

The Wartime Work of U.S. Museums

By Clarissa J. Ceglio

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of American Studies
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

Clarissa_Ceglio@brown.edu

© 2010 by Clarissa J. Ceglio

In the summer of 2010, I spent two weeks at the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) as part of my preliminary dissertation research into the domestic and international activities undertaken by U.S. museums during World War II and its immediate aftermath. A core focus of this project, currently entitled “A Cultural Arsenal for Democracy: The War Work of U.S. Museums, 1930-1955,” is the ways in which museum exhibitions contributed to the construction of national belonging, civic identity, conceptions of America’s place in the world, and the public’s relationships, as both citizens and consumers, to war and its technologies. Additionally, my aim is to situate the embodied ways of knowing, constructed by museums within the broader matrix of exhibitory practices pursued by government agencies, many times in partnership with museums.

Chief among the museums to be included in my study is the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). During World War II, it constituted what Russell Lynes called a “minor war industry.”¹ On behalf of the Office of War Information, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA), the Library of Congress, and other agencies, MoMA reportedly fulfilled 38 government contracts totaling \$1,590,234 by the end of World War II.² The museum also formed an Armed Services Program; mounted some 40 exhibitions related to the war (many of which circulated as traveling editions stateside and abroad); analyzed enemy

propaganda films and prepared motion pictures for the government through its Film Library; and initiated a War Veterans Art Center. As Eva Cockcroft observed, the relationship that developed between MoMA and Uncle Sam during World War II served as a prelude to the museum's later involvement in government-sponsored initiatives on the Cold War's cultural front in the 1950s.³ Due to the ambitious scope of MoMA's wartime involvement—and the more voluminous than usual documentation that the museum maintained of its exhibition activities—this institution serves as the hub, or spine, of my dissertation.

The Rockefeller Archive Center presented a unique opportunity to review in one location institutional and personal records related to MoMA, the CIAA, and the philanthropic activities of the Rockefeller Foundation in support of museums. Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, one of MoMA's founders, and her son Nelson A. Rockefeller were active in the museum's affairs and its wartime involvements. Even after Mr. Rockefeller resigned his post as president of MoMA in early 1941 to assume the role of CIAA, his relations with the museum continued, particularly in the form of the previously mentioned government contracts and services. For her part, Mrs. Rockefeller played an instrumental role in promoting the development of an Armed Services Program, which brought art displays and supplies to domestic military installations, promoted arts therapy, and made the museum's facilities available for the respite and entertainment of the Allied Nations' armed forces when on leave in New York. In time, this program, with Mrs. Rockefeller's committed backing and encouragement, shifted its focus to assisting returning veterans. As ~~the~~ child of Mrs. Rockefeller's imagination," the War Veterans Art Center endeavored to reorient returning combatants to civilian life through therapeutic and pre-vocational arts programs until its closure in 1948.⁴

Because my visit to the RAC and the writing of this report fell within the earliest stages of my dissertation's development, what follows is an overview of findings rather than an integrated analysis of the material. Such a synthesis will not be possible until further research is conducted at institutions with complementary holdings. These include the archives of the Museum of Modern Art, Brooklyn Museum and Newark Museum as well as the U.S. National Archives and Records Administrations' Office of Inter-American Affairs collection (Record Group 229).

The bulk of material consulted during my time at the Rockefeller Archive Center resides in the Rockefeller Family Archives' Record Group 2 (The Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller) and Record Group 4 (Nelson A. Rockefeller, Personal), with additional documentation pertaining to funding of various museums and museum-related initiatives drawn from the Rockefeller Foundation Archives' Record Group 1 (Projects, 1912-1989). Of these, I spent the majority of my time reviewing Nelson A. Rockefeller's personal papers from his years as the Coordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs (Record Group 4, Series O, Subseries 1). This research will inform a dissertation chapter addressing museum initiatives supported by the CIAA in its efforts to stimulate U.S. interest in Latin America and construct a supranational imagined community characterized by shared cultural, political, and economic interests.⁵ Therefore, I have chosen to focus this report on materials related to this aspect of my work.⁶

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA)

The Council of National Defense created the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (OCCCRBAR) on August 16, 1940, with the aim of orchestrating a multi-pronged defense against the expansion of fascism and Axis influence in Central and South America. The Office would, as its name indicated, be responsible

for coordinating projects that, hitherto, had often lacked common focus or oversight. The expansive scope of the Office's initiatives ranged from projects in the areas of health, sanitation, agriculture, and industrial infrastructure to language programs, cultural exchanges, and delivery of U.S.-controlled content through print, radio, and motion pictures. The aim of these and other diverse undertakings was to stabilize Latin American economies, deepen U.S. influence, and counteract anti-U.S. policies and sentiments.

To accomplish this feat, the Office sought the cooperation and expertise of a range of specialists. Accordingly, it engaged paid staff and volunteer advisers from various private and public sectors, including academia, industry, the media, and cultural institutions. Pundits even described Rockefeller's agency as a hybrid entity unlike anything else in the Capitol. "It's not really a government office," one observed, "but a combination international bank, trade bureau, art gallery and propaganda office."⁷ Renamed the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA) in July of 1941 and streamlined yet again in 1945 to the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA), the agency remained under Nelson A. Rockefeller's leadership from August 1940 to December 1944.⁸

Just as its name shifted overtime, so too did the CIAA's scope, organizational form, budget, and personnel. In the cultural arena these changes often reflected the outcomes of power struggles as well cooperative agreements with the pre-existing but perennially underfunded Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State.⁹ Prior to the war the CIAA's Cultural Relations Division, headed by Robert G. Caldwell, Ph.D., dean of humanities at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology, oversaw plans involving museum exhibitions. The work of proposing these initiatives and, after approval, helping to shepherd them to completion generally fell under the purview of the Advisory Committee on Art. Appointees included John E.

