

Cold War Humanities: Modern Language Study, American Studies, and the National Interest

by Deborah Cohn

Indiana University Bloomington



© 2019 by Deborah Cohn



Cold War Humanities: Modern Language Study, American Studies, and the National Interest*

In 1953, the Association of American Universities issued a pamphlet, “The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties: A Statement on Communism and the Colleges,” which described U.S. universities as “indispensable instruments of cultural progress and national warfare.”¹ Such affirmations spoke to a McCarthy-era climate in which scholarly initiatives, including the expansion of academic fields, were intertwined with official Cold War policies and priorities. While scholars have explored these dynamics in fields such as area studies (Berger, Delpar), anthropology (Price), and the social sciences in general (Solovey), the role of the humanities during this period has been much less studied.² My project, “Cold War Humanities,” puts the Cold War politics motivating the domestic and international institutionalization of the fields of modern languages and American studies front and center. Each field, in different ways, was considered to be ancillary to the United States’ assumption of an international leadership role in the postwar years. In the case of American studies, as the field comprised the study of U.S. history, culture, and politics, both academics and government officials viewed it as a means of disseminating information about the nation and the democratic system, both at home and abroad. Foreign language study, in turn, was seen as fostering the ability to communicate with and gather expertise on international “Others,” thereby surmounting the previous years of political isolationism. Both fields were thus viewed as having an instrumental role in shoring up the U.S. national interest.

Funding from the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, in effect, underwrote the postwar expansion of both fields within and outside of the United States. Studying the history of these fields therefore suggests sites of convergence between scholarly, pedagogical, philanthropic, and institutional priorities, on the

one hand, and, on the other, U.S. foreign policy goals. It also sheds light on a Cold War nexus of academics, scholarly organizations, K-12 schools, universities, government offices, and, of course, philanthropic organizations that extended the practical reach and prominence of the humanities in the United States and abroad. This project thus brings to light the engagement of humanities scholars with the most pressing political concerns of their day. It demonstrates the myriad ways that these scholars used their teaching, research, and administrative efforts to complement official U.S. efforts to win “hearts and minds” around the world, simultaneously advancing U.S. foreign policy interests and furthering the relevance and institutional success of their fields.

Promoting American Studies

The object of American studies was the national self, its history, culture, and politics. As such, the field lent itself to the task of disseminating information about the U.S. and projecting a positive image of the nation to allies and would-be allies abroad. During the Cold War, the field of American studies functioned—and was funded—as a mode of soft power that was capable of shaping attitudes abroad towards the United States and, by extension, democracy as a whole. Thus, a 1961 report issued by the State Department’s Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs affirmed:

The study of American subjects in the educational systems of other countries strengthens the basis for a better understanding of American life and institutions on the part of those elements of the population that shape public opinion and give direction to national policy... [T]he fostering of American studies in foreign countries can contribute powerfully toward building the mutual respect, appreciation, and understanding which are prerequisites for the success of all of our other cooperative international efforts.³

Similarly, one of the field's founders, Robert Spiller, who established an institutional base for the field of American studies at the University of Pennsylvania with three grants from the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and Carnegie Corporation of New York between 1949 and 1954, argued in 1966:

Assuming that the purpose of a cultural foreign policy is the development of international good will by an increase in the mutual understanding of national cultures, it is possible to observe three levels in American cultural foreign policy since 1945: the informational [corresponding to the USIA], the exchange [the Fulbright], and the American-studies levels.⁴

American studies initiatives aimed at promoting greater understanding of the U.S. through international exchanges, establishing positions abroad, and strengthening library holdings in U.S.-related materials—they thus simultaneously served the national interest and strengthened the field's institutional infrastructure, which, in turn, helped to establish its authority as a field.

