

TWENTY-FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON  
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

---

LETTER

FROM THE

CHAIRMAN, U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

TRANSMITTING

THE 21ST SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE EDUCA-  
TIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES FROM JULY 1  
THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1958, PURSUANT TO  
PUBLIC LAW 402, 80TH CONGRESS



JANUARY 26, 1959.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs  
and ordered to be printed

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

34011

WASHINGTON : 1959



## LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE,  
*January 22, 1959.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

SIR: The U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange submits herewith its 21st semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1 through December 31, 1958.

This report fulfills the requirements of section 603 of the above-mentioned act which states that this Commission shall transmit—

\* \* \* to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the programs and such recommendations as shall have been made \* \* \* to the Secretary of State for effectuating the purpose and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

The membership of the Commission is as follows:

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, chancellor emeritus, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Chairman;

Arthur H. Edens, president, Duke University, Durham, N.C., Vice Chairman;

Laird Bell, lawyer, member of the firm of Bell, Boyd, Marshall & Lloyd, Chicago, Ill.;

Franklin David Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.;

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, dean emeritus, Mills College, and president of the American Association of University Women, Orleans, Vt.

A duplicate copy of this report is being furnished the Senate.

Very truly yours,

R. H. FITZGERALD,

*Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.*

(Enclosure: Advisory Commission's 21st semiannual report to the Congress.)



---

**TWENTY-FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT  
TO THE CONGRESS  
BY THE  
U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE  
(July 1–December 31, 1958)**

---



## CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
I. Financial resources for the educational exchange program.....	<b>1</b>
II. The cultural relations program comes of age.....	<b>2</b>
III. Appointment of special assistance to the Secretary of State for the coordination of international educational and cultural relations.....	<b>3</b>
IV. Proposal for obtaining expert guidance on educational exchange activ- ities in Latin America.....	<b>4</b>
V. Educational exchange as carried out by Communist countries.....	<b>5</b>
Appendix.....	<b>10</b>





# TWENTY-FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS BY THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

## I. FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

In submitting this 21st report to the Congress, the Commission reiterates its conviction that the financial resources made available annually for international educational exchange are grossly inadequate. The goals in our foreign relations that can be served through this program are increasing in dimension and priority, and new needs are constantly emerging. When additional resources are not made available for exchanges, therefore, we do not simply stand still; relatively, we lose ground.

The Commission expressed this concern in its quarterly report to the Secretary of State.

*Recommendation (submitted to the Secretary of State July 17, 1958).*

In the Commission's 10-year association with the educational exchange program, it has frequently stressed the disparity between the needs which this program could and should serve and the inadequate financial resources placed at the program's disposal.

Perhaps failure in the early years to provide funds adequate to the program's purposes stemmed from the fact that it was new and had not sufficiently demonstrated its worth. After a decade of accomplishment, however, the value of educational exchange in our relationships with other countries has been made clearly evident, and if this value has been questioned by any responsible source—within or outside Government—the Commission is unaware of it. There are few Government activities that enjoy such wide support from the agencies and media that reflect American public opinion.

Why, then, has the disparity between needs and resources grown ever greater? Why has it not been possible to provide the exchange program with the means it must have to realize its full potentialities? The Commission cannot answer these questions: There are undoubtedly considerations—budgetary and other—that have been deemed overriding.

It is not for this Commission to judge the relative importance of these considerations. It should be clear, however, that we have urged the program's increase out of a conviction of the importance of educational exchange—based on personal observations, on knowledge of the favorable findings of evaluative studies, on awareness of the support it commands at home and of the cordiality of its reception abroad.

Two years ago the Commission expressed "vigorous support" of a request of \$35 million for the exchange program for fiscal

year 1958. The final figure was \$20.8 million. This year (1959) the Commission supported the efforts of the Senate to accord the program a \$10 million increase. Through the efforts of Members of both Houses of the Congress, \$2 million was finally added.

Meanwhile, the costs of the program have arisen in proportion to costs everywhere. New areas for exchange—Africa and Eastern Europe—have demanded attention. Recent events have made manifest the need for increasing our program with Latin America—and the shortsightedness of our previous reductions in that area. Further, the constant efforts to improve the quality of the program should be greatly accelerated.

In addition to these new demands, existing programs and activities of proven worth must be maintained. As our Latin American experience should demonstrate, cultural exchange cannot be turned off and on like a faucet. To meet new needs, therefore, additional funds must be placed at the program's disposal. In view of the long-range effectiveness of exchanges, the time to provide these funds is now.

The foreign currencies made available to the program as a result of war surplus and agricultural sales abroad, including those without appropriation, have even while adding to its resources limited its flexibility—it is difficult to judge their net effect. The Commission is hesitant for this reason to commit itself to support of any precise figure for next year's appropriation for educational exchange. We recognize, however, that additional demands made on the program since the Commission recommended \$35 million 2 years ago make the reasonableness of this amount even more evident today.

Therefore, the Commission with deep conviction urges the Department of State, the Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the Congress to review the needs of the educational exchange program in terms of its obvious merits and of the many purposes of high national priority that it ought to be serving but is not. We have no doubts that such a review would result in a proper increase in an activity so important to our security in today's and tomorrow's world.

*Departmental reply (dated August 12, 1958, from Acting Secretary Herter)*

I am pleased to be able to inform you that the Department's estimate of its requirements for the international educational exchange program for fiscal year 1960 should more nearly accord with the Commission's views as to the amount which should be allotted from Federal funds for this program.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Commission was gratified at receiving this assurance. At its 40th meeting just concluded, however, the Commission was deeply disappointed to learn that the President's 1960 budget contains no request for additional funds for the educational exchange program.

## II. THE CULTURAL RELATIONS PROGRAM COMES OF AGE

It is interesting that the publication of the Commission's 21st report should happen to coincide with the beginning of the 21st year of an official Government program of cultural relations. It is thus the Commission's pleasure in these pages to mark the coming of age of this important national endeavor.

Since its natal date of 1938—the year the United States Senate ratified the convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations and the Department of State established a Division of Cultural Relations—the cultural program has demonstrated over and over again, in a period of World War and cold war, its value for the conduct of our external relations. It has enlisted the participation and commands the support of the American people in an uncommon degree. Its popularity at home and acceptability abroad are in large measure attributable to its close identification with our national life and institutions and to the priority it has given to long-range goals of understanding, cooperation, and friendship with other peoples. It will continue to grow in influence as long as it maintains this character.