Abbott, the committee's chair and executive vice president of MoMA, George C. Vaillant, associate curator of Mexican archaeology with the American Museum of Natural History, and several museum directors. The latter were Alfred H. Barr of MoMA, Laurance Roberts of the Brooklyn Museum, the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Francis H. Taylor, and Grace L. McCann Morley of the San Francisco Museum of Art.¹⁰

The art committee developed ambitious plans and, prior to the United States' entry into the war, proposals involving museum-orchestrated exhibitions received generous allocations. For example, of 26 projects approved in late 1940 to be carried out under the Cultural Relations Program, plans for an epic inter-American exhibition received the greatest single portion, \$150,000, of the total budgetary allotment.¹¹ The committee envisioned a sweeping chronological survey of the arts of the Western hemisphere from the pre-European epoch to the present time."¹² At least 25 versions of the proposed photomural show, adapted to suit different national venues, would be shown in simultaneous and parallel exhibitions in the capital cities and other important cities of the Americas."¹³ Most likely inspired by the recent success of MoMA's international coordination of *Twenty Centuries of Mexican Art* (May 15-September 30, 1940), the multi-institutional cooperative effort would be executed under that museum's management. Plans underwent several permutations and delays before fizzling out in early to mid-1941 for reasons that, at present, remain unclear.¹⁴

As Gisela Cramer and Ursula Prutsch have noted, a clear overview of the CIAA's activities is not easily achieved due to its frequent restructurings, the transfer of projects between government agencies, and shifting priorities. Cultural programs, in particular, had been vulnerable to criticism from the outset. Some critics, for example, read the emphasis on art, music, sports, and the like to be a misguided attempt to find "an international language" that

would compensate for the lamentable failings of the U.S. to achieve competence in linguistic communication.¹⁵ Other detractors highlighted what they saw as the futility of such efforts, noting, “American ‘culture’ cannot be ‘put over,’ they say, like an automatic refrigerator.”¹⁶ When the U.S. entered the war after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the cultural relations programs of both the CIAA and Department of State came under increased scrutiny. Also, new project classifications came into play. Class A and B projects of immediate or secondary significance for defense took precedence over those aimed chiefly at developing mutually sympathetic bonds between the American republics. Increasingly, the CIAA’s priorities shifted to projects in the emergency category, the planning and management of longer-term cultural initiatives shifted to the Department of State’s Division of Cultural Affairs. By the close of 1943, most all such programs, including planned exhibitions as well as those completed and still circulating, had been transferred.

CIAA-sponsored Exhibitions

On the relationship between the arts and defense, Nelson Rockefeller proclaimed, “An important foundation for our schema of hemispheric defense must be a social order in which there is balance and perspective. In no better way can this be aided than by encouragement and free interchange of the art of each American republic.”¹⁷ These remarks, announcing the *Exposition of Contemporary North American Painting* (or *La pintura contemporánea norteamericana*), the first CIAA exhibition to be sent abroad under the direction of its Art Section, also promised that future exhibitions of graphic arts, photography, industrial design and architecture would be forthcoming. Rockefeller voiced similar sentiments at a subsequent exhibition that brought Latin American art to the U.S. At the March 1942 opening of *Chilean Contemporary Art* at the Toledo Museum of Art, he noted:

To win the struggle, we need more than diplomatic and political cooperation between governments, more even than economic cooperation between our industries and productive agencies. We need a feeling that we are neighbors—intimately and personally neighbors—both in the crisis we face and in the stake we have in a better future.¹⁸

Shared exchanges of customs, history, and art would, Rockefeller, declared, create the necessary understanding of each other's aims and aspirations, each other's love of beauty and each other's lives."

For their part, many museums sought to take a proactive role not only in implementing but also in shaping the CIAA's cultural initiatives. In early 1941, for example, institutional representatives assembled at the American Association of Museums annual meeting passed a "spontaneous resolution" that the various papers that had been presented on promoting hemispheric solidarity through "cultural rapprochement" be called to the attention of Nelson Rockefeller.¹⁹ In this sentiment they built on a longer history of engagement in Pan-American concerns during the 1920s and 30s. In particular, their professional body, the American Association of Museums (AAM), sought to ally itself with agencies such as the Pan-American Union and to develop plans that would foster collaborations among museums in North, Central and South America. For example, in 1928, AAM director Laurance Vail Coleman embarked on a four-month journey through Latin America. Financed by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, this fact-gathering mission resulted in the publication of a *Directory of Museums in South America*, an "illustrated reference work for all concerned with museums' work or international relations in education, art, science or history."²⁰ Similarly, exhibitions intended to promote hemispheric solidarity had preceded the CIAA's formation and continued, even without its direct involvement (though perhaps inspired by its mission), throughout the war years. The Newark Museum's *Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia: Three Southern Neighbors*, which opened in April 1941 to mark Pan-American Day, is one such example.

While scholars have written about some of the exhibitions prepared by museums in cooperation with the CIAA, a reliable, comprehensive list of all such efforts has not yet been identified by this researcher and, if none is found in the course of ongoing research, one will be developed.²¹ (A preliminary list can be found in Appendix A of this report.) Of the CIAA materials held by the RAC, the monthly and quarterly status of projects reports provide a useful starting point.²² Here one generally finds, depending on the reporting format used in a given period: brief project descriptions, government-assigned project number, pending and acquired approvals, monies allocated and expended, scheduled completion dates, progress made since the last report, and the CIAA staff member(s) responsible for oversight.

These succinct entries overtime provide a basic framework and sense of project development overtime. Given the nature of Nelson Rockefeller's position as head of the CIAA it is, perhaps, not surprising that the holdings reviewed provided broad overviews of museum-related projects but not detailed, project-level documentation and correspondence. Still, materials such as the status of project reports do provide some sense of where exhibitions fit in the larger and much broader schemes of the CIAA. For example, as a communicative medium, exhibitions never achieved the favored status of radio, motion pictures, and printed materials. The CIAA accorded a greater portion of its budget and pursued more individual projects in these popular mass media—as might be expected given the desire to reach wide and diverse audiences in Latin America. Also, each of these areas remained a stable, singular category of endeavor for reporting purposes over the course of the war whereas the CIAA's many realignments saw exhibitions grouped under different headings and alongside a mix of efforts loosely united by their "cultural" focus.

One caution to bear in mind when reviewing CIAA documentation is that the terms “exhibit” and “exhibition” referred to a variety of organized displays. These ranged from inexpensive, flexible arrangements of materials, such as books, pamphlets and photographs furnished by the CIAA, that most any willing volunteer could quickly set-up on a tabletop in a library or other community center to the more elaborate, scripted affairs developed by museum professionals. So, when one encounters a general statement about exhibitions in CIAA documentation, care must be taken to determine the type or types being referenced.

