

American Private Foundations and Reinforcement of Democracy in the Cold War Europe, 1945-1968: Rockefeller Foundation as the Case Study

By Renata Nowaczewska

Assistant Professor, History and International Relations Institute
Szczecin University
Poland

renata_nowaczewska@univ.szczecin.pl

© 2012 by Renata Nowaczewska

My study examines the role of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) in the processes of delivering democratic values, enhancing democratic behavior, reeducating societies in democratic processes and conduct, and promoting free exchanges of ideas and scholarly pursuits in Europe during the initial period of the Cold War. At the same time, I wanted to find out if there were any existing relations between the RF and the U.S. government in the broadly defined goal of promoting democratic actions in the countries of Western and Eastern Europe. My intention was also to assess the function that select American universities performed in establishing networks of scientific cooperation with institutions and research centers in Western and Eastern Europe that received RF funding. The democratic values were to be reinforced within the nations that suffered from totalitarian regimes, that needed re-education and reestablishment of civic behavior, freedom of intellectual exchanges, and a willingness for peaceful cooperation.

My project concentrates on three Western European countries that were undergoing major reconstruction after WW II, i.e., Austria, Germany and Italy. With the presence of Western allies in their territories it seemed quite an easy and straightforward task, whereas the countries behind the Iron Curtain appeared to have experienced a totally different situation. In the Eastern Europe I selected three countries—Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia—that not only had benefited from the RF programs, in the interwar period,

but also showed some “promise” of countering communist influences, particularly after the 1956 uprisings. Poland and Hungary drew much attention from RF officers. For one reason or another, they kept returning to these countries or kept looking for ways of reaching the scientists, scholars, intellectuals and leaders through RF programs, grants and fellowships.

These actions were expected to help scholars participate in international intellectual exchanges, advance their personal scientific goals, and create foundations for future scientific cooperation that in consequence might result in a more open and peaceful coexistence between nations. The objectives were to be achieved via the exchange of persons, financial support for the development of new scientific fields, equipping laboratories and research centers with new materials and tools; supplying of literature and scientific magazines, particularly to university libraries that had been destroyed by the war, and finally through the support of the American studies programs, reading corners, international studies conferences and projects, such as the Contemporary Readings in International Relations or Maps for the Study of International Relations, both conducted at the MIT with an RF grant.¹

At this point, I would like to share some immediate, though still very general impressions that I have obtained after having researched the vast archival resources of the RF, the Rockefeller Family Papers, particularly Nelson A. Rockefeller Papers, officers’ diaries and a series of different institutions and organizations that are housed at the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

It has been generally asserted that the RF has mainly concentrated on medical and scientific research and study. Contrary to this assumption, one that I must admit to have shared for a very long time, both the RF and the Rockefeller Family in particular, shared a very lively interest in the field of international relations, national security and democracy, often in direct relation to Americanism that opens up totally new vistas for the study of the Cold War. The RF attempted to seize every available opportunity to expand the humanities in

Europe as well as the development of the social sciences, with a special role played by the RF in an “urgent need of building bridges between an isolated Eastern and Western Europe.”² The report, “Postwar Policy in the Support of International Relations,” prepared by Joseph W. Willits near the end of WW II, recommended the “safeguarding of democratic institutions, that would be the most effective in strengthening American foreign policy,” among others, required the preparation of adequately trained personnel in the U.S. Having spent nearly ten million dollars since 1926 in the field of international relations, the RF needed to make sure it was getting the most for the money given to this purpose in the future, by “contributing to the critical issues that arise in the second attempt to rebuild a peaceful and prosperous international order.”³

The RF documents I studied reveal a close cooperation with other private foundations active in international grant-making, particularly the two leading private foundations, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. There was an on-going exchange of views and cooperation in a series of initiatives. The RF financially supported international conferences such as the one organized by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace that gathered representatives of different foundations, institutions, organizations and universities from the U.S. and Europe as well as the United Nations Secretariat.⁴ There was also a kind of cross-examination of program directions and the selection of best candidates for the fellowships, which resulted in a frequent exchange of applicant’s data that were considered to be fit for the scope of interest of the other foundation.⁵ The directors and presidents of the foundations also contacted one another in respect to the grant decisions made towards foreign institutions and organizations.⁶

