

Cultural Logic: Marxist Theory & Practice
2014 (Whole Number 21), pp. 76-96

The Ford Foundation, Little Magazines and The CIA in the Early Cold War

Larry Schwartz
Montclair State University

Given the persistent scholarly interest in the cultural cold war, especially the role of the CIA, and several recent archival investigations of *Perspectives, USA*, a quarterly journal of literature and the arts underwritten by the Ford Foundation from 1952 to 1956, it is an appropriate moment to review the Foundation's policy toward the arts and humanities in the first half of the 1950's as it became the world's wealthiest private philanthropy. Since the publication of Frances Saunders's far reaching study of CIA entanglements, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*(1999), discussion in this arena has been shaped by her argument which claims a vast, intrusive web of secret CIA funding. Saunders contends that the CIA was the money source for much of the American mission to thwart Soviet cultural influence through both blue chip and phony foundations. After 1953, with Allen Dulles as Director, the CIA pulls together a "consortium" of businessmen, foundations, philanthropists, academic institutions and individuals to support American cultural programs around the world. The CIA emerges, in her view, as a de facto "ministry of culture."¹ Unquestionably, the Ford Foundation trustees and officers, as part of the American ruling elite, shared the prevailing, anti-Communist Cold War assumptions in support of American hegemony. But to what extent was Ford Foundation policy towards cultural projects influenced by CIA policy?

The Ford Foundation of the early 1950's provides an interesting test case for Saunders's argument because despite its vast resources the giving program in arts and humanities was surprisingly limited. Its major grant was for *Perspectives, USA* published by James Laughlin, best known for his avant-gardist New Directions Press, under the imprimatur of a non-profit corporation, Intercultural Publications Inc. (IPI). Additionally, beginning in 1954, the Foundation also supported a second little magazine, *Der Monat*, a German language monthly of cultural and political commentary, edited by Melvin Lasky. It had originated in 1948 as U.S. government sponsored journal in divided Germany and became the prototype for the Congress For Cultural Freedom's (CCF) flagship publication, *Encounter*. Until very recently, *Perspectives, USA* has been little studied, but when mentioned its genealogy and short life is usually presented as a failed, minor effort in the larger covert cultural operations of the CIA. *Der Monat*, also little studied, has been routinely, but incorrectly, presented as CIA sustained almost from its inception. Just recently several scholars have reviewed the *Perspectives, USA*/IPI archives to present a detailed record of the journal's history. Based on this new research and the review of Ford Foundation archives now including, for the first time, analysis of *Der Monat*, it is possible to consider both journals in terms of Saunders's "ministry of culture" hypothesis. In this context, the grants to these journals provide a bounded instance of the interaction between shapers of cultural authority and masters of finance capital as the Cold War intensified and the newly endowed Ford Foundation came into existence. The evidence seems to suggest a far more muddled anti-Communist paradigm than presented by Saunders and others, and very little in the

way of a Ford Foundation “strategy” towards the arts and humanities as part of Cold War “cultural diplomacy.”

The “New” Ford Foundation

The best narrative of the emergence of the post-1950 restructured Ford Foundation remains Dwight MacDonald’s lengthy, acerbic, four-part *New Yorker* profile published at the end of 1955 and then separately as a book, *The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions* (1956), where he famously remarked here was a “large body of money surrounded by people who want some.” In 1950, three years after Henry Ford’s death (Edsel, his son, died in 1943) when the probate issues had been settled, the Ford Foundation became the inheritor of the bulk of the Ford family fortune in the form of privately owned stock estimated at some \$500 million with dividend income averaging about \$50 million per year at the start of the new decade. Instantly and somewhat embarrassingly, the Ford Foundation became the country’s largest philanthropy, far surpassing Rockefeller and Carnegie. The unprecedented endowment was to initiate philanthropy of breathtaking scale and reach. A central theme of MacDonald’s profile was the challenge and complexity of how to disperse those tens of millions.²

To shift the Foundation from a local Detroit and Michigan centered philanthropy to an international enterprise, the Board of Trustees commissioned a year-long study to create a structure and philosophy for the new organization. “Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program” (1949) was prepared by H. Rowan Gaither, a California attorney, head of the Rand Corporation, and a friend of Henry Ford II (Edsel’s son and chairman of the Ford Foundation Board of Trustees). Known as the “Gaither Report,” it became the Ford Foundation’s “magna carta.” It called for the creation five program areas: I The Establishment of Peace; II The Strengthening of Democracy; III The Strengthening of the Economy; IV Education in a Democratic Society; and V Individual Behavior and Human Relations. Without a separate program area for the arts, *Perspectives, USA* and *Der Monat* were assigned to Area I and its International Affairs department, a designation that created a good deal of internal tension, as will be seen.³ Henry Ford II recruited Paul G. Hoffman for the Presidency --a man MacDonald notes “was *persona grata* both to the business community and to the Truman administration, someone who was reasonably liberal and conservatively reasonable and also...experienced in spending large sums of money for social purposes.”⁴ Hoffman was the former president of Studebaker, a liberal Republican, who had been selected by President Truman to run the European Cooperation Administration (ECA) and to oversee the Marshall Plan as it orchestrated German recovery and European security in the increasingly tense post-war environment.

Hoffman recruited as associate directors of the new foundation his well-connected acquaintances: Chester Davis, former head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and president of the St. Louis Federal Reserve, to handle overseas development; Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago, to administer education and civil rights; Milton Katz, former chief deputy to Averell Harriman, who was director of all ECA programs in Europe and briefly took over for Harriman as its director, to advise on broad issues of war and peace. Gaither was asked to oversee behavioral sciences. The Hoffman era began on January 1, 1951. As an administrator Hoffman saw his role as the maker of policy not as someone concerned with day-to-day details. He relied heavily on the associate directors, but especially the iconoclastic Robert Hutchins. It was clear that Hoffman and Hutchins wanted the Ford

Foundation to be markedly different from the staid Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, to avoid the timidity Edward Embree had criticized. In a 1951 interview about his Ford Foundation presidency, Hoffman stated, “I don’t want to be just a banker, watching over a tightly guarded repository from which dollars could be cautiously withdrawn from time to time to meet the needs of well-established and ‘safe’ charities.”⁵

Hoffman clearly understood the importance of Europe, but he also looked to the horizons in the new Cold War era and pushed initiatives in India, South East Asia, and the Far East. Domestically he was committed to supporting civil liberties and educational initiatives. According to MacDonald’s review of year-end reports, through 1954 the Ford Foundation made grants totaling \$186,000,000. Of this amount, some \$89,000,000, or almost half, went for education; \$54,000,000 for international programs; \$15,000,000 to establish the Fund for the Republic, concerned with civil liberties, \$8,000,000 for behavioral sciences; \$10,000,000 for economic development and administration; and the remaining \$10,000,000 mostly for a miscellany of “good works” in the Detroit area. Dividend income distributed to the foundation was \$30.9 million and \$46.4 million in 1952 and 1953 respectively. As MacDonald notes, to quickly disperse large sums Hoffman and Hutchins set up several substantial independent education funds: Fund for the Advancement of Education which had received, by 1954, \$57 million from the Foundation and the Fund for Adult Education which had received some \$30 million.

