

## America's Giant Foundations and Cultural Relations with Europe during the Cold War

Hrustan Šišić, PhD<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

Analyzing archival documents of the Rockefeller and Ford foundations, the US government, as well as the CIA archive and other relevant materials, this study seeks to analyze the work of major philanthropic foundations on the international scene during the Cold War. In this respect, this study seeks to show the significance of American foundations for the cultural relations of the United States with Europe during the turbulent years of the Cold War. Also, this study touches on the sensitive issue of the connection between the American establishment and primarily the CIA with the giant Rockefeller and Ford foundations regarding the American approach to Eastern Europe.

*Keywords:* Cold War, Foundations, United States, Europe

### 1. Definition and significance

Philanthropic foundations and the non-governmental sector have largely been pushed aside in studies on American foreign relations despite the fact that the private sector has played a significant role in both American domestic and foreign politics since its founding. Many people have relied predominantly on the non-governmental, non-profit sector to fund education, social welfare, and health care. For example, the federal government used a private corporation to provide health services to the Union Army during the Civil War (George M Frederickson, 1968). In recent times, foundations have played a more significant role in the lives of ordinary citizens than various American public institutions (the federal government, independent states, religious organizations, etc.) in many fields and occasions: influence on higher education before 1960s, the evaluation of college applicants, education for African Americans in segregated South, establishing the teaching hospital-medical school complex in 1920s and 1930s, creating the institutions of nonsectarian private social welfare between 1905 and 1930 (Hammack, 1999). In this way, by the early 20th century, emerging philanthropic foundations re-emphasized the significance of the private sector in American public life, because foundations, due to their enormous financial capacity, were able to influence many aspects of public life, including state market organization, education trends and methods, and various civic activities.

When it comes to American foundations, the literature lists four different categories of foundations: a) Independent foundations, that is, organizations generally endowed by private individuals or families that primarily engage in grant making; b) Company sponsored foundations, which are similar to independent foundations but established by proprietary businesses; c) Operating foundations, that is, foundations that primarily operate their own programs or projects but may also provide funds to other organizations; d) Community foundations, which are grant making entities that receive their funds and endowments from a variety of sources (Anheier & Stefan Toepler, 1999).

Foundations were certainly not an American invention primarily because of the rich history of other civilizations, but the way in which they were utilized on the domestic and then on the international scene is simply unique. Because of their investment and commitment to knowledge and science, American philanthropic foundations have succeeded to have a significant role in the modernization processes of different societies.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, Department of International Relations and European Studies  
International Burch University, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
E-mail: [hrustan.sisic@ibu.edu.ba](mailto:hrustan.sisic@ibu.edu.ba)  
Tel: +38762751975

In studying foundations today, one needs to be careful not to overestimate the economic power of these foundations compared to government spending, as noted by the authors Anheier & Toepler arguing that 'although the overall scale of foundation assets seems quite large, it pales in comparison to assets of other institutions in American society' (Anheier & Toepler, 1999). Indeed, this was not the case during the history of the 20th century and particularly the period of the beginning of the Cold War when the financial resources and all additional capacities of the foundations played a very substantial role for the American government.

One of the important approaches that foundations used in their operational activities was the tendency to shape public opinion in the United States and abroad, through the support of certain studies that highlighted the problems or benefits of certain policies. Thus the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation, through the influence of public opinion at the level of the American elite, played a crucial role in promoting the internationalist tendencies of the United States during the 1920s and 1930s (Wertheim, 2020). The two giant foundations sent millions of dollars to the League of Nations and its work in the fields of health, economy, finance, and intellectual cooperation (Stephen Wertheim, 2020). Their money also supported the establishment of the three largest foreign relations institutes in the United States: the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Institute of Pacific Relations (Wertheim, 2020).

Philanthropic foundations have supported and promoted liberal American values worldwide, emphasizing the importance of the rule of law, freedom of speech and opinion, and tolerance as a condition for the progress of human society. To make such progress, foundations have invested vast resources in knowledge – as the most effective tool, establishing educational institutions, financially assisting existing institutions, awarding grants, and providing scholarships to many intellectuals to study in the United States. Believing in the superiority of American values over other ideologies in the world, especially communism, these foundations supported the view that scholarship programs, among other efforts, significantly contributed to the spread of American influence across the globe because foundation fellows often occupied important positions in societies. An intellectual with a pro-Western mindset was able to spread ideas to hundreds if not thousands of students.

Historical analysis focused on archival and document-based research is crucial for understanding the power politics during the Cold War since any attempt to study international conflict, environmental politics, international organizations, or human rights requires us at some level to engage with documents (Lamont, 2021). This research relies on primary source documents i.e. official documents released by the US philanthropic organizations Ford and Rockefeller (some of the documents directly accessed by author in person, not available online), archival documents of the State Department, as well as the CIA archive. Primary document-based research requires a researcher to invest time in discovering where to look for documents that may be relevant to the research (Lamont, 2021).

Researchers dealing with historical case studies must find a way of assessing the evidentiary value of archival materials that were generated during the policymaking process under examination (George & Bennett, 2005). Also, George and Bennet emphasize that researchers are not immune from the general tendency to attach particular importance to a document or evidence that supports their pre-existing or favored interpretations, and to overturn or downplay the importance of documents or facts that challenge them (George & Bennett, 2005). Analytical or political bias on the scholar's part can lead to a distorted interpretation of archival materials (George & Bennett, 2005). In order to avoid a distorted analysis of historical documents, it is very important for the researcher to understand the context of specific archival materials. According to George and Bennett, it is useful to regard archival documents as a form of purposeful communication (George & Bennett, 2005). Using such a framework makes it easier for the researcher to assess the meaning and evidential value of 'what' is communicated in a document, interview, or speech. In interpreting the significance and importance of what was said, the researcher should take into account who is speaking to whom, for what purpose, and under what circumstances (George & Bennett, 2005).

Analyzing archival documents of the Rockefeller and Ford foundations, the US government, as well as the CIA archive and other relevant materials, this study seeks to analyze the work of major philanthropic foundations on the international scene during the Cold War. In this respect, this study seeks to show the importance of American foundations for the cultural relations of the United States with Europe during the turbulent years of the Cold War. Also, this study touches on the sensitive issue of the connection between the American establishment and primarily the CIA with the giant Rockefeller and Ford foundations regarding the American approach to Eastern Europe.

## 2. The emergence of giant philanthropic foundations in America

Based on charity and humanitarian work, the first American philanthropic organizations spread worldwide at the beginning of the 19th century. Popularly known as ‘missionary organizations’ or simply ‘missionaries’, foundations devoted their work to charity activities and education, predominantly among Christian minorities. Still, the main activities of these organizations were based on religious work, namely religious conversion. Foundations established in the early 20th century also provided traditional support to religious activities but significantly changed the course of the movement. The new foundations have refrained from giving direct assistance to people and societies in need but have focused on the causes of crises and finding long-term systemic solutions to public problems. Thus, the world became acquainted with the new institutional philanthropy, which pushed aside traditional charity dedicated to predominantly religious activities due to its mode of action.

