

THE U.S. STATE, THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND MODERN ART IN SOUTH  
AMERICA 1940-1943

by

Olga Ulloa-Herrera  
A Dissertation  
Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty  
of  
George Mason University  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree  
of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Cultural Studies

Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_ Director

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Program Director

\_\_\_\_\_ Dean, College of Humanities  
and Social Sciences

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Spring Semester 2014  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA



The U.S. State, the Private Sector and Modern Art in South America 1940-1943

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy at George Mason University

by

Olga Ulloa-Herrera  
Master of Arts  
Louisiana State University, 1989

Director: Michele Greet, Associate Professor  
Cultural Studies

Spring Semester 2014  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA

Copyright 2014 Olga Ulloa-Herrera  
All Rights Reserved

## **DEDICATION**

This is dedicated to Carlos Herrera, Carlos A. Herrera, Roberto J. Herrera, and Max Herrera with love and thanks for making life such an exhilarating adventure; and to María de los Angeles Torres with gratitude and appreciation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my committee chair Dr. Michele Greet and to my committee members Dr. Paul Smith and Dr. Ellen Wiley Todd whose help, support, and encouragement made this project possible. I have greatly benefited from their guidance as a student and as a researcher.

I also would like to acknowledge Dr. Roger Lancaster, director of the Cultural Studies Program at George Mason University and Michelle Carr for their assistance throughout the years. It would not have been possible to write this dissertation without the help, kindness and support of people around me, to only some of whom it is possible to mention here. Thanks to my peers and now colleagues for their friendship, help, comments, especially Rachel Delgado, Randa Kayyali, Pawin Malaiwong, Pia Møller, Katy Razzano, Tara Sheoran, Cecilia “Lia” Uy-Tioco, Victoria Watts, Fan Yang, and Nuh Yilmaz. Much gratitude goes to Ludy Grandas for her unfailing moral support, advice, intellectual generosity and friendship. Special thanks to my professors Amal Amireh, the late Peter Brunette, Dina Copelman, Jean-Paul Dumont, and Alison Landsberg.

Along the way I have received the support from various colleagues. I am most grateful to Alejandro Anreus, Gilbert Cardenas, Melissa Carrillo, Eduardo Díaz, María Gaztambide, Jon Goldman, Tracy Grimm, Melissa Kroning, Jose Limón, Andrés Navia, Adriana Ospina, Mari Carmen Ramírez, Will Rochin, Victor Sorell, Ranald Woodaman, and Tomas Ybarra-Frausto. My most sincere thanks to Maria de los Angeles Torres who has made many things possible including the completion of this project and to my cheering colleagues Luz Acosta and Cristina Correa.

As an archival project, I am indebted to the staff of the Rockefeller Archive Center in particular Amy Fitch, the staff of the Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection at the University of Texas at Austin, the staff of the University of Chicago Special Collections Research Center, the staff at the OAS Columbus Memorial Library and Stella Villagrán, the staff of the Museum of Modern Art Archive, the staff of the National Archives at College Park and Adriana Ospina at the OAS Art Museum of the Americas Archives.

I would like to thank my family for their endless love and support. I want to note the late Samuel D. Eaton for making so many things possible for my family and me

and for introducing me to the “Western Hemisphere Idea.” Above all I thank my husband Carlos and my sons Carlos and Roberto. Words cannot express how grateful I am for your love, support, inspiration and encouragement at every step of the way. And to Max who structured my writing days and made sure (for his very own selfish reasons) that I took breaks and exercise.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Abbreviations .....	viii
Abstract.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
The Rebuilding of a U.S. Modern Industrial State and the Developing of a U.S. Modern Art, 1933-1939 .....	37
Nineteen Thirty-Three: A New Modern Industrial Capitalist U.S. State.....	38
Nineteen Thirty-Three: A Modern U.S. Art.....	44
Nineteen Thirty-Three: The U.S. State and Modern Art .....	50
Nineteen Thirty-Three: The Global Stage and Modern Art.....	55
Art and the State: Democracy .....	58
A New State Narrative: Modern Art, Democracy, Museums and American Industry .	78
Towards a Definition of a Modern U.S. Art in 1939 .....	89
Modern Art as a Strategy and Tool of National Defense: The Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics and the Office of the Coordinator OF Inter-American Affairs, 1940-1943.....	99
The OCCCRBAR Art Section and Modern Art in South America .....	165
Commercial and Cultural Networks: South American Modern Art in the United States and the Field of Latin American Art .....	264
The Art of Defense, The Defense of Art: Lincoln Kirstein and The Art Acquisition Trip to South America, 1942.....	324
Modern Art: Cultural Flows and Networks.....	380
APPENDIX A.....	406
APPENDIX B.....	407
APPENDIX C .....	417
APPENDIX D.....	419
APPENDIX E .....	426
APPENDIX F .....	430



APPENDIX G.....	433
APPENDIX H.....	436
References.....	438

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Civil Works Administration.....	CWA
Elektricitäts-Gesellschaft Aktiengesellschaft.....	AEG
Federal Emergency Relief Administration.....	FERA
Foreign Direct Investment.....	FDI
Franklin Delano Roosevelt.....	FDR
International Business Machines Corporation.....	IBM
Multinational Corporations.....	MNCs
The Museum of Modern Art.....	MoMA
National Archives and Records Administration.....	NARA
Office of Inter-American Affairs.....	OIAA
Office of Strategic Services.....	OSS
Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics.....	OCCCRBAR
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	CI-AA
Office of War Information.....	OWI
Organization of American States.....	OAS
Pan American-Grace Company Airlines.....	Panagra
Pan American Union.....	PAU
Public Works of Art Project.....	PWAP
Sociedad Colombo-Alemana de Transporte Aéreo.....	SCADTA
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.....	UNESCO
United States Information Agency.....	USIA
United States of America.....	U.S.
Works Progress Administration.....	WPA
Works Progress Administration Federal Art Project.....	WPA/FAP
World War One.....	WWI
World War Two.....	WWII

## **ABSTRACT**

THE U.S. STATE, THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND MODERN ART IN SOUTH AMERICA 1940-1943

Olga Ulloa-Herrera, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2014

Dissertation Director: Dr. Michele Greet

This dissertation examines the role of modern art as a strategic tool of national defense during an unprecedented moment in U.S. history in which the U.S. State and the private sector converged to develop an economic and cultural war preparedness program in South America. By taking modern art as a cultural object, this project studies the intersections of modernity, capitalism, power relations and culture by looking at the activities of the Art Section of the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (OCCCRBAR) and its successor the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA). The dissertation argues that the defense interventions of the United States in South America at this particular moment—with shifts in diplomacy, power, hegemony, and world order—laid out the foundation for a regionalization and industrial modernist infrastructure. As such, these interventions established early cultural flows and networks of commerce, transportation, communication for an American ideology,

cultural industries and visual culture later to be fully realized with the expansion of the Americanization of culture in contemporary globalization.

## INTRODUCTION

*All too often the 'Good Neighbor' Policy is  
thought of as wholly a governmental program*  
—Kenneth Holland<sup>1</sup>

The early 1940s witnessed an increased intra-cultural activity in the Western Hemisphere. Between 1940 and 1943 the United States engaged in a concerted and deliberate cultural defense effort to export what would become identified in later years as quintessential American values of democracy, modernization, progress and a meritocratic new American Dream way of life of economic prosperity and consumerism<sup>2</sup> to countries in South America. Struggling to come out of an economic crisis of world proportions, these countries were now facing a new

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Holland, Director, Division of Science and Education, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA), to Mr. J. G. Del Pozo on behalf of U.S. Vice President Henry A. Wallace, October 24, 1942. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, Folder: Arts; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>2</sup>The original term of the "American Dream" was defined and formulated by James Truslow Adams in 1931 during the Great Depression in the epilogue of *The Epic of America*, reflecting the economic and social conditions of the moment. Adams perceived it to be "that dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for everyone, with opportunity for each according to ability or achievement. It is a difficult dream for the European upper classes to interpret adequately, and too many of us ourselves have grown weary and mistrustful of it. It is not a dream of motor cars and high wages merely, but a dream of social order in which each man and each woman shall be able to attain to the fullest stature of which they are innately capable, and be recognized by others for what they are, regardless of the fortuitous circumstances of birth or position." James Truslow Adams, *The Epic of America*, Boston: Little, Brown, and company, 1931, 214-215. As an evolving dream, however, in the context of the 1939-1940 the "American Dream" had naturally gone forward responding to improved economic and social conditions. The new aspirations for the future reflected in the 1939 New York World Fair (Chapter 1), was a changed "American Dream" of a capitalist consumerist middle class, economic prosperity and a higher standard of living.

imminent threat of an expanding totalitarian ideology in a fast escalating European and soon to be global conflict.

In this dissertation I critically examine the role of modern art as a strategic tool of national defense during an unprecedented moment in U.S. history in which the U.S. private sector and the U.S. State converged for the first time in developing an economic and cultural defense program. Financed with state funds from the Military and Naval Appropriation Acts of 1941 and 1942 the program served as a new U.S. national security strategy and tool to carry out a U.S. cultural and commercial penetration in South America during 1940-1943. I look at the circumstances and conditions by which interest on the part of the U.S. State and the U.S. private sector in modern art in South America during the early 1940s came into being. Rather than from a diplomatic cultural foreign relations perspective, I explore the interest and intersections of art, culture, and commerce from an strategic and emergency point of view of national security and defense under conditions of war that sought to change dominant cultural values and cultural dynamics and patterns in a South America regional societal structure seen at the moment at high risk of being infiltrated and dominated by German, Italian, and Spanish totalitarian ideology and governance.

In taking modern art as a cultural object, this project is guided by the overarching question of how modern art became a strategic tool for the U.S. State and the U.S. private sector during August 1940 to June 1943 in South America. In looking at its production, identity, representation, regulation and consumption it

seeks to answer a set of sub-questions as follows: what was the role of modern art within a frame of economic and cultural relations under conditions of U.S. national security and defense? How did modern art become a tool of U.S. cultural penetration under the values of freedom and democracy? What was the role of the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (OCCCRBAR hereafter) and its successor the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA hereafter)<sup>3</sup> Cultural Division and its Art Section within that larger context of its defense initiatives? What was the strategic value of this cultural intervention for the future of the U.S. State, the modernity project, modern art circuits and circuits of global knowledge about South America? What was the joint role of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA hereafter), the San Francisco Museum of art, the Brooklyn Museum of Art, Disney Studios, The Rockefeller and Guggenheim Foundations? What was the role of the proto-multinational corporations such as WR Grace, Pan American Airways, Panagra-Grace, Esso, Kodak, Walt Disney Co., IBM, in the creation of global cultural flows and networks in their expanding business models and plans? What specific roles did Nelson A. Rockefeller, Lincoln Kirstein, René d’Harnoncourt, Grace L. McCann Morley, Stanton L. Catlin, John Hay Whitney and other rarely mentioned figures involved with modern art in South America play at the time? What was the critical reception of modern U.S. art in the North, Eastern and West Coasts of South

---

<sup>3</sup> I use the acronyms OCCCRBAR and CI-AA as they were used in their own particular historical moment and context in 1940-1941 and 1941-1943.

America? Did this cultural intervention create the roots for new global circuits and networks of a future (contemporary) globalization of culture in the Americas?

This dissertation is based and builds upon the fact that traditionally up to this particular historical moment U.S. cultural relations were inextricably linked with philanthropy and were, therefore, in the hands of foundations, corporations, and private individuals rather than under the purview of the U.S. State and its Federal Government.<sup>4</sup> It is during the period of this study when the shift to a hybrid model of private and public sector began to take root only to be fully established after WWII. In its investigation, it seeks to establish the residuals of this model, if still in existence.

In defining terms, when using “U.S. State” I am referring to the political community of forty-eight states (1940-1943) as a sovereign state governed by a federal government whose distinct executive powers were vested in a president responsible for national issues such as national security and defense, monetary policy, international diplomacy, etc. From a theoretical perspective, I follow the sociological concept of “state” formulated by Max Weber as “a human community

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to note though, that indeed there were at the time of the establishment of the OCCCRBAR other modest non-emergency and non-defense federal and quasi-federal cultural initiatives that addressed specifically international agreements and signed conventions such as the Pan American Union’s Division of Intellectual Cooperation established in 1929 and the two-year old Department of State’s Division of Cultural Relations established in 1938. These two divisions did operate in the realm of foreign relations as enforcers and implementers of conventions agreed upon and signed during Inter-American Conferences by members of the supra-national hemispheric Pan American Union, a regional block of twenty-one Western Hemisphere Republics supported by annual contributions of member countries, administered by a Director General and governed by a Board of diplomatic representatives in Washington D.C. whose chairman ex officio was none other than the U.S. Secretary of State. In addition to these, there were a number of much smaller private initiatives from organizations and groups.



that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory.”<sup>5</sup> Weber contends, “force is a means specific to the State...[and] the right to use physical force is ascribed to other institutions or to other individuals only to the extent to which the state permits it. The state is considered the sole source of the right to use violence.”<sup>6</sup> As a war preparation program of an emergency agency, the U.S. State ascribed the right of force to the agency, in this case commercial and cultural, to defend the state’s international political, economic and security positions. In 1940, the structure of the U.S. State as it concerned its executive branch was represented by offices, departments and agencies including the president, vice president, a secretary of agriculture, a secretary of state, a secretary of the treasury, a secretary of war, an attorney general, a postmaster general, a secretary of the navy, a secretary of the Interior, a Secretary of commerce, and a secretary of labor and heads of other smaller agencies.

When using the term “Private Sector” I refer to the part of the economy that is controlled by private individuals with for profit businesses not owned by the government (public sector). Given the involvement of MoMA, the use of the term “Modern Art” in the context of this project follows the designation by the museum to refer to contemporary and innovative modernist art by living artists and ancestor of the modern movement since 1880 (Van Gogh, Seurat, Gauguin, Toulouse Lautrec, Rousseau, etc.). As it refers to media, it also follows MoMA’s extensive definition of

---

<sup>5</sup> Max Weber “Politics as Vocation Lecture,” 1919. Online: <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/ethos/Weber-vocation.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

modern art to encompass not only painting and sculpture but drawings and prints (works on paper), photography, typography, industrial design, architecture, stage design, furniture, decorative arts, and film.<sup>7</sup>

By looking at the U.S. state-sponsored art programs as part of commercial and cultural defense relations developed by the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA, I elucidate, through modern art, how big a role these U.S. State-private sector interventions played in expanding **cultural flows** and **networks** at a moment of a global shift with a geo-political reorganization of the world. I utilize this “Cultural Flows” approach to denote flows that are state-regulated paths/circuits on which culture circulates. This differs considerably from what Arjun Appadurai categorizes as ethnoscaples, technoscaples, mediascaples, and ideoscaples.<sup>8</sup> In using the concept of “Networks,” I follow closely Peter Dicken’s definition as “the process connecting actors or agents (firms, states, individuals, social groups, etc.) into relational structures at different organizations and geographical scales.”<sup>9</sup> Moreover, in his analysis of the geoeconomy in the early 2000s, Dicken added that the use of a network-based approach allows us “to think in terms of *connections* of activities through *flows* of material and non-material phenomena, of the different way that networks are connected, and the power relations through which networks are

---

<sup>7</sup> Press Release, “Publicity for Organization of Museum, August 1929.” [http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press\\_archives/1/releases/MOMA\\_1929-31\\_0001\\_1929-08.pdf?2010](http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/1/releases/MOMA_1929-31_0001_1929-08.pdf?2010).

<sup>8</sup> In addition, in thinking about these terms, there is a parallel to electricity, electric flow, electric circuit and electric networks.

<sup>9</sup> Peter Dicken, *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, 2003: 14.

controlled and coordinated.”<sup>10</sup> Given that the Office was one of both commercial and cultural defense relations, I consider the nexus of commerce and culture in the resulting cultural flows and networks as possible origins of circuits and networks of a contemporary globalization (Americanization)<sup>11</sup> of culture in South America. I investigate the development of mid-century circuits of globalization of culture looking at them from the lens of modern art as a cultural object.

The intersection of U.S. economic capitalism, power relations and culture within the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA program sought to secure the region for U.S. interests. Its purpose was to reconfigure market interests in the region and replace them with a new and expanded U.S.-led form of free trade zone for the supply of raw and agricultural materials to the U.S. and the demand of U.S. manufactured products in South America. Aided by foreign direct investment (FDI) from U.S. companies (future multinational corporations), they would take over German and Italian market share in addition to a cultural program by way of the imposition and diffusion of a new ideology, modern values, taste, and a materialistic and consumerist way of life—a 1940’s American Dream. From this standpoint of globalization, I explore the critical power shift in a new world order as it concerned

---

<sup>10</sup> Dicken, 2003: 14.

<sup>11</sup> Americanization as a theory of globalization has been explored by George Ritzer and Alan Bryman, who have theorized significant social processes that have their foundation in previously formulated concepts that are intrinsic to the American corporations McDonalds and The Walt Disney Company’s business models. George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2000 and Alan Bryman, *The Disneyzation of Society*. London: Sage Publications, 2004. From a standpoint of Globalization of culture this Americanization is seen as cultural imperialism by David Harvey (2003) and John Tomlinson (1991).

culture in South America, which at the time had a larger German, British and Italian presence. As part of this shift caused by the European War, I look at the interventions of the U.S. State and private sector to change the cultural outlook of the region and the necessary convergence with commercial and economic forces to create circuits and networks of transportation, communication, promotion of ideology and cultural goods.

I argue that both modern art and the formation of new expanded cultural flows and networks were being grounded within forces of national security and defense and of trade and commerce under conditions of war beginning in the late spring of 1940. Under the bigger umbrella of U.S. security and national defense, modern art (painting, sculpture, architecture, film, industrial design, photography) was intended to become a unilateral means by which countries in South America would familiarize themselves with and hopefully follow the modern trends of U.S. American society, culture, art and visuality (this last still had not come of age) and thus substitute and replace a cultural dependence on Europe for an American one.

Within a frame of economics, commerce, and art, the period of study is critical to the understanding of the intersection of power and culture. It is also a period when the roots of a contemporary globalization take hold in the region. New processes of global thinking, unitary ideas and a new world order with the U.S. at the helm of power start to emerge. So is the exportation of a 1940 American Dream as a new societal model of an industrial modern capitalism with a consumerist middle class and the expansion of democracy and freedom.

An important shift at the moment was the transition of cultural diplomacy from the hands of the private sector to the hands of the state and public sector. Therefore, by looking at the role of the U.S. State I hope to elucidate a shift in cultural policy in the United States. As the U.S. began to plan for a new world order, we find the beginning of the roots of globalization and Americanization of the Western Hemisphere by means of the creation of an infrastructure that facilitated a shift in the cultural influence and societal change in the region from European to American ideology as well as in a presentation of “Latin America” in the United States.

In addressing South America, I use the geographical division of the continent in coastal areas employed by the U.S. Government in its cultural (and commercial) defense exchanges between 1940-1943 as follows: North Coast—Colombia and Venezuela; Western Coast—Ecuador, Peru and Chile; and East Coast—Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. Within this division I look at audience reception (consumption) in the cities of Bogota and Caracas; Quito, Lima and Santiago; Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo and Buenos Aires. These designations corresponded to established circuits of navigation and trade and a network of ports that facilitated international exchange and transportation.

In observing these possible new cultural flows and networks facilitated by the intervention of the private and public sector, and the nexus between culture and commerce and power and culture, I examine three particular case studies: first, the production, distribution and critical reception/consumption of the Contemporary

North American Painting (*La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*) exhibition; second, the intersections of culture and commerce with the Macy's Latin American Art Fair and Art Gallery and the series of Latin American exhibitions organized by the San Francisco Museum of Art for circulation in educational centers in the United States; and third, Lincoln Kirstein's modern art acquisition trip in South America on behalf of the MoMA, his private art criticism in the region, plans for a Latin American Art Department at the museum, and the resulting Latin American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art exhibition in New York and its aftermath.

I argue that the interventions of both the public and private sectors of the United States in the region at this particular moment—with shifts in diplomacy, power, hegemony and world order—laid out the foundation for a modernist infrastructure. At the same time these interventions planted the seed for a cultural shift through an external cultural infusion, diffusion and transmission of cultural propaganda programs that facilitated and created cultural flows and a network of circuits for an American cultural ideology, cultural industries and visual culture later to be realized with the expansion of the Americanization of culture in globalization.

Grounded in the disciplines of Cultural Studies and Art History this dissertation takes modern art as a cultural object, rather than as an aesthetic one. It examines culture and power and the origins of contemporary circuits and networks by which meanings, images, people, ideology circulated at a moment of societal change and cultural turn in the Americas. This happens as the U.S. sought to

position itself as the world power and as South America entered a new stage in a modernization phase of development and capitalist industrialization with a rather marked U.S. orientation replacing a German and Italian influence.

The processes by which these changes took place engage cultural studies' theoretical positions about modernity and modernism, nation and state, hegemony and security. Moreover, from a theoretical standpoint on globalization, it also engages theories of globalization and governance including regionalization (the Inter-American System, the American [Western] Hemisphere), deterritorialization of European culture, reterritorialization of U.S. culture, cultural imperialism (Americanization), formation of identity (Pro-American dreams of peace under conditions of constant threat of war), modernization project (progress and development) and politics of culture and cultural policy. By utilizing a cultural globalization theoretical framework, I demonstrate that this period was a foundational one to more recent forms of cultural globalization in South America. This particular historical period of the WWII years falls within what has been characterized by Roland Robertson as the Phase IV of globalization or "The Struggle-for-Hegemony Phase"<sup>12</sup>

I see that under conditions of war, South America became at mid-century the testing and experimentation ground for a cultural penetration and Americanization of culture that set up an structure and ideology of capitalism and industrialization in society, press, economy for future circuits and networks of the globalization of

---

<sup>12</sup> Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Culture*. London: Sage Publications, 1992: 59.

culture to come in the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There exists the question of considering the South America project as the pilot model for the export of art and values used during the Cold War where ideas of freedom and democracy were imbued in art styles of abstraction and Abstract Expressionism as art continued to be the carrier of values at the service of the State.

From an art historical perspective, I examine the construction of modern art, ideas of visual modernity, and national identity in the U.S. and aforementioned South American countries at the time.<sup>13</sup> By looking at the U.S. contemporary art traveling exhibition and books program of 1941, the exhibitions at Macys and those put together by the San Francisco Museum of Art for circulation in the United States in 1942, and Lincoln Kirstein's acquisition trip of 1942 that served as the basis for the Latin American Art exhibition at MoMA of 1943, I elucidate how U.S. culture and U.S. modern art were perceived in the region during these years and assess the critical responses to the various engagements of U.S. artists with modernism. In addition, I reveal the engagement of South American artists with their own definition[s] of modernity and modern art and their own artistic strategies and styles.

As it concerns the emerging field of "Latin American" art history, I look at the initial stages of the development of the idea of "Latin American art" in the United States taking as a point of departure art exhibitions at the New York and San

---

<sup>13</sup> The first definitions of modern architecture and modern painting began to appear in 1942 and 1943 as part of MoMA's efforts to provide a comprehensive introduction to the general public about the meaning of modern architecture and modern painting in the books *What is Modern Architecture?* (MoMA, 1942) and *What is Modern Painting?* (MoMA, 1943).



Francisco World Fairs of 1939 and 1940. It was at these two fairs where the U.S. construction of a modern “Latin American” and, specific to this study, South American art began to take root. This interest would blossom in the war years with New York and San Francisco as important nodes in the cultural initiatives of the state and private sector.

Moreover, I pay attention to the assumptions in the literature of the unique role that Alfred Barr, Director of MoMA from 1929 to 1943 and Director of Collections after 1943, played in the early development of the field. Barr figures prominently as a MoMA-Barr single unit in the literature. His presence has been explained by scholars through his early 1930s scheme of modern art as a torpedo navigating through the sea of change. This 1933 torpedo illustration, however, only makes reference to a Mexican art at its nose with nothing to show for the art of South American countries.<sup>14</sup> This problematic construction of modernism in art has led to the assumption that Mexican art represents all of the modern art production of Latin America. As such, it has found its way into the literature as an inorganic one-size-fits-all model that takes into consideration neither the historical nor the geographic context in which it was produced. Thus, the Latin American art discourse in the United States has been cast in light of Barr’s torpedo and MoMA’s collecting practices and its developing notion of modernism, which at the time of its conceptualization only included Mexican art.

---

<sup>14</sup> Scholars of Mexican art in the U.S. credit Alfred Barr and MoMA with the reception of Mexican art in the U.S. (Hurlburt, 1989; Anreus, 2001; Goldman, 1994; Barnet-Sanchez, 1993; Delpar, 1992; Oles, Cullen and Indych-Lopez, 2003 and 2009).

## The Literature

The engagement of MoMA with Mexican pre-Columbian art and modern art post-1945 has been the focus of a good number of studies, dissertations and publications.<sup>15</sup> The literature has explored at length the relationship of culture between Mexico and the United States and the role of the Museum of Modern Art and Alfred Barr but not much has been written about the relationship between MoMA, South America and the United States. A few passing references and limited paragraphs exist in the literature about MoMA and modern art in South America with little or no reference to the underlying dynamic of art, ideology, patronage and power.

---

<sup>15</sup> In the modern art literature, Cathleen M. Paquette has looked at MoMAs activities from the perspective of Mexico and Mexican art in the period between 1929-1954 (Paquette, 2002, Ph.D. diss. UCSB), arguing that MoMA constructed the meaning of Mexican art by virtue of being the keeper of the master aesthetic narrative of modernism (U.S. institutional). She raises critical questions about MoMA and Mexican art—including issues of interpretation and evaluation, promotion of artists, and the political and economic forces behind it mainly the intersection of public duty and private interests which led to the strengthening of international relations with Mexico and the promotion of capitalism. She provides in-depth studies of Mexico and MoMA, but due the obvious parameters of her project, she provides only brief and passing references to South America collections. Similarly Holly Barnet-Sanchez concentrates on the U.S.- Mexico relationship but instead explores the U.S. reception of Pre-Columbian art (mostly Mayan and Aztec). Pre-Columbian archaeological artifacts being excavated in the 1920s and 1930s became of great interest in the U.S. and in exhibitions organized by MoMA. These were not presented as archaeological artifacts, but as works of art and as sources of modern art “within a carefully constructed yet often unspoken historical context of shared experiences of indigenous, colonial and post-colonial American pasts against Old World Enemies.” (Barnet-Sanchez, 1988: 5). She argues that the aestheticizing of otherwise primitive artifacts served to position them as art or as an artifact depending on context. Also exploring the role of MoMA but in this case within a framework of the reception of modern art and muralism, Anna Indych-López studies the period between 1927 and 1940 and the logic of portable murals by Rivera, Orozco and Siqueiros and murals without walls to appeal to a U.S. market. She argues that this idea of portable murals was a tactic for promotion and circulation with the strategy of adapting their artwork to U.S. audiences to gain mural commissions in the United States. By way of this lens, Indych-López looks at patronage and collecting practices and reception by U.S. audiences of modern Mexican muralism (Indych-López, 2007 and 2009).

In the art literature originating from MoMA itself, Alfred Barr framed the issue of institutional collecting of contemporary art from the other American Republics within WWII and Western Hemisphere cultural understanding and good will. Thanks to the war, MoMA became the keeper of the “most important collection of contemporary Latin-American art in the United States, or for that matter the world (including our sister republics to the south).”<sup>16</sup> Barr recounted the evolution of MoMA’s interest with an early one focused on Mexican muralists (Rivera one-man show in 1931); Pre-Columbian art as a source of Modern art (Mayan, Aztec and Incan in 1933); Mexican art (1940), and beginning in 1940 an interest in South American Art (Portinari of Brazil), design contests and competitions.

MoMA’s South American collection begins in 1939 with the purchase of Cândido Portinari’s *Morro* followed by gifts from trustees and private collectors. From 1942 on, the Inter-American Fund facilitated the acquisition of “works of interest or quality.” Lincoln Kirstein, rather than Alfred Barr, traveled to South America to acquire works in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Colombia and Uruguay, while Barr traveled to Mexico with Edward M. M. Warburg for four weeks and to Cuba for eight days in the summer of 1942.<sup>17</sup> Kirstein himself planned and proposed unsuccessfully the Department of Latin American art at MoMA and continuously gave recommendations for future acquisitions and wrote the survey

---

<sup>16</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Foreword, *The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art* by Lincoln Kirstein, New York: MoMA, 1943: 3.

<sup>17</sup> Proceedings of the conference were published in 1949. See Elizabeth Wilder, ed., *Studies in Latin American Art, Proceedings of a Conference Held in the Museum of Modern Art New York, 28-31 May 1945*. Washington, DC: The American Council of Learned Societies, 1949: 37.

essay of the collections in 1943 prior to being drafted by the U.S. Army in February of that year.

In May 1945 during the conference on Studies in Latin American Art at MoMA, and speaking to those present at that very moment, Barr in his ten-minute address on “Problems of Research and Documentation in Contemporary Latin American Art”<sup>18</sup> confessed rightly to be very new to Latin American studies: “I had really not wanted to talk at all because this is primarily a learned meeting and I don’t feel that I am at all a scholar in the study of Latin American Art... I feel that we who are concerned with modern art are very new indeed to Latin-American studies, with the exception of Dr. Morley.”<sup>19</sup>

Of note, is that at the time of the meeting, Lincoln Kirstein had been with the U.S. Armed Forces in Europe since 1943, hence the omission of his name. Barr, in addition, clarified that his interest dated from 1941-1942 and that he “...might not have taken any great interest in South America had it not been for the war, the state of emergency, the necessity of establishing closer relations with the countries to the south,” adding “I think we were very conscious of the political background of our interests, and conscious, too, of the somewhat complicating nature of that political atmosphere.”<sup>20</sup> Barr himself, a member of MoMA’s acquisition committee through which all new artwork passed for approval, questioned some of the acquisitions

---

<sup>18</sup> Quoted in Wilder, 1949: 37. This was first in a series of conferences sponsored by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies with a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies. Transcription of Barr’s address in Wilder, 1949: 42.

<sup>19</sup> Quoted In Wilder, 1949: 37.

<sup>20</sup> Quoted in Wilder, 1949: 38.

concluding that a few were the result of errors in policy and taste.<sup>21</sup>

Scholars dealing with the engagement of art and politics in the period subsequent to that of this project and specifically during the Cold War have included Shifra Goldman on Latin America and Mexico. She positions the period between 1955 to 1965 as one of imperialism characterized by an intense cultural penetration and covert funding by a collusion of the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and multinational corporations as part of a Cold War cultural politics and foreign policy strategic game to influence the direction of art and as part of U.S. world dominance. Spearheading this effort, she argues, was none other than the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art (established in 1953) utilizing cultural imperialism as a weapon of economic neo-colonialism within the framework of the Cold War.<sup>22</sup> In particular, she argues, they promoted distinct art styles (abstraction) by supporting an infrastructure of museums of modern art.<sup>23</sup>

Similarly, Max Kozloff, looking at the years between 1948-1973 in the United States, makes the argument that this period in American postwar art (Cold War) was one of triumph as American art came of creative age with the gestural pictorial style of Abstract Expressionism and the New York School. Even more significant were the forces behind the triumph: political ideology, national self-image and

---

<sup>21</sup> In this conference in 1945, Barr had already been demoted as director of the museum. René d'Harnoncourt wrote the forward of the publication as Chairman of the conference organizing committee. Barr instead was a member of the conference plagued by wartime restrictions on travel.

<sup>23</sup> Shifra Goldman, *Contemporary Mexican Painting in a Time of Change*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977: 29-35.

history. To Kozloff, the state became an engine of “benevolent” propaganda: “American art as a sole trustee of the avant-garde ‘spirit’ and the U.S. government’s notion of itself as the sole guarantor of capitalist liberty.”<sup>24</sup> It was in the 1950s, Kozloff argues, when the U.S. developed its own culture by conquering all intellectuals and affecting almost all levels of cultural life with a flow of public information through the USIA and the International Council of MoMA.

Unlike Kozloff who looks at the U.S., Eva Cockcroft projects Cold War art onto other regions and explores the entanglements of state power and patronage and artists at the service of the state. In looking at MoMA and the ideology behind the rise of Abstract Expressionism, Cockcroft characterizes it as a weapon of the Cold War. She argues that this connection between abstract expressionism and Cold War can be “clearly perceived through the international programs of MoMA. As a tastemaker in the sphere of contemporary American art, the impact of MoMA—a major supporter of the Abstract Expressionist movement—can hardly be overestimated. In this context, the fact that MoMA has always been a Rockefeller - dominated institution becomes particularly relevant (other families financing the museum, although to a lesser extent than the Rockefellers, included the Whitneys, Paleys, Blisses, Warburgs, and Lewisohns).”<sup>25</sup> In support of her argument about art, she further argues, “the development of American cold war politics was directly shaped by the Rockefellers in particular and by expanding corporations and banks

---

<sup>24</sup> Max Kozloff. “American Painting During the Cold War.” *Art Forum* 11.9 (May 1973): 2.

<sup>25</sup> Eva Cockcroft, “Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War.” *Art Forum* 12.10 (June 1974): 39-41.

in general (David Rockefeller [was] also chairman of the board of Chase Manhattan Bank, the financial center of the Rockefeller dynasty).”<sup>26</sup>

However, as I think about Goldman, Kozloff and Cockcroft’s assertions of politics and art in a Cold War period in relation to this study, I see that their claims most likely had their genesis in the period which this project studies and in the war agencies that became the forerunners to the CIA, the USIA and possibly MoMA’s International Council. Issues such as neo-imperialism, cultural penetration and MoMA (Goldman), political ideology, arts as propaganda, national self-image and MoMA (Kozloff), and art as a weapon in the arsenal of democracy guided by MoMA and Rockefeller (Cockcroft) are elements found present in my analysis of the years between 1940-1943. A deeper analysis of the cultural flows and networks that were possibly established during WWII will determine if this is the case and in turn will revise them.

Recent scholarship has attempted to reevaluate the position of MoMA’s engagement with the art of Latin America; collecting practices of contemporary art; the growth of the collection (gifts in the 1930s, Inter-American Fund in the 1940s and beyond); and its geopolitical and region-specific construct in a museum’s canonical global collection of modern art characterized by a formal media and genre classification.<sup>27</sup> However, the discourse tends to incorrectly overemphasize the

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, Cockcroft, 1974, 39-40.

<sup>27</sup> A more recent contribution to the MoMA/Barr debate has been that of Miriam Basilio who has framed collecting practices from the private sector and their institutional gifts as deviating from a parameter of institutional collecting practices. She argues that the museum tendency has been one of collecting rather than exhibiting, hosting only three exhibitions in a period of fifty years: “The Latin

centrality of Alfred Barr as the sole promoter within MoMA of Latin American art largely ignoring members of the Board of Trustees, staff, consultants and scholars. Therefore, I look at the activities of more foundational figures such as Nelson A. Rockefeller, Lincoln Kirstein, Grace L. McCann Morley, René d'Harnoncourt, Stanton L. Catlin, John Jay Whitney, Caroline Durieux, Mildred Constantine, Leo S. Rowe and Dorothy Miller as well as the role of the proto-multinational corporations (MNCs) in support of the circuits and networks of art exchanges, modern exhibitions and museums.

Moreover, I address a problematic in the emerging field of "Latin American art" history which despite being inclusive of all hispanophone and lusophone countries and artists in the Americas, has concentrated heavily on the United States-Mexico axis in this particular period of 1940-1943 producing an extensive body of knowledge but almost nothing to show for South America. In addition, Latin American art has previously been and continues to be analyzed within the confines of a rhetoric of "the Good Neighbor Policy" a policy that did not exist in writing beyond one sentence, but instead became a catch-all phrase serving as an overarching concept for the Department of State, when convenient, in its dealings with Latin American nations. Thus, this project addresses the recurrent framing in the literature of the rise in cultural interest in the region and in modern art in South

---

American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art," March 31- June 6, 1943 selected by Barr and Kirstein; "Latin American Art 1931-1966" March to June 1967; "Latin American Artists of the Twentieth Century" summer of 1993. Deborah Cullen has asserted that the idea of Latin American art as a "troubled construct, as many have noted, may have been created in the United States under the auspices of the Museum of Modern Art" (2004: 69) by a classification or taxonomy that defies the normal system of artworks by the regional rather than national origin of the producer.



America (including cultural exchanges) within ideas of goodwill, friendship and non-intervention (“Good Neighbor World Policy”) as well as within a modernist perspective of MoMA espoused by Alfred Barr, its director from 1929 to 1943 and director of collections from 1943 to 1969.<sup>28</sup>

As a reductive cultural framework, the Good Neighbor-MoMA-Barr discourse fails to take into consideration complex global circumstances, contexts, events, and forces that came together to shape this interest and the cultural ideology of the moment. Among these is the fact that prior to World War II (WWII), cultural relations were in the hands of the private sector. The Department of State only organized a small office of cultural relations and student and professors exchange in 1938-1939 as a result of commitments originating at the Eight Conference of American States in Lima in 1938.<sup>29</sup> Hence, the framework Good Neighbor-MoMA-

---

<sup>28</sup> In the literature focusing on this period, scholars have often tended to see erroneously the cultural activities originating in this temporary emergency agency of the National Council of Defense and the Office for Emergency Management, as part of a Department of State’s “good neighbor” policy. This tendency of conflating two opposite government agencies—one as a temporary emergency agency in war preparation times under the Council of National Defense and the Office for Emergency Management and the other one under the Department of State charged with the foreign relations and diplomacy of the state—has taken a life of its own, positioning “the good neighbor policy” as the catch all phrase of the period and the frame by which many studies on art and culture are inaccurately seen. There was a “good neighbor” rhetoric with origins in the 1920s for internal consumption, which was often invoked conveniently by politicians and government officials in referring to the good deeds of the State. Indeed, FDR’s March 1933 inauguration speech alluded to the policy of a “good neighbor” in his one sentence about *world* relations, but was not invoked as the policy of security of a state at the time of war preparations and conflict.

<sup>29</sup> The Department of State Division of Cultural Relations had its genesis in specific requests made in the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations agreed upon by participating nation-states during the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance, Preservation and Establishment of Peace held in Buenos Aires on December 1-23, 1936. Signed on December 23, 1936 by twenty American nation-states and ratified by eleven including the United States on July 15, 1937, the convention did not enter into full force until December 7, 1937 (51 Stat. 178; Treaty Series 928). The Convention for the Promotion of Cultural Relations was nevertheless limited in scope to the exchange of professors, teachers and graduate students through annual fellowships among the American republics with the purpose of advancing “greater mutual knowledge and understanding of

Barr obscures key private individuals and institutional contributors such as museums, corporations and foundations, in addition to the U.S. state and its federal agencies. All these were major players at this particular juncture when important shifts in society, business, and industry were beginning to take root in a new re-organization of the world order.

One of the pivotal figures behind the economic and cultural interests, cultural exchanges and modern art in South America was Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller, heir along with five siblings to the Rockefeller fortune of oil and gas represented by Standard Oil.<sup>30</sup> He saw in the region the potential for an expanded U.S. capitalist presence through trade, private investment and production replacing European (and a threatening Nazi) influence and business. Between 1940 and 1945 Rockefeller as a public servant served as Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and as Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics Affairs. It is through him that this project will look at the State and the private sector joining efforts for the

---

the people and institutions of the countries represented and a more consistent educational solidarity on the American continent.” This educational vision indeed informed the direction of the Department of State Division of Cultural Relations when it was established officially in July 1938 with Benjamin Mark Cherrington as its founding director (1938-1940). See Charles Irving Bevins, *Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America, 1776-1949: Multilateral, 1931-1945*. Volume 3. United States: Department of State Publication 8484, Released November 1969: 372-377.

<sup>30</sup>In 1933 due to a new taxation system and code John D. Rockefeller Jr., started to transfer the family fortune to his children by way of 200,000 shares of Socony-Vacuum stock each to John, Barbara and Nelson. In 1934 in the midst of the Great Depression, Rockefeller Jr., set up the '34 Trusts or trust funds for his older children in the amount of twelve million dollars in stock generating annual income of \$476,000 for each. See Cary Reich, *The Life of Nelson Rockefeller: Worlds to Conquer, 1908-1958*. New York: Doubleday, 1996: 122.

first time to develop a cultural defense program by supporting each other's interests in defense, capitalist economies and markets, and ideology.

Studies on U.S.-South America art and exchanges that look at this particular decade of the 1940s from a U.S. academia-perspective are very limited in number and some only provide fleeting references to it. For instance, Cathleen M. Paquette in considering MoMA and its interest in Mexico has touched tangentially on the role of OCCCRBAR, and superficially on its activities in South America with exhibitions and Lincoln Kirstein's acquisition trip on behalf of MoMA.<sup>31</sup> Art historians have begun to fill in some of the gaps in terms of countries in South America during this period. Michele Greet, in particular, has looked at Ecuador and the Andean Region during the period between 1920-1960 noting that pictorial indigenism as a modernist strategy was part of an international avant-garde current and not a local one. She addresses the 1939 World's Fair and the fact that it featured "the first exhibition in the United States to present the art of Latin America as a conceptual whole, separate from so-called American art."<sup>32</sup> She also touches on the CI-AA from the perspective of the exhibition of indigenists paintings in the U.S.

More recent studies within a U.S. perspective and vantage point have centered on providing a glimpse into the activities of the Pan American Union (PAU)/post-1948 Organization of American States (OAS). Michael Gordon Wellen's

---

<sup>31</sup> Cathleen Paquette. "Public Duties, Private Interests: Mexican Art at New York's Museum of Modern Art, 1929-1954." Diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2002.

<sup>32</sup> Michele Greet, *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009: 133.

2012 dissertation “Pan American Dreams: Art, Politics and Museum-Making at the OAS, 1948-1976”<sup>33</sup> looks at how the OAS promoted Latin American artists and art within a frame of Pan-Americanism that had a great influence in the development of Latin American art as a field of art historical study. Concentrating on the figures of José Gómez Sicre, an Art Specialist, Director of the Visual Arts Section and later Department, and founder of the Museum of Modern Art of Latin America in the period of 1946-1981 as well as Rafael Squirru, Director of Cultural Affairs and Gómez Sicre’s boss in the period of 1963-1970, Wellen explores the Cold War period and OAS Latin American art activities as guiding tastemakers for a U.S. audience and how they framed Latin American modern art within a constructed Pan American dream “of prosperity, equality and cooperation.”<sup>34</sup>

Similarly within the idea/discourse of OAS Pan Americanism, Claire F. Fox in her 2013 book *Making Art Panamerican: Cultural Policy and the Cold War* examines Pan-Americanism, traditions of intellectualism and circuits of hemispheric cultural diplomacy after the absorption of the Pan American Union under the bigger umbrella of the OAS in 1948. Framed within a methodology of cultural policy and cultural citizenship, she examines the activities of the Visual Art Section and its director José Gómez Sicre as curator and tastemaker, arguing that he conceived the Western Hemisphere as an art circuit and a cultural citizenship concept of a constructed “Latin American art” for “Latin American artists” to make them visible

---

<sup>33</sup> Michael Gordon Wellen. “Pan American Dreams: Art, Politics and Museum-Making at the OAS, 1948-1976,” Diss., University of Texas at Austin, December 2012.

<sup>34</sup> Wellen, 2012, x.

citizens in a wider international scene.<sup>35</sup> However a current study in progress by Adriana Ospina of the Art Museum of the Americas at the OAS posits that the institutional structure of the organization itself with member countries dictated art activities by country challenging the idea of “union” in a larger view of a Pan Americanism after 1948 and of homogeneous block of “Latin American art” at the OAS.<sup>36</sup> In relationship to these scholarly investigations, my work, framed in theories of globalization is located in the period preceding Wellen’s and Fox’s studies.

### **Methodological and Theoretical Engagements**

Methodologically and theoretically, I engage theories of modernity and cultural modernism [postmodernity-modernity in Latin America], cultural

---

<sup>35</sup> Claire F. Fox. *Making Art Panamerican: Cultural Policy and the Cold War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013: 29. This concept of “cultural citizenship” draws from William Flores and Rina Benmayor research working group sponsored by the Inter-University Program of Latino Research. However, cultural citizenship is contextualized within a U.S. Latino model of a minority group within a larger U.S. society and culture and as an identity and political strategy. Although expanded as a model to include other marginalized groups, the idea of a Latin American citizenship defies the basic concept of what citizenship is and what a state can grant. In addition, this construction of a continental view rather than by nation-state goes against the very institutional structure of the Organization of American States (OAS). Gómez Sicre’s curated exhibitions, curatorship and catalogs amply demonstrate the presentation of artists from specific countries. Within this organizational structure of the OAS, Gómez Sicre introduced artists by countries and with a very few exceptions included them in regional showings. Therefore, I find this thesis weak given that the presentation of artists in exhibitions sponsored by the Visual Arts Section of the Pan American Union of the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States was always sponsored by individual member countries and the titles in exhibition pamphlets provided the country of origin for each artist featured. It, in a way, takes Gómez Sicre out of the mission of the very institution that employed him. During 2012-2013 I was the principal investigator in a collaborative grant awarded to the University of Notre Dame by the Museum of Fine Arts-Houston to identify key institutional papers of Gómez Sicre at the OAS’s Art Museum of the Americas Art Archives. During the cataloguing of Gómez Sicre’s professional papers beginning in 1946 when he joined until his death in 1991, it became evident that the Pan American construction was informed more by the use of the name Pan American Union on exhibition pamphlets as a unit of the OAS rather than by a Pan American vision.

<sup>36</sup> Adriana Ospina, “Institutional Structure (OAS) and Historiography of the Visual Arts Section and Its Activities.” Paper presented at the College Art Association Conference, 12 February 2014, Chicago.

globalization, networks, culture industries, cultural production and taste such as those of Anthony Giddens, Néstor García Canclini, Roland Robertson, John Tomlinson, Louis Althusser, Armand Mattelart, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, and Pierre Bourdieu. I hope to elucidate on an earlier or first phase of the Americanization of culture and cultural imperialism, which by imposition, diffusion, and emulation sought to create a cultural uniformity of values and taste in South America. But within these, I also look at the cultural resistance and artistic agency on the part of the artists and the general populations.

I engage Giddens idea that modernity is “inherently globalizing” due to its universal and scientific discourses with institutions such as the nation-state, capitalism, industrialism, urbanization, military-scientific complex among others. The spatiality of South America and its geographical configuration at the time of this study falls into three regions—North Coast, West Coast and East Coast—presents a contesting space for origins of modern art and ideas of aesthetic modernity and the temporal inversion of a post-modernity before modernity. From this perspective of South America [as part of Latin America] I consider the contradictions of that modernity first by engaging Néstor García Canclini’s revisionist position of the theory of modernity which questions modernity in Latin America “where traditions have not yet disappeared and modernity has not completely arrived.”<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995: 1

Similarly, I also engage John Tomlinson's notion that "socioeconomic modernity is the 'fate' of all cultures in that they are integrated at a structural level in the orders of the nation-state system and global capitalist market."<sup>38</sup> Tomlinson's more recent views on cultural identity will also help to elucidate the role of the state. Althusser's ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses will also help elucidate the connection of power-culture-ideology of the State and museums as well as Benedict Anderson and the role of museums in national ideology. Although this project looks at modern art, the fact that in its definition of the time it includes film will lead me to look at Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's writings of 1944 on "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception" which later made it into a chapter of the 1947 book *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Adorno lived in England and later in the United States—New York and California—before moving to Frankfurt in 1947. Their writings coincide with the work of Disney and Hollywood Studios in South America at the service of the U.S. State.

The ongoing connection of art and taste present in the late 1930s that found its way into the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA and in particular speeches by President Roosevelt and decisions within the Office's Art Section regarding selection of art works for the three versions of the Contemporary Art Exhibition that circulated in the Northern, Western and Eastern coasts of South America will be studied and

---

<sup>38</sup> John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991: 140-141.

analyzed within the concepts of Bourdieu's analysis of cultural practices and distinction of the habitus of the U.S. and South America.

I engage these concepts of cultural globalization to argue that between 1940-1943 these processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization sought to change a cultural ideology from a European one with totalitarian overtones to an American one of capitalism, freedom, democracy, modernity and progress reflected in modern art. Although partially successful at the time, it proved to be the testing ground for an eventual shift of a private to a governmental control of foreign cultural politics and cultural relations in the United States. The discourses at the time at OCCCRBAR/CI-AA under conditions of war were not those of "a good neighbor" but instead those of security and defense via Americanization, as a neo-Monroe Doctrine and imperialist cultural ideology, in which the Western Hemisphere replaced European influences by U.S. ones and thus shifted the pole of cultural influence from Europe to the United States. I also explore this pilot Initiative as a possible genesis of larger projects that came later during the Cold War when art became a weapon in "the Arsenal of Democracy."

Just as blueprints were being developed in the third term of the Roosevelt Administration for the financial architecture of globalization under the Bretton Woods Accord and Institutions, so were the blueprints for a long-term cultural diplomacy and cultural relations through organizations and new cultural flows and networks for an Americanization of South America. This penetration was possible thanks to the technologies of the day—airplanes, telex, radio and film which



facilitated a systematic yet fast and efficient saturation of the American way of life, including American values of peace, progress and prosperity with the underlying values of modernity present in all its endeavors.

Within these cultural initiatives, I look specifically at modern art and visual culture, in particular the traveling exhibitions, scholarly exchanges, conferences, publications and exchange of books for Latin American libraries and the roles of the private sector (Rockefeller Family, Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Corporation and the Simon Guggenheim fellowships) in creating and supporting a future cultural policy and the shift of cultural diplomacy to the State.

This dissertation project relies heavily on primary source materials in archival collections and libraries utilizing memoranda, letters, correspondence, inter-office communications, meeting agendas, minutes of planning meetings, annual reports and the like to reconstruct the historical aspect of the program as well as to dig deeply into the politics and ideology behind it. I have conducted research at the National Archives at College Park, the Museum of Modern Art, the Archives of American Art at the Smithsonian Institution, The Library of Congress Hispanic Room, the University of Chicago Special Collections, the Art Museum of the Americas of the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, the Rockefeller Archive Center, and Butler Library at Columbia University.