In Hoffman and Hutchins, the Foundation hired two “large” personalities with grandiose visions, but whose insistence on autonomy did not seem to include careful attention to many of the routine aspects of foundation administration. However, by 1952, it became clear to the Board that the Foundation needed to be run in a more “business like” way by a more conventional and harmonious leadership team. The Board viewed Hoffman as too distanced from day-to-day administration and too forward in his outside interests --Hoffman’s four-month, though board approved leave of absence in support of Eisenhower’s presidential campaign was symptomatic. The Board saw the associate directors as too independent and at odds with one another, especially Robert Hutchins and Milton Katz. Hoffman’s requirement of a Pasadena headquarters was also not helpful. MacDonald quips the Foundation was once described “...as a monster with its head in Pasadena, its legs in New York, and its pocketbook in Detroit.” Further, cold war politics dramatically sharpened the board’s anxieties. There was heightened anti-Communist and isolationist pressure from right wing Republicans in Congress and the Senate, including planned 1952 Congressional hearings by conservative Georgia Democrat Eugene Cox about subversive activities of foundations --some 28 hearings were held with foundations having to respond in lengthy detail to a 12 page questionnaire. Additionally, in the fanfare of the launch of the new Ford Foundation there had been attacks by conservative columnists like Westbrook Pegler about Hoffman’s overt support for the United Nations and UNESCO, emerging countries in the Near and Far East, and East European and Russian refugees. In short, the globalism Hoffman espoused and funded was based on the premises of the Gaither Report (to create a foundation dedicated to “problem solving” on a large scale) but was, paradoxically, its most criticized quality. The animus directed at the Foundation heightened the board’s concern about possible changes in the tax code and potential IRS rulings with respect to large tax exempt foundations.⁶

In late 1952, Henry Ford II and the Board acted forcefully to oust Hoffman and replaced him with Gaither. His presidency began in February, 1953 with his study-group team of 1949

hired to form the new leadership: Dyke Brown, Thomas H. Carroll, William McPeak, and Donald K. Price replaced Hutchins, Katz, and Davis during the year. The transition included the move of all Ford Foundation functions to the new headquarters in New York. As MacDonald comments:

One standard American business type, the high-powered salesman, had been replaced by another, the low-keyed administrator. If Hoffman was the glittering ringmaster of a philanthropic circus, Gaither is the hard-working transmission belt between the Ford millions and the outside world; if Hoffman was a crusader, Gaither is a catalyst...if Hoffman was the enthusiastic amateur who rushed in where the trustees feared to tread, Gaither is the cool professional who never rushes anywhere. His approach is discreet.⁷

However, in addition to the Gaither appointment, there was the important election of John J. McCloy to the board. McCloy was quintessential American establishment and cold warrior, former president of the World Bank, former High Commissioner for Germany, then chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. In 1958, he became chairman of the Ford Foundation board. Just before his appointment to the board, McCloy and his former HICOG deputy of Public Affairs, Shepard Stone, began a Ford funded project, known as “Conditions For Peace,” which had as its focus how to connect the foundation more closely to developments in Europe. Needless to say both McCloy and Stone were vehement anti-Communists. Stone eventually became the Foundation’s director of International Affairs’ European Program (June 1954) and directly influenced funding for both *Perspectives, USA* and *Der Monat* as will be discussed below. In these early years at the Foundation, the definitions of “international” and “overseas” were much in dispute between those who wanted more Euro-centric engagement and those looking to concentrate on the Near East and Asia.⁸

Once appointed to the board, McCloy’s central activity in his first two years was as a member of the trustee’s financial committee, comprised of James F. Brownlee, a partner in the private bank J.H. Whitney, Charles E. Wilson, formerly president of General Electric and then chairman of W. R. Grace & Co., and Gaither. During 1953-55, the major focus of the committee was to address the domestic political pressure to separate tax exempt foundations from control over businesses especially when the endowment is tied to a large privately held company such as Ford Motors. This was particularly sensitive given the rebound in sales for Ford as Korean hostilities ceased and the resultant 1955 dividend of \$131.3 million to the foundation. As a step toward greater diversification of holdings, the finance committee recommended the public sale of stock, some 15% of the foundation’s holdings. The Ford IPO in 1956 would be the largest to date, re-valuing Ford Foundation assets to approximately \$2.5 billion, and generating an immediate new cash fund of more than \$600,000,000 for the foundation to disburse --some \$250 million went immediately in the form of grants to all U.S. four year colleges and universities to increase faculty salaries, \$200 million to U.S. hospitals, and \$95 million to private medical schools to improve medical care and training. In short, with the IPO funds and appointments of Gaither and McCloy, the Ford Foundation was re-invented once again.

However, as Volker Berghahn relates in his study of Shepard Stone, the administrative upheaval was particularly acute in Area I: Conditions For Peace, and especially the International

Affairs division where there was a good deal of uncertainty about how and where to include overseas development. Stone tried to convince McCloy to press the trustees for a comprehensive plan for European cultural projects to address widespread anti-Americanism and Soviet propagandizing. According to Berghahn, Gaither was cautious about Europe given the complexities of Germany, relations with Atlantic allies, and the active presence of State Department and CIA. Gaither much preferred overseas projects in Africa, India, and Southeast Asia. And despite Stone's lobbying, the trustees did not approve a grand plan for Europe. In short, *Perspectives, USA* and *Der Monat*, as Area I projects, were again caught up in restructuring and re-definition. *Perspectives, USA* became a very early casualty of that dramatic and sudden shift in the Foundation leadership in 1953 which ousted both Hoffman and Hutchins, while *Der Monat* benefitted from McCloy's authority and Stone's concerns about Soviet power and influence in Europe. However, the grants to both journals were miniscule in relation to the overall budget.⁹

Perspectives, USA

According to three recent, archival-based studies, *Perspectives, USA* was launched on Robert Hutchins's personal authority at the outset of Hoffman's tenure as Ford Foundation president when both men believed they had a mandate to innovate.¹⁰ According to Matthew Corcoran, one of Hutchins's personal areas of interest was how the Ford Foundation might develop support for the humanities and the arts. In the summer of 1951, Hutchins contacted his friend James Laughlin, the publisher of New Directions Press, a supporter of avant-garde literature and well connected to the leading "little" magazines of the arts, criticism and literature to discuss a proposal for the Ford Foundation. New Directions issued an array of modernist writers such as Ezra Pound, Henry Miller, William Carlos Williams, Gertrude Stein, Kenneth Rexroth, Delmore Schwartz, William Faulkner, and Dylan Thomas to name a few –as well as four novels by Maude Hutchins (married to Robert Hutchins). Laughlin also published many important European authors in translation, Brecht, Celine, Lorca, Sartre, etc. He had long-standing personal and publishing ties to Ezra Pound which in turn connected Laughlin to a wide net of academics, publishers, editors, writers, journalists, and the State Department as he tried to end Pound's post-war incarceration for treason and worked to justify the controversial award to Pound of the 1949 Bollingen Prize in poetry.¹¹

Laughlin suggested to Hutchins a three-fold publishing venture in intercultural exchange: first to publish a survey (mainly reprints) of literature, art, music architecture and philosophy, second to tie in with *The Atlantic* magazine to publish supplements of literary work from other countries, and lastly, to distribute copies of important American cultural journals abroad. The project would proceed under the aegis of a separately created, tax exempt corporation, Intercultural Publications Inc. (IPI) In June 1951, Hutchins reported to the officers that he had asked Laughlin to generate a proposal for a quarterly digest of the best American material for circulation to European intellectuals. In November, Laughlin was invited to Pasadena to discuss the details and formulate a plan for the magazine and for the creation of IPI to accept Foundation funds as a non-profit corporation. Hutchins asked Laughlin to run the project and to prepare a pilot issue for formal presentation to the Board at its February 1952 meeting. Laughlin saw the IPI project as "a logical extension of my interests and gives me the opportunity I have longed for to try something which would contribute a little more to improving the state of the world today." In short, Laughlin believed the advantages of Ford Foundation prestige and the opportunity to

engage European intellectuals in conversation about the depth and strength of American cultural achievements as a counter-balance to the “low-brow” stereotypes depicted in mass circulation magazines and Hollywood films –analogous to his publishing approach at *New Directions*.¹²

The orientation of the magazine was to be specifically towards the arts –i.e. to focus on literary criticism, poetry, creative prose, short plays, and philosophical speculation, but no science and no politics. Laughlin maintained a decidedly apolitical orientation. *Perspectives* was not to be propaganda and not linked to the CIA or USIA : “It was to be purely an authentic cultural exchange at an aesthetic level.” Art and musical scores would be reproduced within a thoroughly modern design produced by the best graphic designers along with abstract art for the covers. The journal was to be fully Eurocentric, published in five languages: English, French, Italian, German, and Spanish. There would be no propaganda of the “American Way.” The purpose as stated in the grant proposal was decidedly “highbrow:”

To promote peace by increasing respect for America’s non-materialistic achievements among intellectuals abroad. At present, America’s cultural standard is judged by such popularized media as Hollywood movies, certain popular magazines in the mass field, etc., which arouse the derision and contempt of foreign intellectuals and students, creating an attitude which contributes to the concept of America as a commercial imperialist.¹³

The overview to the project proposal did mention the necessity of a separate corporation to act as publisher and alerted the trustees to that fact that Hutchins was considering “the possibility of establishing a company that might operate all the publishing ventures of the Foundation, but have reached no conclusion on this subject.” For now IPI would serve as publisher and Laughlin as managing editor of *Perspectives, USA* and his plan calls for a distinct guest editor for each issue to avoid “the magazine from falling into the hands of a literary or artistic clique.” In February 1952, the pilot issue of *Perspectives, USA* and a proposal was formally presented. The board approved the requested \$500,000 for a three year project to IPI. This was a large grant for a venture in the humanities and arts, which was not a particular focus for the Ford Foundation as stipulated in the Gaither Report, but a minute item in the \$38 million total awarded for the year.