Interdisciplinary courses in American studies were first offered in the early 1930s, and were soon followed by the founding of the first programs in the field. Over the next few years, the field's institutional growth snowballed. This development reflected concern for the international reputation of the United States, for the nation's international relations and leadership role, and for the global battle to affirm democracy over Communism. It created a climate in which public and private institutions alike were eager to support academic initiatives that foregrounded the nation's accomplishments and democratic institutions. By 1947, there were 60 American studies programs with undergraduate curricula and 15 with graduate curricula, with the numbers increasing rapidly.⁵ The American Studies Association was founded as a parent organization for the field in 1951, and the field's flagship journal, *American Quarterly*, first appeared in 1949. In the years following the Second World War, the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and Ford Foundation (FF) provided multiple small and large grants to scholars, universities, and scholarly organizations that underwrote new programs and initiatives in the

U.S. and abroad. The FF awarded two separate five-year grants to the American Council of Learned Societies in the 1960s to further work in American studies abroad. The first, in 1960, was for \$2.5 million, and was to “strengthen ‘American subject matter instruction at European educational institutions,’” while the second, in 1964, provided \$3.1 million to advance similar goals, adding institutions in Australia, New Zealand, and Japan (and, as of 1967-68, Taiwan).⁶ The awards included fellowships to bring scholars to the U.S. for training, funding for positions abroad (to ensure employment when the scholars returned home, as well as the perpetuation of the field), and grants to libraries. The field rapidly gained traction as part of the U.S. arsenal for soft diplomacy: by the early 1960s, 20% of all Fulbright fellowships—the largest number in any field—were awarded in American studies, which also comprised the largest subject field in the State Department’s educational and cultural programs abroad.⁷

The history of the Salzburg Seminar in American studies, an annual event that began in 1947, gives a clear example of how the field expanded abroad in the postwar years, creating transnational networks of scholars interested in the U.S., as well as how it operated as medium of public diplomacy. The seminar was initially organized through Harvard as a means of rebuilding intellectual community among Europeans, fostering communication among Americanists in Europe and the U.S., and, perhaps almost secondarily, helping to establish the field of American studies abroad. The seminar was led by faculty from the U.S., including distinguished scholars and writers from a variety of fields, including Alfred Kazin, F.O. Matthiessen, Margaret Mead, Henry Nash Smith, and others, along with several student assistants. Almost 100 faculty and students representing a broad range of disciplines came from across Europe to attend the first seminar. As these individuals were often opinion leaders in their home countries, the seminar’s impact was multiplied across the audiences that their voices reached.

From the beginning, the seminar explored questions of democracy within an atmosphere of academic freedom, thus both enacting and teaching U.S. values; the willingness of U.S. participants to discuss statements that were critical of their homeland also made an impression on the scholars from Europe. These factors contributed to descriptions of the seminar as “one of the most effective ways of promoting an intelligent understanding of the United States among Europeans and of contributing to the cooperation and mutual respect of Europeans with each other,” with one faculty member affirming that “In short, the idea of democracy has had no more powerful nor persuasive spokesmen, and no more perceptive listeners, than at Salzburg.”⁸ Although the seminar was often referred to as a “Marshall plan of the mind,” it was all the more successful precisely because organizers worked carefully to ensure that it could not be discounted as a mode of U.S. propaganda or cultural imperialism. Organizers initially refused to pursue U.S. government funding for the seminar, instead raising private funds (the RF, for example, awarded several grants to the seminar through programs such as “Student Cultural Relations” and the “European Cultural Rehabilitation program”). Similarly, the faculty and student assistants alike volunteered their services to avoid any appearance of the seminar being propagandistic.

Anthropologist Margaret Mead was a faculty participant in the first seminar. Her analysis of the program testifies to its power as a mode of cultural diplomacy for the U.S., as well as to how organizers and participants alike viewed it as a force for reconciliation within postwar Europe. Mead described the Schloss Leopoldskron, where the seminar took place and participants stayed, as an:

architectural backdrop for a way of life devoted to the arts. In this setting students arriving to meet other students from the countries of their former enemies, students who had fought on opposite sides, students who had been active in the underground, were able to meet in a mood which combined a sense of distance from real life, and a sense of the importance of the traditions of civilization... The first shock as they found themselves sitting side by side with men whom two short years ago they might have killed, was softened as they saw