### **Articulations, Networks and Relational Structures Method of Analysis**

This project finds a point of departure in methods of analysis of cultural

studies and globalization theory. Taking Modern Art as a cultural object, I engage Paul du Gay's Circuit of Culture method of analysis which looks at "structure, strategy and culture"<sup>39</sup> through a story or a biography of the object. According to du Gay the Circuit of Culture breaks with previous methods of analysis that only took into consideration the mode of production of the cultural object/artifact for its meaning. Instead, what du Gay proposes is an analysis of "the biography of a cultural artefact in terms of a theoretical model based on the articulation of a number of distinct processes whose interaction can and does lead to variable and contingent outcomes."<sup>40</sup> Du Gay identifies these distinct processes as Representation, Identity, Production, Consumption and Regulation, which "taken together, they complete a sort of circuit—what we term the circuit of culture—through which any analysis of a cultural text or artefact must pass if it is adequately studied."<sup>41</sup>

Du Gay's method looks at how these processes operate on a cultural artefact/object. In the cultural process of Production, the object is analyzed through the culture and practices of production both as it is technically and culturally produced and made meaningful with particular encoded or inscribed meanings and values. In the cultural process of Representation, the object is studied through the organizational or institutional culture that produces it and the identity that is created and recreated in its various depictions and advertisings. In looking at the

---

<sup>39</sup> Paul du Guy et al., *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage Publications in Association with the Open University, 1997: 2.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid: 3.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

cultural process of Identity, the object's encoded meanings during production are analyzed to reveal the relationship between the object and particular groups of consumers. In the process of cultural Consumption, consumers decode the various meanings and associations attached to the object during production. Here is where meanings are made by the different practices of consumption, which in turn imbues the object with new meanings as an ongoing process of production and consumption. In the consumption process it is revealed how objects are utilized by social groups as markers and reproducers of class in the symbolic dimension of consumption once it is inserted into social relations. In the Regulation process, the object is studied by the institutional control and parameters established for it once it is inserted into circuits.

These five processes overlap and intertwine in complex ways. But it is in the articulation, or what connects these processes, where meanings are found. I consider the circuit of culture theoretical method important for the analysis not only of cultural objects and artefacts, but also for the analysis of constructed ideas in which processes are interconnected and mutually interact with one another in a non-linear process. In the particular case of an American Modern Art (versus an European modern art) as a cultural object/idea, I analyze its production as a construction created in the United States responding to specific U.S. contexts and factors and the ways it is recreated in South America. I examine its representation of its various evolving meanings in the years 1939-1943 in exhibitions and in narratives of sponsoring museums, the social identities imbued in its construction,

its consumption in the Western, Eastern and Northern regions of South America and the United States, and the regulations that determined its production, distribution and consumption.

Through this method of analysis I hope to reveal how a U.S. construct of modern art ca. 1940-1943 was produced culturally; how it was encoded with meanings/identities during its production process to reach out to consumers in South America; how it was represented in distinct ways such as images, signs and ideas in art exhibitions, books, talks that created and recreated an identity; how it was culturally consumed in South America and the United States and the processes of meaning making as producers encoded meaning and consumers decoded the object; and how it was regulated by the U.S. State's own interests in tandem with those of the private sector.

However, this framework alone is not enough to analyze the construction of the idea of Modern Art and its trajectory within an actual geographical space. To reveal and fully understand its construction, production, and circulation of meaning, therefore, I complement du Guy's analytical tool with Peter Dicken's concept of networks explained above. In his exploration of the reshaping of the geo-economic map in the twenty-first century as a global shift rather than a full globalization, Dicken utilizes his concept to unravel the complex nature of a new economic model. Although Dicken's networks concept was in effect utilized to look at the global shift of the turn of the twenty-first century, it very well accommodates the period of WWII as one of shift with its own reshaping and redrawing of a new world order. I

argue that 1940-1943 was a moment of geographical change in the location of economic activity from Europe to the U.S. with a new internationalization, an early way of organizing production with processes outside national boundaries and a shrinking of the geographical distance via new communication and transportation technologies.

\*\*\*

To examine how modern art became a strategic tool to the U.S. State and the U.S. private sector during the WWII years in South America, this study is divided into six sections. The initial debates about definitions of American modern art go back to the late 1920s and early 1930s. In Chapter one, I establish the historical context of the study by looking at the “story or biography” of modern art through the developing discourse and construction of ideas of modern art in the United States beginning in 1929 and through the 1930s as a new approach to the study of the interconnections of the state, security and culture. I examine the relationship between the U.S. State and modern art during the Works Progress Administration that employed thousands of artists and the evolution of contested definitions and key ideas as well as the changing identity of the U.S. State in its exercise to re-build the nation and itself amidst the economic and political chaos of the Great Depression.

The changing politics in Europe and the imminent threat of an expanding conflict in 1939 served to put the U.S. State and the Americas in a state of alert. In Chapter two, I examine the antecedents and establishment of the OCCRBAR/CI-AA

and its Art Section. I look here at the evolution of cultural relations, the origins of the role of the U.S. private sector in these through foundations and other institutions and the important role of the Pan American Union and its conferences in facilitating the initial overtures of foreign cultural relations in the United States. Of special interest is the role of the Pan American Union as keeper and enforcer of Inter-American agreements. I explore the role that the Pan American Union played in assisting in the development of cultural policy for the Americas with resolutions adopted in years prior to 1939. The activities of the Art Section as part of a temporary emergency agency under the Council of National Defense tasked with an economic and cultural program conducted studies that produced baseline knowledge about Latin America and South American art. These studies, carried out in conjunction with MoMA, the Library of Congress and the Pan American Union, provide an unprecedented assessment of art and its infrastructure in Latin America and, in the particular interest of this study, in South America.

One of the activities of the Art Section was the circulation of exhibitions in the Americas. In the exploration of cultural flows, circuits and networks by which ideas of modern art and U.S. art circulated in South America, I take as an empirical case study in Chapter three the traveling exhibition of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana/Contemporary North American Painting* and its production, representation, identity, regulation and consumption as it circulated through the West, East and North Coasts of South America. I look at proto-multinational corporations, commerce and U.S. politics.

In addition to the presentation of U.S. modern art in South America, the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA created a parallel successful program for the presentation of Latin American art in the United States to be circulated to universities and small museums. Through the examination of the production, identity, regulation, representation and consumption of this exhibition Chapter four highlights the construction of Latin American art in the U.S. in these years by looking at the local traveling exhibitions. Parallel to these activities, the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA also advised on the organization of the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery that supported its commercial and cultural aspirations for a much larger hemispheric economic and cultural bloc.

As a contractor of the CI-AA supporting its activities, the Museum of Modern Art privately embarked in an acquisition program in the Americas during the war years aided by the Inter-American Fund of the Museum of Modern Art. The intersections of modern art and capitalism, ideology and the market are explored in Chapter five. It considers the implications of the establishment of the fund and Lincoln Kirstein's art acquisition trip to South America to purchase artworks for the MoMA permanent collection and his proposal to create a Latin American Department at the museum. One of these implications is capitalism and art as a commodity establishing market networks in South America. His visits to artists and their art studios, his selection of artworks and artists, and his recording of his personal accounts in notes provide a glimpse at perhaps the first art criticism from a U.S. perspective as well as the roots of an art market that would continue through

the efforts of museums and galleries in the years after 1943. The trip and the process of selecting, acquiring, transporting and shipping of art commodities help to examine the circuit and networks created and the actors intervening in the different processes. The trip itself as a secret information-gathering mission also serves to provide a more ample panorama of the political situation in the region at the time and the forces shaping CI-AA cultural actions.

In looking at modern art, modernization and the circuits as the early roots of a contemporary globalization of culture in South America, the conclusion considers through cultural flows and networks the combined three cases studies in their articulations and networks of the resulting exchanges and partnerships to reveal how Modern art became a medium for the circulation of meaning and how modern art operated within the circuit of culture. The residuals of this 1940-1943 State and private sector intervention in the culture and art in South America in the present moment are also explored here. I consider the possibility of the expertise acquired in circulating culture as the model and South America as the testing ground for future U.S. actions in other parts of the world including in the re-construction of Europe through a more formal establishment of State cultural relations in the Department of State.



## **THE REBUILDING OF A U.S. MODERN INDUSTRIAL STATE AND THE DEVELOPING OF A U.S. MODERN ART, 1933-1939**

Between 1933 and 1939 the U.S. State underwent a profound questioning of its own economic, political, and social institutions against a backdrop of a crisis that brought it close to a stand still. Likewise, during this same period modern art experienced intense activity and debate on the various meanings of what constituted a U.S. modern art and the role of art and the artist in society. This chapter provides a historical context through a look at what Paul Du Guy calls “structure, strategy and culture”<sup>42</sup> through a story or a biography of the modern U.S. state and U.S. modern art in evolving discourses, redefinitions, linkages and intersections. The emergence of re-constructed images and reformulated identities throughout the period of 1933 to 1939 of both State and art help to elucidate future developments that followed in the early 1940s, which are the subject of this study.

In this chapter I argue that the rebuilding and reconstitution of the state went hand in hand with a new phase in the construction of a post-1933 modern U.S. art. As the modern U.S. State and U.S. modern art intersected at various points along the way, they interconnected by the close of the decade when art became infused with values of democracy and freedom. On May 8, 1939 in a nation-wide radio

---

<sup>42</sup> du Guy et al., 1997: 2.

broadcast address marking the opening of the Museum of Modern Art's new building on 11 West 53rd Street in New York, FDR would state, "The conditions for democracy and for art are one and the same. What we call liberty in politics results in freedom in the arts...[i]n encouraging the creation and enjoyment of beautiful things we are furthering democracy itself."<sup>43</sup> This intersection of art and state evolutionary paths that had a high point in Roosevelt's speech, also helped to forge and define a new American identity projected onto the future with a post-1933 New Deal of relief, recovery and reform. Furthermore, this identity came to be framed within a revised modern industrial capitalist program with a new infrastructure for what Henry R. Luce would define as the American Century.<sup>44</sup>

### **Nineteen Thirty-Three: A New Modern Industrial Capitalist U.S. State**

The year 1933 is pivotal for the circumstances and forces that would come to shape the political, economic, social, and cultural developments as well as the role of the United States in national defense, world policy and international relations of the years 1940-1943, subject of this study. It is in this year when decisions and actions proved critical not only for a rebuilding of a modern industrial capitalist U.S. State with additional state institutions that strengthened it and expanded democratic societal values, but also for a new definition of State itself within a frame of Inter-

---

<sup>43</sup> "Address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a nation-wide broadcast which marked the opening of the Museum's new building on May 8, 1939." Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Record Group 4, Series Washington DC Files, Roosevelt, Franklin D. Correspondence, 1939-1945, Box 9, Folder 76. Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>44</sup> Henry R. Luce, "The American Century," *Life* (17 February 1941): 61-65.

American relations. Although the Great Depression had its beginnings in October 1929 with the Stock Market Crash, the economic crisis of the period only reached its peak in the first months of 1933 coinciding with the actual transfer of presidential power between Herbert Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR henceforth). A lack of banking liquidity and cash flow which, combined with a rampant poverty and unemployment affecting 24.9% of the population or 15 million people, threatened the very capitalist nature of the democratic U.S. state.

On Saturday, March 4, 1933 as FDR assumed the presidency of the United States, he came face to face with the greatest capitalist crisis of the century. Marked by a banking credit squeeze and cash liquidity crunch it threatened all aspects of the U.S. economy and society from payments of payrolls and circulation of money to distribution of food and basic household needs. It is at this precise moment in 1933 that these crisis conditions provided a clean slate on which to rebuild both a modern industrial capitalist state and the struggling nation with the implementation of innovative federal programs, institutions and infrastructure, which would last until the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. With this rebuilding also came a revised structure for the arts given that among the 24.9% of the unemployed population was a large number of unemployable artists.<sup>45</sup>

In the political developments, already in his inaugural address as the 32<sup>nd</sup> U.S. President, FDR's revealed his unique pragmatism when he called for measures

---

<sup>45</sup> Francis V. O'Connor lists the number of unemployed artist as being close to ten thousand in his report "Federal Support for the Visual Arts: The New Deal and Now," Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1971 [1969]: 16.

“to put the national house in order”<sup>46</sup> with a sound national economy first and foremost, and international trade relations second to a domestic agenda of recovery. In a far distance was his one-sentence plan for *world relations*: “In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.”<sup>47</sup> In this context of world relations in late 1933, “State” came to be re-defined during the Seventh International Conference on American States in Montevideo as a “sole person in the eyes of international law.”<sup>48</sup>

In fact, the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States posited a declarative theory of statehood defining it with a legal personality: “The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: (a) a permanent population; (b) a defined territory; (c) government; and (d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states.”<sup>49</sup> In addition, the convention made clear that: “The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by the other states,” in addition to clarifying the issue of sovereignty: “No state has the right to

---

<sup>46</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt: “Inaugural Address,” March 4, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project* Accessed 3 September 2012. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14473>.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> The Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, Article 2. Signed December 26, 1933.

<sup>49</sup> The Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, Article 1. Signed December 26, 1933.

intervene in the internal or external affairs of another,”<sup>50</sup> and casting the state in a new perspective of peace: “The primary interest of states is the conservation of peace. Differences of any nature which arise between them should be settled by recognized pacific methods.”<sup>51</sup>

In economic developments, on his first day on the job FDR encountered an acute lack of confidence in the U.S. banking system that was manifested by a rush of depositors to withdraw cash from bank and savings accounts and convert it into currency and gold. The unsustainable situation led FDR, as one of his very first measures in office and as a first step to re-build the State’s financial and economics sectors, to shut down the banking system and, on March 5, to declare a four-day Banking Holiday.<sup>52</sup> On March 9 the 73rd U.S. Congress, acting on a special session before their regular session, enacted the Emergency Banking Act. The Act required the Treasury Department to reserve deposits and a bailout of failed banks and it also broadened presidential powers. The extension of the Banking Holiday for a few extra days allowed FDR the first steps towards the restructuring and rehabilitation of the financial system and the economy. Federal Reserve Banks reopened on March 13 followed by other banks in Fed cities, after being tested and found sound and secure. FDR, two months later, would refer to the dark days of March’s capitalist

---

<sup>50</sup> The Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, Article 8. Signed December 26, 1933.

<sup>51</sup> The Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, Article 10. Signed December 26, 1933.

<sup>52</sup> See William L. Siber. “Why did FDR’s Banking Holiday Succeed?” *Economic Policy Review* 15.1 (July 2009). Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Accessed 3 March 2012. <http://www.newyorkfed.org/research/epr/09v15n1/0907silb.html>.

crisis as a moment in history when “the country was dying by inches [with] conditions, which came very close to destroying what we call modern civilization.”<sup>53</sup> FDR saw the situation as affecting the already weakened industrial and market economy and having a harmful impact on the social conditions and processes of American modern society and threatening the very essence of the U.S. as a capitalist state. FDR also by this allusion equated “modern civilization” to the capitalist industrial model of the United States and its way of life.

During the first One Hundred Days, FDR worked relentlessly to rebuild the modern industrial capitalist state through experimentation. To accomplish the stabilization of both state and nation he sought to implement what he had avowed in his inaugural address: “the greatest primary task is to put people to work” He added, “It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war.”<sup>54</sup> Under severe circumstances and in a special legislative session, FDR requested from the newly elected and re-elected Democrat majority Congress unprecedented executive powers to relieve the crisis. A dark crisis if there ever was one was described by

---

<sup>53</sup> Second Fireside Chat, May 7, 1933. Online. Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14703> accessed 30 September 2012. FDR stated: “We found ourselves faced with more agricultural products than we could possibly consume ourselves and with surpluses which other Nations did not have the cash to buy from us except at prices ruinously low. We found our factories able to turn out more goods than we could possibly consume, and at the same time we were faced with a falling export demand. We found ourselves with more facilities to transport goods and crops than there were goods and crops to be transported. All of this has been caused in large part by a complete lack of planning and a complete failure to understand the danger signals that have been flying ever since the close of the World War. The people of this country have been erroneously encouraged to believe that they could keep on increasing the output of farm and factory indefinitely and that some magician would find ways and means for that increased output to be consumed with reasonable profit to the producer.”

<sup>54</sup>Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933, op. cit.

FDR himself in his inaugural address as a decline in values, an increase in taxation, a reduction of pay power with a shortage of liquidity affecting the government and its solvency; frozen trade exchange; lack of markets for farmers produce, a drop in industrial output, the loss of citizens savings; and a rampant unemployment.<sup>55</sup> FDR soon converted the once limited central government into an expanded federal government with authority, reach and a powerful Office of the President.

In this One Hundred Days period, FDR sent to the special session of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Congress sixteen major bills that restructured the state and transformed the nature of the nation. Act reforms in financial, labor and job relief, farming and prohibition sectors were swiftly passed and were made into laws between March 9 and June 16, 1933 among them: the Emergency Banking Relief Act on March 9; the Government Economy Act on March 20; Beer-Wine Revenue on March 22; Creation of Civilian Conservation Corps on March 31; Abandonment of the Gold Standard on April 19; Federal Emergency Relief Act on May 12; Emergency Farm Mortgage Act on May 12; Tennessee Valley Authority Act on May 18; Securities Act on May 27; Abrogation of Gold Payment Clause on June 5; Home Owners Loan Act on June 13; National Industrial Recovery Act on June 16; Glass-Steagall Banking Act on June 16;

---

<sup>55</sup> FDR actual words were: "Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone. More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment." FDR, Inaugural Address, Saturday, March 4, 1933.

Emergency Railroad Transportation Act on June 16; and the Farm Credit Act on June 16.

Under these acts, several corporations and administrations were established including among them the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), which would play a key role in the initial transformation of the structure of the arts by providing the first work-relief to artists. Created under the Federal Emergency Relief Act, FERA came to replace Hoover's ineffective relief bill of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of July 21, 1932 with a more efficient, lasting and expanded version of federal relief.<sup>56</sup> With FERA once in place as a two-year agency, FDR immediately appointed as its head the former New York State Temporary Emergency Relief Administrator Harry L. Hopkins on May 19, 1933. FERA provided direct aid in the form of grants to states and cooperated with them in work-relief projects for the unemployed and indigent.

### **Nineteen Thirty-Three: A Modern U.S. Art**

In the rebuilding process of the State, intense activity and debate took place in the visual arts. Art debates in the United States in the 1930s were informed by several factors, among them the need for a true American art voided of foreign influences, an economic crisis and the subsequent collapse of the art market and

---

<sup>56</sup> Previously, Hoover's emergency act of 1932 had created the Reconstruction Corporation to provide temporary loans with interest to states to support their efforts in dealing with the economic hardship and social distress, loans to states for construction of public works that would generate employment as well as loans to agriculture. However, the act had proven mostly ineffective in the face of the magnitude of the crisis.



gallery activity, a new configuration of art patronage with the state at its helm, the rise of the left with the social and political activism of concerned artists and critics responding to domestic and international developments, and a mass resistance and repudiation of Fascism, Hitler's anti-Semitism, totalitarianism and war. Art historians and scholars have noted three overarching art themes that came to dominate the decade: Americanism marked by the land, small town values, the middle class, families and the native born; Marxism with the social realities of the working class, émigrés, and the link of culture to workers; and Modernism in relation to formal experimentation and abstraction in alliance with capitalism.<sup>57</sup>

In the evolution of the arts and political activism during the stated six-year period, artists and critics who would identify with one of these three themes at a certain point in time would also find appealing the other two at other times leading them to undergo complex renegotiations of their own ideologies and positions. As has been explained by Susan Noyes Platt and others, these reconfigurations and intersections of artists and themes followed a broad chronological course: After the introduction of European modernism to the United States in the 1913 New York Armory Show, American modernism was barely beginning to take form by the end of the 1920s. But in the early to mid-1930s Americanism with the American Scene, Regionalism and the Midwestern Agrarians styles would reign supreme often times intersecting with Modernism and later with Marxism (Social Realism) as the 1930s

---

<sup>57</sup> Including among them is Susan Noyes Platt with her Foucauldian analysis of discourses and cultural activism and politics in the arts in the 1930s. Susan Noyes Platt, *Art and Politics in the 1930's: Modernism, Marxism, Americanism, A History of Cultural Activism During the Depression Years*. New York: Midmarch Arts Press, 1999.

decade went by. While Americanism dominated the New Deal artistic programs, Modernism—with its genealogy for the ideal modern art permanent collection conceptualized by Alfred Barr in his “Evolving Torpedo”<sup>58</sup> beginning in 1933—was appropriated by the Museum of Modern Art and its founders.<sup>59</sup> By the mid 1930s Marxism (Social Realism) mixed with Americanism and Modernism in the Popular Front to oppose war, preserve civil liberties and destroy Fascism. But by the end of the decade a strong current with modernism and abstraction was beginning to take over.

The 1933-1939 period was marked by an unprecedented activism in the arts. Artists for the first time united under umbrella organizations of the popular front such as the Artists’ Coordination Committee, the Artists’ Union and the American Artists’ Congress. These organizations provided artists with sites for collective action where they would come together to exchange information on issues, to organize, and to be political. Now as a more unified force, artists were able to demand and sometimes secure financial support through federal employment after the collapse of the art market and the shortage of private patronage, to denounce discrimination affecting unemployed artists, to protect freedom of expression, and to unite against censorship and the destruction of art.<sup>60</sup> The Artists’ Union would

---

<sup>58</sup> Kirk Varnadoe, “The Evolving Torpedo: Changing Ideas of the Collection of Painting and Sculpture of The Museum of Modern Art,” *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change*, Studies in Modern Art Series, No. 5, New York, MoMA, 1995: 12-73.

<sup>59</sup> Platt, 1999: xiv.

<sup>60</sup> Members of the Artists’ Coordination Committee were: the American Artists’ Congress, An American Group, Inc., the American Society of Painters, Sculptors and Gravers, the Harlem Artists’ Guild, the Mural Artists’ Guild of the United Scenic Artists, the National Association of Women

come to see itself as an art movement and social group rallying for a state's sponsorship of arts, which according to members, was to "build an art in our country predicated upon our historical ideals of democracy."<sup>61</sup> The American Artists' Congress saw itself as the unifying force for artists to oppose war and combat the threat of fascism without falling into extreme radicalism.

In the midst of debates and activism, definitions of modern art became multiple and varied. The ongoing discussion after WWI had been dominated by the quest for a distinct American modern art. Beginning in 1929 cultural and art critics alike started to converge on the need for a new subject matter in American art linked to practical and everyday life experience and away from technique and form. In the early debates of 1929, Waldo Frank in response to the perceived prevalence of a Eurocentric art model, called the United States "the grave of Europe."<sup>62</sup> The same year, the nationalist and conservative critic Thomas Craven, who would a few years later become the champion of the American Scene art movement, in looking at French culture noted "the American soil could not nourish a metaphysical imported style."<sup>63</sup> Likewise Lewis Mumford in his take on American culture from the

---

Painters & Sculptors, the National Society of Mural Painters, the New York Society of Women Artists, the Sculptors' Guild, Inc, and the United American Artists. See Hugo Gellert. "Artists' Coordination Committee, *Art for the Millions: Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*, Ed. Francis V. O'Connor, Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd, 1975: 255-257.

<sup>61</sup> Chet La More, "The Artists' Union of America," *Art for the Millions: Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*, Ed. Francis V. O'Connor, Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd, 1975: 238.

<sup>62</sup> Waldo Frank, *The Rediscovery of America*. New York: Scribner, 1929. Also quoted in A. Joan Saab, *For the Millions: American Art and Culture Between the Wars*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004: 5.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Craven, "The Curse of French Culture." *The Forum*, July 1929, pp. 57-62. Also quoted in A. Joan Saab, 2004: 5.

perspective of taste and its derivative nature, also in 1929, coincided with the need for a unique participatory aesthetic drawn from U.S. life that would erase the line between high and low brow. He said, the “seventeenth-century American farmhouse, with its usable kettles and pans, its neatly paneled walls with simple checked molding...was the example in America of a healthy tradition, untainted by foreign modes and meaningless precedents and strange fashions.”<sup>64</sup> These early concerns and calls for a new American aesthetic would inform new definitions of modern art in the 1930s.

In the early 1930s John Dewey brought a new perspective to the debate by seeking to expand further the definition of art to an experience—as an instrument for social change voided of aesthetic hierarchies of high and low distinctions and residing in everyday life.<sup>65</sup> It was Dewey’s philosophical positions for a creative democracy that would strongly influence his contemporaries leaving an indelible mark on the development of the arts of the time. Notable figures such as Edgar Holger Cahill, art curator at the Newark Museum and Acting Director of MoMA in 1932-1933, and Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Director of the MoMA, attested to the impact of Dewey’s ideas in their definitions of an American modern art and in their subsequent conceptualization of the Work Progress Administration Federal Art

---

<sup>64</sup> Lewis Mumford, *American Taste*. New York: Grabbon Press, 1929: 3. Quoted in A. Joan Saab, 2004: 5.

<sup>65</sup> John Dewey, *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee Books, 1934. Dewey explored democracy and its meaning throughout most of his life in particular in the areas of education, schools and civil society and as social inquiry and social reform. His books *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Psychology of Education* (1916), *The Public and its Problems* (1927), *Art as Experience* (1934) and *Experience and Education* (1938) and *Freedom and Culture* were highly influential at the time.

Project (WPA/FAP), and the institutional modeling of MoMA and its education project,<sup>66</sup> respectively.

Early 1930s attempts at defining modern art by both Cahill and Barr provide a glimpse at the trajectories and evolution that these took through the decade and into the 1940s. Cahill writing in 1933 in the introductory text of the catalog of the *American Sources of Modern Art* exhibition at MoMA drew attention to the “complex heritage” of modern art and its many sources beyond Europe. Rather than concentrating on Africa or primitive sources, in this particular instance, he favored an exploration and evaluation of the art of ancient civilizations of the Americas. His perspective on its high aesthetic quality and value as an art of a advanced civilization pointed to the relation and presence of its influence in modern artworks making way for what Holly Barnet-Sanchez has called the aestheticizing of pre-Columbian artifacts from utilitarian to art museum objects.<sup>67</sup> Similarly in an early effort to explain the modern in modern art in 1933, Barr noted:

‘Modern Art’ is recurrently a matter for debate, to be attacked or defended, a banner for the progressive, a red flag for the conservative. In this sense the word modern can become a problem not of periods but of prejudices...The truth is that modern art cannot be defined with any degree of finality either in time or in character and any attempt to do so implies a blind faith, insufficient knowledge, or an academic lack of realism.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Alfred Barr started the education department at MoMA in 1937 when he hired Victor D’Amico, an educator who was inspired by Dewey’s philosophies and theories. See Carol Morgan “From Modernist Utopia to Cold War Reality: A Critical Moment in Museum Education.” In *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change*, Studies in Modern Art, no. 5., New York: MoMA, 1995: 150-173.

<sup>67</sup> Holly Barnet-Sanchez, “Aestheticising the Pre-Columbian Past: Exhibitions Sponsored by the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1940-1945,” paper presented at the 1988 College Art Association Annual Meeting, 12 February 1988.

<sup>68</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr., “Modern and ‘Modern.’” MoMA Press Release, 1933-1934, No. 52.

Ten years later in 1943, Barr would express the same caution in defining in writing “what is modern painting?” In a booklet written for a general public with limited art experience, he continued to allude to the need to undermine prejudices and to increase understanding by writing of the wide variety of modern art as one reflecting the complexity of a modern world, life and society.<sup>69</sup>

If debates after WWI had dealt in general with an American modern art untainted by foreign models and influences, beginning in 1933 freedom and democracy became fundamental factors informing these discussions: the freedom of creative expression; the freedom to demonstrate; the freedom to be political; the freedom for artists to address pressing world issues in traditional media of painting, sculpture, watercolor and expanding new media such as photography, film and printmaking; and values of freedom and democracy in the implementation of an unprecedented U.S. State work-relief program.

### **Nineteen Thirty-Three: The U.S. State and Modern Art**

On November 8, 1933 FDR established the Civil Works Administration (CWA) as a short-term federal agency that would complement the relief efforts already provided by FERA to states through the creation of temporary jobs during the 1934 winter months as public assistance rather than placing people on public dole, fulfilling his promise from his inaugural address “to put people to work.”<sup>70</sup> The

---

<sup>69</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr., *What is Modern Painting?* New York: MoMA, 1943: 2-3.

<sup>70</sup> FDR, "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933, op. cit.

CWA employed people on relief rolls in public works to improve an existing infrastructure further develop a new one for the modern industrialized state with projects ranging from sanitary works, utility systems, public buildings schools, parks to transportation and communication with the establishment of a network of roads, bridges, airports in addition to rural electrification. When the agency ended its activities on March 31, 1934, its almost five-month run was quite a success in providing temporary winter jobs to over four million people at a cost of \$200 million per month.

The CWA also established the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP henceforth) under the Department of the Treasury on December 8, 1933 as the first in a series of four government-sponsored programs in the 1930s. Although the U.S. State had supported the arts sporadically through national competitions and commissions for architecture and art in federal buildings and monuments, this was the first time in which the U.S. State would concentrate on the artists themselves rather than on the art. They would patronize by them and assume the role that had previously largely been played by a private sector in a now almost-defunct infrastructure of galleries, commissions, and art market that had made their work and livelihood possible.

Endowed with an initial budget of \$1,039,000 from CWA moneys, the PWAP played a critical role in securing work for artists in the 1934 winter months. But more importantly, it established “artist” as a job classification. It utilized the existing structure of the CWA with 16 regions with the main objective to provide

---

employment and temporary work relief to artists in the embellishment of non-federal public buildings and parks.<sup>71</sup> The genesis of this particular state patronage has been attributed to several factors including among them the activist efforts of artist George Biddle, FDR's former schoolmate at Groton School and brother of FDR's future Attorney General. In a letter to FDR advocating for opportunities for muralists along the lines of President Alvaro Obregón's program in Mexico where artists were paid plumber's wages and were given walls in federal buildings to decorate them with frescoes, Biddle made a case for a similar program given the rampant unemployment conditions and the new social ideas that FDR envisioned. But in its implementation, the PWAP went beyond Biddle's idea of providing artists walls for murals to a much larger and more comprehensive vision of art and art media that included painting, sculpture, design and crafts to embellish and decorate non-federal public buildings and parks. However, as a federal program, art produced under the PWAP became the property of the State.

Unlike the CWA, the work of the PWAP was extended beyond March to give time for artists to complete projects. When it came to a close on June 30, 1934, the PWAP had provided work to 3,749 relief and non-relief artists alike generating 15,633 works of art for the state at a total cost of \$1,312,177 with weekly wages

---

<sup>71</sup> In one of the many accounts of the time, Florence Loeb Kellogg looking at the results of the PWAP noted: "Schools, zoological gardens, libraries and hospitals, particularly for their children's departments, municipal auditoriums, state universities and normal schools, city halls, county courthouses, post-offices, customhouses, museums, Ellis Island, the Naval and Military Academies—institutions all over the country had seized this opportunity to decorate walls or add sculptural details. This decoration varies in importance. Much of it is merely pleasant, some is more ambitious." Florence Loeb Kellogg, "Art Becomes Public Works," *Survey Graphic*, 23.6 (June 1934): 279.



ranging from \$26.50 to \$42.50.<sup>72</sup> In addition to providing employment, as noted by the PWAP director Edward Bruce, the state through the program “recognized that the artist, like the laborer, capitalist and office worker, eats, drinks and has a family, and pays rent, thus contradicting the old superstition that the painter and the sculptor live in attics and exist on inspiration.”<sup>73</sup>

However, as an emergency work-relief initiative, the PWAP encountered a dual standard in the selection of those who would be employed: artists had to prove that they were in need of jobs and that they also had the artistic qualifications and ability to produce quality works of art for the state. This aspect of the program as implemented called into question the very nature of the program as work-relief and not as a means for the state to acquire works of art. This contradiction did not go unnoticed by artists who grouped to protest these requirements at a moment of dire straits and needs. This in fact, called attention to a much larger of unemployed artists and the need to create more expansive art relief programs. Although the PWAP allowed artists the freedom to utilize a variety of media in embellishing non-federal public buildings including murals, easel paintings, sculpture, lithography, etchings, etc., the program did stress the theme of the American scene in its many

---

<sup>72</sup> Francis V. O'Connor, *Federal Support for the Visual Arts: The New Deal and Now*, Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1971 [1969]: 19.

<sup>73</sup>Judith G. Keyser, *The New Deal Murals in Washington State: Communication and Popular Democracy*, Thesis (M.A.)--University of Washington, 1982), 39. Quoted in Eleanor Mahoney, “The Great Depression in Washington State: Pacific Northwest Labor and Civil Rights Projects, University of Washington. Online: [http://depts.washington.edu/depress/visual\\_arts\\_index.shtml](http://depts.washington.edu/depress/visual_arts_index.shtml)

interpretations of American landscapes, cityscapes, even in still life and figuration in addition to the representation of values of hard work and community.<sup>74</sup>

The PWAP created a new set of favorable conditions in the cultural realm of the state and nation in its quest to generate temporary employment for thousands who had been previously perceived as unemployable due to lack of practical skills. Moreover, it brought an unprecedented public support to the arts and established a new relationship between artists and the state as the major patron, supporter, and promoter of the arts in media ranging from murals, easel paintings, sculptures, prints, ceramics and crafts. In the process of recognizing art as a job category and as regular work, the state also established a democratic view by allowing artists to experiment.

With the completion of PWAP, the debate in the arts would soon shift to include issues of what was an “authentic” American art and identity, the impartial view of process of selection for quality production which favored well known artists instead of the unemployed. In addition, it took into consideration the need for a democratic process and freedom of creativity beyond a prescribed depiction of American themes such as small town life or history or the American scene. PWAP Director Edward Bruce would come to see the PWAP as an example of what FDR envisioned for the nation: giving it “a more abundant life” and as the “the first completely democratic art movement in history.”<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Edward B. Rowan to Emmanuel Benson, May 24, 1932. In O'Connor, 1971: 20.

<sup>75</sup> Quoted in David A Taylor. “What’s the Deal about New Deal Art?” Smithsonian.com, May 19, 2009. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/Whats-the-Deal-about-New-Deal-Art-.html>

## **Nineteen Thirty-Three: The Global Stage and Modern Art**

But If 1933 was a key year for FDR in the reformulation of a modern state and modern American art structure in the United States, it was equally so for Germany. Adolf Hitler became head of government on January 30 after 84-year-old President Paul von Hindenburg appointed him Chancellor of a coalition government in the young and fragile Weimar Republic that had replaced the German Empire at the end of WWI. With parliamentary elections set for March 5, 1933, one day after FDR's inauguration, Hitler began to secure full power in a matter of weeks. The burning of the Reichstag parliament building in Berlin by alleged Communists provided him with the perfect opportunity to start his consolidation of power. On February 28, one day after the fire, President von Hindenburg invoked powers given to him by Article 48 paragraph 2 of the Weimar Constitution to issue the Reichstag Fire Decree (*Reichstagsbrandverordnung*) or Decree of the Reich President for the Protection of People and State (*Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat*) to restore public order and safety. In coordination with his chancellor, he suspended civil liberties spelled out in articles 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 124 and 153 of the Weimar Constitution thus restricting the right of personal freedom or habeas corpus rights, freedom of opinion or expression, freedom of speech and press, freedom to organize and assembly, and privacy of post, telegraph

and telephone communications and restrictions on protection of property and home with house warrants, orders for confiscations and restrictions on property.<sup>76</sup>

Only three weeks after the Reichstag Fire Decree, the Weimar Republic would collapse giving way to the Third Reich or National Socialist State facilitated by the passage of the Enabling Act or the Law to Remedy the Distress of People and State (*Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich*). Signed on March 24 by von Hindenburg and approved by parliament, the Enabling Act granted state powers to the government. The Chancellor as the head of government and his cabinet received plenary legislative powers and authority to enact legislation and laws, deviating from the Weimar Constitution as constitutional amendments, and to enter into foreign treaties without consent or control of parliament.<sup>77</sup> As originally enacted,

---

<sup>76</sup>Original text: Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat. Auf Grund des Artikels 48 Abs. 2 der Reichsverfassung wird zur Abwehr kommunistischer staatsgefährdender Gewaltakte folgendes verordnet: Die Artikel 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 124 und 153 der Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs werden bis auf weiteres außer Kraft gesetzt. Es sind daher Beschränkungen der persönlichen Freiheit, des Rechts der freien Meinungsäußerung, einschließlich der Pressefreiheit, des Vereins- und Versammlungsrechts, Eingriffe in das Brief-, Post-, Telegraphen- und Fernsprecheheimnis, Anordnungen von Haussuchungen und von Beschlagnahmen sowie Beschränkungen des Eigentums auch außerhalb der sonst hierfür bestimmten gesetzlichen Grenzen zulässig.

<sup>77</sup> Original text: Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich. Der Reichstag hat das folgende Gesetz beschlossen, das mit Zustimmung des Reichsrats hiermit verkündet wird, nachdem festgestellt ist, daß die Erfordernisse verfassungsändernder Gesetzgebung erfüllt sind: Artikel 1: Reichsgesetze können außer in dem in der Reichsverfassung vorgesehenen Verfahren auch durch die Reichsregierung beschlossen werden. Dies gilt auch für die in den Artikeln 85 Abs. 2 und 87 der Reichsverfassung bezeichneten Gesetze. Artikel 2: Die von der Reichsregierung beschlossenen Reichsgesetze können von der Reichsverfassung abweichen, soweit sie nicht die Einrichtung des Reichstags und des Reichsrats als solche zum Gegenstand haben. Die Rechte des Reichspräsidenten bleiben unberührt. Artikel 3: Die von der Reichsregierung beschlossenen Reichsgesetze werden vom Reichskanzler ausgefertigt und im Reichsgesetzblatt verkündet. Sie treten, soweit sie nichts anderes bestimmen, mit dem auf die Verkündung folgenden Tage in Kraft. Die Artikel 68 bis 77 der Reichsverfassung finden auf die von der Reichsregierung beschlossenen Gesetze keine Anwendung. Artikel 4: Verträge des Reiches mit fremden Staaten, die sich auf Gegenstände der Reichsgesetzgebung beziehen, bedürfen für die Dauer der Geltung dieser Gesetze nicht der

the Enabling Act lasted four years with the possibility of renewal which was eventually done in 1937 and 1941. The Enabling Act provided Hitler with dictatorial powers. In a matter of a few weeks he proceeded to ban trade unions, abolish and dissolve political parties and remove German Jews from civil service among others. By June 1933 as FDR was completing his One Hundred Days, Hitler was establishing a new national order with a blacklist of German artists, intellectuals and scientists.

Beginning in September 1933 the Third Reich systematically carried out a deliberate campaign to banish *entartete kunst* or degenerate art by banning modern art and publications. It forbade modernist artists to create and produce art by dismissing them from teaching positions in art schools and preventing them from exhibiting and selling. This premeditated attack on the intellectual and creative life with censorship and frequent persecutions led to an exodus of Jewish and non-Jewish vanguard artists, architects, graphic designers and others to various parts of Europe and the Americas. The *Reichskulturkammer* or Reich Culture Chamber under Joseph Goebbels and with artist Adolf Ziegler in charge regulated the visual arts by purging them of modernist experimental elements, by seizing and confiscating collections, and by eradicating modern art from museums and national collections.<sup>78</sup>

---

Zustimmung der an der Gesetzgebung beteiligten Körperschaften. Die Reichsregierung erläßt die zur Durchführung dieser Verträge erforderlichen Vorschriften.

<sup>78</sup>Artworks gathered during raids to museums were shown at the 1937 Degenerate Art Exhibition in Munich on July 19 1937. Not all modern art was destroyed though; key artworks were sold at auctions in Switzerland by the Third Reich with proceeds helping to feed the Nazi war machine. See Peter Adam, *Art of the Third Reich*, NY: Harry N. Abrams, Inc, 1992, and Lynn Nichols, *The Rape of*

The Third Reich instead, would come to favor a representational figurative style that exalted the nation's social values and virtues and the racially pure Aryan aspirations of a Nazi State for a German fatherland, converting art into a carrier of ideology and a propaganda tool for the state and nation. These initial and later developments in the German art milieu did not go unnoticed in the United States. In fact, the migration of German artists, among them former Bauhaus faculty, artists and architects to the United States to Boston, Chicago, New York, Saint Louis, Aspen, Black Mountain and elsewhere, would influence enormously the various formulations and definitions of the modern in modern art, and of design for industrial production and architecture in the modern industrialized state and society that the U.S. was becoming.

### **Art and the State: Democracy**

Emerging ideas of an American democratic spirit and freedom in the arts in opposition to a totalitarian state's restrictive measures on creativity, expression and censorship of the arts, would echo the larger national discourse of a constitutional state in a struggle for the revival, restoration, growth and preservation of values and democracy amidst an unprecedented national economic and political emergency. In considering the first days of the FDR presidency and his New Deal in contrast to Hitler's totalitarian consolidation of power and the initial days of the Third Reich it

---

*Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*, New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

is easy to discern that the world events of the next twelve years would have their direct origins at this very time. Beginning in 1933 both President and Chancellor worked with differing and opposing political views towards strengthening and modernizing the state and the nation while similarly fighting against the destructive forces of a global economic depression and with decidedly opposite national and *world* policy agendas: one with totalitarian views of empire and aspirations for a Third German Empire, and the other one with democratic views of a New Deal and a desire to respect others and be a *world* good neighbor.

Included in FDR's 1933 inaugural address was the one-sentence reference to world relations equating them to the behavior of a good neighbor (or U.S. State). Although it was applied also to Latin America, it was not tailored in this historical moment and context specifically by FDR to the region as the art literature often assumes and repeats, but to the *world*. Relegated well behind more pressing domestic agendas such as the rebuilding of the state as first, and international trade a distant second, world policy and international relations nor the Department of State underwent any significant transformation in the period of 1933 to 1939 as other institutions of the state did.<sup>79</sup>

Latin America already had an established Inter-American System of its own dating from 1889-1890 with a mechanism in place for Inter-American Conferences sponsored by the Pan American Union as a supranational and inter-regional body of

---

<sup>79</sup> The transformation of the Department of State would not happen until 1945 when it absorbed war agencies expanding its reach and activities.

twenty-one republics in the Western Hemisphere. The twenty independent republics of Latin America, without counting the United States, were seen in 1911 as a “wonderland of progress, resources and opportunity”<sup>80</sup> with “latent natural wealth and material resources awaiting development at the hands of capital and labor.”<sup>81</sup> Having as its aim “the development and conservation of peace, friendship, and commerce between them,”<sup>82</sup> the Pan American Union (PAU henceforth) was the de-facto repository of international relations agreements for the region in a city in which all member countries had diplomatic missions. Founded in Washington D.C. on April 14, 1890 at the end of the first Inter-American conference as the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, it was later renamed the International Bureau of the American Republics in 1902, and ultimately adopting the name Pan American Union in 1910.

In 1933, the Seventh International Conference on American States in Montevideo’ definition of State and Sovereignty, as mentioned above, set the tone for a clean break with previous administration’s foreign policy positions of territorial invasions and political meddling. Secretary of State Cordell Hull reiterated: “Every observing person must by this time thoroughly understand that under the Roosevelt Administration the United States Government is as much

---

<sup>80</sup> John Barrett. *The Pan American Union: Peace, Friendship, Commerce*. Baltimore: Munder Thomsen Press, 1911: 8.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid: 7.



opposed as any other government to interference with the freedom, the sovereignty, or other internal affairs or processes of the governments of other nations.”<sup>83</sup>

In fact, permeating the U.S. international relations discourse at the time, in addition to the Inter-American System, was the idea of the ‘Western Hemisphere’ as a concept of continental unity in a hemisphere of peace, freedom and democracy. Underpinning the idea was the sense of urgency and security as a result of the 1930s global depression and economic loss that created nationalisms against capitalist-imperialism and the rise of political instability and dictatorships in Argentina, and Brazil.<sup>84</sup> The ‘Western Hemisphere’ idea, as explained by Arthur P. Whitaker, was “unilateral in form but multilateral in spirit...[and]...described in terms of the French Revolutionary triad of liberty, equality and fraternity”<sup>85</sup> As such, it stood in contrast to the sites of authoritarianism, totalitarianism<sup>86</sup> and despotism reigning in Europe and Japan at the time. As a unit, the Western Hemisphere was mostly imagined as an amalgamation of nation-states and European dominions/colonies (French/Dutch/British) in a new, peaceful and united continent in contrast with an old and belligerent war-ridden Europe.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Cordell Hull, “Reservations.” Seventh International Conference on American States. December 26, 1933.

<sup>84</sup> Arthur P. Whitaker. *The Western Hemisphere Idea: Its Rise and Decline*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954: 134.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid: 132-133.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Whitaker traces the roots of the Western Hemisphere idea to the First Inter-American Conference, “The International Conference of American States” held in 1889-1890 in Washington, DC and sponsored by the U.S. government to promote commerce, security as part of the then Secretary of State James Gillespie Blaine protectionist policies for Latin America that echoed the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

With his first presidential inaugural address on March 4, 1933, FDR made the re-building and re-shaping of a modern industrialized and capitalist state center stage in his administration. His political credo for a pragmatic yet experimental national recovery called for the restructuring of the state and nation—with a new order, a new machinery, a New Deal. This credo prioritized restoration of people to work through government employment rather than giving out food vouchers; the reorganization of the use of natural resources; the redistribution of agriculture with better use of land and urban space; the strict supervision of banking, credit and investment; and the unification and supervision of utilities, transportation, and communications. In his Fireside chats, FDR alluded to this new architecture of the state in certain “construction” terms such as the “granite foundation” of a program for treasury loans and federal credits, the “new machinery” of new legislation for home, farm, and Industrial recovery.<sup>88</sup> He would also allude to “constructing the edifice of recovery” through work relief and the delay of foreclosures, extension of credit, abolition of child labor and elimination of sweatshops among others.<sup>89</sup>

In addition to this rhetoric of the re-building of the state was the re-formulation of a national identity with renewed values of freedom and democracy. In the formulation of a U.S. national identity, FDR emphasized democracy as a value that had been and would continue to be associated with the U.S. As John Tomlinson

---

<sup>88</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Fireside chat (Recovery Program),” July 24, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 30 September 2012.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14488>

<sup>89</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Fireside Chat.” October 22, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 30 September 2012.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14537>

has theorized as part of his analysis of identity as cultural power, "...identity is not in fact some merely communal-psychic attachment, but a considerable dimension of *institutionalized* social life in modernity. Particularly in the dominant form of national identity, it is a product of deliberate cultural construction and maintenance via both regulatory and the socializing institutions of the state in particular the law, the education system and the media."<sup>90</sup> In FDR's speeches and fireside chats in public radio evening addresses or presidential reports from 1933 to 1939 on banking, the economy, the reemployment of millions of unemployed workers, he referred in very distinct ways to the values of democracy first in a local context and later in a global one. He said: "we do not distrust the future of essential democracy"<sup>91</sup> in 1933; "the primary concern of any Government dominated by the humane ideals of democracy is the simple principle that in a land of vast resources no one should be permitted to starve...All that we do seeks to fulfill the historic traditions of the American people. Other nations may sacrifice democracy for the transitory stimulation of old and discredited autocracies. We are restoring confidence and well-being under the rule of the people themselves"<sup>92</sup> in 1934; "I prefer and I am sure you prefer that broader definition of liberty under which we are moving forward to greater freedom, to greater security for the average man than

---

<sup>90</sup> John Tomlinson, "Globalization and Cultural identity" *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, Ed. David Held & Anthony McGrew, London: Polity, 2007: 270-271.

<sup>91</sup> FDR, "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933.

<sup>92</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Fireside Chat," June 28, 1934. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 19 September 2012  
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14703>

he has ever known before in the history of America”<sup>93</sup> also in 1934; “Fear is vanishing and confidence is growing on every side, faith is being renewed in the vast possibilities of human beings to improve their material and spiritual status through the instrumentality of the democratic form of government...[with]...the recovery of confidence in our democratic processes and institutions.”<sup>94</sup> These

This identity of the U.S. State with freedom and democracy as part of the rebuilding and re-construction of the modern industrialized state and nation also would come to permeate culture and the arts and its discourses. When the PWAP ended in June 1934, it was immediately followed by yet another federal program for the arts: the Treasury’s Section of Painting and Sculpture established in the fall of 1934. However, the PWAP had been a work-relief program, the Section was a specific program for the beautification of federal buildings in which the issue of quality in art, rather than work relief, was of the utmost importance. Those indigent artists who went back to relief rolls questioned the very process of selecting artists for a program which, rather than receiving money from a direct appropriation, assigned a “one percent” of their own federal allocation for building construction to the embellishment of buildings. At issue was the democratic process in awarding commissions and the request of names of well-established artists for its awards.

The Treasury Section, as it became known, beginning on October 14, 1934 has as its

---

<sup>93</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Fireside Chat," September 30, 1934. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*, accessed 19 September 2012. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14759>

<sup>94</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Fireside Chat," April 28, 1935. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*, Accessed 19 September 2012. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=15046>.

objective “to secure suitable art of the best quality for the embellishment of public buildings”<sup>95</sup> in the form of mostly murals and sculpture for new constructed federal buildings such as the Justice Department and Post Offices along the lines of what George Biddle had envisioned for the United States based on Mexico’s government mural commissions of the early to mid-1920s.

However, the state program that had the greatest impact in the construction of a public art infrastructure, albeit temporarily, and on definitions of both art and artist and the discourse on the very nature of an American art would be part of the larger Works Progress Administration (WPA) instituted on May 6, 1935 and again under Harry L. Hopkins’ supervision as had been FERA.<sup>96</sup> The WPA became one of the best known of the New Deal programs. Set up as a work-relief program, the WPA sought to employ people on the relief rolls to carry out public works projects for a new modern infrastructure of bridges, highways and roads, airports, the extension of utilities to rural communities including electricity grids, water mains, dams and water conservation, sewage treatment plants and sanitation, parks, schools, firehouses, and administrative buildings. With the WPA machinery in place, a work-relief program dedicated to the areas of art, music, theater and writers’ projects for artists on relief-roll was established as the WPA Federal Project No. 1’s Division of Professional and Service Projects. Started on August 29, 1935, what

---

<sup>95</sup> Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau’s objectives for the program listed on Bulletin No. 1, Section of Painting and Sculpture, Public Works Branch, Procurement Division, Treasury Department, Washington, DC (March 1, 1935): 3-4. Also quoted in O’Connor, 1971: 21-22.