There is a danger that, in an era of instability and change, the continuity of our international educational and cultural programs will not be adequately appreciated. It is for this reason that the Commission in its reporting strives always to place subjects discussed in their proper historical perspective. (See, for example, the Commission's 14th semiannual report of July 19, 1955, which traces various phases of the development of exchange programs from their inception to that date.) It is for this reason, also, that the Commission is reprinting, as an appendix of this 21st report, a recently published article "Twenty Years After: Two Decades of Government-sponsored Cultural Relations," written by Mr. Francis J. Colligan of the Department of State. The Commission is glad to be able to facilitate the distribution of this informative historical account.

### III. APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

The international educational and cultural activities of the U.S. Government, established at different times and under differing legislative authority, undoubtedly require for maximum effectiveness the most careful coordination. It is a real sign of program maturity, therefore, that the beginning of the third decade of Government-sponsored cultural relations should coincide with the designation of the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations, and by appointment of Mr. Robert H. Thayer to this position.

The Commission had the opportunity, at its meeting on December 15-16, of considering in some detail with Mr. Thayer his plans for carrying out his assignment. We have been impressed by his evident appreciation of the dimensions of the problems of coordination.

This action by the Department of State appears to be in definite accord with frequent judgments and recommendations expressed over a period of years by this Commission. (For example, see the 17th semiannual report dated May 13, 1957.) It indicates progress, at least, toward full compliance with recommendations of the study on coordination prepared in 1957 by Dr. J. L. Morrill, former Chairman of this Commission. Presumably it is consonant with the intent of legislation introduced in the 85th Congress. The Commission supports the passage of this or similar legislation by the current Congress to afford desirable support for this new office.

#### IV. PROPOSAL FOR OBTAINING EXPERT GUIDANCE ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES IN LATIN AMERICA

*Recommendation (submitted to the Secretary of State July 17, 1958)*

In the light of the current reassessment of our relationships with the peoples of Latin America, and particularly in view of the earmarking of \$4,623,775 from the 1959 International Educational Exchange Service (IES) appropriations for the other American Republics, the Commission was informed that the Department would like the benefit of as much expert guidance as possible—both from within and outside Government—in developing educational exchange programs for the hemisphere.

The Commission was of the opinion that the advice of educators, who have had wide experiences in inter-American cultural relations, would be most helpful in connection with the major problems with which the Department is faced.

The Commission, therefore, approved the calling of a meeting of private experts under the sponsorship of the Commission, for the purpose of assisting the Department in a reappraisal of its educational exchange activities in Latin America. Members of this working group, referred to as "conferees," should be selected on the basis of their wide experience in inter-American cultural relations.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following is excerpted from the Department's reply, dated August 26, 1958, from Acting Secretary Herter:

Your decision to obtain expert guidance in reappraising our educational exchange activities in Latin America, I am sure, will produce fruitful results.

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting in question was held at the Department of State on September 4, 1958, with the following conferees in attendance: Rex Crawford, University of Pennsylvania; Alan Manchester, Duke University; Francis Rogers, Harvard University; Carleton Sprague Smith, New York Public Library; Walter Thurston (Ambassador, retired); and S. Walter Washington, University of Virginia.

During the 1-day session, the conferees discussed certain projects which the Department was already considering under an expanded program for Latin America and suggested other projects or activities that might be undertaken by the Department to improve relationships with the peoples of other countries in the hemisphere.

The Department was already considering Latin American student leaders' seminars, wherein small groups of Latin American student leaders will spend a few weeks at an American university, working on a valid educational project while acquiring personal knowledge and understanding of the United States. The conferees agreed in principle with this project, but made several useful suggestions regarding its content and conduct. Ten such group seminars have been arranged by the Department of State to bring student leaders from 34 universities in the other American Republics. Each group will spend 6 weeks in the United States and Puerto Rico, 4 weeks in intensive seminars conducted in their native languages, and 2 weeks in seeing other aspects of American life.

The Department's proposal to increase the number of American students studying in Latin America was approved also, providing that

first priority was given to graduate students. One exception to this emphasis was the proposal that the Department encourage American educational institutions to inaugurate "junior year abroad" programs in Latin America. At the suggestion of the Department, three universities have initiated "junior year abroad" projects for American students in Brazil, Peru, and Chile.

The plan to send additional American professors to Latin America was commended, but the conferees indicated a preference for research scholars over visiting professors because the former are more apt to be familiar with the language and culture of the country visited.

The group also discussed increased programs for American-sponsored schools and educational travel in the United States for Latin American students.

In the area of new ideas, the conferees suggested that more should be done through exchanges in the fields of labor relations, librarianship, athletics, and the arts. They also proposed that the Department do more to stimulate interest in Latin America on the part of teachers and students by drawing the attention of educational institutions to opportunities and requirements for participation in Government programs in Latin America.

The principle proposal for improving relations with Latin America through means other than educational exchange projects was an emphatic recommendation that action be taken to improve the caliber and status of cultural affairs officers attached to our embassies in that area.

## V. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE AS CARRIED OUT BY COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The rapid expansion in recent years of programs of educational and cultural exchange conducted by the U.S.S.R. and other countries of the Soviet bloc constitutes a portentous development concerning which not enough is known by the American public. The Commission receives, at regular intervals, copies of reports prepared in the Department of State on the extent and nature of these exchanges, and it reviews these reports carefully in the light of its responsibilities for advising the Department concerning this country's exchange programs.

The Commission is using this report as a medium for making the most current information on this subject available to members of the Congress and the interested public. There follow excerpts from an unclassified report recently prepared in the Department dealing with Soviet bloc exchanges during 1958.