The RF, together with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, developed acute awareness of foreign policy formation and the role of U.S. in international relations; the postwar security, decision making processes or educational challenges that were placed

before universities in the field of foreign affairs.⁷ This cooperation resulted in several publications, such as “America in the Changing World” that was made possible with grants from the RF and the Twentieth Century Fund.⁸ Another example of a close cooperation between the RF and universities is the Center of the International Studies. With generous grants from the RF, the Institute conducted inquiries into five fields: political processes that influence foreign policy; diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral relations; international economic policy including foreign aid; military policy and national security and finally international law and organization.⁹

The RF and Rockefeller Family members showed keen interest in European integration. Wide-ranging cooperation of institutions and individuals appeared to be one of the basic conditions for holding the countries of Europe to democratic ideals, keeping them away from aggressive communist ideas, and helping them work out long-standing resentments, hostilities and historic conflicts. By starting a “dialogue between cultural areas of Europe and South-East Asia and Europe and American hemisphere,” the aim of RF support was “to unite, to maintain and enlarge the friendly solidarity which united or should unite all civilized beings whatever their tenets of faith.”¹⁰

Numerous organizations put the key word “democracy” or “freedom” into their name, trying to draw the RF’s attention to their actions and programs hoping for a generous appropriation of funds. The RF and Rockefeller family members tended to decline rather than fund most such applications. This happened not because of the lack of interest in the general aims of the promotion of democracy; on the contrary, they were just being extremely cautious about the partners they were choosing in international activities.¹¹ Their actions became even more careful once the Reece and Cox Committees began to challenge the patriotism and Americanism of private foundations’ involvement in international grant-making programs.

There were also many symptoms of the proximity of relations, particularly in respect to the decision making and cooperation in common projects with the Department of State. These were very noticeable at the times when John Foster Dulles, a former RF trustee, was appointed Secretary of State in 1953, and when Dean Rusk, the president of the RF from 1952 to 1961, became Secretary of State under John F. Kennedy.

As a consequence, the RF was greatly interested in John P. Armstrong's research at the Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies on a comparative study of the foreign policy of the two secretaries, Acheson and Dulles, which the RF funded. The project expected to comprehend how each secretary defined American political strategic and economic interests, to grasp their conception of the nature of the threats to American interests and the basic political assumptions underlying their thinking. Armstrong also investigated "the decision making process and the use of the machinery of government by the two secretaries."

The core of the study focused on various aspects of communist activism inside and outside the U.S. Armstrong based his research on the Reports on Organized Communism in the U.S., Hearings on Communist tactics in controlling youth organizations, American Committee for Cultural Freedom, and Americans for Intellectual Freedom. The report of the study, with a detailed outline of the project and possible findings, was sent directly to Kenneth Thompson, an RF consultant on foreign affairs.¹² At the same time, the RF gave a grant-in-aid to Professor William H. Roberts for an inquiry into the theory of the American foreign policy and the examination of the "general moral principles to the conduct of American foreign policy."¹³

Both Nelson A. Rockefeller (NAR) and John D. Rockefeller 3rd appeared to be very active in the plans and undertakings of the U.S. government. Frequent requests from the State Department or the Secretary himself were sent to JDR 3rd or NAR to participate in advisory

committees, symposiums or projects, such as the one forwarded by the United States Information Agency (USIA) that asked NAR to take part in a recording for the Voice of America series, “The Frontiers of Knowledge and Humanity’s Hopes for the Future.”¹⁴ NAR received an almost constant flow of reports and briefings from USIA and various United States Information Service (USIS) posts in Europe¹⁵ asking for assistance, help, and comments or just advising him to refrain from action at the times when the Fulbright Program was expected to be implemented soon in Italy.¹⁶ The RF officers suggested that NAR should refuse some of the requests, saying that he “should not be too much linked with the activities of the USIA.”¹⁷ President Dwight Eisenhower asked NAR directly to participate and/or give his opinion on several issues including revising the tax law for art, economic assistance, programs and administration; military assistance; or mutual security.¹⁸

The project undertaken by me at the RAC turned out to be an extensive one. Having collected over twenty-five thousand pages of documents, I decided to discuss only some aspects of the findings made in the archives of the RF, the Rockefeller family, and several other collections. For that reason I will concentrate only on the activity of the RF in Austria, particularly in a project that supported American Studies there as one of the methods of approaching the reinforcement of democracy in Europe.