<sup>96</sup> The WPA run until September 1939 when it was reorganized into the Work Project Administration (same acronym WPA) as part of the Federal Works Agency with most of its programs passing to state and local control only to end on June 30, 1943.

became known as the Work Progress Administration Federal Art Program (WPA/FAP henceforth) administered by Edgar Holger Cahill, provided employment to a much larger number of destitute and indigent artists in the visual arts. Criteria for choosing artists was based on need and abject destitution and poverty rather than artistic quality, provided they had artistic training and background.

Artists were hired as federal workers to create, paint, sculpt, print, teach and conduct research in larger numbers than its predecessor the PWAP or the then concurrent Treasury's Section and Treasury Relief Art Project. In contrast to these two programs, the WPA/FAP provided relative creative freedom to experiment with new media, new materials, and new techniques. For the first time, the state gave artists a space to work collectively as an imagined creative community or artists' nation with shared social and political concerns while exploring the role of art and artist in the United States and the world.

John Dewey's ideas from the early 1930s about an American art found their way to the very heart of the conception and implementation of the WPA/FAP. In a talk titled "American Resources in the Arts," Cahill credited Dewey's philosophical pragmatism as foundational for the WPA/FAP in a plan of action for the everyday aesthetic experience of art and in which organized communities could participate and share. Dewey's emphasis on the significance of the arts in education and life

experience became manifested in his definition of art as “a mode of interaction between man and his environment.”<sup>97</sup>

In turn, Cahill conceived of the WPA/FAP as a national program of community participation in the arts, or in his words, the beginning of a “democratic sharing of the art experience.”<sup>98</sup> His position was clearly informed by Dewey’s beliefs that “democracy should be the name of a life of ‘free and enriching communion’ in which everyone may have a part”<sup>99</sup> and that “art is the most civilized form of communication and the best means of entering sympathetically into the deepest life experience of other peoples.”<sup>100</sup> Dewey’s advocacy for democracy in general had its roots in his ideas and writings about schools and education in the 1910s (*Democracy and Education*) and about civil society in the 1920s (*The Public and Its Problems*).

Thus the long Great Depression with a high number of artists among the unemployed and unemployable came to serve as a laboratory for them to generate further analysis and a wider rethinking of the relationship of art to society. Artists explored political activism as they became members of labor unions utilizing art as a means to bring about radical change in a common struggle against capitalism and its failures, seen at the roots of the Great Depression. Shortly after presenting

---

<sup>97</sup> Holger Cahill. “American Resources in the Arts,” In Francis V. O’Connor, 1975: 19.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 35-36.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.* p. 39.

themselves as a united front in condemnation of world's totalitarianism and war.<sup>101</sup>

An unprecedented debate among critics and artists became that of the meaning and the role of the artist as producer in society. Their participation in the labor force changed the way society perceived their creative work and their work acquired new meanings reflecting contemporary issues and the complexities of modern life.

As the U.S. State positioned itself as the leading patron of the arts with the WPA/FAP relief-program to alleviate the plight and extreme hardship of the high numbers of destitute artists, it also helped shape their own identity. Relief-roll artists soon began to proclaim their identity as art workers and federal employees at the service of the state earning professional artist relief wages of \$23.50 a week or \$94 per month on average, and participating in the government's program of labor under forced accounting and time-keeping and more importantly being part of a national economy.<sup>102</sup> The WPA/FAP assigned 90% of its relief budget to relief-roll artists in the categories of professional and technical, skilled, intermediate and unskilled and a 10% of non-relief artists filling jobs as art project supervisors. To qualify for WPA/FAP relief jobs, artists had to be certified as destitute and eligible for welfare. Once employed by the WPA/FAP the artist was obliged by the State to

---

<sup>101</sup> For an extended exploration of political activism among art critics and artists see Platt, 1999. For a discussion of the debates and the positions of artists such as Thomas Hart Benton, John Steuart Curry, Grant Wood, Rockwell Kent, the John Reed Club and Stuart Davis see Joan A. Saab, *For the Millions: American Art and Culture Between the Wars*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004: 15-23.

<sup>102</sup> Holger Cahill, Director of the Federal Art Project, would later note in 1962, that "the curious thing is that the art projects were run just as labor projects were run. They were run on the idea of force account...You have a timekeeper going down and marking the people." Oral History Interview with Holger Cahill, 1960, April 12 and April 15. Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. <http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-holger-cahill-11990> accessed 4 August 2012.



maintain this certification. They were required to provide proof of residence through utility bills or others and to be indigent—meaning not be able to supply for him/herself or a family and not owning assets convertible to cash such as appliances like radios, refrigerators and the like. Artists were submitted to home relief investigations that often times looked for food in refrigerators as proof of indigence, which many found degrading.

Artists soon organized to protest and demonstrate against the humiliating requirements of Home Relief Investigations or what they called the “Pauper’s Oath.” and to change requirements of destitution for requirements for certification of need. Other protests followed such as the two-year requirement of residency that left many artists who had recently moved to New York out of the pool of those eligible for the roll-relief. Moreover, the WPA/FAP was not immune to quota cuts of artists already certified as destitute to receive relief with more artists eligible than positions available. This created a great uncertainty of job security with the additional stress of not knowing if the program budget would be approved by Congress fiscal year after fiscal year. But at the same time, the WPA/FAP replaced the public dole with employment, providing a sense of productivity rather than the denigration of relief checks.

Overall, artists in the WPA/FAP generally enjoyed the unprecedented artistic creativity and freedom to work and to explore and develop new styles, try new materials, thus growing in their art unlike their contemporary German counterparts. The added value for artists came from the sense of a non-competitive community of

artists working alongside one another in groups and on projects talking, sharing, arguing and exhibiting to educate the community rather than the former competitive nature of individual exhibitions in a gallery and private patron system. In addition, by its very nature, the WPA/FAP provided continuous and steady work giving them time to further grow and develop into artists. The very vitality of it all provided a solid foundation for the growth of a cadre of new artists mostly in their 20s and 30s, the development of new art that would subsequently mature into a modern American art. The state, by not controlling the creative process, helped nurture a group of artists working in the different sections of the program (art production, education outreach, and art research), to become key figures of an American modern art of the 1940s and 1950s. Artists such as Jackson Pollock, David Smith, Wilhelm de Kooning (partially due to citizenship), Mark Rothko, Philip Guston, William Bazotes, Arshile Gorky, Harry Gottlieb, Ad Reinhardt participated among many others while the programs helped them weather the economic maladies of the Great Depression

In a 1936 draft of an unpublished national report/anthology titled *Art for the Millions*<sup>103</sup> produced by the WPA/FAP National Washington Office to quell criticism, Cahill sought to defend the WPA/FAP from attacks by Congress and a conservative public and press claiming the wastefulness of taxpayers' money. He wished to show them and the nation the importance of American creativity, art and a national cultural production. In his words, the report was to be a "record of the greatest

---

<sup>103</sup> The title was changed to *Government in Art* in 1937 and reverted to *Art for the Millions* in 1939.

importance to art history and society.”<sup>104</sup> For this Cahill commissioned essays from project artists and administrators alike to write, on government time and paid by federal tax dollars, about their personal views and experiences, thus documenting the successes of the program and its government workers. Communicating his idea of a multi-essay report to his supervisor, Cahill noted that the “democratic procedure reaped a rich harvest far beyond our wildest expectations. We found the artists, contrary to prevailing opinion, have something vital to say about themselves, about their crafts, about the world they live in, and about the relation of all these things to the Federal Art Project.”<sup>105</sup>

The structure of the WPA/FAP with its three areas of art production (easel division, mural division, sculpture and graphic arts), art education and outreach (establishment of community art centers, experimental galleries and art instruction in schools) and art research (Index of American Design), secured an emerging infrastructure for the arts, one with artist supervisors, artist producers, artist teachers, and a national community of consumers. The widely expanded circulation of art was achieved through means of “circuit exhibitions” and by the art caravan<sup>106</sup> that took art to WPA/FAP established Federal Art Galleries and Arts Community Centers and to community centers and schools with additional art curriculum and instruction. In the various essays of the anthology that was eventually published in

---

<sup>104</sup> Cahill quoted in O'Connor, ed., *Art for the Millions*, 1975: 13.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> The Art Caravan was a complete one-day showing outdoor/indoor exhibition and evening lecture packed in a refitted army ambulance vehicle.

1971, artists would refer to the WPA/FAP areas in distinct terms revealing the nature and organization of the State's art program in its totality.

The WPA/FAP, in the course of the work assignments, facilitated dialogue and debate on aesthetic questions among the artists it supported. In reviewing the work of the Easel Section, artist Donald J. Bear noted the great range of styles reflecting multiple localities in urban and rural environments. To him, the artists of the Easel Section showed an "American spirit" or a reality of life around them and the development of a budding general audience appreciating art pointing to the foundations for a school of American painting in the near future. Like Bear, Eugene Ludins also approached the issue of audience and reception through the efforts of the program to bring an American cultural experience to rural communities who oftentimes came face to face for the first time with art. In looking at the specific case of New York State, Ludins reveals the structure of a program that engaged the local community and schools with the establishment of small art teaching and exhibition units and furthermore, encouraged municipalities to request the federal art produced in the WAP/FAP to start their own art collections as an education tool and strategy.

The important role of exhibitions to bring a wider art experience to all was also addressed by Mary Morsell who noted that with the WPA/FAP exhibitions, the art experience indeed took a national "American" identity and character reflecting the land, the cities, and the people of the various United States regions converting exhibitions into a cross-section of art production displays. As an outcome, the

WPA/FAP exhibitions generated in the process “healthy democratic opportunities for recognition and growth through criticism.”<sup>107</sup> The idea of democracy in the arts took root with the presentation of exhibitions showcasing emerging and established artists side by side with new responsive audiences taking up interest in developing a contemporary art competency as “an extension of experience, possible to all.”<sup>108</sup>

As Federal workers, artists were required to adhere to limitations on militant actions including participation in strikes, picketing and demonstrations. However, those who organized under the Artists’ Union, such as Chet La More, saw the WPA/FAP as “the historical beginning of a new and democratic movement of art in America.”<sup>109</sup> The idea of a new art movement with democratic direction also saw itself as being part of the experience of everyday life in the United States as a normal extension of the values of and predicated upon democracy in a government patronage of the arts and national culture. Others who organized under the Artists’ Coordination Committee fought for the democratic ideal and against discrimination and censorship in who and what could be exhibited.

An international view responding to shifting world conditions was adopted in turn by the First American Artists’ Congress of February 14-16, 1936 in New York, which sought unity in its social and political activism. Exploring issues of importance to artists in society and planning for a permanent organization under

---

<sup>107</sup> Mary Morsell, “The Exhibition Program of the WPA/FAP,” in Francis V. O’Connor, Ed. *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Boston: New York Graphic Society, LTD, 1975: 229-231.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid: 231.

<sup>109</sup> Chet La More, “The Artists’ Union of America.” In Francis V. O’Connor, 1975: 237.

the name of the American Artists' Congress, it addressed the then perceived imminent threat of the rise of fascism under the slogan "For Peace, For Democracy, For Cultural Progress." With its print exhibition *Against War and Fascism*, the Congress cemented the artists union and resolve in dealing with this threat. Artists' activism extended into support for countries at risk of totalitarian regimes, as were China and Spain at the moment. Some of the Congress' artists would go on to become members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade aligned and fighting alongside Spain's Republicans against Francisco Franco's Nationalist faction.

These changing international developments and concerns with the threat of the rise of Fascism soon reached the U.S. State and its dedication to what FDR had proposed as the policy of *world* relations. In particular with the Inter-American System, a new meeting was called by the PAU and the Department of State, which had entered into close working relationship throughout the years. Member countries gathered at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance, Preservation and Establishment of Peace in Buenos Aires on December 1-23, 1936. Already with definitions of State and Sovereignty in effect as defined in the last conference in 1933, in the resulting Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation a new concept of Pan-Americanism was formulated and defined as "a principle of International law...understood [as]...a moral union of all the American Republics in defence [sic] of their rights of autonomy, independence

and free development...”<sup>110</sup> In addition to this definition, the Conference also ratified “common likeness” among participant countries with collective principles of democracy and democratic forms of governments; and “common ideals” in the preservation of peace and justice and in the establishment of new efforts in “the harmonious development of their commerce and of their cultural aspirations in the various fields of political, economic, social, scientific and artistic activities.”<sup>111</sup> In fact, Panamericanism came to inform the activities of the Pan American Union’s Office of Intellectual Cooperation to support mutual understanding as part of that larger frame of peace and friendship in its very mission.

With respect to these cultural aspirations and in particular the field of artistic activities, the Inter-American Conference produced an important convention that would set up a new form of cultural relations by the PAU member states with the Convention for the Promotion of the Inter-American Cultural Relations and the Convention Concerning Artistic Exhibitions. This last was ratified by the U.S. State and signed by FDR on July 15, 1937, proclaimed on September 16, 1937 and entered

---

<sup>110</sup> “Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation; December 21, 1936.” The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. New Haven: Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library (online). [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam07.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam07.asp) Accessed 13 March 2011.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid. The Declaration included three points as follows: “That the American Nations, true to their republican institutions, proclaim their absolute juridical liberty, their unqualified respect for their respective sovereignties and the existence of a common democracy throughout America; 2. That every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of them, and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation provided for in the convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Reestablishment of Peace, signed at this conference; and 3. That the following principles are accepted by the American community of Nations: (a) Proscription of territorial conquest and that, in consequence, no acquisition made through violence shall be recognized; (b) Intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another State is condemned; (c) Forcible collection of pecuniary debts is illegal; and (d) Any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or unrestricted arbitration, or through operation of international justice.”

into force on December 7, 1937. The Convention for the Promotion of Cultural Relations was limited in scope to the exchange of professors, teachers and graduate students through annual fellowships among the American republics with the purpose of advancing “greater mutual knowledge and understanding of the people and institutions of the countries represented and a more consistent educational solidarity on the American continent.”<sup>112</sup> In fact, the Department of State Division of Cultural Relations had its genesis in specific requests made in the Convention. This educational solidarity guided and informed the direction of the Department of State’s future Division of Cultural Relations when it was established officially in July 1938 with Benjamin Mark Cherrington as its founding director (1938-1940).<sup>113</sup>

Instead, the signatories of the Convention Concerning Artistic Exhibitions stated that governments at the conference were “desirous of improving their spiritual relationships through a better acquaintance with their respective artistic

---

<sup>112</sup> Bevins, 1969: 372-374. Signatories of the convention stated in: “Article I: Every year each Government shall award to each of two graduate students or teachers of each other country selected in accordance with the procedure established in Article II hereof, a fellowship for the ensuing scholastic year. The awards shall be made after and exchange between the two Governments concerned of the panels referred to in Article II hereof. Each fellowship shall provide tuition and subsidiary expenses and maintenance at an institution of higher learning to be designated by the country awarding the fellowship, through such agency as may seem to it appropriate, in cooperation with the recipient so far as may be practicable. Traveling expenses to and from the designated institution and other incidental expenses shall be met by the recipient of the nominating Government. Furthermore, each Government agrees to encourage, by appropriate means, the interchange of students and teachers of institutions within its territory and those of the other contracting countries, during the usual vacation periods. Article II: Each Government shall have the privilege of nominating and presenting to each other Government on or before the date fixes at the close of this article a panel of the names of five graduate students or teachers together with such information concerning them as the Government awarding the fellowship shall deem necessary, from which panel the latter Government shall select the names of two persons...”

<sup>113</sup> Prior to joining the Department of State, Cherrington was director of the Foundation for the Advancement of Social Science at the University of Denver, a foundation dedicated to international education relations.



creations.”<sup>114</sup> Article I and II of the seven articles in the convention stipulated the granting by each of the signatory nations of “all possible facilities for the holding within its territory of artistic exhibitions of each other Parties;” and in Article II, that “the facilities referred to in Article I shall be granted to Government agencies and to private enterprises which are officially authorized by them and shall be extended, as far as possible, to customhouse formalities and requirements, to transport on communication lines belonging to the respective States, to rooms for exhibition or storage, and to other matters related to the object referred.”<sup>115</sup> By removing obstacles the signatories envisioned a more active cultural exchange flow and exchange among states.

Meanwhile the impact of artists’ activism and the very activities of the WPA/FAP were summarized in a chart report issued on July 1, 1936. After a year of activities, the WPA/FAP listed employment of 5,257 artists on roll relief. Included in this total were 955 artists working on murals, 469 in sculpture, 883 in easel paintings, and 259 in graphic arts as part of the fine arts area. Moreover, artists were employed in the area of practical arts with an additional 393 in the Index of Design, 449 producing posters, 312 in arts and crafts, 111 in photography, 53 in stage set design and 24 producing dioramas and visual models. In the Education area, 639 artists were teaching art, 132 were working in arts centers and galleries, and 103 conducting research. The last group of miscellaneous included 144 artists

---

<sup>114</sup> Bevins, 1969: 383.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid: 385.

employed in technical and draftsman occupations, 133 as artists' models, 72 in framing and like labor, and 126 in coordination roles. In total 195,617 works of art had been produced by this date. From the public perspective, the 18 art centers and experimental galleries in Alabama, Florida, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia had opened by August 1, 1936 with 296,443 people attending exhibitions and lectures and an additional 56,885 attending art classes.<sup>116</sup>

### **A New State Narrative: Modern Art, Democracy, Museums and American Industry**

From 1936 to 1939 the State through the WPA/FAP positioned itself as the major art patron and a significant employer of artists of the time. In spite of job quotas that limited the availability of work and the number of artists employed, it came to be seen as a laboratory for unprecedented creative activity reaching wider audiences many of whom were experiencing art for the first time. Spurring a large number of exhibitions of American art in schools, libraries, museums and art centers and galleries, in addition to the publication of books, and offerings of art and art appreciation classes, it eventually generated what Cahill had envisioned: the community experience of art and the possible development of standards of taste. In addition this new national interest in the arts became what he described as the

---

<sup>116</sup> Poster: USA Work Program WPA. "Comparative Report of Projects as of July 1, 1936. Total Number Employed 5257." Image reproduced in Francis V. O'Connor, Ed. *Art for the Millions*, 1975:40.

“democratic sharing of the art experience”<sup>117</sup> after John Dewey’s concept that “democracy should be the name of a life of ‘free and enriching communion’ in which everyone may have a part.”<sup>118</sup>

To bring art to all corners of the country was of paramount importance in order to break down the concentration of most of the activity in urban arts centers such as New York. As A. Joan Saab has noted, “the New Deal cultural programs attempted to shift cultural power away from the control of elites and make it more accessible to a broader constituency in the name of democracy.”<sup>119</sup> In a 1938 public radio address under the title of Art in Democracy, Audrey McMahan, Director of the New York Region of the Federal Art Project, declared “the artist has emerged to see himself as a worker and to recognize his identity in the light of a worker producing art for the American people.”<sup>120</sup> Thus, under a federal policy of creative freedom, themes of art and democracy came to permeate the activities of the New Deal WPA/ FAP from August 1935 until 1939 under the jurisdiction of the Federal government.<sup>121</sup>

By early 1939, as the WPA/FAP’s impact was being felt all across the country, the U.S. State had also began to see modern art as tool for social progress, peace and democracy. In his speeches and talks, FDR not only emphasized the role of

---

<sup>117</sup> Holger Cahill, “American Resources in the Arts.” In O’Connor, 1975: 35.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid. pp. 35-36.

<sup>119</sup>Saab, 2004: 16.

<sup>120</sup> Audrey McMahan, Art in Democracy town hall dinner, New York, June 7, 1938. Quoted in Saab, 2004: 36.

<sup>121</sup> In 1939 the WPA changed its name from Works Progress Administration to Work Projects Administration under state rather than federal purview only to cease activities in 1943 due to lack of unemployment as the result of a new war economy.

museums as free and democratic national institutions representing and furthering democracy and the democratic spirit, but also bridging the gap between artists and American industry. Benedict Anderson, in his study on the spread of nationalism has noted that museums are institutions of power in nation-building policies while serving as vehicles for the “instilling of nationalist ideology.”<sup>122</sup> Anderson asserts that as part of the imaginings of the state, “...museums, and the museumizing imagination, are both profoundly political.”<sup>123</sup> In the context of working to rebuild the modern industrial U.S. State and nation, FDR’s narrative of modern art and the museum as an instrument for social change and creative democracy now combined with American industry puts in evidence their political and social nature and roles in supporting a national ideology and identity.

The museum as a national institution was the underpinning idea of FDR’s fifteen-minute nation-wide radio broadcast address marking the opening of the new MoMA building on May 8, 1939. In it FDR equated the conditions for art and democracy with those of freedom as reflected in the creation of “beautiful things.”<sup>124</sup> In his remarks under the overarching MoMA-devised theme of “cultural freedom,”<sup>125</sup> FDR named MoMA “a citadel of civilization.”<sup>126</sup> In addition, he elaborated on the

---

<sup>122</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London: Verso, 1991: 163. Although, Anderson refers to the “nation-building” policies of the colonial state in the formation process of new states in specific colonized areas in Africa and Asia, I see a parallel here as FDR’s New Deal re-built a modern industrial U.S. State and nation between 1933-1939.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.* p. 178.

<sup>124</sup> “Address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, May 8, 1939,” op. cit. Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*

significant social function of modern art and museums in the new expanded ways that they shared the art experience with all. Moreover, FDR emphasized the important role of traveling exhibitions that afforded national far-flung communities a “visual chance to get to know modern art” and in the process raise standards of American taste. Within the context of MoMA and its new building, FDR stated:

...traveling exhibitions will extend the perspective of the general public, which too often has been accustomed to think of the fine arts as painting and possibly sculpture. But the proposed traveling exhibitions and nationwide shows will make all of our people increasingly aware of the enormous importance of contemporary industrial design, architecture, including the great social art –housing—which by its very nature is one of the most formidable challenges to a democracy, as well as photography, the printed book, the illustration, the advertisement, the poster, the theater and the moving picture. Thus, a nation-wide public will receive a demonstration of the force and scope of all these branches of the visual arts.<sup>127</sup>

National circulating exhibitions were not new. They were already part of programs sponsored by the American Federation of Arts, the College Art Association and in both WPA/FAP and MoMA at the time. Even though circulating exhibition was not part of its original plan, MoMA had ventured in this area beginning in 1931 with *The International Exhibition of Modern Architecture* to both museums and smaller schools and colleges and universities. Between 1932 and 1939 sixty-eight exhibitions traveled to large museums and smaller schools and colleges in the U.S. and Canada. The first traveling exhibition sent abroad was *Three Centuries of Art in the United States / Trois siècles d'art aux États-Unis* shown at the Musée du Jeu de

---

<sup>127</sup> These expanding definitions of art were highly informed by the German Gesamtkunstwerk and the ideology of the Staatliches Bauhaus and fueled by the presence of their major figures in the U.S. beginning in the 1930s—Walter Gropius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, László Moholy-Nagy, Marcel Breuer, Josef Albers, Werner Drews, Herbert Bayer, Annie Albers, Lyonel Feininger among others.

Paume in Paris in the summer of 1938.<sup>128</sup> In addition in 1939 the Rockefeller Foundation provided MoMA with a grant of \$100,000 to expand its program of circulating exhibitions to small colleges and schools during the years 1939-1943.

However in the idea of creative democracy, as FDR also noted, the role of the museum and the circulating exhibitions brought with them the issue of taste-making and quality to raise the cultural competencies of a nation. This sense of nationalism and cultural pride, in fact, calls attention to issues of power and control and the museumizing imaginings of prestige by the U.S. State, not only linking it to the prestige of the museum itself, but also to the prestige of the nation. Once the State and nation were completely rebuilt and reorganized, these circulating exhibitions and the museum, as would be in evidence in Chapter three, would go beyond the geographic national to a geographic international and a new hemispheric space of prestige building.

The coalescing of modern art, democracy and American industry that FDR noted was found in the two biggest events of the time: the 1939-1940 New York World's Fair *Building the World of Tomorrow/For Peace and Freedom* and the 1939-1940 San Francisco *Golden Gate International Exhibition*. Inaugurated on April 30, 1939, a few days before the new MoMA building, *Building the World of Tomorrow, Inc.*, as the largest World's Fair to date, became the transformative event in architecture, engineering, design, art, industry, advertising, and marketing shaping a

---

<sup>128</sup> For information on MoMA's circulating exhibitions between 1931-1954, see *MoMA Bulletin*, Volume XXI, No. 3-4, Summer 1954.

new futuristic vision for a modern United States society and life as it was imagined to be in 1960.<sup>129</sup> As useful measures of wealth and progress and narrators of commerce, industry, culture, history, social life, and as microcosms and panoramic windows into the state of world affairs, these two two-season World's Fairs also serve to elucidate the drastic shifts that occurred from one year to the next at a time when the United States was on the brink of war.

Marked by widespread optimism despite continuing conditions of an economic depression with a national unemployment rate of 15%, the New York Fair launched a new capital relationship between corporations and corporate applied science, industrial design and art, giving rise to a new consumer culture that promised, as a new revised ca. 1939-1940 American Dream, a standard of living of prosperity and affluence to all. Built on the reclaimed grounds of the former ash and silt filled 'Corona Dumps' in Flushing Meadow,<sup>130</sup> the fairground's buildings and dioramas were executed by the top industrial designers and architects of the day—Norman Bel Geddes, Walter Dorwin Teague, Raymond Loewy, Donald Deskey, Henry Dreyfus, Albert Khan and Wallace K. Harrison to name a few, foretelling of an emerging world of urban planning (à la Le Corbusier), transportation with

---

<sup>129</sup> In the welcome essay of the Official Guide Book of the New York's World Fair of 1939 Grover Whalen, President of the New World's Fair 1939 Incorporated, indicated the fair to "give a graphic illustration to the dream of a better 'World of Tomorrow' ...[with] the best industrial techniques, social ideas and services and the most advanced scientific discoveries." *The Official Guide Book*. New York: Exposition Publications, Inc., 1939: 5.

<sup>130</sup> The World' Fairs in New York and San Francisco, unlike their European predecessors, were privately funded and incorporated with the status of educational institutions. Funds for state buildings and basic public works and infrastructure of the grounds (sewers, roads, bridges, airport planning) were provided by the municipal governments and the federal government. *Ibid.* 1939: 21-22.

superhighways, innovative communication technology, and commercial products fitted for a new global role for the United States.

As a futuristic constructed view of a modern nation-state complete with its own miniature cities of Democracity and Futurama,<sup>131</sup> the Fair was characterized by the editor of the New Republic as “the salesman’s dream of democracy.”<sup>132</sup> And as a sales event, it emphasized a globalized future of mobility, transportation, communications and business systems as the shapers of the world of tomorrow. Buildings and statues sported such inscriptions as “world peace through world trade”<sup>133</sup> and “Modern means of communication span continents, bridges oceans, annihilate time and space... servants of freedom of thought and action, they offer to all men the wisdom of the ages to free them from tyrannies and establish cooperation among the peoples of the earth.”<sup>134</sup> For business systems, the Fair featured the International Business Machines Corporation (IBM), which brought together artists and engineers in its Gallery of Science and Art. In a combined display of art and business and forming the core of the IBM corporate art collection, the exhibition *Contemporary Art of 79 Countries* was, according to IBM’s President Thomas J. Watson, Sr., to represent the closer interest of businessmen in art and

---

<sup>131</sup> Democracity found inside the symbolic 18 story-high Perisphere was designed by Henry Dreyfus with Harrison & Fouilhux Architects and Wadell & Hardesty Engineers. The Highways and Horizons exhibit or “Futurama” in the General Motors building was designed by Norman Bel Geddes with Albert Khan, Inc. Architects. It envisioned the future of town and cities and motor transportation, superhighways, suspended bridges foretelling an upcoming prosperity and high standards of living.

<sup>132</sup> Bruce Bliven, “Gone Tomorrow,” New Republic, 98 (17 May 1939): 40-42.

<sup>133</sup> International Business Machines Corporation, Inscription on base of statue in the Gallery of Science and Art.

<sup>134</sup> Official Guide Book, 1939: 77.



artists in business.<sup>135</sup> About this display, he said, “[t]his step by an industrial organization is in recognition of the part played by art in industry, and its importance to industry in broadening the horizons of culture, and influencing the needs and desires of the people of every country.”<sup>136</sup>

Art was so prominently displayed on the fairgrounds and off with commissioned murals, sculptures, and structures that Albert Einstein, noticing art’s privileged position over the marginalized place of science at the fair and society at the time,<sup>137</sup> commented in a speech during the first-ever televised public event of the opening ceremonies that “if science, like art, is to perform its mission totally and fully, its achievements must enter not only superficially but with their inner meaning into the consciousness of people.”<sup>138</sup>

Contemporary art of Latin America, in particular from South American countries, was featured in national pavilions (Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, Brazil) as well as in a special 1939 exhibition sponsored by the United States New York

---

<sup>135</sup> Thomas J. Watson’s exact words were: “Our endeavor is to increase the interest of business in art, and of artists in business, and to create something of permanent educational and cultural value, not only to the millions who visit the Fair but to the people of our own and other countries who will eventually be able to see the exhibition... We have tried to create something which, so far as we can ascertain, has not previously existed in the entire history of art, namely the opportunity to compare, in a single showing, the characteristic art of today executed by living artists in seventy-nine countries... The International Business Machines Corporation believes its Gallery of Science and Art will help in some degree to create a better knowledge of the cultural ideals of the people in the seventy-nine countries. The official Guide Book, 1939, p. 82-83. The catalog of the exhibition featured among the 79 countries South American’s Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela artists.

<sup>136</sup> Thomas J. Watson, Sr., quoted in *The Official Guide Book, 1939*: 83.

<sup>137</sup>For the diminished role of science at the fair see, Peter J. Kuznick. “Losing the World of Tomorrow: The Battle Over the Presentation of Science at the 1939 New York World’s Fair.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Sept., 1994): 341-373.

<sup>138</sup> Albert Einstein, opening sentence of speech at New York World’s Fair, April 30, 1939. For video clip see: [vimeo.com/28281530](https://vimeo.com/28281530). Accessed 2 June 2012.

World's Fair Commission at the Riverside Museum (former Roerich Museum) under the title of *Latin American Exhibition of Fine and Applied Art*. It featured modern art and artists from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico and Paraguay. The exhibition, held from June 2 to September 17, 1939, had the endorsement of President Roosevelt whose printed handwritten note appeared on the second page of the catalog: "All cultural efforts to promote the mutual understanding of the Americas have my interest and hearty support."<sup>139</sup> These words were echoed by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture and Chairman of the Federal New York World's Fair Commission, who expanded on the vision through the fair's lens and beyond:

The World of Tomorrow will see a great increase in understanding among the Americas. The Latin-speaking and English-speaking peoples of the New World love this hemisphere for the opportunities it has given them. It is appropriate therefore that each New World Nation should express freely and fully its artistic ideals...I hope the future will see further efforts of this sort to develop art and cultural consciousness among the Americas. All of America is coming of age.<sup>140</sup>

Leo S. Rowe, Director General of the PAU, the depository of treaties of the Americas and the organizer of Pan American Conferences and Conventions, highlighted the role of the U.S. State by writing: "In making available to the visitors to the New York World's Fair this notable exhibit of Latin American contemporaneous art and thus advancing cultural relationships in this hemisphere, the United States Commission

---

<sup>139</sup> Latin American Exhibition of Fine and Applied Art. Exh. cat. New York: United States New York World's Fair Commission, 1939. The United States New York World's Fair Commission included Edward J. Flynn, Theodore T. Hayes, Charles M. Spofford, and public servants among them Henry A. Wallace (Agriculture), Harry L. Hopkins (Commerce), Frances Perkins (Labor).

<sup>140</sup> Ibid. Introduction.

is performing an important service to the people of the United States as well as to the nations of Latin America.”<sup>141</sup> Rowe was affirming the compliance on the U.S. part with the ratified 1936 Convention Concerning Exhibitions of the Buenos Aires Conference.

Concurrent to New York, The San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939-1940, *A Pageant of the Pacific* rather than the future celebrated the present. In addition to developments in trade, industry, and transportation, it highlighted the engineering feats of the longest suspended bridge—the Golden Gate Bridge and the largest structure of its kind—the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge located on the grounds of a future international airport to be built by the Works Progress Administration.<sup>142</sup> In its inauguration address via radio on February 18, 1939, President Roosevelt stated:

As the boundaries of human intercourse are widened by giant strides of trade and travel, it is of vital import that the bonds of human understanding be maintained, enlarged and strengthened rapidly. Unity of the Pacific nations is America's concern and responsibility; their onward progress deserves now a recognition that will be a stimulus as well.<sup>143</sup>

Like the New York Fair, the Golden Gate Exposition highlighted art throughout its fairgrounds with a building design program drawing from Mayan, Old Spain and Mexican architecture mixed with Cambodian and Oriental elements complemented with commissioned works by artists and art exhibitions. In San Francisco, a special

---

<sup>141</sup> Leo S. Rowe. Foreword. *Ibid.* 1939.

<sup>142</sup>The grounds of the fair was none other than reclaimed under water shallows which were raised 13 feet above water level to create the man-made water sand-filled Yerba Buena Shoals.

<sup>143</sup> Jack James and Earle Vonard Weller. *Treasure Island, "The Magic City," 1939-1940: The Story of the Golden Gate International Exposition.* San Francisco: Pisani Printing and Publishing Company, 1941: 56.

exhibition of artworks from Central and South America was organized by the San Francisco Museum of Art, with Grace McCann Morley concentrating on countries in Central America, other than Mexico, and South America. For this she embarked on a curatorial trip throughout several Pacific coast countries selecting art and establishing initial contacts with South American schools, museums and modern artists.<sup>144</sup>

The celebratory *A Pageant of the Pacific* and the utopian *Building the World of Tomorrow* with its own slogan “Dawn of A New Day” closed their 1939 inaugural seasons respectively on October 29 and October 31 as changed fairs against a new world backdrop of a fast escalating European and a soon to be global conflict which loomed large on the horizon. Also changed in 1939 was the WPA/FAP after facing a barrage of criticism from Congress on the size of New Deal relief appropriations and welfare programs and suspicion that it was the feeding ground and hotbed for communism in the United States. The federal WPA was reorganized into the Works Project Administration and placed partially into the hands of states with reduced budgets, stringent requirements, gradual decrease of activities as well as job quotas for artists. In 1942, the reality of the war transformed the WPA Art Program into the Graphic Section of the War Services Division, which employed artists to design camouflage patterns as well as produce graphic and poster design for war

---

<sup>144</sup> Ibid. 1941: 141.

propaganda.<sup>145</sup> The WPA was liquidated on June 30, 1943 due to low unemployment in a new war economy.

### **Towards a Definition of a Modern U.S. Art in 1939**

Transformed as well by the end of 1939 was the debate on the definition of a U.S. modern art. If 1933 had found artists and critics focused on a modern art reflecting experience, in contrast, the year 1939 saw a 180-degree turn to debates about the meaning of politics and art. As the decade came to a close, the Moscow Trials of 1938 with the outcome of death sentences imposed on leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution, the 1939 Hitler-Stalin pact, the fall of the Socialist Popular Front in Madrid, Hitler's invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia and later Poland, contributed to an ideological crisis of the left, the winding down of the activism inside the WPA/FAP, and the return of artists to art studios signaling an emerging individualism. An aesthetic reaction seeking to sever the visible ties between arts and politics soon emerged with a new call for a modernist art discourse whose main underpinnings were quality, formalism, and "art for arts' sake" creation facilitating a new definition of American modern art that would come to dominate the 1940s and beyond.

Clement Greenberg's "Avant Garde and Kitsch" essay published in the Partisan Review in 1939, provided a new criticism of society at what had been seen

---

<sup>145</sup> Audrey McMahon. "A General View of the WPA Federal Art Project in New York City and State." In *The New Deal Art Projects: An Anthology of Memoirs*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1972: 74-75.

as a moment of creative stagnation and ideological confusion and violence. In examining the relationship between aesthetic experience and the then social, historical, and political context, he outlined a series of points that would have strong resonance in art criticisms and creativity in the decades to come. Greenberg noted two simultaneous cultural phenomena developing in the United States and the industrialized western world: avant-garde art and kitsch. To Greenberg avant-garde was the genuine and “only living” culture searching for the absolute, turning away from experience and into an exploration of the medium “of its own craft,” of space, shape, surface, color; a culture that belonged to a small, yet powerful, ruling class of the rich and cultivated. In contrast, kitsch, as he characterized it, was a product of industrialization for the new urbanized masses insensible to culture, a “simulacra of genuine culture,” mechanical, imitating the process of art, and easily reproduced in the form of illustrations, rotogravure, calendars, magazines, movies, etc.; and fast “becoming a universal culture, the first universal culture ever beheld.”<sup>146</sup>

A point Greenberg made in the political context of the moment, and very much informed by the work of his ideological colleague Dwight McDonald’s on Soviet cinema, was noticing the embrace of kitsch as a state strategy to conform to the cultural taste of the masses to preserve full power. As a tendency present in the cultural policy of Soviet Russia, Germany and Italy, Greenberg associated kitsch as demagoguery, as pliable propaganda, and as the culture of the masses in totalitarian

---

<sup>146</sup> Clement Greenberg, “Avant-Garde and Kitsch,” *Partisan Review* 6.5 (1939) 34-49. Print.

regimes—“kitsch keeps a dictator in closer contact with the ‘soul’ of the people.”<sup>147</sup> This positioning of “kitsch” with totalitarian regimes, masses and mechanical art in opposition to a now cultivated public for an avant-garde democratic United States helping artists to create freely, helped cement a reformulation in subsequent years.

Agreeing with Greenberg in this new modernist art discourse in favor of formalism or the “own craft of art” Stuart Davis in the essay “Abstract Painting Today” of 1939<sup>148</sup> noted what he, as an abstract artist, saw as the still prevalent cultural isolationism of American art from progressive influences. Subsuming contemporary styles under the term abstract, he criticized the position taken by some artists and critics who went against the gain in the area of abstract or modern art since the first showing of European modern art at the 69<sup>th</sup> Infantry Armory Show of February 1913. Davis noted the dominant “domestic naturalism,” man’s contemporary struggles in society, “American-history-in-costume” murals and proletarian muralism rampant in the art of the 1930s, leading him to ask “what happened to the Armory Show and modern or abstract art?”<sup>149</sup> In his assessment, Davis looked to the 1939 New World’s Fair Contemporary American Art Exhibition. In taking stock of American art at the moment, he noticed the lack of contemporary meaning in art. He characterized this lack as an absence of a “spirit of discovery, of new possibilities, of the dynamism of contemporary life, of the uniqueness of our

---

<sup>147</sup> Greenberg, 1939.

<sup>148</sup> Stuart Davis, “Abstract Painting Today,” *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*, Boston: New York Graphic Society, LTD, 1975: 121-127.

<sup>149</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 122.

time.”<sup>150</sup> However, in seeing the potentiality in American art, he observed the role of federal support for the arts as the one behind the freedom of expression in the WPA/FAP, and the freedom in the selection of art works for the exhibition.

In his conception of an abstract modern art, Davis stated it to have a contemporary sentiment and to be “not a method, a technique, or a style, but...a point of view, an attitude towards reality...manifested in painting in various styles and techniques which are subsumed in the term ‘abstract’.”<sup>151</sup> To him, abstract art, as a direct progressive social force with a spirit of democratic freedom, was at the time “an integral part of the changing contemporary reality...constructive and progressive...in direct opposition to the destructive forces of totalitarianism and reaction.”<sup>152</sup>

Moreover, Davis, in an early version of the same essay under the title of “Abstract Art Today—Democracy—and Reaction,” had taken a stab at the reactionary conservatism and cultural monopoly of the fine arts by the private sector. Labeling as the “trustee-museum unit,” and represented in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Davis argued that it was that unit that set up the standards and styles of art by controlling museum directors, critics, and dealers and subsidizing art publications. In his view, a monopoly of culture acted along the lines of the banking and industry monopolies opposing the WPA/FAP and developing an active campaign to “smash” modern and abstract art and make the artist conform or

---

<sup>150</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 124.

<sup>151</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 125.

<sup>152</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 126. Also see Cécile Whiting, *Antifascism in American Art*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989. Print.



starve.<sup>153</sup> To Davis, the government was the one called upon to maintain and secure freedom of expression and a democratic art as a right of the citizen from a vantage point that “a free art cannot be destroyed without destroying the social freedom it expresses.”<sup>154</sup>

Davis formulated one of the first definitions of American modern art and abstract painting as realistic spatial fields defined by “Tone-Direction-Size-Story-Shape units” in the context of a specific social and historical moment of a contemporary environment. The spatial fields of American modern art to him were “characterized by great color range, severe directional definition, and positive positional statement, with the resultant autonomy of parts corresponding to the freedom of the individual under a democratic government.”<sup>155</sup> This idea of modern and abstract art reflecting the contemporary life went beyond aesthetic factors to take into consideration and utilizing “scientific analysis of color, development of synthetic chemistry, development of photography, electric light, development of oil industry and new speeds, electronic physics, etc., [which to Davis] have all been powerful factors in shaping the environment which lives in modern and abstract art.”<sup>156</sup>

There was the widespread recognition of the WPA/FAP role in providing a more democratic audience for the arts and art consumption beyond previous private infrastructures of museums, trustees and private collectors. Davis saw the

---

<sup>153</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 122, note.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Davis in O’Connor, 1973: 127.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

WPA/FAP as the vehicle to overcome the cultural monopoly in the fine arts by a trustee-museum unit that exhibited artists who had been dead for at least fifty years. Instead, to him the WPA/FAP was a program of democratic art with the state securing the right of citizens “to participate in art just as they are guaranteed the right to an education in reading and writing.”<sup>157</sup> But Davis also looked beyond the program into the establishment of a Bureau of Fine Arts that would employ artists and control the management of art production. In anticipating future trends, Davis declared, “abstract art is here to stay because the progressive spirit it represents is here to stay. A free art cannot be destroyed without destroying the social freedoms it expresses.”<sup>158</sup>

Joining the modernist discourse in 1939, in his assessment of “Modern Sculpture and Society,”<sup>159</sup> David Smith noted that “art is born of freedom and liberty, and dies of constraint.”<sup>160</sup> Wrapped within the notion of the democratic society, he viewed the function of creative and abstract sculpture in the United States in close and definite relation to science and to contemporary functionalist architecture and design as reflecting the “composition of lines, spaces, textures forming the structure of a modern building...”<sup>161</sup> As an art of the day, sculpture for Smith reflected a contemporary and progressive cultural force as one made up of accumulations from

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Stuart Davis, “Abstract Art Today—Democracy—and Reaction” First draft of August 11, 1939. Reprinted in O’Connor, 1973: 122.

<sup>159</sup> David Smith, “Modern Sculpture and Society,” *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O’Connor, Boston: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1975: 90-92.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid. p. 90.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid. p. 91.

the past while dealing with the realities of the present. In its function it provided an aesthetic identity to buildings and public spaces with the use of contemporary metals like aluminum, stainless steel, duraluminium and other newer non-corrosive alloys.

These definitions at the end of the 1930s would give way to newer definitions of a modern American art in the early 1940s during the war years by the quintessential U.S. modern art institution, MoMA. From the moment of its founding and on, MoMA provided an ample and evolving definition of American modern art by living artists which encompassed painting, sculpture, drawing, film, architecture, graphic arts, industrial design and publications. Beginning in 1942 the museum published a series of booklets under the title of *Introductory Series to the Modern Arts* to educate the public about the meaning of modern art. The first booklet based on the traveling exhibition What is Modern Architecture? positioned architecture from a point of view of art as science and art responding to everyday life, climate, new structural systems, new materials all under the mantra of Louis Sullivan's 'Form Follows Function' and under heavy influence of the design principles originating in the Staatliches Bauhaus. In 1943 Alfred Barr authored the second booklet What is Modern Painting?<sup>162</sup> in which he similarly observed that "the

---

<sup>162</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr., *What is Modern Painting?* New York: MoMA, 1943: 2. In the preface, Barr stated the purpose of the booklet: "This booklet is written for people who have had little experience in looking at paintings, particularly those modern paintings which are sometimes considered puzzling, difficult, incompetent or crazy. It is intended to undermine prejudice, disturb indifference and awaken interest so that some greater understanding and love of the more adventurous paintings of our day may follow."

variety of modern art reflects the complexity of modern life...<sup>163</sup> of ordinary life, and also of the “crucial problems of our civilization: war, the character of democracy and fascism, the effects of industrialization, the exploration of the subconscious mind, the revival of religion, the liberty and the restraint of the individual.”<sup>164</sup> Equating art to a language, “a kind of visual Esperanto,” he added, “the work of art is a symbol, a visible symbol of the human spirit in its search for truth, freedom, and perfection.”<sup>165</sup> These evolving definitions of art reflected the changing times and global conditions pointing towards an imminent new world order. If in 1933 Barr had stated the difficulties of defining modern art, the experience in the last ten years made it easier to define now after the unprecedented period of experimentation that was the WPA/FAP in addition to three more years of a new industrial modern society and a turn towards formalism.

Barr stressed the unique freedom of artists in depicting his /her subjects: “his freedom as we find it expressed in his work of art is a symbol, an embodiment of freedom which we all want but which we can never really find in everyday life...”<sup>166</sup> Imbuing modern art with the values of truth, freedom and perfection, Barr also cast modern art within the circumstances of the contemporary world and in contrast to Hitler’s views of modern art as “degenerate, foreign, Jewish, international, Bolshevik.”<sup>167</sup> In other terms, he alluded to a new visuality in which

---

<sup>163</sup> Barr, 1943: 3.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid. p. 39.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid. p. 38.

forms were freely arranged or broken up to treat subjects and transform real images in their combination of elements such as their geometry, structure, architecture, composition, color, texture, design, form, line, plane, pattern, rhythm to depict the dynamics of modern life (movement, noise, speed).

In conclusion, in looking at the historical context of this project through the “story or biography” of modern art and the developing discourse and construction of ideas of modern art in the United States beginning in 1929 and through the 1930s, I revealed the initial intersections of the State, security and culture. I examined the relationship between the U.S. State and modern art during the WPA/FAP that employed thousands of artists as well as the evolution of contested definitions of modern art and key ideas. Likewise, I explored the changing identity of the U.S. State in its exercise to re-build the nation and itself amidst the economic and political chaos of the Great Depression. From 1933 to 1939, the re-orientation of the discourse on the meaning of modern art explored art as an experience, in its relationship of the artist with the State, and later in relation to the complexity of a contemporary life. In addition, the promotion of art, art education and research by the state as part of a work-relief program created a new consumer segment composed of the general public. It also generated an infrastructure of art centers, art instruction, and curricula and a wider circulation of art to all corners of the nation. The promotion of visual arts in public places and spaces and the facilitation of the acquisition of art as federal property by universities, colleges, schools secured the creation of permanent collections for education thus ensuring wider future

audiences. This presence of art in the everyday life experience of the nation also afforded a much wider access and in FDR's words, a "more abundant life."

**MODERN ART AS A STRATEGY AND TOOL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE: THE OFFICE FOR COORDINATION OF COMMERCIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND THE OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS, 1940-1943**

The restructuring and transformation of the U.S. State between 1933 and 1939 expanded a once limited central government into a large federal state apparatus with augmented executive powers in the Office of the President. As he had delineated it in his first inaugural address and in his pragmatic way of putting first things first, by 1939 FDR was on his way to accomplish his priorities of putting the “national house in order...[with] the establishment of a sound national economy”<sup>168</sup> through the creation of jobs, new State institutions and a new capitalist regulated structure. The once relegated international trade relations and *world* policy would soon move to center stage and would come to fully occupy FDR at the end of his second and in his third and fourth presidential terms. The changing world conditions with a rapidly escalating European conflict would necessitate as decisive a leader internationally as he had been nationally. If FDR had treated the rebuilding of the state and nation in 1933-1939 as he “would treat the emergency of a war,”<sup>169</sup> beginning in 1940 he was confronting the actual emergency of war in a

---

<sup>168</sup> FDR, "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

potential Germania Corporation in the Western Hemisphere whose geographic entry point was South America. This German policy of expansion threatened an already envisioned future U.S. political and economic regional and global hegemonic position in a new world order.

In the summer of 1940 the U.S. State faced the organization of a new temporary emergency war agency under the Council of National Defense. This chapter looks at the creation of the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (OCCCRBAR henceforth) and its Art Section. The OCCCRBAR was active between August 16, 1940 and July 30, 1941 at which time the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA henceforth) under the Office for Emergency Management superseded it. The change responded to a questioning of power and clarification of roles of agencies of the U.S. State that transferred it from under the purview of the National Council of Defense to the Office for Emergency Management while keeping its personnel, projects, and objectives intact. The office under the new name was active until March 23, 1945. It was once more renamed to Office of Inter-American Affairs until May 20, 1946 when it was terminated as a temporary emergency war agency. Its Art Section was active only between August 1940 and June 1943 when it ceased operations with the end of a budget line item for art activities under CI-AA FY1943 appropriations and a



contesting congressional committee that questioned art activities at a time of war.<sup>170</sup>

In his sociological theorization of State, Max Weber has defined it as “a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory.”<sup>171</sup> Weber contends, “force is a means specific to the State...[and] the right to use physical force is ascribed to other institutions or to other individuals only to the extent to which the state permits it. The state is considered the sole source of the right to use violence.”<sup>172</sup> With the OCCCRBAR as a temporary emergency agency during war preparedness and set to engage in a war in the commercial and cultural battlefield that South America was soon to become (1940-1941), the State did solely ascribe that monopoly of the legitimate cultural and commercial (rather than physical) force to the agency as one of its institutions under the Council of National Defense. In addition it also ascribed it to those individuals associated with the agency thus legitimizing their activities in the service of the State. Weber also sees the modern state as “a compulsory association which organizes domination.”<sup>173</sup> This domination, as Weber explains it, follows three forms as traditional, charismatic and legal that are never found in pure forms but rather as variants, transitions and combinations. Given the agreements of

---

<sup>170</sup> Already with a Division of Cultural Relations, the Department of State eagerly took on developing art programs centered on educational and artistic interchange and passing exhibitions exchanges to the National Gallery of Art until 1945. I do not cover this activity here as it is beyond the scope and focus of this project.