Referring to the broad sweep of exhibition types, for example, and their use within the U.S., one early report noted that the network of inter-American centers supported by the CIAA found them to be effective means of introducing a mass public to the message of hemispheric solidarity and mutual cultural appreciation. The report’s author noted that centers had used this medium “with increased frequency” during the 1941-42 fiscal year and that over 1,000,000 people had seen them.²³ This compared to estimates that motion picture showings at the inter-American centers averaged 136,000 persons per month or 1,632,000 sets of eyes that year.²⁴ Likewise, in early 1944, a fiscal status report of such efforts noted, “Approximately 200 exhibits and 500 portfolios of materials on the other American Republics are kept in constant circulation throughout the United States. Recent reports contain favorable comments on the usefulness of exhibits and requests for more.”²⁵

Overtime, enthusiasm for the exhibition medium appears to have waned in some corners, particularly as governmental will—and funding—to support cultural programming declined. In some reports the logistical difficulties and ongoing expenses involved in the upkeep and shipment of exhibitions surfaced as complaints. In 1943, for example, John Roy, associate director of the Division of Inter-American Activities in the United States, reported back to

Washington that the 15-, 30- and 50-foot exhibits being shown around the U.S. would continue to circulate only so long as they remained in good repair. Their continued use, however, would not be stressed since in proportion to their effectiveness they are difficult to transport.”²⁶

Such obstacles proved particularly true for materials that crossed national borders. Tightened travel restrictions and escalating fuel prices resulted in time delays and cost increases. Elodie Courter, director of MoMA’s Department of Circulating Exhibitions, lamented of such circumstances when she reported back to the CIAA that a version of the *United Hemisphere Poster Competition* exhibit sent to Cuba in 1943 had spent six months traveling to and from Havana but due to delays had been displayed for only one week.²⁷ In closing she observed, “It hardly seems worthwhile, does it?”

One reason that exhibitions did find favor as an U.S. export during this period is that those devoted to the fine and applied arts provided the CIAA with a counterclaim to German and Italian assertions of cultural superiority. The CIAA perceived that Latin America kept its eye on Europe as the paragon of high culture while viewing the industrial colossus to the north as cultural infant in comparison.²⁸ Art exhibitions, along with performances by ballet troupes, symphony orchestras, and other ensembles, sought to prove the U.S. more than capable of expressing itself ably in cultural forms that demanded nuance and refinement. Moreover, the intent was to demonstrate that while Europe might lay claim to culture’s history, the New World, led by the U.S., possessed the vitality and dynamism to define its future.

Stateside, exhibitions of the cultural products of the 20 republics to the south had a two-fold aim. First, they sought to educate U.S. citizens and influence perceptions about the importance of hemispheric solidarity. Second, by showcasing demonstrable public interest in such exhibitions, the CIAA hoped they would provide wary Latin Americans proof of the

sincerity of U.S. intentions. It is the exhibitions designed for U.S. consumption that will be a primary focus of my planned dissertation chapter on the wartime role of museums in helping the CIAA shape U.S. attitudes toward Latin America.

The CIAA openly acknowledged the image problems that the U.S. faced in Latin America due to its foreign policies and incursions. (This is not to say that acknowledgement constituted reform or redress.) Internal memos as well as public statements made no bones about the sins of the past that had bred a healthy skepticism for Uncle Sam's renewed profession of neighborly intentions. Stimulating U.S. interest in Latin American culture and affairs was, therefore, essential to fulfilling promises being made in Latin America. The CIAA's propaganda strategy, as articulated in a 1942-43 memo outlining its philosophy and objectives, hinged on persuading individual Latin American citizens —to accept as their own" a multi-part "Credo."²⁹ This profession of faith denounced the "Axis Credo" as harmful to Latin American national and economic sovereignty while affirming personal allegiance with the U.S. based on security interests as well as cultural, geographic, and aspirational affinities.

The "U.S. Credo for the Individual Citizen of Latin America," or Latin American Credo, consisted of four points, each with a series of supporting beliefs (which are not enumerated in the quote below):

- I. I believe my best interests are linked with the U.S., because...
- II. I believe my best interests will be harmed by the Axis because ...
- III. I believe that the U.S. is going to win this war, although it will be a difficult struggle, because...
- IV. Therefore, I am supporting the U.S. and stand ready to cooperate with the Americas and to make additional personal sacrifices along with the American people so that I can help the U.S. win the war and establish a better world; hence...³⁰

The CIAA conceived of the Credo's implementation in almost Pavlovian terms. Content developed in support of the four points represented the propaganda or stimuli which are

transmitted through various media”; the ascribed professions of belief constituted the expected responses to these stimuli.³¹

The memo tied the justification for the activities of its departments (Propaganda, Basic Economy, and Economics, at this time) and the various divisions within each to the specific contributions that their projects would make to the successful adoption of the Latin American Credo. Accordingly, this work plan specified which of the Credo’s four points each of its diverse undertakings was expected to support. This held true for the Science and Education Division’s projects, which included museum exhibitions, even though the memo described these as “not directly concerned with propaganda”—despite the fact that the division fell within the Department of Propaganda.

For example, cultural exchange projects would strengthen Points I and IV of the Credo. That is, the CIAA framed art or architecture exhibitions, for example, as helping to encourage the Ecuadorian, Argentinean or Bolivian to aver, “I believe that my best interests are linked with the U.S.” (Point I). The contents of such projects would lead the citizen to this conclusion by convincing him or her that the “U.S. way of life,” as expressed through its culture, spoke not only to shared traditions and tastes but also to the promise of a better standard of living. Cultural initiatives would also stir the beholders to embrace Point IV’s tenets and “make additional personal sacrifices along with the American people” in order to “help the U.S. win the war and establish a better world....”³²

As previously noted, the CIAA believed that the success of its efforts in Latin America depended on a reciprocal shift in belief on the part of U.S. citizens. Therefore, the CIAA also developed a “Credo for the Individual U.S. Citizen.” It, too, had a four-point structure but lacked the longer list of supporting assertions present in the Latin American version. Noting that, “Latin

Americans will not lend support to the United States unless they are convinced that our own citizens have a sincere interest in them,” the U.S. Credo required the following attitudes be adopted:

