagers in addressing issues such as 'establishing independence,' the 'urge to create, ... and express.' On one level, film clips were designed as a 'technique of the self' with which teenagers could begin to explicitly direct their own 'adjustment' to cultural expectations. In the language Frank helped to codify, the film segments were designed to create aesthetic experiences in which teenagers would begin to discover and manage their own personality and to relate that personality to the weight of cultural expectation. On another level, however, films were also used to encourage discussion of the cultural norms they were supposed to adjust to and the ways in which those norms themselves were often changing dramatically. The list included, for example, segments designed to provoke discussion of the 'importance of religion in society' and 'race prejudice,' to cite two examples of changing norms the Commission felt were especially reflective of ongoing processes of cultural upheaval.²⁸ In both of these senses—as a technique of personal adjustment, and as an opening for discussions of cultural disintegration and change—the film project was a concrete attempt at the diverse commitments that marked Frank's interwar preoccupation with the antinomies of culture and personality.

In charting these kinds of commitments, the architects of the film project conceived of it as a particularly urgent intervention at a moment of profound and confusing cultural change, especially for those who experienced that moment of cultural upheaval at a psychologically crucial age. The project, according to Keliher, was designed to help teenagers:

orient themselves with their immediate colleagues, with a hostile adult world, with an unpromising social order, with a confused disorganization of beliefs ... this period is one in which the total organization of the individual is taking place, and the consequent sorting and resorting lends a unique opportunity for the clarification and revision of valuations ...²⁹

In attempting to furnish teenagers with an instrument which could allow this kind of probing work on the self, Keliher's work invoked a series of crucial assumptions about the power and reach of film. Keliher and her staff placed particular emphasis on film as a technique that could intervene directly into the inner selves of individuals.

A relatively novel form, film was often framed as a practice that provoked new ways of understanding and experiencing space and time; a visual medium able to situate its audience in striking kind of ways. Attempting to harness this capacity, Keliher's Commission used film to make key psychological issues dramatically visible. The edited film clips, for example, all sought to frame particular moments of behavior as the product of much longer and more complex psychological chains made visible only through the dramatic perspectives film could achieve. This dramatic framing would, in turn, allow teenagers to confront psychological issues as moments that could be consciously addressed and negotiated, and not as unchangeable or unknowable patterns. Film, as one staff-member of the project put it, was used "to widen their horizon of meaning, to help students pursue the history of any given bit of behavior, thereby minimizing tendencies to assume that large events or group action are due to capricious chance or to 'human nature' broad and undefined."³⁰ As a medium capable of making psychological pressures visible in unexpected ways, film was integral to the widening of the 'horizon of meaning' we use to assess our own behavior and personality.

In general terms, for Keliher, film was unique in its ability to reach deeply into the lives of those it confronted. If at the heart of culture and personality is, as Frank suggests, a

relationship between the construction of meaning and the regulation of human conduct, film provides a useful surface of experimentation; a mechanism with which individuals could see, shape and make sense of their own experience. Accessible to those without specialized knowledge of psychology, film situates each of us within the spaces of our own experience, confronting us with the various narratives we might assemble as we make sense of that experience. “Film,” argues Keliher forcefully, “is employed as an instrument for reaching into experience, for delving into matters of an inherent nature ... The cinema's value ... lies most surely in its readiness to converge with the stream of experience serving to widen or even divert it into fields of creative thought ...”³¹ Film, in this view, is most importantly understood as a technique of *intervention*. Able to reach deeply into the inner spaces of individual selves, and to make visible the 'inherent' matter at the core of those selves, film is a unique and powerful tool which pries open the spaces inside of us that are insulated from human consideration and reflection.

In its film work, Keliher's Commission on Human Relations was a reflection, in a very particular and concrete way, of Frank's preoccupation with the dynamic relations of culture and personality—with what two key scholars referred to as the essential processes of “emotional adjustment of a person to his environment.”³² Keliher's Commission mobilized a very particular kind of self-consciously progressive film practice and ultimately sought a reconstructed culture and society that might better achieve ‘human values.’ As Frank himself noted, “it must be clearly recognized, this is essentially an artistic task, of creating a consistent picture of the universe [which will] ... express the new aspirations and sensibilities through which we seek to attain enduring human values.”³³ Film, for Frank and Keliher, was a medium capable of generating the ‘consistent pictures’ that progressive cultural change demanded. On one hand,

this was a project consistent with other interwar calls (like Grierson's) for the use of film as the centerpiece of progressive social change. On the other hand, however, Keliher's progressive film project also presided over an important and unique shift in the very meaning of the 'social' and the kind of change it could help unleash.

Conclusion: From a Social to a Psychological Self?

Throughout the 1930s and into the 1940s, the Rockefeller Boards made the progressive use of film—the attempt to link film to progressive forms of social change—key to its programming and priorities. This preoccupation was marked by two related, but distinct emphases; a focus on film as a technique of social citizenship, on one hand, and as a device of internal psychological introspection, on the other. Although there are many lines of connection between these projects—lines of personality and progressive politics—these approaches offered starkly contrasting conceptions of the new kinds of citizens that would populate a progressive new social order. More importantly, although it would differ considerably from Keliher's experiments, psychological programming would become ever more integral to postwar programs of mass communications pursued both at the Rockefeller Boards and beyond. The RF support for 'attitude studies' programs, for example, was organized as an explicit attempt to understand and leverage the psychological dimensions of cultural and communication consumption. These psychologically-inflected areas of research and practice would, it seems, eventually displace the type of work Grierson was attempting in relation to social citizenship. In this respect, the research I conducted at the RAC is richly suggestive. Although it suggests the formative role of the Rockefeller Boards in delineating an important shift from a 'social' to a 'psychological' frame for communication programs, it also leaves important questions unanswered. A greater sense of the political motivations for and implications of this shift remain important questions

that need to be addressed. This, in turn, implies the need for further research on the historical complexities with which both social and psychological perspectives were programmed, promoted and ultimately displaced.