The RF had been actively involved in Austria in the 1920s. The RF’s International Health Board (IHB) sent a group of Austrian scientists to the U.S. to study public health and changing public health practices. The activities continued into the 1930s in rural areas in particular, but the cooperation with scientific institutes was interrupted by the outbreak of WW II. It was resumed in 1947. Until then there were no legal terms (not to mention the difficulties with transportation or foreign exchanges) that would permit any cooperation, because Austria remained the enemy country. As soon as the U.S. government officially

declared Austria to be a “liberated” country, the RF decided to continue its operations, limiting it however, to rehabilitation programs.

The first visit was planned to take place in April 1947.¹⁹ Under its European Rehabilitation program the RF made two grants—in 1948 and 1949—to the World Student Service Fund towards the expenses of the Alpbach International Seminar, organized by the Austrian College Society. These meetings, held since 1945 under the common name of “Austrian College,” or the “Alpbach International Seminar,” turned out to be an increasingly important forum for younger and older scholars discussing the cultural, intellectual and artistic sides of European society as a whole, every year picking a different topic and discussing it from historic, philosophical, sociological, artistic or psychological viewpoints. The RF was immensely interested in the purpose of the Seminar that aimed at developing “European intellectual unity rather than furthering scientific or cultural specialties from a national point of view.” Once the Seminar became self-supporting the RF supported another initiative of the Austrian College Society, the establishment of an Institute for Current European Cultural Research.

The research institute provided a meeting ground at which “different philosophical attitudes and points of view and different religious, economic, and political considerations [could] be brought together,” and kept in close touch with other similar groups in Europe interested in European unity, such as the Salzburg Seminar and the Europa Archiv in Frankfurt, Germany. Between 1951-1952, with further support from the RF, the Institute continued with two research projects: the empirical cultural sociology of the Vienna area and the reform of the Austrian universities, and a series of seminars, public lectures and discussions on the study of contemporary problems of Europe and America; contemporary history, economics, town planning and comparative art.

With several smaller grants awarded to the Austrian College since 1948, the RF decided to appropriate \$40,000 for three years, from October 1952 to September 1955, for a research program in intercultural understanding. The project focused primarily on questions of general education and the role of the university in European life, working against much observed nationalism (in liberal arts in particular) that could result in the political isolation of Europe. The RF shared the views of the Institute that the “building of a common European consciousness [depended] largely on a rational explanation” of the present-day thinking in literature, art, differing philosophical attitudes, religion or economics and politics.²⁰

In its report for 1951/1952, the Institute for Current European Cultural Research self-proclaimed to have become the leading element of the cultural and intellectual life of Vienna. Although free expression of ideas and opinions was guaranteed by the Austrian Constitution, the historic reasons, as well as the current situation caused by the allied occupation, made the initiative of organizing a forum for free discussion of the contemporary problems of Europe particularly challenging. All institutions were not free from the local political pressures of state or municipal governments. The teachers and instructors were not prepared to lead open discussions on contemporary problems, while the lack of funds prevented the institutions of higher learning from bringing in foreign experts. This report had a lasting impact on the way the intellectual exchanges of Europe were perceived by RF officers.

Historic conflicts appeared to be making any attempt to increase European unity more difficult. University programs were mostly retrospective in character, avoiding any evaluations of current policies or policy makers, while the total lack of courage on the part of university authorities to undertake “tough” decisions to make changes seemed to be the exact reason young students’ became more prone to communist propaganda, distributed not only by the Austrian Communist Party, but also by many other organizations sponsored by the Soviet Union. The Institute reported that since 1945 Vienna had become an intellectual desert that

brought about increasing provincialism. Separating young intellectuals from the integral part of their western heritage made it much easier to dominate them with alien communist ideals. The topographic placement of Austria contributed to its isolation. The Institute, with generous RF help, attempted to present the entire spectrum of contemporary European problems, as well as distributing information on the cultural and political life in America, and political and economic relations between two continents.²¹