During the economic expansion of the United States at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the number of millionaires in the country had been steadily increasing. By 1916, there had been over 40,000 millionaires in the United States. At least two of these millionaires, John D. Rockefeller and Henry Ford (the second having contributed much to the expanding wealth of the first), counted their fortunes in billions (Zunz, 2014). Some of the American wealthiest industrialists and business people in that period, like Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford, have decided to establish private grant-providing foundations for the amelioration of life standards of human kind at home and all around the globe – investing dominantly in education, infrastructure and public health: Andrew Carnegie Foundation established in 1906, Rockefeller Foundation established in 1913, and Ford Foundation established in 1936 – popularly known as Big 3 foundations. The main focus of these newly established foundations was on support for science, which meant that a new form of philanthropic work arose in the United States. Contrary to the sharing of traditional charity, commitment to knowledge and the search for systemic solutions to human problems were emphasized as the primary responsibility of the new foundations. Due to the nature of American public life and its importance in the early 20th century, philanthropists led by the Rockefeller Foundation played a central role in founding many universities in the country as well as introducing new research agendas focusing on the broader public interest and precise research method that have brought noticeable results in practice. Soon after achieving a clear impact on education in the United States, new philanthropists started to provide enormous support to American organizations abroad and mainly supported American universities in the Middle East: Robert College in Istanbul, American University in Beirut, and American University in Cairo.

The Rockefeller foundation, established to invest in public health in the United States and abroad, soon emerged as the leading philanthropic organization that operated all around the globe. It is recorded that the Rockefeller Foundation, as the largest foundation during that period, provided significant support for religious activities of Christian missionaries in the Ottoman Empire (Erdem & Rose, 2000). A clear example of Rockefeller’s early activities abroad could be seen in providing assistance to Christian missionary organizations in the Ottoman Empire, and after the establishment in 1913, the foundation provided significant aid to Armenian and Greek refugees after the First World War (from today’s Turkey) (Erdem & Rose, 2000).

It should be mentioned that there is no consensus in the general public on the primary goals of philanthropic foundations, especially the Big 3 (Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie). Yet their impact on the domestic scene worldwide is an indisputable fact. Some argue that philanthropic foundations have played a significant role in establishing and promoting American political culture and have provided serious assistance in setting up American hegemony worldwide, dominantly through culture and intellectual domination (Parmar, 2015). Scholars like Parmar also accuse the foundations stating that through their programs of helping and maintaining institutions, they greatly promoted elitism and inequality among social classes (Parmar, 2015). However, a commitment to the path of anti-isolation and liberal internationalism since the early 20th century has been a policy that has helped foundations promote their visions and goals around the world, and become consciously or not very significant actors in international politics.

From the first activities on the international scene until today, the foundations have worked on creating intellectual networks that have provided them with a great influence, considering that their associates were often elected to important positions in the state. Parmar claims that foundations constantly operated as adjuncts of official US foreign policy and rarely had or challenged the dominant thinking within the State Department (Parmar, 2002). The core purpose of intellectual hubs around the globe, he claims, is the achievement of the US hegemony in strategically important areas through the following goals: a) financial grants for new educational and research institutions with the aim of producing new knowledge, ideas, and specialization of the workforce, favoring a certain type of economic development; b) harmonization and consolidation of existing institutions in a

certain area towards the same goal; c) sponsoring research projects and programs that were inclined towards certain directions of inquiry of others, thus setting the research agenda; d) establishing and forcing a scholarship project at prestigious American universities to bring students from third world countries; e) bringing in academic staff as well as other professionals from America and the world, to create intellectual networks through seminars and conferences that will work to strengthen American hegemony in the world;(Parmar, 2002).

Without entering into the debate over whether foundations in this way intended to build intellectual hegemony around the world that would serve their interests, it is essential to emphasize that grants from foundations, especially during the Cold War, aimed to educate (and cooperate) elite with pro-American stance, which further indirectly impacted the public opinion.

### **3. The significance of American philanthropic foundations during the Cold War**

Many cases in American history point to the fact that foundations have often been an alternative to state responsibility internationally. For the state, foundations were so-called vehicles that could perform certain tasks faster and more efficiently than the state administration could (Anheier & Leat, 2013).

American foundations closely followed the events on the international scene during the Cold War. They were often part of the American strategy towards certain countries or regions by offering their ideas and resources for the purpose of national interest. One such example is found in the Central American region during 1960s when the Dominican Republic was going through a turbulent period and was in general need of international assistance. To help the Dominican Republic recover, President Johnson approved \$20 million in immediate assistance, while the state also received a \$50,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to launch a planning study of the economy (O'Leary, 1965).

At the very beginning of the Cold War, the American foreign policy establishment, aware of the positive image of the foundations, realized their capacity and coordinated its activities with the External Research Staff. Analyzing the reports of the American Central Intelligence Agency from the beginning of the 1950s, we find a report from the director of the agency Max F. Millikan from April of that year on the topic 'Suggestions on kinds of projects we would like to see the Ford foundation support'(CIA Archive, 1951). According to him, privately sponsored projects (alluding to foundations) can do studies and projects of interest to the Government better than government agencies. Some of the projects include: a. studies which are long-range either in the sense that they will take several years to complete or in the sense that they deal with fundamental long-range problems rather than those of immediate operating concern; b. projects which cut across the interests of two or more agencies such as e.g. the political and psychological consequences of economic assistance; c. projects which involve an independent private evaluation of the effectiveness of Government programs; d. historical and other basic studies on the nature and structure of foreign countries which can be done best from unclassified materials; e. the establishment of area institutes for both training and research in the political, social, economic and legal structure of regions of great importance to present United States policy but not as yet extensively studied in universities (CIA Archive, 1951).

Thus, foundations with their broad base of knowledge and field experience were a very important source of information as well as an advisor in the entire State Department program of creating intelligent programs of economic assistance, political reorientation, and psychological warfare. At home, the foundations have been a significant factor in modernizing and reorganizing American universities by introducing new programs, funding various projects, and connecting new universities together (McWilliams & Banning, 1994).

For example, in the archives of the State Department we find that the Ford Foundation funded training for Americans in the field of 'Foreign Area Training Fellowships' and 'International Relations Training Fellowships' between 1957 and 1959, tenable in the United States or abroad (State Department Archive, 1957b). According to sources, during 1957-1958, one American appointee was selected for departure to U.S.S.R., one to Yugoslavia;1958-1959: one may go to U.S.S.R., several to Eastern Europe (State Department Archive, 1957b). The Ford Foundation played a very important role in the official exchange program between the United States and the Soviet Union that was launched in the late 1950s.For instance, under a grant from the foundation in 1958, the Institute for International Education organized the arrival of 38 Polish professors, research scholars, and specialists in the United States for a period of two to ten months (State Department Archive, 1957b). Twelve American consultants, lecturers, and researchers were recommended the same year for Polish universities in the fields of social sciences, humanities, and architecture (State Department Archive, 1957b).

At the beginning of the Cold War, the Western world faced a trend of influxes of refugees from the countries of the Soviet orbit. Due to the brutality of the communist regime, more than 15,000 people fled to Western European countries in search of salvation and better living conditions (Rockefeller Foundation Records,

1951). Almost all fugitives sooner or later went through camps or hospitals organized by Western governments and American public and private organizations. And on this specific problem, the American government coordinated its activities with its private organizations, which were very present in Europe. The American archives from the end of 1951 state that fifteen private American organizations contributed several million dollars of annual social assistance to displaced persons and refugees. All private American organizations spent \$3.5 million in 1951 to care for and house about 6,000 refugees from Soviet-influenced countries (Rockefeller Foundation Records, 1951). Of that, the Ford Foundation set aside \$900,000 for these and similar purposes during 1951, and about \$500,000 for 1952 (Rockefeller Foundation Records, 1951). During this period, American foundations and other non-governmental organizations donated more funds than the American Congress for cases of escapees from the Soviet Union, and their role in such processes should not be neglected.