### THE SOVIET BLOC EXCHANGE PROGRAM, 1958

#### A. INTRODUCTION

The Soviet exchange program in 1958 was marked by a steady but less spectacular growth than in former years. With over 3,000 delegations exchanged, over half of these with countries of the free world, the actual pattern of exchanges remained remarkably consistent with former years. The largest single group of exchanges continued to be in the technical, professional, and scientific fields, which accounted for (44 percent) of all Soviet exchanges. Western Europe and the United States occupied over 60 percent of Soviet exchanges with the free world, followed by Asia and Africa with a combined average of 25 percent. While

sharp individual rises in individual countries did occur, they did not change the general geographical pattern of the total exchange program.

The one genuine break in past patterns was the fact that 17 Soviet students are now studying in U.S. institutions of higher learning and 22 U.S. students are studying in the Soviet Union. This exchange is the largest of its type with any free world country and marks the first time that Soviet students have gone abroad in any numbers. Further, 1958 saw the first small groups of Soviet tourists visit the United States.

The initiative and drive for expanding exchanges remains with the Soviet Union, but its enthusiasm for broader exchanges continues to be limited to the exchange of persons. While the Soviet Union does considerable talking about broad exchanges in the entire cultural field, difficulties inevitably develop in arriving at reciprocity in exchanges of publications, radio and TV programs and motion pictures. \* \* \*

The tourism program of the U.S.S.R. continues to expand, but the average visitor to the Soviet Union is limited to an Intourist-controlled program with a minimum of contact with Soviet citizens. Further, Soviet authorities continue to make little effort to give their people a genuine opportunity to get to know and understand the cultural backgrounds and institutions of the people who come to see them. Even when prominent western spokesmen have been offered the facilities of Soviet radio and TV, the coverage of the event, either before or after, in the Soviet press has been minimal and far outshadowed by the vituperative attacks on the free world as served up daily by Soviet propagandists.

#### B. STUDENT EXCHANGES

Soviet bloc educational exchange programs with countries of the free world for 1958 doubled the 1957 levels. The expansion took place primarily with the underdeveloped countries, although the share of exchanges with the more advanced free world countries increased.

The total volume of bloc student exchanges involves approximately 17,000 students. Of the 17,000, 1,163, or less than 7 percent, are from the free world. These students are divided, with 688 studying in the U.S.S.R., 314 in East Germany, 81 in Czechoslovakia, and 80 distributed among schools in the other Eastern European satellites. Further, it should be noted that the largest group of free world students within the bloc consists of the 725 students from the UAR (386 from Egypt, 339 from Syria).

The significant factor regarding Soviet bloc educational exchange is that it is attaining a degree of respectability. When the first scholarships or offers of educational aid were offered by the Soviet Union 3 years ago, the number of offers greatly exceeded the number of acceptances. Today the offers are being accepted with less hesitancy. However, the evidence is that where equal offers are made between schools in the West and schools in the Soviet bloc, offers from the West are overwhelmingly preferred.

Through maintaining a pose as a champion of increased student exchanges, the Soviet Union, with a few minor exceptions, until 1958 limited exchanges of its own students to the bloc. Under the U.S.-U.S.S.R. exchange agreement, however, an exchange of students for a year of study was provided, and 22 American graduate students, 2 of them accompanied by their wives, are studying in Moscow, while 17 Soviet students have entered U.S. universities. \* \* \*

The following chart indicates the known number of free-world students going to Soviet bloc countries:

Free world students in bloc countries, 1958-59 school year

Country	U.S.S.R.	Czech	East Germany	Other Eastern European satellites
Algeria.....			6	
Austria.....			7	
Belgium.....			1	
Bolivia.....		5		
Brazil.....			3	
Colombia.....			7	
Cyprus.....			2	
Ecuador.....			1	
Egypt.....	335		16	35
Ethiopia.....	1	1		
Finland.....	15		4	
France.....	5	2	5	
Ghana.....			2	
Greece.....			28	
Guatemala.....	3			
Haiti.....			1	
Iceland.....	1		8	
India.....	17		13	
Indonesia.....	10		32	6
Iran.....			26	
Iraq.....		7	7	
Italy.....	70		2	
Japan.....			1	
Jordan.....			2	
Lebanon.....			2	
Madagascar.....			1	
Nepal.....	15			
Nigeria.....	1		17	
Norway.....	12			
Pakistan.....	10			
Peru.....			2	
Sierra Leone.....			1	
Spain.....			5	
Sudan.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	40	1
Switzerland.....			1	
Syria.....	180	66	63	30
United States.....	24		2	
Uruguay.....			1	
West Germany.....	3			9
Yemen.....			5	
Total.....	688	81	314	80

\* 1,163

<sup>1</sup> Number of scholarships or mutual exchanges offered by U.S.S.R.; number of acceptances not known.  
<sup>2</sup> All but 10 rumored to be Communists.  
<sup>3</sup> Exact number unavailable, though presence of group known.  
<sup>4</sup> Predicted by recipient country.  
<sup>5</sup> Total and subtotals represent the number of students or scholarships as announced in various sources. At the most they present a minimum picture of current enrollment. No official data are available.

C. TOURISM

1. Visitors to the U.S.S.R.

Despite a series of international political crises, the number of tourists going to the U.S.S.R. continued to swell in the past year. It is estimated that over 50,000 foreign tourists from the free world visited the Soviet Union in 1958, compared to 30,000 the previous year. Of these, some 5,000 were Americans. (Soviet spokesmen in giving out information refer to "travelers" when speaking of tourists and claim much larger figures, apparently counting any person traveling to the Soviet Union, regardless of his mission.)

The Soviet authorities appear highly satisfied with the results of their program of tourism and have already announced a further expansion during the coming year. The number of tourist routes has risen from 15 in 1955 to 40 in 1958, and 60 have been promised in 1959 \* \* \*

Soviet publicity last year gave much attention to the number of people who drove their automobiles to the Soviet Union as well as those who came by bus on group tours from Western Europe. An additional motor route was opened between Finland and Leningrad and Moscow, but automobile touring remained highly circumscribed, with travel limited to three prescribed routes and with each auto party accompanied by an Intourist guide and interpreter.

Air service into the Soviet Union was broadened with the signing of air agreements for an exchange of weekly commercial passenger flights with India, Belgium, England, France, and the Netherlands. The steamer *Baltika* plied regularly between London and Leningrad. Early in 1959 the Greek liner *Olympia* will visit three Soviet Black Sea ports, the first time since World War II that a major trans-Atlantic cruise ship has entered the region.