- I. I believe that Latin America has much to offer me not only economically; but also socially, esthetically, and spiritually.
- II. I believe that the Axis wishes not only eventually to conquer Latin America but also more immediately to use certain of the Republics as bases from which to attack the U.S.
- III. I believe that active cooperation from Latin America in all ways is essential if the U.S. is to win the war.
- IV. I believe that, therefore, Latin America should be assisted by the U.S. in order to enable her to assist us and also herself.³³

The Division of Inter-American Activities in the United States held chief responsibility for the work done to engender adoption of the U.S. credo, but cooperated with fellow CIAA Divisions as well as other government agencies and private groups. Certain of the traveling exhibitions organized by museums and shown domestically, for example, fell under the Science and Education Division’s auspices. A “first purpose” of these domestic efforts was to “demonstrate to Latin Americans [in the U.S. as well as abroad] that we wish to know more about them than their tangoes or gauchos.”³⁴ Some saw urgent need for such educational work. Citing a survey completed in 1941, one observer noted that only 1% of those interviewed could correctly name 15 of the 20 Latin American republics and only 6% could name up to 10. “These facts raise serious questions for the future,” he cautioned. “. . . how can we expect to be good neighbors with the family next door if we have difficulty recognizing them on the street?”³⁵

In researching the domestic exhibitions that are the foci of my efforts, attention will be paid to how the CIAA credos may have informed, either explicitly or more subtly, the selection of content and the framing of the material presented. Additionally, CIAA content directives may also shed light on the relationships between the CIAA’s agendas and exhibition content. The

affective dimension of these exhibitions is also of interest given the emphasis that CIAA planning placed upon such notions as sincerity, mutuality, and genuine affinity. Domestic exhibitions to be studied include *America South of U.S.* (Brooklyn Museum, 1941-42), *United Hemisphere Poster Competition* (MoMA, 1942), and *The Americas Cooperate* (MoMA, 1942). The latter effort, designed to be shown in libraries, railway stations, and other public spaces, aimed ~~to~~ make citizens of the United States aware of the vital importance to the war of Latin American resources and production.”³⁶ To a lesser degree, CIAA efforts abroad, such as the six-part *Creative Achievements of the U.S* (MoMA circulating exhibitions, ca. 1944), will also be addressed.

The Museum of Modern Art

The Museum of Modern Art proved exceptional among its peers both for the volume of contract and voluntary wartime work it performed as well as for its ties to government during this era. In the war’s earlier stages, as government agencies began availing themselves of MoMA’s expertise, some involved in the museum’s governance saw a range of new possibilities for its future—as well as a useful form of leverage for pleas to the Rockefeller’s to increase its financial stability. Steven Clark, chairman of the board, for example, cited both the expanded staff and income resulting from government work as reasons why John D. Rockefeller, Jr., might give to the museum the property on 54th Street, which it then leased from him at a modest fee.³⁷ Clark noted that although some of the museum’s emergency work would, of course, conclude at the war’s end, it seemed likely that jobs related to Latin America would continue and that ~~o~~ther projects for the government will be added....” As support for his assertions, Clark enclosed a financial statement showing monies earned from government appropriations for MoMA –

managed projects totaled just over \$62,000 for the 1940-41 period — an income source outdone only by foundation grants (\$96,997) and members' dues (\$80,358).³⁸

Just days later, Clark sent a second missive. This one detailed a vision of MoMA's future in which it would proceed "on a theory quite different from that of any other museum in the country" by placing its "main reliance [so far as financial security] upon the industries and public groups" that it served.³⁹ In this postwar vision, he included advice and services to federal agencies alongside continued work for department stores, labor unions, and the motion picture industry. Future realities proved quite different, however. The wartime expansion of museum activities, particularly in the area of the circulating exhibits program, could not be sustained once the special contracts ceased. Without these outside contracts, the MoMA faced not only a reduced budget but also a programmatic mission in need of overhaul.

Enthusiasm for wartime programming among other museum staff varied over time as well as according to individual temperament and situational demands. Some early notions reached what now seem humorous extremes. For example, Julien Street, Jr., who Nelson A. Rockefeller had hired as secretary of the museum, proposed that MoMA help form a Government Bureau of Industrial Design. Its function would be to equip the nation's wartime presence and publicity efforts with greater consistency and aesthetic appeal. In the war of branding and image making, the U.S. had already lost, so far as Street was concerned, to the totalitarian states. Commenting on two recent images in the *New York Times*, Street lamented:

One is an impressive picture of German parachute troops, the other a pathetic demonstration of the U.S. Army at war games in Louisiana showing a gawky recruit carrying a portable radio-telephone set which looks like a sack of potatoes and at his side another soldier who resembles one of Walt Disney's seven dwarves. The latter is obviously making a fake telephone call and looks very embarrassed about it.⁴⁰

Other sins included the inferior visual quality of everything from posters, stamps and press photographs to housing projects and the placement of insignia on military airplanes. MoMA, Street thought, could not only assist the government in forming an agency to oversee such matters but could also survey the field so that recommendations might be made.

Among those taking a less ebullient view of wartime entanglements was Alfred Barr, the museum's director. Certain missions, such as the work he, his wife and others associated with MoMA did to help imperiled European artists immigrate to the United States, found favor, but other endeavors met with skepticism. When, in 1940, John Abbott asked Barr to weigh in on the matter of the museum taking on an exhibit of donated artworks to be sold for the benefit the British war relief effort, Barr responded, "I do not think the Museum as an institution should sponsor any kind of charitable or benefit undertaking, whether sale or exhibit, ball or football game."⁴¹ Once the U.S. entered the war, however, this sentiment did not preclude fundraising efforts in support of the museum's Armed Services Program. Perhaps swayed by Abby Rockefeller's passionate support for this initiative, an exhibit of artworks for sale took place in June 1942 in the member's penthouse with the goal of raising funds to buy art supplies for military camps and therapeutic uses.⁴²

In staking out its wartime mission, MoMA found itself afoul of more conservative opinions articulated by other leading art museums. Fiske Kimball, director of the Philadelphia Art Museum, summarized the sentiment of the status quo in noting, "The task of art museums in war time as in peace time is to provide spiritual refreshment through the resources of one of the realms of the spirit—to minister to the inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness, in the enjoyment of living breathing form."⁴³ He further observed that once art museums had secured their most valuable treasures, they should, "Go right on doing essentially what we have been

doing, not for the sake of business as usual, ‘ but because what we were doing is still the right thing to do.” He did allow that, ~~all~~ museums with programs worth their salt have always tried to pay attention to actuality, to timeliness, in exhibitions, in activities,” and trusted that this, too, would continue during the war.

