

TWENTY YEARS
OF UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT
PROGRAMS IN
CULTURAL RELATIONS

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL INTERCHANGE POLICY
1 EAST 67TH STREET — AT FIFTH AVENUE — NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

JANUARY 1959

The Committee on Educational Interchange Policy was established by the Institute of International Education in 1954 in response to a recommendation made by an independent committee which studied the role and functions of the Institute. This group noted the need for a policy committee to survey the field of exchange, and recommended that the Institute create such a body. The Committee has been assigned responsibility for helping to:

1. Clarify the values of exchanges; set standards and provide objectives for exchange activities.
2. Identify problems and difficulties; find solutions.
3. Identify promising programs and bring them to the attention of interested groups.

Although established by the Institute, the Committee's responsibility is to study and report upon the whole area of exchange of persons, and not only those activities to which IIE itself is related. The Committee is served by a small secretariat in the Institute.

DETLEV BRONK

IVAN PUTMAN

HARLAN CLEVELAND

LAUREN K. SOTH

JAMES T. DUCE

PHILLIPS TALBOT

HOWARD E. WILSON

KENNETH HOLLAND (ex-officio)

DONALD J. SHANK, *Secretary*

BARBARA J. WALTON, *Assistant Secretary*

TWENTY YEARS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN CULTURAL RELATIONS

TWENTY YEARS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN CULTURAL RELATIONS

This paper presents the highlights of twenty years of United States government activity in cultural relations¹ with other countries. The reader is referred also to Francis J. Colligan's article *Twenty Years After: Two Decades of Government-Sponsored Cultural Relations*, appearing in the Department of State Bulletin, July 21, 1958. To do full justice to the subject, there is needed a definitive study of the aims of government programs, the assumptions on which they are based, and their relation to private effort. We have attempted here to present some thoughts that might stimulate such a comprehensive work.

* * *

Just twenty years ago the United States government officially undertook to promote cultural relations between the United States and other countries. Prior to 1938, American intellectual, cultural and technical cooperation with other countries was primarily in the hands of private citizens and organizations. Interests of the United States were represented by non-governmental groups. Philanthropic foundations, business firms, religious missions and private societies concerned with particular nations carried out technical, welfare and cul-

¹The term cultural relations, as used throughout this pamphlet, refers to cultural, educational, technical and scientific relations with other countries, with emphasis on exchange of persons. The term educational exchange is used interchangeably. Cultural relations usually includes also the exchange of books, periodicals, films and cultural exhibits, the establishment of overseas libraries and cultural institutes and the support of national schools overseas.

tural activities abroad. Gradually, as the United States became aware of the potential political implications of such activities, it decided to support financially an official cultural relations program. The use of cultural relations by unfriendly nations to create anti-American feeling abroad gave this program urgency. Today the United States government is involved in many types of cultural relations programs, including large-scale information and technical assistance activities, all over the world.

PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES

The major purpose of the cultural relations program is to create better understanding of the United States abroad, and of other countries in the United States, in the hope that this will contribute to international amity. A second major purpose is to promote the exchange of knowledge and ideas between countries. This purpose has taken on new urgency with the accelerated rate of technological progress in many countries of the world. Other objectives of evident importance are to provide educational opportunities for promising students and scholars here and abroad, and to contribute to the general advancement of knowledge.

More indicative of the nature of United States cultural relations than its purposes are the principles which guide it. These principles were recommended in the early years of the program by the cultural groups and private citizens called upon to advise the government. These groups sought to protect U. S. cultural relations from the nationalistic bias apparent in some cultural programs, and to make sure that the U. S. program conformed to the best principles of American democracy. *The principles on which the U. S. government's international cultural relations program is based are: (1) reciprocity in relations with other countries; (2) wide par-*

ticipation by non-governmental groups and private citizens; and (3) objectivity in presenting America to other countries.

The principle of reciprocity means that, to the maximum extent possible, cultural relations between the U. S. and other countries should be beneficial to both. Cultural relations involve a two-way exchange. The culture of one country should not be imposed on another. Ideas and knowledge should flow in both directions. Citizens of both countries should participate as equals. There are many ways in which reciprocity manifests itself in the U. S. cultural relations program. Bi-national organizations carrying out mutually agreeable purposes have been set up and are administered jointly abroad by citizens of the United States and of other countries. Students and scholars flow in both directions. *Exchange, mutual understanding and cooperation on a basis of reciprocity* are stressed in the basic legislation setting up the programs. The concept of technical assistance has become technical *cooperation*.

The principle of wide participation means that, to the maximum extent possible, cultural relations consist of relations between the people and the institutions in the two countries involved. This is the essence of cultural relations.² The United States program emanates not from the government but from many diverse sources. Those who participate are not government employees but individual citizens representing individual points of view. Institutions participating are not government departments, but the authentic cultural institutions of the nation.

Wide participation was a natural development in the

² "For the cultural relationship is essentially that of friendship from people to people, from the citizenry of one country to the citizenry of another, through such channels of mutual acquaintance as make friendship rewarding between individual and individual." McMurry, Ruth Emily, and Lee, Muna, *The Cultural Approach*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947, p. 3.