Bearing in mind the RF's involvement with the Institute, the refusal to continue the five-year support for the Austro-American Institute of Education might seem to be difficult to explain, since, in the words of Gerard R. Pomerat, RF Associate Director of the Natural Sciences and Agriculture, it held a leading role in Europe in "selling America in the only country in Western Europe where the Soviet army still patrols the streets." With the General Education Board about to cease its operations in the early 1960s, the possible contributions of the RF in the field of general education were extensively discussed among RF officers. Such an opportunity, with very little resources required, seemed to be an extremely "good investment in the spiritual well-being of ... very worthy unit of mankind." A grant of only \$7,000 for two years in "aiding Europe to know America better," in the opinion of Pomerat would not only work against Soviet influences, but would make a lasting impact of the RF in the field of education.²² In spite of the great importance of the Austro-American Institute in the promotion of good relations between the two countries, Edward F. D'Arms, Associate Director of the Humanities Division, supported by Lindsley F. Kimball, RF Vice President, declined to recommend further support. In his opinion, it was comparable to other European organizations, such as the American-Scandinavian Foundation or its subsidiaries: the Swedish-American, Danish-American and Norwegian-American Foundations. All of them were serving very important purposes, but were not supported by the RF. Austria was in a peculiar situation after the war and the RF seized a rare opportunity to work through the

European Rehabilitation Program and help the Institute's program on equal terms with many other Austrian institutions and organizations. The favorable economic conditions in Austria that in 1953—for the first time since the establishment of the Republic in 1918—allowed a positive balance of foreign trade, made the support of a flag program affordable.

Furthermore, due to the harsh treatment the RF received during the Congressional hearings of the Reece and Cox Committees, RF officers tended to refer all similar cases to the government for further support. In their view, if the U.S. government was strongly interested in countries such as Austria (because of its proximity to the Iron Curtain) it should be willing to “find means of keeping the Institute alive.” This should be the responsibility of the American Embassy in Vienna not the RF. In this case as in many others, the RF made it clear to the U.S. Cultural Attaché in a given country that RF support was conditional or uncertain and “in no case [should] be regarded as continuing for a protracted period of time.”²³

After the 1956 Hungarian uprising, Austrian universities and institutes became an important partner in admitting refugee students from Hungary under a program funded by the RF. Of the 175,000 refugees who crossed the border before it was successfully closed by barbed wire, minefields, watchtowers and guards, 22,000 remained in Austria. Of this group, 7,000 possessed some kind of training or qualifications, the rest were workers. The majority of the refugees decided to leave for Canada or the U.S. About 1,100 university students, of the 6,000 that escaped Hungary, were studying in Austrian universities. Some enrolled with scholarship aid from various sources, about 500 had no aid, the rest received emergency aid from the RF.²⁴ The program, initiated in December 1956, was mostly in music, arts and sciences, and met the expenses of admitting institutions, estimated at \$600,000. Between 1958 and 1959 as many as 672 refugees from communism were able to study at institutions of higher learning in Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck and Salzburg. They received financial support for clothing allowances, stipends, equipment and supplies. Alongside the scholarships the RF

made additional funds available for young graduates who had difficulties finding jobs. Salaries of 2,000 to 4,000 schillings per month were to be paid at the discretion of the universities, depending on the age, experience, academic qualifications and family responsibilities. Later on, the RF officers would try and to help individuals from the Hungarian refugee's program find employment in research centers or universities outside Austria, but these were very rare instances. The refugee program in Austria was terminated in 1964, although some universities kept paying scholarships for an additional year.²⁵

Another program generously funded over the years by the RF was the Salzburg Seminar. In the summer of 1947, on the initiative of three graduate students from Harvard, a program of American Studies was inaugurated at Leopoldskron, Austria. Initially, with few other opportunities available in Europe, it was to familiarize Europeans with the United States in an objective and scholarly fashion, "to give them an intensive glimpse into all aspects of American intellectual and political life and to provide a forum for discussion and networking."²⁶ As a means of encouraging American studies abroad, which had been an important feature of the program of the RF at that time, it not only permitted the free exchange of ideas and the study of contemporary problems, but it provided a rare opportunity for establishing contacts and even friendships as well.