<sup>171</sup> Max Weber, “Politics as Vocation Lecture, 1919, op. cit.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid. p. 4.

the Montevideo Conference of 1933 that bound the United States, between 1940 and 1941 as part of war preparedness the OCCCRBAR used a variant of domination later transitioning to a full psychological warfare as part of state violence at war. At issue was how to adapt that force in the midst of legal treaties. Rather than coercion, the U.S. State chose a persuasion force of soft power in its commercial and cultural defense initiatives for a hemispheric market domination.

It is important to note that OCCCRBAR was not the only one doing cultural relations at the time. There were other modest non-emergency and non-defense federal and quasi-federal cultural initiatives that addressed specific international agreements and signed conventions such as the Pan American Union's Division of Intellectual Cooperation established in 1929<sup>174</sup> and the two-year old Department of State's Division of Cultural Relations under Benjamin Cherrington. These two divisions did operate in the realm of foreign relations as enforcers and

---

<sup>174</sup> The Office of Intellectual Cooperation had its origins in 1915 from an initial educational effort arising from the recommendations of the Second Pan American Scientific Congress of 1915 to promote the study of Spanish and Portuguese languages, Latin American history and geography in U.S. colleges and universities in addition to supporting the exchange of information with Latin American educators and institutions; outlining courses for study of Latin America in US universities; facilitating specialists on Latin America as speakers for universities, clubs, societies and the like; advising US professors and students interested in studying in Latin America and otherwise, and preparing lists of books on Latin America for the use of libraries and individuals. In 1919 it was formally organized as the Education Division. However, by 1929 activities had grown beyond the Education Division initial breadth and scope. One of the resolutions that were passed at the Sixth International Conference of American States in Havana, Cuba that year called for the establishment of an Inter-American Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, namely scientific and cultural cooperation. This gave the impetus for the expansion of the Division of Education and name change to the Division of Intellectual Cooperation as one that would lay the ground for the development of the Institute. At the same time the name came to better reflect the wide range of activities it was about to undertake in compliance with the acts of the conference. Olga U. Herrera. "Of Art and Intellectual Cooperation: The Pan American Union 1936-1948." Paper presented at the Constellations: Past, Present and Future Directions at the Art Museum of the Americas Symposium, OAS Art Museum of the Americas, Washington, DC, 12 September 2013.

implementers of conventions agreed upon and signed during Inter-American Conferences by members of the supra-national hemispheric Pan American Union.<sup>175</sup> Paradoxically, cultural relations had not figured as part of the U.S. state world foreign or educational relations prior to 1938. As Cherrington would note, “the United States was one of the last among the nations of the world officially to enter the field of international cultural relations.”<sup>176</sup> Instead, cultural relations had been traditionally placed in the hands of the private sector—foundations, colleges and universities, museums, associations and the like. As such, when established in 1938, the Department of State’s Division of Cultural Relations saw itself as “an agency to cooperate with the private organizations engaged in the stimulation of cultural interchange...[as] primarily a service rather than a directive agency”<sup>177</sup> thus acting as a clearinghouse to support international educational exchanges.<sup>178</sup>

From this perspective, the division fiercely avoided all types of propaganda methods as Cherrington perceived them to carry an “implication of penetration, imposition, and unilateralism.”<sup>179</sup> This position was mostly informed by his location

---

<sup>175</sup> Canada was not a member at the time as it was a British dominion. It did not join the organization as a full member until 1990.

<sup>176</sup>Ben M. Cherrington, “American Intercultural Activities,” *Phi Delta Kappan*. 24.3 (Nov. 1941): 97-98. Print.

<sup>177</sup> As mandated by the 1936 Convention, the new Division targeted Latin America with an emphasis on “an ever-increasing intercommunication between all of the American nations –an intercommunication of ideas, of goods, of human beings.” Quoted in Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981: 29.

<sup>178</sup> After the Eighth International Conference of American States in Lima December 9-27, 1938 (Declaration of Lima), the new division organized a series of conferences on Inter-American relations in the fields of art, music, education, and publications and libraries to address commitments originating at this Lima meeting.

<sup>179</sup> Quoted in Ninkovich, 1981: 31.

in a diplomatic setting and his deeply ingrained belief in the “futility, even the absurdity of the export of culture by any government.”<sup>180</sup> Thus in its very modest size and world scope, the Division’s official position was that the “responsibility for the formulation of policies of interchange, for the direction and control of those policies and programs, should be vested in private citizens and private agencies.”<sup>181</sup> In its modest size, the Division responded to specific educational exchange international conventions in its establishment, directives and operations.<sup>182</sup> With a limited budget of \$72,000 it only managed exchanges of professors, teachers and graduate students through annual fellowships initially with Latin America and in 1941 with China and Asia. The OCCCRBAR was a full-fledged temporary emergency agency with a more ample budget of \$2,000,000 (exclusive of office operational costs) of which \$1,050,000 was authorized for contracts with a *carte blanche* for its initiatives in both coordination and execution of economic and cultural defense activities in the Americas.

I argue that the production, identity and regulation of the programmatic activities in the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA Offices were informed by national security as part of the war emergency and preparedness rather than by diplomatic relations. The context of the creation of the agency and its successor requires it to be seen

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

<sup>181</sup> Quoted in Ninkovich, 1981: 32.

<sup>182</sup> In fact, the Division had its genesis in specific requests made in the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations agreed upon by participating nation-states during the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance, Preservation and Establishment of Peace held in Buenos Aires on December 1-23, 1936.<sup>182</sup> Signed on December 23, 1936 by twenty American nation-states and ratified by eleven including the United States on July 15, 1937, the convention did not enter into full force until December 7, 1937 (51 Stat. 178; Treaty Series 928).

from a perspective of strategic defense. The construction of a philosophy for a commercial and cultural relations program responded to the needs of the very penetration, imposition and unilaterism that Cherrington despised. The Office as national defense arm of the U.S. State provided the initial inroads into a post-war reorganization of the hemispheric space and power and an expansion of a U.S. cultural and commercial presence in South America. In the organization of the OCCCRBAR, modern art became a strategic tool as part of the larger hemispheric national defense initiative.

Engaging du Guy's methodological circuit of culture,<sup>183</sup> I look at the Office's Art Section formation and its structure, strategy and culture (or biography). In the specific cultural processes of production I take into account the inscribed values and meanings and consider the identity of the Section and its encoded meanings during production and the relationship with particular groups of consumers, in this case the advisory policy committee and art committee. In the use of modern art by the Office and Section, I consider the regulation process and the parameters established for U.S. modern art before being inserted into South American circuits with the larger goals of national security and defense in mind. The representation and consumption of U.S. Modern art and South American modern art will be considered in the three case studies in Chapters three, four and five. From a theoretical standpoint of view, I mostly engage Dicken's concepts of networks<sup>184</sup> to observe the

---

<sup>183</sup> du Guy et al., 1997: 2-3.

<sup>184</sup> Dicken, 2003: 14.

connections of individuals and social groups into relational structures and their impact on the cultural flows and the establishment of cultural circuits and networks and the power relations in their coordination and control at this moment of a regional and global shift.

### **Modern Art, and National and Hemispheric Defense**

A few months before the 1940 November U.S. presidential elections, President Roosevelt, through a recently re-activated Council of National Defense, dating from WWI, and by Executive Order, established on August 16 a temporary federal emergency agency—the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics (OCCCRBAR). He then proceeded to name Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller as a coordinator without compensation<sup>185</sup> to develop a program of hemispheric defense “with particular reference to the commercial and cultural aspects of the problem.”<sup>186</sup>

At the time of his appointment, his new civil servant peers characterized thirty-two-year old Rockefeller as optimistic, direct, enthusiastic and with a clear interest in South America. However, that perception did not preclude them from also seeing him in a less positive light as “a Republican [in a Democratic

---

<sup>185</sup> The order establishing the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics stated: “The coordinator shall serve as such without compensation but shall be entitled to actual and necessary transportation, subsistence and other expenses incidental to the performance of his duties.” Rockefeller became one of the many “dollar-a-year men” working for the U.S. government at the time. Quoted in Donald W. Rowland, *History of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Historical Reports on War Administration*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1947: 280.

<sup>186</sup> Order Establishing The Office. Rowland, 1947: 279.

administration], rather youthful, and lacking in experience in governmental administrative practices. [Although] particularly in the cultural field, the Rockefeller name was...considered an asset."<sup>187</sup> In his letter of acceptance to President Roosevelt, Rockefeller made evident the significance of this asset when he wrote:

In order to devote all of my time to this new position, I am resigning as director and officer of the development company which was organized at the invitation of the Venezuela government, and I am also withdrawing from active participation in other South American enterprises in which I have been interested. I plan to continue as President of the Museum of Modern Art, which has been active in developing cultural relations between the American Republics for many years, because it is one of a number of institutions which may be able to render effective assistance in the work which you have asked me to undertake.<sup>188</sup>

Overstating the cultural link of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA henceforth) with the American Republics in his letter of acceptance, Rockefeller failed to mention that this activity had been focused in the years between 1930 to 1938 exclusively on Mexico and that it was only since 1939 that the museum had included Brazil as a second republic in its so-called cultural relations development.<sup>189</sup> Likewise, this narrow interest during the 1930s was also reflected in the museum's collecting practices, which since establishing a permanent

---

<sup>187</sup> Rowland, 1947: 8.

<sup>188</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller (NAR) to FDR, August 16, 1940. Copy. Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Record Group 4, Series Washington DC Files, Roosevelt Franklin D. Correspondence, Box 9, Folder 76. Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>189</sup> Among the cultural activities with Mexico were Diego Rivera retrospective exhibition in 1930-1931, followed by The American Sources of Modern Art exhibition in 1933 (which also included art of the Pre-Columbian Inca Empire), and 20 Centuries of Mexican Art exhibition in 1939, one originally planned by Mexico for the Jeu de Paume Museum in Paris which, due to the European conflict, was re-routed to New York and MoMA thanks to the efforts of Rockefeller himself.

collection with the 1934 Bliss Bequest, MoMA and its founders had concentrated in the pre-1939 years solely on Mexico and on acquiring Mexican art.<sup>190</sup>

As Rockefeller foresaw it from the point of view of defense and commercial and cultural relations, modern art and in particular MoMA, as a privately held entity founded and incorporated in 1929,<sup>191</sup> would become important tools to address the so-called problem—the German, Italian, Japanese and Spanish presence in South America. With most of Europe and China under totalitarian control there was the imminent threat of a Germania Corporation dominating and ruling the world. In fact, at its founding in 1929 MoMA had hoped by that 1939 it would be the “greatest modern museum in the world”<sup>192</sup> showing the ancestors and the living artists of the modern art movement. MoMA’s Board of Trustees in 1939 already included some of the key actors in what would be the new agency. In addition to Rockefeller himself

---

<sup>190</sup> For his retrospective, Rivera painted a series of portable frescoes and later in 1935 Rockefeller’s mother Abby Aldrich Rockefeller gave the museum what was considered in 1943 by the then director Alfred Barr to be the first artwork of MoMA’s Latin American Collection: José Clemente Orozco’s The Subway in 1935. It was not until 1939 when the first work by a South American artist entered the collection with the purchase of an artwork by Cândido Portinari of Brazil.

<sup>191</sup> The initial application for incorporation of the Museum of Modern Art was submitted to the Regents of the University of the State of New York on July 31, 1929 with the purpose of “The establishing and maintaining in the City of New York a museum of modern art, encouraging and developing the study of modern arts and the application of such arts to manufacture and practical life, and furnishing popular instruction.” Quoted in Russell Lynes, *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: Atheneum, 1973:16. The provisional charter of the Museum of Modern Art issued on September 18, 1929 by the Board of Regents for an of behalf of the Education Department of the State of New York incorporated Lizzie Bliss, Josephine B. Crane, Frank Crowninshield, Paul J. Sachs, Mary Sullivan, Abby A. Rockefeller, A. Conger Goodyear and its associates and successors “as a museum of modern art, to be established and maintained in the City of New York for the purpose of encouraging and developing the study of modern arts and the application of such arts to manufacture and practical life, and furnishing popular instruction, under the corporate name of the Museum of Modern Art...” Quoted in Harriet S. Bee and Michelle Elligott, Eds. *Art in Our time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2004: 26.

<sup>192</sup> MoMA Publicity for Organization of Museum, August 1929. [http://www.moma.org/docs/press\\_archives/1/releases/MOMA\\_1929-31\\_0001\\_1929-08.pdf?2010](http://www.moma.org/docs/press_archives/1/releases/MOMA_1929-31_0001_1929-08.pdf?2010), Accessed 7 April 2012.



as President, there were First Vice-Chairman John Hay Whitney; trustees Wallace K. Harrison, John E. Abbott, Henry R. Luce, Archibald MacLeish, Beardsley Ruml, Carleton Sprague Smith, and Edward M. M. Warburg; advisory committee members Lincoln Kirstein and Monroe Wheeler; museum Director Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and museum Secretary Julian Street, Jr.

Although not the first name initially circulated to head the office (William Clayton and Ferdinand Eberstadt were at the top of the list),<sup>193</sup> Rockefeller himself had been the proponent of a broad and comprehensive plan for a commercial and cultural coordinating office with future views to a new post-War reorganization of global power in which the U.S. would play the dominant role. His plan for a “Hemisphere Economic Policy” had as its main purpose to protect the United States and to “maintain its security and its political and economic hemisphere position.”<sup>194</sup>

Rockefeller’s initial economic interest in South America had first begun in Venezuela in 1935 when, with the Rockefeller 1934 Trusts that his father John Davison Rockefeller, Jr. had set up for his children, he invested in Creole Petroleum Corporation, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey which since 1928 had owned and had been exploiting oil wells in Lake Maracaibo, Venezuela.<sup>195</sup> It was not until the spring of 1937 when he visited Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru and Panama

---

<sup>193</sup> Reich, 1996: 183.

<sup>194</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller. “Hemisphere Economic Policy” (Plan presented to Secretary Harry Hopkins by NAR at a meeting with him and Beardsley Ruml on June 14, 1940). Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Record Group 4, Washington DC Files, Franklin D. Roosevelt Correspondence, Box 9, Folder 76 with copy in CI-AA General, Box 1, Folder 1. The Rockefeller Archive. Also listed in Rowland, 1947: 279-280.

<sup>195</sup> As an investor, Rockefeller was a member of Creole’s Board of Directors.

for the first time in a two-month combined business/pleasure trip that helped him establish contacts for new enterprises<sup>196</sup> which he alluded to in his letter of acceptance to FDR mentioned above. Traveling again to Venezuela in March 1939, and now fluent in Spanish thanks to a Berlitz Spanish language course, Rockefeller established *Compañía de Fomento Venezolano* whose only completed project would be the first-class Hotel Avila in Caracas among a good number of ideas, schemes and plans that never materialized.<sup>197</sup>

Rockefeller's growing commercial interest in South America, beyond Venezuela, had been fueled in part beginning in 1938 by weekly evening discussions with a circle of close confidants that included Beardsley Ruml, Treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co.; Jay Crane, Treasurer of Standard Oil of New Jersey; Wallace Harrison, architect of Rockefeller Center and the Avila Hotel; Hugh Robertson, manager of Rockefeller Center; and Joseph Rovensky, head of Chase National Bank's Foreign Department. Also joining the group occasionally were Robert Maynard Hutchins and William Benton, President and Vice President of the University of Chicago, respectively. Due to Rockefeller's increasing excitement and passion for Latin America, "The Group" or "The Junta," as sometimes they called themselves, targeted the region to develop ideas for U.S. investment and commercial future in Latin

---

<sup>196</sup> Although Rockefeller had visited Mexico in 1933, this was his first trip to countries other than Venezuela in South America where he met government officials and Standard Oil executives. Accompanying Rockefeller were his wife Tod and her cousin Eleanor, his brother Winthrop, Jay Crane-Treasurer of Standard Oil of New Jersey and Joseph Rovensky of the Chase National Bank's Foreign Department. See Reich, 1996: 166-169.

<sup>197</sup> Projects discussed included joint efforts with Pepsi-Cola, Pillsbury, Cargill, General Foods, and Lambert. For a detailed account on a variety of possible projects by the *Compañía de Fomento Venezolano* that never came to fruition see Darlene Rivas, *Missionary Capitalism: Nelson Rockefeller in Venezuela*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002: 28-33.

America.<sup>198</sup> Invoking Dicken's concept of Networks, these gatherings connected individuals or trusted advisors of a particular social group in a relational structure or network to plan for a specific geographic commercial intervention. The power relations in the group were dictated by Rockefeller and his very commercial interests and investments in the region that the members of the group highly supported and encouraged by looking at new foreign direct investment opportunities.

Although Rockefeller had attempted to get the President's attention on the topic since 1938, by March 1939 he had only succeeded in inviting FDR to speak from Washington via radio at the opening of the new MoMA building thanks to the efforts of FDR's advisor and Rockefeller's confidant Anna Marie Rosenberg. Nevertheless, his ultimate interest was to share with the President his and The Group's ideas for a private/public partnership to promote his long-view plan for security and commercial and cultural relations with Latin America.<sup>199</sup>

The rapidly deteriorating and daunting world conditions of the spring of 1940 with German armies marching into Norway, Denmark, the Low Countries, and France forced FDR and his cabinet to begin to see Latin America as a geo-political area of strategic concern and as the possible next target of Nazi expansion. Sympathy for Germany in Argentina and Uruguay and the existence of German diasporic communities in these countries as well as in Brazil and Chile did not help a

---

<sup>198</sup> Reich, 1996: 165.

<sup>199</sup> According to Rowland, members of "The Group" developing the ideas included Ruml, Rovensky, and Nelson's brother Laurence. See Rowland, 1947: 6 note 12. Also mentioned in Reich, 1996: 177.

grim panorama. Already on April 18, FDR had acknowledged the German commercial ties to South America to the press and had pondered the possibility of a Germania Corporation.<sup>200</sup>

It was in June 1940, when Rockefeller finally reached the White House accompanied by Beardsley Ruml, who in addition to being treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., was also director of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Personally presenting the “Hemisphere Economic Policy” on June 14, 1940 to the Secretary of Commerce Harry L. Hopkins (former director of the Works Progress Administration and thus overseer of the Federal Art Project) who at the time resided at the White House, Rockefeller’s four-page memo called for a State program for the absorption of surplus agricultural and mineral commodities, elimination of tariffs to aid flow trade, U.S. private investment to develop sources of raw materials for U.S. consumption, financial and trade assistance from the U.S. private sector, a comprehensive government consular personnel overhaul and increase, and the co-administration of the program by integrating private and government sectors and interests through an advisory committee to the President composed equally of private individuals and inter-departmental personnel (Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture and Commerce) under a coordinated scheme. To complement this economic and commercial program, Rockefeller was also suggesting a parallel cultural, scientific and educational program that would use government funds in a non-traditional and unprecedented way.

---

<sup>200</sup> Reich, 1996: 177.

From an organizational standpoint, Rockefeller was proposing the creation of two committees—one interdepartmental and one advisory committee composed of private citizens under one executive person appointed by the President. Hopkins, excited at the prospect of the program, indicated that he would share it with FDR and, felt that as conceived the program would solve the issue of friction among competing individual programs already being developed by the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture and Commerce.<sup>201</sup> FDR shared the memo the next day with the four secretaries (Cordell Hull, Henry Morgenthau, Henry Wallace, and Hopkins) to elicit one joint interdepartmental program from them.<sup>202</sup> In turn, Hull shared the memo with his Under Secretary Sumner Wells who made the ominous remark, “I don’t know who prepared it...but whoever did apparently is not familiar with the things we are already doing.”<sup>203</sup> Obviously Rockefeller was not. In fact, the things that Wells was referring to were of such small scale and uncoordinated that the reason for requesting comments was to address the emergency situation for the State and to find a more viable and effective plan and work. This pointed to the lack

---

<sup>201</sup> Reich, 1996: 197.

<sup>202</sup> The Memo dated June 15, 1940 read: My Dear Mr. Secretary: I am anxious to get in specific form from the several departments that are concerned with our economic relations with Latin America, the combined judgment of the Secretaries of the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture and Commerce relative to the action which this government should take. I am enclosing a copy of one of the many memoranda I have received relating to the subject. Inasmuch as the matter is of great urgency I request that you report to me no later than Thursday, June 20. I wish you take the initiative in calling this group together...,” Rowland, 1947: 279.

<sup>203</sup> Quoted in Reich, 1996: 180. What Wells was referring to were agreements reached during the Panama Conference of the Pan American Union members on September 23, 1939, which explored neutrality, the maintenance of peace in the region and hemispheric economic cooperation. Conference attendees agreed to the establishment of an Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, which led to the resolution to create the Inter-American Development Commission on January 15, 1940 and organized in June 1940.

of a clear and effective philosophy on the part of the U.S. State in its relationship with Latin America which Rockefeller was addressing in his plan.

Responding to the FDR's request, the four secretaries submitted the joint inter-departmental proposal on June 20, 1940 suggesting the establishment of The Inter-American Trading Corporation to buy and manage surplus commodities, but one lacking the private sector advisory committee that Rockefeller had envisioned. The urgency of the situation prompted FDR on June 28, 1940 to appoint James Vincent Forrestal, one of his new special administrative assistants and former President of the Wall Street banking firm Dillon, Read & Co., to oversee Inter-American affairs. This was clearly not what Rockefeller had anticipated as the right response to his plan. Forrestal in turn saw his own new assignment as a temporary stepping-stone towards a more permanent future one more akin to his own interests of state intelligence and defense strategy amidst rapidly changing global conditions. The implications of this was that his post as the person working in charge of Latin American affairs would soon be vacant.

Working alongside Forrestal was his former banking aide Paul Henry Nitze who immediately embarked on a study of the Latin America situation by making the rounds about Washington. Nitze, now face to face with the bureaucratic state machine, concluded that an Inter-American Trading Corporation would not work. He came to the realization that "there weren't many people in the State Department who had a sense for action...they weren't interested in taking a problem and

defining it, and deciding who should do what with it, and getting it done.”<sup>204</sup> This opinion was also shared by FDR based on his observations of a dysfunctional agency marred by factionalism, rivalries and jealousies between the Secretary and Under Secretary.

Instead, Forrestal and Nitze took action by devising a new position that would report directly to the President to coordinate the various government inter-American initiatives. At issue was who to name coordinator. There were three names under consideration: William Clayton, Ferdinand Eberstadt and Nelson Rockefeller, in that order. Clayton was the president of Anderson-Clayton a cotton brokerage firm with international reach in South America. However, Clayton had participated in the anti-New Deal Liberty League and that in FDR’s eyes automatically disqualified him. The second on the list Ferdinand Eberstadt was an investment banker whom FDR thought to be rather difficult and controversial. After much discussion that took into consideration among other things campaign contributions, FDR decided to go for the third name on the list: Nelson Rockefeller.

Forrestal and Nitze met for initial consultations with Rockefeller on July 9 to talk at length about what they envisioned for a position that was still lacking a title, a budget, and funding. In the meeting Forrestal addressed what in the short time in the office he had identified to be the most urgent need: to “start taking action in relation to certain specific phases of the problem, namely, the securing of American financial interests and, to a certain degree, managerial control of all Latin American

---

<sup>204</sup> Reich interview with Paul Nitze. Quoted in Reich, 1996: 182.

local air lines, in order to prevent domination by Italian and German interests. Secondly, Forrestal mentioned the development of a cultural relations or propaganda program in the fields of art, education, music, science, etc., using radio, and press.<sup>205</sup> By July 15 Rockefeller had decided to accept the job despite the constant strategic maneuvering and apparent drawing and redrawing of the position by the White House: one day it was a coordinator, the next it was the chair of a commission and so forth just to navigate the bureaucracy and gain support from the departments. With Rockefeller moving to Washington but still without an official announcement or offer, Forrestal and Nitze developed an outline for the position, one which with FDR's blessing had "more emphasis on the cultural and propaganda side"<sup>206</sup> to counter the Nazi propaganda machine already in place in South America busy dispersing a German view about the United States. These were strategies to counter an ideology that was gaining ground given the earlier migration and the formation of diasporas.

Framed as a defense plan from the point of "hemispheric economic cooperation and dependence,"<sup>207</sup> both Roosevelt and Rockefeller had arrived separately to the same conclusion: culture had a significant and decisive role in the protection of the hemisphere. By early August it became apparent that what was needed was not a one-person position but rather an agency for hemisphere defense

---

<sup>205</sup> Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller to Carl Spaeth, July 10, 1940. Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Record Group III, Series Washington DC Files, Subseries: CIAA General 1940, Box 1, Folder 1. Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>206</sup> Reich interview with Paul Nitze. Reich, 1996: 187.

<sup>207</sup> Op. cit. Nelson A. Rockefeller, "Hemisphere Economic Program," 1940: 1.



in which a coordinator would devise a plan for commercial and cultural defense relations with Latin America and would chair the interdepartmental committee on Latin American affairs.<sup>208</sup> As a temporary agency, it would be placed under the aegis of the Council of National Defense and report directly to the President. Already in his “Hemisphere Economic Policy” plan of June 1940 Rockefeller had made clear that regardless of who won the war, the United States must protect its international stance and its security, political and economic position in the Americas through economic prosperity. As Forrestal would later recall in an interview in 1945, in the creation of the agency it was “President Roosevelt himself [who] was responsible for the specific inclusion of cultural matters among the duties of the proposed coordinator.”<sup>209</sup> Peter Dicken has noted that “States perform extremely important roles: as containers of distinctive cultures and practices; as regulators of trade, foreign direct investment and industry within and across their borders; and as competitors within an increasingly interconnected global economy. States are also increasingly involved in regional collaborations.”<sup>210</sup> At this time of war preparedness with a threatening German corporation and power competition that was already altering a regional economy with an exclusive German trade bloc and the global economy with a Continental blockade, these roles of the U.S. State in

---

<sup>208</sup> As Rowland notes, “The memorandum emphasized that the Latin American program was a program of hemisphere defense and should therefore be correlated with the work of the Council of National Defense, and also that there was immediate need for an executive vehicle to correlate the activities of the several agencies and departments working on Latin American problems.” Rowland, 1947: 7.

<sup>209</sup> Rowland, 1947: 7, footnote 15.

<sup>210</sup> Dicken, 2003: 3.

culture, trade, foreign direct investment in South America were more than essential, they were urgent.

On August 14 Forrestal submitted the final plan for the new agency and was immediately nominated, as he had anticipated a few weeks before, to the post of Under Secretary of the Navy.<sup>211</sup> Two days later FDR appointed Rockefeller to be the head of the new temporary federal emergency agency, the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics while accepting his proposal to remain as President of the Museum of Modern Art.

### **Modern Art, The OCCCRBAR and the Production of a Cultural Program for National Defense**

In the first days as Coordinator of the new emergency agency Rockefeller met the task of organizing the office head on. With the transfer of funds from the Department of the Treasury to the Council of National Defense through Allocation No. 22 of August 24, 1940, the OCCCRBAR counted with a budget of \$1,340,000 from the Military Appropriation of 1941 and \$660,000 from the Naval Appropriation of 1941 for a total of \$2,000,000 for its use during Fiscal Year 1941. Of this \$2,000,000, contract authorizations in the amount of \$700,000 from the Military and \$350,000 from the Naval appropriation were approved for “every expenditure, determined to be necessary by the coordinator, requisite for and incident to carrying out the functions and the program in connection with emergencies

---

<sup>211</sup> Forrestal would go on to become Secretary of the Navy in 1944 and first U.S. Secretary of Defense in 1947.

affecting the national security and defense prescribed in the order of the Council of National Defense..." A separate allocation No. 23 provided an additional \$375,000 for operating expenses for the Office.<sup>212</sup> He set it up with Commercial, Financial and Cultural Relations Divisions engaging trusted members of his well-heeled circle to advise him while utilizing some of the Rockefeller Family related institutions such as the University of Chicago, Chase National Bank, the Rockefeller Foundation and MoMA. For the Commercial Division he appointed a member of "The Group," Joseph C. Rovensky, Vice President of Chase National Bank and head of its Foreign Department,<sup>213</sup> and for the Financial Division Berent Friele, President of the American Coffee Corporation. In the Cultural Relations Division, the topic of this chapter, he initially engaged Robert G. Caldwell, Dean of Humanities at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as Chairman; William Benton, Vice President of the University of Chicago and an occasional member of "The Group;" and Henry Luce publisher and owner of Time Inc., to serve as a the three-member Policy Advisory Committee to aid in the production of what he had called in the passing reference of his "Hemisphere Economic Policy" as the parallel cultural, scientific and education program.

Although at first glance the advisory committee might have appeared to lean towards the academic sector with Caldwell, Benton, and with a future fourth

---

<sup>212</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Group 4, Washington, DC Files, Roosevelt, Franklin D Correspondence, Box 9, Folder 76. Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>213</sup> The Chase National Bank had gone through mergers and acquisitions including the Equitable Trust Company of New York in 1930, of which John D. Rockefeller was the largest shareholder. The acquisition made Chase National Bank the largest bank in the United States. Upon graduating from Dartmouth, Rockefeller worked at the bank under Rovensky.

member present at the second meeting—James Webb Young, a professor at the University of Chicago from 1931-1939, in reality it was heavy on advertising and publishing executives with a rather internationalist view. William Burnett Benton (1900-1973) had worked in advertising in Chicago and New York after graduating from college and had gone to co-found Benton & Bowles (B&B) in 1929, an innovative New York advertising agency located at 444 Madison Avenue. Its success in radio with soap opera-type of advertisements and entertainment had made it by the mid-1930s the sixth largest advertising agency in the world.<sup>214</sup> Selling his stake in 1937 for about one million dollars in the midst of the Great Depression, Benton then accepted the part-time post of Vice President at the University of Chicago, a Rockefeller-founded university, from his Yale schoolmate Robert Maynard Hutchins who was then President. Benton was also an art patron and collector at a modest scale.

Like Benton, James Webb Young (1886-1973) began work in advertising as a copywriter at the J. Walter Thompson Company (JWT) in Cincinnati in 1912, rising to the position of Vice President by 1917 and continuing serving as a Director and consultant throughout the 1930s and 1940s and beyond. In the 1920s Young had been in charge of expanding JWT international advertising market beyond England by opening branch offices in Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Egypt and in South

---

<sup>214</sup> "William Benton." *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2013. Web. 23 Aug. 2013. <<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/61209/William-Benton>>. Benton would negotiate with Sears, Roebuck & Co., the sale of Encyclopedia Britannica to the University of Chicago and later would acquire it himself from the university.

America after securing the General Motors Export Corporation account. His teaching in business history and advertising history at the University of Chicago's School of Business led him to compile concepts about advertising later to be found in the book *How to Become an Advertising Man*,<sup>215</sup> and *A Technique for Producing Ideas* published in 1940. Between 1939-1941 he was founder and chairman of the War Advertising Council.<sup>216</sup> Along with Benton and Young, Henry Robinson Luce (1898-1967), born to a Presbyterian missionary in Tengchow, China, where he lived until age 15 before settling in the U.S., was by 1940 the successful and influential publisher of the widely read Time and Fortune magazines and had just launched Life, a photo weekly magazine.<sup>217</sup> In fact, given the interest of FDR in putting emphasis on the cultural side, the selection of these advertising men would have important implications as they would give shape to the identity that was imbued in the production of the office and Art Section based on techniques used in the field to influence attitudes.

The true academic of the group Robert Granville Caldwell, Sr. (1882- N/A) born to an American Presbyterian minister in Bogotá, Colombia, had grown up in Ohio and had attended Princeton University where he received a Ph.D. with a

---

<sup>215</sup> Based on his class lectures, the seven processes Young identified were: Knowledge of Propositions, Knowledge of Markets, Knowledge of Messages, Knowledge of Message Carriers, Knowledge of Trade Channels, Knowledge of How Advertising Works, Knowledge of The Specific Situation.

<sup>216</sup> James Webb Young Papers, 1927-1984 Finding Aid, J. Walter Thompson Company Archives: James Webb Young Papers, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University, web, 23 August 2013, <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/findingaids/jwtyoung/>.

<sup>217</sup> Luce was a schoolmate of Benton's at Yale between 1918-1920. Luce was managing editor of the *Yale Daily News* while Benton was the chairman of the *Yale Record*.

dissertation that looked at the expedition travels of Narciso López to liberate Cuba from Spain in 1848-1850. He joined Rice Institute as a history professor and later on became dean. In 1933 FDR appointed him minister to Portugal and in 1937 to Bolivia.<sup>218</sup> In February 1939, he was named Dean of Humanities Division at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he remained until 1948.<sup>219</sup> He was the only member of the advisory policy committee with a Department of State foreign relations perspective and, as a former minister, a direct link to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State since 1933. But at the same time he was an expert in Latin American history and, unlike the other members of the committee, Caldwell was knowledgeable and familiar with the life and culture of the region. The Cultural Relations Advisory Committee would hold its first official meeting on September 27, 1940, not coincidentally in the political capital of Washington but in Room 5600 at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, headquarters to the Rockefeller family offices in New York City which only emphasized the importance of the commercial aspect of the office and the private interests and priorities.

As constituted, this well-heeled brain trust jointly combined expertise in the areas of national and international advertising, publishing, commerce, academic management and foreign relations and an interest in modern art. Facing them was the challenge of constructing a State's cultural program for defense of a hemisphere

---

<sup>218</sup> The appointment as minister was the equivalent to a modern-day ambassador. Rather than embassies, many countries had U.S. Legations and consulates at the time. Duncan Caldwell, "A Biography of Robert Granville Caldwell, Jr., Part I - Spy Catcher," [http://duncancaldwell.com/Site/Spy\\_Catcher,\\_My\\_fathers\\_biography.html](http://duncancaldwell.com/Site/Spy_Catcher,_My_fathers_biography.html) accessed 23 August 2013

<sup>219</sup> "Present Minister to Bolivia, Dr. R. G. Caldwell, Appointed Dean of Humanities Division." *The Tech*, 59.3 (February 14, 1939): 1, 4. <http://tech.mit.edu/V59/PDF/N3.pdf> accessed 22 August 2013.

where American commercial interests had been heavily localized in Mexico and Central America with limited inroads into South American trade and economy and almost none in culture. Instead, Germany, Britain, France, Italy and Spain had more significant foreign economic investment and thus a larger cultural presence.

In considering the initial OCCCRBAR discussions among the policy advisors to construct the cultural relations program and looking at the interrelated processes of production, identity, and regulation, the circuit of culture provides a glimpse at how the cultural relations program at the service of the state was conceived, implemented and deployed as part of the national security and defense hemispheric initiative. As Paul du Gay et al., propose, the study of the “biography” or “story” of the object—in this chapter the creation of the division of cultural relations and its art section and program—and the articulations or connections between the processes reveal the overall unity of the program in its planning stages.<sup>220</sup> In analyzing the production from the perspective of the advisory policy committee it is discernable how the program was informed by methods of advertising and how these in turn shaped the formation of an identity, production and representation imbued with state and public social identities with an specific consumption design while regulated in its distribution and use by the state as explained below.

But as Du Guy et al. note, cultural objects, texts or artefacts are not only produced technically but also produced culturally, made meaningful with encoded meanings in their identity, represented with imbued social identities, meanings and

---

<sup>220</sup> Paul Du Gay et al., 2000: 3.

practices; and regulated through their distribution and consumption.<sup>221</sup> In doing an analysis of the construction of the OCCCRBAR cultural relations program and the study of the 'biography' of its initial strategy, structure and culture to see how culture works, the combination of processes of the circuit of culture reveal the constant articulations or interactions and linkages of the distinct processes of production, identity, representation, regulation and consumption as a national security and hemispheric defense program. Inevitably also informing the construction of a public program were the distinct way of life and social and cultural identities and practices of its private sector creators and advisors network.

### **A Defense Identity of Sympathetic Understanding and Friendship**

In its first meeting in New York, the Advisory Policy Committee with Caldwell, Benton, Luce, and Rockefeller present, and also joined by John M. Clark and Arthur Jones of "Room 5600," began to plan the construction of the cultural relations program. Following an outline for discussion that listed topics such as objective, coordination, groups to be reached, methods of approach, media, measurement, and organization, Rockefeller further clarified his expectations for the committee as one not involved with the actual mechanics of the program but to advise him on ideas, the philosophy, and the inter-relation of the commercial and cultural aspects of the office.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> Paul Du Gay, et al., 2000: 3-5.

<sup>222</sup> "First Meeting of Policy Board, Division of Cultural Relations of Office of Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics. Outline for Discussion of Underlying Philosophy of Cultural Relations Program," Sept. 27, 1940. p. 1. Benton, William. Papers,



In the initial process of producing an underlying identity to make the program successful, the policy advisors were confronted with what Rockefeller noted as the then absence of a clear philosophy on the part of the United States in its relations with the nations in Latin America. Although there was a U.S. presence in Central America and Panama, South America had been mostly left to European influences. Factionalism and rivalries existed at the Department of State making it somewhat ineffective. In fact, FDR had remarked upon this situation and had compared the Department of State's dealings and decision-making with "watching an elephant become pregnant. Everything's done on a very highly level, there's a lot of commotion, and it takes twenty-two months for anything to happen."<sup>223</sup> There existed, as Rockefeller did observe, a concept "loosely called 'good neighbor.'" <sup>224</sup> Given the urgency of world conditions and the need to counter the fascist propaganda blitz in South America which preached its own German "New Way of Life," Rockefeller remarked that the only concept that the United States was selling at the moment was "Democracy." But as he recognized, it was a complicated philosophy that could even come back and hurt the U.S. as it had not been sufficiently thought out and tested in a region known for a number of military

---

Box 371, Folder 14, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>223</sup> Quoted in Reich, 1996: 183.

<sup>224</sup> "Minutes of Meeting of Policy Committee of Cultural Relations Division of Coordinator's Office." September 27, 1940, p. 1. Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 14, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library. However, by 1940 with an expanding European War looming large globally, the 'good neighbor' was becoming more of a public relations sound bite on the part of the state.

dictatorships and the tradition of totalitarian governments.<sup>225</sup> In his views, Rockefeller was beginning to see the philosophy as an identity and as a marketing theme even suggesting to the committee to become familiar with Nazi and Falangist propaganda techniques and public opinion and sentiment of social groups in the different countries in Latin America. In fact, this echoed the assertions that FDR desired more emphasis on propaganda and culture as mentioned above.

Evoking the very interrelation of commerce and culture in the temporary agency's long-term defense objectives and agreeing with the theme of democracy, Luce alluded to Manifest Destiny, noting that the intrinsic necessity of the United States to expand would also yield a philosophy. To Luce this necessity was not a "military expansion but expansion of trade, of commerce, and of the ideas important to us."<sup>226</sup> In other words, looking into the future position of the United States in the post-War as the world superpower and hegemon, Luce's reasoning for expansion<sup>227</sup> was none other than a shift to an industrial modernity and the spreading of the American way of life and democracy.<sup>228</sup> Although Luce may have seen it through a lens of an old expansionist philosophy or through the effect of media, this was nonetheless an imperialist view of imposing an industrial modern capitalist way of

---

<sup>225</sup> Ibid. "Minutes," Benton, William Papers, September 27, 1940: 2.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid.

<sup>227</sup> In his reasoning, Luce argued that the international expansion of the United States had only started after WWI without considering the Spanish American War and the resulting spoils of war such as Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

<sup>228</sup> Five months later he would dub this expansion as "The American Century" with the United States as the leader of world trade and free economic enterprise; sharing its technical and artistic skills with the world; being the good Samaritan of the world; and spreading American ideals and values. Henry R. Luce. "The American Century." *Life*, 17 February 1941. Web. 22 Feb. 2011. <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm>

life. The idea of spreading the American way of Life and the American dream for that matter amounted to no less than imperialism by a cultural modernity imposition that John Tomlinson has identified with being the predecessor to contemporary globalization.<sup>229</sup> And at this moment the cultural imposition meant the spread of democracy, a capitalist consumerism, and to Luce the expansion of media to overcome the socialist forces of Nazism with a capitalist economic-cultural system.

However, given his academic expertise and recent diplomatic experience in Bolivia, Caldwell noted that the concept of expansion and democracy representing the spirit of the United States had little resonance in South America. In conflict were two competing views: the U.S. of Luce and a South American one which, according to the good historian in Caldwell, saw its inhabitants as the “heirs of all the ages.” This self-assigned identity was one informed by a Latin Roman tradition of law and fair dealing, a Christian tradition of mutual helpfulness, and the Renaissance idea of personalism and self-expression.<sup>230</sup> Also informing these views was more recent French influence through the French Revolution and the universal rights of men, the Napoleonic code in law, and the motto of *liberté, égalité, fraternité* which had influenced the independence movement and the formation of the new republics in the 1820s. Caldwell reminded the group that dictatorships in South America denied

---

<sup>229</sup> Tomlinson, 1991: 175.

<sup>230</sup> “Minutes,” Benton, William Papers, September 27, 1940: 2-3.

freedom of expression and opinion in topics only related to politics and acts of revolution and not in others.<sup>231</sup>

At stake in the production of the program was the issue of the perception of what seemed to be two diametrically opposed and disparate identities of a Latin heritage and an Anglo/Germanic one. Caldwell best saw reflected in the *modernismo* literary work *Ariel* by Uruguayan author José Enrique Rodó.<sup>232</sup> Noting that the text had been highly influential on generations after 1900 when it was published two years after the Spanish American War, by 1940 it was still fresh in the minds of many South Americans. In fact, the essay had been translated into English by Frederic Jesup Stimson, U.S. Ambassador to Argentina, 1915-1921 and published in the U.S. in 1922. In this literary work, Rodó had delineated a vision for South American culture while encouraging youth to nurture and cultivate their spirit, good taste, intelligence, and refinement and to develop an artistic attitude and a feel for the beautiful thus constructing a cosmopolitan (via *modernismo*) imagined trans-national cultural community of civilization.

In his theorizing on nation and nationalism, Benedict Anderson has pointed out that the novel and the newspaper are the two forms that “provide the technical means of re-presenting the kind of imagined community that is the nation.”<sup>233</sup> From Rodó’s perspective as a continental rather than a national imagined community

---

<sup>231</sup> Caldwell was referring to the dictatorships of Getúlio Vargas in Brazil (1930-1945) and Germán Busch in Bolivia (1939).

<sup>232</sup> José Enrique Rodó, *Ariel*. Translated with an Introductory Essay by F. J. Stimson, Late United States Ambassador to Argentina. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company/Riverside Press, 1922.

<sup>233</sup> Anderson, 1991: 25.

represented in *Ariel*, the book served to unite culturally a continental region of nations. The ideology in *Ariel* was so influential throughout the years that vestiges, as Caldwell indicated, were still in existence in 1940. In experiencing this imagining though, Caldwell noted South Americans had come to see themselves as carrying the torch of civilization and as the personification of the rational *Ariel*. They were the embodiment of the essence of civilization, intellectualism and high taste in art and were also imbued with spiritual, moral, aesthetic and social values. In contrast to *Ariel*, there was the barbarism and the untamable rebellion of the utilitarian *Calibán* (Renan's democracy) lacking in spirit and art, which to South Americans embodied "the materialistic industrial colossus of the North."<sup>234</sup>

In this critique, Rodó was denouncing the materialism and self-indulgence of a machine made industrialism that to him mutilated the minds creating one-sided U.S. culture. What Caldwell was explaining was that expansionism as a theme would not work or help in achieving immediate defense objectives due to its association with imperialism the still fresh negative memories of the U.S. imperialistic aspirations of the U.S created Spanish American War of 1898 with Cuba and Puerto Rico, the taking of Panama in 1903, and the invasions in Nicaragua in the 1920s, but also the materialistic perception of the United States being capitalized by fascist propaganda.

Finding this situation to be an "an ethical misunderstanding," Luce wondered if it would be possible to flood South America with five-cents copies of Ralph Waldo

---

<sup>234</sup> "Minutes," Benton, William Papers, September 27, 1940: 4.

Emerson's books and philosophies in response to Rodo's Ariel.<sup>235</sup> Caldwell offered a simple solution to these diverging perceptions: "expanding" on the commonalities in both cultures with fair-dealing and mutual helpfulness to preserve "mutual values" and civilization in the face of the Nazi and Fascist offensives in a soon to be world war. Benton agreed that fair-dealing was better done in the cultural rather than in the commercial area further recommending the committee to consult with experts on Latin American culture to continue addressing the program's identity formulation owing to the new awareness of the negative perceptions of the U.S. in South America at the time.

In producing the identity for the cultural program issues of interpretation, social and economic groups, geographical area, approach, implementation and evaluation were also discussed. It became apparent that establishing a philosophy would clarify the cultural program's mission and objectives while maintaining a connection as a defense initiative with the economic program, with foreign relations and with the military. Considering the defense emergency the expanding war was creating, the advisory committee agreed on a short-term program that would yield immediate results. Given the negative perception of the United States that the Germans were supporting and fueling, at least in its initial iteration, the program was to be one utilizing methods of inducement rather than imposition to "interpret

---

<sup>235</sup> "Minutes," Benton, William Papers, September 27, 1940: 4. I have not ascertained yet the connection of "Ariel" and Luce's "The American Century," but I do think there is a connection between Luce's participation in the committee and his writing of February of 1941, which I intend to explore in the future.

the United States to Latin America rather than vice versa”<sup>236</sup> in an exercise of soft power to change attitudes.

Not surprisingly, given Luce’s and Benton’s publishing and advertising backgrounds and interests, the committee came to see press, news and radio as some of the most effective short-term strategies to spread ideas and values common to the Americas. However, facing them at this initial stage was the reality of the limited commercial business activities of the American Press (AP) and United Press (UP) News Services in South America. Although wanting to reach a larger number of newspapers in Latin America beyond a regional market share of only 25% out of 800 newspapers, the news agencies were not amenable to reducing their rates. In the meantime, the other 75% of newspapers in the region, that could not afford AP and UP rates, were getting free transoceanic European news, narratives and propaganda. Anderson has noted the role of the press in the view of the nation as an imagined community “always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.”<sup>237</sup> Therefore, conjuring a hemispheric construction and trans-national imagining of a community with common values, the issue of the limited amount of news outlets about Latin America in the U.S. press was also of great concern for that horizontal conception. Although Luce noted that coincidentally at the time the Herald Tribune was opening the first two bureaus in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro as was his Time Magazine and would be able to provide news about Argentina and Brazil for

---

<sup>236</sup> “Minutes,” Benton, William Papers, September 27, 1940: 5.

<sup>237</sup> Anderson, 1991: 7.

U.S. consumption, it was still at a very limited stage on which to create a [trans] national community linked by print.

In what now was becoming a U.S. State vision of the constitution of a unified hemispheric front of “mutual values” and civilization facing the Nazi and Fascist news offensives in South America, the idea of a hemispheric geo-political space and social terrain with a trans-nationalist imagined community, and a changed form of consciousness, at least temporarily, was beginning slowly to take shape. In fact this pointed to a process of cultural regionalization that was going hand in hand with the commercial and economic activities of the other divisions of the OCCCRBAR. The establishment of a trade region as economic defense with purchases of commodities and raw material surpluses as well as the stimulation of trade was directly alluding to a process of an early globalization in regionalization.

Meeting for a second time in Room 5600 in New York on October 14, 1940 the Policy Advisory Committee now with the new fourth member James Webb Young, decided on the specific geographical target area. Special emphasis was placed on countries with totalitarian regimes as well as those that occupied a strategic geographical location along the inter-oceanic commercial and trade route du jour since 1914--the Panama Canal. Thus the cultural relations program came to favor South America as a region of concentration and action with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Colombia and Venezuela as targets for the defense program in



addition to Cuba in the Caribbean.<sup>238</sup> In addition to the cultural aspect, also at hand was the economic restructuring of the South American space with a regionalist defense project that organized and established new transnational U.S. commercial and trade networks of production and trade, reduced foreign exchange requirements and debt service, increased and stimulated commerce and industrialization, improved transportation facilities and routes.<sup>239</sup> Armand Mattelart has pointed out that Networks also act as leading symbols of progress while at the same time “never ceas[ing] to be at the center of struggles to control the world.”<sup>240</sup> In that struggle for the commercial and cultural defense of the region from totalitarian forces, the new networks would help the U.S. to establish a visible presence in a geographic area which up to that moment had little U.S. commercial presence.

With the unresolved issue of a philosophy or identity to underpin the cultural relations program, the committee, and in particular Benton and Young with their advertising expertise, strategically posed the idea of admiration of Latin American values rather than forcing Latin America to conform to U.S. values. In what in reality was an advertising and psychological strategy, the philosophy would give the

---

<sup>238</sup> Panama was not included as the Canal Zone was already under U.S. Administration and was a military base. Mexico already had a significant U.S. commercial presence and so did the smaller countries in Central America where the United Fruit Company dominated the banana and other agricultural business. “Minutes of Meeting of Policy Committee of the Coordinator’s Office –October 14, 1940,” p. 1. Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 3, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>239</sup> See Rowland, 1947: 11.

<sup>240</sup> Armand Mattelart, *Networking the World 1794-2000*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000: viii.

impression of mutual help under the premise that, as Young stated, “the best way to get a person to like you is to give him the idea that you admire him.”<sup>241</sup> However to make the program successful in countering the totalitarian influence and opening new circuits and networks for U.S. commerce and culture, the committee came to see that “only by understanding the symbols that effect Latin Americans, and their ideals and civilization, can our programs be effectively adapted to them.”<sup>242</sup> In other words, it was imperative to understand the audience and appeal to them at their very own vulnerable spots to influence and win their hearts and minds through a well-designed cultural defense marketing campaign of U.S. values and ideas adapted to their needs.