themselves reflected back ... from the great mirrors ... Throughout the Seminar, the loveliness and unreality of the setting consistently muted stridencies which might have developed ... [and yet] Salzburg with its bombed areas, its American MP's, in large bright tin helmets, its DP camps and its Jewish refugees, its population among whom there was not a single plump child ... kept pulling the Seminar members back to the real world and assuring them that Leopoldskron was not an escape but merely a setting within which it was possible to meet each other ... The Salzburg Seminar plan was a product of the sort of cross national thinking on which it will be necessary to rely in constructing a more closely knit and more mutually intelligible world ... The choice of Salzburg meant that the Seminar would be held in a country which had once been famous for a culture which regarded itself as European rather than narrowly Austrian, but in a community of Austria which had a markedly Nazi record, and was now occupied by the U.S. Army. Holding such a Seminar there was a way of saying to the European students: "We believe that there is a living tradition of European culture, we realize that central Europe with its recent Nazi tradition, and present critical economic and social conditions is a crucial spot in the whole question of European and world recovery." Thus the choice of Salzburg was both an expression of faith in the powers of recovery which still existed in Austria and an acceptance of a challenge from some of the worst conditions to be found in Europe. The choice of American civilization as the subject of a Seminar, to be held in a country which had recently been on the side of the enemy and which was still occupied by the American Army, also had several implications [... including the Seminar's dissociation] from any government or propagandic venture and that the content had to be cultural, and relatively free from political controversy.⁹

Nevertheless, Mead observed that as most schools in Europe had been closed during the war, and that in Italy and Germany since 1922 and 1933, respectively, "there has been no fair presentation of the United States and democracy," "education and information about the United States [were] vital," at this time; she further added that "Since students from Hungary were included in the project it also might permit some of those from behind the Russian propaganda sphere to see the other side." To this end, she affirmed, "I sincerely place understanding of

America on the same plane as sending food to Europe and do think the former should not be neglected at this time.”¹⁰

The emphasis on American studies meant that seminar organizers walked a fine line. While on the one hand, they aspired to revitalize European scholarship, rebuild academic networks that had been casualties of the destruction of both infrastructure and human relations alike during the war, and avoid the appearance of U.S. influence and imperialism, these goals were in tension with the seminar’s very subject matter, that is, the exploration of U.S. culture, history, and institutions. The political challenges seem to have been successfully navigated, based on participants’ enthusiasm for the endeavor, which became an annual event attracting top scholars and writers. The seminar’s networking goals were equally successful: participants were eager to maintain connections with one another, and in 1954, they founded the European Association of American Studies, which formalized the connections into an institutional network that to this day continues to link scholars in the field across Europe.

The Salzburg Seminar also had a foundational knock-on effect on other efforts to promote American studies abroad. For example, between 1952 and 1955, the Fulbright Commission and the RF organized a series of four conferences on American studies in Great Britain for academics and teachers interested in the U.S. The idea for the conferences came from the State Department, which had taken note of the results of the Salzburg seminar. The British Association of American Studies emerged out of these conferences in 1955, with funding from the RF.¹¹ This cultivation of interest in the field and the development of infrastructure to sustain it, in turn, laid the groundwork for the Ford Foundation’s aforementioned grants for American studies abroad.

In sum, then, the 1950s and 1960s bore witness to multiple initiatives to fund American studies programs abroad, granting the field considerable soft power that allowed it to perform an ambassadorial role for the United States. The public-