Even as the war progressed, Kimball would remain steadfast in his view that art museums best served their public when operating on a higher plane than the secular sphere. In 1943 he wrote:

A world in flames has confronted art museums with an alternative: of making frantic efforts to serve, for the most part badly, purposes for which they are ill adapted, or of continuing calmly to serve well their characteristic purpose, as a haven of serenity, peace and rest. We have not hesitated to choose the latter, and the public — whether of war workers, or of men on leave from the services, or of relatives who must wait in anxiety — seems to have ratified the choice.⁴⁴

Frances Hawkins, in a 1943 letter to Nelson A. Rockefeller with accompanying minutes from a meeting of the Board of Trustees, quoted precisely this passage from Kimball. She offered a stern rebuttal, citing a higher rate of membership renewal and increased attendance as evidence that members and the public had also ~~ratified~~ our choice” to ~~seriously~~ but by no means fantically“” serve the war effort.⁴⁵ (Her faith in numbers proved premature. Membership would close at 4,880 for 1943, continuing a yearly decline from the 7,309 members tallied in 1940 — not that this can be easily read as a vote for or against the museum’s programming.)⁴⁶

As further proof that MoMA could simultaneously embrace the dictum that ~~a~~ museum ought to be a haven of serenity, peace and rest” while also engaging wartime topics in its programming, she quoted sentiments offered by renewing members. One, whose son served overseas, had been ~~again and again~~” to see *Road to Victory: A Procession of Photographs of the Nation at War* (1942). “Geared as your program is to the war effort,” the person wrote, ~~you~~ manage to elevate the stark realities of today into something quite awesome and beautiful. ...The

present is easier to bear and the future looms up brighter because of what the Museum of Modern Art is doing for society.” Another praised MoMA for keeping abreast of the need for meeting the demands, intellectual and spiritual, of this time of war, when so many cultural organizations are falling by the wayside.”

The letters from MoMA’s various employees, and particularly those of Frances Hawkins, to Rockefeller family members often contain excerpts from correspondence that the museum received from the public. As public reactions to programming are often hard to gauge, even these cherry-picked snippets are welcome windows into the reception that MoMA exhibitions garnered. I say cherry-picked because, of course, it was Hawkin’s wont to impress MoMA’s greatest benefactors, with reviews favorable to the work being undertaken. Through such correspondence, one learns, for example, that the Committee on Refugee Education brought its classes on Americanization to the *Road to Victory* exhibit and used its labels to teach the participating immigrants how to read English.⁴⁷ This is a meaningful piece of information given my dissertation’s exploration of how museums’ wartime exhibitions participated in the construction citizenship. This is just one example of many small leads gleaned from correspondence held in the RAC collections that will be pursued during ongoing research at the Museum of Modern Art Archives and other repositories.

It is important to note that while copies of these letters likely exist in MoMA’s archives as well, their presence at the RAC is of value to researchers; this is due in part to the fact that, as of this writing, the Museum of Modern Art Archives are currently open to researchers on a somewhat limited basis, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. on Thursdays and Fridays only. While researchers into various aspects of MoMA’s history will, of course, want to consult the

museum's records, the additional and complementary material at the RAC is a valuable supplement and worth the time to cross reference.

Other Intersections

Another goal of my dissertation is to situate museum-based exhibitions within the network of enterprises that utilized exhibitory forms to communicate social messages leading up to and during the war. This loosely bound network or, to borrow Tony Bennett's term, —exhibitionary complex,“ included not only government agencies but also corporations and the mass media.⁴⁸ The intersections among the various institutional actors were many and included collaborative alliances as well as unintentional alignments. For example, the New York Museum of Science and Industry (NYMSI), with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, published a volume, *Exhibition Techniques*, which summarized best practices for informative, eye-catching and visitor-engaging displays based on surveys museum staff conducted of corporate exhibitions at the New York and San Francisco World's Fairs of 1939. For an example of corporate involvement, one might look to *Life* magazine which both sponsored and created touring exhibitions that appeared in museums during and after the war.

Relevant findings at the RAC related to this area of interest include a speech by Nelson Rockefeller to mark the opening of R.H. Macy and Co.'s Latin American Fair in June of 1942.⁴⁹ Organized by the department store, this combination exhibition, trade show and bazaar featured among its many attractions replicated temple ruins from Chichen Itza in Mexico's Yucatan and a mock façade of a Spanish Colonial-style church in Arequipa, Peru.⁵⁰ Visitors also encountered an array of foodstuffs, shopping arcades, a —Macy-made jungle” with live chinchillas, and a display of contemporary Latin American paintings and sculpture in a gallery based on the

Museo de Bellas Artes de Caracas —all arrayed on the expansive fifth floor of Macy's building in New York⁵¹

To mark the importance of the event to national interests, the dignitaries in attendance at the fair's opening included Eleanor Roosevelt, Ilo Browne Wallace (the U.S. Vice President's wife), Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles' spouse, ambassadors and other representatives from the Latin American republics, and, of course, Nelson Rockefeller.⁵² The CIAA had aided the store in collecting the merchandise that would be displayed and sold in an effort to promote U.S. consumption of Latin American goods. Given that Latin America had lost its European markets, the CIAA sought to compensate by stimulating demand at home. An emphasis on manufactures not related to wartime needs also assured, the CIAA felt, Latin America that longer-term trade relations would be fostered. With this goal in mind, Rockefeller told the assembled crowd:

We in the United States, must, for a long time, devote ourselves militantly to the production of the weapons and munitions of war and we will need—and need increasingly—from our neighbors, not raw materials for war alone, but these products of their crafts and industries for our basic living requirements.⁵³

Speaking nine months earlier about the project's ambitions, Jack I. Straus, president of Macy's, emphasized a similar intent. He proclaimed that the exhibition would serve as a practical demonstration to retailers throughout the United States that merchandise can be bought in Latin America which is competitive with any in the world's markets."⁵⁴ At the conclusion of the fair's 3-week run, Macy's reported that over 825,000 had attended.⁵⁵ Alternatively striving to be like a museum of contemporary arts, in its inclusion of a gallery patterned after one such Venezuelan institution, and *not* like a museum exhibit confined to ancient arts," this exhibition presents an interesting case study for my dissertation.