Given the backgrounds of the Committee’s members—an “advertising” campaign to sell an idea to a Latin American audience to change public perceptions was urgently needed and Benton knew the right man to help them produce the cultural program. Harold Dwight Lasswell, a University of Chicago alumni and professor, was a communications theorist and political scientist whose dissertation had been a study and analysis of propaganda techniques during World War I, which had been published in 1927. Although the general assumption in the U.S. had been that the Germans were ahead in the work of war and propaganda with Paul Joseph Goebbels as Reich Minister of Propaganda since 1933, Lasswell had been busy analyzing the impact of propaganda on collective attitudes including looking at the

---

<sup>241</sup> “Minutes–October 14, 1940,” Benton, William Papers, p. 6.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid. p. 2.

German war propaganda model. His research interest was in the areas of the psychological and sociological foundations of political behavior, content analysis of the media of communication, and cultural diffusion and mass communications.

Lasswell soon shared his ideas in a memo to Caldwell, Benton, and the committee whose topic was “Some Basic Problems of the Cultural Relations Program.”<sup>243</sup> He provided his own views towards the initial production stages of a cultural defense program that would strengthen national defense while protecting national security in the hemisphere. Lasswell identified what Roosevelt, his cabinet and Rockefeller himself had already perceived to be the major threat to the Western Hemisphere: the use of South America as “a base of intensified strategic, diplomatic, economic and propaganda offensives against the United States.”<sup>244</sup> If the United States were to join the war as part of the Allies of World War II Lasswell argued, South America would become an actual battleground where countries would be induced or pressured to join either Allies or Axis forces.

In his analysis, Lasswell noted remnants of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine in foreign policy, which viewed the national defense of the United States as one extending to the whole hemisphere. But at a time of a precarious peace, the intersection of culture and defense was a strategic tool to create a hemispheric consciousness of unity. From that point of view, a cultural relations defense program strategically positioned as “friendship and unity” would yield the expected

---

<sup>243</sup> Harold D. Lasswell Memo to Robert G. Caldwell. November 11 (dated in pencil). Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 9, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>244</sup> Lasswell Memo to Caldwell, Benton, William Papers, November 11, 1940: 1-2.

results. Although not aware of the Pan American Union, Lasswell saw the idea of unity also achieved through a confederation of nations, and under the most extreme circumstances, the expansion and admittance of all nations into a hemispheric United States.

However, the fear factor played by European totalitarian governments was precisely U.S. imperialism, which was fresh in the minds of some with the lack of sovereignty for Puerto Rico and the Philippines after the 1898 Spanish American war. To tame this fear, an identity of “friendship” and “unity” through the cultural diffusion of symbols and everyday signs would be the way to address the problem. In constructing the identity of the program Lasswell’s recommendations included the use of “we” to create a common consciousness and sameness of experience in coded words such as the “American Republics,” “Western Hemisphere,” “Pan-America” “Inter-American” “American peoples” instead of “Latin America,” “Spanish America” “Hispanic American” that played down the otherness of a heritage, language, religion, social values, and norms. The use of “they” to convey the enemy, further accentuated the “we” in a fight for difference: “They” as the Axis powers, totalitarian regimes, “Old World,” “Eastern Hemisphere,” “Eurasian-African World.”<sup>245</sup>

The deployment of symbols in addition to language in a daily experience to represent and stand for ideas of unity and friendship in addition to constructed meanings with a favorable image of the United States would make cultural diffusion

---

<sup>245</sup> Ibid. pp. 4-5.

more effective. The use of maps of the hemisphere as an insignia could be adapted to be used in postage stamps, buttons, posters provided that South America's size would be more appropriately represented and the size of Canada not be exaggerated as in mercator projection maps. Other unifying symbols of identity as a Western Hemisphere suggested by Lasswell were a salute, salutation, song, holidays particular to the Americas (Columbus Day had become a federal holiday in the United States in 1937 although it had been observed since the 19<sup>th</sup> century by distinct groups, Pan American Day had already instituted on April 14, 1930 by the Pan American Union), ceremonies. As Lasswell noted, "symbols are only of value when they are grounded in intellectual, artistic and general cultural achievement."<sup>246</sup> For the OCCCRBAR's cultural relations program this translated into the deliberate inclusion of symbols in all of its activities in addition to a re-orientation of thought and perception towards its own continental culture removed from European influences to create a new hemispheric frame of reference and a unified history and destiny.

Beyond culture, Lasswell was instrumental in clarifying for the office its cultural and commercial links, in particular the principles to coordinate the cultural program with strategic, diplomatic and economic programs. Based on his research, Lasswell identified three principles: the principle of maximum effect in politics, as a formula to effect social change of the dominant values and environment though the gain and losses of income, deference, and safety; leaving control in local hands,

---

<sup>246</sup> Ibid. p. 6.

rather than institute U.S. ownership and management; and the economic building of a middle class. Given Rockefeller's plan, it would go beyond the purchase of surplus commodities as a result of the British Blockade of Europe and into the encouragement of exploitation of strategic commodities such as rubber, manganese and tin essential for war production. Likewise, Lasswell saw the growth of small industry as a catalyst for change in the structure of society in South America by contributing to the development of a middle class that would mediate between the ruling elites and the lowest classes in support for democracy and development of private enterprise, as key to the success of the defense program and modern production.

To measure the success or failure of the defense program, Lasswell suggested a macro analysis and study of who controlled key political, economic and social activities in each country, in the "armed forces, civil offices, political parties, trade and professional associations, newspapers and periodicals, radio stations, motion pictures, distributors and exhibitors, colleges, universities, preparatory schools, firms engaged in finance, commerce, manufacturing, mining, refining, transportations, raw materials, production, private associations like churches, fraternities, clubs and other cultural organizations."<sup>247</sup> With the information, a Who's Who should be created at an individual level to determine their US friendly or hostile attitudes.

---

<sup>247</sup> Ibid. p. 10.

In addition, Laswell recommended opinion gathering by methods of study such as pooled impressions in the U.S. of those involved in one form or another with South America and direct observation in South America of attitudes and social structure. However this being a program of national defense, polling and other like methods were discouraged as not to arouse unnecessary suspicions. A study of communication exposure and representation would be helpful in determining what people were thinking and feeling depending on what they were hearing and seeing with respect to the United States in South America and South Americans in the United States in newspapers, magazines, newsreels, motion pictures, radio, lectures, etc. and the depiction of constructed stereotypes.

In the third planning meeting now in Washington D.C. on November 12, 1940 in Room 3860 of the Department of Commerce, Benton, Caldwell, Luce, Rockefeller agreed to a cultural relations program as a clearinghouse for ideas and disbursement center for short-term duration programs that collaborated with strategic partners both in the public and private sectors for the execution of its commercial and cultural programs. Contacts with universities that had academic programs dealing with Latin America were made in particular with the presidents of the Universities of Texas, California, Chicago and Harvard to ask for assistance from experts in their faculty about their views on cultural relations with Latin America. Caldwell and Benton had worked out a definition of cultural relations as a way to guide their activities but also to explain what the office did by the coordinator and by the staff of the office: "Cultural influences are those that affect life and thought

among large numbers of people. For our programs, preference should be given to efforts that will yield quick results in the two Americas, especially Latin America.”<sup>248</sup>

However, the definition that Rockefeller came to use at least in its early contacts with these university presidents, stemmed from several other people involved but mostly Benton with the help of the Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago President’s Office International Relations:

The term “cultural relations” embraces all contacts which increase sympathetic understanding and friendship among peoples of different cultures. Such understanding and friendship among the peoples of North and South America is stimulated by the dissemination of knowledge of each other’s history and social organization. It is further stimulated by the development of appreciation of each other’s characteristic beliefs, habits, ways of thought, work and creative efforts, especially in their best expressions. A positive program of cultural relations, such as my office is sponsoring, seeks above all to foster those cultural objectives and ideas held in common among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Preference is given to projects that promise quick results with large numbers of people, particularly in South America.<sup>249</sup>

Contrary to what the text may have conveyed to the unassuming reader as “sympathetic understanding and friendship” this was still a program in a defense

---

<sup>248</sup> In a letter to Caldwell dated November 26, 1940, Benton mentioned that Nelson Rockefeller may have to provide specifics on the activities of the office and therefore it would have to explain what “cultural relations” means. Benton Letter to Caldwell, November 26, 1940. Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 9, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>249</sup> There is a slight variation from what Wright suggested to the text used: The term cultural relations: “As used in this office it includes only those contacts which increase sympathetic understanding and friendship among the peoples of different nations. Such understanding among the American Republics is stimulated by the dissemination of knowledge of each other’s history, language, and social organization. it is further stimulated by the development of appreciation of each other’s characteristics beliefs, habits, ways of thought, work and creative efforts—especially in their best expressions. A positive program of cultural relations, such as this office is sponsoring, seek above all to foster those cultural objectives and ideas held in common among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Preference is given to projects that promise quick results with large numbers of people, particularly in South America.” Quincy Wright Letter to William Benton, December 7, 1940. Benton William Papers, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.



war. In fact, Rockefeller had wanted to give his Office a very low profile. He was anxious to avoid publicity which could reveal that the office was part of the Council of National Defense, a fact detrimental to the effectiveness of the outward image of “friendship and closer understanding.”<sup>250</sup> What the office was doing was engaging the concept of the “Western Hemisphere” to secure closeness through commonalities masking the true intentions of defense. Three themes resonated: respect and liking for Latin Americans, defense of the hemisphere and unity. This unity was seen as a response to a lack of one in the economy, language, cultural heritage and to be found in a common history, love of freedom, and new world outlook.<sup>251</sup>

The OCCCRBAR, organized with Divisions under which were Sections, would run under chairmen and committees headed by the private experts in the field. With a Communications Division already in place with Young as Chairman, Young confirmed the cooperation of the News Services and arrangements with Joshua B. Powers, representative in the United States for over 100 newspapers from Latin America in charge of their advertising and also buying paper and ink for them. In addition to News, special editions of a magazine on defense were planned. Radio news was not promising given that radio signals from the eleven US stations were

---

<sup>250</sup> Minutes of Meeting of Policy Committee of the Coordinator’s Office, December 30, 1940. Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 3, p. 10. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>251</sup> In exploring the message for the Office, Young also suggested an emphasis on showing Nazi doctrines as contrarian to Christian values. “Minutes of Meetings of the Policy Committee on Cultural Relations, November 12, 1940.” Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 3, pp. 4-5. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

not strong enough to be audible in South America. However, in agreement with Lasswell's study, the shaping of public opinion was an important aspect informing the office's strategic plan as conflicting reports about German and Italian activity were coming from South America. Young thought that the Office should have its own observers to study public opinion and gather information which in the end was the study of the consumption of all the cultural relations initiatives.

It was at this third meeting in November that the Policy Advisory Committee first considered art as part of the defense cultural relations program. With Rockefeller present, Caldwell announced a personally envisioned art program proposal consisting of exhibitions of about 500 to 1000 color images depicting American life and arranged in photo murals. What Caldwell was proposing was for these American life exhibitions to open simultaneously in the twenty capitals and six additional cities in Latin America identified as having a significant population and market. Once the exhibitions closed, the color photomurals would be presented as a gift to each city. Caldwell's estimation of the total cost for his envisioned art initiative was \$150,000. As one not to be shy about making contacts, he had already secured, at least verbally, assurances from the Eastman Kodak Company that they would assemble the photographic panels for the exhibition.<sup>252</sup> This was a proposal that was not in accordance to the ideas that Rockefeller had and was soon shelved. It is not difficult to imagine the reaction of Rockefeller as President of MoMA and an art collector himself after hearing Caldwell's simple plan for a color photomural

---

<sup>252</sup> "Minutes November 12, 1940." Benton, William. Papers, p. 2.

exhibition of scenes of American life as the leading art project for his Office. Ignored by Caldwell were Rockefeller's plans for MoMA in the development of the Office as outlined in his letter of acceptance and also his dependence on yet another trusted network of experts in the areas of museum administration, publications, and moving pictures connecting them to a relational structure of modern art and MoMA.

In art, the expert came to be John E. "Dick" Abbott, Executive Vice President of the museum whom Rockefeller appointed as Chairman of the Art Committee on October 24, 1940. Abbott had worked as a Banker in Wall Street prior to joining the museum in 1935 as the Director of the Film Library and as Executive Vice President. He was married at the time to film curator Iris Barry.<sup>253</sup> Similarly, Monroe Wheeler, Director of MoMA's Exhibition Department and Publication Department became Chairman of the Publications Section and consultant to the Art Section based out of New York. When founded, MoMA had come to embrace a broad definition of modern art and made the commitment to include departments of architecture and design, photography and films in addition to the other modern arts. As a full-fledged museum with an education mission, it included the Publications Department that Wheeler directed.

Although moving pictures entered the expanding definition of modern art, I do not consider it at length in this project since in the organizational structure of the Office it was placed under the Communications Division under Young rather than in

---

<sup>253</sup> Abbott was Director of the Film Library from 1935 to 1946. He and Barry had co-written the plan titled "An Outline of a Project for Founding the Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art" on April 17, 1935. See Mary Lea Bandy, "Nothing Sacred," *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change*. Studies in Modern Art No. 5. New York: MoMA: 1995: 102, note 41.

the Cultural Relations Division under Caldwell or for that matter in the Art Section under Abbott. However I do want to mention its beginnings as they serve to illustrate the conditions in South America and the initial expansion of cultural industry circuits and cultural flows. In fact, for the moving pictures or film Rockefeller was relying on the third MoMA expert and trustee of the museum John “Jock” Hay Whitney. Whitney, an heir to Payne Whitney’s fortune in 1927, had become interested in 1933 in the film industry and in particular Technicolor, a three-color (cyan, yellow, magenta) process developed by Herbert T. Kalmus that was beginning to be used in short films as well as in “talkies.” In fact, Whitney had gone to co-found Pioneer Pictures with Merian C. Cooper of RKO Radio Pictures with the sole purpose of producing color films and had signed a contract with Technicolor to distribute them. As an investor, he had a joint stake of 15% of Technicolor Inc. with his cousin C.V. Whitney. His interest in a growing sound film industry had led him to join forces in 1935 with David O. Selznick with whom he co-founded Selznick International Pictures which by 1939 had produced the hugely successful film *Gone with the Wind*. On a philanthropic side, in May 1935 Whitney had established MoMA’s Film Library Corporation as a separate corporation whose stock was solely owned by the museum. He became its President with Abbott as its Director.<sup>254</sup> Despite the Office’s split of art from moving pictures in the art and

---

<sup>254</sup> Thanks to Whitney’s financial support in addition to a grant of \$100,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation the first educational film library in the world came into being “for the purpose of assembling a collection of motion picture films suitable for illustrating the important steps historically and artistically in the development of motion pictures from their inception and making

communications sections, in reality both operated in New York and out of MoMA.

Under an arrangement with producers, they would submit scripts to the Office for vetting content and interpretation of Latin America. However the lack of interest and an inventory of films with Latin American themes would be solved with a direct patriotic appeal to producers. One of the producers who had indicated interest in developing films was Walt Disney. His studio had just been embroiled in a labor dispute in which the government had to intervene in favor of its studio employees. Disney would commit to distribute his animated films as long as the Office provided financial aid for special sound equipment for *Fantasia* soon to be released in South America. Moreover, Disney was willing to travel to South America to gather ideas for future animated productions for a South American market. Also under consideration were informational movies or documentaries to show Latin American students in the U.S., at the international houses in university campuses such as Chicago. With investments in the film industry, Whitney was also interested in developing a wider distribution of 16 mm film starting by providing projection equipment to diplomatic missions in Latin America for their use.

Rockefeller by now was more than ready to exercise his plan to use MoMA to “render effective assistance”<sup>255</sup> with the volunteer work of Abbott, Wheeler and Whitney. In a December 9, 1940 meeting in New York, Abbott outlined his plan for an art section, one that envisioned programs such as archaeological expeditions,

---

the said collection available at reasonable rates to colleges, schools, museums, and other educational institutions.” Quoted in Bandy, 1995: 83.

<sup>255</sup> Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller to FDR, August 16, 1940. Op. cit. Rockefeller Archive Center.

exchange of exhibitions, scholars, and artists. Moreover, Abbott noted that the Art Section was considering as its first short-term yet impactful project a series of large exhibitions to be shown simultaneously in all the capital cities of the twenty-one countries in the Western Hemisphere in addition to fifteen secondary cities. As initially envisioned from a curatorial perspective, each of the thirty-six exhibitions would be designed to have three historical sections representing pre-Columbian, colonial, and modern art from 1820 to the present. That the modern art period was defined as 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century is not surprising given MoMA's canon through the Barr-conceived modern art evolving torpedo.

The envisioned huge and unprecedented exhibition undertaking would be organized according to the taste of each country and therefore would be different from country to country. Included in the initial plans was the tailoring of the exhibitions responding to a hemispheric audience with a wide range of levels of literacy. Hence the idea to go in their conceptualization with a popular rather than intellectual approach and curatorial paradigm that would utilize moving parts, neon light, gadgets and props to make it more appealing to the expected masses. In this unrealistic yet grandiose initial plan was the simultaneous opening of the thirty-six exhibitions in all cities—to attract the most publicity via radio and the most newsreel and press coverage of this hemispheric event.<sup>256</sup> What Caldwell had previously considered in his own color photo mural exhibition and what Abbott and

---

<sup>256</sup> Minutes of Meeting of Policy Committee of the Coordinator's Office, December 9, 1940. Benton, William. Papers, Box 371, Folder 3, p. 8, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

the committee of art historians and museum experts were proposing now was a total departure in a very ambitious yet unattainable scale. This was in fact no more than an exercise in imagining the targeted territory smaller than what it was in reality and an attempt to mass produce a large number of exhibitions without established cultural circuits, cultural infrastructure or museum networks.

Coming to their senses both in ambition and geographic reach, the Art Committee soon settled on a less ambitious and more realistic plan: the exhibition of the best American modern painting at a much reduced and manageable scale that would feature between 65 to 70 artworks in a tour to five cities from among Havana, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Santiago, Lima and Mexico City. The itinerary would follow existing shipping maritime transportation routes at the moment mostly navigated by Grace Line and Moore McCormack Line.<sup>257</sup>

Contributing knowledge to this plan were members of the Art Committee which, in addition to Abbott as Chairman, now included Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Director of MoMA; Juliana R. Force, Director of the Whitney Museum (founded by John Hay Whitney's Aunt Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney); Laurance P. Roberts, Director of the Brooklyn Museum; Francis Henry Taylor, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art; George C. Valliant with Stanton L. Catlin as Secretary and Grace McCann Morley, Director of the San Francisco Museum of Art, as advisor to the committee and art representative in Latin America.

---

<sup>257</sup> Grace Line, founded by William Grace provided steamship service between Peru and New York as well as to the West Coast of South America and the Caribbean.

Inevitable, given the national defense nature of the cultural program with a masked philosophy of unity and friendship, questions about the reception of American art in South America soon dominated the discussions and meetings. For example, Benton wondered if South Americans would like American Art. Wheeler in turn equaled the possible reception of the exhibition in South America as that of the 1938 MoMA exhibition *Trois siècles d'art aux États-Unis: Peinture, sculpture, architecture, art populaire, photographie, cinéma* presented in Paris at the invitation of the French Government at the Musée du Jeu de Paume from May 21 to July 13, 1938.<sup>258</sup> Wheeler noted that a “triumph” of modern, or for that matter any U.S. art in the world had yet to occur. The critical appraisal of the exhibition had been mixed with more positive reviews in the areas of film, architecture and photography. Instead the sections on painting, sculpture and folk art had been criticized as being no more than derivations of European art with artists who were European immigrants or not even born in the United States. In addition, the public questioned the role of MoMA as a modern art museum carrying the master narrative for three centuries of U.S. art rather than just focusing on the predecessors of modernism and modern artists as its mission implied.

In response to Benton’s question if South Americans would like American art, Wheeler reasoned, “Latin American culture is largely French and that in view of the

---

<sup>258</sup> The exhibition had featured artworks selected by Alfred Barr, Conrad Goodyear and curatorial staff and reflected the multi-department vision of MoMA including folk art. Mentioned in Helen M. Franc, “The Early Years of the International Program and Council.” *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: At Home and Abroad*. Studies in Modern Art, No. 4. New York: MoMA, 1994: 112. Also mentioned in Bandy, 1995: 103, note 70.



recent French reception of the Museum of Modern Art show in Paris, he felt they would not.”<sup>259</sup> Abbott in turn defended his decision to organize the U.S. modern art exhibition bringing up conversations with South American acquaintances who, according to him, had expressed great interest to have such an exhibition traveled. As Abbot explained, their view was one that if the U.S. failed to procure an exhibition of contemporary art to be shown in South America, the lack of the gesture would be interpreted as “a lack of good art in the United States.”<sup>260</sup> With options equally unfavorable and with the 1938 Paris exhibition in mind, Rockefeller recommended having a moving picture component be sent along, as it was the section that had received favorable responses then. This exhibition of the best U.S. art exhibition as a pioneer of a public/private defense model and its production, identity, regulation, circulation, and consumption is the topic of study and analysis in the next chapter.

This interconnection of art, publications, and film in the Office now under MoMA’s purview and control and shaped by Abbott, Wheeler, Whitney and Rockefeller as main actors in a cultural network reflected MoMA’s very own multi-department organizational private museum structure. One more person—Lincoln Kirstein—would join them in 1941 further shaping the MoMA narrative of a modern art. More obvious was this increasing MoMA importance and dominance at the last meeting of December 30, 1940. In view of New York as the main commercial center and important node for art, advertising, film and radio communications, Rockefeller

---

<sup>259</sup> “Minutes, December 9, 1940.” Benton, William. Papers, p. 8-9.

<sup>260</sup> Ibid.

established a branch office for the OCCCRBAR and the National Council of Defense at none other than the Museum's Goodwin Houses at 9 & 11 West Fifty-Fourth Street. The contract between MoMA and the Office stipulated a rental agreement at a cost of \$2,166 per month for the initial seven months and \$1,166 per month for the remaining five months for a total of \$20,992 in what would be known as the Inter-American House.<sup>261</sup>

Now meeting at MoMA and with all art, publications and film MoMA members present (Abbott, Wheeler, Whitney, and Rockefeller), the discussion mostly centered on the issues confronting the moving pictures section, one that by this date was laid out and with an operational structure in place. It in fact it illustrated one more aspect of the cultural defense project in its assistance to establish the U.S. culture industries in South America. Whitney reported on his most recent conversation with New York film industry executive representatives and producers who were not aware of the pressing defense emergency and totalitarian cultural presence in South America. Yet they were very keen in exploring market segmentation in the expansion of a culture industry in a new emerging market that the industry knew little about. In the meantime, producers in Hollywood were facing an official protest from the Argentine Embassy to the White House due to the film *Down Argentine Way*, and its grossly misrepresented portrayal of Argentina.

This, Whitney noted, was one of the main challenges facing the film industry in the

---

<sup>261</sup> In the rental agreement MoMA would come to receive the cost of remodeling and operations rather than making a profit. Contract NDCar-9, Inter-American House, December 1, 1940. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 366, National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

production of South American-themed films and representation of cultures and ways of life. Whitney, then Chairman of Selznick International, had succeeded in meeting important film producers in Hollywood. In view of the national defense program of unity and friendship, Hollywood producers had come to the agreement to have an expert on South American culture as part of the Moving Pictures Producers Association to read, review and approve scripts to identify those that could be perceived to include objectionable content and other misrepresentations that could alienate the new consumers.

Now with Hollywood solidly on board, Whitney confirmed the organizational structure of his section which included six sub-committees in charge of Moving Pictures star tours to Latin America as unofficial representatives of the government in which studios paid stars and the Office arranged transportation using the services of Grace Line and/or Pan American Airways in which Whitney had a financial interest.<sup>262</sup> In addition, the section would count with the Ways and Means subcommittee to identify stories to be developed in films. For South America, plans for a Simón Bolívar film were in the works with Clark Gable as the main character. However, South Americans had complained about the casting of Gable preferring a less marketable but more realistic Robert Taylor. In thinking along dollars and sense, Selznick International (with Whitney as Chairman and partner) the producer

---

<sup>262</sup> John Hay Whitney was an investor in the Aviation Corporation of American that later became Pan American World Airways. He was also Chairman of the Board of Selznick International, a film company which he had co-founded with David O Selznick.

of the film, saw the South American market as much smaller than the U.S. internal market. The change in actor casting would translate to a substantial loss of revenue for the studio which was not inclined to make.

The third subcommittee would address directly the yet-to-be known South American moving pictures film facilities and industry. A survey of theaters and movie houses would soon be underway with technicians evaluating the existing lighting, sound equipment, and English speaking extras for filming on location. Now the Office was infiltrating Hollywood and placing a representative in the Office of the Production Code to increase coverage of South America and the placement of sound equipment. And the remaining three subcommittees would look at academies of motion pictures and art and sciences, short films and the use of art design incorporating the use of cultural motifs in costumes, and set decorations.

It was this expansion of the Hollywood film business and the increase in the production of mass culture that Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer alluded in their writings in 1944 on “The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception.” Adorno and Horkheimer lived in the United States—New York and later Los Angeles in 1943 before moving to Frankfurt in 1947. In their critique, they saw film as one of “ready-made clichés” leaving no room for the power of imagination or reflection of any ideas but only concerned with the business itself and with effects and technical skills such as the Technicolor of which Whitney was an investor. Both Adorno and Horkheimer characterized the culture industry as having an assembly line character with tricks, effects, repeatable devices and sameness in mass

produced culture that “perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises.”<sup>263</sup> The challenge for the moving pictures section was to harmonize the interest of the Coordinator’s Office for national defense and choke the totalitarian regimes distribution network of free movies in South America, deal positively with an audience in an emerging market in Latin America that demanded accurate representation, and support the nascent culture industries in which studio producers grappled with a larger domestic than international market share.

Given the issues exemplified with the situation of the film *Down Argentine Way*, studios faced issues of accurate representation in a yet to be understood South American market and audience. The major issue was one of both audience and cost. Once the producers of the film had consulted with the Embassy of Argentina, several undesirable scenes had to be reshot at a cost of \$50,000. However, one area in which the studios chose to not compromise was music. The film continued to feature a Cuban-inspired rhythm rather than tangos or music genres from Argentina.<sup>264</sup> Hollywood movies, rather than documentaries, for a U.S. audience would have no problem with a U.S. audience to whom Latin America music sounded all the same. However, with a Latin America audience, this would be a great cause of criticism and cultural derision. Producers were also faced with the challenge of audience reception and censorship. Whitney and his committee had to make sure

---

<sup>263</sup> Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception*, 1944. <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/adorno/1944/culture-industry.htm>

<sup>264</sup> “Minutes, December 30, 1940.” Benton, William. *Papers*, p. 5.

that the content of films and shorts would “touch the appropriate chord” and avoid content that could be censored.<sup>265</sup>

As Whitney saw it, in view of the short-term projects for defense that the Office was recommending, the expansion of a market share for short films, now eroded in the U.S. by the rising popularity of the double-feature that was dominating the U.S. market, was the most effective means to achieve a penetration in the region. South America was now being seen as an untapped emerging market for short films in Spanish and Portuguese in a growing U.S. film industry subsidized by the State for national defense. Although the Office came to split art from moving pictures in the art and communications section, in reality both operated in New York and out of MoMA. But if the motion pictures section was ready to start work with Whitney, the art section with Abbott as chairman and Rockefeller still as President of MoMA was not far behind.

In fact, at the end of December a more fleshed out Art Section now counted with a blueprint that included exhibitions and archaeological expeditions to sites in the hemisphere with teams of U.S. and U.S. trained young Latin American archaeologists at an estimated cost of \$114,000. That the archaeological expeditions would fall under the purview of the Art Section and under Abbott is not surprising given the formal elements of modern art found in pre-Columbian design, which MoMA had already explored in its 1933 exhibition *American Sources of Modern*

---

<sup>265</sup> A number of foreign films in South America including Charlie Chaplin’s *The Great Dictator* was banned due to protests by German Embassies. Whitney was concerned with the upcoming *Eyes on Brazil* film which had explicit anti-Nazi content.

*Art*.<sup>266</sup> This was part of looking at the hemispheric heritage and the use of particular forms and shapes such as the line, the triangle, the swirl, the circle, the square found in decoration of utilitarian artifacts and vessels, fresco paintings and jewelry.

Rockefeller fervently supported the expeditions as he had come to see pre-conquest history as the true cultural link between the two Americas and an area of research that provided little controversy but much scientific contribution.<sup>267268</sup>

However the largest and most immediate project was the exhibition of American contemporary painting, as reported by Abbott in the meeting of December 30. To establish the exhibition circuit, South America would be divided into three regions by coasts with an East, West and North coasts that followed existing land, air and sea transportation routes. The exhibition, as Abbott mentioned, would be assembled from existing art works in the permanent collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Whitney Museum, the Brooklyn Museum and MoMA, whose directors were part of the art section committee, in addition to a few private

---

<sup>266</sup> The exhibition *American Sources of Modern Art* was presented from May 10 to June 30, 1933 when Holger Cahill was director of exhibitions. The catalog opened with the sentence: "Modern Art, like everything else in modern culture, has a complex heritage. Among the diverse sources upon which it has drawn in the art of the ancient civilizations of America." *The Museum of Modern Art. American Sources of Modern Art. Exh. Cat.* New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1933: 5.

<sup>267</sup> Moreover, in favor of the Office was the keen and far greater interest in the U.S. of intellectual elites in Latin America in archaeological objects that helped them to construct national identities drawing from "usable pasts." That the pre-conquest civilizations were more advanced than any group in the U.S. territory, Rockefeller argued, would give a "just cause for pride." If publicized well with publications, documentary films, and news, the expeditions could yield tourist destinations thus giving a stimulus to a nascent U.S. travel and tourism industry. This was the one project in which the policy advisory committee agreed by unanimous decision that it would make a substantial contribution "to lay the groundwork for tying together the history of different parts of the hemisphere." "Minutes December 30, 1940," Benton, William Papers, pp. 8, 11.

<sup>268</sup> *Ibid.* The U.S. had already been involved in archaeological expeditions with Yale University's Hiram Bingham in Peru and Machu Pichu and with the Carnegie Corporation supporting archaeological expeditions to the Yucatan Peninsula among others.

lenders. At stake for the advisory committee at the meeting was how to reach the defense objectives of the office to make the exhibition appealing to an audience that was not familiar with U.S. art while providing an identity of unity and friendship. Abbott mentioned that the U.S. art exhibition would be adapted to South American taste. Both Benton and Wheeler suggested the selections of the artworks be made by Latin Americans. However, Abbott had other ideas in mind and a different model: Americans with Latin American advice. Concerned about the reception of the exhibition by South American consumers and aware of other initiatives in the private sector for the circulation of exhibitions Benton suggested Abbott to get in touch with Herbert Houston to discuss IBM's Thomas J. Watson plans for his hemispheric art traveling exhibitions to South America where IBM counted with a presence since the 1910s.<sup>269</sup>

At the start of a new year on January 13, 1941, Abbott reported to the Policy Advisory Committee on progress in the U.S. art exhibition front. The Art Section now using the full support of MoMA as Rockefeller had envisioned, was in the process of preparing the traveling exhibition with U.S. curators and with Latin American authorities present. Abbott was comfortable enough with his model that he suggested to the Policy Advisory Committee a preliminary U.S. showing of the art selection prior to shipping it to South America. The venue he was suggesting was the Whitney Museum for a space of two weeks.<sup>270</sup> Remembering Abbott's art

---

<sup>269</sup> Ibid. pp. 1-12.

<sup>270</sup> Meeting of January 13, 1941, p. 2. Benton, William Papers, Box 371, Folder 4, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.



section audience solution to adapt the exhibition to South American taste, the committee became increasingly concerned with what they perceived to be a different set of curatorial parameters, ones that would appeal to a South American audience rather than a U.S. audience. Following the model of the exhibition sent to Paris, the committee was relying in watercolor as one of the most popular medium. The apprehension of the Policy Advisory Committee centered on the critical assessment of the exhibition that could give less than favorable reviews before reaching the intended audience and thus jeopardizing the purpose of the exhibition itself before arrival.<sup>271</sup> Instead what the Policy Advisory Committee suggested was to show the exhibitions in Washington at the White House to add prestige to them while having regular reporters, rather than art critics, write ravishing reviews.

Abbott also shared additional plans put forward by the art committee including a possible commission for Miguel Covarrubias, the Mexican caricaturist and artist based in New York since the early 1930s, to paint a map of the Americas following those he painted for the Pacific Exposition in San Francisco. Abbott commented that a proposal from FDR to have artist Jo Davidson make busts of the Latin American presidents for exhibition in the U.S., had not been encountered with much enthusiasm by the art committee. However members of the policy advisory committee found it to be an excellent opportunity for publicity and for promoting the Office's defense philosophy of unity and friendship in the Western Hemisphere.

---

<sup>271</sup> Ibid. p. 3.

In fact, Jo Davidson did receive a commission and traveled throughout Central and South America completing the commission of sculpted busts of presidents. An exhibition of his work was held at the National Gallery of Art in 1943.

Perhaps the most innovative recommendation from the art committee at the time of increased Department of State criticism, as shared at the meeting by Abbott, was the purchase by the State of South American contemporary paintings and vice versa following a similar pattern as those of the literary program of exchange with purchases of books. Benton and Caldwell felt that the program could be a controversial one given that the Office as part of the National Council of Defense would be placed in the role of art critic/curator in the selection of paintings, one that could backfire creating more ill than will towards the office and its defense project. This however, was to be accomplished by MoMA through other means as considered in Chapter five.

Although the Advisory Policy Committee seemed to have a cultural relations program now in its initial stages of implementation with the cultural relations and the communications divisions, there was still a major hurdle in front of them. At issue was the financing of projects and the U.S. Code, referred to by Moe as Section 529 Title 33, which prevented the advance of public monies. Projects had to be completed before the State could pay out contracts. But with a circle of well to do one-dollar a year men, some members were making the implementation of the program possible by using personal funds to pay salaries and guaranteeing bills. Whitney had been providing financial backing to the production of short and

educational films, while Bickel had been paying staff. In contrast at MoMA, Abbott and Wheeler noted that their secretaries had not been paid for at least seven weeks. This enormous challenge was affecting the engagement of the private sector, and without it the work of the office would not be accomplished. At risk were collaborations with publishers, museums, press, film producers and the cultural industry sector. The committee decided to put this issue at the top of the agenda for Rockefeller to discuss with FDR.

Two days after the January 13, 1941 meeting, and in view of a growing criticism of the cultural relations program, Rockefeller and Caldwell made the decision to disband the Office's Policy Advisory Committee. They felt that meetings were no longer productive and instead were riddled with a pervading view of a lack of action on the part of the Office by a now difficult, opinionated, and ineffective committee of private and public sectors. Instead, what Rockefeller had in mind was going back to the original private sector members Benton, Caldwell, Luce and Young and replace those with links to the Department of State with other government officials members of his trusted circle of advisors including his confident Anna Rosenberg and others. He was interested in continuing informal meetings in New York at the National Council of Defense Offices in the MoMA Godwin House.

From the point of view of a private-sector structured agency, the Office was in a fraught relationship with the Department of State despite the fact that Rockefeller was himself the chairman of the Inter-Agency committee appointed by FDR. As Rowland has noted, Sumner Wells in 1940 was "opposed to the cultural

relations information program under consideration by the office and noted that a representative of the Office would meet with one from the Department to work out the place of each of the two agencies in the cultural relations field.”<sup>272</sup> However, this did not prevent the Department of State in November 1940 from requesting \$14,280 to the OCCCRBAR for six additional staff for its Cultural Relations Division.

In February 1941, Cordell Hull appointed new members to the Department of State Advisory Committee on Art. In a memo to FDR he assured him that his committee would in no way conflict with the OCCCRBAR’s as his were for the purpose of long-range projects while the office’s was to oversee temporary emergency activities. Two months later in April of 1941 the power struggle between the Department of State and the OCCCRBAR reached a high point with the resulting restatement of the relationship between the two and a delimitation of power. In an April 22, 1941 letter, FDR told Rockefeller of the need to “apprise the Secretary of State of all government undertakings, whether carried on directly by Governmental agencies or indirectly through private agencies, relating to foreign countries.”<sup>273</sup> This centralization, as FDR reasoned, was essential to reaching maximum results both in national defense of the hemisphere and in diplomatic relations. However what FDR was asking was for Rockefeller to cooperate fully with the Department of State and even look for their approval on all their projects.<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>272</sup> Rowland, 1947: 182.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid.

<sup>274</sup> FDR Letter to Nelson Rockefeller, April 22, 1941. Rowland, 1947: 280-281.

Part of the power struggle was the name cultural relations. Although the committee had come up with a definition of the term “cultural relations” that guided them in their formulation of a plan, Rockefeller was neither happy with the cultural relations name on the program nor with the long name of the Office. After close to nine months of existence, the Office of the Coordinator for Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics under the Council of National Defense sought a clarification of jurisdiction and name change to refocus in its mission given the changing world conditions in the spring of 1941.

In the process the Bureau of the Budget ruled that the Office should continue to be reporting to the President as part of his Executive Office but under the Office for Emergency Management and no longer under the Council of National Defense. On July 30, 1941 FDR established the new Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA) now under the 1940-established Office for Emergency Management by Executive Order 8840. At the same time, the Council of National Defense revoked the order for the establishment of OCCCRBAR thus ceasing to exist. With the new Office still reporting directly to FDR as one of the temporary offices within the Executive Office of the U.S. President, the CI-AA objectives now spelled out the role of the office in hemispheric defense as “the center of coordination of the cultural and commercial relations of the Nation affecting Hemisphere defense.”<sup>275</sup> With the capability to continue formulating and executing programs with federal and private agencies, including the Department of State, the CI-AA would continue

---

<sup>275</sup> “Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs.” p. 1.

to further national defense while developing mutual understanding and appreciation to strengthen the bonds and solidarity between the American Republics. With a long view to a post-war world, the cultural relations program was seeking to create a “prototype” of what the post-war would look like with a strong foundation of cultural unity in the Americas through the visual arts, music, science and education.

By the end of its existence in July 1941, the OCCCRBAR was already a full fledged agency operating with 232 paid staff and 52 staff on loan from other government agencies or working without compensation and has grown to include divisions in Cultural Relations, Communications, Commercial and Financial Activities, Public Health and Security, and Anti-American Activities. In the yearly report of activities of August 15, 1941 the Art Section with John E. Abbott as Chairman and Philip R. Adams as Director and Executive Secretary, had now a specific mission of the interchange of art through exhibitions and artists exchanges. As the next chapters demonstrate MoMA, now a State contractor, would be busy executing contracts for the exhibition of contemporary art of the United States in South America (NDCar-14) and traveling exhibitions of Latin American art in the United States (OEMcr-42); while acting in its private capacity to implement the recommendation of the art committee to acquire modern art from South America. The oversight of 10 archaeological field survey expeditions in Colombia, Ecuador,

Peru, Chile, Brazil, and Central America was now at the hands of the Inter-American Andean Institute.<sup>276</sup>

The cultural relations program in the new Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA) also proved to be short-lived. Once the U.S. entered WWII in December 1941 the program became one of offense rather than defense finally changing its name to Social Science and Education Division in February 1942 which once and for all resolving the name issues of a cultural relations division with the Department of State's own division.<sup>277</sup>

As the war expanded, the Department of State took over CI-AA's administration, music, exchange and libraries on January 16, 1943 with the purpose to make these initiatives long-term. Likewise, it took on art activities beginning on July 1, 1943. It appointed an Advisory Committee on Art for the remainder of the 1942-1943 fiscal year (Press Release No. 31) whose purpose was to "to advise the Department, through the Division of Cultural Relations, regarding the stimulation and artistic interchange among the American republics and the coordination of activities in this country which concerns inter-American art."<sup>278</sup> The Advisory Committee came to include an even greater number of MoMA trustees and staff, members of the old OCCCRBAR Art Section Committee, and other museums

---

<sup>276</sup> "Cultural Relations Division. Organization, Objectives, Accomplishments, Plans. August 15, 1941." NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 351, National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>277</sup> Wallace K. Harrison to William Benton, February 5, 1942. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 351, National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>278</sup> NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, Folder: Arts; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

directors among them John E. Abbott, Stephen Carlton Clark, René d'Harnoncourt, Grace McCann Morley, Francis Henry Taylor, George C. Vaillant, George Biddle, Robert Wood Bliss, Daniel Catton Rich, with an Art Section overseen by d'Harnoncourt and Porter McCray.

The production and identity of a cultural relations program in an agency that was part of the State war machine in which the commercial and the cultural went hand in hand, reveal in its articulations that what seemingly was hemispheric unity and friendship was indeed part of a bigger battlefield in South America. The first of the case studies in the next chapter, the Exhibition of Contemporary Art looks at the representation, consumption and regulation of a program seen from the lens of modern art and the role of art as a tool of the state for national defense with views to building a post-war world.



## THE OCCCRBAR ART SECTION AND MODERN ART IN SOUTH AMERICA

With the appointment of MoMA's executive vice president and trustee John E. Abbot as Chairman of the Committee on Art on October 24, 1941, Nelson Rockefeller realized his vision of the museum rendering effective assistance to the State through the National Council of Defense's OCCCRBAR. In keeping with his idea of maintaining a low profile to increase the effectiveness of the Office, Rockefeller also found the perfect covert front for art programs in South America operating under the "cultural" aspect of his defense office in a committee of New York museums.

With an Initial meeting held in September 1940, the Committee on Art included, in addition to Abbott, key personalities of the New York art world such as Alfred Hamilton Barr, Jr., Director of MoMA; Juliana Rieser Force, Director of the Whitney Museum of American Art; Laurance Roberts, Director of the Brooklyn Museum; Francis Henry Taylor, the newly appointed Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art; George Clapp Vaillant, Associate Curator of the American Museum of Natural History; and Stanton Loomis Catlin who, since the summer of 1939 had been affiliated with MoMA and was to become the Secretary of the Committee.<sup>279</sup>

---

<sup>279</sup> After graduating from Oberlin College in 1937 with a degree in art history, Catlin received a fellowship from the Institute of International Education to travel to Czechoslovakia where he spent two years studying art at the National Art Academy in Prague. In 1939 Catlin was chosen as the as the

Holding subsequent planning meetings on October 24 and November 7, 1940 the Committee on Art considered several projects settling on one that would yield immediate results. Agreed by all in the November meeting was the presentation of a color photo-mural exhibition that would have as a central theme the commonalities of Western Hemisphere culture to depict hemispheric unity. As envisioned, it would encompass the historical development of hemispheric art and culture with a look at pre-European, Colonial, and Modern painting, sculpture, folk arts, architecture, decorative arts, and graphic arts. In addition, as a project of an office in charge of cultural and commercial relations, it would also explore “art in relation to industry.” This ambitious plan was in fact a series of 21 parallel exhibitions that would open simultaneously in capital cities and additional larger cities in the Americas carrying with it an estimated price tag of \$150,000.<sup>280</sup> Given the success of MoMA’s presentation of *20 Centuries of Mexican Art* and the solo exhibition of Brazilian artist Cândido Portinari in May 1940, the Committee on Art unanimously delegated the management and budget oversight of the project to MoMA.<sup>281</sup> What this meant to

---

first Harvard University’s Fogg Museum Fellow in Modern Art to study modern art collections in Europe, some directly suggested by Alfred Barr Jr., and Paul Sachs. However, while waiting to travel to Europe, Catlin joined MoMA temporarily in the summer of 1939. With deteriorating conditions in Europe, he was forced to change plans and with the Fogg’s approval ended up doing a study of the origins of modern art and mural painting in Mexico which coincided with MoMA’s on site preparations of the exhibition *20 Centuries of Mexican Art* presented in the late spring of 1940 in New York.

<sup>280</sup> The exhibition of Western Hemisphere culture had as goals to “strengthen the bonds between the nations of the Americas by their joining in a cooperative and united effort to interpret the development of art and culture of the Western Hemisphere.” John E. Abbott to Robert G. Caldwell. No date (Estimated to be second week of November 1940). Copy. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 367, Folder: Exhibits; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>281</sup> As envisioned by MoMA, the exhibition would promise the latest techniques in exhibition display, namely printed reproductions of original art, black/white and color photographs, charts, 3-D models,

Rockefeller was a direct conflict of interest in which he could no longer be President of a museum in the process of becoming a state contractor under the office he coordinated. He immediately resigned his post as President of MoMA now certain that his wishes for a pivotal role for the museum would carry on with his successor John Hay Whitney.<sup>282</sup>

However, the Committee on Art would find soon enough a changed discourse within the office. Although having initially envisioned unity as the defense objective, the Policy Advisory Committee had come to realize, after lengthy discussions (see above), that their new strategy would be to present the United States culture and way of life to countries under heavy Fascist influence in South America as a means to address misconstrued cultural perceptions. Although approval for execution of the project from the National Council of Defense was sought on November 12, 1940<sup>283</sup> and was granted, the Committee on Art ultimately came to defer action on the Western Hemisphere culture exhibition for one more year thus placing it as an encumbrance on the Fiscal Year 1942 budget appropriation.

---

motion pictures, and screen projection. For maximum effect as a hemisphere-wide event, it would be accompanied by a massive publicity campaign of newsreels, radio, television and press coverage. Abbott indeed highlighted MoMA's "unique experience and technical skill of that institution in arranging and supervising exhibitions of this type and because of its recent and successful shows in the field of Latin American art." Adding a freebie, Abbott also noted: "the services of the well-trained executive staff of the museum would be contributed without cost to direct the full project." Ibid. [Letter from John E. Abbott to Dr. Caldwell. No date. NARA, RG229, Box 367, Folder: Exhibits.]

<sup>282</sup> In a November 12, 1940 letter from Gordon W. Winks to Sidney Sherwood, Assistant Secretary of the National Council of Defense, it is noted that "Mr. Rockefeller is no longer an officer or agent of the Museum." Letter from Gordon W. Winks to Sidney Sherwood. November 12, 1940. Copy. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 367, Folder: Exhibits; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD. Replacing him was none other than John Hay Whitney, Chair of the film section of the OCCCRBAR.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid. Gordon W. Winks to Sidney Sherwood. November 12, 1940.

As the result of discussions during meetings of the Policy Advisory Committee, the priority for the Committee on Art was now shifting from Western Hemisphere commonalities and unity to one of using art as a tool of national defense to project the United States and its culture to key countries in South America identified as having strong fascist sympathies and cultural influence. With a changed plan of action, the Committee on Art soon settled on an exhibition of contemporary U.S. art that would travel mostly to countries in South America. Therefore, by early December 1940, it was engaging Grace Louise McCann Morley, the foremost expert in the contemporary art in Latin America at the time and Director of the San Francisco Museum of Art.<sup>284</sup> As chairman, Abbott invited Morley to join the Committee on Art as an Advisor to assist in laying out the initial circulation plan by utilizing her network of contacts in South America. Abbott reaffirmed the committee's views when he wrote to her: "convinced you are the best person for job and January fifteenth not too late but any earlier date better whole committee most anxious for your acceptance STOP Funds will definitely be adequate please wire if you desire official telegrams from Mr. Rockefeller and myself."<sup>285</sup> At the time Morley was familiar with the art of the Pacific coast countries in Central and South America having coordinated art presentations at the San Francisco World's Fair in the spring of 1940.

---

<sup>284</sup> Since about 1936 Morley had established a direct contact with South American art and artists as organizer of exhibitions of South and Central American artists in San Francisco, California.

<sup>285</sup> Cable wire from John E. Abbott to Grace McCann Morley. December 13, 1940. MoMA Archives, Latin American Committee Folder. Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Papers, Group 4, Washington DC files, Roosevelt, Franklin D Correspondence, Box 9, Folder 76. Rockefeller Archive Center.

In his urgency to secure Morley's consultant services for the state, on December 16 Abbott expanded the initial invitation from advisor to committee member and specified her role. In a wire telegram he wrote: "Can you serve as a member of the Committee on Art for Latin American and make a special survey of the most important centers which would give the committee necessary data in shaping its policies STOP Important you leave at your earliest convenience STOP Funds now available to Committee Guarantee full expenses STOP Do hope it possible for you to accept."<sup>286</sup>

With the shifting of a defense strategy, albeit temporarily, from unity to a positive projection of the United States culture the Committee on Art sought to break stereotypes of a rapacious imperialist and materialistic colossus of the North propagated by German propaganda in South America with a new project. On December 20, 1940 the Committee on Art settled with unanimous decision for what would be the most effective short-term defense plan in art: a large exhibition of contemporary U.S. painting and watercolors to circulate in three coastal sections through major cities in South America. In addition to the artwork, the exhibition itself would have as supporting educational materials a catalog and color reproductions.<sup>287</sup> Again, it reaffirmed that MoMA would produce and circulate the

---

<sup>286</sup> Ibid.

<sup>287</sup> John E. Abbott to Robert Caldwell, December 23, 1940. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD. Present at this particular meeting was Gustavo Santos, the director of the National Library in Colombia and the editor of the major newspaper in Bogota and brother of the country's president.

exhibitions given their institutional capacity and previous success in exhibition circulation in both the United States and Canada.<sup>288</sup>

The exhibition as envisioned at the meeting would be an aggregate of four hundred oil and watercolor paintings as the latter was considered “an outstanding field in the United States.”<sup>289</sup> As proposed, the catalog would include an introductory historical essay most likely by art critic Waldo Frank, well known in Latin America for his 1929 *Rediscovery of America* and 1931 *American Hispania*,<sup>290</sup> succinct information on artworks and artists’ biographies tailored to each country’s audience and printed in Spanish and Portuguese. For the catalog, the Committee on Art would work across sections within the OCCCRBAR with the Committee on Publications headed by another MoMA staff Monroe Wheeler, thus maintaining control of both exhibition and publication. Included in the exhibition would be a display of recent art publications on various periods of U.S. and European art that would be presented at the closing of each show as a gift to local institutions.