private linkages underlying this trajectory speak to what scholars have designated a “state-private network,” which Liam Kennedy and Scott Lucas have characterized as “the extensive, unprecedented collaboration between ‘official’ U.S. agencies and ‘private’ groups and individuals in the development and implementation of political, economic, and cultural programs in support of U.S. foreign policy from the early Cold War period to today.”¹² At the same time, though, funding the institutional development of American studies also had a strategic benefit in the private sector. For example, it afforded the philanthropies some protection within the anti-Communist political climate of the late 1940s and 1950s, which saw the rise of McCarthyism and the HUAC. For example, during the Cox and Reece investigations of 1952 through 1954, in which a U.S. House of Representatives committee scrutinized philanthropic and other tax-exempt organizations to assess whether they were “using their resources for un-American and subversive activities or for purposes not in the interest or tradition of the United States,” the RF used its funding of American studies abroad as evidence in its defense. A 1954 RF report described its grants for several American studies initiatives as demonstrating that “by its effort in the support of American studies to secure full treatment of the diversification, breadth, and richness of American culture, the RF hoped to contribute to a more profound and a more valid understanding of what this country has been and is. Such understanding ... provides the security of knowing who one is that is essential in one’s security in dealing with others.”¹³ The Rockefeller Foundation could thus argue that it was promoting knowledge about U.S. history, values, and accomplishments, which, in turn, provided greater awareness of the benefits of democracy and could help strengthen the resistance to Communism and other contemporary threats.

Revitalizing Modern Language Study

At the turn of the 20th century, U.S. demographics were changing rapidly, and between 1890 and 1915, the number of students enrolled in high schools increased from 202,000 to almost 1.3 million. During this period, enrollments in language courses also soared: while in 1890, half of all high school students studied either Latin (34.7%), German (10.5%), or French (5.8%), between 1900 and 1915, the percentage of students studying languages fluctuated between 72% and 83%, with the study of modern languages claiming an ever-increasing proportion of the enrollments.¹⁴ Following the First World War, though, language study went into a sharp decline. By 1922, only 55% of students were studying language at the high school level. While these numbers were evenly split between Latin and the modern languages, the fate of German—which was, after English, the language most spoken in the United States—offered a harbinger of things to come: in 1915, 24.4% of all high school students studied German, but by 1922, the number had plummeted to 0.6%, rarely topping 2% for the next four decades.¹⁵ These statistics gesture towards the broader impact that the post-World War I tide of anti-German sentiment in particular and political isolationism in general had on attitudes towards language study in the nation. Over the next few years, 22 states implemented laws that prohibited the teaching and public use of foreign languages. Some of these laws were overturned by the Supreme Court while others eventually expired, but the hostility towards language study that they reflected continued to pervade an environment where the use of “correct” English was considered to be an affirmation of patriotism, and where immigrants were urged to assimilate.

The onset of WWII dramatically pointed out the shortsightedness of this stance. Soldiers and diplomats found themselves unable to communicate with enemies or allies, prompting the development of the (time- and money-) intensive army language training program. Nevertheless, the impetus for language training quickly faded after the war. Between 1934 and 1949, the percentage of high school

students enrolled in modern languages dropped even further, from 19.5% to 13.7%.¹⁶

The tide began to turn in the early 1950s. This was not due to any single, paradigm-shifting event—although this would come in 1957, when the launching of Sputnik transformed prevailing political and educational attitudes towards language study, generating tremendous institutional and financial support. Rather, the change in course stemmed from the conviction, drive, and sheer force of will of William Riley Parker, who between 1947 and 1956 was Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association (MLA), the parent organization of scholars and teachers of English and foreign languages and literatures. In this capacity, Parker spearheaded a series of initiatives that both revolutionized and revitalized the study of foreign languages in the United States. Top among his accomplishments was the founding of the Foreign Language Program (FLP) at MLA headquarters. It mobilized scholars and teachers to identify and implement the needs and priorities for language education, and to work with the U.S. Office of Education to develop policies for language instruction and pedagogical training. The FLP's efforts laid the groundwork for the federal response to Sputnik, most notably, the language study provisions (e.g., Title VI) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