Originally, it was an exchange between American specialists, academia, representatives of government, business and labor and prospective leaders of Western Europe. With the help of RF grants to the World Student Service Fund, for the purpose of supporting the American Studies program in Austria,²⁷ the Salzburg Seminar was also able to include representatives from Eastern Europe and later on from third world countries. The seminars were formulated more around a topic, i.e., European-American relations; development and social change; international migration; industry, labor and employment; human rights, health and aging and many more.²⁸ What began as a dialogue between Europe

and the U.S. soon developed into an East-West dialogue with a keen interest and an active role played by the RF.

The Salzburg Seminar had substantial participation from Eastern Europe since 1966.²⁹ The biggest number of Fellows came from Poland and Yugoslavia, the most “open” countries to scientific cooperation with the West since the mid-fifties. Substantial numbers also came from Rumania and Bulgaria, while Hungary and East Germany, the most repressive communist regimes sent the smallest number of representatives. The U.S.S.R. rarely nominated Fellows, while Czechoslovakia was among the most active participants, though it changed over the years as well. The U.S. government also supported the Seminar; between 1960 and 1978 through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the State Department and then from 1979 to 1980 by the U.S. International Communication Agency. In 1981, in difficult times during the Reagan administration, however, the funds, particularly for East European fellows were reduced and then totally eliminated soon after.³⁰

The extent to which the Salzburg Seminar was an effective tool in familiarizing European students with American civilization was explained in reports by faculty members and participants. Fellows from Eastern European countries treated the program with suspicion, as

“the cover to give lessons in American democracy, i.e., that type of democracy which shows no willingness to recognize its own faults and contradictions, while sees only too well the faults of other nations. This suspicion, however, proved to be unfounded, because there was not even a trace of propaganda in Salzburg. The American hosts openly pointed out their own faults and showed realistic interest toward the political, economic and cultural problems of East Europe. In this magnificent atmosphere ... the problems of spiritual cooperation between Europe and America were aired.”³¹

Many considered the Seminar to be “a spiritual meeting which [could] form the basis for the further international cooperation of progressive young intellectuals.”³²

Faculty members who participated in the Seminar observed that they saw “the hostility of some Europeans change to friendliness,” while “democracy has had no more

powerful or persuasive spokesmen, and no more perceptive listeners, than at Salzburg.” They regarded the Salzburg Seminar as the most effective institution for “explaining America to European intellectuals, and for introducing Europe to American intellectuals,” with the alumni already “revealing themselves as some of the intellectual leaders of the new Europe.”³³

One of them, Professor Sigmund Skard from University of Oslo, in a book *American Studies in Europe*, supported the opinion that the value of the Salzburg Seminar could hardly be overestimated, as “during the post-war period in Europe, the Salzburg Seminar has done more than any institution to foster the critical understanding and development of American Studies. By so doing it has also served its wider purpose, that of furthering international cooperation.”³⁴ The great value of the Salzburg Seminar to the future international cooperation was also recognized by Walter J. Donnelly, the U.S. High Commissioner and Minister to Austria, who expressed his hope that the time would come when “exchanges [would] cease to be official and when there [would] be many more splendid private institutions like the Salzburg Seminar meeting in all parts of a truly free world.”³⁵

The RF vastly contributed to the realization of this vision, so optimistically expressed so early in the Cold War. Its role in the establishment of such programs has been acknowledged and shown to be most effective. In a way the RF followed the observation made by Elihu Root that:

“When foreign affairs were ruled by autocracies or oligarchies the danger of war was in sinister purpose. When foreign affairs are ruled by democracies the danger of war will be in mistaken beliefs. The world will be the gainer by the change, for, while there is no human way to prevent a king from having a bad heart, there is a human way to prevent a people from having an erroneous opinion.”

Thus, the RF noticed the considerable demand for adult education in democratic practices. Despite the demonstrated overwhelming and long-term need, the RF’s role seemed not very important, being rather “a trailer rather than a leader.” Its contribution to international

relations lay in encouraging other institutions and organizations to define the points of strategic importance in enhancement of democracy, and offering support to the agencies or persons of greatest competence, with the RF's policies evolving and advancing with the requirements and pressures of modern times.³⁶ Although, already in 1958³⁷ the RF announced its "rapid reduction of interest" in the support of some programs in Europe (including American Studies), as it decided to move on to other "important problem areas ... in other parts of the world,"³⁸ it managed to lay the cornerstone for the future East-West cooperation and bring democratic ideals much closer to the societies that were devoid of them for a long time.