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

ENDNOTES:

¹ Barry to Marshall, May 22, 1946, Folder 2943, Box 246, Series 200R, Record Group (RG) 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, (RF) RAC.

² John Marshall (JM) interview notes, June 11, 1946, Folder 2942, Box 246, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC. This interest in a bold investment is reiterated a few weeks later on July 8, 1946, when Marshall meets with Bosley Crowther, film critic at the *New York Times*, who suggested that such a fund could be "strategically most productive." JM interview notes, June 11, 1946, Folder 2943, Box 246, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

³ Rob Aitken. "A 'World Without End': Postwar Reconstruction and Everyday Internationalism in Documentary Film." *The International History Review*. Forthcoming—2013.

⁴ John Grierson. "The Challenge of Peace." In Forsyth Hardy, editor, *Grierson on Documentary*. London, U.K.: Faber and Faber, 1966, p. 328; See also Rob Aitken. "Provincializing Embedded Liberalism: Film, Orientalism and the Reconstruction of World Order." *Review of International Studies* 37: 4 (October 2011), pp. 1695-1720.

⁵ *Developments in Humanities in Motion Pictures*, July 6, 1938, Folder 2583, Box 199, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ AFC Funding Proposal, January 20, 1939, Folder 2583, Box 199, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

⁸ John Grierson. "Public Relations." *Sight and Sound* 19: 5 (1950), p. 201; See also Aitken, "Provincializing Embedded Liberalism."

⁹ Slesinger, *Report to the Documentary Producer's Association*, September 28 1939, Folder 2384, Box 199, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

¹⁰ The RF funded Benoit-Levy's exile from France during World War II and his residency at the New School in New York. See Benoit Levy, Folders 546-547, Box 46, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC. See also Benoit-Levy, 1946.

¹¹ Intriguingly, the International Film Center was partly designed as a way of "supplanting the work of the Division of Cultural Relations of the State Department." *Memorandum from International Film Center*, May 13, 1940, Folder 2385, Box 199, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

¹² JM interview notes with C.S. Goldner, January 22, 1946, Folder 2392, Box 200, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.

-
- ¹³ Iris Barry, *An Outline of a Project for Funding the Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art*, Folder 1363, Box 139, Projects Series, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ¹⁴ John Jay Whitney, December 9, 1937, Folder 1367A, Box 139, Projects Series, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ¹⁵ JM to Donald Stevens, December 30, 1938, Folder 2983, Box 250, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.
- ¹⁶ Barry, *Documentary Film: Prospect and Retrospect*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1945, Folder 2998, Box 251, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ JM to David Stevens, August 5, 1946, Folder 2392, Box 200, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.
- ¹⁹ Progressive Education Association, *Request to Board of Directors for Action on Extension of Commission on Human Relations Budget*, Folder 2960, Box 283, Series 1.2, General Education Board Archives (GEB), RAC.
- ²⁰ Keliher, "Films and Human Relations." *Scholastics* October 20, 1939, Folder 2965, Box 284, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ²¹ This entails a faith in the power of film as an instrument that could intervene into individual personalities. See Lawrence K. Frank (LKF), *Progressive Education Association Commission on Human Relations*, January 6, 1936, Folder 2956, Box 283, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC; See also LKF, Interview notes from a meeting with Louise Rosenblatt, December 27, 1935, Folder 2955, Box 283, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ²² Alice Keliher (AK), "Films and Human Relations." *Scholastics* October 20, 1939, Folder 2965, Box 284, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ²³ William Wells, *Documentary Film as Education for Life*, 1951, Folder 2952, Box 256, Series 200R, RG 1.1, RF, RAC.
- ²⁴ Social order, like culture, is an artifact of human invention: "Social order is not given ... social order is what individuals create and maintain by their beliefs and their practices, especially their human relations." See L.K. Frank. "Personalities for Social Progress." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 19: 1 (1945), p. 35.
- ²⁵ See L.K. Frank. "Cultural Coercion and Individual Distortion." *Psychiatry* 2: 1 (1939), pp. 11-27.: "Thus we face the dual aspects of personality and culture. The culture ... imposes upon the individual's behavior, its direction and form and instrumentation in the institutional practices for personal relations. The personality that emerges from this cultural tuition, with the affective tones, meanings and drives that the individual develops from the way the cultural training has been imposed."
- ²⁶ See L.K. Frank. "Freedom for the Personality." *Psychiatry* 3: 3 (1940), pp. 341-349.
- ²⁷ AK, *Memorandum*, June 4, 1941, Folder 2965, Box 284, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ²⁸ Commission on Human Relations, *Typical Points of Focus*, 1940, Folder 2959, Box 283, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ²⁹ AK, *Motion Picture Project Human Relations*, 1937, Folder 2966, Box 285, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ³⁰ Dorothy Wilmotte, *Discussion Analysis*, 1937, Folder 2965, Box 284, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ³¹ AK, *Commission on Human Relations Grant Proposal*, 1939, Folder 2961, Box 283, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ³² George V. Sheviakov and Jean Friedberg, *Evaluation of Personal and Social Adjustment*, 1939, Folder 2952, Box 283, Series 1.2, GEB, RAC.
- ³³ L.K. Frank. "Science and Culture." *The Scientific Monthly* 50: 6 (June 1940), pp. 491-497.