The first issue included Laughlin’s statement of purpose. In explaining the function of the new magazine Laughlin demonstrated his commitment to “high” culture and to the proposition that American artists, thinkers, scholars, and critics produce work of the “first” order. He cites Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams, and Kenneth Rexroth in poetry, Aaron Copland in music, and Ben Shahn in art as exemplary of a pioneering aesthetic worthy of an international audience. He wants the new journal to showcase “the achievement of our finest creative spirits and of our most perceptive intellectuals” in line with his understanding of the central philosophy of the Ford Foundation to offer a venue for cultural exchange where art can transcend ideological difference. Laughlin notes that the pages of the magazine will be propaganda free and the sponsor will not impose a political agenda. He claims, “Its sponsors believe in the principle of the freedom of artistic expression.”¹⁴

The public announcements about the launch of *Perspectives, USA* after the February approval showed both an enthusiasm for the initiative and concern about avoiding the taint of

propaganda. Hoffman's news release at the end of February briefly mentions how intellectuals in Europe were far more influential than in the U.S. which was somewhat more nuanced than language in the proposal to the board. Additionally there was no explicit criticism of popular culture. Two months later when plans for a fall launch were set, Henry Ford II, as Chairman of the Ford Foundation, issued a formal statement for *Perspectives, USA* noting that it provides foreign readers "a representative picture of the intellectual and artistic life of the United States." Guest editors, he added, will be chosen for the quality of their critical judgments and in their selections will "demonstrate the diversity of American thought and culture and its variety and freedom of expression." Here there was no mention of foreign intellectuals and again no slighting of American popular culture.¹⁵

Corcoran and Healey argue, based on the correspondence between Laughlin and Ford Foundation officers in the IPI archives, that there was on-going tension between Laughlin's notion of an arts journal not engaged in "politics" and the officers' belief that there was an "ambassadorial" role that demanded more awareness of cultural diplomacy. Corcoran implies a Foundation policy somewhat at odds with Laughlin's aestheticism:

In their cultural relations projects, Ford Foundation officers attempted to turn capital into political goodwill for the US, and they wanted to receive a strong return on their investment. Early in the publication history of *Perspectives, USA*, the officers realized that the magazine was not going to give them a very good return. Laughlin's purely aesthetic approach was too ambiguous and ironic for this project. Literary writing could be easily mis-read and mis-appropriated by audiences in Europe or in the US who were unsympathetic to the Ford Foundation's program. The officers of the Ford Foundation wanted a journal that did more than incite controversy. For this reason, the Foundation abandoned Intercultural and turned to the CCF and their journal *Encounter*.(2-3)

Additionally, Corcoran and Healey see the Foundation much more engaged in directing the content and emphasis of the magazine. In their reading, officers attempted to turn the journal away from Laughlin's purely aesthetic emphasis: "As much as these officials may have respected American art and culture, they were much more concerned with improving political and economic relations with Europe and the non-aligned countries throughout the world. To them cultural exchange was simply a method to help advance American policies" (Corcoran 12 and Healey 193). Corcoran points to the several surveys conducted by the Foundation to gauge the journal's effectiveness. He argues the often tepid responses, especially in France, was evidence of its modest, lackluster influence and funding was withdrawn. In short, according to Healey and Corcoran, the Ford Foundation approach to the arts was not well served because *Perspectives, USA* was too esoteric, too removed from politics. The conclusion according to these scholars is that Ford Foundation did indeed have a theory for the arts and *Perspectives, USA* was abandoned, in large part, because it was not advancing the program.

Greg Barnhisel agrees that while the journal had minimal "strategic" effect it played a "key role in redefining modernism" and in providing a pathway for a linkage between modernism and the "mission of the U. S. national-security establishment:"

Perspectives, USA depoliticized and aestheticized modernism, contextualizing it as the natural product of free artists exercising free inquiry and free expression in a free society. In the pages of *Perspectives, USA*, modernism was transformed from an oppositional literary and artistic *movement*...into an artistic and literary style that could be adopted by the power elite of the West...and then reflected back at the Europeans. (731)

In this respect, modernism exemplified and represented Western individualism and freedom. And in postwar terms it became in its apolitical orientation a defense of the “cultural superiority of the West” (734): “The Ford Foundation was eager to use culture as a weapon against Soviet totalitarianism, and its officers had practical experience in just such efforts” (737).

Barnhisel contends in its support of *Perspectives, USA* the Ford Foundation was identifying a theory for the arts which privileged apolitical modernism and matched well with the larger American Cold War strategy:

...this was a modernism deracinated from its avant-garde or revolutionary heritage, comfortable with capitalism and establishment power, making a compromise between cutting critique of the bourgeois order and mass (or ‘middlebrow’) culture and its ultimate choice ‘of the West,’ as Dwight MacDonald memorable put it. Modernism itself became propaganda for a “Free World’ defined by democratic institutions free-market capitalism, and bourgeois individualism. (731)

Arguably, Barnhisel, Corcoran, and Healey accept Saunders’s view of Ford Foundation’s participation in a strategy of cohesive American cultural diplomacy and claim *Perspectives, USA* as an example. While providing an excellent base from which to understand the creation and demise of *Perspectives, USA*, these studies unfortunately do not include a sufficient review of the Ford Foundation archives. Indeed, a review of those archives reveals a good deal of disagreement about strategy among Ford Foundation officers and a clear pattern of avoidance of a grand plan for the arts and humanities in the first half of the 1950’s. One can safely say that while individual officers held sharp, personal positions about support for cultural activities and their lobbying produced positive funding decisions for small projects, the Board was not willing to commit to a specific program for the arts and humanities until several years later and it was one which declined further publishing initiatives.

In part, such a cautious, unfocused approach for the arts involved complex questions of Foundation management, jurisdiction, endowment, and relations with U.S. government foreign policy agencies. With Gaither in charge the direction was toward more careful planning and professional oversight: there would be a moratorium on projects initiated by Ford Foundation officers; after initial awards grantees should expect no further commitments from the Foundation (the curtailment of open ended grants); projects to existing institutions were favored rather than creating new structures; and relations with government agencies were to be carefully monitored to maintain Foundation independence. Of course, with the financial re-structuring and even greater wealth after 1956, this meant increased fiscal vigilance. There would be no room for the kind of insider “pet project” which Hutchins and Laughlin created and which Hoffman endorsed

in deference to his friend Hutchins. *Perspectives, USA* is best seen as an experiment rather than an evocation of Ford Foundation policy.

Interestingly, the Ford archives include an ambitious proposal in February 1953 by Hutchins and Laughlin to re-jig IPI. They requested a name change from IPI to the “Fund for Intercultural Activities” and a grant of \$850,000 with about \$730,000 for publications and cultural exchange activities and \$120,000 to establish an arts council within the Foundation to consolidate all arts related programs under IPI in a single planning group. The major expense in the proposal was \$350,000 for IPI’s conversion into the Fund for the Arts. The proposal claimed “a favorable worldwide reaction to the first numbers of *Perspectives, USA*” and argued for an expanded role in cultural exchange. It also included mention of a “Books for India” project begun by Laughlin and IPI board member Richard Weil, Jr., which was subsequently funded in 1955 as the Southern Languages Book Trust—an IPI project that outlasted *Perspectives, USA* which was terminated in 1956. Not surprisingly the Board declined to fund to this expansion given Hutchins’s imminent departure and the absence of a formal evaluation of *Perspectives, USA*.¹⁶

Additionally, in July 1952 *Perspectives, USA* had already received another grant of \$200,000 for cultural exchange in publishing. This supplemental grant emerged from discussions between Laughlin and Milton Katz starting in April 1952. In their correspondence Laughlin pushes for an expanded role for IPI and a possible name change to “Fund for Intercultural Publications.” However, Katz reminds Laughlin that IPI operates within the Gaither Report as focused on “cultural exchange” in Area I and to expand its function to address the arts in general would be complicated and not something the board is ready to consider.¹⁷