To maximize the intended effect of presenting the United States as a cultural leader to South American audiences, the exhibition was scheduled to coincide with the social season in the region in the fall-winter months of March through October

---

<sup>288</sup> Although MoMA had sent the exhibition *Trois siècles d’Art aux États-Unis* to the Musée du Jeu de Paume in Paris in May 1938, and had worked with Mexico in bringing the exhibition *20 Centuries of Mexican Art* in May 1940, its expertise in circulating exhibitions laid with the United States and Canada. In fact, in the year 1939-1940, MoMA had circulated more than fifty exhibitions to 290 institutions. With an educational and public focus service, the circulating exhibition program had received a grant of \$100,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1939 to expand the program.

<sup>289</sup> MoMA Press Release, April 1941.

<sup>290</sup> Segments of Waldo Frank’s *Rediscovery of America* had been published in José Carlos Mariátegui’s journal *Amauta*. Frank had also toured South America in 1929.

1941. And given the short time frame for production and shipping, the Committee on Art agreed to tap into its own institutional collections to select significant U.S. artworks, thus bypassing possible protracted negotiations with institutions and private collectors. With an insurance value of \$366,063.35, a representative was needed to accompany the exhibitions, oversee customs and supervise unpacking and installation processes and opening ceremonies at all venues. With an estimated initial production cost of \$47,780 that covered assembly, catalogs, invitations, books and reproductions, transportation costs, insurance, and travel expenses for the representative, the Committee on Art thus came up with its first short-term cultural project that utilized art as a tool of security and defense of the United States. And as the organizer of the exhibition, MoMA became the State's contractor to produce the project. Indeed the choice of MoMA not only secured the support of a private sector but also opened immediate access to a solid institutional structure, a respected curatorial team and the latest exhibition methods, a professional staff and a network of collectors and benefactors, notwithstanding a museum operating budget in the red.

In the early planning stages for the new exhibition, prior to the approval of the contract and project, the now "Committee on Museums" would come to rely on MoMA's specialized staff members such as Elodie Courter, Director of the Department of Circulating Exhibitions. And MoMA, on behalf of the Committee on Museums, would embark on an unprecedented South American exhibition tour for a

U.S. museum.<sup>291</sup> Catlin would later recall these initial moments as a case of naiveté, “we had no conception of what the size of South America was.”<sup>292</sup> In their initial exploration of routes, MoMA and Catlin envisioned a geographic itinerary by both steamship and rail. Departing from New York Harbor with a stop in Havana, the exhibition would travel in boxes to Rio de Janeiro as cargo/freight on a steamboat and on to São Paulo by rail. To take it to the next venue, the boxes would be transported to the port city of Santos and placed back on a steamship to Montevideo from where it would be taken by truck to Buenos Aires. Catlin, in thinking on how to use rail routes more effectively, suggested at some initial point to retrofit the East Coast exhibition (Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina) and send it across to the West Coast (Chile, Peru, Ecuador) by train on a new railway route that connected Buenos Aires, Mendoza and Santiago. Once on the West Coast of South America in Santiago, the exhibition would travel by train or truck to the port of Valparaiso on the Pacific Coast where it would be shipped to the port of El Callao in Peru and taken by truck to Lima.<sup>293</sup> In addition to transportation, insurance was necessary at a moment when German U-Boats navigated the seas of the world. A rate of 18% of the valuation of the 400 paintings would have to be added to the budget as insurance

---

<sup>291</sup> An exhibition featuring artworks owned by the International Business Machines (IBM) by artists of the Western Hemisphere in whose countries the company operated, was about to start circulating in Mexico, Argentina, and other countries.

<sup>292</sup> Oral History Interview of Stanton L. Catlin, July 1-September 14, 1989. Conducted by Francis V. O’Connor for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. Transcription. Web. 10 December 2013. <http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-stanton-l-catlin-5454>.

<sup>293</sup> Stanton Catlin to Dick Abbott (John E. Abbot), December 23, 1940. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Exhibits; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.



for the three exhibitions going to South America.<sup>294</sup> As efficient as the exhibition circulation that Catlin was initially proposing may have looked on an actual Western Hemisphere map, the reality was that it needed to follow established commercial transportation and freight routes that differed considerably to those that Catlin had plotted on paper. In fact, Catlin had investigated with the airline Panagra to send the exhibitions by plane at prohibitive rates at a time in which ship cargo was the norm.<sup>295</sup> On December 26, 1940, four months after the establishment of the OCCCRBAR, the Committee on Art was submitting the project for approval and execution.

The exhibition *Contemporary North American Painting/La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*/serves as a case study to analyze the role of the State and its interconnections with art and culture. By looking at how the exhibition was produced, represented, imbued with social identities, regulated in its distribution and circulation and the manner in which it was consumed to reveal the particular use of the exhibition as a tool of national security leading to a larger hemispheric defense. In considering Du Guy' circuit of culture the interconnected cultural processes of production, identity, representation, regulation and consumption, it is here that the additional use of the concept of *network* as proposed by Peter Dicken or "the processes connecting 'actors' or 'agents' into relational

---

<sup>294</sup> Given the new geographic destination, the estimate was provided by the Royal Shipping Company.

<sup>295</sup> Oral History Interview of Stanton L. Catlin, July 1-September 14, 1989.

<http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-stanton-l-catlin-5454>.

structures at different organizational and geographical scales”<sup>296</sup> to study the reshaping of a global economic map, that one can study the reshaping of a regional cultural and commercial map through the processes and at the same time reveal the true actors and agents.

The fact that MoMA was given the task of organizing and circulating the exhibition, places it as one of the institutional actors in a role that went beyond its private origins. Since its founding in 1929 as a corporation, MoMA had expanded to the point that by the end of 1940 it was seeing itself as a “national institution which occupies an important place in the cultural life of the country.”<sup>297</sup> Indeed, its trustees considered the role of the museum to be one that provided “increased service to the public, the more definite establishment of the Museum as a national institution devoted to increasing the esthetic content of our national life.”<sup>298</sup> There was no question that MoMA, eleven years after its founding, played a significant role in the contemporary cultural life of the United States with a well-tuned circulating exhibition program and had slowly but solidly cemented a good relationship with the State.

In reality, this view of the museum as a national institution had already been shared by FDR. In his 15-minute nation-wide radio broadcast of May 10, 1939 on

---

<sup>296</sup> Dicken, 2003: 14.

<sup>297</sup> Stephen C. Clark. Chairman of the Board. Foreword. *The Year's Work: Annual Report to the Board of Trustees and the Corporation Members of the Museum of Modern Art For the Year June 30, 1939 – July 1, 1940*. New York: William E. Rudge's Sons, January 1941: 5.

<sup>298</sup> Conger Goodyear, Chairman of the Board, The Museum of Modern Art. Quoted in Harriet S. Bee and Michelle Elligott. *Art in Our Time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*, New York: MoMA, 2004: 60.

the occasion of the inauguration of the “glass-walled, two-million-dollar museum building...[that emphasized] not only the cultural significance of the museum’s work but also the national scope of its activities,”<sup>299</sup> under the overarching MoMA-devised theme of “cultural freedom”<sup>300</sup> President Roosevelt stated:

The conditions for democracy and for art are one and the same. What we call liberty in politics results in freedom in the arts...[i]n encouraging the creation and enjoyment of beautiful things we are furthering democracy itself. That is why this museum is a citadel of civilization....<sup>301</sup>

And now at the end of 1940, MoMA as a private entity<sup>302</sup> in the role of a national museum was ready to expand to a much larger hemispheric one as the visual front for the State and as a carrier of values of freedom and democracy.

---

<sup>299</sup> MoMA Press Release, “President Roosevelt Speaks on Program Inaugurating new building of Museum of Modern Art Wednesday Night, May 10,” 39426-12. April 27, 1939. Accessed April 15, 2012.

<sup>300</sup> Ibid.

<sup>301</sup> “Address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, May 8, 1939.” Op. cit. Nelson A. Rockefeller Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>302</sup> The Museum, incorporated as a private entity opened in 1929 in a rented six-room space in the Heckscher Building two weeks after the October 29th Market Crash. When established in 1929 MoMA had followed a “feeder to historical museum” model of the Luxembourg – Louvre Museum in Paris, and others such as the *National Galerie* in relation to the Kronprinzen Palaest in Berlin, the *Neue Staatsgalerie* in relation to the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, the Stedeliks Museum in relation to the Rijks Museum. Two months before opening, MoMA was conceiving itself not in competition with the Metropolitan Museum of Art but as the keeper of modern artworks until time had proven their artistic significance to be transferred to the master house of U.S. Museums. But for the most immediate period, MoMA was to be a *kunsthalle*—a gallery for loan exhibitions of living artists from France, the U.S., expanding to other countries in the future such as England, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and so on. The provisional charter of the Museum of Modern Art issued on September 18, 1929 by the Board of Regents for and of behalf of the Education Department of the State of New York incorporated Lizzie Bliss, Josephine B. Crane, Frank Crowninshield, Paul J. Sachs, Mary Sullivan, Abby A. Rockefeller, A. Conger Goodyear and its associates and successors “as a museum of modern art, to be established and maintained in the City of New York for the purpose of encouraging and developing the study of modern arts and the application of such arts to manufacture and practical life, and furnishing popular instruction, under the corporate name of the Museum of Modern Art...” Harriet S. Bee and Michelle Elligott, Eds. *Art in Our time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2004: 26. Print. At this early time, it also imagined a larger conception of modern art beyond the categories of painting and sculpture to include “drawings, prints, and photography, typography, the arts of design in commerce and industry, architecture (a collection of projects and maquettes), stage designing, furniture and the decorative arts. Not the least

As such, the social and aesthetic values of MoMA would inevitably come to inform the production and identity of the exhibition. In the official request for approval to the Policy Advisory Committee's Cultural Relations Chairman, Abbott noted that the first exhibition going to the North Coast of Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador would include artworks selected with the criteria of "aesthetic quality to meet particular standards of taste in these countries."<sup>303</sup> In contrast artworks for the second exhibition going to the West Coast countries of Peru, Chile and possibly Mexico were, according to Abbott, to be selected "with particular regard to the intellectual predilections of these countries"<sup>304</sup> as were artworks for a yet third exhibition traveling to countries on the East Coast such as Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. This language of the differentiation of "aesthetic quality" assigned to the North Coast of South America in contrast to those of "intellectual predilection" for the East and West Coast, seem to have responded to what the museum and the Committee on Art perceived as the degree of cultural "distinction" and "aristocracy" in the aesthetic competences in the formal reading of the works of art and culture and levels of social use and consumption of modern art in each targeted coastal region. In addition, this particular geographic region of the Southern Cone was one

---

important collection might be the filmotek, a library of films, with a projection room such as is already maintained in Moscow, where the score or so finest films of the year would be preserved and shown. In addition to these permanent collections much space would be set aside for great loan exhibitions, national and international." See MoMA Publicity for Organization of Museum, August 1929. Web. 7 April 2012. [http://www.moma.org/docs/press\\_archives/1/releases/MOMA\\_1929-31\\_0001\\_1929-08.pdf?2010](http://www.moma.org/docs/press_archives/1/releases/MOMA_1929-31_0001_1929-08.pdf?2010).

<sup>303</sup> John E. Abbott to Robert Caldwell, December 23, 1940. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Exhibits; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid.

of strategic interest given the deeply ingrained German and Italian cultural influence that the Office was targeting with its efforts. Therefore, the paintings sent would be carefully selected from among the best examples of U.S. modern art and artists.

Pierre Bourdieu in his ethnographic study on French culture emphasizes what he calls “the particularity of the French tradition...the persistence...of an aristocratic model of ‘court society’ personified by a *haute bourgeoisie*.”<sup>305</sup> In this project and particularly in this case study, it serves as a lens to look at those assumptions of “prestige” and “cultural judgment” that Bourdieu himself noted fascinates the Anglo-Saxon world. In his view, the persistence of the model indeed presents a universality of a system of “distinctive features” beyond France to reveal social and economic difference, and in this case study degrees of culture and industrial modernization within particular systems of stratified class societies in South America. That MoMA divided South America indeed alludes to a particular perception of dominant classes in these coastal regions as a target for the transfer of U.S. values of taste to this very segment that the U.S. wanted to influence as part of its defense strategy with goals to find equivalents of its own life-style and extending to a preference of a social class as consumer of modern art.

Taking modern art as a tool of national defense, art would speak to these social classes where power resided about the very ideas of the prestige of the United States via culture. The more sophisticated, or in Bourdieu’s words more aristocratic

---

<sup>305</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984: xi.

and with higher social capital the audience the easier to influence with the higher examples of culture from the United States. But if there was a deliberate classed market segmentation in the production of the three exhibitions reflected in taste and intellectual preference by zone, the OCCRBAR's main Executive Committee in charge of approving all projects was also grappling with more immediate concerns about the reception of U.S. art in South America. Thus processes of consumption became a significant factor informing the production of the exhibition when questions arose about U.S. art appealing to South American audiences. The upmost concern was "whether these exhibits would merely tend to confirm them in their theory that American [sic] has no culture anyway."<sup>306</sup> There was indeed an element of cultural insecurity as the U.S. planned its cultural and commercial offensive. Instead of U.S. contemporary art, a member of the Policy Advisory Committee proposed to send European old masters paintings in U.S. collections to South America. Rockefeller who was present at the moment of the project approval assured his office Executive Committee that South American experts would take part of the selection thus guaranteeing a more tailored sample to taste. Moreover, at the risk of running the same fate as the *Trois siècles d'art aux États-Unis* exhibition in Paris, which was received as a derivation of European art with European-born but U.S. resident artists, Rockefeller further suggested the inclusion of motion pictures

---

<sup>306</sup> Concerns were raised by James Young. Dudley T. Easby, Jr. letter to Sidney Sherwood, Assistant Secretary, National Council of Defense. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

as part of each sample to make it more appealing as it had been the most successful part of the exhibition at the Musée du Jeu de Paume in 1938.<sup>307</sup>

With the OCCCRBAR project approval granted on January 3, 1941 and the final approval from the National Council of Defense on January 7, 1941, the exhibition was finally on its way to be produced. Funds to be used were to originate from Allocation No. 22 of June 11, 1940 under contract NDCar-14. MoMA was confirmed to be the contractor to execute the project for a total amount of \$50,100 inclusive of translation and printing services and special crating and packing for sea travel. An additional \$3,500 was added as Encumbrance No. 884 for Morley's contractual exploratory survey trip in January-March 1941, in which she would conduct initial negotiations for appropriate venues for the exhibition.

The process of the selection of the exhibition as the first major project in the Cultural Relations Division talk about the role and goals of the OCCCRBAR as one of defense preoccupied with international attitudes towards the United States in issues of reception by audiences in South America and as a project of cultural inducement rather than imposition. With a specific focus on Argentina, Brazil and Chile, the Committee on Art was preoccupied to present the best of U.S. modern art to audiences that seemly were conversant with European art and had not been exposed to U.S. culture or art.

---

<sup>307</sup> Fine Arts Exhibition in Latin America. Excerpt from Executive Committee Minutes of January 3, 1941. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

## PRODUCTION

Despite Rockefeller's assurances of the presence of a South American art expert in the production of the exhibition, the fact was that *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* was produced by a committee of curators who selected the artwork under the direction of Helen Appleton Read, who was experienced in organizing international exhibitions.<sup>308</sup> Among them were John I. Baur then Curator of Contemporary Art at the Brooklyn Museum, Lloyd Goodrich Research Curator of Contemporary Art at the Whitney Museum of American Art, Dorothy Miller Assistant Curator of Paintings and Sculptures at MoMA, Hermon More of the Whitney and Hermann Warner Williams, Jr. With only three months to assemble, as the Advisory Committee on art had foreseen, the curators first looked to their own collections and then to collectors and trustees.<sup>309</sup> This had been generally the practice at MoMA in the production of exhibitions since its founding in 1929. Therefore, the short period of time presented no challenge to the organization of the exhibition.

---

<sup>308</sup> Helen Appleton Read, who was for many years an art critic with the Brooklyn Daily Eagle was an art historian and the organized an exhibition of German art for the United States in the mid 1930s.

<sup>309</sup> Among the private collectors who lent artworks to the exhibitions were John Carroll, Stephen C. Clark (Singer Co. & MoMA Trustee), Mrs. Hendrick Eustis, Marshall Field, Ernest Fiene, Balcomb Greene, Mr. and Mrs. William Averell Harriman, Alexandre Hogue, The Lewisohn Collection, De Hirsh Margules, Reginald Marsh, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Neuberger, William S. Paley (CBS & MoMA Trustee), Mrs. Ogden Phipps, David L. Podell, Cole Porter, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Sheppard, Thomas J. Watson (IBM), and William Zorach. Institutional loans originated from the Albright Art Gallery of the Buffalo Arts Academy, The Art Institute of Chicago, The Brooklyn Museum, Canajoharie Library and Art Gallery, Carnegie Institute, The Cleveland Museum, The Corcoran Gallery of Art, Denver Art Museum, Montclair Art Museum, Museum of Fine Arts-Boston, Nebraska Art Association, Newark Museum, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Phillips Memorial Gallery, Rhode Island School of Design, Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts.



Thus the curatorial committee rapidly secured loans from nineteen private collectors in New York, Texas and California; seventeen galleries in New York, and sixteen museums in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Washington DC, Colorado, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Nebraska and Rhode Island. In addition, it approached commercial galleries whose list read as the who is who of New York: A.C.A. Gallery, Associated American Artists, Incorporated, The Boyer Galleries, Buchholz Gallery, The Downtown Gallery, Ferargil Galleries, Grand Central Galleries, C. W. Kraushaar Gallery, Julien Levy Gallery, The Macbeth Gallery, Pierre Matisse Gallery, Midtown Galleries, Milch Galleries, Perls Gallery, Frank K. M. Rehn Gallery, Valentine Gallery and the Weyhe Gallery.

The curatorial committee came to adopt a definition of U.S. contemporary art as one covering a period of artistic production of about fifty years, with the earliest works dating from 1890 all the way to 1941. Styles ranged from Impressionism, and Ash Can School realism, in addition to Abstraction, Regionalism, and Social Realism that came to dominate the art of recent years through the state-sponsored WPA Federal Art Program. This cross-section apparently guaranteed something appealing for all audiences while presenting a more comprehensive view of U.S. modern and contemporary culture and art.

With the selection of about four hundred oils and watercolor paintings finalized by March 31, 1941, the art committee, reconsidering an earlier discussion, decided to open the tour with a New York showing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in late April. As Abbott conceived it, the showing would increase the prestige of

the curated exhibition and secure validation with positive critical press reviews. By now that exhibition's name had been decided in English as *Contemporary Painting in the United States* with a Spanish translation of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* rather than *La pintura contemporánea de Estados Unidos*. This positioning of North and South denoted the difference that was in currency in South America where the United States was not recognized as America but rather as the United States of North America and its people known as *norteamericanos* rather than *Americanos*. As a strategy for presentation, the OCCCRBAR was securing a recognizable name and hopefully an unproblematic reception of U.S. culture while constructing an identity of hemispheric unity that the OCCCRBAR needed to transmit as part of its defense mission. Hence, the positioning of the exhibition as North America in South America also indicated another kind of difference as the initial long-term cultural neo-imperialist presence of the North in the South.

In the initial presentation of the exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum, the OCCCRBAR would come to figure prominently as the main organizer in collaboration with the five museums. As soon as the exhibition left U.S. soil for its tour in South America, this role of the state was inverted to give prominence to the five museums.<sup>310</sup> However, one obstacle to this idea of a privately organized exhibition with the backing of the state was the reality of its circulation in other

---

<sup>310</sup> See title page of: The Museum of Modern Art. *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. Exh. Cat. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1941: 3.

sovereign countries where art had to go through custom houses and pay import and export taxes.

As the first U.S. originating exhibition to tour South America, when the exhibition left New York some of the venues were still under negotiation. The last of the contracts would not be signed until July 1941. Preliminary arrangements carried out by Morley in the months of January and March 1941 in South America were mostly limited to initial contacts for appropriate exhibition venues. Not included in the discussions was the more practical aspect of securing the adequate permissions for free entry in the sovereign territories of the countries where the exhibition would be shown. Two weeks after March 13, 1941 when the Department of State had officially indicated that they did not object to the organization of the exhibition for circulation, Abbott told Caldwell that it was time to ask them again to actively cooperate now that at least verbal arrangements for venues had been made in various cities although the itinerary for the exhibition would not be complete and confirmed until mid-May.<sup>311</sup> What MoMA as organizer on behalf of the art committee was realizing at this time was that the success of the exhibition and the achievement of the defense goals of presenting the United States to Latin America would indeed need the support of U.S. Embassies and U.S. Legations to secure the

---

<sup>311</sup> Letter from John E. Abbott to Robert Caldwell, March 31, 1941, p. 2. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

collaboration of governments in making state run venues available such as libraries, museums, theaters and university salons.

Although the OCCCRBAR had operated relatively independently as a federal emergency agency and with a charter for the coordinator to work in collaboration with other federal agencies, its relationship with the Department of State the first year of existence was challenging and tense. The Department of State had come to see all activities in South America as its own domain and the OCCCRBAR as competition making the working relationship between Rockefeller, Cordell Hull and Sumner Wells rather difficult. The intervention of FDR on April 22, 1941 marked the turning point for the OCCCRBAR as it sought to clarify its role and delimitation of power within the larger state apparatus. In a letter to Rockefeller, FDR indicated the changing emergency context of U.S.-Latin America relations and his desire to centralize operations relating to foreign relations. To that effect he was asking Rockefeller to apprise the Secretary of State of all OCCCRBAR state and private activities from then on and making the point that he, the President, was cognizant that those were Rockefeller's wishes as well.<sup>312</sup>

## **IDENTITY**

With the curatorial aspect of the production of the exhibition almost complete, on Friday, April 11, 1941 Rockefeller announced the tour of three exhibitions of paintings and watercolors by U.S. Contemporary artists to Central and South

---

<sup>312</sup> Letter from FDR to Nelson Rockefeller. 22 April 1941. Quoted in Rowland, 1947: 280.

America through a press release bearing the letterhead of the National Council of Defense and the OCCCRBAR.<sup>313</sup> Rockefeller was quoted as saying:

At this time...a grave responsibility faces the countries of the Western Hemisphere. At a moment when the creative artists of Europe are engulfed by war it is imperative that in at least part of the world there be preserved an order in which the arts can thrive. An important foundation for our scheme of hemispheric defense must be a social order in which there is balance and perspective. In no better way can this be aided than by encouragement and free interchange of art of each American Republic.<sup>314</sup>

With these words to the U.S. press and general public, Rockefeller revealed publicly the goal of utilizing modern art as a tool of national and hemispheric defense within a societal order that allowed it to flourish amidst democracy and freedom in contrast to modern art in Germany, Italy and Spain under the shadows of totalitarianism and artistic censorship. This way, Rockefeller was positioning modern U.S. art in direct opposition to the forces the Office was directly engaging in the cultural battleground in South America. The press release also noted the exhibition preview at the Metropolitan Museum of Art from April 19-29, 1941 and a yet to be finalized itinerary that listed as tentative venues cities such as Rosario in Argentina and São Paulo in Brazil as intermediary points between capitals for actual geographical circulation purposes. Announcing an accompanying catalog, Rockefeller noted that it included as preface an essay by Waldo Frank, an

---

<sup>313</sup> As mentioned in the press release, the first exhibition was going to the East Coast of South America to the cities of Buenos Aires, Rosario, Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro, and Sao Paulo. The second exhibition was going to Mexico, Santiago, Lima, and Quito and the third exhibition going to Bogota, Caracas and Havana.

<sup>314</sup> Press Release, OCCCRBAR, April 11, 1941. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

“outstanding authority in the history and culture of Central and South America,”<sup>315</sup> which by then Abbott had decided not to include due to Frank’s radical views, and an introduction, biographical information and a bibliography by Helen Appleton Read.

Alluding to the curatorial or production process of the exhibition, Abbott affirmed, “the pictures have been selected on a basis of aesthetic value...but at the same time consideration was given to the subject matter, in order to select subjects that would be of greatest interest to our neighbors.”<sup>316</sup> With a great number of artworks originating as temporary art loans from private collectors, Abbott emphasized the largesse of an upper economic industrial art collecting class and the museums in which they served as trustees who “considered the cultural exchanges between the American republics of such importance that they have generously stripped their galleries of their most prized works of outstanding artists of the United States.”<sup>317</sup> Reflected in this text was the loaded discourse of unity and friendship that the office had settled on in the planning meetings of the fall of 1940 as the ones it would come to favor and advocate in its national defense work as part of its identity and philosophy. In addition, the OCCCRBAR was promising a formal interchange between South and North and announcing new exhibitions of graphic arts, photography, industrial design and architecture informed by MoMA’s departmental structure.

---

<sup>315</sup> Press Release, NCD-OCCCRBAR, April 11, 1941, op. cit.

<sup>316</sup> Ibid.

<sup>317</sup> Ibid.

In the production of the exhibition, its identity reflected the commonalities that the Advisory Policy Committee in Cultural Relations and Harold Lasswell had opted for with a terminology that united all American Republics. Here was the United States sending the best of their art to South America so that they could become acquainted with its outstanding artists. Further emphasizing unity and friendship, the Spanish version of the catalog included text to appeal to its South American audiences with its noble intentions, rather than stating the real national security and defense objectives, characterizing it as *“un sincero esfuerzo para mostrar a nuestros vecinos una imagen de la vida y el pensamiento contemporáneos en los Estados Unidos, un claro reflejo de nuestros deseos y aspiraciones y de la labor realizada en nuestra pintura moderna.”*<sup>318</sup>

Raymond Williams has explained the social definition of culture as “a description of a particular way of life which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behavior. The analysis of culture, from such definition, is the clarification of the meanings and values implicit and explicit in particular ways of life, a particular ‘culture’.”<sup>319</sup> Indeed, the exhibition in its inherent identity as a tool for national security encapsulated values of freedom and democracy in addition to friendship and unity. Moreover, the desires and aspirations that the selected artworks depicted were

---

<sup>318</sup> Translated by author as “a sincere effort to show our neighbors an image of the contemporary life and thought in the United States, as a clear reflection of our desires and aspiration, as well as the work done in our modern painting.” The Museum of Modern Art. *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. Exh. Cat. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1941: 5.

<sup>319</sup> Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution*, Harmandsworth: Penguin, 1961: 57. Print.

indeed those of a nation getting ready for a post-war new future whose vision was summed up in Henry R. Luce's commentary on the present situation of the United States in the February 1941 editorial "The American Century"<sup>320</sup> published in the influential and opinion shaping Life Magazine.

A MoMA Trustee, Luce was also one of the original members of the Policy Advisory Committee along with Benton and Caldwell (see above) and had participated in the OCCCRBAR Cultural Relations planning meetings. In this editorial, he was spelling out the present position, problems and possible solutions that could shape the future of the United States as a way to clear away the existing "moral and intellectual confusion." With the U.S. already in a war of defense, not of territory but of American ideological and democratic values at a world level, his internationalist position on this global defense war was one that fully engaged the protection, promotion, and support of democratic principles and constitutional American democracy. As a choice, it also defended justice, freedom and the free enterprise of the capitalist system against the forces of a dictatorial national socialism, repression, and a socialized and collectivist economy. Luce was alluding to FDR's Fireside Chat of December 29, 1940 on national security and the changing national economic model to a war economy, or what became known as the talk of the Great Arsenal of Democracy, as the U.S. arsenal for friends and allies. Luce was making a plea for the support of FDR's current efforts in supporting Britain and

---

<sup>320</sup> Henry R. Luce. "The American Century." *Life Magazine*, (February 1941). Online: <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm> accessed 22 February 2011.



protecting South America and the Western Hemisphere. He was appealing to the end of isolationism and the full support of the American people to make him one of the great American internationalist presidents and leaders of the world.<sup>321</sup>

At this point in February 1941 the driving question was how to win a war on the U.S.'s own terms and with U.S. aims. At issue was the historical shift for the U.S. to embrace world leadership and power to exert U.S. influence in the world as it saw fit while protecting the "world-environment" to secure the preservation and growth of an American way of life. For this, Luce identified four propositions characteristic of the times: the contemporary world for the first time being one indivisible and interconnected world; the hatred of modern men for war and the realization of its destructiveness; the capacity of man to produce for all inhabitants of the world with a promise to a "more abundant life" as part of freedom under law; the twentieth century as the American century<sup>322</sup> sharing with others the bill of rights, the U.S. Constitution, industrialism and technical skills and an internationalism with an American intellectualism, culture, prestige and good intentions.<sup>323</sup>

Indeed, the introductory text of the exhibition positioning it as a sincere effort to introduce U.S. desires and aspirations to South America, was none other

---

<sup>321</sup> FDR, Fireside Chat No. 16. December 29, 1940, Web, 13 September 2012, <<http://xroads.virginia.edu/~1930s2/time/1940/fdrsena.html>>.

<sup>322</sup> The first century for the United States as the dominant power in the world as well as a power in industry and science.

<sup>323</sup> In other words, Luce's vision for the post-War period was the U.S. as a world power in the economic, as "guarantor of the freedom of the seas" and leader in world trade; in science and the arts sharing technical skills; as the "Good Samaritan of the entire world...[as] manifest duty" to feed the destitute of the world; and as the powerhouse of values of freedom, equality of opportunity, self-reliance, and the principles of Western Civilization of justice, truth and charity and ideals of freedom and progress.

than a strategy in this larger activity in the war of defense that Luce had discussed in his editorial in the Life magazine issue of February 1941. Luce knew first hand that the U.S. was at the moment involved in a war of defense through his role in the National Council of Defense's OCCCRBAR Policy Advisory Committee and as a MoMA trustee of a museum at the service of the state in a defense war. In addition, in the preliminary discussions for the creation of an identity for the program in South America, the view of the United States as Calibán mentioned above, Luce had characterized it as an "ethical misunderstanding," and here he was presenting his own view of a new United States for the Twentieth Century.

The identity in the exhibition came to be one of creative freedom showing a range of styles, artists and media that facilitated aesthetic exploration in contrast to the European experience as Rockefeller indicated in the press release. The presentation at the Metropolitan Museum of Art not only sanctioned the selection as the best of contemporary art U.S. shown in a museum which specialized in "dead artists," but also imbued it with the prestige it needed as representative of the United States culture. This way, the sample secured an entry into a new territory under the defense guise of friendship and unity and the establishment of new U.S. circuits for cultural flows.

## **REGULATION**

If the curatorial production for the circulating exhibition had inscribed in it an identity with values of freedom and democracy reflected in a wide artistic mode

of expression that afforded a democratic vista into U.S. society and culture, the actual circulation schedule was far from finalized with venues still to be negotiated. Although MoMA had circulated exhibitions successfully throughout the United States and Canada by truck and train and had arranged for and shipped international exhibitions, this was indeed a new experience. For one, as much unity and friendship as the OCCCRBAR desired, the reality was that the sovereignty of each state impinged upon the circulation of the exhibition within the state own territory with state regulations on customs, inspections, import/export of art and taxes. During the Seventh International Conference of American States in Montevideo in December 1933 a new declarative theoretical definition of “state” had been agreed upon under the Convention on Rights and Duties of States (Article 1) as: “The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: a) a permanent population; b) a defined territory; c) a government; and d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states. And its existence (Article 3) as: “The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by the other states.” Likewise, it had defined “Sovereignty” (Article 8) as: “No State has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another” (Declaration of Montevideo, 1933).<sup>324</sup> As ratified by the signatories, these definitions were the ones in effect at the moment in international law and ruling the Western Hemisphere.

---

<sup>324</sup> Declaration of Montevideo. December 1933. The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. New Haven: Yale Law School, Lilian Goldman Law Library (online), 13 March 2011, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam03.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam03.asp).

Moreover in 1936, within the frame of the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in Buenos Aires, the American Republics had signed the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations with a big emphasis on education exchange between professors and students which was perceived to be the most effective way to advance cultural relations. However, in this same conference a new Convention Concerning Artistic Exhibitions (51 Stat. 206; Treaty Series 929) was introduced,<sup>325</sup> which stated that governments at the conference were “desirous of improving their spiritual relationships through a better acquaintance with their respective artistic creations.”<sup>326</sup> Article I and II of the seven articles in the Convention stipulated the granting “so far as its legislation may permit, all possible facilities for the holding within its territory of artistic exhibitions of each other parties.”<sup>327</sup> Moreover, Article II stipulated that “the facilities referred to in Article I shall be granted to Government agencies and to private enterprises which are officially authorized by them and shall be extended, as far as possible, to customhouse formalities and requirements, to transport on communication lines belonging to the respective States, to rooms for exhibition or storage, and to other matters related to the object referred.”<sup>328</sup> The ratified convention had been sporadically implemented between 1938-1940 at a very modest level by the Pan

---

<sup>325</sup> This convention was signed in Buenos Aires on December 23, 1936 with Senate advice and consent to ratification on June 29, 1937, followed by the ratification by President Roosevelt on July 15, 1937, proclaimed on September 16, 1937 and entered into force on December 7, 1937. Bevans, 1969: 383-387.

<sup>326</sup> Bevans, 1969: 383.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid.

<sup>328</sup> Ibid.

American Union's Office of Intellectual Cooperation with a handful of graphic art exhibitions that were sent by travelers/couriers to other countries.

The convention was to be tested through the public/private OCCCRBAR-MoMA channels. Catlin was facing in South America the overseeing of cargo unloading at the ports of entry by stevedores who did not read English signs of "Handle with Care" on boxes; the inspection and custom clearance at customhouses at foreign ports where all boxes containing the artworks would be unpacked, inspected and inventoried; and placing boxes on freight train cars for transportation from ports of entry to capital cities. To manage the risk and minimize handling and damage to the artwork, MoMA was requesting a similar courtesy as in Europe, where custom revisions were done on site at the museum venue. As Catlin noticed "the customs have to inspect and check each picture because they are permitted to enter the country as a temporary import and there must be a record to go by when they are later inspected again to leave."<sup>329</sup> If the museum were not a de facto customhouse, then hosting institutions would have to solicit their governments to hire private professional custom agents to handle the entry-exit process. In fact, in some instances it was left to the United States embassies and legations to request a special dispensation for entry/exit and taxes as discussed below.

In addition to this Inter-American exhibition convention, the existing physical infrastructure in South America was also in the hands of the state and

---

<sup>329</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Edith Snook. May 23, 1941. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

overseen by Ministries of Education. Morley, in her early 1941 trip to negotiate venues, had engaged U.S. embassies and legations in the initial identification of local exhibition points of contact and appropriate and secure venues.

Now in April 1941 Abbott was officially requesting that the OCCCRBAR ask the Department of State to secure the assistance of U.S. embassies, legations and hosting governments in the entry, internal circulation, and exit of the exhibition. In addition, it was asking the host governments to exempt the exhibition of customs and taxes. The reality of blazing these new exhibition circuits was that customs laws differed from country to country and now it was up to MoMA to find out from consulates in New York what each country customs requirements were. In considering the regulation of the exhibition and the establishment of initial U.S. cultural circuits on which it circulated, the sovereignty of the South American States impinged on the transit of the art, publications, catalogs, invitation and posters as well as the people accompanying it. This omnipresence of the state, being the U.S. or any of the other eight states in South America, regulated the transit of goods and people. No matter how free the movement of cultural commodities was and is, it is always regulated by the sovereignty of the state through agreements, laws, and borders. It is the state itself that allows and disallows and further defines the transit, flow and movement of people and commodities within borders by its own apparatuses and institutions. Therefore, in using the term of cultural circuits I refer to those material flows that are not free but regulated by the state as “regulated cultural circuits and flows.”

If the artwork as non-commercial symbolic goods and commodities were regulated as they circulated, so was the transit of the experts accompanying the exhibition. Issues of sovereignty and the regulation of travel required securing travel visas from all countries to negotiate and coordinate exhibition details. Catlin was foreseeing a challenging circulation in South America.<sup>330</sup> The fact was that this was an exhibition shown in public spaces regulated by the state. As Catlin would note, based in his experience in an early circuit that took it to Mexico to reciprocate the presentation of the *20 Centuries of Mexican Art* which had closed at MoMA in the fall of 1940, “we are not dealing with a museum, we are dealing, to put it badly, with the government.”<sup>331</sup> And indeed this became the case with the tour to South America in venues in museums, libraries, national theaters and institutions of the state. As much as the OCCCRBAR wanted to disguise the defense nature of the exhibition

---

<sup>330</sup> An initial circuit of New York-Veracruz-Mexico City-Veracruz-New York for a showing in Mexico City was more goodwill and reciprocating a cultural exchange for the April 1940 Mexico exhibition at MoMA. Stanton Catlin as the expert designated to accompany this particular showing had a face-to-face encounter with the challenges of establishing a U.S. exhibition circuit where none existed in a new and expansive geographical area. Although falling outside the geographical scope of this project, as well as its defense argument, I consider briefly the challenges that the Mexico venue presented as they dictated adjustments to the South American tour. Indeed, the Mexico presentation should be taken as a separate and closed circuit of New York-Veracruz-Mexico City-Veracruz-New York. The exhibition was shown in Mexico City at the Palacio de Bellas Artes in three galleries, which Catlin described at the time as being “high-walled, gaudy, badly lighted and utterly inflexible.” There were the venue issues of unpacking and hanging of the artworks, lighting, security, naming a sponsoring committee, local publicity and access to media. From the regulation point of view, the exhibition contract had to receive the approval of the government, which in turn had to facilitate custom clearances and transportation from the port of entry to the physical venue of the exhibition. And given the real purpose of the exhibition, the most difficult issue had to do with what to make of it, an official exhibition from the U.S. government or an unofficial one. As Catlin observed, “in practically all instances the sponsoring institutions are or subtend official agencies and the mere fact that they are showing any kind of foreign art exhibition immediately faces one with the official authors of the local patronage.”

Letter from Catlin to Sarah Newmeyer, May 29, 1941, p. 2. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>331</sup> Letter from Catlin to Sarah Newmeyer, May 29, 1941, p. 2. NARA, RG 229, Box 1209.

through the consortium of museums, in the end it was dealing directly with institutions that were part of the state and government. Prior to the beginning of the tour, he was already commenting on individual countries and their physical museum infrastructure. Of Uruguay he noted, "...they have no entrenched museum or museum tradition."<sup>332</sup> About Brazil's Sao Paulo he observed that there were "no functioning museum and where the pictures will be shown in a special gallery."<sup>333</sup> Likewise about Colombia he added, "the exhibition hall is part of the Biblioteca Nacional and where the idea of a big international exhibition is probably new and where publicity arrangements may have to be handled quite especially."<sup>334</sup> And Ecuador and Peru "which have no museums for our purposes and where exhibitions I hear are rarified and seldom as on the moon and where Nazi penetration and class differences, both involving artists are acute."<sup>335</sup>

The involvement of Grace McCann Morley, Director of the San Francisco Museum of Art, as the Office exhibition representative to secure all initial logistics and arrangements prior to the actual exhibition presentation, facilitated initial contacts with her acquainted art officials with whom she had worked in previous exhibitions featuring art of the Central and South American Pacific Basin and the 1939/1940 World's Fair in San Francisco. Morley's preliminary arrangements however did not include others with whom she was not familiar with and who were late in indicating their interest. The hurried production of the exhibition and

---

<sup>332</sup> Letter from Catlin to Sarah Newmeyer, May 29, 1941, p. 2. NARA, RG 229, Box 1209.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid.

<sup>335</sup> Ibid.



circulation was only compounded by the fact that Morley's arrangements were only verbal and she had not received any formal signed agreements when she cut her duties short to return to her job in San Francisco.

## **CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

With Catlin solving basic presentation problems in Mexico, Elodie Courter, Director of MoMA's Circulating Exhibitions was taking a look at Morley's initial negotiations and arrangements in South America. She soon realized that the circulation of the exhibition was more complicated than initially thought with cultural nuances in the way of conducting business and losses in translation.<sup>336</sup> About this Courter commented: "After all, we had to jumb [sic] into something we knew nothing about and it does take time to get one's fingers on various things that have happened as well as to organize things so that they may run smoothly from now on."<sup>337</sup> Courter happily noted the hiring of Olive Lyford to handle the traveling exhibitions. A veteran in arts administration, she had worked with Edgar Cahill in managing exhibitions for the WPA New York Project and had been head of the Arts and Interests Bureau of the Junior League and was already on the job on June 6, 1941.<sup>338</sup>

---

<sup>336</sup> This despite MoMA's recent hiring of Luís de Zulueta, Jr., as adviser for translation and communication.

<sup>337</sup> Letter from Elodie Courter to Stanton L. Catlin. June 3, 1941. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>338</sup> Letter from Olive Lyford to Catlin, June 6, 1941. Copy. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1209, Folder: Latin American Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting \$50,100; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD. Lyford was one of the key actors in the Art Section well into 1944.

Critical to the success of the defense goals of the OCCCRBAR were the processes of circulation and consumption of the exhibition. And for this, a controlled message was necessary. Although Morley initially had verbally negotiated the publicity for the South American venues with the stipulation that it be in the hands of each venue, by May 1941 it had changed. Now MoMA was in charge of producing it following its standard exhibition practice of publicity package of press release material with background information and mat photographs of artworks (a posterboard matrix of a photograph for newspapers widely used by the press in South America). In addition, MoMA was now required to write text in English with Spanish and Portuguese translations for articles to appear in local media outlets to secure wide coverage by the local press and a large attendance by the local public during the duration of the exhibition.

This practice, however, was not seen with good eyes by the museum. In fact, Sarah Newmeyer, MoMA's Director of Publicity felt instead that each venue should get actively involved with the local publicity to avoid what she called a "damnyankee interference...[or] even the appearance of."<sup>339</sup> Newmeyer further clarified that "this is the reason which has put the matter in the hands of a private museum rather than in the hands of a government agency."<sup>340</sup> Catlin in agreement, stated: "the further idea of purging the air of gringoism and government is first rate..."<sup>341</sup> This correspondence exchange pointed to the very defense nature of the OCCCRBAR and

---

<sup>339</sup> Letter from Sarah Newmeyer to Stanton L. Catlin. May 28, 1941. NARA RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid.

<sup>341</sup> Letter from Stanton L. Catlin to Sarah Newmeyer. May 29, 1941. NARA RG229, Box 1209.

the desire of Rockefeller for the office to keep a low profile in order to achieve its goals and objectives. With the exhibition originating in the consortium of museums rather than in the State itself, the plan was to increase its cultural value and sincerity in these exchanges by attracting the specific audience it sought to influence in their attitudes towards the United States. Without the support of the museum in the publicity, the exhibition would suffer from lack of media coverage. But as Newmeyer indicated, having the articles and publicity done by local media secured a deeper engagement and ownership of the OCCCRBAR message adapted to local consumption and a better measure of reception and public opinion.

With tailored press releases for each of the three South American coast tour segments, the one for the North Coast boasted that five major museums in the U.S. were sending exhibitions to Central and South America. In a carefully written text, as not to reveal the origins of the exhibition in an office that in fact was subordinate to the Council of National Defense, MoMA extolled South America as an idyllic locale in the minds and imaginings of a U.S. public for its adventure, love, beauty, and an old and gracious civilization. Positioning exhibitions as a didactic means to learn about countries and its people (only after travel and radio & film), the press release highlighted the many past exhibitions from South America shown in the United States. Despite listing examples from Mexico only, it was trying to present a positive spin in a geographical area that had little U.S. presence and influence.<sup>342</sup> The press

---

<sup>342</sup> The conflation of Mexico with South America was not limited to the naming of exhibitions but also was done in the biography of the experts such as George C. Vaillant's, whose official title at the

release cleverly stated that it was now the turn for the United States to reciprocate with these exhibitions visits.

With the support of the five major museums in New York—The American Museum of Natural History, the Brooklyn Museum, the Metropolitan Museum, MoMA and the Whitney Museum of American Art—the exhibition of Contemporary North American Art, despite not including works from Canada, appropriated this North to visit the South in what could be considered a shift of a West-East paradigm to a new hemispheric one given the emergency conditions and a soon to be global war looming large. Highlighting the artworks from each museum and also providing background information, the text of the prepared press release served as a letter of presentation for this visit.

Shrewdly playing with the great interest in South America at the time in Bauhaus architecture and its principles of design, the press release noted MoMA's 1939 new building as a marble and glass building with its simple design lines so modern in its construction and its function, that it echoed the modern industrial design aesthetic maxims of "form follows function" and "die form ohne ornament." It not only positioned itself as the second best known museum in the Americas, after the Metropolitan Museum, but also elaborated on its education mission to show through its own permanent collection and its exhibition program the different aspects of modern art. Complementing this mission, was its publications program

---

Museum of Natural History in New York was Associate Curator for Mexican Archaeology. He was presented as an expert in Mexico and South American archaeology.

and what it said to be its unique methods of display of artworks including painting, sculpture, architecture, photography and industrial design related to modern life. Supporting the interests of John H. Whitney and the Office's Motion Picture Section, the press release further emphasized MoMA's uniqueness as the only museum in the world collecting films as a visual art. In addition, it noted its successful exhibition circulation program in the United States and Canada.<sup>343</sup>

The circulation of the three exhibitions in South America was in fact a new model for MoMA. Although it had sent to Paris the *Trois siècles d'art aux États Unis* exhibition in May-July 1938<sup>344</sup> in an established trans-Atlantic exhibition exchange route, this was different. It was producing in less than six months three exhibitions to venues in eight countries in South America where MoMA had not exhibited before. In this new geographical space in which the museum was about to blaze an exhibition circuit, its very own contacts were limited at best and non-existent at worst. Added to this, were the evolving European conflict and expanding war, and the fact that commercial passenger and cargo steamships to South America were not maintaining regular schedules anymore. In fact, sailings were being cancelled or rescheduled at the last minute. A serious concern for steamship companies was the possible requisition of boats from U.S. shipping lines to the war effort at a moment's notice.

---

<sup>343</sup> "Cinco grandes museos norteamericanos envían exposiciones a la América Central y a la América del Sur." Press Release, n.d.. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1213; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>344</sup> Musée Nationaux, France. *Trois Siècles d'Art Aux États-Unis*. Exposition Organisée en collaboration avec le museum of modern art, New-York. Musée du Jeu de Paume, Paris, Mai-Juillet 1938.

As a project that had a short period for preparation, it was becoming close to full implementation more of an improvisation with constant changes and contract adjustments and revisions. In fact, Courter noted, "This had been a very hectic period because neither posters nor catalog were ready according to schedule and new arrangements are made literally every 15 minutes, requiring changes in export forms, instructions to Byrnes, catalog binders, etc. I haven't been able to do any of my own work for over a week and I am afraid the schedules of circulating exhibitions are going to suffer. Still for the sake of cultural relations, I am happy to help at all."<sup>345</sup> Indeed, it was an understaffed team for such a project.

Given the challenging transfer arrangements of the exhibitions from port of entry to exhibition venue in each country with consular forms and copies and the need for the OCCCRBAR to have a better way to gather information on the social and political milieu, Abbott made the decision in early June of 1941 to extend contracts to additional multilingual (French and Spanish) experts to accompany the exhibitions<sup>346</sup> based on a recommendation by Morley in her preliminary report of her January-March 1941 venue negotiating trip. For the East Coast circuit which included Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil the OCCCRBAR hired Caroline Durieux on June 2, 1941 under contract NDCar-70 for a total of \$7,600 to accompany the exhibition for about six months and to conduct a field trip and survey and to

---

<sup>345</sup> Letter from Elodie Courter to Stanton Catlin, unsigned, June 3, 1941. Copy. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1213, Records Concerning Exhibitions and Related Projects, Folder: Exhibitions. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>346</sup> In a letter dated June 13, 1941, Abbott informed Augusto de la Rocha of Argentina about the change in representative thus introducing Caroline Durieux instead of Catlin.

requiring that she “develop new opportunities for art interchanges between the United States and such countries, and to report to the Coordinator upon art projects already in progress in those countries.”<sup>347</sup> Included in Durieux’s contract was \$1,500 for entertainment of art officials and personalities.<sup>348</sup> Likewise for the North Coast circuit that included Colombia and Venezuela and on the exhibition’s return to New York a stop in Cuba to coincide with the Inter-American Conference on Intellectual Cooperation, Lewis Riley III was hired on July 3, 1941 under contract NDCar-96 for a total of \$4,200 to accompany the exhibition and to “assist in setting up the Fine Arts Exhibition...and to watch closely the reception and influence of that exhibition,”<sup>349</sup> with similar duties as Durieux’s. Catlin was notified that his itinerary as the sole representative accompanying the exhibitions was now limited to the West Coast of South America. Given his logistics experience in Mexico with a preliminary showing, this was more of a welcome relief for him.<sup>350</sup>

Also In the middle of June 1941, when the shipment of artwork to the East Coast had already arrived in Argentina for an opening on July 3, 1941, and to the

---

<sup>347</sup> Stipulations in Contract NDCar-70 indicate that Durieux job was to “watch closely the reception and influence of the Fine Arts Exhibition...seek new opportunities for art interchanges between the United States and the East Coast Republics, and in particular search out that type of project which might be carried out locally in South America with some financial assistance from us.” Project Authorization. “Durieux Trip to East Coast of South America.” Cultural Relations-Art T 128. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1217, Folder: Contracts and Project Authorizations; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<sup>348</sup> Authorization for Amendment of contract NDCar-70. November 27, 1941. NARA, RG 229, Box 1217, Folder ‘Contracts and Project Authorizations.’

<sup>349</sup> NDCar-96. Riley Trip to Colombia, Venezuela and Cuba. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1217. Folder: Contracts and Project Authorizations.

<sup>350</sup> However, he was scheduled to travel to Colombia, a North Coast venue, via Panagra for the opening in Bogota before going to Quito and Lima to finalize arrangements and contracts for the exhibition and then on to Santiago where the exhibition would be opened on September 1, 1941.