A Milton scholar who was quick to admit his lack of facility with foreign languages, Parker might seem an unlikely champion of foreign language study, but he was simply convinced that language study was critical to protecting the U.S. national interest. Indeed, he later described the decline in language study as a “language curtain” that “has inhibited our knowing the minds and hearts of either our enemies or our friends,” and that had directly contributed to the rise of the Iron Curtain.¹⁷ On June 20, 1952, the RF approved a \$120,000 grant for the MLA to examine “the situation of foreign language study in the United States,” as well as its contribution to broader foreign policy goals.¹⁸ The grant, which was Parker's brainchild, supported the MLA's new Foreign Language Program, which formally opened its doors on October 1.¹⁹ Parker described the FLP as “conceived in an

awareness of America's new role in the world and outlined with a deep sense of urgency. This is no longer an 'academic matter.'"²⁰ RF officers both supported the grant's efforts to expand language training and agreed with its underlying motive of strengthening U.S. interests. As Edward F. D'Arms in the Division of Humanities wrote to Parker, the foundation hoped that the MLA could bring "to the awareness of more persons in this country the importance of the study of foreign languages and literatures for the United States as a whole in its present position in world affairs."²¹

The grant supported FLP-related research, conference organization, travel, and the creation of new positions, including an associate secretary (to assume many of Parker's responsibilities as he also took on the role of Director of the FLP), and a research assistant. This support allowed the program to take on new initiatives and quickly become a driving force in the organization. Over the next few years, the FLP revolutionized, revitalized, systematized, and professionalized the study of foreign languages in the U.S., transforming the MLA from a research-oriented scholarly organization into the nation's leading advocate of foreign language education. It gathered data on language enrollments and requirements (and the lack thereof) in elementary and secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities across the nation; it both conducted research into best practices for teaching languages and developed pedagogical materials grounded in these practices; it spearheaded widespread discussion of foreign language study by preparing reports on the data collected, new pedagogical findings and materials, and so on, that were sent to teachers, scholars, administrators, and the general public; and it lobbied successfully for changes in policy, practice, and pedagogical training for teachers that have continued to shape language study through the present day.

The primary goal of the FLP was to expand language education at all levels across the nation. It set up a Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools (FLES) department that spearheaded initiatives such as developing materials and guides

for teaching French, Spanish, and German; organizing conferences; and preparing reports. As a result of its initiatives, the number of students studying languages in public elementary schools quickly skyrocketed, from under 2000 in 1939 to over 330,000 in 1954. Much of this growth took place between 1951 and 1954:²² whereas in 1951, languages were only taught in elementary schools in 57 communities across the nation, by 1954, they were taught in approximately 1000 elementary schools.²³ In order to ensure demand for language study at the secondary level, the FLP also worked to reverse the recent trend in colleges to eliminate language study entrance and graduation requirements. MLA officers invoked U.S. foreign policy interests as the rationale for these changes: “our country’s foreseeable international responsibilities make it imperative for more Americans to acquire a more functional knowledge of modern foreign languages.”²⁴

Parker understood that networking and publicity were necessary for the program to gain traction in pedagogical and policy-related spheres, so he coordinated FLP activities with outreach to scholars and government officials. He organized brainstorming meetings at MLA headquarters to articulate the missions of various humanistic fields and their professional organizations with questions of the national interest and the strengthening of democracy. (His interlocutors included, among others, Carl Bode [English, University of Maryland], president of the newly-founded American Studies Association, which—as noted above—was itself undertaking its own efforts in cultural diplomacy and the international dissemination of democracy.)

Parker left the MLA in 1956 to join the English department at Indiana University Bloomington, the university where—full disclosure—I am now on faculty. As a highly-regarded expert on foreign language education, he continued his advocacy in the field, traveling around the nation to lecture on the topic and publishing in academic and popular venues. He died in 1968, and while he is remembered by some for his institutional engagement and leadership, his activism in the field of

language study is all but unknown here, much as it is absent from the larger history of the Cold War expansion of language study in the United States.

After Parker returned to academia, the sheer scale of the FLP's activities, coupled with the increase in public attention to the topic of language education, consumed an increasing amount of the MLA's time and resources. As the end of the Rockefeller Foundation grant approached, MLA officers committed \$20,000 per year from the general budget to continue to support the FLP. Escalating tensions with the Soviet Union that culminated in the launching of Sputnik in October 1957 soon secured the program's place, both in the organization and on the national scene. The episode sparked fears about the nation's ability to compete with the Soviet Union's technological capabilities, as well as about its ignorance of Soviet scientific abilities. Such knowledge, of course, required language skills, but despite the expansion of language education since the FLP's inception, in 1957, Russian was only taught in 16 of the nation's 27,000 public and private high schools, and in 183 colleges and universities across the country, leaving the nation completely unprepared to meet the current demand for people with knowledge of the language.²⁵ On January 27, 1958, President Eisenhower called for "emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern ... [placing] principal emphasis on our national security requirements."²⁶ The ensuing recommendations called for expanding existing programs in science and math education and establishing new ones supporting foreign languages and area studies.