United States cultural relations program. Experience and knowledge lay with non-governmental institutions. Far-reaching cultural relations activities with other countries had been carried on by private organizations long before the government set up a program in 1938. To tap their knowledge and draw them into the program, Secretary of State Cordell Hull set up a general advisory committee.³ He then called together for a series of conferences more than a thousand American intellectual leaders. They met in Washington in 1939 at their own expense to recommend policies and suggest projects in a wide range of fields. They set up specialized committees to guide the Department of State. Thus were established the first of the advisory bodies which, after the war, became a standard feature of legislation authorizing State Department educational exchange programs.⁴ Today the government assists individuals and private groups active in cultural relations abroad, but having no official connection. It contracts with non-governmental groups to help in the selection and supervision of exchange students and visitors. It carries out educational exchange programs, wherever possible, by "using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity."⁵ The result is a complex interplay of private groups and public agencies in the cultural field.

³ The general advisory committee was made up of such distinguished persons as Stephen Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education; Waldo Leland, President of the American Council of Learned Societies; Carl Milam, President of the American Library Association; James Shorwell, a Director and Trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and George Shuster, Acting President of Hunter College.

⁴ The four major groups advising the State Department on cultural matters today are: the United States National Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the Advisory Committee on the Arts. There is also the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information advising the U.S. Information Agency.

⁵ U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Public Law 402, 80th Congress, January 27, 1948.

Objectivity means that as far as is humanly possible a factual image of America and American policies is presented to the peoples of the world. Every effort is made to separate fact from opinion, in the best tradition of American journalism. While objectivity may never be fully achieved, it exerts a powerful moderating force on United States activities in the cultural relations area. It is recognized as fundamental in the United States information program. It is inherent in the programs planned for exchange visitors. While the Congress has occasionally suggested that foreign visitors see more of America, no one has advocated an official government indoctrination program for them.

American emphasis on objectivity in official cultural and information programs can be traced in part to fear and distrust of propaganda. Between the two world wars, propaganda came to mean self-serving distortions of the truth to most Americans. The Nazis openly adopted the "big lie" technique as an instrument of national policy. Even the British admitted that they had "lied damnably" in foreign communications during World War I.⁶ Many Americans became convinced, and some still are, that any sort of official information program involved a measure of deceit. During World War II, when presenting a positive American point of view to other countries became urgent, resistance to official information activities was to some extent overcome. After the war, however, legislation setting up an official United States information service carefully distinguished between cultural relations and information. Testimony on the floor of the Senate is pertinent:

"But we are also agreed . . . that there must be a distinct set-up, on the one hand, of the so-called informational service, which may conceivably have certain propaganda

⁶ McMurry and Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

implications and may even become involved politically; and on the other hand, we must set apart by itself the so-called educational exchange service, which if it is to be truly effective, must be objective, non-political, and above all, have no possible propaganda implications."⁷

The principles on which the U. S. cultural relations program is founded are periodically put to the test. Like all principles, they are subject to misinterpretation, unimaginative thinking and the stress of national emergencies. During the Korean War, political detachment was dropped in favor of strengthening resistance to communism.⁸ During the McCarthy era, the State Department reported gloomily that "our legislative history does not encourage us to hope for Government funds to foster an appreciation of other cultures in this country".⁹ In recent months, reciprocity in cultural relations with the Soviet Union seems to have become a means of preventing either side from gaining a competitive advantage.¹⁰ Finally, wide participation by non-governmental agencies has produced strain on both sides. The Department of State has

⁷ Senator H. Alexander Smith, Congressional Record, January 16, 1948, pp. 260-261.

⁸ "Originally conceived as an instrument for achieving understanding of the United States among other nations, the program's objectives have sharpened so that it is now dedicated to the following three objectives:

(a) Keeping alive the spirit of cooperation among the free nations of the world for the purpose of self-protection and progress for all;

(b) Strengthening resistance to communism in countries immediately threatened with infiltration or aggression;

(c) Weakening the forces of communism and diminishing its power in areas now under the domination of the U.S.S.R." U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, *Seventh Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities*, July 1-December 31, 1951, p. 4.

⁹ U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, *Tenth Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities*, January 1-June 30, 1953, p. 18.

¹⁰ Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, *Academic Exchanges with the Soviet Union*, October 1958, p. 11.

on occasion asked, "How can the responsibility of the Department to achieve certain objectives with the educational exchange program be properly discharged when control over the administration and operation rests elsewhere?"¹¹ Colleges and universities have, on the other hand, suggested that governmental control over the operations of cooperating agencies is too strict.¹² There is needed a periodic reaffirmation of basic principles, and a continuous effort to understand them and make them work.

These then are the basic principles which guide the United States cultural relations program. They derive from American traditions, from the nature of basic American institutions and from the American democratic heritage. They present our national culture, not as interpreted by or through an official body, but through cultural institutions and the people who created them. They help to make sure the process of communication is two-way, an interchange of knowledge and ideas among equals. They help to present a "full and fair" picture of America abroad. They may never be fully applied in all programs, but they represent a goal worth striving for.

PAST AND PRESENT PROGRAMS

Official participation by the United States government in cultural cooperation with other countries began with the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations of 1936, ratified by Congress in 1937. Prior to that date

¹¹ U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, *Tenth Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities*, January 1-June 30, 1953, p. 21.