Der Monat and The Launch of Perspectives, USA

As counterpoint is the treatment of *Der Monat* both in the early period (1950-52) and later under Gaither (1954). In the Spring of 1951, as Hutchins and Laughlin were in discussions about *Perspectives, USA*, the Ford Foundation received an unsolicited grant application from Melvin Lasky, editor of *Der Monat*, the government sponsored monthly magazine, in German, of culture and politics comparable in format to *Harpers*. Begun in 1948 during the period of military occupation of Germany under General Lucius Clay and then continued by McCloy and Stone within the U. S. High Commission, *Der Monat* was designed to present American views on politics, arts and culture to German intellectuals. Uncertain about its future, Lasky wanted *Der Monat* sustained under private auspices with an ultimate goal of self-sufficiency or purchase by a German publisher. Lasky requested a grant of \$250,000 for a two or three year period to shift away from U.S. government sponsorship and the perception that it was an “official” publication. His application claims the quality of published material has given *Der Monat* an important and well regarded role in intellectual communities within Germany, where it is seen as international rather than an American journal. For example, from 1949-50 *Der Monat* serialized a full-text German version of both Cold War ur-novels *Animal Farm* and *1984* in translations which emphasized Soviet totalitarianism and robust critical essays valorizing the novels and George Orwell.¹⁸ He understood that permission for such a shift in funding would have to be approved by McCloy as High Commissioner and the State Department as funder under the Marshal Plan. In a detailed ten-page memorandum, Lasky presents, in sharply Cold War political terms, the case for the importance and influence of the journal. He says *Der Monat* has two key objectives:

From a political point of view DER MONAT would be a weapon against authoritarian and totalitarian ideas and tendencies; in the immediate context of the central European situation against Communism and Nazism, and especially the Soviet attempt to exploit both of these totalitarian factions in the drive to power. From a larger cultural point of view DER MONAT would be a constructive instrument to help stimulate intellectual and moral currents in a free Continent and to foster a democratic Western system of European-American cooperation.(Application, p. 4)^{18.}

The application was sent first to John Howard, Ford Foundation director of overseas training, who in turn sent it to Bernard Gladieux, Hoffman's New York office assistant, with a covering memo of endorsement and mention of support for *Der Monat* from both George Fischer and George Kennan. Gladieux forwarded it to Joseph McDaniel, Hoffman's Pasadena office assistant, noting the size of the request which he thought large for such a project and commenting on fact that the Ford Foundation policy does not provide subventions to magazines, though in a hand written comment he remarks that the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* had received a small grant. Also mentioned is a possible application from CCF.¹⁹

However, when Hutchins learned of the solicitation, he is very much opposed to support for *Der Monat* since he is already committed to Laughlin's project and does not want to undercut their own effort. He writes his objections to Hoffman saying that *Der Monat* would never be self-supporting and that just because it was started by the US government is no reason for Ford Foundation to take it over. He is also not keen on supporting a German language journal published in Germany for European intellectuals. However, he does agree to check in with Kennan. Within a week, Hutchins reported his conversation with Kennan who still favors helping *Der Monat* but is also supportive of the Laughlin quarterly journal of American material. By mid-June, Howard had been in touch with the State department's Bureau of German Affairs and in consultation with Shepard Stone, then HICOG's Director of the Office of Public Affairs under McCloy, it was determined that there were sufficient government funds to continue *Der Monat* for at least another year. Further, McCloy and Hoffman had discussed *Der Monat* and it was made clear that neither HICOG nor the State Department was actively seeking to move the journal to private financing. John Howard was asked to inform Lasky that the Foundation would not consider the application under these circumstances.²⁰

However, there was one more discussion of *Der Monat*. On the last day of 1951, McCloy wrote to Hoffman about how the Foundation might engage in various initiatives begun by HICOG but that might be curtailed once the shift to Embassy status occurs: "I don't have to tell you that there is a great deal still to be done in this area, not only in protecting the investment we have made in German democracy, but in support of new ideas and institutions which can contribute to strengthening the peace in this part of the world." McCloy asks Hoffman to send a representative to Germany to meet with him. And he ends the letter by noting two publishing ventures *Neue Zeitung* and *Der Monat* that would be difficult to continue subsidizing but are of "great significance in United States objectives in Germany." He also requests Hoffman to consider Foundation funding. However, there would be no revival of Foundation interest in *Der Monat* until 1954 when the State Department officially suspends support. By then Gaither is Foundation president and McCloy and Stone are also in place at the Foundation and ready to push for a more assertive European presence.^{21.}

In addition to the *Der Monat* application, Hutchins also knew there was pressure from the State Department and the CIA for the Foundation to back CCF and its new French magazine, *Preuves*, edited by Francoise Bondy. In April 1951, according to Berghahn, the status of Foundation cultural activity in Europe was discussed at a meeting of Ford Foundation officers and CIA leadership. It focused on whether the Foundation could receive government funds for disbursement. The Foundation officers rejected the idea of acting as a CIA channel. But then a separate issue was presented as Berghahn explains: "If the Foundation found it easy to reject Dulles's idea to act as conduit for covert CIA funds to 'worthy organizations,' the more difficult question was whether Ford should give money to organizations that also received covert CIA support"(221). The officers very much opposed such grants, but before a formal decision was required the CIA backed away from making a formal request. Keeping such distance remained official Ford policy for many years but, as will be discussed below, apparently there was an undisclosed, back-channel linkage to the CIA through McCloy.

As noted above, throughout the summer and fall of 1951 Hutchins lobbied for the *Perspectives*/IPI project including a grant for Laughlin to create a pilot issue. Laughlin was enthusiastic after his November planning visit to Pasadena writing to Hutchins about perhaps even trying to gain support for an independent fund for the arts. Hutchins was also in favor of such a fund but cautioned that only *Perspectives*, *USA* and IPI would be endorsed by the trustees. Hutchins well understood that he was testing precedent in asking for support first for a publishing venture, second for project that had no prospect of financial independence, and third for a journal decidedly aesthetic and "highbrow." Further, he also saw how complex and fraught European initiatives were. Yet both men were eager to explore the possibilities of a vibrant Ford presence in the arts. By year's end, Milton Katz agreed to endorse the project, though he also doubted the Board would approve of an expanded IPI role. The *Perspectives*, *USA* application was made ready for the Board's February 1952 meeting. Hutchins prepared a one page summary for Hoffman based on the proposal, highlighting the importance of the *Perspectives*, *USA* grant and outlining the publishing plan. Noted in that summary was the brief mention of the possibility IPI might become the publisher for "all" such Foundation "ventures."

Unlike CCF's cultural magazine *Preuve* edited by Francois Bondy, *Perspectives*, *USA* was to be a journal fully committed to the "exchange of ideas" and not drawn into cultural politics. In mid-April 1952, Laughlin reported to Milton Katz on a meeting with State Department officials who, he claimed, were enthusiastic about *Perspectives*, *USA* and where Laughlin agreed to provide limited free copies for USIS libraries. Laughlin notes that as much as these officials may have respected American art and culture, they were much more concerned with improving political and economic relations with Europe and the non-aligned countries throughout the world. To them cultural exchange was simply a method to help advance American policies. But he also remarks State officers wanted a clear label on the journal to avoid the hint of government involvement. Laughlin agreed and mentioned to Katz earlier discussions about whether the Foundation would even be named in the journal's front matter. Laughlin preferred to have the subsidy identified to avoid suspicion that such a handsome magazine might be government funded. The decision reached was the notice, in each issue, that IPI was "established" by the Ford Foundation.²²

Unfortunately, for Laughlin, the launch of *Perspectives*, *USA* in fall 1952 coincided with the end of the Hoffman/Hutchins tenure. But it is also safe to say that the response to