In the early 1950s, the Ford Foundation showed great interest in caring for refugees from the Soviet Union who arrived in the United States. Through the East European Fund program, the foundation sought to help refugees socially, economically, and culturally adjust to the American way of life, and to learn English and American values and institutions. The foundation's 1952 grants for these purposes amounted to \$1,588,500 (Ford Foundation Archive, 1952). In addition to working on the integration of refugees from the Soviet bloc, the foundation, along with other agencies, took advantage of the presence of talented individuals in these groups. Some of them were top experts in their fields, so the foundation, with the help of American and Canadian universities, awarded grants to them. From the point of view of the Emigres Foundation from the Soviet bloc, they were also important in terms of intelligence for the purposes of the Cold War: "Refugees to the United States can advance our understanding and knowledge of Russia. Many of them have had extensive experience with the conditions of Soviet life. A Research Program on the U.S.S.R. was therefore established in 1951" (Ford Foundation Archive, 1952).



**REFUGEES FROM TYRANNY ARE ORIENTED TO A NEW WORLD**

(Ford foundation annual report 1952, Retrieved from: <https://www.fordfoundation.org/media/2413/1952-annual-report.pdf>)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Here an émigré group in Detroit is given instructions and advice on the process of application for American citizenship.

The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations invested heavily in educational institutions across America during the Cold War. Many organizations and associations have witnessed the generosity of these philanthropic giants. Among the organizations that received funding from the foundations in the early 1960s was the National Student Association (NSA). Dennis Shaul, NSA President during 1962-1963, confirmed in his statements the veracity of these allegations, claiming that the association received funding from the CIA in addition to the foundation's money (State Department Archive, 1967). These funds were used to send American students abroad to talk to young people from developing countries, as well as to send American students to youth festivals abroad, including communist-sponsored youth festivals (State Department Archive, 1967).

At the beginning of the Cold War, U.S. government funds for cultural activities were in many cases limited. For this reason, the State Department sought to coordinate its activities in this field with private foundations. In this context, we single out an interesting case from 1958 in which Yale Russian Chorus intended to tour the Soviet Union during the summer, and for whose sponsorship the government could not allocate funds. In correspondence with Central Intelligence Agency Director Allen W. Dulles, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State William S.B. Lacy regarding this case stated that 'the amount of government funds available for such cultural activities is extremely limited and what little is available for the coming summer is already practically all committed' (State Department Archive, 1967). Lacy in his letter to Dulles also stated that the only promising opportunity left for this cultural activity during the summer is financial assistance from some foundations, such as the Ford and Rockefeller foundations which you mentioned in your letter (State Department Archive, 1967).

In the same context, we find that the Hungarian Refugee Orchestra received grants from the Ford Foundation in the late 1950s for its activities, which was considered extremely important at meetings of senior US government officials from the perspective of psychological influence abroad (CIA Archive, 1967). After the Ford Foundation's grant expired in the late 1950s, the State Department decided that one of the U.S. government departments could have funds available for the orchestra's further needs, indicating the government's coordination with the Ford Foundation. All American governmental and non-governmental organizations in foreign policy in this period acted as one body with a common interest. For this reason, the activities of the foundations were coordinated with the activities of the State Department and other organizations and institutes. From the information found in the archives of the State Department, we see the leading position of the Ford Foundation in the process of rapprochement with communist countries. For example, the New York-based Institute for International Education received a second grant from the Ford Foundation in September 1958 to send a delegation of American lawyers, led by Professor Milton Katz, of Harvard Law School, to Warsaw to meet with the International Association of Legal Science (CIA Archive, 1967). IIE has also administered certain American programs for UNESCO Fellows. In the same period at the end of the 1950s, fourteen people from Yugoslavia received a UNESCO grant, one grantee in higher education, three nuclear physicists, one scientist, one composer, and eight educators (CIA Archive, 1967).

In the process of official exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union in the late 1950s, the Ford Foundation awarded a grant to the Inter-University Committee to cover travel expenses for 50 American graduate students, from prestigious American universities competent in Russian area of study, to attend the University of Moscow or Leningrad in the academic year 1958-1959 and 1959-1960 (CIA Archive, 1967). Their stay in the U.S.S.R. was financially covered by Soviet authorities (CIA Archive, 1967). The grants awarded were predominantly in the fields of social sciences, humanities and related fields. In addition to the grant, the same committee received an award from the Carnegie Endowment for 120 grants for social sciences, education, arts, literature, and chemistry, for a month-long trip of American specialists to the Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe (CIA Archive, 1967). Most grantees were affiliated with colleges and universities and represented a total of 52 American institutions (CIA Archive, 1967).

The full cooperation of the American authorities with the foundations as well as their trust in them can be seen in the example of the reception of two delegations of Soviet men and women medical scientists in 1957 as part of an exchange mission program organized by the State Department (CIA Archive, 1967). The US Public Health Service was in charge of the itinerary of the first group, while the sponsorship of the second delegation, six women physicists from the Soviet Union, was organized by the Rockefeller Foundation (CIA Archive, 1967). During the same period, the Rockefeller Foundation set aside \$175,000 for fellowships that allowed 20-30 young Polish scholars to study outside of Poland during 1957-1958, while \$300,000 was provided for the purchase of materials and equipment for Polish universities and research institutes (CIA Archive, 1967).

Under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the Ford Foundation has provided grants for U.S. mature scholars in the field of social sciences and humanities. In 1956, two American scholars resided in the

Soviet Union, while one in Yugoslavia (CIA Archive, 1967). Under the same auspices, the following year, 1957, one American grantee resided in Poland and three in Yugoslavia (CIA Archive, 1967).

On January 27, 1958, the United States and the Soviet Union announced a formal agreement on the exchange of people in the fields of culture, education, technology, and the media, including radio and TV broadcasting and film screenings (State Department Archive, 1957).

In addition to the above, the academic field in this exchange was very rich, including the exchange of delegations of professors from prestigious universities, the exchange of students from Moscow and Leningrad and American universities, the exchange of delegations of students and young editors of academic journals 1958-1959, various exchanges in agriculture and medicine, as well as other exchanges of sports teams and artists, such as Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra and the Bolshoi Ballet (State Department Archive, 1957a). In this program of exchange and cooperation between the two powers, the State Department financed the departure of three people from America to the Soviet Union in March 1958 to observe the elections in Moscow, in exchange for a visit by Russian observers in 1956 to observe the US presidential election (State Department Archive, 1957a).

In the archives of the State Department, we find that in the official exchange of people between the United States and the Soviet Union, the American foundations played a very significant and constructive role, with the Ford Foundation as a leader. As we mentioned earlier, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations were in contact and cooperation with communist countries, such as Poland and Yugoslavia, much earlier than the official state exchange project between America and the Soviet Union. Due to their professionalism, quality work, and trust among the countries 'behind the wire', it can be said that the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations were the initiators of the official cultural and educational exchange between America and the Soviet Union. In addition to the official exchange with the Soviet Union, the State Department also initiated official exchanges with countries in Eastern Europe, including countries such as Poland, Yugoslavia, and Romania. This program should not be confused with the individual projects that the Rockefeller and Ford foundations had in the mentioned countries during the 1950s and 1960s.