¹² "Once a contract is established, full professional technical responsibility and authority for its operation should rest with the contracting university. The role of Government is properly that of assuring conformance with broad public policy, not direction of the operations of a technical mission. Both parties should carry the responsibility for continuing communication and consultation." American Council on Education, *University Projects Abroad*, Papers Presented at the Conference on University Contracts Abroad, Michigan State University, November 17-18, 1955, p. 21.

cultural and scientific exchanges by government departments were significant historically but small in number. The Smithsonian Institution set up an International Exchange Service as early as 1849, which exchanged official documents with other countries and deposited foreign documents in the Library of Congress. The National Bureau of Standards was authorized in 1892 to receive qualified foreign scientists and technicians as guest workers. The State Department in 1908 created the Boxer Indemnity Fund, which utilized reparations, paid to the United States government by the Chinese government, to finance study in the United States by Chinese students. These activities were carried on without an overall government policy concerning cultural relations, and without central coordination.

CULTURAL RELATIONS DIVISION

In 1938 the Department of State set up a Cultural Relations Division to work out an integrated program for developing United States cultural ties with other countries. Shortly before this the heads of key departments had been called together by President Roosevelt to form what became known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation (See page 18). The Division and the Committee worked together, concentrating at first on Latin America, where aggressive German and Italian cultural activities were adversely affecting United States interests. The Division's purpose was to encourage greater appreciation in the United States and Latin America of each other's values and achievements. The keynote was "intellectual cooperation", as contrasted with the later emphasis on "mutual understanding". With Dr. Ben Mark Cherrington¹⁸ as its first head, the Divi-

¹⁸ Dr. Cherrington was Chief of the Cultural Relations Division from 1938 to 1940. He was Director of the Social Science Research Foundation, University of Denver, from 1926 to 1951, and Chancellor of the University from 1943-1946. He has been Director of the Denver Office of the Institute of International Education since 1951.

sion carried out a wide range of activities, many of which also saw the beginnings of programs in the Near East and became separate programs administered by separate organizations in later years. The Division was charged with:

"the exchange of professors, teachers, and students; cooperation in the field of music, art, literature and other intellectual and cultural attainments; the formulation and distribution of libraries of representative works of the United States and suitable translations thereof; the participation by this government in international radio broadcasts; encouragement of this and of closer relationship between unofficial organizations of this and of foreign Governments engaged in cultural and intellectual activities; and, generally, the dissemination abroad of the representative intellectual and cultural works of the United States and the improvement and broadening of the scope of our cultural relations with other countries."¹⁴

Exchange of persons was a major activity. The Division administered grants for students and professors as provided for in the Inter-American Cultural Convention. It stimulated United States colleges and universities to offer scholarships to Latin American students. Together with the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, (CIAA) it provided additional financial assistance where necessary. In the period from 1940-1943 alone, some 500 Latin American students were aided.¹⁵ With CIAA, it arranged exchanges of professors, leaders, technicians and trainees in significant numbers. The 1940-1943 period also saw the beginnings of programs in the Near East and the Far East, financed from an emergency fund of the Pres-

¹⁴ State Department Departmental Order No. 367, July 27, 1938.

¹⁵ Hanson, Haldore, *The Cultural Cooperation Program 1938-1943*, U.S. Department of State Publication 2137, 1944, p. 11.

ident, which laid the foundation for subsequent activity in those areas.

COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs¹⁶ (CIAA) was established in 1940 with Nelson Rockefeller as its chief. The functions of CIAA were not clearly differentiated at first from the functions of the Cultural Relations Division. In addition to its economic activities CIAA was charged with:

"the formulation and the execution of a program in cooperation with the State Department which, by effective use of Governmental and private facilities in such fields as the arts and sciences, education and travel, the radio, the press, and the cinema will further national defense and strengthen the bonds between the nations of the Western Hemisphere."¹⁷

CIAA took over, and then gradually relinquished, many of the cultural activities of the State Department in Latin America. It provided funds to carry out projects recommended by the advisory groups cooperating with the Cultural Relations Division and the Interdepartmental Committee. It was involved in the exchange of students, professors and specialists in a wide variety of fields, and in the establishment and support of bi-national institutes where cultural events were held and English language instruction was offered. By agreement with the State Department, however, it narrowed its activities in 1943 to projects in the area of elementary, secondary and adult education, especially those of an emergency nature. Long-range and permanent projects, including student exchange,

¹⁶ Until July 1941 it was called the Office for the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics.

¹⁷ Executive Order, August 16, 1940.

libraries and bi-national institutes were assigned to the Cultural Relations Division. When the war ended, CIAA was terminated and most of its remaining activities, including its information functions, were turned over to the State Department.

The history of CIAA provides an early example of difficulties encountered in attempting to combine activities having widely different objectives. Although CIAA was set up to meet emergency wartime needs in the economic, cultural and information spheres, it was also charged with long-term activities aimed at "strengthening bonds" between nations. This meant that unilateral information activities such as short-wave broadcasting to counteract hostile Axis propaganda, were combined with long-term reciprocal activities such as exchange of persons. It also meant that CIAA programs cut directly across those of the Cultural Relations Division. The inevitable result was a confusion of both basic principles and lines of administrative authority.

THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

The wartime emergency gave rise to an agency whose primary function was the dissemination of information. The Office of War Information (OWI) was established in 1942 to "assure an accurate and consistent flow of war information to the public and to the world at large",¹⁸ using modern techniques of mass communication. Except for the Western Hemisphere, where information remained the responsibility of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the OWI consolidated all the information functions of federal agencies in one office. It also engaged in certain activities in the cultural field. The libraries which OWI established abroad are a prominent feature of U. S. cultural relations today. When the war came to

¹⁸ Executive Order, June 13, 1942.

an end, the OWI, like the CIAA, was terminated. Functions and some personnel of both agencies were taken over by the Department of State, which combined them with the Cultural Relations Division and set up an Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.¹⁹

UNESCO

Immediately after the war the United States government re-affirmed its cultural ties with other countries by joining the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). This step was fully supported by the many private citizens and cultural groups in the United States which had participated in drawing up the UNESCO Charter. The Charter stresses the principle that people as well as governments should be involved in cultural relations. It provides that each member country shall set up a national commission of citizens representing both public and private interests to advise the government and maintain liaison with non-governmental organizations in each country. Such a commission, to consist of not more than 100 members, was established in the United States in 1946, with a secretariat in the Department of State.²⁰

The United States government participates in other multi-lateral cultural relations activities. These include programs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and regional programs established by the Organization of American States (OAS), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). Bilateral programs are preferred by the United States, however. Congress reduced the U. S. contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program from 60% of the total budget

¹⁹ Executive Order, August 31, 1945.

²⁰ Public Law 565, 79th Congress, July 30, 1946.

in 1952 to 49% in 1957, and has stipulated that by 1960 the U. S. share shall not exceed one third. Multi-lateral cultural relations activities of the United States government will not be discussed in detail in this report.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE

For a number of years after the war exchange of persons and related cultural activities of the State Department were dominated by its much larger information activities. The Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC) stressed "promotion among foreign peoples of better understanding of the aims, policies and institutions of the United States"²¹. Understanding on a reciprocal basis was secondary. Gradually, however, the concept of reciprocal cultural relations re-asserted itself. An Office of Educational Exchange was set up in 1948, and in 1952 became the International Educational Exchange Service (IES) as it is known today. IES administers the major exchange of persons programs established by legislation, as well as a number of smaller exchange programs for specific countries. It also houses the secretariats of the four major groups advising the government on cultural relations. (Listed on page 4.)

Fulbright Program. In 1946 cultural relations was given new impetus by imaginative action on the part of Senator J. William Fulbright and the Congress. In that year the Senator from Arkansas sponsored the now-famous Fulbright bill, instituting a fellowship program which has made the word "Fulbright" synonymous with an exchange fellowship. The act provided that funds derived from the sale of surplus United States war property abroad might be used by mutual agreement with other countries, to "finance studies, research, instruction

²¹ Department of State Regulation, OIC, December 31, 1945.

and other educational activities . . . ”²² on the part of both U. S. and foreign citizens. Interestingly enough, the act itself set forth no objective other than to dispose of surplus property, apparently on the assumption that the purpose of educational exchange was self-evident.

The Fulbright program provides full fellowships for Americans, and travel grants for nationals of other countries. It is unique among government programs in the number of fellowship opportunities it provides for Americans. Without this program, the post-war ratio of American students abroad to foreign students in the United States might be even smaller than it is. (The present ratio is about four to one in favor of the foreign student.) The act does not authorize expenditure of United States currency. Only those countries can participate which have acquired foreign currency through sale of surplus property. Subsequent legislation has provided new sources of foreign currency, permitting the program to continue and be extended to additional countries. The total number of countries participating in 1958 was 39, as compared with two in 1947.²³ The Fulbright program is supervised by a ten-member Board of Foreign Scholarships, representing both governmental and non-governmental agencies.

Smith-Mundt Program. A second act of major significance was the Smith-Mundt Act,²⁴ which gave the Department of State authority to set up both a cultural relations and an information program on a global basis. It permitted exchange of persons at all levels, and provided certain funds. Passed in 1948, after two years of discussion and amendment, the ob-

²² Amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Public Law 584, 79th Congress, August 1, 1946.

²³ *IIE News Bulletin*, March 1958, p. 2.

²⁴ U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Public Law 402, 80th Congress, January 27, 1948.

jectives of the act were “to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries”.²⁵ It provided for two distinct services: “an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States . . .” and “an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills . . .” It provided also for two advisory commissions, the Advisory Commission on Information and the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, each to consist of five members drawn from appropriate fields. They were expected to “formulate and recommend . . . policies and programs.” Finally, the act stipulated that the Department of State should make use wherever possible of “reputable private agencies” in carrying out the educational exchange program.

One result of the Smith-Mundt Act was that, for the first time since the war, educational exchange was recognized, on paper at least, as a separate activity, on an equal footing with dissemination of information. Not until 1953, however, when the United States Information Agency (USIA) was set up as an autonomous agency while IES was left in the State Department, was substantial administrative separation achieved. The two operations are still not separate abroad. In most countries USIA officers administer the educational exchange program for the State Department.