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 Rockefeller Foundation (RF), Record Group (RG) 1.1, Series 224 S, Box 7, Folders 68-69.

² RF, RG 1.1, Series 700 R, Box 22A, Folders 162A, 162B; Box 22A, Folders 162D, 162E; Series 700S, Box 23, Folder 167.

³ The report was released on May 14, 1945. RF, RG 3, Series 910, Box 8, Folder 67.

⁴ The Conference of Representatives of Institutes of International Affairs took place in October 1950. It was organized based on the ones held before the war. The delegates came from Australia, Canada, Germany, Norway, France, Denmark, India, Italy, England, South Africa, Greece, and one East European country—Poland. The group also included representatives from the Ford Foundation, World Peace Foundation, Woodrow Wilson Foundation, Field Foundation, and Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association and many more. RF, RG 1.1, Series 200 S, Box 315, Folder 3749.

⁵ Occasionally, reports prepared by RF officers were also sent to other foundations or other institutions. For example, the report prepared by Crane Robert Treat, an acting Assistant Director of the Social Science Division in Europe, on the "Social Sciences in Europe," (British and French universities in particular) was sent to the Social Science Research Council and the Carnegie Foundation. RF, RG 1.1, Series 700 S, Box 23, Folders 169-170.

⁶ One example is a telephone conversation between Edward F. D'Arms and Shepard Stone about the Salzburg Seminar applying to the Ford Foundation for \$250,000 over a period of five years, which resulted in the RF deciding to cease its support by 1960. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 112, Folder 980.

⁷ Mutual projects included security formation at the State Department, inter-great power relations, the German question, training of future policy makers, education of citizens, political movements in Europe; Anglo-American cooperation and many more. RF, RG 1.1, Series 200S, Box 417, Folders 4950-4951; Box 418, Folders 4961-4962.

⁸ The extensive study at The Johns Hopkins University, took its author W.S. Woytinsky three years to prepare. Its 1000 pages, 500 tables, and 400 maps and graphs presented an analysis of the impact of world scholarships on society, immigration, health, education, and industry, and showed “basic information on the changes in political and economic life in the world” and the impact on the U.S. He gathered resources for the book by travelling across England, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Holland and Belgium, presenting European viewpoints and the evaluation of American aid in Europe, the Marshall Plan, and its impact on the European economy. RF, RG 1.1, Series 200 S, Box 362, Folders 4288-4290.

⁹ Several of the projects were also supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, such as the ones concerning: “the spread of modernization from Western Europe around the world;” “a Study of Modern Russia;” “Nature and Effectiveness of American Diplomacy;” “Personnel Problems of the State Department;” or the study “to improve our understanding of the characteristics and problems of modern democratic citizenship under various conditions.” It must be mentioned that the RF played a leading part in the transfer of the Center from Yale to Princeton, with the condition that the grant-in-aid would be prolonged only if the Center had been moved to Princeton. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200S, Box 548, Folders 4684, 4686, 4688-4691.

¹⁰ RF, RG 2.1955, Series 700, Box 58, Folder 367. Rockefeller Family, RG III 2Q, Box 32, Folder 273, includes examples of Nelson A. Rockefeller’s (NAR) personal interest in European integration.

¹¹ Rockefeller Family, RG III 2 D, Box 7, Folder 35, contains a letter directed to John D. Rockefeller 3rd (JDR 3rd) that discusses the German dislike towards democracy and suggests that the best way to promote democratic behavior was through teaching the English language, to which JDR3rd answered that “the idea appeared to be interesting and worth considering.”

¹² RF, RG 1.1, Series 200S, Box 362, Folder 4294.

¹³ RF, RG 1.1, Series 200S, Box 362, Folder 4296.

¹⁴ Rockefeller Family, RG III 4 L, Box 270, Folder 2702.

¹⁵ Rockefeller Family, RG III 2 D, Box 45, Folder 351-352. NAR received United States Information Agency (USIA) Barometer Surveys, which were foreign public opinion reports or special reports such as: “Post-Crisis Opinion in Western Europe after the Suez and Hungarian Crises,” or “West European Reactions to American Jazz.” Rockefeller Family, RG III 4 L, Series 270, Folder 2704.