Table 1: The official exchange program between the USA and the U.S.S.R. launched in 1958

\* U.S. universities and colleges participating in exchange with Eastern Europe

U.S. Institution	Home country	Host country	Field
California (Berkeley)	Poland	US	Social Sciences
California (Riverside)	Yugoslavia	US	Biology
Chicago	Poland	US	Social Sciences
Columbia	Poland		Social Sciences, Linguistics
Drexel Institute of Technology	Yugoslavia	US	Physics
D'Youville College	Yugoslavia	US	Modern languages
Johns Hopkins	Polannd	US	Civil engineering
Harvard	Poland	US	Social Sciences, Linguistics
University of Michigan	Poland	US	Linguistics
Montana State College	US	Yugoslavia	Home Economics
N.Y. State College of Agriculture, Cornell	Poland	US	Pomology
New York University	Poland	US	Humanities

University of Pennsylvania	Poland	US	Architecture, Pharmacology
Pittsburgh	US	Yugoslavia	Biology
Pittsburgh	US	Czechoslovakia	Pathology
Princeton	Poland	US	Humanities
Rochester	Yugoslavia	US	Psychology
Stanford	Poland	US	Social Sciences
University of Texas	Yugoslavia	US	Social Sciences
Tulane	Poland	US	Mathematics
Virginia	Poland	US	Humanities
Yale	Poland	US	Social sciences
Yale	Romania	US	Mathematics

Source: State Department Archive – check folder: Exchanges between the USA and the USSR

During the same period, governments in Eastern Europe awarded grants to foreign nationalities, including American citizens. Thus, for example, we find that the Yugoslav government awarded a grant in the period 1957-1958 under the title 'Grants open to candidates from countries according to similar awards to Yugoslav candidates – maximum number of candidates is 60, duration of 1 year, and field is unrestricted' (State Department Archive, 1957). This indicates the fact that Yugoslavia has had a very positive view of foreign delegation visits and exchanges between different countries. Although this is not the subject of this study, it is essential to note that Yugoslav education made great strides in the decades that followed. Many international students came to study at Yugoslav universities. In addition, programs initiated by American organizations during the 1950s and 1960s, including philanthropic foundations, significantly contributed to developing educational and cultural institutions in Yugoslavia.

During the Cold War, foundations were institutions with integrity and a point of view that represented their country in a very broad capacity. In an interview in 1964, the president of the Carnegie Foundation said the foundations were respected and trusted around the world for their openness, honest approach, directness, and good faith motives (CIA Archive, 1964). Their reputation has been built hard over 50 years so that many nations, because of the trust they have built, have worked very easily with foundations (CIA Archive, 1964).

Research in the social sciences has contributed significantly to the conduct of the Cold War, so the U.S. federal government, with its many agencies, has invested heavily in those purposes since the beginning of the Cold War. Outside the government, during the fiscal year 1952, the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations spent over \$6 million to support social science research of value in the Cold War (CIA Archive, 1952b). That number rose by several million dollars in the years to come as the Ford Foundation became operational at full capacity. In addition to foundations, five major radio networks spent over \$2 million on social science research, according to a 1952 Psychological Strategy Board report, trying to define their impact on audiences (CIA Archive, 1952b).<sup>3</sup> For the sake of comparison, the Department of Defense allocated between 6 and 7 million annually for the same purposes, while the Department of State allocated 3 and a half million dollars (CIA Archive, 1952b). Other government agencies such as MSA, Commerce, Agriculture, contributed less than \$1 million each on annual basis (CIA Archive, 1952b).

The history of relations between the academic community and the American governmental community in the field of international relations is very rich. This connection was the strongest after the end of the Second World War. In the U.S. government archives we find that many professors took leave of absence from campus to

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.



serve in the U.S. Army or the State Department during 1941-1945 hostilities (CIA Archive, 1977). After the war, most professors specializing in foreign policy accepted the fact of the Cold War and arbitrarily wrote research and gave lectures in accordance with American national interests. Much of American Cold War strategic thinking came from civilian intellectuals who worked at universities or associated 'think tanks' such as the RAND Corporation (CIA Archive, 1977). Russia's launch of Sputnik in October 1957 further strengthened the connection of intellectuals with officials from government circles. The strengthening of this connection was significantly influenced by the money of the great American foundations Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie, which is confirmed by a note from the archives: The major private foundations such as Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie added many more millions of dollars to support campus-based research which was designed to support U.S. foreign policy in one way or another (CIA Archive, 1977). In short, solid and warm ties between government agencies and academia lasted from about 1945 to 1965, after which these relations were disrupted in the mid-1960s. As a result, many professors and foreign policy experts have expressed their disagreement and adverse reactions to processes such as President Kennedy's management of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the Berlin Wall crisis, and the Cuban missile crisis.

#### 4. Foundations and cultural relations with Europe during the Cold war

Although Europeans were aware of the importance of the Marshall Plan for recovery after World War II, American prestige in Europe was declining. The diplomatic missions of America did not have enough capacity and support from Washington to sufficiently develop relations in the political and social circles of Britain, France, Germany and Italy. This was especially true of European leftists and intellectuals whose role in these societies was significant. On the other hand, the American foundations Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie, although they could not completely replace the official policy of Washington, were in a strategic position to act. Their work was highly regarded in European circles, so one report said the Ford Foundation was valued even in the extreme leftist circles of the British Labor Party, the German SPD, and many intellectuals in France (CIA Archive, 1977). The task of the foundations was to break down the stereotypes that Europeans had about America, its society and culture. For this reason, Sheppard Stone suggested in 1954 that the Ford Foundation 'in the interests of the United States through its own program should start making grants in France, England, and other European countries, not excluding Yugoslavia' (CIA Archive, 1977).

In the case of Britain, Stone felt the need to overcome the lack of confidence in American maturity and fears of "savages" in the US Congress and the Pentagon, setting the stage for contact between British political leaders, intellectuals and business circles with American colleagues (CIA Archive, 1977). In France, the foundation sought to help modernize life and build understanding with the United States. One of the steps was to initiate a project with Paris sociology professor Raymond Aron on analyzing the French political elite, their attitudes and influences in Europe (CIA Archive, 1977). In Germany and Italy, the foundation has invested heavily in strengthening democratic political and economic institutions, and in the educational fields of political science and sociology (CIA Archive, 1977). Ford Foundation officials did not ignore and omit Yugoslavia in their activities and visits, considering it extremely important for American national interests.

Although the American government was very present with the activities in the diplomatic field in Europe, the official policy indicated the withdrawal from the cultural front. It was a space that the Ford Foundation and other private American organizations filled. The director of the international program of the Stone Foundation was very familiar with the deep reservations of Europeans about American culture, negative opinions about trash and vulgar American music, etc. For that reason, the task of the foundation was to acquaint Europeans with excellent American educational institutions, scientific and research institutes, museums, writers, musicians, and artists. Stone believed that many Europeans have unjust prejudices against American society and culture. The Ford Foundation invested heavily in sending American plays, artists, and orchestras to Europe during this period.

The American ambassadors to Europe, aware of the capacity and intentions of the Ford Foundation, sent requests for financial support to projects in the field of culture. For example, the American ambassador in Belgrade sent a strong request to the Ford Foundation to send Porgy and Bess (Gershwin, 1935). to Yugoslavia, emphasizing that such a visit will have astonishing political and psychological results on the ground (Berghahn, 2002). Also, in the mid-1950s, U.S. Ambassador to Paris Dillon strongly urged the Ford Foundation to support the U.S. Art Festival in Paris believing that such cultural content could have strong political effects (Volker R. Berghahn, 2002).

Numerous visits, connections, and knowledge of social and political opportunities in Europe have contributed to Stone's strong interest in supporting the Congress for Cultural Freedom, considering it 'the most effective organization in Europe working among political, intellectual and cultural leaders' (Berghahn, 2002). Like many CCF members, Stone also belonged to an elite that had a deep conviction of the need to unite Americans

and Europeans into a so-called Atlantic community and culture (Berghahn, 2002). Stone therefore believed that Europe and America, in addition to a common military and economic interest against the Soviet Union, also had a common intellectual and historical heritage. Aware of the stereotypes present among Europeans about his country, Stone believed that Americans must wage two cultural wars, one against the Soviet bloc, although he believed it was being won in the 1950s, and the other against Western European perceptions of American culture, which according to him was a more complicated challenge (Berghahn, 2002). During the Cold War, constant information from the field gave Ford Foundation officials a clear signal that people in Eastern Europe were showing a longing and tendency toward Western culture, languages, education, and living standards, positively affecting Ston's confidence in American or Western culture dominance against the Soviet bloc.