MLA officers took advantage of the increased attention being paid to language study to further their agenda. In March 1958, they submitted to the RF a proposal for a "Five-year program for improving modern foreign language instruction in the national interest." While noting the FLP's accomplishments, the proposal stated that there was still much to be done to convince the public and educators "of the compelling need, in the national interest, for improved and widespread foreign language instruction."²⁷ The present moment, they argued, offered an opportunity

to change the situation, so they proposed several initiatives to support efforts that were already underway, such as: increasing interest and enrollments in language classes; increasing the number of languages taught and the length of time studied in order to improve proficiency; strengthening pedagogy; coordinating research on language acquisition with the development of new methods for teaching languages, as well as evaluating the effectiveness of instruction; and establishing a Center for Applied Linguistics to serve as a center for training and research; and coordinating with organizations such as the ACLS and the Linguistics Society of America that were also conducting research on related questions.²⁸

Neither the RF nor the FF, which also received the proposal, awarded any funding, but the MLA found a receptive audience for arguments about the strategic benefits of language study in Congress: MLA leaders testified before Congress, and results from the organization's studies constituted the bulk of the documentation that the government submitted to Congress in support of the language training provisions.²⁹ Indeed, the proposal was later described as a "partial draft of later NDEA provisions for support of modern foreign language education."³⁰ Ultimately, congressional support for language study was so strong that Title VI, which contained the provisions for language study at the post-secondary level, was the only title in the NDEA to face virtually no opposition in the hearings and debates.³¹ On September 2, 1958, two days after Rockefeller Foundation's funding for the FLP ended, President Eisenhower signed the NDEA into law. By designating language study a curricular area directly relevant to the national interest, the Act created many opportunities for the MLA to continue its involvement in the field. Indeed, the language provisions of the Act were, in effect, treated by government officials as an extension of MLA initiatives, and their implementation provided the organization with further opportunities to develop national educational policy. For example, immediately after the NDEA was passed, the director of the FLP was "loaned" by the MLA to the U.S. Office of Education, while Parker took leave from his faculty position in early 1959 to go to Washington,

D.C., where he served for six months as the first chief of the NDEA Language Development Program, working to implement Title VI.

Through initiatives such as these, then, scholars of American studies and modern languages and literature alike have had a profound and lasting impact on the study of languages in the United States, on the study of U.S. history and culture, and on U.S. public diplomacy at large. My project thus speaks to the complementarity of academic disciplines and state interests, and how this synergy has played a role in the growing authority of these disciplines, as well as their institutionalization within the U.S. university and abroad during the Cold War. Philanthropic organizations such as the RF and the FF played crucial roles in this process, providing the funding that in effect underwrote the expansion of these two fields at home and abroad, as well as the development of programs to ensure their longevity.

* This report is based on a visit that I made to the RAC in June 2017, with the support of a RAC stipend, as well as on previously-gathered materials from the Center. I am indebted to the archivists and RAC staff who have helped me with my research on this project, including Renee Pappous, Norine Hochman, and, previously, Lucas Buresch and Erwin Levold.

¹ Association of American Universities, “The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties: A Statement on Communism and the Colleges by the Association of American Universities,” *Engineering and Science* 16 (April 1953): 11.

² See Mark T. Berger, *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and U.S. Hegemony in the Americas, 1898-1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Helen Delpar, *Looking South: The Evolution of Latin Americanist Scholarship in the United States 1950-1975* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008); David Price, *Cold War Anthropology: The CIA, the Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2016); and Mark Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2013).