¹⁶ Detailed monthly reports about USIA activities in Italy were sent to both the Divisions of the RF and to NAR himself in the form of unofficial letters that discussed present programs as well as future plans. One example, an official report prepared by the American Consul in Rome and the Director of USIS for North Italy, Carleton W. Washburne, was sent directly to David H. Stevens, Director for the Humanities Division of the RF, was titled “Special Report on Education Activities,” dated 11/12/1947. It contained Part I- Education Course for Italian Professors in Switzerland; Part II- New Education Fellowship Groups; Part III-Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and Guides. RF, RG 2.1947, Series 751, Box 390, Folder 2632. In one confidential letter sent from the U.S. Embassy in Rome, the RF was informed that with the Fascist ideology so widespread in Italy, the RF should seriously reconsider its social sciences program there. It would require complete reeducation programs, starting from scratch by “opening universities that [would] be almost a tabula rasa in the field of Social Sciences.” The situation required bringing in many American specialists. For that challenging task, the Embassy advised the RF to refrain from activity until the Fulbright Act was launched. See a letter from C.R. Morey, Cultural Relations Officer of the U.S. Embassy in Rome, sent to David H. Stevens, and Joseph H. Willits, Director of Social Sciences of the RF and the Department of State, dated 8/22/77. RF, RG 2.1947, Series 751, Box 390, Folder 2633.

¹⁷ The Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) supported a five year art exhibition of the MoMA collection prepared by the USIA that toured Europe and other parts of the world. NAR appropriated some personal funds for the special catalogue that accompanied the exhibition that was to be published by the USIA, but following the advice of one of the RF officers, did it anonymously. Rockefeller Family, RG III 4 L, Box 137, Folders 1347-1348.

¹⁸ Rockefeller Family, RG III 2 D, Box 45, Folder 353. The Office Files of President D. Eisenhower or his diaries at the Roosevelt Study Center, Middelburg, Netherlands, show the role of both NAR and JDR 3rd to be highly conspicuous. There were also several projects undertaken for the President by the RBF, e.g. on U.S. International Security objectives and strategy; U.S. international economic objectives and strategy; U.S. international social objectives or the utilization of human resources and finally the U.S. democratic process—its challenges and opportunity. Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers, Part I: Office Files, 1953-1961, Reel 25.

¹⁹ RF, RG 1.1, Series 705, Box 1, Folders 1-6; Box 2, Folder 19.

²⁰ RF, RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 1, Folder 5.

²¹ RF, RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 2, Folder 9. Report of the Institute for Current European Cultural Research sent to Edward F. D'Arms, dated 6/24/1952. The list of initiatives included seminars in American art, architecture, the role of the United States in the history of America; poetry and prose, music as well as the erroneous perception of the conditions existing in the USA.

²² Memo from Gerard R. Pomerat, dated 1/6/1954. RF, RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 2, Folder 12.

²³ Memo from Edward F. D'Arms, dated 1/15/1954. RF, RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 2, Folder 12.

²⁴ A Report from John Maier to Dean Rusk, dated 9/17/1957. RF, RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 4, Folder 30.

²⁵ RF, RG 1.1, Series 705, Box 1, Folder 1; RG 1.2, Series 705, Box 2, Folders 15, 16, and 29.

²⁶ A report by Peter Rouf, dated 2/24/84. RF, A86 (unprocessed material), Series 155, Box [5] Folder: "Salzburg Seminar in American Studies—Eastern European Fellows 1981-84."

²⁷ A grant of \$13,000 was made available to the WSSF in 1948 for the general expenses of the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies; a grant of \$15,000 followed in 1949. The next year, a grant of \$50,000 was to be used by the Salzburg Seminar from May 1950 to May 1951. For the period 1951-1954, the RF gave \$100,000; for the FY beginning in 1954- \$25,000; in 1955, the "terminal grant" of \$125,000 for the five-year period was made by the RF, due to the fact that the Ford Foundation made a grant of \$125,000 for the five-year period. In addition annual grants of \$20,000 were made by the Commonwealth Fund until 1959. "RF Appropriations no. 47116, 48120, 50053, 51073, 54012, 55060." RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 111, Folder 974.

²⁸ A report by Peter Rouf, dated 2/24/84. RF, A86 (unprocessed material), Series 155, Box [5] Folder: "Salzburg Seminar in American Studies—Eastern European Fellows, 1981-1984."