Although Intourist continues to supervise the U.S.S.R.'s entire world tourist program, foreign tourist agencies have played an increasingly large role in booking and advising tourists. Intourist claims to have agreements with 80 tourist bureaus in the world. Represented by eight companies in the United States beside its own representative, Intourist has profited by their efficiency in expediting travel to the U.S.S.R. Suggestions from one New York agency resulted in time-saving operations in the Washington Embassy's visa section and were further reflected in the relatively quick 48-hour visa processing for Americans at the Brussels World's Fair. In addition to Intourist, an International Youth Tourist Travel Bureau has been set up in Moscow to facilitate youth travel to and from the Soviet Union. Soviet authorities estimate 3,000 youths from 20 countries visited the U.S.S.R. the past year under the management of this bureau.

Within the Soviet Union tourist discounts on surface and air transportation and the preferential exchange rate of 10 rubles to the dollar were continued. There is some evidence of outright subsidization of tourists. Finnish tourists, for example, have found the Intourist tours offered such bargains as to encourage more than one trip a season. When an American tried to reserve a place on one of the bargain Finnish tours from Helsinki, the Soviet officials refused a visa.

Although new routes are being opened up for tourists and Soviet travel officials mention camping tours for the coming year, Intourist still maintains fairly rigid control over all visitors, and any variance in "the program" is frowned upon or refused because of "lack of facilities." The result is that while tourists move on the prescribed itineraries with relative freedom, many find irksome the constant presence of an Intourist representative and the inability easily to change routes or sightseeing places.

## 2. Soviet tourists in the West

The Brussels Fair was the main attraction for Soviet tourists during the past year. Originally Soviet sources had indicated that as many as 30,000 Soviet tourists might attend, but final figures indicate that only approximately 10,000 actually did.

The first private Soviet tourists, totaling approximately 65 persons, came to the United States in 1958. Organized into four tours, these travelers paid \$1,200 at a 10 to 1 exchange rate to an American tourist company for their tour. The first 3 groups visited New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles on a 14-day package tour. Intourist interpreters accompanied them, although the American touring concern offered this service. The fourth group comprised 18 Soviet film personalities who made an 11-day tour across America to Hollywood. This group used American interpreter-guides.

The *Gruziya*, the Soviet cruise ship plying between Odessa and Leningrad, continued to be the principal method of transportation for Soviet tourists to Western Europe. These tours are of 25-day lengths, with stops in Turkey, Greece, the U.A.R., France, Belgium, and Finland. Tourist visas were refused by Italy to the first group of Soviet tourists because of possible influence on the spring Italian elections and the cruise ship crossed Italian ports off its future trips.

According to the tourist section of the All-Union Council of Soviet Trade Unions, 7,000 trade unionists visited 23 countries during 1958. Most of these tourists are subsidized by their trade unions for most of the expenses of their trip.

Twelve Soviet citizens, several of whom were Jews, went to Israel in July as tourists. Upon returning to the U.S.S.R. the group promptly castigated practically all aspects of Israeli life in "eyewitness" accounts, which were given considerable publicity by Soviet media.

Whether or not Soviet tourists are actually under the surveillance of one of their members traveling with them, Soviet tourist groups continue to remain rather aloof in the countries they visit. They make little or no effort to take advantage of the hospitality offered them to get to know local people. They seem reluctant to accept the help of local guides, and in their comments they often interpret local phenomena in accordance with Soviet propaganda precepts to which they have been conditioned. However, the tourist articles which have been noted in the Soviet press have been reasonably factual. \* \* \*



## D. PATTERNS OF EXCHANGE

*1. Geographic distribution*

Sixty-six percent of all Soviet exchanges with the free world in 1958 were with Western Europe and the United States. The dominance of Western Europe in the Soviet exchange effort, with 52 percent of all exchanges, continues, but the U.S.-U.S.S.R. exchange agreement in 1958 increased the United States share from 8 percent in 1957 to 14 percent in 1958.

The pattern of distribution for the other geographical areas of the world remains essentially the same as in previous years. Free Asia and Africa had 26 percent of the exchanges in 1958, compared with 28 percent in 1957, while Latin America accounted for 8 percent of the exchanges in both years. An interesting side light is that while Soviet exchanges with underdeveloped countries increased absolutely, percentagewise the underdeveloped countries accounted for 2 percent less of the Soviet exchange effort in 1958 compared with 1957 (35 percent in 1957, 33 percent in 1958).

*2. Types of delegations*

Technical, professional, and scientific groups continue to dominate Soviet exchanges with the free world, although their proportion has dropped as the Soviet Union has broadened its exchanges. The actual exchanges with individual geographic areas vary—i.e., while 52 percent of all exchanges with the United States in 1958 were in the technical and professional category, only 21 percent of the exchanges with Latin America were in this category. The professional and technical groups are followed by the cultural (21 percent), sports (14 percent), then youth, women, trade union, trade, and Communist front groups.

Cultural exchanges have been increased overall with the free world by 4 percent, but they jumped 12 percent with the United States, and were up 15 percent with free Asia and Africa \* \* \*.

## THE PERFORMING ARTS

\* \* \* The performing arts were an important aspect of the Soviet exchange program in 1958. The highlight of the year was the Brussels Fair, where the Soviets spared neither money nor talent in presenting a wide variety of shows. There during the U.S.S.R. "National Days" (August 11-13) they combined over 500 performers, including those of the State Symphony of the U.S.S.R., the Moiseyev Ballet, the Ukrainian Ensemble of Songs and Dances, the Moscow Circus, and the Olympic team of gymnasts. While the Soviet performances at the fair were well received, they did not make as much impression on the audiences as was indicated by Soviet sources. (Glaringly absent from the Soviet shows were examples of "contemporary themes" of "Socialist realism" so lauded in the U.S.S.R.) During the fair the Soviets spread their various performers about in Brussels and in neighboring cities, achieving the most success from two concerts of the State Symphony Orchestra with the American pianist Van Cliburn. Earlier in the year Cliburn received first prize in the much advertized Tchaikowsky music competition in Moscow.