Countries eligible to participate in the Smith-Mundt program, and the number of awards, are determined each year by the State Department. The choice of countries and the number of awards depend on local needs as seen from abroad and political priorities as seen from Washington. Favorable

²⁵ *Ibid.*

consideration is given to candidates who are undertaking projects of importance to their home country. Some 4000 foreign visitors are currently assisted in coming to the United States each year, and 2000 Americans are enabled to go abroad under all IES programs. In the selection and supervision of IES grantees, the Department uses a complex of organizations and procedures. It relies heavily on both private and public agencies in the United States, and on bi-national organizations and USIA officers abroad. The major private agencies participating in the United States are the Institute of International Education for students, the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils for professors and scholars, and the American Council on Education, the Governmental Affairs Institute and regional offices of the Institute of International Education for foreign leaders and specialists.

*Occupied Areas Program.*²⁶ IES now administers educational exchange programs in the countries formerly occupied by the U. S. Army. As part of its "reorientation" program for Germany, Austria, Japan and the Ryukyu Islands, the Army began in 1947 to bring nationals of these countries to the United States and to send American specialists there. The objective was to "give the peoples of the occupied country a deeper appreciation of democracy and its function, so that they will be imbued with the desire to form their own democratic, representative and peace-minded organizations."²⁷ University students, scholars and national leaders were brought to the United States. Assistance from universities and private groups was actively solicited, especially during the first few years when

²⁶ "Government and Relief in Occupied Areas", Public Law 793, Chapter 685, 80th Congress, June 28, 1948.

²⁷ *The Army's Educational Exchange Program*, Reorientation Branch, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of the Army, May 1950, p. 2.

neither the State Department nor the Army had funds of its own for this purpose. By the end of 1952, over 6,000 Germans had visited the United States under this program. Beginning about 1950, when the occupied countries began to assume control of their own affairs, exchange programs in those areas were gradually transferred to the State Department. The transition from reorientation to mutual understanding was a remarkably smooth one, in large part because the principles and practices followed in the Army program were similar to those followed in other exchange programs. The Army still administers a small educational exchange program in the Ryukyu Islands.

Cultural Presentations. The State Department administers a fund for the presentation of American cultural attractions abroad. Before the war the Department and CIAA had been active in the arts, exchanging musicians, ballet dancers and art works with Latin America. After the war less attention was paid to the arts. Not until 1954 was a small "cultural presentations" program established in the Department of State, supported initially by the President's emergency fund and after 1956 by Congressional appropriation. Its purpose was "to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the cultural interest, developments and achievements of the people of the United States".²⁸ Congress established an Advisory Committee on the Arts, consisting of ten members, to advise both the Department of State and the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

The 1959 allocation for cultural presentations is \$2,415,000.²⁹ Funds can be used only to supplement private financial

²⁸ "International Cultural Exchanges and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956", Public Law 860, 84th Congress, August 1, 1956.

²⁹ New York Times, December 8, 1958, p. 28.

support and income received for commercial performances overseas. The American National Theatre and Academy, under contract with the State Department, administers the program. Over a hundred attractions, including some of the best of American theatre and music, have been sent to 89 countries in the past four years. To date the cultural presentations program operates only in one direction, the sending of Americans abroad. A precedent for two-way government-sponsored exchanges has been set, however, by the recent cultural agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, which provides for an exchange of artists and performances in both directions.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. Described by Arnold Toynbee as the greatest single idea in foreign policy to emerge from the twentieth century,³⁰ technical assistance as a United States government activity started in 1938. Just prior to the establishment of the Cultural Relations Division, President Roosevelt created what came to be known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation,³¹ under the chairmanship of Sumner Welles. The function of the Committee was to determine what knowledge and skills each executive department had that could be made available to Latin American governments. A list of some 85 projects was drawn up, many of which seem familiar today. They included assistance to foreign countries in taking a census of populations, carrying out

³⁰ Letter to Committee on Educational Interchange Policy from Arnold Toynbee, dated December 12, 1958.

³¹ Until 1944 the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation was known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation with the Other American Republics. It existed until 1950, when it was dissolved.

coast and geodetic surveys and expanding agricultural production. The Interdepartmental Committee hoped that these projects would be privately financed, since government funds were limited. In fact, however, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs provided funds for these and other technical assistance projects, establishing bi-national *servicios* which have set the pattern for administration of United States technical assistance ever since.

Marshall Plan and Point IV. After the war technical assistance achieved worldwide prominence when Secretary of State George C. Marshall set forth a plan for the economic recovery of Europe. He proposed that United States capital and technical skills be put at the disposal of war-torn countries in an effort to "revive a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."³² President Truman, in Point IV of his 1949 inaugural address, extended the technical assistance concept to other parts of the world, stressing the sharing of technical know-how rather than the export of American capital or credits. "Our aim", he said, "should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."³³ A desire to increase the capacity of free nations to resist Communist influence gave urgency to these economic and humanitarian objectives.

International Cooperation Administration. The technical assistance program is now administered by the International Cooperation Administration, a semi-autonomous agency within

³² Speech by George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, at Harvard University, June 5, 1947.