²⁹ Although, in Newsletter I, dated 8/08/1949, on the "Salzburg Seminar in American Studies," there is information that out of eighty-nine members from sixteen countries, four were from Czechoslovakia and two were from Hungary (one of which was a displaced person, nothing is known about the other), however, there is a note about the difficulty of obtaining passports, because Austria was still an occupied country at that time. In 1949, the telegrams with invitations sent to Hungarian and Polish Ministries of Education were left without a reply; the Yugoslavs refused, and out of nine selected students from Czechoslovakia only four managed to come. There were many reservations about the idea of inviting representatives of Eastern Europe due to the fear that the students would be "representatives of Communist governments with closed minds, no real intellectuals." The Iron Curtain was unacceptable "in intellectual and humanistic terms" and in spite of the physical contact with the representatives of these countries there was a need for continued efforts in bringing people with "Open minds" from behind the Curtain to combat their isolation, establish contacts and give them "some broadened viewpoints by Western experience." See also: "Report on the Annual Meeting of the Executive Board, Salzburg Seminar, 10/15/1949." RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 616, Folder 5290.

³⁰ A letter from John Wills Tuthill, Salzburg Seminar, to Edwin A. Deagle, Jr., International Relations, RF, dated 11/24/1981. RF, A86 (unprocessed material), Series 155, Box [5] Folder: "Salzburg Seminar in American Studies- Eastern European Fellows 1981-1984."

³¹ Uj Magyarország, "The Other American Makes An Appearance in Europe." *New Hungary*, September 20, 1947, reprint attached to the report of the Salzburg Seminar to the RF. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 111, Folder 974.

³² Joseph Szentkiralyi, report of a participant in the Salzburg Seminar. RF, RG 1.2., Series 200, Box 111, Folder 974.

³³ Quoted in the Minutes of the RF, dated 5/31/51, RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 111, Folder 974. In a publication "Where are they now?" the RF gathered reports about the alumni of the Salzburg Seminar, similar to the follow up information about other RF grantees.

³⁴ Quoted in a letter from Frederick P. Muhlhauser to John Marshall of the RF Division of Humanities, dated 6/03/58. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 112, Folder 982.

³⁵ High Commissioner Donnelly's Address at the Salzburg Seminar, 01/21/1951. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 111, Folder 977. A collection of support letters from Presidents and Chancellors of leading American universities such as Columbia, Harvard, Cornell, Yale, Chicago, California, Texas, etc. to the Salzburg Seminar proved that the importance of this institution was "teaching young European intellectuals about America," creating a "better understanding on the part of leading Europeans about life, culture and scholarship in the United States" as well as the value system and procedures and operations of the democratic establishment and civic society. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 112, Folder 983.

³⁶ "Postwar Policy in the Support of International Relations," report by Joseph W. Willits, dated 5/14/1945, RF, RG 3, Series 910, Box 8, Folder 6.

³⁷ Although the RF greatly appreciated the extent to which the Seminar enhanced the development of American Studies in Europe and the expansion of the democratic value system, it was of the opinion that the Seminar, after many years of continuous support from various American foundations, institutions or the U.S. government, that it should have become more self-reliant and financially independent, and that the Austrian government should have shown more active involvement. Since 1961 (when the RF officially terminated its support on the grounds that the Seminar, after two substantial five-year RF grants, showed no signs of generating broader support) until 1965, applications were continuously sent to the RBF and to the members of the Rockefeller Family, in particular Nelson and Winthrop Rockefeller. These asked for the support of the Salzburg Seminar, which was unable to collect \$200,000 to cover the basic costs of the Seminar. David Rockefeller contributed \$1,000 annually for five years in the early 1950s and signed off in 1957 with a special gift of \$5,000 toward the purchase of the Schloss Leopoldskron. The RBF declined an informal request from the Seminar in 1961. Similar advice to decline was suggested to both the RBF and Family members. Memos dated 3/23/65 and 4/5/65. RBF, RG 3.1, Box 913, Folder 5518.

³⁸ A memo of an interview with Frederick P. Muhlhauser of the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies prepared by Chadbourne Gilpatric, dated 10/15/58. RF, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 112, Folder 982.