Another such case study of museum, government and industry intersections drawn from the Rockefeller Center's holdings is the New York Museum of Science and Industry. Materials related to this now defunct institution, which for many years made its home in Rockefeller Archive Center, reside primarily in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Record Group 1.1 (Series 200, Box 262) as well as in the Rockefeller Family Archives Record Group 2 (Cultural Interests series, Box 20) and Record Group 4 (Projects Series, Box 168). Given that this particular museum is still little studied, these records, which include museum publications, financial records, and correspondence, present rich potential for examination of an institution that sought to engage the public in innovative ways and pioneered a novel but ultimately unsuccessful model of alliance with industry.

Materials from these records will be used in a different dissertation chapter on the home front, in both the literal and metaphoric senses. This chapter examines three predominant exhibition types of the early war years, including those that sought to forge new national alliances by using the concept of family as either a central or supporting theme. As other scholars have noted, domestic and foreign politics as well as national identity are often refracted through the lens of the family.⁵⁶ Indeed, wartime communications from the government and other parties frequently conflated the private family and its concerns with larger issues faced by the imagined national and international families.

Two Allies—One War—One Peace (1943), an Office of War Information exhibition installed in the NYMSI, is one such example. Designed as part of American-Soviet friendship initiatives it strove to establish cultural commonality between the two nations. Interestingly, given the so-called Kitchen Debate in later years, one means by which *Two Allies* emphasized bilateral solidarity was through an installation of two kitchens, one American and one Soviet,

each featuring the shared plight of mealtime under rationing.⁵⁷ Although, the RAC holds little material related to this or the NYMSI's other wartime exhibits in the 1940s, there is documentation of a later exhibition that serves as an interesting comment on shifting international relations.⁵⁸

In 1948 *Thirty Years of the USSR*, an exhibition presented by the Soviet Embassy, at the NYMSI stirred protests and public outcry. A small group of Lithuanian refugees picketed outside the museum bearing signs denouncing ~~the~~ exhibit of lies.⁵⁹ Visitors to the museum, who sometimes presumed it to be under control of the Rockefeller family, given its location, even wrote to John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to complain. One ~~appalled~~ "businessman called it ~~a~~ dangerous lot of propaganda" that ~~should~~ be suppressed."⁶⁰ That two exhibitions on U.S. and Soviet relations held at the same site just five years apart met with such different reactions from the public graphically illustrates a misstep on the museum's part in its assessment of political sensibilities and, perhaps, also gives insight into one reason why fewer museums would mount domestic exhibitions related to current world affairs during the Korean and Cold Wars.

Conclusion

As other scholars have noted, the diverse undertakings of the CIAA, particularly those in the cultural arena, remain ripe for scholarly study.⁶¹ My interest in that aspect of the CIAA's work that involved the deployment of exhibitions as a persuasive form of material rhetoric lies not only in tracing the wartime history of U.S. museums but also in understanding how the interests of government, private enterprise, philanthropic groups, and museums intersected in these projects. These institutional intersections matter for several reasons. First, by examining them we might better understand what it means for museums to be used for political ends—and to pursue such uses for their own aims. Also, as Susan Smulyan observed in her analysis of the

U.S. military's utilization of Hollywood films in occupied Japan after World War II, ideology is revealed not only in content but also in the form of the business arrangements and agreements that influence the production and distribution of that content.⁶² Material viewed at the Rockefeller Archive Center during the earliest stages of my dissertation research sets a valuable foundation for this work. My findings there have opened new lines of inquiry and, as I go forward, will further enhance my ability to identify and contextualize relevant materials in other collections.

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 See Lynes, 237, and "The Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees and Members of the Corporation of the Museum of Modern Art," *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art* XIII, no. 3 (September 1946) p. 5.

² The government agency principally responsible for Inter-American affairs during the war underwent several name changes. Inaugurated as the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, it was renamed the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs in July 1941 and, in March 1945, designated the Office of Inter-American Affairs. For the most part, I will refer to it as the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs or CIAA, as is the commonly accepted acronym, since that was the agency's title during the years it most actively engaged in exhibition work with museums.

³ Eva Cockcroft, "Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War," *Artforum* 12: 10 (June 1974), pp. 39-41.

⁴ John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (JDR Jr.) to Victor E. D'Amico, March 10, 1949, Folder 1743, Box 157, Series A: Activities, Record Group 4, Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal (NAR Personal), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC. For more about the War Veteran's Art Center, see Bernice Kert, *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*. New York: Random House, 1993, and "Art for Veterans," *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art* XIII, 1 (September 1945), pp. 1-15.

⁵ In his seminal work on nationalism, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991, Benedict Anderson argues that the museum is one of three instruments (the others being the census and the map) that facilitated a new means of visualizing the imagined community of the state and of coalescing and extending its power.

⁶ The Rockefeller Archive Center also holds a substantial amount of information related to the work of the CIAA's Motion Picture Division, including those contracted out to the Museum of Modern Art's Film Library. Included in the material are the films themselves, now viewable on DVD.

⁷ James B. Reston, "Our Second Line of Defense," *New York Times*, June 29, 1941, SM7. ProQuest Historical Newspapers *The New York Times* (1851-2006); hereafter cited as ProQuest.

⁸ Nelson Rockefeller departed the CIAA in December 1944 to become the Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs. Although the CIAA was not formally disbanded until April 10, 1946, most of its functions had earlier been assumed by other government entities, such as the Department of State, or terminated altogether.

⁹ Basic details of the CIAA's structure and history can be found in Gisela Cramer and Ursula Prutsch's, "Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs (1940-1946) and Record Group 229." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 86: 4 (2006) pp. 785-806; and Office of Inter-American Affairs, *History of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs: Historical Reports on War Administration*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

¹⁰ The OIAA's advisory committee on art replaced and was similar in composition to an earlier panel convened by the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State. This is noted in Holly Barnet-Sanchez, "The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art: United States Museums and the Role of Foreign Policy in the Appropriation and Transformation of Mexican Heritage, 1933-1944." (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1993. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 21 Aug. 2010.