As early as 1954, Stone proposed to the Ford Foundation's board of directors to consider financial support for the activities of Congress for Cultural Freedom; to consider the exchange of leaders (influential people in European societies) including cultural leaders; and to consider sending American art exhibitions and theater and music groups to major European centers (Berghahn, 2002). In the bureaucratic structure of the Ford Foundation, Stone had confrontations with colleagues who did not have the support of the Foundation's commitment to Europe, given its limited financial resources. However, with the support of his mentor John McCloy, who was a member of the Foundation's board of directors and chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, he put many ideas into practice.

### **5. The link between the US government and the Big foundations**

The giant American foundations led by Rockefeller and Ford were part of the power elite in the United States. In their Cold War operations and activities, they have been shown to have a political and ideological background with the capacity to influence the shaping of American foreign policy. Some authors, such as Inderjeet Parmar, believe that large foundations were critical tools for building the American empire or hegemony in the 20th century through cultural and intellectual penetrations into societies worldwide (Inderjeet Parmar, 2012). Such thinking stemmed from Samuel Huntington's theory that American expansion was not marked by the acquisition of territories but by their penetration with the help of various organizations, governmental and private, that sought to achieve goals important to them in other societies (Huntington, 1973).

David Hammack in the study on foundations in American polity reemphasizes the significance of the philanthropic foundations for American polity highlighting approaches that foundations have used in their efforts to improve the welfare of mankind (David Hammack, 1999). Two approaches in particular intrigue our attention: (i) foundations sought to shape public opinion by supporting studies that highlight particular problems and devise and advance particular policies; (ii) foundations helped devise and promote specific government policies. Inderjeet Parmar argues in his research on Big 3 foundations and American global power argued that the Big 3 (Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie) foundations actively participated in the formation and promotion of American foreign policy since the end of WWII. Furthermore, Parmar in his case studies on Indonesia, Nigeria, and Chile revealed that foundations operated with the same objective of investing in scholarships for social science students, and economics in particular, to have pro-American intellectuals holding important positions in the country (Parmar, 2015).

Foundations such as Rockefeller and Ford have helped modernize world society through health, agriculture, population control, science, the arts, and educational grant programs (Vogel, 2006). Through their work and expertise, the foundations in practice represented the American understanding of democracy, which strengthened the image of the United States on the international level (Vogel, 2006). This was particularly important during the Cold War. In addition to representing the American democratic consciousness in the world, philanthropic foundations gathered through their projects a huge number of professionals who made up a strong intellectual network. By developing networks of knowledge, philanthropy helped build the American empire or hegemony (Vogel, 2006). The two aspects in which foundations had the most operational activity during the Cold War were knowledge and culture. It could be said that the Rockefeller and Ford foundations contributed the most to the cultural dimension of American hegemony. In a practical sense, philanthropic foundations contributed to the development of American cultural hegemony through their commitment to science. This is particularly true of the Rockefeller Foundation, which in the period between the two world wars had a clear and coordinated policy and was the main source of funding for social sciences in North America (Fisher, 1983).

During the Cold War, the United States used science as an instrument for projecting state power abroad. The use of science has historically been an important component in the process of colonization and traditional empire building (Krige, 2006). The construction of the American empire was a geopolitical reality of the Cold War in which the world order was divided into two rival systems. Philanthropic organizations led by the Rockefeller Foundation played a significant role in this process, whose commitment to knowledge and professionalism

significantly contributed to the entire struggle of the American government during the Cold War. In their efforts, the foundations particularly advocated democracy and capitalism, pushed societies against communism, and sought to promote social, academic, and cultural initiatives in countries that were struggling for independence (Deruga, 2012). An obvious example of such initiatives could be found in Poland and Yugoslavia, which during the Cold War tried to get away from Soviet control.

## 6. CIA and its connection to the Rockefeller and Ford foundations during the Cold War

The Central Intelligence Agency played a significant role in U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War. The agency held regular meetings and made reports on the global world scene, the position of communism, and various opportunities for the U.S. government at any given time. In practical terms, the CIA has kept pace with American foreign policy by providing intelligence support to presidents, secretaries of state, ambassadors, various agencies, etc. In the first decades of its activity, determined in the countering of enemy propaganda, the CIA made an incredible contribution to the containment of Soviet communism. Thus, at one of the meetings in 1957, it was noted that America must take advantage of the crisis between the Soviet Union and satellites in the communist sphere, and it was pointed out that special attention should be paid to countries such as China and Yugoslavia (CIA Archive, 1957b). As it was a conflict of global proportions, the parties did not have the luxury of ignoring the potential space for intervention in any of the world regions. The global dimension of the Moscow-Washington conflict was once mentioned during an interview with the CIA director James Algerton: "We are fighting global conflict where one system is trying to change the other system. So, whatever the obstacle is, executive action would come and play. It was ideological war" (CIA Archive, 1976).

When it comes to Southeast Europe, US officials often emphasized the importance of Poland for a possible rapprochement with the United States and the launch of possible projects, as these were countries (along with Yugoslavia) with massive potential for economic progress. In addition, the CIA thought that many of the problems of these countries would be solved by providing Western financial assistance and launching a process to reduce the military budget (CIA Archive, 1957b). One of the CIA officials at the 1957 meeting stressed that Poland for instance had a higher productivity in coal per worker than England and France, and that it had basically rich and balanced national economy (CIA Archive, 1957b). In case of Yugoslavia, financial assistance from the West was the most significant factor in the country's economic recovery after World War II.

Moreover, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) archive material confirms that the consultants of this agency were aware of (in addition to economic aid) the importance of the attractive force of the Western world in both the economic and cultural realms to many Eastern European (Soviet) Satellites. In practical terms, in the archives of the American intelligence agency, we find that 'the Polish government in the mid-1950s has urged the Rockefeller and Ford foundations to open contact and that exploratory missions of these foundations have already been sent to Poland (a fact being secret at the time)' (CIA Archive, 1957b). In addition to the CIA archives, the archives of the Ford Foundation confirm that these two foundations (especially Ford) had enormous merits in initiating the first official scientific and cultural contacts between Poland and the United States. Practically, Ford foundation began a program 'to establish educational, scientific, and cultural relations between Poland and the United States' (Ford Foundation Archive, 1967). It is believed that such an enterprise was the first significant effort undertaken by an American institution to open channels into Eastern Europe. The Ford Foundation had the privilege and the capacity to deal with such a serious task of representing the Western world in Soviet held territories.

In the CIA archives from April 1957, we find a written version of a telephone conversation between Mr. Rowan Gaither, Chairman of the Board, Ford Foundation with CIA Director Allen Dulles in which Mr. Gaither informs Dulles that the foundation has decided to launch a program for Poland that included bringing Polish professors, intellectuals, and students to the USA, as well as sending certain American lecturers to Poland (CIA Archive, 1957). Mr. Gaither said in his address that the State Department had encouraged the foundation to launch the program and that the foundation was also interested in the CIA's opinion, to which Dulles also expressed his full support. This further confirms our claim that the Ford Foundation's activities were entirely in line with US government strategies.