North Coast on its way to Colombia for an opening on July 19, 1941<sup>351</sup> Rockefeller instructed Abbott to ask the curators of the exhibitions to revise the list of paintings and watercolors and to reduce the total number of artworks being sent to South America from four hundred to three hundred. His rationale was none other than to send the “most outstanding works of prominent artists.”<sup>352</sup> This revision in the language and numbers of the National Council of Defense’s contract ordered by Rockefeller as Coordinator not only solved the problem of mixed quality by withdrawing the least successful artworks, but meant as well a much-needed reduction in an insurance valuation of privately loaned artworks that had far exceeded the approved contract budget for insurance.<sup>353</sup>

Indeed this circuit that the exhibition was establishing for new cultural flows was a complex one. A wide variety of actors in a nascent network in the U.S. State-MoMA contract came to include Budworth and Company for packing and crating of the exhibition; W.J. Byrnes and Co., as the shipping agent in New York for the exhibition with corresponding shipping agents in the South American ports of Buenaventura, La Guaira, Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro, Valparaiso, El Callao and Guayaquil; Grant Warren Co. as the designer and printer of the exhibition poster; J.F. Tapley Co. as the binder of the exhibition catalogs; Grace Line Company as the cargo company in whose steamships the West and North Coast exhibition

---

<sup>351</sup> Artwork to Colombia sailed on June 6 to the Pacific Coast Port of Buenaventura, via the SS Santa Elena of Grace Line, a passenger and cargo ocean liner serving the East and West Coasts of the United States and the West coast of South American through the Caribbean and the Panama Canal.

<sup>352</sup> Letter from Nelson Rockefeller to John E. Abbott. June 16, 1941. Copy. NARA RG 229, Box 1209.

<sup>353</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Ione Ulrich. July 4, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.



would travel; Moore-McCormack Lines as the cargo steamship company serving the East Coast; and Panagra (Pan American-Grace Company Airlines) in whose airplanes staff would travel.

With a tour and venues that were finalized close to opening dates, it included stops in eight capital cities relatively close or with good access to coastal areas: Buenos Aires scheduled to open on July 3, Bogotá opening on July 19, Montevideo opening on August 22, Santiago opening on September 1, Caracas opening on September 20, Rio de Janeiro opening on October 15,<sup>354</sup> Lima on November 4 followed closely by the opening in Quito on November 10, 1941. The North Coast circuit included a stop in the port of Havana with an opening on November 15 coinciding with the Inter-American Conference on International Intellectual Cooperation Committees sponsored by the Pan American Union<sup>355</sup> (APPENDIX A).

The processes of circulation and consumption point to the establishment of new routes and circuits for U.S. culture where none existed. South America was a region in which a U.S. presence was not large or noticeable. The exhibition was accomplishing the task of establishing new circuits while creating new networks with actors, firms, museums, artists in South America. At the same time the OCCCRBAR and MoMA were facing the cultural difference of business practices in museums in South America where the publicity model was more subdued. At odds was the challenge of leaving the publicity at the hands of each venue and risk not

---

<sup>354</sup> Rio de Janeiro was the capital of Brazil until 1960 when it was relocated to the newly-built city of Brasília.

<sup>355</sup> The exhibition in Havana was held at the Salón de los Pasos Perdidos del Capitolio Nacional coinciding with an exhibition of Cuban Contemporary Art.

being promoted at all. As follows below a view at each venue demonstrate the different approaches and solutions to what seem to be a challenging situation with the presence of the State through embassies and legations at odd with the original intent.

### **THE EAST COAST EXHIBITION: ARGENTINA CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

With the first venue exhibition in Buenos Aires, *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* opened at the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes on July 3, 1941 (APPENDIX B). MoMA had engaged the services of W. J. Byrnes & Co. of New York to ship to Buenos Aires and consign to the Museo ten boxes of oil paintings and four boxes of watercolors which comprised what ultimately became A and B selections for the East Coast of South America with an insurance valuation of \$162,380.32. Shipped from New York Harbor in the S.S. Uruguay of Moore-MacCormack Line, the steamship sailed on May 24 arriving in Buenos Aires on June 11/12, 1941.<sup>356</sup> A separate shipment of 550 posters and 4,950 copies of the exhibition catalog went on June 6 on the S.S. Argentina of the Moore-McCormack Lines, which operated passenger and cargo ocean liners between New York and the East Coast of South America including Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay.<sup>357</sup>

As expected, not aware of the true defense nature of the OCCCRBAR sponsored exhibition, Argentina had gone out of the regular MoMA negotiating channels and had requested the U.S. Department of State to make it an official U.S. State

---

<sup>356</sup> Bill of Lading, Museum of Modern Art. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Exhibitions.

<sup>357</sup> MoMA Letter to Flannagan, June 3, 1941. NARA, RG 229, Box 1213.

presentation rather than one by the Committee on Museums. This model followed established protocols for foreign exhibitions. In this manner, the exhibition of one hundred and twenty-five oil paintings and watercolors acquired an official identity and thus was measured by a government standard that represented the U.S. state and nation. Instructions from the Department of State had been sent to the Embassy in Argentina on May 16, 1941 (File No. 810.42711 Art/245). Ambassador Norman Armour reported about the exhibition and arrangements: Fourteen boxes containing oil paintings and watercolors arrived in Buenos Aires on June 10 and were taken to the Museum of Fine Arts where customs were done on site as the museum was a de facto customs warehouse. In fact, as an official exhibition the Argentine government had granted free entry. Boxes were opened in the presence of the Director of the museum, the secretary, a customs inspector and an officer from the Embassy, and unpacked by a professional staff from the museum.<sup>358</sup>

The opening on July 3, 1941, by invitation-only brought about 1,850 guests among them the Acting President, ministers, the President of the Fine Arts Commission and prominent politicians and citizens. In his speech, S. Pinkney Tuck, Chargé d'Affairs of the U.S. Embassy, highlighted qualities of common admiration and respect that both united and brought together nations. Framing the exhibition as an act of friendship and reciprocity, Pinkney highlighted the well-received Argentinean Art sample in the World's Fair in San Francisco and New York.

---

<sup>358</sup> Norman Armour, Mail Instruction No. 1016 of July 25 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

Recently presented at the Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond to very positive reviews, Pinkney added that it was now the turn of U.S. art to be judged by Argentinean eyes.

In the twenty-four days that the exhibition was on view in Buenos Aires approximately 20,285 people visited it. As part of its public programs were three lectures in Spanish by René d'Harnoncourt, traveling at the time in South America for another CI-AA project to identify handicrafts centers,<sup>359</sup> Professor John Erskine, Cupertino del Campo as well as a gallery talk by Caroline Durieux. But if the OCCCRBAR thought to encounter an easy and receptive public eager to learn about the United States culture and art, it was in for a big surprise. In the consumption of the exhibition in Argentina, supposedly curated in accordance with an Argentinean taste in fine arts, audiences raised a series of general questions about format and content. In a country with large German and Italian demographic elements in its population and a strong European and French cultural influence, the exhibition was seen critically by the press as a "back-to-the homeland" agglomeration of national trends that did not respond to current modernist aesthetic positions and investigations. Critics versed in a European modernist art vocabulary found the "back-to the homeland" identity not a sign of artistic freedom, as intended, but rather a sign of artistic backwardness. At the same time, the absence of Grant

---

<sup>359</sup> René d'Harnoncourt in fact had recommended Caroline Durieux as one of the persons to accompany the exhibition. D'Harnoncourt was at the time the General Manager of the Indian Arts & Crafts Board of the Department of the Interior and was conducting a study on opportunities for local arts and crafts project for the OCCCRBAR under contract PNDCar-23. His itinerary in South America included visits in Buenos Aires, Santiago, Lima, Guatemala, and Mexico City from June 18 to July 25. "Itinerary of Mr. D'Harnoncourt." NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

Wood's artworks on display was lamented among the various shown (APPENDIX B).

The Argentine public also found the organization of the exhibition disappointing as they were indeed expecting a contemporary exhibition of current trends, as the name of Contemporary North American Art implied, and not a survey retrospective exhibition of the last fifty years of U.S. artistic production. Quality of execution and technique was a non-issue. However it was not until Erksine's lecture on the 1930s American Scene, that the audience was more willing to understand and more receptive to the genres and styles presented.

Not helping either in the appreciation of the exhibition were the design and layout of promotional materials. Aware of the cultural subtleties gained through her many years living in Mexico as an artist and as a wife of a General Motors Executive, Durieux had urged MoMA to revise promotional materials and delete the word 'learn' or any of its synonyms as "the Latin American reacts negatively to 'learning' from us." Foreboding a poor reception she had emphasized the seriousness of the situation in Argentina by exclaiming, "[t]o say that we are walking on eggs with this project is to put it mildly."<sup>360</sup> Durieux, as the person accompanying the exhibition, was doing her best communicating in French and Spanish with Argentinean elites and explaining the art at every opportunity she had even engaging the public in the galleries where it was being shown. As part of her contract, she was observing attitudes and reception hence her comments on the cultural difficulties

---

<sup>360</sup> Caroline Durieux. 'Report on Buenos Aires.' July 19, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

encountered.

The poster for the exhibition produced by Grant Warren Co., as Durieux put it, created a grave problem due to the symbolism of a design that mimicked a U.S. flag. The very idea of placing posters, or for that matter planting the symbolic U.S. flag as a form of neo-colonization in a German, French and Spanish diasporic commercial houses frequented by the very public it intended to reach, proved to be an impossible act.<sup>361</sup> In fact, Da Rocha who was in charge of local arrangements was only able to place 150 out of 500 posters. Despite all the cultural sensitivity and tailoring of the exhibition and its promotional materials to local taste and “intellectual predilections” the fact was that OCCCRBAR had failed to take into account the local context with direct implications on the very basic promotion of the exhibition. In view of the fact that this was an official exhibition sponsored in its presentation by the U.S. state and the Argentine state, the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes took matters into its own hands and produced a new plain poster design (without flag elements) and in addition printed 5000 billboard posters that were placed all around the city.

If the poster was problematic, the catalog of the exhibition produced by MoMA and printed by J. F. Tapley Co. in New York was close to a total disaster due to uncoordinated logistics and layout design. Arriving in Buenos Aires in a separate cargo ship on June 5, a load of 4,500 free catalogs plus an additional 5,000 copies the

---

<sup>361</sup> Ibid, July 19, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

Argentinean government specially requested had sat in the docks under 5,000 sacs of coffee delaying its delivery to the museum for over a month. When they were finally delivered to the museum on July 12, the exhibition had been opened to the public for nine days. Although catalogs were provided by the OCCCRBAR free of charge, they were sold locally and revenues were used to underwrite local costs. As Durieux reported, by July 18 only forty-seven out of the ten thousand had sold for \$1 each. The more than disappointing sales were attributed diplomatically to the delay of shipping by Argentinean authorities.

However, more than the cargo delay at the docks, was the overall dislike of the catalog organization, design and layout. As Durieux reported, “criticism of our catalog is wide spread. It is felt here to be confused and illogical since it reproduces pictures not found in the show here. The average Argentine as well as the intellectual does not like it. They say that the cover reproduces a picture which is not in the show and it is not contemporary—that the cover design looks like an advertisement.”<sup>362</sup> With a single catalog for three different exhibitions and audiences, its reception was bound to be problematic. In fact, the Committee on Museums had been careful in the choice of words and not only had it designated as a book, but also in the Spanish translation used a particular continental colonial Spanish formal subject of “*vosotros*” “*vuestro*,” in its foreword as a sincere yet distinct message from the Art Committee (Abbott, Barr Jr., Force, Roberts, Taylor

---

<sup>362</sup> Caroline Durieux. ‘Report on Buenos Aires.’ July 19, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

and Vaillant) that maybe speaks more to the person translating it (Luis de Zulueta) than to the actual formal use of language in Argentina. The poor reception of the catalog led Durieux to recommend that the 9,100 + copies be sent on to the next venue in Montevideo and be given away.

In addition to the issues of the design layout of the catalog, audiences also found that the few images the catalog included followed an alphabetical arrangement by artist, some of which of course were not in the Buenos Aires exhibition, which made it “impracticable to coordinate...with the local system of numbering works of art.”<sup>363</sup> As an official U.S.-Argentina state exhibition, the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes once again, after the poster U.S. flag design, took it upon itself to solve the issue by publishing a simple checklist catalog of artworks exhibited.<sup>364</sup>

With a country population of 2,364,263 in 1941, the Argentinean presentation in Buenos Aires had a total attendance of 20,285 people when it closed on July 31, 1941. As part of the defense goals of OCCCRBAR, by now in a new structure no longer under the National Council of Defense but instead as part of Roosevelt’s Office for Emergency Management and boasting the new name of Office of Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (hereafter CI-AA), conversations for possible future projects were conducted by Durieux. In fact, the foreword of the catalog made it clear that this was the first in a series of exhibitions that would be

---

<sup>363</sup> “Exhibition of Contemporary United States Painting.” Report by Norman Armour to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, August 8, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

<sup>364</sup> Embassy Dispatch No. 2906, August 8, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.



shown in the “New World.” More than a manifestation of Inter-American friendship, it was a sincere message to show U.S. contemporary life and thought and the way it was addressing the immense social, intellectual and economic problems facing the world. For mutual understanding, in turn, according to the foreword, a true exchange of art would show the U.S. population the thought and feelings of South American nations. Therefore, the museums and galleries of the U.S., in the name of the state, invited its sister republics to send art exhibitions.<sup>365</sup>

Soon enough, Argentina took the offer at face value and Durieux was approached by Senator Antonio Santa Marina, also President of the Comisión Nacional de Bellas Artes. He wanted to inquire about a reciprocal exchange of Contemporary Argentine Art to be organized by the commission under the same perceived principles of what was seen as “cultural diplomacy” with Argentine produced catalogs, posters, photographs, publicity packet and representative and to be shown at no less than MoMA.

Dutifully Durieux directed the request to Abbott, both as the OCCCRBAR chairman of the art section and Executive Vice President of MoMA. In her letter, Durieux recommended the exhibition on the basis of “national pride.” Based on what she had seen during her visits to museums, private collections and artists’ studios an exhibition would be possible. The caveat, however, was that only a careful selection would make a good show. As a courtesy, Abbott wrote to Santa

---

<sup>365</sup> Preliminar. *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1941: 5.

Marina on July 29, 1941 stating the next logical step for a true exchange would be to present an exhibition of Argentine art in the United States. In a polite, yet noncommittal response, Abbot made the point that there was already an exhibition of Argentine paintings on tour in the U.S. at the moment that had originated as the Argentina exhibition of the 1939-1940 World Fair in New York traveling to a number of cities. Abbott added, "I believe that another exhibition of art would be received with great interest."<sup>366</sup> He asked for Santa Marina's views and possible materials to be shown but made the point that this was for the time being just a tentative plan. Unbeknownst to Santa Marina was that despite all the official rhetoric of exchange, unity, and understanding this was part of a cultural and commercial relations security program seeking to make inroads in a totalitarian sympathizing-country rather than a cultural diplomatic gesture.

Although seen as a collaboration between two states, the reality was that Santamarina himself had not been initially interested in the exhibition. But after seeing it and learning more through the lectures by D'Harnoncourt, John Erskine, Cupertino del Campo and gallery talks by Durieux, he had come to feel that Argentinean artists should be encouraged to develop their own style and expression in art. Santamarina reportedly realized "that it had a truly important quality in that it expressed the character of the United States."<sup>367</sup> In a report from the Embassy, it

---

<sup>366</sup> Letter from John E. Abbott to Antonio Santa Marina. July 29, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

<sup>367</sup> "Exhibition of Contemporary United States Painting." Report by Norman Armour to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, August 8, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

was noted “ because of the exhibition he now feels that he would like to encourage the artists of Argentina to develop their own expressions of art and not to look toward Europe for inspiration anymore.”<sup>368</sup>

Despite Abbott’s polite response regarding plans for a future exhibition of Argentinean art in the U.S. as something just tentative, arrangements for such an exhibition in New York were being contemplated and investigated. What the OCCCRBAR was interested in at the time was local projects in Argentina that could be developed with the office’s support rather than exchange exhibitions. For the purposes of the U.S. instead the OCCCRBAR was willing to spend a modest sum from monies from the 1942 appropriation and have Durieux purchase artworks, ship them to the U.S. to be presented as gifts from the U.S. State to U.S. museums<sup>369</sup> in spite of Benton’s early objection in December 1940 that the state should not be purchasing artworks or passing aesthetic judgment.

The Argentina reception of the poster, catalog and exhibition indeed called attention to larger issues of cultural perception and difference. That the art in the exhibition was understood only once the context where it had been produced was revealed and explained, points to the lack of knowledge about U.S. life and culture. The need for public lectures and gallery talks for general audiences to decode the art and the values imbued in it points to the very attitudes the OCCCRBAR was trying to

---

<sup>368</sup> Exhibition of Contemporary United States Painting.” Report by Norman Armour to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, August 8, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Argentina.

<sup>369</sup> Project Authorization. “Durieux Trip to East Coast of South America.” Copy. NARA, RG 229, Box 1217, Folder: Contracts and Project Authorizations.

change and influence. However, if there was a point to measure success was the interest of Santamarina in an Argentinean art that expressed local values and his support for artists to exhibit in New York.

### **URUGUAY CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

After a challenging presentation in Buenos Aires, the East Coast Exhibition went next to Montevideo, a city-port with a population of 682,644. Durieux had traveled to Uruguay while in Buenos Aires in mid-June 1941 to finalize negotiations for the exhibition with Raúl Montero Bustamante, President of the Commission of Fine Arts. Scheduled for August 22 to September 22, 1941, the exhibition was presented in the large salons of the Teatro Solís where international exhibition and the annual Uruguay Art Salon were usually held. Due to the lack of museum staff, it was agreed that Durieux would be present for the unpacking and subsequent packing of the exhibition, which would be done by people assigned by the Commission.

Given the situation with the catalog in Buenos Aires, Durieux convinced Montero Bustamante to print a new catalog for the Montevideo presentation while reasoning that “this is essential as no one here understands our catalog.”<sup>370</sup> However, with thousands of copies left over from Buenos Aires and given the severe criticism it had attained, Durieux cleverly changed the identity of the exhibition

---

<sup>370</sup> “Caroline Durieux report on Montevideo, June 19, 1941.” Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1214.

catalog to “a book of Art from North America sent this year to South America,”<sup>371</sup> thus improving its chances in a wider circulation and distribution and altering the way that it would be consumed, as a handbook and not an art catalog, by Uruguayans.<sup>372</sup>

The reception of the exhibition in Montevideo differed considerably from that in Buenos Aires. For one, Uruguay did not present an official request to the United States to be an official co-sponsored exhibition. Instead, it was organized and sponsored by the Comisión de Bellas Artes (Commission of Fine Arts), rather than the Museo de Bellas Artes, which wanted nothing to do with it. This action secured the involvement of artists and a large attendance of 18,581 for a much smaller country. This was, what the U.S. Embassy characterized as, a cultivated audience of “discriminating taste and the leaders in local art circles.”<sup>373</sup>

Better coordinated than Buenos Aires, the Montevideo showing had a successful *vernissage* two days prior to the opening with a much friendlier press that covered the exhibition extensively in newspapers such as El Bien Público, the Sun and El Debate. The opening reception at the wing of the Teatro Solís that housed the salon of the National Fine Arts Commission, included about five hundred invited guests among them President Baldomir, ministers and the diplomatic corps.

---

<sup>371</sup> “Caroline Durieux’s Suggestions for the Exhibition in Rio.” July 19, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1214.

<sup>372</sup> In fact, the U.S. Embassy had to assist the Commission to clear customs for the 8,000 catalogs which were distributed among all guests at the *vernissage* and opening reception and the rest put for sale at .50 pesos to defray cost of exhibition.

<sup>373</sup> William Dawson, Diplomatic Dispatch No. 176. Embassy of the United States of America, Montevideo, Uruguay. September 25, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214,

But more importantly was the talk series organized by the Comisión, which Durieux inaugurated on September 1, 1941 with an introduction to U.S. contemporary art. After Durieux local art personalities followed with a program that included Joaquín Torres-García on September 5 with a talk about an evaluation of the art he had seen when he lived in New York in 1920-1922 and what he was seeing now twenty years later; the sculptor José Luis Zorilla de San Martín on September 12 who talked about the art movement in U.S. colleges and universities like Princeton; and the architect Raúl Lerena Acevedo on September 17. Concurrent with these, the Commission of Art and Popular Culture also offered a lecture by Manuel Barraza at the University of Montevideo on “The Historical Evolution of North American Painting.”

The talk series plus the availability of Durieux in the galleries at Teatro Solís fueled and maintained a contemporary art discourse, which not only explored U.S. artistic developments but questioned the very state of contemporary Uruguayan art at the moment. Overlapping the showing for a few days was the exhibition of 19<sup>th</sup> century artist Juan Manuel Blanes in the central auditorium of the Teatro.<sup>374</sup> Durieux noted, “the younger painters of Uruguay have been especially impressed by the exhibit, the modern character of which was in sharp contrast to that of the officially-sponsored, nineteenth-century exhibition of Blanes held just before.”<sup>375</sup> Montevideo artists were thrilled to have the contemporary exhibition as it facilitated re-entering the art discourse prior to the 1941 Salon presentation scheduled for October 1941.

---

<sup>374</sup> The Blanes exhibition closed on August 25, 1941.

<sup>375</sup> Mentioned in William Dawson, Diplomatic Dispatch No. 176. Embassy of the United States of America, Montevideo, Uruguay. September 25, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214, p. 4.

This contraposition indeed stayed the course of the contemporary art conversation thus providing a new momentum for living artists and contemporary art in Uruguay. Indeed the exhibition posed new questions about the art of the new world in the vein that Torres-Garcia and his followers were exploring at the moment: an art of the new world with local cultural inspiration.

In fact, Torres-García's talk was significant given his close knowledge of the art scene in New York in the early 1920s of which he was part. In his evaluation of the exhibition, however, he noted a wide range of quality of the works on display wondering if stricter criteria would have yielded better results. But at the same time he conceded in his reading, his awareness of the purpose of the exhibition to present a wide range of U.S. artists and artworks. What he was seeing in 1941 in the art of contemporary artists was a better grasp of artistic values, a wider field of vision, and more daring exploration of what he termed a hyper-realism influenced by depictions of U.S. city and the countryside life. Torres-García noted a new vision and visual structure in the very particular depiction of an industrial society reflecting contemporary life in the U.S. To him, this was indeed the path toward the realization of an American art, an art of the new world free of European influences and reflecting the artists' own vision of their own world. In his talk, Torres-García highlighted works by Gifford Beals (*The Spotlight*), William Glackens (*Drive, Central Park*), Jack Levine (*The Syndicate*), Nicolai Cikovsky (*Pine Trees*), George Grosz (*Punishment*), Edward Hopper (*Night Window*, *The Mansard Roof*), Paul Starrett Sample (*Whitcomb's Mill*), Georges Schreiber (*Second Balcony*), Max Weber

(Chinese Restaurant), John Kane (Prosperity's Increase) and Alexandre Hogue (Drought Stricken Area); landscapes by Charles Burchfield (November Evening, February Thaw, Six O'clock), Glenn O. Coleman (Downtown Street), Francis Criss (Astor Place), Arshile Gorky (Argula); and industrial scenes by Edmund Lewandowski (Ventilators and Water Tanks), Charles Demuth (August Lilies, My Egypt), Charles Sheeler (County Barn), and Niles Spencer (Near Ave.).

To Torres-García this art sample indeed reflected a new race of men in the new world where a new continental art rising from the bottom up was yet to be achieved. Needed was an organization of artists in all arts to create a new culture for the new world influencing the economy and creating a equilibrium between art and ideas and the world of industry and economics. Torres-García saw these relationships and connections already present in the U.S. exhibition with the freedom for creativity and the support of the State as part of Roosevelt's New Deal plan. For him the idea for a continental art was to go back to prehistory and build, with what was essential to art, a universal intellectualism with a complete order with roots, a world system, and a metaphysic spiritual unification of America.

The wide press coverage and the additional catalogs taken from Buenos Aires to Montevideo helped to increase the interest in the exhibition. Books left unsold after the exhibition closed were distributed to artists, writers, elementary school children and college students.<sup>376</sup> In addition, the fifty books (APPENDIX C) that

---

<sup>376</sup> Raúl Montero Bustamante et al. letter to John E. Abbott. October 17, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214. Folder: Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects. Exhibitions: Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.



were shown at the exhibition were presented to the Alianza Cultural Uruguay-  
Estados Unidos de Norte América. Durieux indeed made inroads in the art scene in  
Uruguay visiting art studios, artists, and museums. Adding local prestige to the  
United States, Durieux was invited to give additional lectures at Amigos del Arte and  
Escuela de Declamación.

After the exhibition closed, U.S. Ambassador William Dawson declared it to  
be “a most successful showing.”<sup>377</sup> In agreement as a great success were the CI-AA  
Art Section and Lyford recounted to Catlin, “the artists were crazy about the show as  
it helped to put them back on the map after, to them, the annoying spectacle of the  
Blanes exhibition which had been very popular.”<sup>378</sup> Indeed, since their annual salon  
was to open right after the exhibition, they were able to enjoy months of a  
contemporary art limelight. To support the artists, Durieux was recommending gifts  
such as projectors, screens, slides, exchange of publications, which the Art Section  
was trying to fulfill.<sup>379</sup> With Durieux present, the exhibition was repacked and put  
on board the Steamship Almirante Jacequay of Lloyd Brasileiro Line on October 10,  
1941 on its way to a ten-day sailing from Montevideo to Rio de Janeiro.

If reception issues were challenging in Buenos Aires, the proactive stand by  
Durieux in Montevideo with her suggestions to make the catalog a book and the  
offering of a lecture series indeed made a difference. Also making a difference was

---

<sup>377</sup> William Dawson. Diplomatic Dispatch No. 176. Embassy of the United States of America,  
Montevideo, Uruguay. September 25, 1941. Pp. 1-6. NARA, RG229, Box 1214, Folder: Records  
Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects. Exhibitions: Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.

<sup>378</sup> Letter from Olive Lyford to Stanton Catlin. October 27, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>379</sup> Ibid. Letter from Olive Lyford to Stanton Catlin. October 27, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box  
1209.

the presence of Torres-García and his valuable assessment of the art of the United States as he had experienced it in the early 1920s compared to what he was seeing in 1941. The exhibition did have an impact on a younger generation of artists who in the 1941 Official Salon exhibited works that began to draw from local Uruguayan sources.

### **BRAZIL CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

With Brazil as one of the target countries of the OCCCRBAR cultural defense offensive, the exhibition of *Pintura Americana Contemporânea* opened in Rio de Janeiro, one of the largest cities in the hemisphere and with a non-Spanish speaking population of 1,711,466 on November 8, 1941 as the last venue in the East Coast Exhibition circuit. Although Morley visited Brazil in April of 1941, she never met with the director of the Museu Nacional de Belas Artes, Oswaldo Teixeira, an academic painter, whose venue she identified as the appropriate one for the exhibition. However, Morley did approach him by letters that were never received by him. Instead, it was d'Harnoncourt in his OCCCRBAR-sponsored survey in his June-July trip to South America who met with Teixeira after the East Coast exhibition was already at the beginning of the tour. He personally established the contact on behalf of the OCCCRBAR and negotiated the initial agreement with tentative dates for October 15 to November 15, which was followed up by a more formal contract by MoMA on July 17, when the exhibition was about to close in

Buenos Aires.<sup>380</sup>

Although Arriving in Rio on October 1, Caroline Durieux basically carried the brunt of the transportation from Montevideo and preparations for the Rio showing with a contract that was never signed. Facing her was the daunting task of the transfer of the works from Montevideo at a moment in which sailings were few and far between resulting in a delayed exhibition opening. With the experience in Buenos Aires and Montevideo, and given the perception of a similar level of consumption by a more cosmopolitan audience, Durieux convinced Teixeira and his museum to publish a checklist for Rio audiences that supplemented the Portuguese version of the unpopular catalog. The actual catalog was instead presented as a “book of the Art from North America sent this year to South America”<sup>381</sup> selling 1,000 copies. Given the experience with the flag elements in the promotional poster in Argentina, Durieux was concerned it would meet with the same rejection “on account of the German influence”<sup>382</sup> in the country. Unfortunately for Durieux, the U.S. Embassy had shown hesitance in fully supporting the exhibition and she was basically fending for herself. This lack of involvement, at least initially, translated into a lack of interest on the part of Brazilian government of Getúlio Vargas, thus placing it as a private initiative rather than a government or official exhibition. In fact, Brazil was the only venue of the East Coast Exhibition in which the president failed to attend, instead sending his military representative, Isaac Cuhna to the

---

<sup>380</sup> Caroline Durieux. “Rio de Janeiro.” July 17, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214.

<sup>381</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley Letter to Olive Lyford. Copy. July 5, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

<sup>382</sup> Caroline Durieux, suggestions for the exhibition in Rio. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

opening of the exhibition.

Support from the Museu de Belas Artes and Teixeira was not what it had been in other cities. Despite the exhibition's venue at a national museum, Durieux supervised the unpacking, hanging and packing of the exhibition with what she characterized as a group of "semi-professional janitors."<sup>383</sup> Despite the challenges, the exhibition opened on November 8 with a well-attended opening reception with artists, intellectuals, CI-AA local staff, embassy staff and a large press presence. Although Teixeira had indicated plans for a lecture series, they never materialized. Given the success in the previous venue in Montevideo, instead Durieux, put together improvised lectures in French and English. Delivering the first one, she then engaged Professor Robert Eskidge of the University of Hawaii, who was at the moment in Rio with the Instituto Brazil-Estados Unidos, to give a second lecture. A third lecture was given by Afrânio Peixoto, a member of the Academia Brasileira de Letras in which he pleaded for the academic and the modern art groups to settle their difference and end what was at the time an ongoing quarrel.

Along these lines was the split of the reception of the exhibition by Brazilian artists with one group thinking it was too modern and for another one not modern enough although both were interested in the national character of the exhibition showing contemporary life in the United States. About ten days before closing, Teixeira arranged an exhibition of conservative art of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century Brazilian painting of artists Pedro Americo and Victor Meireles which was taken by

---

<sup>383</sup> Report, 1942, p. 42.

Durieux as a sign to “offset the influence of our show.”<sup>384</sup> The exhibition closed one day after the Pearl Harbor Attack on December 8, 1941 without any kind of ceremony, as was customary in Brazil. If the Brazilian State and the U.S. Embassy had shown little interest, the Brazilian press did cover it extensively. U.S. expatriates and business representatives, given that this was part of a cultural and commercial relations defense program, likewise showed interest among them, as cited by Durieux, the manager of General Electric in Brazil Earl Givens, the representative of the Texas Oil Company Mr. Bentley and others.<sup>385</sup>

But if this reception was the official version, letters from Durieux from Rio de Janeiro showed a more complex scene, one fraught with challenges at every step of the exhibition presentation. Indeed, the art scene in Brazil was complicated with two competing foci of art activity in Rio and São Paulo. Rio as the seat of government and capital of the country fell under a direct state structure dependent on the Ministry of Education and Public Health. The Museum of Fine Arts shared the same building with the School of Fine Arts, a conservative school in a military regime, which organized the Annual Salon of art with one state-sponsored fellowship for study abroad as the grand prize, as well as others for local study, medals and other recognitions. In diametrical opposition was the São Paulo art scene which was more aesthetically experimental and dependent on a private sector and a nascent art market.

---

<sup>384</sup> Report, 1942, p. 42.

<sup>385</sup> Report, p. 44.

With a contract not finalized until July and the delay in the transportation from Montevideo to Rio, the possibility of a presentation of the exhibition in Sao Paulo were diminishing despite a great interest on the part of the Instituto at Sao Paulo in hosting the exhibition. But Durieux thought “to put on a kind of one-night stand in Sao Paulo even if it were possible, would be worse than nothing, after the big publicity here and the fact that Rio had the show for a month.”<sup>386</sup> The tricky situation and competing preferences of academic versus modern art at the Museu de Belas Artes, which directly reflected the views of its director Teixeira, had Durieux on her toes. With the 19<sup>th</sup> century conservative “counter-exhibition” on view (as Durieux came to call it) Teixeira played with the press and spectators to draw attention to a conservative view.

Fueling this sentiment, Gazeta de Noticias, a pro Nazi newspaper published a note extorting the values of the Americo and Meireles exhibition while criticizing the public lectures for the contemporary North American art exhibition such as the one given by Peixoto who was barely attended. The newspaper note pointed out that although Brazilians were interested in the U.S. and its art (“people now are more impressed than ever by the real prestige of the United States”<sup>387</sup>), they were not interested in modern art, “as our people do not accept ‘modernism.’ And they do not accept modernism because they are cultured and their taste is sure.”<sup>388</sup> Indeed,

---

<sup>386</sup> Letter from Caroline Duriex to Olive Lyford. November 24, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209, p. 2.

<sup>387</sup> “The Unpopularity of Modern Art.” Gazeta de Noticias, November 29, 1941. Typed and translated copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>388</sup> Ibid.

the commentary reflected the art conservatism of Rio de Janeiro at the moment of a military dictatorship busy building a nation and utilizing a usable past, albeit a colonial one. The position of the newspaper was that if the United States sent a historical exhibition of art of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century a broader audience would better receive it.

As director of the museum, Teixeira also tried to control the actual circulation of people by rearranging access to the gallery where the U.S. exhibition was being shown. To increase the flow to his “counter-exhibition,” he not only roped off one of the sides of the grand staircase that lead to the galleries where the U.S. Exhibition was, but placed the coat and umbrella stand next to the entrance of his exhibition. As Durieux explained it, “[t]his meant that the visitors did not have to pass the door into our galleries in order to see the other show and so could easily forget to look for it.”<sup>389</sup> Durieux told Teixeira in certain terms that this new placement could be taken as a discourtesy to the exhibition and, recapitulating, Teixeira ordered things remain as they were.

Not helping the case for the United States in Rio was also the position taken by artist Cândido Portinari, whose work had been acquired by Rockefeller and exhibited by MoMA in 1940. As the sole recipient of a traveling fellowship, Portinari had returned a bigger sensation to Brazil and claimed among his friends that U.S.

---

<sup>389</sup> Letter from Caroline Durieux to Olive Lyford. December 4, 1941. Typed copy of handwritten original. NARA, RG229, Box 209.

artists did not paint well.<sup>390</sup> Durieux also faced the interference of the U.S. Embassy, which only after seeing the success of the exhibition and Durieux's successful French lecture decided to support it. The cultural secretary of the Embassy offered a cocktail in which only a group of artists who supported modern art were invited and the more conservative art block, including the director of the museum and the minister of education, were left out. This event seen as an "official U.S. government" act only served to enrage conservatives. The head of the Art Committee of the Instituto was so enraged that she threatened to resign; others were so furious that Durieux spent a good amount of her time offering tea parties and cocktails. Durieux came to express her views by exclaiming "If we can close this show in Rio without any major cataclysm, it will be only by the grace of God,"<sup>391</sup> and a few days later "If we can close this exhibition and get those boxes out of that museum without a major catastrophe [sic], it will be a miracle because the under currents are pretty swift and strong."<sup>392</sup>

With the exhibition closing on December 8, the Museu de Belas Artes was impressed enough with U.S. contemporary art to request from Durieux an outline of the chronological history of U.S. painting since the colonial and revolutionary period, going through the young republic, genre painters of the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Hudson River School, Civil War period to modern art period and the

---

<sup>390</sup> Letter from Caroline Durieux to Olive Lyford. November 24, 1941. Typed Copy of handwritten original. November 24, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>391</sup> Letter from Caroline Durieux to Olive Lyford. Nov. 21, 1941. Typed copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>392</sup> Letter from Caroline Durieux to Olive Lyford. December 4, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.



Contemporary American School.<sup>393</sup> In view of the value of the outline, Durieux also gave instructions to send it to the new cultural secretaries of the U.S. Embassies for them to be informed.

Completing the East Coast circuit, the Rio presentation was challenging in a country that the now CI-AA considered one of the main targets of its defense initiative. Organization and transportation issues point out to the difficulties at the time with an increasing German presence in the Atlantic Ocean and an escalating conflict. That Durieux went out of her way to make it successful, there is no doubt about. The conservatism in Rio did not facilitate her work at all. In fact, it only proved the need for a seasoned person such as her to accompany the exhibition.

#### **THE NORTH COAST EXHIBITION:**

#### **COLOMBIA CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

With the first venue of the North Coast exhibition circuit opening in Bogotá at

---

<sup>393</sup> Although requested at the end of her stay in Rio, Durieux sent the outline to Lyford for her to complete and send back to Rio as well as to Augusto de Rocha of the Museo de Bellas Artes in Buenos Aires, Pesce Castro of the Museo Municipal del Prado in Montevideo, Sr. Zorilla de San Martin at the Museo de Bellas Artes in Montevideo, Sr. Montero Bustamante at the Comisión Nacional de Bellas Artes en Montevideo and Antonio Santa Marina at the Comisión Nacional de Bellas Artes in Buenos Aires. As outlined by Durieux, the Colonial and Revolutionary Period characterized by portraits and historical paintings included John Smibert, Robert Feke, John Singleton Copley, Ralph Earl, Benjamin West, John Trumbull, Charles Wilson Peale, Gilbert Stuart; the Young Republic with portraits and classic subjects included Washington Allston, John Vanderlyn, Samuel Morse, John James Audubon, George Catlin, Edward Hicks; Genre Painting of the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century included John Neagle, Eastman Johnson and George Caleb Bingham; The Hudson River School with Thomas Doughty, Thomas Cole, John Frederick Kensett and Edward Fredrick Church; the Civil War to Modern Period with James McNeil Whistler, Winslow Homer, George Inness, Homer Dodge Martin, Alexander H. Wynt, Albert Pinkham Ryder, William Morris Hunt, John La Farge, Frank Dubeneck, William Chase, Thomas Eakins, John Sargent, Mary Cassatt, John Twachtman; Modern Art with the Group of Eight and their genre, portraits and landscape painting with Robert Henri, Stuart Davis, John Sloan, George Luks, Glenn Coleman, William Glackens, Everett Shinn, Maurice Prendergast and an open category yet to be determined of the Contemporary American School with landscapes, genre, portrait and mural painting. Letter from Caroline Durieux to Olive Lyford. December 7, 1941. Typed copy of handwritten original. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

the time the East Coast exhibition was being shown in Buenos Aires, Catlin joined, while on his way to Quito and Lima, the recently assigned traveling art consultant Lewis A. Riley III and his wife Peggy for the opening on July 19, 1941. Although not identified as one of the key countries in the cultural offensive the OCCCRBAR was engaged in, Colombia's geographical position close to the Panama Canal demanded a modest presence. As Catlin had discussed in correspondence with Sarah Newmeyer of MoMA, Colombia had a late flourishing in modern art. An inversion of post-impressionist trends had preceded a popular impressionist style found in landscape, still life and portraiture paintings that was still favored with many of the established and older generation of artists. Not helping in the development of a more modern art, was the position of the Colombian State to appropriate a pre-Hispanic cultural past as a "usable past" and thus build through its central bank a national collection of pre-Columbian utilitarian and relic gold work as art. This became the cultural symbol of the country while preserving a pre-revolutionary Colonial religious architecture and art, which still influenced the taste and predilection of the elites.

In fact, Biblioteca Nacional the venue where the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* was to be presented, had been founded in 1777 as one of the first public libraries in the Americas with book and manuscripts collections that had belonged to expelled Jesuit priests. By 1822 its holdings had come to include the research findings of the Royal Botanical Expedition. It had occupied a colonial building in the downtown area of the city, prior to moving in 1938 to a new state of the art library building. Its old location eventually became the site of the

Colonial Art Museum. Indeed Bogotá, which in 1941 had a population of 300,312 inhabitants,<sup>394</sup> had a modest museum-like infrastructure unlike other capital cities such as Buenos Aires, Santiago, Rio de Janeiro and Caracas. What it had was a large number of colonial historical houses, convents and churches with valuable religious art. It was in the large library building, dependent on the Ministry of Education, where a national program of museums and exhibitions operated under the directorship of Teresa Cuervo Borda. It was through this office that Grace Morley had met Cuervo Borda, head of the Colombian art delegation to the 1939 San Francisco Exposition. In addition, the director of the National Library was none other than Gustavo Santos, a former director of the School of Fine Arts, and then editor of one of the most important newspapers El Tiempo. He was also brother to the then Colombian President Eduardo Santos.<sup>395</sup>

In the actual circulation of the North Coast exhibition, W. J. Byrnes and Co. of New York acted as the international shipping agent for MoMA in a new circuit of New York-Buenaventura-Bogotá-Caracas-La Guaira-Havana-New York.<sup>396</sup> A shipment composed of six boxes of oil paintings and watercolors, one case with fifty-three books and labels, and one box with two hundred posters printed by Grant

---

<sup>394</sup> "Report on the Exposición de Pintura Contemporánea Norteamericana 1941," p. 89. NARA, RG229, Box 366.

<sup>395</sup> The current Colombian president, Juan Manuel Santos, hails from the same Santos family. Gustavo Santos had been present at one of the initial meetings of the Art Committee at MoMA and enthusiastically had endorsed the exhibition of U.S. contemporary art to travel to South America.

<sup>396</sup> Letter from J. Flanagan, W. J. Byrnes and Co, of New York, Inc. to David J. Senior. June 5, 1941. NARA, RG 229, Box 1213. Flanagan introduces himself and mentions Senior's name was referred to him by Fred F. Neuman, further establishing MoMA's first shipping to Colombia. Rather than sending the shipment to the port of Barranquilla on the Caribbean coast of Colombia and the mayor hub for transatlantic travel, the shipment went to Buenaventura in a circuit that included going through the Panama Canal.

Warren Co., departed on board a steamship of Grace Line via the Panama Canal to the Pacific Port of Buenaventura on June 6, twelve days prior to the actual signing of agreements between MoMA and Biblioteca Nacional. An additional box with 2,000 copies of the catalog printed by William E. Rudge's Sons and bound by J. F. Tapley Co. was to leave on June 13. The steamship itinerary followed the established commercial routes of Grace Line from New York through the Panama Canal to South America and the Pacific Coast port of Buenaventura, a seven day sailing from New York. With the shipment consigned directly from MoMA to Teresa Cuervo, the Colombian government took care of formalities, tax exemptions and shipment from the port to Bogotá via rail over an Andean mountainous terrain in a train trek that usually lasted thirty days.

But if most exhibition showings were uneventful from the point of view of museum infrastructure and transportation, the large and modern venue of the library in this Andean city proved to be somewhat of a challenge. Prior to Catlin's and the Rileys' arrival in Colombia, staff from the library upon the arrival of the artwork removed the lids of the boxes containing the paintings. Accidentally a piece from a double plate glass chandelier located above one of the opened crates broke off and fell inside making a cut in Charles Demuth's *From the Garden of the Chateau* painting and gouging the surface Marsden Hartley's *The Old Bars, Dogtown* cardboard painting. Catlin described the damage in not very auspicious terms noting that "both the hole and the gouge are ugly and big, the hole in the delicately

painted Demuth being the worst.”<sup>397</sup> Offering to maintain them in boxes for the remainder of the tour as the easy way out of a packing problem and lack of art restoration facilities and personnel, Catlin also pointed out the shipping complications from a city that was geographically located in the Andes Mountain range and far from the Pacific and Atlantic coastal ports.

Despite the grand pomp and circumstance that surrounded the exhibition opening with the attendance of the President, ministers and diplomatic corps on July 19, in addition to a widespread coverage in the President’s family newspaper, only an approximate 6,000 people visited it during the 23 days that it was on display.<sup>398</sup> The U.S. Ambassador Spruille Braden noted this to be the first encounter of Bogota with contemporary art, at least from the U.S. In his view, Colombia was a traditional society in which change came very slowly and, particularly in the arts, it was still appreciating impressionism and therefore its painting had little contemporary influence. Unbeknownst to an unsuspecting limited audience, the initiative of defense to reflect the United States to Colombia was seen instead as a rapprochement of relations in the spirit of a geopolitical Panamericanism that had been until then, as the Santos family newspaper candidly put it, “evidenced only in a vain exchange of words.”<sup>399</sup>

---

<sup>397</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to MoMA, July 28, 1941. Excerpt. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>398</sup> The actual attendance numbers varies in diplomatic dispatches, which list it at 6,000, and in the official exhibition report that puts attendance at 7,000. p. 89.

<sup>399</sup> Editorial note, El Tiempo, n.d. newspaper clipping. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

But Panamericanism had been defined at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in Buenos Aires in 1936 “as a principle of international law...understood...[as]...a moral union of all the American Republics in defence [sic] of their common interests based upon the most perfect equality and reciprocal respect for their rights of autonomy, independence and free development....”<sup>400</sup> In addition to this definition, the Conference also ratified “common likeness” among participant countries with collective principles of democracy and democratic forms of governments; and “common ideals” in the preservation of peace and justice and in the establishment of new efforts in “the harmonious development of their commerce and of their cultural aspirations in the various fields of political, economic, social, scientific and artistic activities.”<sup>401</sup> Instead of a geopolitical Panamericanism, the opening speeches by the U.S. ambassador had been one stressing unity and friendship.

Braden also in his official account observed the reception of the exhibition:

---

<sup>400</sup> Ibid.

<sup>401</sup> “Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation; December 21, 1936.” The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. New Haven: Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library (online). [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam07.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam07.asp) Accessed 13 March 2011.

The Declaration included three points as follows: «That the American Nations, true to their republican institutions, proclaim their absolute juridical liberty, their unqualified respect for their respective sovereignties and the existence of a common democracy throughout America; 2. That every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of them, and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation provided for in the convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Reestablishment of Peace, signed at this conference; and 3. That the following principles are accepted by the American community of Nations: (a) Proscription of territorial conquest and that, in consequence, no acquisition made through violence shall be recognized; (b) Intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another State is condemned; (c) Forcible collection of pecuniary debts is illegal; and (d) Any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or unrestricted arbitration, or through operation of international justice.

“while in many cases it was not completely understood, which is not unusual as in Colombia traditions change slowly and the majority of Colombian painting has been little influenced by modern artistic movements, it was appreciated as an opportunity to see an interesting and vibrant expression of our culture.”<sup>402</sup>

However, Cuervo Borda and Santos did not see the development of the country’s art in those terms. After initial negotiations with Morley, they had requested on March 25, 1941 an exhibition of artists Rómulo Rozo and Luís Alberto Acuña, whose artworks were at the moment in Mexico and San Francisco respectively,<sup>403</sup> to be presented in New York as a reciprocal gesture. However the OCCCRBAR program was not at the time considering instituting an exchange program, only a unidirectional one from the U.S. to South America.

After the opening of the exhibition in Bogotá, Riley was further engaged in more substantial conversations to have other exhibitions at MoMA. So entranced were the hosts of the U.S. exhibition with the perceived cultural exchange, that in addition to the Rozo- Acuña exhibition, Cuervo Borda and Santos and others were also suggesting additional ones such as a Contemporary Colombian Painting exhibition<sup>404</sup> and a complete survey of Colombian art (pre-Columbian, Colonial and

---

<sup>402</sup> Spruille Braden, Dispatch 1997, August 19, 1941, Subject: Exhibition of Contemporary American Paintings in Bogotá. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, p. 2.

<sup>403</sup> Luis Alberto Acuña letter to John E. Abbott, July 12, 1941. RG229, Box 1213. Acuña mentioned that Rozo’s sculptures were in bronze or stone and difficult to transport and given the economic situation of the artist he could not pay for transportation expenses for the artwork or for himself, Acuña was asking MoMA to pay for it.

<sup>404</sup> The Contemporary exhibition was the suggestion of Dario Achury Valenzuela, Director of Extension Cultural y Bellas Artes at the Ministry of Education who wrote to Abbott on August 14, 1941 to elicit his comments. In addition, Gustavo Santos also supported it and had discussed it with

modern)<sup>405</sup> to be presented in New York. However as seen from a diplomatic and foreign relations perspective rather than under the defense objectives of the Office, these were never close to materializing. In fact, documents indicate Abbott and the now CI-AA's Art Section providing "an indefinite reply."<sup>406</sup> To this, Ambassador Braden officially cautioned that a selection would be a delicate issue, seeing the possible exhibition not as an art initiative but more of an "expression of interest in Colombian artistic progress."<sup>407</sup>

The enthusiasm generated by the exhibition in Colombia had much to do with young Lewis A. Riley III and his wife Peggy (née Rosamond Margaret Rosenbaum, later known as Rosamond Bernier) who did a great public relations job meeting and observing the reception and influence of the exhibition per his contract. Indeed, the attendance in Bogota was considered very good at 7,000 with favorable reviews by a friendly press. In fact, Lyford would comment to Catlin the success in Colombia and in particular Mrs. Riley's accounts of Bogota's society its ways.<sup>408</sup>

---

Lewis Riley while in Bogota. Riley considered that it could be possible as long as Santos sponsored it. However, Abbott and the committee had a different vision and mission. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>405</sup> The idea of a survey exhibition of Colombian art came at the suggestion of Jorge Obando, treasurer of the Asociación Cultural Colombo-Norteamericana in Bogotá. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>406</sup> Colombia. RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>407</sup> Spruille Braden, Dispatch 1997, August 19, 1941, Subject: Exhibition of Contemporary American Paintings in Bogotá. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>408</sup> Lyford wrote to Catlin: "Mrs. Riley's letters from Bogota were simple marvelous, giving us the inside 'dope' on newspaper policies, political parties, local customs, as well as the eccentricities and characteristics of individual people—all most geographically and entertainingly described." Letter from Olive Lyford to Stanton Catlin. October 27, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

Although Riley's letters may have not been part of the official reports about Colombia (I have not been able to locate them in the records of the Office at the National Archives II), it is important to note the communication skills and wit mixed with anecdotes were innate talents of Peggy Riley's who, after divorcing Lewis in 1943, moved to Paris to work as European features editor for Vogue magazine in 1947. She soon remarried becoming Peggy Bernier and co-founded L'Oeil with her husband art dealer Georges Bernier. Returning to the United States after a second divorce, she



Indeed, the Rileys carried the brunt of difficulties in all the exhibition presentations in a country that had a mountainous geographic terrain and limited options for transportation. When consulting with W. J. Barnes and Grace Line to take the exhibition to the next venue in Caracas, two options were presented: to ship it back by train to the port of Buenaventura where it would be taken by steamship through the Panama Canal to Caracas in a trajectory that would take more than 40 days; or to take the artwork by truck from Bogota to Caracas in a journey of more than a thousand miles. With the limitations of sea transportation to ship the paintings to Caracas and with the advice of Grace Line, the exhibition was taken by truck to Caracas with the Rileys accompanying the shipment and traveling by car. One of the unexpected situations was the number of custom officials at different points of the route that were not limited to the border zone in a very long drive.