While the various Soviet cultural groups performing abroad during 1958 are too numerous to be listed here, the following are among the highlights of the year: A Georgian Ballet group made an 80-day tour of 7 Latin American Republics and the famous violinist A. Kogin also presented concerts in South America. The Moiseyev Dance team enjoyed a tremendous success in the United States on a nationwide tour. Another Soviet dance team, Beryozka, and the pianist V. Ashkenazy also were received with enthusiasm by American audiences.

Among the many visiting foreign performers to appear in the Soviet Union was the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, which was received by enthusiastic audiences wherever it played.

# APPENDIX

---

## TWENTY YEARS AFTER: TWO DECADES OF GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED CULTURAL RELATIONS

By Francis J. Colligan <sup>1</sup>

It is now 20 years since the Government of the United States undertook for the first time the systematic, long-term encouragement of our cultural relations with other peoples. A brief review of the activities of the Government since that time may be of interest as indicating the types of programs which have grown out of this effort and their role in the conduct of our foreign relations today.

On July 28, 1938, a Division of Cultural Relations was established in the Department of State by departmental order. This event was of a piece with two others of the same year, the ratification of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations and the establishment of what became best known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. These steps were the first to be taken by our Government involving substantial, continuing commitments in the field of international cultural relations. They were followed in 1941 by the assignment of cultural officers to our diplomatic missions, first in Latin America and later in other areas of the world as well. Their duties <sup>2</sup> were defined as assisting the chiefs of mission in matters of cultural significance and keeping the Department of State informed of cultural developments in the country of their assignment. Soon field administration became a principal additional duty. The many-sided programs which were started in those years foreshadowed several types of activities which have been conducted since that time by the Department of State and by other agencies of the Government as well.

Prior to 1938 the role of the Government in cultural relations had been occasional, incidental, and restricted in large part to the eminently "practical." One will recall, of course, a number of outstanding representatives of American culture who served this country abroad, starting with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson (who was not above smuggling seeds out of Piedmont in the interest of our agricultural sciences) and including such figures as Washington Irving, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and James Russell Lowell. Missions of experts to foreign lands to learn or to teach had from time to time been encouraged in one way or another by the Government. In 1900, 1,400 Cuban teachers came to the United States, aboard Army transports, to be guests of Harvard University at a special summer session. In 1908 the remission of the Boxer indemnities to China stimulated an impressive interchange of scholars and students with China, which lasted many years. After the First World War the remainder of the Belgian relief funds, administered by Herbert Hoover, was invested in the establishment of the Belgian-American Foundation, which has played a significant role in our relations with Belgium since that time. During the twenties and thirties, especially, our relations with Latin America were marked by a number of Pan-American Congresses in public health, child welfare, science, and education. In general, however, the Government's efforts in this field had been motivated by no basic, underlying, long-range objective or policy, nor had they represented commitments to any continuing programs.

It was against this background that the United States initiated its first systematic program of international cultural relations. In the foreground were other factors, for, as Ben M. Cherrington, first Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations, has written, it was a "time when Hitler and Mussolini's exploitation of education as instruments of national policy was at its height, and our Government

<sup>1</sup> Francis J. Colligan, author of the following article, is Director, cultural planning and coordination staff, Bureau of Public Affairs. Simultaneous with other assignments in the Department was his service as Executive Secretary of the Board of Foreign Scholarships from 1948 to 1957.

<sup>2</sup> As reported by Muna Lee and Ruth McMurry in "The Cultural Approach," University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1947.

was determined to demonstrate to the world the basic difference between the methods of democracy and those of a 'Ministry of Enlightenment and Propaganda.' There was to be established in the Department of State an organization that would be a true representative of our American tradition of intellectual freedom and educational integrity."<sup>3</sup>

The history of the programs of this organization and of its collaborators and successors falls naturally into three parts. The first covers the years 1938-48; the second, 1948-53; the third, the years since 1953.

#### *Cultural relations with Latin America*

The dominant facts of the first period were the Second World War and the good neighbor policy. Government-sponsored programs were first started with Latin America as an essential element of that policy. Moreover, compared with our traditional cultural relations with Europe, and even with China in a somewhat different context, those with the other American Republics had been slight. The shadow of war, however, hung over the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires in 1936 when the United States proposed, among other topics for discussion, the "Facilitation by Government Action of the Exchange of Students and Teachers." This it did in the belief that the promotion of cultural relationships was one of the most practical means of developing in the American Republics a public opinion that would favor and support a rule of peace throughout the Western Hemisphere. The result was the adoption by the Conference of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. In the years that followed, the threat of Nazi penetration in Latin America quickened the pace at which the good neighbor policy was being carried out. In 1938 the cultural convention was ratified by Congress, and 1939 saw the passage of the act "to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics" (Public Law 355, 76th Cong., 1939). It was under this authority and that of Public Law 63, 76th Congress, 1939, that cultural relations were developed with Latin America. No other permanent legislation regarding cultural relations was enacted until 1948.

The basic policies which governed the initial conduct of the program proved to be sound and are as applicable today to all programs of this type. These were, first, maximum cooperation with nongovernmental organizations and institutions in the United States and, second, the utilization of existing institutions and established centers of culture both in the United States and in the other participating countries. At the same time it was recognized that the Federal Government itself had many resources that could be effectively mobilized for this program—hence the establishment of the Inter-Departmental Committee for Scientific and Cultural Cooperation with its coordinated budget for the programs of participating agencies.

#### *Programs in other areas*

The war was also directly responsible for the initiation of officially sponsored cultural relations with China and the Near East, which were financed from an emergency fund of the President. The program with China was started in 1942 for the purpose of strengthening Chinese scientific and cultural activities during the period of national resistance. The program with the Near East, begun in 1943, focused upon the reinforcement of American-founded schools and hospitals in the area.