Perspectives, USA was mixed both within the Foundation and in Europe as Healey, Corcoran and Barnhisel demonstrate. From the Winter 1953 issue (which included the reprint of Mary McCarthy's provocative essay, "America the Beautiful") until the terminal grant in 1955 there was steady criticism: from an informal survey by one Foundation trustee, Charles Wyzanski, by McCloy and Stone traveling throughout Europe on their Ford sponsored "Conditions of Peace" project, by Frederick Burkhardt, president of Bennington College formally commissioned to evaluate *Perspectives, USA*, and by members of Laughlin's own Board of Directors. The consensus seemed to be that while elegantly printed the journal was lackluster and the rotating editorship failed to provide consistency of theme. Laughlin was pressured to make *Perspectives, USA* less esoteric and more like *Der Monat* and *Preuves* or the newly begun *Encounter*, though he always refused the overtly political. By Spring 1954, Laughlin had begun making adjustments (dropping the rotating editorship, for example) and trying to find new projects for IPI to avoid termination.²³

The Demise of Perspectives, USA

In mid-March 1954, on his way to India for the Southern Languages book project, Laughlin met with Lasky to discuss the status of *Der Monat* as the State Department planned to end its subsidy in June. Laughlin prepared a long memorandum (some ten pages with detailed economic and circulation analysis) addressed to Price and Stone in favor of Foundation support for *Der Monat* but also suggesting *Der Monat's* subvention be structured under IPI. He notes that at present *Der Monat* is not receiving direct financial support from CCF and would have to be shuttered without a new funding source.²³ Laughlin claims a high reputation in Germany even in non-German reading areas where many *Der Monat* articles are translated into French and English for *Preuves* and *Encounter*. In short, he believes it contributes to intellectual "free expression in Germany." However, Laughlin is concerned about the journal's "militancy" –he knows full well Lasky's strident anti-Communism and has cautioned Lasky about it should he receive a grant. It is worth quoting Laughlin at length because this section of the memorandum offers a succinct statement of his guiding philosophy and asks Price and Stone to endorse it within the Foundation:

...I do not believe that The Foundation should become closely identified with any project which uses arts or letters as aggressive weapon in the world fight against Communism. It is quite proper for us to demonstrate the ideals in which we believe, but we should not go in for direct attack. I realize that it is very hard to draw the line between the two positions, but I think we should try. Because if The Foundation acquires a reputation for direct anti-Communist activity it will soon be called a tool of US government policy and it will sacrifice some the respect which it now enjoys in the countries which want to follow a neutral line the world power struggle. Furthermore, on a more theoretical level, if we turn the field of arts and letters in to a battleground it will no longer provide the focus for the long-term understanding between followers of opposed ideologies which is essential for ultimate rapprochement and peace. (pp. 2-3 *Der Monat* memorandum, 25 March 1954)

The memorandum is attached to a 10 April cover letter to Don Price, posted from India, in which Laughlin requests *Der Monat* to be channeled through IPI if a grant is approved. He

also asks Price to contact the IPI board about *Der Monat* because “We were set up to do this kind of international publishing work and if such a project were handled in some other way the inference would be that our Board was not competent. You can see the difficulties which might follow” (Laughlin to Price, 10 April 1954). Price’s reply states his view that the *Der Monat* application will be approved but without a link to IPI. But per Laughlin’s request he will set up an informal meeting of available IPI board members and Ron Freeland associate publisher of *Perspectives, USA*. Price cautiously states: “This problem raises the question whether, if the Foundation should go on from aid to DER MONAT to aid to certain related enterprises, it would be wise to have Intercultural tied in officially in view of your strong feelings (with which I fully agree) that the strength of Intercultural depends on its detachment from anything with too strong a flavor of political controversy.” (Price to Laughlin, 23 April 1954)

On April 29, Price met with several members of the IPI board for an informal discussion. Present were Charles Garside, Richard Weil, Alfred Knopf, and William Casey along with Ron Freeland and William Ferry (Ford Foundation in-house attorney). Price summarized the meeting in an “aide-mémoire” of the same date for the Foundation files with a copy sent to Laughlin. After explaining to the group Laughlin’s support for *Der Monat* as an IPI project, Price asked for reactions. Weil was not in favor because *Der Monat* was too political. Further, Weill thought the Foundation should not “dabble” in small grants but rather in larger initiatives. Knopf also disapproved of support for *Der Monat*, and voiced a general concern that Intercultural never had a clear mission directive from Foundation. Further, he believed there had been no careful vetting of *Der Monat* and he did not like the lack of consultation between the IPI board and the Foundation. Garside was leaning away from having the *Der Monat* grant made through IPI but thought there should be consultation over any publishing venture funded by the Foundation. Lastly, Casey was also not “eager” to support *Der Monat*.

Most significantly Price records his concluding comments to the group about the overall status of IPI which reflects the uncertainties surrounding *Perspectives, USA* and IPI at the Foundation in the spring of 1954 and is worth quoting:

...In reply to the points made by Mr. Knopf and others, I said that I was fully aware that there was a great difference of opinion about what the mission of Intercultural Publications was –whether it was confined to publication of PERSPECTIVES with a few minor additional but related enterprises, or whether it was to be the subsidiary of the Foundation for a whole humanities program or all international cultural enterprises. In view of these difference of opinion, I said that I thought that the *Trustees had clearly not committed themselves to giving Intercultural a broader mission.* (Emphasis added, Don Price, 29 March 1954; copy in IPI files)

Price told the gathering he expected a clear decision on IPI and *Perspectives, USA* by autumn. He wrote to Laughlin several days later to report on the meeting and the level of opposition to *Der Monat*. Given the strong views expressed, Price was not intending to push the Trustees for *Der Monat*’s inclusion within IPI. He suggested a meeting with Laughlin about this once he returned from India. Also of importance in this letter is Price’s mention of a possible application from CCF in support of their magazines, but he noted so far no formal request had been submitted just informal discussions. (Price to Laughlin, 4 May 1954)²⁴

At its May meeting the Board approved a three-year \$175,000 grant to *Der Monat* through a newly created tax exempt German corporation. The grant was approved but IPI was side-stepped. As usual practice under Gaither, there was language stipulating no future money commitments; however, Lasky was able to secure two additional awards, in September 1956 for \$75,000 and then for \$50,000 in February 1957 for a total of \$300,000 before *Der Monat* was folded into CCF. With *Der Monat* outside of IPI and the mediocre review in the summer's release of the Burkhardt report, Laughlin realized support for *Perspectives, USA* was ebbing. In response, he decided to push forward a bold five-year plan for an expanded mission for IPI. His request was for almost \$2.5 million, an unprecedented amount for the arts: \$1.175 million for *Perspectives, USA*; \$450,000 for special editions of "Country *Perspectives, USA*" in *The Atlantic Monthly*; \$345,000 to expand free subscriptions of select journals (from nine to fifteen) to some 900 libraries and educational institutions abroad; and lastly, \$487,500 to begin publication of important American books in translation for distribution overseas. The trustees declined this ambitious and expanded role for IPI and instead agreed to a terminal grant of \$500,000 to extend *Perspectives, USA* to its sixteenth issue, scheduled for summer 1956.²⁵

Given the treatment of *Perspectives, USA* and *Der Monat*, it is evident, contrary to the arguments of Healey, Barnhisel, and Corcoran, the Ford Foundation had adopted no comprehensive policy or theory for support of the arts. Both journals were funded through the strong lobbying efforts of individual officers. When the opportunity to consider a larger plan for cultural efforts arose, the board pulled back, especially hesitant about enterprises involving journal publications in Europe despite Stone's urging and would not initiate direct support for the humanities until after 1956 when the trustees reversed its ban on such grants. In Laughlin's oral history interview, he retrospectively came to believe Stone undermined IPI because he wanted more control over Ford Foundation activities in Europe.²⁶

Also in spring 1954, as Laughlin and Price discussed, the leadership of the CCF approached the Foundation with a \$750,000 grant request for three years to support their key journals, *Encounter*, *Preuves*, and *Cuadernos*, and to help unwind CCF from CIA financial ties. According to Berghahn, discussions with Stone and Price led to a somewhat smaller proposal of \$500,000; however, this grant was not funded. A review of Ford Foundation archives does not show whether this CCF proposal made it to the Board for review or was rejected at the officer level. There is an undated and un-annotated (no Ford Foundation project number assigned) copy of the proposal in Price's oral history file which couches the request in markedly Cold War terms as a way to combat Soviet cultural efforts. Berghahn notes no Foundation support for any CCF activity until 1956 with a \$40,000 grant for an economic development conference in Tokyo in 1957. In 1957, according to the annual report, the Foundation made grants to CCF in two areas: \$95,000 to help resettlement efforts on behalf of Hungarian refugee intellectuals and artists (after the 1956 uprising) and \$500,000 in general funds to CCF in support "of study groups, seminars and conferences; research projects on important current issues; and activities on behalf of Eastern Europe." In 1958, the CCF received a \$66,750 grant for The Free Hungarian Orchestra while in the 1960's more support was forthcoming. For example, in 1960, \$750,000 was granted for "Progress in Freedom Series" (lectures, research, and conferences).²⁷