³³ Inaugural Address by President Truman, January 20, 1949.

the Department of State. Until 1953 it was administered by the Department of State.³⁴ Its purpose is to share American techniques and know-how with other countries by providing American experts to advise governments on economic and social problems, and by training foreign nationals in this country. It is thus basically an exchange-of-persons program. Supplies and equipment are provided only where needed for demonstration purposes. Self-help is a basic principle. The financial contribution of a foreign government generally equals or exceeds that of the U. S. government. Joint operation and financing of local projects in cooperation with the local government is the usual arrangement.

ICA now brings approximately 5,000 foreign nationals related to ICA projects abroad to the United States for training each year. It sends almost the same number of American technicians abroad. (See Appendix Table A, page 29). ICA also sends some 1,700 project participants to countries other than the United States.³⁵ The training of ICA participants is related to the jobs they are expected to fill when they return home. A large proportion visit industrial installations or receive in-service training with government agencies and private firms. Almost half, however, spend a full semester or longer at edu-

³⁴ There have been two main lines of administrative development since 1947. A succession of semi-autonomous agencies (the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, the Foreign Operations Administration and the International Cooperation Administration) administered the programs of economic aid and mutual defense which started with the Marshall Plan. The State Department, until 1953, administered President Truman's Point IV or technical assistance program through the Technical Cooperation Administration. Since that date both technical assistance and foreign aid have been administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

³⁵ *Participant Training Operations*, Statistical Report and Analysis, June 30, 1958, Training Development Staff, International Cooperation Administration, p. 21.

cational institutions.³⁶ ICA is putting increasing emphasis on university study to lay a firm foundation for specialized training. It has recently increased the length of stay in the United States for some participants, and is permitting an increasing number to take degrees. ICA programs are therefore becoming more like the traditional educational programs of IES. This is causing concern on some campuses since ICA does not use the non-governmental placement machinery established by IES.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The United States Information Agency (USIA) was established in 1953 as an agency separate from the State Department.³⁷ The task set for USIA by President Eisenhower was "to submit evidence to peoples of other nations . . . that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress and peace."³⁸ It operates in foreign countries only. USIA carries out its objectives in large part through mass media of communication, exemplified by the Voice of America. It also sponsors libraries, information centers and binational institutes and is involved in educational exchange. It arranges programs abroad for visiting American artists and lecturers, brings some 65 local USIA employees to the United States each year,³⁹ and keeps in touch with returned exchange students. It is directly involved in the Smith-Mundt program, administering this program abroad under contract with the State Department. It sponsored a "people-to-people" conference in 1956 to encourage private citizens in the arts and

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

³⁷ Reorganization Plan Number 8, Department of State, July 1, 1953.

³⁸ U.S. Information Agency, 8th Review of Operations, January 1-June 30, 1957, p. 2.

³⁹ Letter to Committee on Educational Interchange Policy from USIA dated December 5, 1958.

professions, and representatives of voluntary organizations to establish contact with private citizens and groups abroad having similar interests. In general, the cultural relations activities of USIA, like those of IES, stress "long-term efforts to build better inter-relationships with other peoples."⁴⁰

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Department of Defense is currently engaged in a type of exchange activity which has many of the attributes of an educational exchange program. Under the Military Assistance Training Program it brings an estimated 20,000 men from allied countries to the United States annually for training at some 60 bases in the United States, at a cost of approximately \$50,000,000 a year.⁴¹ While much of this training is geared toward specific military skills and techniques, some of it consists of education in a broader sense. In addition, these men are acquiring first-hand knowledge of America and Americans through the efforts of public information officials at military bases, and of community and business groups such as the Junior Chambers of Commerce.

OTHER AGENCIES

Many other government agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Public Health Service and the Office of Education participate in the cultural relations program. Most do not originate programs. They facilitate the interchange of knowledge and skills in fields where they have special competence. They provide training facilities. They cooperate with the Department of State and ICA. They assist foreign visitors sponsored by the United Nations and its member agencies, by the Organization of Amer-

⁴⁰ USIA, *Tenth Semiannual Report*, January 1-June 30, 1958, inside cover.

⁴¹ Letter to Committee on Educational Interchange Policy from the Department of Defense dated December 8, 1958.

ican States and by the visitor's own government. They also assist visitors who come at their own expense.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND VOLUME OF EXCHANGE OF PERSONS ACTIVITY

The State Department's cultural relations program has always been characterized by a small budget compared with the information and technical assistance programs. The IES appropriation today is about 20 million dollars as compared with roughly 100 million for USIA and 150 million for technical assistance. (See Appendix Table B, page 30.) About a sixth of the technical assistance appropriation is spent on the ICA participant training program;⁴² information on the amount spent to send Americans abroad is not available. In volume, the number of persons exchanged under the technical assistance program is not quite twice that under the IES program. (Table B.) The volume of ICA exchange activity is increasing more rapidly than that of IES. In both programs the number of Americans participating is increasing more rapidly than the number of foreign nationals.

CONCLUSIONS

Certain conclusions can be drawn from the record of the past twenty years. First, *U. S. government activity in international cultural relations is based on sound principles: objectivity, reciprocity and wide participation by private citizens.* It has been most successful where these principles were most faithfully followed.