Some idea of the scope and scale of activities during this period may be gathered from the fact that in 1943-44 the cultural programs in all other areas amounted to \$2,871,000 and that of the Interdepartmental Committee in Latin America, to \$4,500,000. No integrated program was developed with Europe, but the need for postwar rehabilitation and multilateral organizations was anticipated. The United States was represented in such conferences as those of the Allied Ministers of Education in London in 1943. By 1946, cultural officers had been assigned to nine countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

While the specific types of activity varied from area to area and indeed from country to country, there emerged from these early programs certain patterns which have characterized our international cultural programs since that time. Dependent primarily upon the personnel and other resources of the Federal Government were cooperative scientific and technical projects and those for governmental inservice training. There were also industrial training projects, which were singularly successful at a time when war conditions increased the

<sup>3</sup>"Ten Years After," Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, vol. 34, No. 4, December 1948, p. 500.

demand for labor. All traditional channels of cultural interchange were widely employed. They included "exchange of persons" through scholarships and fellowships, visiting professorships, and grants for the visits of technical and other experts and leaders; the holding of conferences and seminars; grants to American institutions; the development of American studies and the teaching of English; facilitation of the interchange and use of publications, art objects, and other audio-visual materials; publication and circulation of translated books; and last, but certainly not least, the establishment and maintenance abroad of American libraries and cultural centers.

All these were utilized for various specific purposes, including the creation of better understanding abroad of the American way of life; strengthening of American educational institutions abroad; increasing knowledge of other countries among Americans; and promoting educational, professional, and institutional relations and contacts among leaders of thought and opinion. Basic to all of these was the general objective of developing international cooperation and mutual interest.

#### *International information services*

The effectiveness of these activities was enhanced by the international information services, which, for the United States as for several other countries, emerged also out of wartime needs. These services publicized and supplemented cultural activities and disseminated much cultural material in their programs abroad. These agencies were the Office of War Information and, for the information program in Latin America, certain offices of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Together they formed the basis for what today is the United States Information Agency. Both left us important cultural legacies as well.

Originally charged with definite responsibility for the promotion of cultural projects, the Office of the Coordinator performed a valuable service in strengthening American-sponsored schools in Latin America. Especially notable was the Inter-American Educational Foundation, which was combined later with the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; the IIAA now functions within the framework of the Office of Latin American Operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

The Office of War Information had a different orientation. Its principal legacy in the cultural field has been the libraries which it established and which are now a prominent feature of the program overseas of the United States Information Agency.

The years immediately following the war were marked by general reorganization, resulting in the liquidation of wartime agencies and the retention of certain functions of value for postwar purposes. Certain programs of the Office of War Information and of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, together with those of the Division of Cultural Cooperation (a later name of the original division) and of the staff of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, were gathered on a temporary basis into a single unit which was known as the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

Meanwhile, the United States participated in the founding of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). In 1946, with the passage of legislation sponsored by Senator J. William Fulbright (Public Law 584, 79th Cong.), the ground was laid for the utilization of foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States for a cooperative program of educational exchanges. All this reflected a typically postwar period, one of transition from a war-charged world to what all hoped would be a truly peaceful society of nations. Despite the confusion of these years, the cultural program had developed certain policies, gained certain experiences, and adopted certain techniques which were to prove useful in the ensuing period when the permanent program of cultural relations, previously restricted to Latin America, became worldwide.

#### *Postwar period*

The second period began in 1948, when the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) was passed by the Congress and the program authorized by the Fulbright Act became operative. The former, sponsored by Senator H. Alexander Smith and Representative (now Senator) Karl E. Mundt, authorized the extension of the program with Latin America to other areas of the world as determined by the Secretary of State. This meant in effect its expansion to all the nations of the free world. Early in 1948 an article vehemently attacking the Institute of International Education as a symbol of American cultural relations appeared in the "Soviet Teacher's

Gazette." It climaxed 3 years of Soylet coolness to our suggestions for such contacts. Together with other incidents, the article indicated conclusively that the Iron Curtain applied as much to cultural as to economic and political relations.

Another political development affecting the cultural programs of the period was the conquest of the Chinese mainland by the Communists, which closed the door to relations with that area. It also prompted the establishment of a Chinese emergency aid program for students and scholars, which was financed from funds of the Economic Cooperation Administration and those made available under the Foreign Aid Act of 1949 (Public Law 327, 81st Cong., 1949) and the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong., 1950). These funds enabled the Department to offer assistance to needy Chinese students and some scholars stranded here by the catastrophe in their homeland and to bring here for short periods of research a few students and scholars from various areas of the Far East.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950 resulted in the extension of aid to Koreans similarly stranded in the United States. This program was assisted by a special advisory committee under the chairmanship of the president of the American Council on Education; the close cooperation of more than 300 colleges and universities kept administrative costs to an absolute minimum. Designed to give short-term assistance to enable students to attain their immediate educational objectives, the program was terminated in 1955 after having assisted almost 3,700 beneficiaries at a cost, including administration, of about \$8 million.

The Department, beginning in 1949, faced the task of terminating another type of emergency program, the reorientation programs with occupied areas, which had been started after the Second World War by the military government and which were turned over to the Department for consolidation on a reduced scale with the regular cultural programs. The story of these programs and especially of the cooperation of nongovernmental organizations in the United States, largely through the Commission on the Occupied Areas of the American Council on Education, although an engrossing one, lies outside the sphere of this article. Their most noteworthy contribution to the cultural relations program as a whole was the series of Amerika Häuser and information centers which, on a reduced scale, ultimately became part of USIA's program.

#### *Educational exchange service*

These emergency activities were entirely independent of the regular programs of long-term cultural relations. For the latter, the Smith-Mundt Act became the basic charter. It provided for a separate "educational exchange service" in the Department of State. (The term "educational exchange" was, in this context, practically synonymous with "cultural relations.") The purpose of this service would be "to cooperate with other nations in the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; the rendering of technical and other services; the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences" (sec. 2). It provided explicitly and in detail for the types of activities already developed and tested in the programs with Latin America, China, and the Near East. It amplified and wrote into law the basic policies which had governed cultural programs up to that time: cooperation, reciprocity, the maximum use of nongovernmental agencies and advisers while utilizing fully, on a noncompetitive basis, the resources of the Federal Government itself. It authorized the financing of the program in dollars, including the dollar expenses and dollar grants required by the program under the Fulbright Act.