¹¹ "Approved Projects Under the Cultural Relations Program," November 7, 1940, Folder 35, Box 5, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4 NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC. Budget allocations for each of the specified projects ranged, for the most part, from \$500 to \$20,000. The only other area of activity that came close to the exhibition's allocation was the \$100,000 set aside to promote the exchange of artistic and intellectual workers.

¹² "Our Common Culture or the Art of the Western Hemisphere or the Art of Our Hemisphere or the Culture of Our Hemisphere," project proposal, October 25, 1940, quoted in Barnet-Sanchez, p. 162.

¹³ "Approved Projects Under the Cultural Relations Program," 1.

¹⁴ Barnet-Sanchez hypothesizes that the initial six month timeframe for completion as well as personnel constraints made execution of the project near impossible.

¹⁵ William Rex Crawford, "Cultural Relations in 1941" in *Inter-American Affairs 1941, An Annual Survey: No. 1*, edited by Arthur Preston Whitaker, New York: Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 115-150.

¹⁶ Reston.

¹⁷ Untitled press release from the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, PR 39, April 10 1941, Folder 68, Box 8, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

¹⁸ –Radio address by Nelson A. Rockefeller at the opening of the Toledo Chilean Art Exhibition,” March 25, 1942, in *Addresses by Nelson A. Rockefeller, 1940-44*. CIAA Bound Volumes, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

¹⁹ –Defense and Hemisphere Solidarity Sessions Focus Interest at Columbus,” *The Museum News* XIX, 3 (1 June 1941), p 1.

²⁰ Laurance Vail Coleman, *Directory of Museums in South America*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums, 1929.

²¹ See the previously mentioned work of Barnet-Sanchez as well as Michele Greet, *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009; Cathleen M. Paquette, –Public Duties, Private Interests: Mexican Art at New York's Museum of Modern Art, 1929-1954.” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2002; and Nancy B. Rosoff, –A Revealed by Art: Herbert Spinden and the Brooklyn Museum.” *Museum Anthropology* 28: 1 (2005), pp. 47-56.

²² Compiled into bound volumes which are part of the CIAA Bound Volumes, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

²³ –Department of United States Activities and Special Services,” undated, 4-5, Folder 36, Box 5, Subseries: Division of Inter-American Activities in the U.S., 1942-44, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

²⁴ Such statistics, of course, likely reflect the number of visits rather than the number of discrete visitors. Also, since information about the data collection process is not included in the report, it is difficult to know how reliable the numbers might be.

²⁵ –Status of Projects as of March 31, 1944,” 205, in *Project Reports, 1944*, I, CIAA Bound Volumes, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

²⁶ –Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs Conference of Directors of Inter-American Centers, Washington D.C., June 28-30, 1943, summarized by the Office of Emergency Management Division of Central Administrative Services,” 37, Folder 5, Box 1, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

²⁷ Elodie Courter to Alyce Holscher, May 22, 1945. Department of Circulating Exhibitions Records, 1.24.30.7. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

²⁸ *History of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs: Historical Reports on War Administration*, p. 93.

²⁹ –Philosophy and Objectives of the Office of Inter-American Affairs,” undated, Folder 61, Box 8, Subseries 1: Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA), 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

³² *Ibid.*, 3.

³³ *Ibid.*, 16.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.

³⁵ Francis O. Wilcox, –Government Pamphlets on the War.” *The American Political Science Review* 38: 1 (1944), p. 70.

³⁶ –Museum of Modern Art Designs Five Small Exhibitions on Cooperation of the Americas for Circulation,” press release. Museum of Modern Art, 29 September 1942. (accessed 10 May 2010).

http://www.moma.org/docs/press_archives/825/releases/MOMA_1942_0067_1942-09-29_42929-61.pdf?2010

³⁷ From Stephen C. Clark (Office of the Chairman of the Board) to John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (JDR Jr.), January 8, 1942, Folder 241, Box 23, Series E: Cultural Interests, RG 2, Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller (OMR), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

³⁸ Schedule of Income, no date enclosed with letter cited above. Note: the ways in which MoMA reported allocations and income related to government work requires further study. For example, in the January 11, 1942 letter cited below, Clark notes that the museum has already executed \$650,000 in government contracts with others still pending. Overhead and expenses, therefore, must be considered alongside any income to the museum.