³ J. Manuel Espinosa, “American Studies abroad – the Role of the Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State, November 17, 1961, Group IV, Series 7, Box 166, folder 10, pp.1-2, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection, Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville.

⁴ Robert E. Spiller, “American Studies: Culture and Foreign Policy,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 366 (July 1966): 1.

⁵ Gene Wise, “An American Studies Calendar,” *American Quarterly* 31.3 (1979): 417.

-
- ⁶ R. Taylor Cole, "American Studies Abroad, with particular reference to the American Council of Learned Studies Program," 1969, Report #004642, Ford Foundation records, Education and Public Policy Program (EPP), Office of the Arts, Program Files (FA640), Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).
- ⁷ Walter Johnson, "A Special Report on American Studies Abroad (A Report to Congress)," U.S. Government Printing Office (1963): 14.
- ⁸ Resolution for RF grant 54035 for Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, 22 January 1954, RF Archives, RG 6, SG 1, Ser. 2, Sub. Ser. 1, Box 68, Folder 656, FA 395, RAC.
- ⁹ Margaret Mead, "The Salzburg Seminar in American Civilization," 1947 report to the Harvard Student Council, RF Archives, RG 1.2 (FA 387a), Series 200, Box 111, Folder 974, RAC.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ See Johnson, "A Special Report," 16
- ¹² Liam Kennedy and Scott Lucas, 'Enduring Freedom: Public Diplomacy and U.S. Foreign Policy,' *American Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (June 2005): 312.
- ¹³ "American Studies Addendum," 10 June 1954, RF Archives, RG Cox & Reece Investigation, Series 2 (Witness Files), Box 36, Folder 679, RAC.
- ¹⁴ William R. Parker, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962 [third edition]), 85.
- ¹⁵ Parker, *National Interest*, 3rd ed., 86.
- ¹⁶ Parker, *National Interest*, 3rd ed., 86.
- ¹⁷ William R. Parker, 'The Language Curtain,' *The Modern Language Journal* 38.1 (Jan. 1954), 3.
- ¹⁸ Letter from Parker to D'Arms, 27 April 1952, Rockefeller Foundation (RF) Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 380, Folder 3330.73, RAC.
- ¹⁹ In 1954, Parker secured a second grant from the RF, for \$115,000, which would allow the FLP to continue its work from 1955 to 1958, with the goal that the MLA would provide continuing support for the program after the end of the grant.
- ²⁰ Letter from Parker to D'Arms, 3 June 1952, RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 380, Folder 3330.74, RAC.
- ²¹ Letter from D'Arms to Parker, 30 April 1952, RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 380, Folder 3330.73, RAC.
- ²² Kenneth Mildenerger, "Status of Foreign Language Study in American Elementary Schools" (report), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1954), 1.
- ²³ "Boom in Tongues," *Newsweek* (November 1, 1954), 69.
- ²⁴ Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program, MLA, Statement on college foreign language degree requirements, 11 September 1955, RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 380, Folder 3330.75, RAC.
- ²⁵ Parker, *National Interest*, 2nd ed., 7; "Teaching Russian in American Secondary Schools: A Conference Report," *Foreign Language Bulletin* 59 (June 1958): 58. RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 381, Folder 3330.77, RAC.
- ²⁶ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Special Message to the Congress on Education," January 27, 1958, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=11207>.
- ²⁷ 'Five-year program for improving modern foreign language instruction in the national interest,' n.d., RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 381, Folder 3330.77, RAC. Emphasis in original.
- ²⁸ 'Five-year program,' n.d., RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 381, Folder 3330.77, RAC.
- ²⁹ Quoted from the notes of an interview between Charles B. Fahs, Kenneth Mildenerger, and George W. Stone, Jr., dated March 19, 1958, RF Archives, RG 1.2, Series 200R, Box 381, Folder 3330.77, RAC.

³⁰ John S. Diekhoff, *NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1965), 3.

³¹ Lawrence G. Derthick, "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Foreign Language Titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958," *PMLA* 74, no.2 (May 1959), 50; Parker, *National Interest*, 2nd ed., 11.