What then can be discerned about links between the Ford Foundation and the CIA and other government agencies with respect to Foundation cultural activities? Is it possible to identify a "Cold War" philosophy in the cultural realm with respect to journal publication as

suggested by Saunders and others? In 1954, Kai Bird suggests McCloy was “busy brokering a clandestine relationship between the CIA and the Ford Foundation” because the CIA was rather routinely approaching the Foundation for cooperation on international projects (426). According to Bird, McCloy was worried about the Foundation’s reputation for independence, and in an effort to control CIA approaches to individual Foundation officers and/or grant recipients, McCloy and Price established a special three person committee through which all CIA requests to the Foundation were to be channeled –comprised of McCloy, the Board chairman, and the Foundaton president. For example, the officers were concerned that the CIA might ask various researchers who worked on Foundation projects overseas to also be available to brief the CIA. McCloy and Price claimed they were able to gain CIA commitments to guarantee no such interviews or recruitment while fellows were under Ford subvention.²⁸

However, Bird’s description of this arrangement is based on Donald Price’s Oral History conducted in June 1972. During the interview, Price produced a one-page document dated 21 May 1954 which established the four ground rules for CIA projects and the creation of the overview committee. Price presented Charles T. Morrissey, the oral historian, with a clean (dated, not signed and with no other routine Foundation markings –i.e., no routing list, no date stamp, etc.) typed copy of the statement from his files. Bird claims “over the next few years McCloy’s three-man committee approved a number of CIA-initiated projects.” But the only example is the 1954 CCF request for journal support which Price specifically mentions in his interview. Of course the success of a secret committee is its secrecy. And indeed, there is no further paper trail or reference to that committee, at least none that this researcher could find.²⁹

However, a more telling part of Price’s Oral History Project interview was his general description of relations with government agencies, especially the CIA, which is worth quoting:

...to try to work things so that we would not ever do things at the behest of the government, but at the same time to be sophisticated about where we stood and not be doing things unacceptable to the U.S. Government unwittingly, although we might often do them on purpose; that, in general, our objectives and the U.S. national objectives ought to be in harmony although we would not take the word of government officials as to what that harmony ought to consist of; and that in the interest of honest dealing with host countries, especially in Asia, we ought not ever to engaged in joint operations with any U.S. government agency (63)

In essence, though writing post-1960’s revelations of covert CIA funding of CCF, Price presented a Ford Foundation philosophy which declined to support enterprises either receiving government funds directly or through a third party. The exceptions were to be made by the three-man committee and that only rarely, based on set criteria. Which projects gained special consideration can’t be determined. While Lasky and *Der Monat* were suspected CIA recipients, there is no evidence to demonstrate it –Lasky always denied any CIA connection especially in the early years at *Der Monat*. And as shown above, the government subsidies to *Der Monat* were well known and then publicly suspended. At which point, the Foundation stepped in to prevent *Der Monat*’s closure. As noted above, beginning in 1957, there was regular support provided to CCF and given McCloy’s close ties to Dulles and CIA leadership it seems reasonable to assume he knew of CIA support for CCF and grants were put forward to the board for CCF on the basis of the 1954 Price/McCloy protocol.²⁹

Interestingly, in the arena of book publishing there were close ties (both public and covert) between the Foundation and government programs. Through its Eastern European Fund, the Foundation, from 1951-56, funded Chekhov Publishing House to provide books in translation and new works by Russian émigré authors. And then in 1955, as noted above, the Foundation made a significant grant for IPI's Southern Languages Book Trust for inexpensive editions in four major Indian languages of domestic titles and translations of important American and European works. Such publishing efforts were clearly in line with the Eisenhower's notion of "total Cold War." In fact, recent scholarship has begun to focus on Cold War book publishing as an important component of the cultural struggles of the immediate post-war era. For example, the work of Kenneth Osgood argues for a vast propaganda campaign in which the USIA, CIA, and military agencies worked in a unified way beginning WW II and then expanded during the early Cold War to make American and Western European books widely available to Allied soldiers and European refugees. Alternatively, no program in the 1950's exemplified Ford Foundation's independence from Government collaboration than the its refusals in 1957 and 1958 to participate in the People to People program under the direction of former Foundation trustee, Charles E. Wilson. Despite his forceful direct personal appeals to officers and the Board, the Foundation saw the program as a Government project rather than an independent philanthropic endeavor.³⁰

Finally, in 1957 and in line with the post-1956 shift towards education as its primary philanthropic orientation, the Foundation began a specific program in the Arts and Humanities and to formulate a "theory" of giving in that arena:

... to support in all fields of the arts and letter and in every type of cultural institution, whether related or not to the formal education structure. These are: creative development of individual talents; stimulation of experiments, demonstrations, and studies helping to clarify objectives, set standards, or open new avenues in the arts and humanities; preparation of a comprehensive study of the economic and social position of the arts and of the artist in America today; and encouragement of scholarship and scholarly projects basic to the humanities general rather than to specialized fields.

Aside from a single large grant of \$2.5 million for aid to the creation of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, the Foundation was not planning to make grants in support of general operating needs, nor to create a general fellowship program, though grants to individuals would be considered which began in 1958. In the Humanities, the Foundation awarded a five-year grant of \$2.6 million to the American Council of Learned Societies to expand their programs in humanistic scholarship, and grants of \$1.7 million to 30 university presses to encourage scholarly publication. Once a theory for the arts and humanities evolved, it did not include direct aid to cultural or literary magazines. Direct subsidies to little magazines was left to the Rockefeller Foundation and most notoriously to the CIA.³¹

In 1956, Don Price summarized the European Program and its complications for the newly selected Foundation president, Henry Heald. In passing, he mentioned *Perspectives, USA* and IPI as a worthwhile "experiment" but that the Foundation should not be in the "business of publishing a magazine."³² Without specific authorization for an arts and humanities program, IPI could not easily extend its reach and once Hutchins departed there was no Foundation officer

who advocated for such an expanded role. At the outset of Hutchin's tenure at the Foundation, Laughlin often represented IPI as a subsidiary of the Foundation rather than as a grantee though both were despairing about long-term Foundation commitment given the obvious absence of designated funding category for the arts and humanities in the Gaither report. The success of CCF and *Encounter* obviated the need for further involvement in such journals or publishing in general which seemed to suit the Gaither/Heald/McCloy administrations as they worked to create a perception of Foundation separation from government sponsored programs. In conclusion, with respect to *Perspectives, USA* and *Der Monat*, it is reasonable to say the Foundation had no expansive vision for the arts which could be defined as an agenda for "cultural diplomacy."

NOTES

1. For Saunders on *Perspectives, USA*, see 140-42. For well known secondary sources see Saunders's notes and bibliography. However, there continues to be on-going interest in the CIA connection to culture in the postwar era: see Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge: Harvard UP 2008). Wilford argues that the CIA was not as controlling as Saunders suggests, especially with writers and artists. For a general discussion of the influence of Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie in promoting U.S. hegemony after WW II, see Inderjeet Parmas, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (Columbia UP 2012).

And for an example of the on-going interest in the CIA's Cold War ties to culture, see the NYT report of the letters found in *Paris Review* archive that links the magazine and its founder George Plimpton to the CCF and the CIA (co-founder Peter Matthiessen has long admitted he worked for CIA and used *Paris Review* as a cover): "Renewed Debate on Magazine's Ties to C.I.A." May 31, 2012: C7 and essay in Salon.com by Joel Whitney who discovered the letters in the archives at Morgan Library ("Exclusive: The *Paris Review*, the Cold War and the CIA Sunday, May 27, 2012 www.salon.com.)