Meanwhile, with the actual initiation of programs under the Fulbright Act began that strong support, both financial and administrative, of educational, academic, and research exchanges which has been a significant feature of the cultural program as a whole. By 1948, agreements under the act had been signed with four countries for the financing of exchanges in local currencies and the establishment of binational commissions or foundations for the administration of the country programs. This concrete demonstration of the cooperative and reciprocal nature of the program was repeated in the United States, where the Board of Foreign Scholarships had already been organized and, by the caliber of its membership, had enlisted the wholehearted cooperation of our academic and scholarly community. This board is one of several groups representing public and professional interest involved in the cultural program in its entirety. The others are the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, the Committee on Cultural Information of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information (both of these Commissions were authorized by the Smith-Mundt Act), the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (authorized by Public Law 565, 79th Cong.,

1946), and the Advisory Committee on the Arts, recently authorized by the Humphrey-Thompson Act.<sup>4</sup> These public bodies illustrate strikingly the extent to which as a matter of policy representatives of nongovernmental organizations and private citizens have been involved in the administration of the Government's cultural program.

Other acts of Congress during the postwar period testify to the faith of the American people in the value of cultural relations in the shaping of a peaceful world. These included the allocation of an Iranian trust fund (an indemnity paid some years before) to the student exchange program (Public Law 861, 81st Cong., 1950); the Finnish Educational Exchange Act sponsored by Senator Smith, which allocated funds thenceforth accruing from Finland's payments on its First World War debt to the interchange of students, teachers, and trainees and to the exchange of books and educational equipment with the Republic of Finland (Public Law 265, 81st Cong., 1949); the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, sponsored by Senator Mundt, which provided for the financing of similar exchange projects with India from some of the interest accruing on the emergency food loan (Public Law 48, 82d Cong.); and the informational media guaranty provisions of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, as amended, which authorized the financing of cultural activities from foreign currencies purchased by our Government in the course of encouraging the sale of American publications in certain countries.

#### *Increased activities*

Some idea of the increase in activity during this period may be gathered from appropriations for the exchange of persons and from the number of libraries, cultural institutes, and information centers. In 1948 the budget for the international exchange of persons amounted to \$5,236,518, including foreign currencies under the Fulbright Act; in 1953 the comparable figure was \$22,235,635. In 1948 the libraries, information centers, and cultural institutes (sometimes referred to as binational centers or societies) under the educational exchange service of that time numbered 98; in 1953 they numbered 227.

It was during this period also that the program of technical cooperation was extended on a regular basis beyond Latin America, as announced in President Truman's 1949 inaugural address. As already noted, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, under what is now the International Cooperation Administration, continued its work in Latin America. The Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation was succeeded by other organizational elements under the expanded program.

These developments were paralleled by a growing interest in cultural activities among multilateral organizations of which the United States is a member. One of the four principal objectives of the United Nations, as stated in its charter, is the achievement of "cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character \* \* \*" (art. 1). UNESCO, the specialized agency in the cultural field, had as its basic purpose the contribution "to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture \* \* \*". The United States had played a prominent part in the establishment of the Organization in 1945 and had lent it strong support. During this period UNESCO was going through a phase of exploration and experiment not unusual for any new organization, especially one whose potential membership was as broad as that of the U.N. and whose objectives were writ so large. Other specialized agencies and programs of the U.N. were likewise developing, notably the expanded program of technical assistance, which, in its broad use of the term "technical" and its stress on education as a means of achieving technical goals, shares many of the characteristics of the cultural programs developed by national governments.

Regional organizations were also active. The Organization of American States, in the charter of Bogota (1948), which was ratified by the United States in 1951, states as one of its objectives the promotion by cooperative action of the economic, social, and cultural development of the member states. It pursues these objectives through the Inter-American Cultural Council, one of the three organs of the Council of the Organization; through the Cultural Department of the Pan American Union; and through several specialized inter-American organizations such as the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

In summary, this was a period of organization and reorganization, of programs liquidated and programs expanded, as the United States strove to meet its

<sup>4</sup> For the membership of the Board of Foreign Scholarships through 1956, see "Swords Into Plowshares," Department of State publication 6344, 1956; for the membership of the other bodies, see their periodical reports.

responsibilities on every front of the cold war. The phrase "good neighbor" was superseded in 1950 by another, "the campaign of truth," which was to characterize both the information and the cultural relations programs. This phrase indicates quite well the dominant mood of the period. A semiautonomous agency, the International Information Agency, within the Department of State was created in 1952 to administer both programs.

*The period 1953 to date*

The current period may be dated from 1953, when, in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 8,<sup>6</sup> all the activities of the International Information Administration, except those of the International Educational Exchange Service, were transferred to a new, independent office, the U.S. Information Agency. The exchange programs, together with functional responsibility for the participation of our Government in multilateral cultural activities, remained in the Department of State under the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

Additional legislation in furtherance of cultural activities continued to be enacted. What were, in effect, amendments to the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts broadened the foreign-currency base. Notable especially is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480, 83d Cong., 1954). Marking an expansion into new areas of activity was the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act (Public Law 860, 84th Cong., 1956), which was sponsored by Senator Hubert Humphrey and Representative Frank Thompson. This act authorized on a permanent basis funds for the cultural presentations program which was established in 1954 following a special request by President Eisenhower to the Congress. Originally designed to step up the presentation of American performing acts abroad by underwriting the deficits incurred by American artists, the program has brought to other peoples a new awareness of the cultural maturity and creativity of the American people and of their widespread interest especially in music and the theater. Well featured in the press, it needs no further notice here.

Meanwhile the program as a whole has continued to grow. It is difficult to trace in a direct line the development of the programs which have been touched upon here, with all the factors that have made them what they are. Nonetheless, certain selected figures may be of interest. The budget of less than \$6 million for exchange of persons in 1948 has grown in 1958 to \$20.8 million. The number of foreign countries participating in the programs under the Fulbright Act has grown from 4 in 1948 to 33 this year. No funds at all were available for cultural presentations overseas in 1948; in 1958 they amounted to \$2.3 million. As to libraries, cultural institutes, and information centers, the 98 of 1948 now number 234 in 75 countries.