In the example of Poland, it can be noted that the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations played a very significant role in American cultural diplomacy in the late 1950s. In a period between 1957 and 1962, a total of 330 Polish scientists, professors, including journalists and artists were given the opportunity to visit and study in the United States and Western Europe (Ford Foundation Archive, 1967). From the foundation's perspective, the Poles were very competent and their experience in the United States had a long-term effect. In addition to Poland, the CIA consultants highlighted Yugoslavia's experience in 1950 when 90% students in Croatia chose English and only 2%

Russian as a second foreign language after the choice was allowed in that country (Ford Foundation Archive, 1967). According to CIA consultants, it was fair to expect a similar result in other Eastern European satellites if the choice was allowed.

It is essential to mention that Central Intelligence Agency has often been the subject of debate in the U.S. Congress to analyse its activities and benefits for U.S. interests, as well as for occasional violations of legal frameworks to influence foreign officials and organizations and other political manipulations abroad. Many U.S. members of Congress were aware of the CIA's controversial reputation abroad. Thus, on one occasion in 1967, the American Senators discussed the connection of this agency with the leading American foundations, Rockefeller and Ford, which acted overseas, and the danger of revealing this fact in public. As recorded in the American Congressional Record (Senate):

*"It would be worse if it were now found, for example, that CIA money and personnel have been involved in the work of major foundations overseas, especially the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Their work is crucial for much overseas development. They can operate free of certain diplomatic niceties that restrict federal officials, and they are accepted by most foreigners as what they seem to be – independent advisers and not intelligence gatherers. They can be much freer and franker, said one source who has seen their work in India, where the current five-year plan for agriculture is largely Ford's doing (1967). If Ford and Rockefeller are compromised, it will have the most fantastic repercussions in the whole American effort in the underdeveloped countries, Walter Lippmann said."*(US Senate, 1967)

Given their importance, intentions, and radius of action, the U.S. administration has expressed concern about the eventual demolition of the very positive reputation of the two foundations in foreign countries, by revealing that CIA money and personnel have been involved in their work.

The Congress of Cultural Freedom was an international organization that brought together intellectual leaders, academicians, artists and authors. During the 1960s, the organization was accused that most of its expenses had been paid by the Central Intelligence Agency. The Ford Foundation has allocated \$1.5 million to support the Congress for Cultural Freedom since October 1967 (Murray Kempton, 1967). It was the foundation that was the target of critics during the 1960s, noting that it is challenging to distinguish the international activities of the Ford Foundation from the activities of the CIA. Between 1950 and 1967, the CIA funded and supervised numerous private organizations involved in the work of cultural diplomacy through the activities of artists, writers, musicians, and scientists, who raised their voices and pens for the international struggle against communism (Audra J. Wolfe, 2018). The most famous covert operations in the field of cultural diplomacy carried out by the CIA in Europe were the financing of the Paris-based Congress for Cultural Freedom, which through its work organized academic conferences, cultural festivals, and published literary magazines, of which Encounter magazine was the most famous (Audra J. Wolfe, 2018).

To break the stigma of CIA funding, the Congress of Cultural Freedom has changed its name to the International Association for Cultural Freedom in the late 1960s and has appointed a new president who was a former consultant to the State Department (CIA Archive, 1957d). (CIA Archive, 1957d). The group provided subsidies to many magazines during the period, the most famous of which was the British monthly Encounter. A report by the Central Intelligence Agency states that each of them is anti-communist in policy and follow the U.S. State Department line (CIA Archive, 1957d).

## **7. The Role of the Big Foundations in the US policies towards Eastern Europe during the Cold War**

From the very beginning, the giant Carnegie Endowment, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations paid special attention to educational and cultural affairs (Edward H. Berman, 1983). This enabled them to play a significant role in the production of knowledge and new ideas and the sphere of culture, which, among other things, influenced the course of American foreign policy during the Cold War. These foundations were highly regarded by White House and State Department officials for their professionalism and financial capacity to operate abroad. As non-governmental agencies, they were members of the Psychological Strategy Board (PSB) within the State Department, which reported directly to the National Security Council (NSC). Information from the field and knowledge of specific areas that the foundations ruled were beneficial for decision-making factors in the US government's foreign policy establishment. In practical terms, the procedure for evaluating national American psychological efforts in an official government document looked like this: a) PSB Staff call upon the evaluation units of State, Defense, and CIA to cooperate; b) appropriate use be made of intelligence estimates, diplomatic mission reports, military mission reports, and Mutual Security Agency field reports; c) within the limitations of funds and time, social science research techniques and public opinion survey be utilized; d) that on-the-spot investigations be conducted by the 'task force' technique, whereby the Director would delegate a member of the PSB staff to visit key areas; e) that the PSB evaluation staff would submit a draft report to the working group of

representatives from inside government, as well as selected individuals outside of government with specialized or area knowledge, such as Ford foundation or Rockefeller foundation chiefs (CIA Archive, 1952c).

In an effort by the State Department to provide its employees with language and area training during the 1950s, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller foundation were great sources of information for the U.S. government. In addition, through its own 'International training and research programs and the 'Foundation's foreign area studies fellowship programs', the foundation has had direct field experience in different parts of the world. Therefore, the foundations were often consultants in the field of foreign policy during the ideological war with the Soviet Union.

One of the main preoccupations of the Psychological Strategy Board (PSB) leaders was the contribution of research in the social sciences to the unfolding of events in the Cold War. From the early 1950s on, the agency's leaders believed that US efforts to avoid a military stalemate with the Soviet Union would largely depend on US success in developing new non-military assets that would influence the regime's intentions in Moscow (CIA Archive, 1952d). Due to the underestimation of the social sciences disciplines, there were far fewer research staff than was the case with the natural sciences. Data from 1952 show us that there were 34,000 registered members of professional societies in the social sciences in America, as opposed to 175,000 members in the natural and biological sciences (CIA Archive, 1952d). There were 7,500 psychologists in America at the time, compared to 70,000 chemists (CIA Archive, 1952d). The most needed experts in the field of social sciences for the American government were area and language specialists due to their lack and uneven distribution.

The foundations also allocated significant financial resources to support the resistance against communism. Charles J. Kersten, a lawyer and a member of the US Congress for three terms from 1948-1955, attracted public attention in 1951 when he proposed the famous 'Kersten Amendment', which instructed Congress to set aside \$ 100 million annually to support the resistance behind the Iron Curtain (Raynor Memorial Libraries, n.d.). Kersten was known as an anti-communist, and in the circles of the representatives of the Soviet Union at the United Nations was known as an 'international criminal' (Raynor Memorial Libraries, n.d.). During 1955, he worked as a consultant in the White House in the Department of Psychological Warfare (Raynor Memorial Libraries, n.d.). In the archives of the American intelligence agency, we find information that the Psychological Strategy Board during a meeting in 1952 discussed the initiative of Mr. Kersten. During the meeting, which was attended by high representatives of the American leadership, it was emphasized that the Ford Foundation is ready to allocate \$ 500,000 for Kersten's initiative in supporting the resistance against communism (CIA Archive, 1952a).

That government officials cared about the opinion of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations is evidenced by the minutes of the February 1953 meeting of the Psychological Strategy Board, which discussed, among other things, the Rockefeller Foundation's report on the work of state media and information services abroad: 'There was general discussion of the recommendations on which the Rockefeller Committee is working respecting the future of State Department information activities, especially the Voice of America (CIA Archive, 1953). The report states that any opinion of the PSB should be well coordinated with the report of the Rockefeller Commission (CIA Archive, 1953). It is also stated that the director of the CIA Mr. Dulles accepted the organization of the tasks in accordance with the opinions of the Rockefeller Commission (CIA Archive, 1953). From the statements above, we see that the Rockefeller Foundation also prepared reports on the work of state information and media agencies abroad, which influenced American foreign policy strategies at the beginning of the Cold War.