Objectivity is the most difficult to achieve. Considering the tensions of the cold war, it is remarkable that the U. S. cultural relations program has stood the test so well. Cultural relations cannot be totally detached from a world of contro-

⁴² *Participant Training Operations*, Statistical Report and Analysis, June 30, 1958, Training Development Staff, International Cooperation Administration, p. 5.

versy. Cultural programs can, however, embody on the international scene concepts which guide enlightened thought at home. They can separate fact from opinion. They can present a "full and fair" picture of America. They can emphasize informing people rather than winning adherents. In the end this will be far more convincing to friend and foe alike than any form of propaganda.

The principle of reciprocity has achieved growing recognition as governmental activity has grown. The number of Americans going abroad under government programs is increasing. The one-way street which cast Americans in the role of teachers both here and abroad is giving way to a realization that Americans have much to learn. Congress has recently provided funds for modern foreign language instruction and related instruction necessary to a full understanding of the countries involved.⁴³ There is more to be done, however, to make official U. S. cultural relations truly reciprocal. American respect for other people's culture and way of life should be reflected in everything we do. A perceptive comment by Robert A. Perry is worth quoting:

"Emma Lazarus called to the ancient countries to send us their tired, their poor, their huddled masses. We are now calling to them to send us their brilliant, their gifted, their upper classes. We have come a long way in a few generations, but let us not forget that we are still parvenue among the nations of the world. A lot of people knew us before we had money and moved uptown. And a lot of people think that money is all we have; money and a few good bombs. Perhaps they are right. I hope not. In any case, they are sending us their intelligent young students who will find out for themselves what we are and

⁴³ National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Law 85-864, 85th Congress, September 2, 1958.

what we stand for. I think we have much to give them. But the first thing we must give them, the one requisite without which all other things are meaningless, is respect. They are human beings, God's supreme creation, and they deserve it."⁴⁴

Wide participation by non-governmental groups in official cultural relations can be further strengthened. A prime test of government success in cultural relations is whether it has stimulated private initiative. Non-governmental groups are the foundation on which American cultural relations with other countries rest. Any handicap the government may feel it suffers as a result of its inability to control every aspect of cultural relations is more than compensated for by the authenticity, spontaneity and diversity of the program. It is the responsibility of non-governmental groups interested in culture and education to retain the initiative in this respect. They must suggest ideas. They must make sure they are not dominated or eclipsed by government. Where they join with the government in a joint effort, they must know where to assert themselves; it is the function of advisory committees to advise, of administrative agencies to administer and professional organizations to use their professional knowledge. The wide participation of non-governmental groups of all kinds gives cultural relations a vitality that it could not achieve by any other means.

A second conclusion is that *government cultural relations programs have had important results in the United States and abroad*. They have done much to help people in other countries understand America, and to help Americans understand other countries. This is evident from the testimony and the actions of those who have participated in educational exchange

⁴⁴ Perry, Robert A., "People are Human", *International House Quarterly*, Spring 1956.

programs.⁴⁵ Contact with other peoples and cultures taught them many things they had not previously understood about foreign countries, and often about their own country. Every increment of insight and understanding is a net gain. A word of caution is in order, however. Understanding and liking are not the same thing. Understanding means an increased comprehension of how and why other people behave as they do. Greater comprehension frequently leads to balanced appreciation. Appreciation may not be expressed in predictable ways. Votes in foreign parliaments or in the United Nations, even by those who "understand" the United States, are influenced by many factors. Only where understanding is given a favorable climate in which to grow, can we expect to see its fruits in improved international relationships.

While cultural relations programs can be said to "support the foreign policy of the United States",⁴⁶ they do so indirectly and over a long period. The use of a cultural program to carry out day-to-day foreign policy defeats its major purpose. "International exchange in the realm of culture should be carried on because of its intrinsic value to man; it should never be exploited as an instrument of national policy designed to serve some irrelevant purpose of state."⁴⁷ Exchange helps to establish a community of interest apart from current problems in diplomatic relations. It is not a panacea for the ills of the world. Even at its best, it cannot save the world from tyranny. Its value to foreign policy lies in long-term, constructive con-

⁴⁵ See for example: Scott, Franklin D., *The American Experience of Swedish Students*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957; and Useem, J. and Ruth H., *The Western Educated Man in India*. New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

⁴⁶ Colligan, Francis J., "Twenty Years After: Two Decades of Government-Sponsored Cultural Relations", *Department of State Bulletin*, July 21, 1958.

⁴⁷ Cherrington, Ben Mark, "America's Future Cultural Relations", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, September 1944, p. 77.

tributions to international relations, which tend to be neglected under the pressure of daily business.

The United States cultural relations program has assisted other countries in the development of their human and natural resources. It has provided educational opportunities which have enabled young men and women to make full use of their capacities, and to participate in their country's quest for progress. It fostered the concept of technical assistance, which has proved a timely and inspiring answer to a basic need of our times. If the result of government participation in cultural relations was limited to stimulating education and sharing knowledge alone, it would be well worth while.

Finally, *the United States cultural relations program is still growing and evolving*. It has shown a steady increase in size and scope over the past twenty years, and will probably continue to grow for some time to come. Some cultural relations activities have expanded until they required separate administrations to handle them. New activities sometimes threaten to submerge the old ones. This trend can be expected to continue in the future.