-
- ³⁹ Clark to JDR Jr. January 11, 1942, Folder 241, Box 23, Series E: Cultural Interests, RG 2, OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴⁰ –Re: Gov’t Bureau of Industrial Design,” Julien Street to Elliot Noyes, November 20, 1940, Folder 1307, Box 133, Subseries: MoMA, Series L: Projects, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴¹ Alfred H. Barr to John Abbott, August 8, 1940, Folder 1203, Box 123, Series L: Projects, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴² Frances Hawkins, (Secretary, Museum of Modern Art), to Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, June 9, 1942, Folder 115, Box 9, RG2 OMR, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Papers (AAR Papers), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴³ Fiske Kimball, —“Museums in War Time.” *The Museum News* XX, 6 (September 15, 1942), pp. 7-8. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Museums at Williamsburg, May 18-19, 1942.
- ⁴⁴ Fiske Kimball, *Annual report of the Philadelphia Museum of Art*, 1943. Quoted in *The Museum News* XXI, 10 (November 15, 1943), p 1.
- ⁴⁵ Frances Hawkins to Nelson A. Rockefeller (NAR), October 29, 1943, Folder 1203, Box 123, Subseries: MoMA, Series L: Projects, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴⁶ Museum of Modern Art, —“Project Memorandum,” June 9, 1948, Folder 1611, Box 158, Series L: Projects, RG 4, NAR; and Museum of Modern Art, —“Project Memorandum,” December 31, 1942, Folder 219, Box 22, Series E: Cultural Interests, RG 2, OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴⁷ Hawkins to Nar, June 25, 1942, Folder 1131, Box 136, Subseries: MoMA, Series L: Projects, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁴⁸ Tony Bennett, —“The Exhibitionary Complex.” *New Formations* 4 (1988), pp. 73-102; see 74 and 76. There existed, too, vernacular exhibitions put on by civic groups. These community-based efforts are more difficult to trace, but there is some evidence that institutions sought to incorporate these expressions into their own efforts just as John Bodnar has argued happened with commemorative activities during this period. See, John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 41.
- ⁴⁹ —“Speech of Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American affairs, at Macy’s Latin American Fair, New York City, January 16, 1942,” in *Addresses of Nelson A. Rockefeller, 1940-1944*, CIAA Bound Volumes, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁵⁰ —“Fiesta of Fashion.” *New York Times* January 11, 1942, RP4. ProQuest.
- ⁵¹ —“Preview Tonight of Latin American Exhibit.” *New York Times* January 16, 1942, p. 19. ProQuest.
- ⁵² —“Fair to Aid Trade of Latin America.” *New York Times* October 15, 1941, p. 16. ProQuest.
- ⁵³ NAR speech at Macy’s Latin American Fair.
- ⁵⁴ “Macy’s to Conduct Latin American Fair as Aid to Trade with Southern Republics.” *Wall Street Journal* October 15, 1941, p. 3. ProQuest.
- ⁵⁵ —“Latin American Fair Ends,” *New York Times* February 8, 1942, p. 51. ProQuest.
- ⁵⁶ Useful examples of how domestic and foreign politics interconnect within imaginings of and debates over the family are offered by Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003; Judith E. Smith, *Visions of Belonging: Family Stories, Popular Culture, and Postwar Democracy, 1940-1960*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004; and Natasha Zaretsky, *No Direction Home: The American Family and the Fear of National Decline, 1968-1980*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- ⁵⁷ —“American-Soviet War Exhibit Here Opened by Wife of Red Ambassador.” *New York Times* June 2, 1943, p. 5. ProQuest.
- ⁵⁸ On the WWII exhibit, see an invitation extended to Laurance S. Rockefeller to attend its preview and reception in Folder 196, Box 20, Series E: Cultural Interests, RG 2, OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC. Material related to *Thirty Years of the USSR* (1948) is found in the same folder.
- ⁵⁹ —“Soviet Opens Exhibit in Rockefeller Center; Gromyko and New Ambassador View Display,” *New York Times* March 5, 1948, p. 6. ProQuest.
- ⁶⁰ Wellborn C. Phillips to JDR Jr., April 1, 1948, Folder 196, Box 20, Series E: Cultural Interests, RG 2, OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
- ⁶¹ Cramer and Prutsch provide a useful summary of scholarly work dealing with the many facets of the OIAA.
- ⁶² Susan Smulyan, *Popular Ideologies: Mass Culture at Mid-Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Appendix A

Exhibitions Produced by Museums in Cooperation with the CIAA

Note: Dates listed below are generally those for the debut installation of a given exhibition at the organizing institution prior to adaptation of the contents for circulation, sometimes in multiple editions, to other venues in the U.S.A. and/or Latin America.

Multi-institution Exhibitions

- *Exposition of Contemporary North American Painting/ La pintura contemporánea norteamericana* (1941)
Organized by the Brooklyn Museum, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Museum of Modern Art, Whitney Museum of American Art, and American Museum of Natural History. Contents were divided into three sections and circulated by the Museum of Modern Art simultaneously throughout Latin America. Prior to shipment, the show appeared at the Metropolitan under the title, *Contemporary Painting in the United States* (April 19-27, 1941).
- *Latin American Art* (sections I, II and III, 1941-47)
 - ~ Section I: Pre-Columbian (organized by Brooklyn Museum)
 - ~ Section II: Colonial Art (organized by Brooklyn Museum)
 - ~ Section III: Contemporary Art (organized by San Francisco Museum)

Circulated at various points by the CIAA, MoMA (sections I and II) and the San Francisco Museum of Art (section III).

Brooklyn Museum

- *America South of U.S.* (Brooklyn Museum, November 13, 1941- January 2, 1942)

The Museum of Modern Art

- *Organic Design in Home Furnishings* (MoMA Exhibit #148, September 24-November 9, 1941)
This exhibition featured three Latin American designers who furnished winning entries in the CIAA-funded Industrial Design Competition for the 21 American Republics organized by MoMA.
- *The Americas Cooperate* (MoMA Exhibit #198, September 30-October 18, 1942)
- *United Hemisphere Poster Competition* (MoMA Exhibit #201, October 21-November 24, 1942)
- *Brazil Builds* (MoMA Exhibit #213, January 13-February 28, 1943)
- *Faces and Places in Brazil: Photographs by Genevieve Naylor* (MoMA Exhibit #215, January 27-February 28, 1943)
Although the CIAA sent Naylor to Brazil for the purposes of documenting local culture, further research is needed into whether it also funded the exhibition at MoMA and circulating versions.¹

Appendix A
Exhibitions Produced by Museums in Cooperation with the CIAA
-continued-

The Museum of Modern Art - continued

- *Creative Achievements of the U.S* (ca. 1944)
Six photo panel exhibits prepared for the OWI and CIAA for circulation in Latin America:
 - ~ *This Is the U.S.A*
 - ~ *A Culture Grows*
 - ~ *Land and the People*
 - ~ *Men and Machines*
 - ~ *A Healthy Mind in a Healthy Body*
 - ~ *Citizens in a Democracy*

Note: It also appears that in the case of some MoMA exhibitions, the CIAA also funded adaptations for circulation in Latin America even though it played no role in the original production. *Road to Victory: A Procession of Photographs of the Nation at War* (1942) is an example. A more robust compendium of CIAA-related museum projects would include these as well.

Toledo Museum of Art

- *Chilean Contemporary Art* (1942)
Organized by the museum in cooperation with the CIAA and sponsored by the Ministry of Education of the republic of Chile and the faculty of fine arts of the University of Chile, this exhibition also traveled to other venues.

Other

- *The Americas Cooperate for Victory* (1943)
CIAA fiscal reports for 1944 note that this project was —carried out in cooperation with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, and interested persons.”² Any relationship to MoMA’s exhibition with a near-identical name the year prior is as yet unclear.

¹ The exhibit of Naylor’s work is mentioned in Madeleine W. Nichols, —Cultural Relations.” in *Inter-American Affairs 1943. An Annual Survey: No. 3*, edited by Arthur Preston Whitaker, New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 182.

² —Quarterly Reports on Status of Projects of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs as of July 1-September 30, 1944.” In *Project Reports, 1944*. II, p. 151. CIAA Bound Volumes, Subseries 1: CIAA, 1940-1944, Series O: Washington, DC, RG 4, NAR Personal, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.