The activities of the Ford Foundation during the 1950s and 1960s were as well entirely in line with the State Department's policy. This foundation has been very active in communicating with people and institutions 'behind the wire', improving communication and building bridges for rapprochement and cultural activities. The Ford Foundation held informal meetings and discussions with Yugoslavs, Poles and other people from Southeast Europe. US embassies and the State Department were informed of the activities promptly. In many cases, the foundation sought the green light from the State Department for self-initiated ventures. One of them is from 1962. In correspondence with the White House, the Ford Foundation asked for an opinion on a planned meeting of a group of American citizens in Warsaw with representatives of Poland under the auspices of the foundation (CIA Archive, 1962). The meeting was planned behind closed doors, free for all topics in the discussion, as well as without the need for a public report on the outcome of the discussion. In the talks that lasted for three or four days, the representatives of the American group, in addition to two professors and the director of the Carnegie Foundation, also included two Senators from American Congress, all with an aim to improve communication between Americans and Poles (CIA Archive, 1962).

The above example shows us that the Ford Foundation had developed capacities on sensitive terrains such as Poland and that, at the same time, it acted following the hierarchy of American leadership.

Poland, like Yugoslavia, was one of the countries that was very interested in contact with the West, particularly with the United States, during the 1950s. At the request of Polish officials in early 1957, a US government delegation traveled to Poland for a meeting on Polish trade discussions (CIA Archive, 1957c). Items of the highest priority to Poles for procurement from the United States in that period were machines for the production of coal and fertilizers and other products needed to increase agricultural production (CIA Archive, 1957c). The impressions of the American delegation indicated that the Polish side accepted the general conditions of the U.S. loan-aid program but that they were somewhat unhappy about the presence of U.S. government officials in overseeing or facilitating the program in Poland. Poles preferred contracts with private U.S. technicians rather than with government employees. This indicated a situation in which Poland, like Yugoslavia, preferred to choose contact with private agencies such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations because of their reputation and political pressure from Moscow and the eventual destruction of goods coming from America.

On that occasion, The Chairman of the mentioned American delegation spoke with Shepard Stone from the Ford Foundation, who had just returned from Poland because the Ford Foundation organized a project of exchanging people in that country, on the topic of American trade with Poles. Mr. Stone, like the Poles, was convinced that the foundations should lead this process, explaining that through the financial capacity of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, grants could be awarded to technicians, and that all technical assistance from the foundations would strive to follow any steps taken by the US government in these negotiations (CIA Archive, 1957c). Prior to the launch of the project, the leadership of the Polish Medical Aid project emphasized that previous experiences of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation and the CARE (The Care for All with Respect and Equity) program indicated that full press coverage of the project was very likely (CIA Archive, 1957c). In addition, information about the lack of medicines was so widespread that any relief in the form of a donation could not be hidden. According to the report of the commission in charge of implementing this project, the American government believed that aid in the form of medicines would be much more effective if it contributed on a people-to-people basis rather than through government channels (CIA Archive, 1957c). When it came to U.S. government projects at the time, the Soviet Union always sought reciprocity in launching the same or similar programs on American soil. That was one of the reasons why the American private sector, led by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, was deeply involved in programs to encourage people in their struggle for freedom and liberation from communist slavery.

Ford foundation's president for international affairs, Shepard Stone, was in charge of long-term planning for increased academic and cultural contacts with Eastern Europeans, which saw the light of day in the late 1950s. An article in the New York Times in 1957 reported that the Ford Foundation had allocated a \$500,000 grant for a program to bring Eastern European (including Yugoslavia) experts, economists, social scientists, to America and Western Europe for study and training (CIA Archive, 1957c). The Rockefeller Foundation launched a similar program at the same time for medical staff and agricultural specialists. The launch of such programs by the foundations had a strong echo in the American public, which was mostly accustomed to the characteristic of waging the Cold War with direct power, political and economic means. One of the positive reactions came from then-Senator John F. Kennedy, who congratulated the Ford Foundation on a program that will be 'the beginning of important processes between the United States and Eastern Europe' (CIA Archive, 1957c).

The Ford Foundation had the strong support of the US government to launch this program. 1957 memorandum between foundation officials stressed that 'State Department officials and Allan Dulles, head of the CIA, are urging the Foundation to continue and expand the program in Poland, and in Yugoslavia, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and possibly the Soviet Union (CIA Archive, 1957c). On the other hand, the Ford Foundation's leadership firmly intended that any of the foundation's plans be discussed with the State Department and other government agencies to ensure that the foundation's actions and operations are consistent with U.S. policies and objectives (Ford Foundation Records, 1960). Regarding cooperation with academic and educational institutions in Eastern Europe and bringing individuals to the United States or Western Europe, Ford's leadership stressed before launching the program that individual selection must be free from communist control and that selected individuals can live and study freely in the West (Ford Foundation Records, 1960).

In addition to the cultural and philanthropic dimension, Ford's program in Eastern European countries had also a political character. The foundation's operations Eastern Europe began in the mid-1950s when officials discussed a program called the *East European Program Possibilities*, which aimed to take advantage of the current shift in the political climate to institute research, exchange and educational efforts significant for democratic objectives (CIA Archive, 1958). It was a period in which the feeling that the Western world was leading the Cold War cultural war against communism was increasingly emerging in America and Europe. Under the auspices of this program, the foundation initiated the project proposed to address academic and intellectual elites, essential technicians, journalists, and university students through fellowships, the distribution of Western scholarly and scientific

publications to East European university libraries, and joint East-West conferences to discuss present trends in international affairs.' (Berghahn, 2002). Moreover, it was emphasized that 'none of these and other related activities were merely cultural-philanthropic but also aimed to stimulate scholarly critiques of Communist declarations and policies and assistance for their publication and wide distribution' (Berghahn, 2002).

After the mid-1950s, the Ford Foundation became more involved in the international arena through educational and research activities, with the goal of contributing to a better American understanding of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. To this end, in 1954 the foundation launched fellowship programs for individual Americans, which were held under the auspices of Soviet and East European training (Ford Foundation Records, 1955). In the initial year, the number of students was twenty seven, while the following year the number increased to sixty-two (Ford Foundation Records, 1955). In 1955, the foundation donated \$80,000 to the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council (Ford Foundation Records, 1955). In addition, two research projects also received support from the foundation during 1955: one was for the Institute for Intercultural Studies, which aimed to gain more information about Soviet Muslim societies through talks with emigrants in the United States; while another was focused on historical research in the Soviet Union accomplished by a member of the Pennsylvania State University (Ford Foundation Records, 1955). As we noted during the research, in many cases, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations carried out activities during the Cold War that were the pure responsibility of the state. In various post-World War II situations, Yugoslav and Polish officials preferred to cooperate with American foundations rather than with the state. Of the previous examples, we single out a case from Poland in the mid-1950s when their officials contacted the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations to launch programs in this country, considering the move vital to improving social and economic well-being. This resulted in the fact that philanthropic foundations, through their programs and activities, established American cultural ties with Poland, a state that was under the influence of the Soviet Union.

In the case of Yugoslavia, we cited the example of a Yugoslav delegation touring American industry in the early 1950s, in which the Yugoslav side insisted that foundations cover their travel expenses. In American foreign policy strategies, Yugoslavia was seen as a 'vulnerability' of the Soviet Union because it represented a state interrupting the chain of connection of satellite states, territorially and ideologically. The split between Tito and Stalin also meant a different policy for Moscow towards its satellite states, which could have taken similar steps, following the example of Belgrade. For this reason, the State Department and non-governmental agencies, led by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, considered Yugoslavia together with Poland to be of vital strategic interest. The programs of the foundations were shaped by the goals of the government's foreign policy since each activity of the foundations had to be screened and obtain permission from the US embassy in Belgrade and by the State Department (Ford Foundation Records, 1955).