2. "Foundation I" *The New Yorker*, Nov 26, 1955: 57. See also Francis X. Sutton's introduction to the 1989 reissue of *The Men and The Millions*. For a representative reaction to the "new" Ford Foundation, see Robert Bendiner, "Report on the Ford Foundation" *The NY Times Magazine*, 1 Feb. 1953, Web. As MacDonald noted, the new foundation was indeed "a product of the tax laws" (Part I, 73). The Foundation held 90% of the Ford Motors stock, but all of it non-voting to guarantee the foundation was not engaged in running the company. The new foundation structure saved the Ford family some \$300 million in inheritance taxes --with the foundation even covering the \$42 million in taxes owed by family members for their 10% share.

3. For the Gaither Report, see Ford Foundation archives. For a general background to the trends in philanthropy, see the widely read Edward Embree (former executive at both Rockefeller Foundation and Julius Rosenwald Fund), "Timid Billions." *Harper's Magazine* 198 (March 1949): 28-37 --especially his criticism of the lack of support for the humanities and arts by the large philanthropies. F.L. Allen, *Harper's* long-time editor was also a Ford Foundation trustee.

4. "Foundation IV" Dec 17, 1955: 49.

5. "Foundation IV" Dec 17, 1955: 59. For the standard overview, see Kathleen D. McCarthy, "From Cold War to Cultural Development: The International Cultural Activities of the Ford Foundation, 1950-1980" *Daedalus* 116.1 (Winter, 1987) 93-117. For Hoffman's time at the Ford Foundation, see Alan R. Raucher, *Paul G. Hoffman: Architect of Foreign Aid* (Lexington, Ky, Kentucky UP, 1985):80-99 and for Hutchins at the Foundation see Mary Ann Dzuback, *Robert M. Hutchins, Portrait of an Educator* (Chicago, Chicago UP,1991).

6. See "Foundation IV" Dec. 17, 1955: 55 and 59 ; "Foundation II: 58 and 77+; and Ford Foundation, Annual Reports.

7. Foundation Part IV, Dec 17, 1955: 65-66 and passim.

8. For a review of McCloy's early career and involvement with the Foundation, see Kai Bird, *The Chairman: John J. McCloy and The Making of the American Establishment* (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1992). For an in depth critique of Stone's work in Europe with McCloy and his move to the Foundation , see Volker R. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold War in Europe: Shepard Stone Between Philanthropy, Academy and Diplomacy* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001). Berghahn's work is another elaboration on Saunders --in this case, based on Stone's substantial archive of primary documents retained from his tenure at the Ford Foundation.

9. See Berghan, Chs. 6, "The Ford Foundation" and Ch. 7 "Philanthropy and Diplomacy." For Foundation activities in Europe, see F.X. Sutton, "The Ford Foundation and Europe: Ambition and Ambivalence," in Giuliana Gemelli, ed., *The Ford Foundation and Europe: Cross-fertilization of Learning in Social Science and Management* (Brussels: European International UP,1998): 21-67; see also Oliver Schmidt, "Small Atlantic World: U.S. Philanthropy and the Expanding International Exchange of Scholars After 1945" in Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and Frank Schmuacher, eds. *Culture and International History* (NY: Berghahn Books 2003): 115-134.

10. For a careful, detailed history of *Perspectives, USA*, see Matthew Corcoran, "Pure Child of a Wavering Mother: *Perspectives, USA* 1952-1956. MA Thesis. Harvard U, 2012. Print. For a view *Perspectives, USA* as part of the politicized cultural Cold war, see Greg Barnhisel, "*Perspectives, USA* and the Cultural Cold War: Modernism in Service of the State," *Modernism/modernity* , 14:4 (Nov 2007): 729-754. Print. For a discussion of *Perspectives, USA* as part of an international discourse community and the implications for cultural politics, see Elspeth E. Healey, "Writing Communities: Aesthetics, Politics, and Late Modernist Literary Consolidation." PhD Diss. U of Michigan, 2008, esp. Ch 4: "Institutionalizing Anti-Institutionalism: The Paradox of *Perspectives, USA*'s Cold War Modernism." For an approach that attempts to "theorize" the cold war in terms of cultural production and the universalizing of international literature dominated by America, see Andrew N. Rubin, *Archives of Authority: Empire, Culture and the Cold War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP 2012) [For his discussion of *Perspectives, USA*, see pp. 65-73.] On the origins of *Perspectives, USA* see Ford Foundation Oral History Project, interview with Robert Hutchins (May 23 and 24, 1972) and James Laughlin (May 22 and 23, 1971), Ford Foundation Archives.

11. For a general profile of Laughlin, see *Cynthia Barnes, "Jaz," The New Yorker, March 23, 1992: 41+*. For the links between Laughlin and Pound, see Greg Barnhisel, *James Laughlin, New Directions, and the remaking of Ezra Pound* (Amherst, MA: Massachusetts UP, 2005). For a discussion of Bollingen controversy and Laughlin's ties to the little magazines see, Lawrence Schwartz, *Creating Faulkner's Reputation: The Politics of Modern Literary Criticism* (Knoxville, TN: Tennessee UP, 1988).

12. See Barnhisel and Corcoran, *passim*. See Hutchins memo to officers, 19 June 1951 and Laughlin to Hutchins 13 November 1951 in Hutchins correspondence Box 5 Folder 10, FFA with pilot Issue in Folder 11.

13. See "Excerpt from "President's Report" December 31, 1951 on docket for 4 February Board meeting. FFA, Reel 1057, FFA PA-52-86, orig. project A-678. For apolitical stance, see Laughlin's oral history interview conducted in May 1973 (FF Oral History archives). Of course, the FF oral history project which included key Foundation officers and program officers was conducted after the revelations of the covert role of the CIA and contain some "backfill" and guarded commentary on the links between the Foundation and the Agency . For example, Hutchins mentions an early meeting with the CIA Director, Walter B. Smith, about relations between the Foundation and the CIA but says, at the time, he was "sworn to secrecy" about the conversation and some twenty years later was still not prepared to break that oath.

14. "The Function of This Magazine," *Perspectives, USA 1 Fall 1952: 5-8*; Corcoran and Barnhisel, *passim*; and FFA Project A-678. Serving on the IPI board of trustees were: James F. Brownlee, partner in J. H. Whitney, investment bank; William J. Casey, tax and investment lawyer former Army Intelligence and OSS officer and later director of the CIA; Charles Garside, lawyer, and head of various NY State agencies such as Blue Cross and SUNY; Joseph Hambuechen, banker with First Boston; H.J Heinz II, CEO H. J. Heinz and childhood friend of Laughlin's from Pittsburgh, Alfred A. Knopf, publisher, and Richard Weil Jr., President of R. H. Macy.

Laughlin's list of possible guest editors (all men) were to be drawn from elite academia and the important small magazines, for example: Alfred Barr, Jacques Barzun, R.P. Blackmur, Cleanth Brooks, Albert Guerard Jr., Alfred Kazin, Francis Ferguson, Mark Schorer, Delmore Schwartz, Karl Shapiro, Allen Tate, Lionel Trilling, Robert Penn Warren, Monroe, Wheeler, Yvor Winters, Morton Zabel. Indeed, Trilling was the first guest editor. Additionally, Laughlin obtained endorsements for the proposal from a distinguished group of publishers, editors, writers and critics, for example: Saxe Commins of Random House, Malcolm Cowley, editor and critic, Francis Ferguson, Director of Princeton Seminars in Literary Criticism (a Rockefeller Foundation initiative in the Humanities), Harold Guinzburg, publisher of The Viking Press, Edith Halpert, art collector, Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, Hiram Haydn, editor, *The American Scholar*, H.J. Kaplan, USIS, Paris, Robert Lippencott, editor Random House, Archibald MacDonaldLeish, Perry Miller, Harvard University, Meyer Schapiro, Columbia University, Arthur Schlesinger, Harvard University, Mark Schorer, University of California. And many of these would agree to serve on the journal's advisory board.

15. Press Release, 29 February, 1952 and April 7, 1952, FFA Project A-678 and Corcoran and Barnhisel.

16. See FFA, PA 53 227. IPI purchased subscriptions of American “little” magazines with long associations to Laughlin and New Directions Press: *Kenyon Review*, *Hudson Review*, *Partisan Review*, *Accent*, *American Scholar*, *Art News*, *Musical Quarterly*, *Art and Architecture*, and *Yale Poetry* for free distribution to USIA libraries and reading rooms. Indirectly, Ford did provide assistance to key “little” magazines in this period.

17. See IPI archives Box 29 “Administrative Records,” “IPI Background Folder,” especially Katz to Laughlin, 4 April 1952, 2 July 1952, 10 July 1952. Access to the IPI archive was made possible through a Helms Visiting Scholar grant and the Lilly Library, Indiana University.