Emphasis on immediate "country needs", typical of technical assistance, is assuming growing importance in all types of educational exchange. Students under the IES program are increasingly selected for study in the United States because they are associated with an on-going project of value to their home country. American and foreign scholars are chosen on the basis of their contribution to a particular institution abroad. In the technical assistance program, emphasis on long-term educational needs is becoming increasingly evident. Thus educational exchange and technical assistance are finding common ground in their methods and objectives.

The arts and culture are receiving increasing emphasis. The small but flourishing cultural presentations program, no

longer in the experimental stage, is one indication of this. Growing USIA involvement in cultural activities is another. The appointment of a new assistant for cultural affairs in the State Department, and the authorization by Congress of a national cultural center in Washington, are still others. America's growing maturity in the arts, and the importance of international communication unhindered by the barrier of language, will undoubtedly make this an expanding area for the future.

The U. S. government program of cultural and educational exchange has made its influence felt in America and throughout the world. It has increased understanding of the United States abroad and of foreign countries in the United States. It has contributed to the social and economic development of many countries. Most important, through education, it has changed the lives and outlook of thousands of individuals who have participated in educational exchanges. It has done this by adhering to principles consistent with American traditions and beliefs. It is a credit to the foresight and statesmanship of the nation that the government has associated itself with this type of cultural relations program.

APPENDIX

Table A

VOLUME OF EXCHANGE OF PERSONS ACTIVITY

Fiscal Year	Department of State: International Educational Exchange Service ¹			International Cooperation Administration: Technical Assistance		
	Total Grants	Grants to Americans	Grants to Foreign Nationals	Total	U.S. Technicians Overseas ²	Participant Arrivals In the U.S. ³
1950	5,584	1,249	4,335	*	*	1,710
1951	7,819	1,528	6,291	*	*	3,265
1952	7,235	1,621	5,614	*	*	5,886
1953	7,121	1,808	5,313	6,430	1,837	4,603
1954	5,820	1,938	3,882	5,950	1,971	3,990
1955	5,994	1,925	4,069	8,175	3,228	4,947
1956	5,770	1,970	3,800	8,698	3,964	4,734
1957	5,952	1,806	4,146	9,798	4,494	5,304
1958	*	*	*	10,306	5,020	5,305

* Information not available.

¹ Source: International Educational Exchange Program 7th-19th Semiannual Reports to Congress, 1952-1958.

² Source: 1950-1952, figures not available; 1953-1954, Office of Statistics and Reports, International Cooperation Administration; Trend of Personnel Strength Statement as of November 30, 1958, page 112.

³ Source: Participant Training Operations, Statistical Report and Analysis, July-September 1958, Training Development Staff, International Cooperation Administration, p. 14. Figures are exclusive of university contract participants.

Table B

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS

	State Department: Educational Exchange ¹ (Including foreign currency)	ICA and Predecessor Agencies: Technical Assistance ²	United States Information Agency and Predecessor Agencies ³
1951	25,983,116	34,500,000	182,263,307 ⁴
1952	23,761,486	159,300,000	150,460,716
1953	23,265,497	155,600,000	122,742,378
1954	19,774,110	119,000,000	83,417,000 ⁵
1955	20,241,351	117,000,000	77,299,000 ⁵
1956	18,863,038	153,000,000	87,336,630
1957	21,424,712	152,000,000	113,000,000
1958	20,800,000	142,000,000	96,200,000 ⁴

¹ Source: 1951-1956, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange 17th Semiannual Report, May 1957, p. 4; 1957, International Educational Exchange Program 19th Semiannual Report to Congress, August 1958, p. 59; 1958, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange 19th Semiannual Report, January 1958, p. 2.

² Source: 1951-1954, Calderwood, James D. and DeRycke, Laurence, *A Door to the Present*. New York: International Development Placement Association, Inc. 1954, p. 24; 1955, Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program for the Six Months Ended December 31, 1954, p. 2; 1956-1957, Mutual Security Program, Summary Presentation, June 1957, p. 32; 1958, Mutual Security Program, Summary Presentation, February 1958, p. 45.

³ Source: U.S. Information Agency Comparative Table of Estimates and Appropriations Reflecting on a Comparable Basis, Activities in Prior Years now included in USIA as a Result of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, Fiscal Years 1947-1958, unpublished. Figures include supplemental appropriations.

⁴ Includes funds for construction of new radio facilities.

⁵ Excludes funds transferred from Foreign Operations Administration.

Other statements in this series by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy:

The Goals of Student Exchange. January 1955.

Geographic Distribution in Exchange Programs. January 1956.

Chinese Students in the United States, 1948-55. March 1956.

Orientation of Foreign Students. June 1956.

Expanding University Enrollments and the Foreign Student. February 1957.

Hungarian Refugee Students and United States Colleges and Universities. March 1957.

United States Medical Training for Foreign Students and Physicians. July 1957.

The Foreign Student: Exchangee or Immigrant? May 1958.

Hungarian Refugee Students and U. S. Colleges and Universities: One Year Later. June 1958.

Academic Exchanges With the Soviet Union. October 1958.

Copies are available free of charge through the Publications Division, Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21, New York.