The program now extends, on a limited, experimental basis at least, to the Soviet Union and some of the other countries of Eastern Europe. This expansion originated at the summit meeting at Geneva in July 1955, when the question of contact between the Soviet bloc and the free world was referred to the foreign ministers. The latter discussed it at their meeting the following October, which was followed by direct negotiations and the initiation of limited, specific projects. These culminated in the agreement for cultural exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union which was signed on January 27, 1958.<sup>6</sup>

Meanwhile, other programs were underway. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has developed a series of cultural activities; the report of the "Three Wise Men" (the Committee of Three on Nonmilitary Cooperation in NATO, 1956)<sup>7</sup> stressed the role of cultural cooperation in heightening that "sense of community" on which must be based the continuing cooperation of peoples and governments. "This will exist," they said, "only to the extent that there is a realization of their common cultural heritage and of the values of their free way of life and thought." Under somewhat different circumstances, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization has undertaken a modest program of the same general type.

The Organization of American States has continued its development of cultural cooperation. For example, in 1954 at the Inter-American Conference at Caracas it revised the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations to render it more realistic and effective. It has recently announced the initiation of a program of 500 scholarships to students of the Americas as recommended by the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives in 1957.

<sup>6</sup>Bulletin of June 15, 1953, p. 854.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., Feb. 17, 1956, p. 243.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., Jan. 7, 1957, p. 18.

The interest of member states in UNESCO has grown substantially and, as Walter H. C. Laves and Charles A. Thomson pointed out in their review of the Organization's first 10 years, it seems to have found a successful formula for program planning in its concentration on a few major projects of widespread interest.

*Cultural planning and coordination staff*

The increase and expansion of so many of these activities is responsible at least in part for the revival of the feeling that, as in 1938, our international cultural relations should be effectively integrated, that they should retain their identity as such, and that they should be regarded, like those of other countries, as coordinate with information, technical, and other "action" programs. Over the years this view has been expressed in many ways. It was behind the establishment of the original Division of Cultural Relations as a separate administrative element in the Department. It is reflected in the Smith-Mundt Act, in the recommendations of the Select Committee of the Senate on Overseas Information Programs (the Hickenlooper-Fulbright committee) in 1953, in the provisions for the International Educational Exchange Service in Reorganization Plan No. 8. More recently it has been indicated in the concern of the Senate that the coordination between educational exchange and technical training be as effective as possible. It was to allay that concern that Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota, undertook to study the problem for the Department. The basic recommendations in his report of May 1, 1956, were twofold: that the Department effect an "authoritative coordination between such programs" and that it upgrade "the U.S. exchange activity in governmental, congressional, American public, and foreign consciousness." Steps have been and are being taken to carry out both recommendations. The establishment of the cultural planning and coordination staff in the Bureau of Public Affairs has been one such step. This staff, which was created in July 1956 and which includes representatives of ICA, has the dual task of stimulating coordination of the educational exchange program with ICA's technical training activities and of developing policies on international cultural activities. Another step is to be found in the bills now in Congress which would provide explicitly for a special assistant to the Secretary of State for international cultural relations.

This review of cultural relations as sponsored by our Government is necessarily of a general nature. The scale and scope of the programs with individual countries and the types of projects and resources involved are recorded in periodical reports which are readily available. Enough has been noted here, however, to suggest some general conclusions regarding these programs.

The first conclusion is that the programs are still growing—and encountering all the problems one associates with growth.

More significant is the fact that they are responsive to the political milieu in which they exist; in other words, that they support the foreign policy of the United States. Within that framework, however, they have, and should have, specific characteristic purposes, coordinate with those of other international activities. These purposes in turn indicate the role they play in the furtherance of our foreign policy as a whole. They both heighten a sense of solidarity through greater awareness of our common heritage, as with the countries of the NATO area, and increase understanding of the significant differences between others and ourselves by broadening the channels of cooperation on matters of mutual interest. They also balance technological progress with ideas and principles, which, as Vice President Nixon pointed out after his trip to Africa,<sup>9</sup> is vital in the struggle for the minds of men.

Basic to all such programs is, of course, the presentation, direct or indirect, of a balanced picture of one another's way of life. In his address to the Baylor University graduating class of 1956, President Eisenhower declared: "Security cannot be achieved by arms alone, no matter how destructive the weapons or how large their accumulation. So today it is vitally important that we and others detect and pursue the ways in which cultural and economic assistance will mean more to free world strength, stability, and solidarity than will purely military measures."<sup>10</sup> It is for this basic purpose that the programs described earlier have been conducted.

<sup>1</sup> "UNESCO: Purpose, Progress, Prospects," Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Ind., 1957.

<sup>9</sup> Bulletin of Apr. 22, 1957, p. 636.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., June 4, 1956, p. 915.



*Nongovernmental cultural activities*

Since this is a sketch of governmental activities, it has given little space to those of nongovernmental institutions and organizations. The latter, however, both in cooperation with the Government and independently, have been widespread and impressive. Cultural relations are, in fact, essentially relations between peoples; hence the importance of cooperation between governmental and nongovernmental agencies in this field.

From the very beginning of the Nation, cultural relations with other countries have developed as a function of our educational, scientific, and cultural institutions. They have been a byproduct of international trade and have loomed large in the work of missionary and other religious organizations. They have formed an essential part of the programs of our great philanthropic foundations and of such other organizations as binational societies, professional and scholarly groups, and educational and public welfare associations. The entry of the Government into this field did not signify the emergence of competition with these groups. It has been, rather, catalytic—facilitating financially and otherwise the efforts of those on whom the burden for this kind of relations ultimately rests. This fact accounts for the widespread support of the programs as reflected not only in the acts of Congress but in participation and cooperation on a national scale.

This underlying concept is just as vital today as it was in 1936, when it was stated by Secretary of State Cordell Hull at the Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires. At that time he said: "Since the time when Thomas Jefferson insisted upon a 'decent respect to the opinions of mankind,' public opinion has controlled foreign policy in all democracies. \* \* \* There should be brought home to them [the people] the knowledge that trade, commerce, finance, debts, communications, have a bearing on peace. \* \* \* In all our countries we have scholars who can demonstrate these facts; let them not be silent. Our churches have direct contact with all groups; may they remember that the peacemakers are the children of God. We have artists and poets who can distill their needed knowledge into trenchant phrase and line; they have work to do. Our great journals on both continents cover the world. Our women are awake; our youth sentient; our clubs and organizations make opinion everywhere. There is a strength here available greater than that of armies. We have but to ask its aid; it will be swift to answer, not only here, but in continents beyond the seas."