18. *Der Monat* has been little studied, but for its early history, see Giles Scott Smith, “A Radical Democratic Political Offensive’: Melvin Lasky, *Der Monat*, and the Congress for Cultural Freedom,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 2000:35 (263-80). Web. For *Der Monat* and Orwell, see John Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation: The Making and Claiming of St. George Orwell* (NY: Oxford UP, 1989): 288-303. According to Kai Bird, Lasky understood McCloy to have convinced the Board to support *Der Monat*. (*The Chairman*, note 85, p. 720) and McCloy had assumed *Der Monat* was also the recipient of CIA funds (356-58).

19. FF Archives, *Der Monat*, Project A-337. Received by John Howard, 21 May 1951. See Howard to Gladieux 22 May 1951; Gladieux to McDaniel, 23 May 1951.

20. Ford Foundation, Project A-337: Hutchins to Hoffman, 31 May; Hutchins to distribution (Hoffman, Chester Davis, Gaither, McDaniel, Gladieux, and Kennan), 7 June; Howard to Hutchins 18 June; Hutchins to distribution, 19 June; and Gladieux to Chester Davis, 20 June. Kennan was then president of the Ford’s Eastern European Fund and Fischer an assistant director (and son of Louis Fischer). For years, Kennan would remain a key advisor to the Foundation.

21. Ford Foundation, Proj. A-337, McCloy to Hoffman 31 December, 1951 and Smith, 271 (though Smith has wrong date). Lasky was added to Perspective’s advisory board.

22. See Ford Foundation Archives for *Perspectives, USA* grant renumbered PA 52-86 (originally A-678) Laughlin to Katz 15 April 1952 and Barnshiel 746-47. Ford FoundationA PA 52-86 November 1951 letters to Laughlin in Hutchins Correspondence Box 5 with copy of pilot issue in Folder 11.

23. See Corcoran Ch. III, “Evaluating *Perspectives, USA*” pp. 48-74 with references to Barnhisel and Healey. Laughlin initiated his own reader survey in issue #5, Fall 1953; he saw the results as essentially positive and claimed Burkhardt ignored this data in his 1954 analyses.

24. Ford Foundation reports and correspondence with regard to *Der Monat*’s March-May 1954 application are located in A-337 and PA-55.

25. Ford Foundation A-337 . The proposal’s stated reason for support: “If the magazine DER MONAT ceases publication, one of the most important intellectual efforts of the United States in foreign relations will be damaged.” Stone received formal notification from the Acting Director, Abbott Washburn, of the USIA of the suspension of *Der Monat* as a HICOG publication at the end of May but if the Ford Foundation acts positively he could find transitional funding for some short period of time.(20 May1954). The project received a nice publicity boost when *Time*

magazine noted the grant and Lasky's editorship (20 September, 1954, p.50). For a further discussion of Foundation responses to the Burkhardt study and pressure by Stone to support CCF, see Corcoran, pp. 65-70. Saunders brief account of *Der Monat* and the Ford Foundation, it should be noted, is not accurate (216-17).

26. Ford Foundation PA 55-32 and Ford Foundation Laughlin Oral History, May 22, 1973, p. 51. Also in his oral history interview he believed Burkhardt's study was biased in favor of Stone's position. Stone and Burkhardt were friends dating to postwar work in Europe. For the reversal on arts and humanities funding see W. McNeil Lowry to Gaither, 4 Sept. 1956 in Henry Heald, Office of the President files, Group 22 Box 5, Series 1, Folder 63, Ford Foundation Archives.

27. Ford Foundation Donald Price Oral History, Ford Foundation Annual Reports 1957-1960, and Berghahn, 222-26.

28. Bird, 426-428 and on the 1951 dealings n.76, p. 719.

29. Bird, 428. Price suggests the CCF application was funded and Bird assumes it was though the archives and annual reports indicate it was not.

30. See Ford Foundation Annual Reports 1955-60. For Cold War book publishing, see Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: UP of Kansas, 2006), esp. Ch. 9 "A New 'Magna Carta' of Freedom: The Ideological Campaign," 288-322; see also Greg Barnhisel, "Cold Warriors of the Book: American Book Programs in the 1950's," *Book History*, 13 (2010): 185-217; and see also Greg Barnhisel and Catherine Turner, eds. *Pressing the Fight: Print Propaganda, and the Cold War* (Boston: UP of Massachusetts, 2010). It should be noted that these studies did not include perusal of Ford Foundation archives as part of their scholarly apparatus. For details of People to People and the Ford Foundation, see John E. Juergensmeyer, *The President, the Foundation and the People to People Program* [Inter-University Case Program #84] (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965).

31. Ford Foundation Annual Report 1957, pp. 18-20. On Rockefeller Foundation's support for little magazines, see Schwartz's review of RF archives and its theory of support, *Creating Faulkner's Reputation* Ch. 5 "Forging a Postwar Aesthetic: The Rockefeller Foundation and the New Literary Consensus" pp. 113-141; also see Evan Kindley, "Big Criticism" *Critical Inquiry* 38:1 (Autumn 2011): 71-95 and Jeffrey J. Williams, "The Little Magazine and the Theory Journal: A Response to Evan Kindley's 'Big Criticism'" *Critical Inquiry* 39:2 (Winter 2011): 402-11 and Kindley's response to Williams (412-18). For Laughlin's inquiry about getting the Rockefeller Foundation to take over the magazine subscription program after 1956, see Laughlin to Chadbourne Gilpatrick, an Assistant Director of the Rockefeller Foundation, 3 October 1955, IPI Archives, Box 35, "Rockefeller Foundation" folder.

32. Price to Heald, 1 Oct 1956 (Price Oral History folder).



Since 1997
ISSN 1097-3087
<http://clogic.eserver.org/>

Editors

Rich Gibson
San Diego State University

Martha Gimenez
University of Colorado (retired)

Gregory Meyerson
North Carolina A & T University

James Neilson
North Carolina A & T University

Joe Ramsey
Quincy College

E. Wayne Ross
University of British Columbia

David Siar
Winston-Salem State University

Advisory Group

Robert Albritton, *York University, Canada*
Theodore W. Allen, *Brooklyn Public Library (1919-2005)*
Crystal Bartolovich, *Syracuse University*
Rosalyn Baxandall, *State University of New York, Old Westbury*

Vladimir Bilenkin, *North Carolina State University*
Jamie Owen Daniel, *Director of Organizing and Development, UPI Local 4100, IFT/AFT/AFL-CIO*
Anthony Dawahare, *California State University, Northridge*

Greg Dawes, *North Carolina State University*
Teresa L. Ebert, *State University of New York, Albany*
Barbara Foley, *Rutgers University*
Marcial González, *University of California, Berkeley*
Rosemary Hennessy, *State University of New York, Albany*

Mike Hill, *State University of New York, Albany*
Peter Hitchcock, *Graduate Center-City University of New York*

Amitava Kumar, *Vassar College*
Neil Larsen, *University of California, Davis*
John McClendon, *Michigan State University*
Sophia A. McClennen, *Pennsylvania State University*
Andrew Milner, *Monash University, Melbourne*

Warren Montag, *Occidental College*
Bill V. Mullen, *University of Texas, San Antonio*
Richard Ohmann, *Wesleyan University*
Bertell Ollman, *New York University*
Vijay Prashad, *Trinity College*
Russell Reissing, *University of Toledo*
Modhumita Roy, *Tufts University*
E. San Juan, Jr., *Philippines Cultural Study Center*
Sean Sayers, *University of Kent*
Helena Sheehan, *Dublin City University*
David Slavin, *Westfield State College and Emory University*
Paul Smith, *George Mason University*
Alan Spector, *Purdue University Calumet*
Michael Sprinker, *State University of New York, Stony Brook (1950-1999)*
Carol A. Stabile, *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*
Richard Stahler-Sholk, *Eastern Michigan University*
Kenneth Surin, *Duke University*
Jeffrey Williams, *Carnegie Mellon University*
Richard Wolff, *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*
Michael Yates, *University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown (retired)*

Indexed in: MLA Bibliography, EBSCO Databases, MLA International Directory of Periodicals, International Progressive Publications Network. Digital preservation by LOCKSS at Stanford University.