## 8. Conclusion

Although the US government was very present with the activities in the diplomatic field in Europe, the official policy indicated the withdrawal from the cultural front. It was a space that the Ford Foundation and other private American organizations filled. In the beginning of the Cold War, U.S. government funds for cultural activities were in many cases limited. For this reason, the State Department sought to coordinate its activities with private foundations keeping in mind their professionalism and operational capacity. The diplomatic missions of the United States did not have enough capacity and support from Washington to sufficiently develop relations in the political and social circles of Britain, France, Germany and Italy during the Cold War. This was especially true of European leftists and intellectuals whose role in these societies was significant. On the other hand, the American foundations Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie, although they could not completely replace the official policy of Washington, were in a strategic position to act. Their work was highly regarded in European circles, so one report said the Ford Foundation was valued even in the extreme leftist circles of the British Labor Party, the German SPD, and many intellectuals in France (Ford Foundation Records, 1955). The task of the foundations was to break down the stereotypes that Europeans had about America, its society and culture. As non-governmental agencies, they were members of the Psychological Strategy Board (PSB) within the State Department, which reported directly to the National Security Council (NSC). Information from the field and knowledge of specific areas that the foundations ruled were beneficial for decision-making factors in the US government's foreign policy establishment. The foundations also allocated significant financial resources to support the resistance against communism. The activities of the foundations during the Cold War were entirely in line with the State Department's policy. Giant foundations have been very active in communicating with people and institutions 'behind the wire', improving communication and building bridges for rapprochement and cultural activities.

## References

- Alexander L. George, & Andrew Bennett. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. The MIT Press.
- Andrew Deruga. (2012). *Hegemony needs society; Gramsci, the Ford foundation and democracy in Poland, 1980-1994*. University of Ottawa.
- Anheier, H. K., & Leat, D. (2013). Philanthropic Foundations: What Rationales? *Social Research*, 80(2), 449–472.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/24385611>
- Audra J. Wolfe. (2018). *Freedom's Laboratory: The Cold war struggle for the soul of science*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Christopher Lamont. (2021). *Research Methods in International Relations*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- CIA Archive. (1951). *Suggestions on kinds of projects we would like to see the Ford foundation support*.
- CIA Archive. (1952a). *Eighth meeting of the psychological strategy board, Room 3E928, Item 2, PSB D8/b, NSC 127*.
- CIA Archive. (1952b). *Psychological Strategic Board report, Report on Social Science Research in Cold War Operations*.
- CIA Archive. (1952c). *Psychological Strategy Board, Procedure for evaluation of National Psychological effort, PSB E-4, Item 3*.
- CIA Archive. (1952d). *Psychological Strategy Board, Social Science Research, Washington D.C.*
- CIA Archive. (1953). *Psychological Strategy Board Meeting, CLA RDP8, Memorandum for the record*.
- CIA Archive. (1957a). *Memorandum for OCB, Telephone conversation between Allen Dulles and Mr. Rowan Gaitber from the Ford foundation*.
- CIA Archive. (1957b). *Office of National Estimates, Consultants' meeting 23-24 January 1957*.
- CIA Archive. (1957c). *Office of National Estimates, No. 8-57, NIE 12-57, The Polish trade discussions*.
- CIA Archive. (1957d). *Office of the President, CLA's Culture Group Renamed, RDP78*.
- CIA Archive. (1958). *Polish Medical Aid Project*.
- CIA Archive. (1962). *Correspondence between the Press Secretary to the President Mr. Pierre Salinger and Stanley J. Grogan, Assistant to the Director of the Ford foundation*.
- CIA Archive. (1964). *CLA Mailroom Library, Larry Birns Show*.
- CIA Archive. (1967). *Resume of OCB Luncheon Resume, C.P. Cabell, General, USAF Deputy Director*.
- CIA Archive. (1976). *Cold War: Interview with James Algenton, The Head of Counter-intelligence at the CLA*.
- CIA Archive. (1977). *Memorandum for Stan Turner, 31 May 77*.
- David Hammack. (1999). Foundations in the American Polity, 1900-1950. In *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Indiana University Press.
- Edward H. Berman. (1983). *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy*. State University of New York Press.
- ERDEM, M., & ROSE, K. W. (2000). AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY IN REPUBLICAN TURKEY: THE ROCKEFELLER AND FORD FOUNDATIONS. *Milletleraras*, 001–027.  
[https://doi.org/10.1501/Intrel\\_0000000022](https://doi.org/10.1501/Intrel_0000000022)
- Fisher, D. (1983). THE ROLE OF PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS IN THE REPRODUCTION AND PRODUCTION OF HEGEMONY: ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATIONS AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. *Sociology*, 17(2), 206–233.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42852563>
- Ford Foundation Archive. (1952). *Annual report for 1952*.
- Ford Foundation Archive. (1967). *International Affairs Records, Institute of International Education, Exchange and Scientific Activity with Eastern Europe including U.S.S.R.*
- Ford Foundation Records. (1955). *Annual report 1955*.
- Ford Foundation Records. (1960). *International Affairs Records, FA748, Exchanges, Series V, Box 7, Folder Title: Yugoslavian Program – General Information*.
- George Gershwin. (1935). *English language opera*.
- George M Frederickson. (1968). *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union*. Harper Torchbooks.
- Helmut K. Anheier, & Stefan Toepler. (1999). *Private Funds, Public Purpose: Philanthropic Foundations in International Perspective*. Springer.
- Huntington, S. P. (1973). Transnational Organizations in World Politics. *World Politics*, 25(3), 333–368.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2010115>
- Inderjeet Parmar. (2012). *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. Columbia University Press.
- Jeremiah O'Leary. (1965). *Garcia-Godoy Cheered in Rebel Zone*.
- John Krige. (2006). *American Hegemony and the post-war reconstruction of science in Europe*. The MIT Press.
- Murray Kempton. (1967). *Brave New World*.
- Olivier Zunz. (2014). *Philanthropy in America: A History*. Princeton University Press.
- Parmar, I. (2002). American foundations and the development of international knowledge networks. *Global Networks*, 2(1), 13–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00024>
- Parmar, I. (2015). The “Big 3” Foundations and American Global Power. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 74(4), 676–703.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43817536>
- Raynor Memorial Libraries. (n.d.). *Marquette university Archives, Manuscripts, Charles J. Kersten Papers, 1919-1972, Bulk 1946-1960, Biographical note*.
- Rockefeller Foundation Records. (1951). *General Correspondence: Program for Soviet Orbit Escapees*.
- State Department Archive. (1957a). *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Soviet Union, Eastern Mediterranean*.
- State Department Archive. (1957b). *The Exchange Program between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe*.
- State Department Archive. (1967). *Ex- Pomona Student Revealed CIA Aid*.
- Stephen Wertheim. (2020). *Tomorrow, the World: The Birth of U.S. Global Supremacy*. Belknap Press.
- US Senate. (1967). *Congressional Record FOLAb3b*.
- Vogel, A. (2006). Who's making global civil society: philanthropy and US empire in world society. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(4), 635–655.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00129.x>
- Volker R. Berghahn. (2002). *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*. Princeton University Press.
- Wilson Carey McWilliams, & Lance Banning. (1994). *The lost promise of progressivism*. University Press of Kansas.