The smaller sample of artworks in the North Coast signaled a level of importance lower than the East and West Coast had. However as the discussions of the fall of 1940 indicated, the proximity of Colombia to the Panama Canal which until 1903 had belonged to the country, made this tour an important one.

### **VENEZUELA CIRCULATION AND CONSUMPTION**

Despite Rockefeller's extensive business dealings in Venezuela, the OCCCRBAR preliminary plans for the Caracas presentation were handled by correspondence. The first letter from Morley dated May 6, 1941 to the director of

---

entered the art history lecture circuit in 1971. After a third marriage to art critic John Russell she began to her first name professionally thus becoming Rosamond Bernier. Lewis A. Riley III went on to marry Mexican actress Dolores del Río in 1947.

Museo de Bellas Artes Luís Alfredo López Mendez offering the exhibition a week before her return to San Francisco to resume directorship duties was left unanswered. Although George Vaillant, a member of the Committee on Museums visited Venezuela in late May, it was Luís de Zulueta, Jr., MoMA's translator and advisor to the exhibition on his way to Colombia to renew his MoMA's working U.S. visa, who met with his friend López Mendez in early July where he confirmed the interest of the museum to host the exhibition and the commitment from the Department of Education's Dirección de Cultura to pay for the transfer of paintings from the Colombian Border to Caracas.<sup>409</sup>

With arrangements finalized on July 16 for an opening in mid-September in Caracas, and due to the increasing unreliability of sailings from New York to South America by August 8 the shipment of catalogs, books and posters was already ahead of time on its way to Caracas via the SS Santa Paula of Grace Line, a cruise and cargo ship. With one-week delay due to the failure of the Department of Education to produce advance publicity for the exhibition, it opened on September 28 in Caracas, a city of 350,000 inhabitants. Although located thirty minutes from the downtown area, the small neoclassical Museo de Bellas Artes proved to be an appropriate venue for the thirty-eight paintings that were shown. Riley described the space as having "natural light which was hard but adequate,"<sup>410</sup> and as the venue of choice for important international exhibitions.

---

<sup>409</sup> Report, p. 104.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid.

With Caracas lacking the publicity knack that other venues had, Riley had that very week to promote the exhibition contacting newspapers, magazines, distributing photographs, mats and press releases, as well as making arrangements for radio weekly announcements. Riley even offered a press preview cocktail for the exhibition. To add to matters, Caracas did not have a tradition of hosting receptions for exhibitions and the government was disinclined to cooperate. Invitations by the Ministry of Education were reluctantly extended to the diplomatic corps, government officials and Caracas society at a time in which the country was in a presidential transition period with a president who was ill and had resigned. Because of this lack of tradition of opening receptions, the Minister of Foreign Affairs declined the invitation to give a speech and the Minister of Education after accepting changed his mind on the very day of the opening with none given. The reception was well attended by Venezuelan ministers, government officials, members of the U.S. Embassy, and guests. Noticeably absent were Venezuela's President and the U.S. Ambassador who happened to be out of the country for the duration of the exhibition. However, the exhibition in its early days did not generate much interest in the press due to the lack of promotion by its sponsor the Ministry of Education.

Reception was positive throughout all socio-economic classes, although it received little press interest as such and was presented more as a news item. Only

one newspaper review was published by October 1.<sup>411</sup> Riley did notice “the great curiosity and an apparent open-mindedness about accepting something new without prejudice, a much more flexible audience than in Bogotá.”<sup>412</sup> It caused a bit of a surprise to see U.S. painting as the country also had the preconceived notion that none existed in a materialist society. However, a great interest was generated by the American Scene painters among them Thomas Hart Benton, John Steuart Curry, Reginald Marsh that provided a view of the average man and an indication about U.S. society, something that the CI-AA and the Committee on Museums were after. Riley gave one lecture at the museum on Columbus Day, which was broadcast by radio in addition to a talk at the American Women’s Red Cross Committee. In addition two articles by him were published in Ahora. When the exhibition closed on October 24, an estimated 8,000 people had seen it. This was considered as record-breaking for the city.

Although foreign travel and French impressionism and the School of Paris informed the taste in art for Caracas’ art collectors, there was a movement to support local artists. Likewise, the government in Venezuela did indeed support the arts making the occupation of artists a professional one.

## **THE WEST COAST EXHIBITION CHILE CIRCULATION AND RECEPTION**

With Chile as one of the countries initially identified by the OCCCRBAR

---

<sup>411</sup> Joseph Flack, U.S. Embassy Dispatch 1193, U.S. Embassy Dispatch No. 1193, Embassy in Caracas, October 1, 1941. RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>412</sup> Report, p. 108.

Advisory Planning Committee as critical in the Office's cultural offensive in South America against a growing German and Fascist presence, the South America West Coast Exhibition made its first stop in Santiago as the city readied to celebrate the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its founding.<sup>413</sup> Opening on September 6, 1941 in the second floor of a connecting gallery shared by two buildings and two institutions, the National Museum of Fine Arts and the School of Fine Arts at the Universidad de Chile,<sup>414</sup> the exhibition benefited from a good space. Catlin, as the emissary and representative of the Committee of Museums, characterized it as a "huge hall with three ten foot dividing walls" with appropriate wall coverings in tones of grey-blue and good natural day and excellent night lighting. In addition, the building was a designated customhouse and all entry custom clearance inspections were done on site.

But if the space and customs had created no problems for Catlin, the sharing of the space by the two institutions did. The preliminary verbal arrangements by Morley had created some confusion about which the real Santiago sponsors were. Even though final negotiations had been conducted in New York between Abbott, Catlin and Domingo Santa Cruz, Dean of the School of Fine Arts at the Universidad de Chile in March-April 1941 as the sole sponsor, the sharing of gallery space by two

---

<sup>413</sup> This was the same exhibition section that Catlin had accompanied to and had been shown in Mexico City in May-June and had to returned to New York prior to its South America journey. It followed its own transportation circuit departing from New York via the Panama Canal to Valparaiso, Santiago, Valparaiso, El Callao, Lima, El Callao, Guayaquil, Quito, Guayaquil, back to New York via the Panama Canal.

<sup>414</sup> Although initially scheduled to open on September 1, 1941, Domingo Santa Cruz, Dean of the School and organizer in Chile postponed it until September 6 to fit with the quadricentennial program.

adjoining buildings led to incidents. The Art Section had sent boxes of paintings, books, catalogs, and paperwork including bills of lading and shipping invoices and thank you notes to the wrong person, Júlio Ortíz de Zarate, Director of the National Museum of Fine Arts when it was Santa Cruz himself who should have received it as sole sponsor and organizer.<sup>415</sup> Already sharing a fraught relationship, this indeed did not help the ease of handling the shipment nor the two men in their personal dealings.

Moreover Catlin, arriving in Santiago on August 20 to oversee the smooth development of logistics and arrangements, was faced with the reality of a quadricentennial celebration in which nations of the world were presenting gifts to the city and in which act the U.S. was notably absent. Getting tangled in the issue of the official gift of the United States to the celebration of the founding of Santiago de Chile in 1541, a request made in the spring of 1941 by the U.S. Embassy in Santiago to the Department of State had fallen on deaf ears. In view of this, and with his very obvious presence in Chile, Catlin asked Abbott to look into it through the now CI-AA and use the Office's and Rockefeller connections to have the Department of State address it. He wrote, "every other country in the world has given something except ourselves...Germany sent facsimiles of Old Master Prints, Japan the largest silk flag in the world; Britain paintings of famous Britain associated with Chilean history, etc. Can some patron be interested in this?"<sup>416</sup> After reviewing the situation, Abbott

---

<sup>415</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Olive Lyford. August 21, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>416</sup> Letter of Stanton L. Catlin to Elodie Courter. No date. Copy. Seal on copy of letter indicates it arrived at MoMA on August 22, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

wrote back informing Catlin that this was out of their hands.

In addition, to make the situation more awkward for Catlin the negotiations with Santa Cruz in New York had included a mention of a reciprocal exhibition of contemporary Chilean art for New York for 1942. And indeed Catlin was being reminded at every stop. He insistently inquired about the status of the plans for the exhibition as everyone in Santiago was assuming it was a go with works already being selected from the Autumn Salon. However, this was not part of MoMA's agreement with the now CI-AA. What the Art Section was suggesting instead was the awarding of additional OEM contracts to U.S. museums to host exhibitions from South America. In fact, the CI-AA and the Toledo Museum of Art had come to an agreement, and Director Blake-More Godwin would travel to Chile in mid-September to negotiate the Chile exhibition on behalf of the Office and to convince the Chilean authorities to have it in Ohio instead of New York. This was a plan suggested by Adams, who had taken Catlin's job as Secretary of the Art Committee, to link museums in South America with museums in the United States, and as such Chile was the first to do it.

In the speech given during the opening reception on September 6, Ambassador Claude G. Bowers addressed point blank what he saw as a distorted perception of the United States in Chile as a malignantly constructed view of "the North American people as mere money-makers, industrialists and financiers with no feeling for the finer things in life, with no capacity for reaction to art and beauty, and

as possessing no genius in the arts.”<sup>417</sup> Reminding the Chilean audience of U.S. born world-renown painters such as James Abbott McNeil Whistler and John Singer Sargent, Bowers addressed a yet to be convinced audience of the North American appreciation of the spiritual. Perhaps unbeknownst to Bowers was the fact that Whistler indeed had visited Chile, in February 1866 when Spain had blocked the port of Valparaiso. Whistler had painted four compositions of Valparaiso Harbor that went to constitute his initial nocturnes series.<sup>418</sup> Although not having traveled to Chile, Sargent instead had been involved with Chile through an expatriate high society in Venice, Paris and London.<sup>419</sup>

Framing the presentation from a fresh perspective of a geographical “New World” and its people united by struggles in the past, the Ambassador characterized it as being the best of contemporary art of the United States and “as an ambassador unhampered by protocol...as a mirror of the soul and of the spiritual side of the people of my country....”<sup>420</sup> Bowers was not only presenting the exhibition as distinct from a diplomatic or ambassadorial program, he was offering it as a sincere gesture of affection, and shrewdly as the gift from the United States to join in the

---

<sup>417</sup> “Speech of Ambassador Bowers at the Bellas Artes September 6, 1941, on the opening of the Exhibition of Contemporary American Art.” Enclosure No. 1 to Dispatch No. 1885 from October 1, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>418</sup> Whistler painted *Crepuscle In Flesh Colour and Green: Valparaiso 1866* (Tate Gallery, London), *Nocturne in Blue and Gold Valparaiso Bay 1866* (Freer Gallery, Washington), *The Morning After the Revolution, Valparaiso* (Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow), *Valparaiso Harbor 1866* (Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington).

<sup>419</sup> Sargent painted three portraits of Eugenia Errázuriz, one of Ramón Subercaseaux (Dixon Gallery and Gardens, Memphis), and one of Amalia Errázuriz y Urmeneta as Mme. Ruben Subercaseaux (Private collection).

<sup>420</sup> “Speech of Ambassador Bowers at the Bellas Artes September 6, 1941, on the opening of the Exhibition of Contemporary American Art.” Enclosure No. 1 to Dispatch No. 1885 from October 1, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.



celebration of the Four Hundredth anniversary of the founding of Santiago.<sup>421</sup> Here was the U.S. Ambassador presenting a defense initiative as a gift to the Chilean people when Catlin's requests through MoMA had been ignored.

The consumption of the exhibition by a Santiago public was very much what Abbott had predicted. Audiences showed a preference for watercolor paintings. Catlin noted the press commentary and critical appraisal in which three out of four comments were "spoken quite pointedly" in that preference. In his interactions with visitors in the galleries of the museum, they also revealed a predilection for the watercolor paintings. This as he put it, was "not because of any greater conservatism in style or subject matter (even though the three most conservative pictures in the exhibition, the two Fausetts and the one Wyeth, were by far the popular favorites of all paintings)," but as a matter of the excellence of technique and execution.<sup>422</sup> Favorite artworks for the Santiago audience proved to be *Night in New Orleans* by Georges Schreiber, *The Red Tablecloth* by Henry Barnum Poor, *Old Tree and Old People* by William Gropper, *Vermont in Late Autumn* and *Landscape* by William Dean Fausett, *From Mount Kearsage* by Andrew Wyeth, *New York Harbor* by George Grosz, *Lifeguard* by French, *Moira* by Robert Henri, *Eviction* by Mitchell

---

<sup>421</sup> Bowers said, "we bring it to you on the occasion of the celebration of the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of this beautiful city, and as a gesture of affection to your own artists and to the Chilean people." "Speech of Ambassador Bowers at Bellas Artes September 6, 1941, on the opening of the Exhibition of Contemporary American Art." Enclosure No. 1 to Dispatch No. 1885 of October 1, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>422</sup> Catlin explained: "the 'pleasanter' watercolors, i.e. most of the landscapes and the less radically painted subjects, were put in one room, and the semi abstract and wilder scenes of American life in another. Each of the two rooms was liked almost equally." Stanton L. Catlin, 'Exhibition of Contemporary US Painting, Santiago, Chile, 1941. Concluding Report.' NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Exhibitions Chile, p. 2.

Siporin, *Early Sunday Morning* by Edward Hopper, *Early Morning* by Raymond Breinin, *Woodland Brook* and *Sunburst* by Louis Michel Eilshemius.

The Santiago audience, and particularly artists from the School of Fine Arts, did not delve much in finding an European influence (despite the presence of European-born artists Schreiber in Belgium, Grosz in Germany, Breinin in Russia or European-trained Poor in England and France, Henri in France), but instead concentrated on seeing the identity of the exhibition as a reflection of life in the United States, just what the Office's cultural relations advisory committee had intended in this defense project. Encountering for the first time a U.S. art with artists views and depictions, Chileans saw an art that was addressing specific contexts and times providing a veritable example of what could be done beyond European influence. In this process of consumption, Catlin noted that the general public "tried to put themselves in the places of the creating artists, to grasp their problems, feel their environment, understand their ideas."<sup>423</sup> There was also the fact that the majority of the audience was according to Catlin, "overwhelmingly intellectual and middle-class."<sup>424</sup>

Press coverage was widespread and with positive reviews aided in the favorable reception articles in newspapers El Mercurio, La Nación, El Imparcial, Las Ultimas Noticias, and ZigZag.<sup>425</sup> In the consumption of the exhibition in Santiago a

---

<sup>423</sup> Stanton L Catlin, 'Exhibition of Contemporary US Painting, Santiago, Chile, 1941, Concluding Report.' RG229, Box 1213. Records of the Department of Information, Education Division, Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects, Folder: Exhibitions Chile. p. 3.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid, p. 3.

<sup>425</sup> Major articles appeared on El Mercurio on September 6, La Nación on September 7, El Imparcial

city with a high European immigrant concentration and with strong links to Great Britain and continental Europe, audience reception was positive. In a testimony about this consumption, Jorge Delano wrote:

Santiago is hard to please. They say what they think, especially if they don't like it. Jean Sablon didn't go at all. Other American things this year no pushover. People were very suspicious about the American exhibition before it came. Now that they have shown they like it you can take their praise at face value. Recent cultural exchange projects have been a wonderful thing and infinitely more effective on public opinion than anything done in the political and commercial fields. People have never supposed that the US had any culture, much less painting. Now that this exhibition has come, the ballet, the woodwind quartet, they see their efforts and it has done wonders for good relations.<sup>426</sup>

The widespread interest that the exhibition created was also reflected on a high number of catalog sales numbering 1,300 with an additional 400 given to the press, personalities, friends of the *Instituto Chileno Norteamericano de Cultura*, and to schools as text books given the large number of children groups who attended it.

The local presentation sponsored by the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Chile, rather than the museum, gave a wider voice to art critics and artists affiliated with the school who were more conversant with a contemporary vocabulary of art and thus having a different tone and wider reception. When the exhibition closed on October 5, 1941 an estimated 22,767 people had visited in a period of twenty-six days. Domingo Santa Cruz characterized the exhibition as “record-breaking” and a “triumph” for U.S. art. As reported by Catlin, the high

---

on September 12, *Las Ultimas Noticias* on September 15 and *ZigZag* on September 18, 1941.

<sup>426</sup> Quoted in Stanton L Catlin's report, 'Exhibition of Contemporary US Painting, Santiago, Chile, 1941, Concluding Report.' RG229, Box 1213. Records of the Department of Information, Education Division, Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects, Folder: Exhibitions Chile, p. 1.

number of visitors was “an all-time record” for the country.<sup>427</sup> However a memo from E. P. Warner to Robert T. Miller gave a much lower attendance at 18,000 but still “breaking the mark of a similar German exhibit early this year.”<sup>428</sup> The official report from the U.S. Embassy to the Secretary of State also characterized the exhibition as successful but gave much lower attendance estimated at about 15,000 and characterizing the reception “as a sincere indication of what contemporary artists in the United States are accomplishing.”<sup>429</sup>

At its closing on October 5, 1941, Carlos Humeres Soler of the newspaper El Mercurio summarized the exhibition in rather positive terms as the best attended art exhibition with over 20,000 visitors going to the Museo de Bellas Artes in a period of one month. From the point of view of consumption by a Santiago audience, the exhibition proved to be an unexpected success in which people became deeply interested and appreciative of the sample of U.S. art in particular intellectual and artistic groups. In his review, Humeres Soler praised the independence of the arrangement with MoMA adding that neither an Embassy nor a tourist superficial exchange could achieve what art was achieving with the exhibition. In the reading of the artwork in the exhibition, Humeres Soler argued, one could see the reflection of a nation, its racial character and the preoccupation for national issues. The wide selection of artists and art provided a more accurate representation of the

---

<sup>427</sup> Stanton L. Catlin, ‘Exhibition of Contemporary Us Painting, Santiago, Chile, 1941. Concluding Report.’ NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Exhibitions Chile.

<sup>428</sup> Memorandum To Robert T. Miller from B. P. Warner. Subject: Modern Art Exhibit. Santiago, Chile, October 11. 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213 Folder: Exhibitions Chile.

<sup>429</sup> Dispatch No. 1885, October 1, 1941. Ambassador Claude G. Bowers. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

contemporary state of U.S. Art, one that audiences in a museum that was part of a school of fine arts found highly didactic in its creative vision for a new art and its own culture. And this was indeed what the revelation was.

The support of the state through the WPA Federal Art Project indeed had its signature in the variety of styles and approaches presented, something the art critic was signaling out. For him the support and the willingness to organize an exhibition and circulate it was a clear demonstration of the commitment to culture and something that Chile indeed wanted to emulate. In fact, the newspaper El Mercurio was announcing the exhibition of Chilean art in the main centers of the United States beginning in January 1942 while thanking Catlin as MoMA's representative and in charge of organizing the Santiago venue for his personal charisma, knowledge, enthusiasm in the promotion of the art of U.S. artists among Chilean counterparts.<sup>430</sup>

Indeed, to Catlin, the exhibition in Chile ultimately achieved the goals of the cultural relations program in garnering widespread interest and sympathy with the artistic life of the United States and generating a series of discussions on the part of Chilean artists on cultural exchange. Moreover, so inspired were Chilean artists that a manifesto authored on behalf of the Federation of Plastic Arts of Chile to the artists of the United States was presented to Catlin on October 8 during his farewell party.<sup>431</sup> It read:

---

<sup>430</sup> Carlos Humeres Soler. "Hoy se clausura la gran exposición de pintura Norteamericana." El Mercurio, Santiago, Octubre 5, 1941.

<sup>431</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Olive M. Lyford, Oct 3, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

The Federation of Plastic Artists of Chile, through Mr. Stanton L. Catlin, Emissary of the Exhibition of North American Painting, sends a fraternal greeting to the artists of the United States and at the same time expresses its admiration and highest appreciation that your work has commanded in our country.

We have recognized the effort, discipline and the creative impulse of your great people in this exhibition; we have felt, on seeing it, the powerful bond that unites us in the pursuit of the same ideals of perfection.

For this reason, in this dark hour in history, Chilean artists cordially greet our brothers of the United States of North America and fervently hope that their efforts, united with ours and with those of all free men of the Americas, will contribute to the active maintenance of sacred rights of civilization, of liberty and of peace, through the predominance of the activities of the spirit.<sup>432</sup>

It would be a month after the exhibition closed in Chile, when Domingo Santa Cruz wrote to Abbott. In his letter, Santa Cruz noted that U.S. contemporary art was not very well known in Chile to the general public or to artists and was perceived to be derivative and an imitation of European art. However, the exhibition had changed everything. There had been a contagious excitement about the character of U.S. life in the exhibition in particular in “social art.” As the first historic contact, Santa Cruz credited Catlin in the triumph of the exhibition noting him as “successful in awakening the spirit of brotherhood and affection for the United States” in

---

<sup>432</sup> Quoted in Letter from Julio Ortíz de Zárate to John E. Abbott. 18 de Octubre de 1941. Original in Spanish. NARA, RG229, Box 1213, Folder: Exhibitions Chile. Translation in English by author. Original Text appears as: “La Federacion de Artistas Plásticos de Chile, por intermedio de don Stanton L. Catlin, Comisario de la Exposición de Pintura Contemporanea Norte Americana, envia a los artistas de Estados Unidos un saludo fraternal y al mismo tiempo les expresa la admiración y el alto aprecio que ha suscitado su obra en nuestro país. Hemos reconocido en esta Exposición el esfuerzo, la disciplina y el impulso creador de ese gran pueblo; hemos sentido al verla el vínculo poderoso que nos une en la persecución de los mismos ideales de perfección. Por eso, en esta hora oscura de la historia, los artistas chilenos saludamos cordialmente a nuestros hermanos de los Estados Unidos de Norte America y hacemos fervientes votos por que sus esfuerzos unidos a los nuestros y a los de todos los hombres libres de la América, contribuyan a mantener vigentes los derechos sagrados de la civilización, de la libertad y de la paz, mediante el predominio de las actividades del espíritu.” Also published in Las Últimas Noticias, October 10, 1941.

Chile.<sup>433</sup> This was just the right result for what the OCCCRBAR Policy Advisory Committee had envisioned back in the fall of 1940 in the utilization of an ideology of unity and friendship for national defense. Indeed, so successful was the Office in its presentation of an innocent cultural exchange that its national security objectives were never suspected. Rather than a reciprocal request for an exhibition, at least for the moment, Santa Cruz was hoping to host future ones as well.

The success of the exhibition in Santiago may be attributed to the setting of the School of Fine Arts/Museum of Fine Arts where much discussion took place. Artists affiliated with the school visited it often and discussed it much. At the end they were the ones that felt the message of freedom expressed in the variety of styles and experimentation. Complementing this was the presence of Catlin who in a few weeks he was in Santiago became the best ambassador for U.S. artists and art. In fact, he would return to Chile again at the invitation of the School of Fine Arts in 1942.

### **PERU CIRCULATION AND RECEPTION**

After the great success in Santiago, Catlin had the difficult situation of coordinating almost simultaneous presentations of the West Coast exhibition in two countries at war with each other. Catlin was confronted with the challenge of splitting into two the exhibition that had been presented in Chile due to the much smaller size proposed venues in both Lima and Quito. Moreover, there was the

---

<sup>433</sup> Letter from Domingo Santa Cruz to John E. Abbott. November 12, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

delicate situation the war presented in giving preference of dates to one country over the other. Arriving from Valparaiso at the Peruvian port of El Callao, the seven boxes containing the paintings encountered difficulties at customs due to the delay in the paperwork by the shipping agent in Chile and the lack of a response by Peruvian authorities to a request by the U.S. Embassy for a courtesy free custom clearance.

Meeting with José Sabogal in Lima, Morley laid down the initial exploration for a presentation of the exhibition. Her work with Peru and the resulting exhibition of painting at the International Exposition in San Francisco had received positive reviews. Using this as a strategy, the Committee was trying to sell the idea of the eagerness to present in Peru the exhibition of the finest of U.S. Art as a means to establish greater friendship between the two countries. However, opening on November 5, 1941, the exhibition in Lima was inevitably marred by the tensions of the Ecuadorian-Peruvian conflict over a border dispute that had led to the War of '41 in July 1941. Although a cease-fire had been implemented, Peru was still occupying Ecuadorian territories. A few days before the opening of the exhibition the United States had confiscated eighteen planes. Soon Catlin was confronted with a rampant anti-U.S. sentiment. Although close to 2,500 invitations were distributed for the opening reception, it was marked by a rather lean attendance. The Peruvian President declined the invitation, as did the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Education. Compounding the delicate situation was the rift between José



Sabogal, Director of the Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes where the exhibition was being shown and the Department of Education.

The exhibition attracted a large press corps whose reviews noted the vigor of the art activity in the United States. However, it singled out the view that the U.S. was still in search of a national art as the exhibition in its origins and its quality still reflected a rather marked European influence. In considering this influence the art critic noted French impressionism as the major style found on the art of artists who had studied in Europe and returned to the U.S. to infuse it with local main streets and Central Park scenes. For recently executed paintings, the critical analysis instead noted the influence of Pablo Picasso and Salvador Dali. However, the press celebrated the exhibition as a noble gesture on the part of the committee on art in their sharing of the exhibition with the Peruvian people. In the public reception, watercolor paintings again were highlighted for their magnificent technique and luminosity that reveal the true North American art at capturing the landscape and cityscape. It was considered to be a great catalyst to the Peruvian art scene as it reflected a good use of art training.

In a report to the U.S. Secretary of State, Jefferson Patterson elaborated on the official views of the U.S. Embassy on the exhibition consumption by a Lima audience. Opening a few days after the United States had grounded 16 planes, the exhibition suffered from a public repudiation against the United States. Despite this, an estimated attendance of 6,000 people was recorded. But at the end the low number was not surprising for Lima. Even under the conditions, the exhibition was

regarded as successful in its goal to present U.S. art to Peruvian audiences.<sup>434</sup> Upon its closing on November 30, 1941, the collection of 53 books was presented to the School of Fine Arts by Catlin.<sup>435</sup> The exhibition was to be re-shipped to the U.S. from El Callao to New York via the Panama Canal on December 5 on board the S.S. Santa Elena steamer of Grace Line.

### **ECUADOR CIRCULATION AND RECEPTION**

In the preliminary planning for the circulation of the exhibition, Morley visited with U.S. Minister Boaz Long on January 29, 1941 the U.S. Legation in Ecuador to discuss the Committee on Museums and its plan for exchange of paintings with several cities in South America and to identify suitable exhibition spaces. Not knowing Morley beforehand, Long pointed out what he thought to be a dismal state of contemporary art in Ecuador where few painters were active and a market was non-existent.<sup>436</sup> However, Morley's trip was not her first. She had visited Quito in the spring of 1940 to make arrangements for Ecuadorian artists to

---

<sup>434</sup> Diplomatic Dispatch No. 2353. Lima, Peru December 1, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

<sup>435</sup> Letter from José Sabogal to John E. Abbott. Spanish. 3 de Diciembre de 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

<sup>436</sup> In dispatch to the Secretary of State, the Legation quoted Long as saying: "at this time there were comparatively few active Ecuadorian painters in this country. Indeed, their canvases had no local market, that is, the public appreciation and the prices the local public would pay for paintings offered scant encouragement to artists. The sucre was low, fifteen to the dollar, and the best Quiteño painters could barely make a living. Most of them have other jobs and did painting on a part time basis. As neither good colors nor canvas are available in the is country due to the high cost abroad in gold, most of the paintings are done on cheap cotton cloth and the artists are obliged to grind their own colors." US Embassy Dispatch No. 1581 to the Secretary of State. 'Visit of Mrs. Grace McCann Morley; proposed interchange of paintings." Quito, Ecuador, January 31, 1941. RG 229, Box 1213, Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects, Exhibitions.

participate in the exhibition of the art of Latin America at the Fine Arts Palace at the San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition of 1940.<sup>437</sup>

Although this Ecuador visit had more to do with identifying a group of people interested in art, Morley's meeting with the U.S. Legation was a networking visit to secure introductions to people she did not know already. In addition to her work for the OCCCRBAR she was also considering the possibility of organizing an exhibition of Ecuadorian watercolors and prints at the San Francisco Museum of Art, which she directed. In her two-day stay in Quito, Morley reconnected with artists and met new ones whom she had not met in her 1940 trip. She indeed used the Legation to validate her choice of Nicolas Delgado, the former Director of the Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes and Commissioner for Ecuador's Pavillion at the San Francisco World's Fair to be the organizer in Ecuador. By early April, MoMA on behalf of the OCCCRBAR Art Committee was confirming general verbal arrangements between Delgado and Morley for an October 24 arrival of the exhibition based on the Grace Line itinerary for Steamships.<sup>438</sup>

The Quito presentation of the exhibition when it opened was everything that Lima's was not. If the Peru audience was mildly receptive, the Ecuadorian one proved to be an unanticipated surprise. With the preliminary arrangements made by Morley in the spring of 1941, Ecuador was preparing itself to receive the exhibition as early as May 1941. In an article published by El Comercio in Quito, the

---

<sup>437</sup> Boaz Long Diplomatic Dispatch. Quito, Ecuador. January 31, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

<sup>438</sup> Letter from John E. Abbott to Nicolás Delgado. In Spanish. 11 de abril de 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 1214

exhibition was being announced almost six months ahead of its opening date. More than a note, it was the press release that MoMA had made available to venues, which in addition announced the selection of Nicolas Delgado as the person overseeing the local arrangements with the Ecuadorian government.<sup>439</sup> It further described the exhibition in terms as “the best thing that has been done so far, and is part of the general plan for interchange between the U.S. and Latin America in the field of art.”<sup>440</sup> In addition, as the date of the opening neared, Delgado gave weekly radio reports. This well-orchestrated publicity and organization on the part of Delgado proved to be critical in the successful reception of the exhibition.

With boxes shipped from Valparaiso, this half of the original West Coast Exhibition arrived in the port city of Guayaquil via Grace Line steamship on October 24, 1941 and from there was transported by train to Quito via Riobamba. As part of the agreement, MoMA on behalf of the OCCCRBAR Art committee would donate 1,000 catalogs to be used as the organizing entity saw fit and would present a gift of 50 books to be shown during the exhibition and given after it to an institution chosen by MoMA.<sup>441</sup>

Seen as a major diplomatic event in 1941, the Quito presentation of the

---

<sup>439</sup> The agreement with Ecuador specified MoMA sending all materials to the port of entry in this case Guayaquil with expenses paid for unloading and insurance at the dock. The organizing entity in Ecuador, the Universidad de Quito in this case was to pay for customs, and transportation from Guayaquil to Quito and back, with all materials return to MoMA free of custom import and export taxes. If there were to be any additional taxes imposed by the government, the Universidad would be responsible for those.

<sup>440</sup> “Importante exposición de pintura contemporánea norteamericana tendrá lugar en esta ciudad próximamente. El Comercio. May 1941. Page 1-2. Copy of newspaper clipping in NARA, RG229, Box 1214.

<sup>441</sup> “Memorandum.” 8 de Julio de 1941. Spanish. NARA, RG229, Box 1214.

exhibition featured a total of thirty-four oil paintings and twenty-seven watercolors, or half of what was presented in Chile given the small exhibition space and the War with Ecuador.<sup>442</sup> The opening reception on November 15 at the Auditorium (Paraninfo) of the Universidad Central del Ecuador included the President, ministers and other government officials, diplomatic corps and general public. The Minister of the U.S. Legation Boaz Long delivered a speech wrapped in ideas of sympathy and understanding, and further suggesting the possibility of future exhibition exchanges such one of an Ecuadorian art exhibition in the United States.<sup>443</sup> In fact, following the arrangements in Chile with the Toledo Museum of Art, the CI-AA was put the Worcester Museum of Art in contact with Ecuadorian authorities for an exhibition in the fall of 1942 as a direct contract with the CI-AA.<sup>444</sup>

As the event that inaugurated the recently built auditorium, it necessitated special temporary walls to create a gallery appearance. Built by the Escuela Central Técnica, these twelve wood frame panels covered in fabric served in the made-shift gallery as the background for the paintings. Catlin, in his final report, characterized the Paraninfo as “anything but an ideal gallery, but with their new temporary walls (first experiment of its kind in Ecuador), good day skylight lighting, and help of plants from the cemetery, four huge spotlights hooked together and hung like a chandelier from the center of the room, it proved, in spite of its sloping floor, a most

---

<sup>442</sup> Paraninfo de la Universidad Central. *Pintura Contemporanea Norte-Americana*, 1941. Quito, Ecuador: Imprenta de la Universidad, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>443</sup> Enclosure No. 1 to U.S. Legation Dispatch No. 2292 of November 20, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>444</sup> Agnes Rindge, Executive Secretary, Letter to Catlin on December 4, 1941.

attractive place to the Quito public.”<sup>445</sup> The exhibition and building proved to have a popular appeal in a country with a large indigenous population. Catlin would later recall “something like thirty thousand Indians came to see it...”<sup>446</sup> Some estimates calculated that by November 20, only five days after being opened to the public, attendance had reached 18,000 visitors in a country whose population at the time was about three million people.<sup>447</sup> In addition, the University also organized a series of seven lectures by Delgado, José Gabriel Navarro, Luís Mideros, Jones Odriozola, Antonio Jaen Morente and Catlin whose talk was titled “A Critical Study of the Exhibition.”<sup>448</sup>

The large attendance led the U.S. Legation to request three police guards for the space to be on duty day and night. After the December 7, 1941 Pearl Harbor attack and now with a Japanese-American War, security was increased with the number of guards doubled to six.<sup>449</sup> Upon its closing the exhibition was packed and shipped to Guayaquil for return to the U.S. via Grace Line on December 19 with an arrival in New York on December 29, 1941. The U.S. Legation report from Ecuador placed Quito with the highest number of attendees at 43,000, well above audiences in the major centers of Buenos Aires, Rio and Santiago. Fueling these large

---

<sup>445</sup> “Report on the Exposición de Pintura Contemporánea Norteamericana 1941,” p. 83. NARA, RG229, Box 366.

<sup>446</sup> Stanton L. Catlin. Oral History conducted by Francis V. O’Connor for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. [www.si.aaa.edu](http://www.si.aaa.edu).

<sup>447</sup> U.S. Legation Dispatch No. 2292 to the Secretary of State. Quito, November 20, 1941. Boaz Long, American Minister. NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>448</sup> “Report on the Exposición de Pintura Contemporánea Norteamericana 1941,” p. 85. NARA, RG229, Box 366.

<sup>449</sup> Dispatch No. 2373 December 12, 1941. Boaz Long, Quito Ecuador. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

numbers was the setting in the newly built Paraninfo where the exhibition was held as its opening event.

Although preliminary plans with the Worcester Museum for an Ecuadorian contemporary art exhibition had been discussed and material had been gathered by both Catlin and Delgado, the changed world conditions made them no longer possible. In addition, Catlin notified Delgado on May 8, 1942 that the CI-AA Art Section was redefining its policy now that the United States was at war. Plans for a cultural relations exchange were being put on hold. Giving consideration to an idea for a large Ecuadorian contemporary art exhibition in the United States now had to be postponed indefinitely due to uncertain times. Although Delgado and Catlin had been in conversations for this exhibition and preliminary research and consultations were in the process of being made, it had not been vetted or approved officially.<sup>450</sup>

In fact, Delgado had shared with Catlin photographs and documents that he had taken to New York and shared with others. Although part of the plan was to commission Delgado to do a preliminary survey, by May 1942 the possibility of an exhibition was nil. As Catlin noted “both the situation and the value of the Ecuadorian material put this out of the question at the moment. The only thing is to wait for a more favorable time.”<sup>451</sup> Indeed, times in mid-1942 were not as they had been in 1941 when the exhibition was on tour. Ocean transportation routes with

---

<sup>450</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Nicolas Delgado, May 8, 1942 (I). NARA, RG229, Box 1213.

<sup>451</sup> Letter from Stanton Catlin to Nicolas Delgado, May 8, 1942 (II). NARA, RG 229, Box 1213.

the U.S. were now limited by war and by the unpredictable presence of German U-Boats in the Caribbean and Atlantic Ocean. In addition, The United States upon entering the war in December 1941 had requisitioning Grace Line and other companies' steamships for troop mobilization during the war. Grace Line would not re-instate service until 1947.

Ecuador's high attendance benefitted from the setting at the university as well as from the newly built Paraninfo where the exhibition was held. It was a combination of the two that led such large crowds to visit the space and see the art. Also contributing to the success was the well-orchestrated publicity campaign by Delgado, one he started in the local press several months thus maintaining an interest and curiosity about the exhibition of U.S. Contemporary art.

## **PEARL HARBOR AND THE AFTERMATH**

With the Committee on Museums and the CI-AA's Art Section having completed the circulation of *La exposición de pintura contemporánea norteamericana* in South America, they were now faced with a changing reality of Japan declaring war on the United States on December 7, 1941. With this new Japanese-American War full-blown by December 8, 1941 when the United States officially declared war on Japan, it would be just a matter of days before the United States would become part of a global armed conflict. With Germany and Italy declaring war on the United States on December 11, the conditions that had created the OCCCRBAR and CI-AA in August 1940 and July 1941 as defense agencies in



preparation for war at the time of peace no longer applied. Now the state was becoming a warfare state with its own Arsenal of Democracy. The context that had given rise to the cultural and commercial relations as part of a strategic defense initiative of the Council of National Defense and later the Office for Emergency Management was now one of open hostility in a declared War.

The shipments of artworks departing from the South American ports of El Callao, Guayaquil, Rio de Janeiro and Havana (North Coast Exhibition shown in Cuba) to the United States were caught in the middle of this partial global conflict that now included Panama (December 7, 1941) and the United States, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua (December 8, 1941). In a few days it would morph into a full blown global conflict with the United States, Germany and Italy declaring war amongst themselves on December 11, 1941.

The Grace Line, Moore-McCormack Line, and Ward Line now required mandatory war insurance as the artworks were about to sail in uncertain waters with a total insurance value of \$366,063.35 and borrowed from 56 institutions and collectors.<sup>452</sup> Two of the shipments would go through that global strategic waterway that was the Panama Canal located in a country now at war with Japan since December 7 and one that Germany was eager to control. The West Coast Exhibition split in two, was on board the S. S. Santa Cruz of Grace Line after departing the port of El Callao in Peru on December 8 after an initial delay which would place it in New

---

<sup>452</sup> MOMA, EMH, v.1.a (Folder MoMA 4.19+20 2012)

York Harbor on December 20, 1941.<sup>453</sup> The other half was scheduled to depart from Guayaquil in Ecuador on the S. S. Santa Cecilia of Grace Line on December 19 arriving in New York Harbor on December 29, 1941. Likewise, the East Coast Exhibition was scheduled to leave Rio de Janeiro on the S. S. Argentina of the Moore-McCormack Line on December 17 arriving in New York Harbor the same day as the West Coast exhibition. The North Coast Exhibition after leaving the Port of La Guaira in Venezuela made a stop in Havana, Cuba for a brief presentation to coincide with the Pan American Union-sponsored Intellectual Cooperation Conference. It left Havana on the S. S. Mexico of Ward Line on December 20 arriving in New York Harbor on December 23, 1941.

The CI-AA Art Section thus became busy in the last days of the circulation of the exhibition taking out war risk insurance on all paintings aboard the four ships. Although covered through the MoMA insurance umbrella or by individual owners, there was the last issue of the shipment from Rio which the established United States-Brazilian tariff laws required Moore-McCormack Line to fully cover the value of the paintings. That the political influence on culture during the war was just beginning, the main actors were looking beyond the short term just as Rockefeller had indicated in his 1940 commercial and cultural plan and more so now that the United State was fully in the global conflict: "Regardless of who wins the war..."<sup>454</sup>

---

<sup>453</sup> Originally scheduled to depart on December 4, the sailing was delayed until December 8. Catlin Cablegram to Olive M. Lyford. December 7, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 1209.

<sup>454</sup> Op. cit. Nelson A. Rockefeller, "Hemisphere Economic Program," 1940: 1.

The war and the resulting international regulation of commerce and transportation of goods and people impinged in programs beginning in 1942. Two initiatives that backed by the CI-AA although sponsored by the private sector, the R. H. Macy's Latin American Fair and the Contemporary Latin America exhibitions and Lincoln Kirstein and his art acquisition trip to South America are considered in the next two chapters.

## **COMMERCIAL AND CULTURAL NETWORKS: SOUTH AMERICAN MODERN ART IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE FIELD OF LATIN AMERICAN ART**

The intersection of the commercial and the cultural at the hands of the private sector came to fruition in early 1942 with the presentation of the R. H. Macy & Co. Inc. Latin American Fair and Art Gallery at its flagship store in New York City. Although a merchandise sale event, it was publicly associated commercially and culturally with the Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA henceforth) by way of an advisory committee that was listed in the Fair's program including John E. Abbott, Wallace K. Harrison, Evans Clark, John Hay Whitney and Nelson A. Rockefeller who in reality provided some assistance.<sup>455</sup> In fact, what R. H. Macy & Co. was accomplished from a commercial point of view was to identify new sources for merchandise at a moment in which the continental embargo was limiting established markets with Europe.

Since the summer of 1940, the British blockade to the continent had substantially limited the trade of commodities between the Western Hemisphere and Europe. The economic impact on a disappearing market for raw materials,

---

<sup>455</sup> The Advisory Committee listed on the fair booklet included the OCCCRBAR staff John E. Abbott, Wallace K. Harrison, Nelson A. Rockefeller and John Hay Whitney. Other members included Leo S. Rowe of the Pan American Union, Evans Clark, Frederick E. Hasler, D Stewart Iglehart, and Dr. A.S.W. Rosenbach. R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., Herald Square, New York. "Macy's Latin American Fair." New York: R. H. Macy & Co., 1942: 3.

agricultural and cattle products, and retail goods threatened to diminish foreign exchange and to increase the possibilities of an economic collapse in Latin America. At risk was the hemispheric security and defense initiative of the U.S. State. Thus Rockefeller enthusiastically came to see the R. H. Macy & Co. commercial and cultural event as “the most important step that has been contemplated to encourage importation of retail goods from Central and South America for sale in this country.”<sup>456</sup> As he noted, this initiative, in fact, showed the beginning of an integration of a hemispheric market and a proto commercial and cultural regionalization with the opening of a U.S. market for finished goods and art for retail sale. It further situated the United States as the logical re-directed market for surplus commodities that had been otherwise destined for Europe. At the same time it positioned R. H. Macy & Co, Inc., itself the “largest store in the world,” as the pioneer in the creation of this new U.S. market with the support of the U.S. State via the CI-AA.<sup>457</sup>

Initially scheduled for the fall of 1941, later postponed until early 1942, the Fair and Art Gallery planning also coincided with the award and execution of new CI-AA contracts given to the San Francisco Museum of Art for the production of three small exhibitions of the contemporary art of Central and South America. In a reversed model to the 1941 introduction of U.S. modern art to South American audiences with the *Contemporary North American Painting/La pintura*

---

<sup>456</sup> Letter from Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller to Jack I. Straus. April 2, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>457</sup> “Macy’s Latin American Fair,” 1942: 6.

*contemporánea Norteamericana*, these small circulating exhibitions were to travel the East and West Coasts and the Midwestern area of the United States to introduce modern art of Central and South America to U.S. audiences.

This chapter takes as a case studies the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery of January-February 1942 and the Contemporary Latin-American Art exhibitions organized by Grace McCann Morley of the San Francisco Museum of Art in 1942. Although at first glance these two disparate art showings may give the impression of two unconnected events, they were not. In fact, the link is Morley herself. She became a reluctant actor in the former and an active one in the latter. As such, I argue here that in the production of these two events one can start discerning two diverging views of the contemporary artistic production of South America: One as a private-public view of art as a commodity, and a second one as a private aesthetic view of symbolic capital by someone who at the time was characterized as the foremost expert shaping the initial contours of a field of study and constructing the "idea" of Latin America Art.

Taking into consideration the commercial R. H. Macy & Co. Fair and Art Gallery and the educational San Francisco Museum of Art organized exhibitions, I also explore in this chapter the initial construction of the idea of contemporary "Latin American art" in a model that came to be seen as below standard and not part of the East Coast nascent canon that dominated modern art narratives. That these exhibitions served a specific purpose, there is no doubt, and it can be argued that by

their presentation they helped to illustrate the carefully controlled and dominant East Coast modern art discourse and canon based on quality and taste.

At the same time, the R. H. Macy & Co. Fair and Art Gallery, as a commercial merchandise fair of Central and South American products, gave new meanings to modern art as a commodity affording a view to a possible art market in the United States. Although it was common practice for museums and galleries to sell the art in their temporary exhibitions, the Macy's Latin American Fair Art gallery was instead a plain and simple store sale. Both merchandise and art selected and consigned for sale by each State and government were displayed in a grandiose architectural stage setting that afforded a U.S. "impression" of Latin America under the guise of "meet your neighbor" spurring the demand for the "novel," "colorful" and "exotic" in art and wares.<sup>458</sup>

### **The Production of the R.H. Macy & Co. Latin American Fair and The Art Gallery**

As the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* was about to open at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in April 1941 before embarking on its South American tour, R. H. Macy & Co. was in the initial stages of developing plans for a combined commercial and cultural event of merchandise and art from Latin America to be held at its flagship store on Herald Square in New York in the fall of 1941. As Charles Roditi initially shared confidentially with Rockefeller, R. H. Macy &

---

<sup>458</sup> R. H. Macy & Co. was not the first corporation to show contemporary Latin American Art. In fact, The International Business Machines (IBM) featured art from each country where it conducted business in its Art and Science Gallery at the 1939 World's Fair in New York and in San Francisco. However the difference between IBM and Macy's was that while the former was part of a corporate collection the latter was part of a merchandise fair.

Co. wanted to support the diplomatic “Good Neighbor” policy and the development of “Latin American relations.”<sup>459</sup> Roditi, President of D. Roditi and Sons, Casa de Compras Universales—a hemispheric commercial house with offices in Mexico City, Caracas, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Valparaiso, Lima and Bogota—had gone to Washington D.C. at the end of March 1941 to meet with Rockefeller and John C. McClintock in relation to a loan to purchase the Fair’s merchandise. He confidentially shared with them the R. H. Macy & Co. promotional program including details of a \$50,000 exhibit display in one full floor of its New York store and the \$100,000 worth of merchandise for retail sale.<sup>460</sup> Roditi’s approach to Rockefeller’s office had to do with the bank loan and with his personal investments and interests in Venezuela. At stake for Roditi was the financing of the merchandise whose loan was still awaiting approval by the Export-Import Bank,<sup>461</sup> with which Rockefeller’s office worked closely.<sup>462</sup>

---

<sup>459</sup> “Latin American Artistic, Historical & Industrial Exhibition” (D. Roditi & Sons, Inc. Casa de Compras Universales letterhead). March 31, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>460</sup> Memorandum re Meeting with Mr. Charles Roditi. April 2, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206.

<sup>461</sup> The Bank’s Lending authority had been increased by Congress from \$200,000,000 to \$700,000,000 with the additional \$500,000,000 “to assist in the development of resources, the stabilization of economies, and the orderly marketing of the products of the Western Hemisphere.” Public Law No. 792, 76<sup>th</sup> Congress, approved September 26, 1940. Quoted in Rowland, 1947: 12.

<sup>462</sup> Rockefeller also offered him a contact with his *Corporación Venezolana de Fomento*, and its director Robert Bottome for additional possible private funding. Bottome had attended Dartmouth with Rockefeller where they developed a friendship and later a business relationship. Memorandum re Meeting with Mr. Charles Roditi. April 2, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432. In fact, Venezuela would come to figure prominently in the Art Gallery as its façade was the very Museum of Fine Arts of Caracas. Charles Roditi at the time of this meeting was married to Margot Boulton de Roditi of Caracas and her influential family was personal friends with Rockefeller. Boulton would go on to marry Robert Bottome after Roditi. See Darlene Rivas, *Missionary Capitalist: Nelson Rockefeller in Venezuela*, 2002: 35.



Soon after the meeting with Rockefeller however, it dawned on Roditi and the R. H. Macy & Co. advertising executives that this was no diplomatic and foreign relations marketing event. It was instead one that fell in the category of a commercial defense strategy for the stimulation of trade and the introduction of South American merchandise to the U.S. market. Already in his June 1940 Memo "Hemisphere Economic Policy" Rockefeller had identified the need to create new markets for Latin American surplus commodities that in a normal time under conditions of peace would go to continental Europe. In the initial OCCCRBAR planning meetings of September 26, 1940, Rockefeller had approached the topic of preclusive buying from a point of view of defense with FDR. He in turn shared the next day a memorandum about "Development of Economic Warfare" with his cabinet and the National Council for Defense. FDR noted that forty percent of Latin American exports to Europe had been lost due to the war situation with the "grave danger that in some of these countries economic and political deterioration may proceed to the point where defense of the western hemisphere would be rendered much more difficult and costly."<sup>463</sup> For that FDR was asking for "sympathetic consideration to Latin American products in the procurement of strategic and critical materials for the defense program...including numerous other commodities."<sup>464</sup> In fact, R. H. Macy & Co. was jumping into the private industry's

---

<sup>463</sup> Quoted in Rowland, 1947: 12.

<sup>464</sup> Rowland noted the conversation between FDR and Rockefeller. Office Memorandum: "Development of Economic Warfare" quoted in Rowland, 1947: 12.

defense bandwagon of the private industry to absorb to the surplus production of manufactured goods, crafts, and art.

In its vision for the Latin American Fair and Art Gallery, R. H. Macy & Co. was looking at a full-floor staged store display for Central and South American industrial manufactured goods and arts and crafts commodities.<sup>465</sup> In hosting such an event, the store was betting on its large customer base of about 140,000 people who visited the store daily,<sup>466</sup> and the possibility of creating more sales volume. As conceived, this Fair and Gallery would most likely pique the interest of other major U.S. department stores to display and sell Central and South American products thus creating a much larger market in the United States.<sup>467</sup> In mind were J.L. Hudson Co. in Detroit, Marshall Field in Chicago, Kaufman of Pittsburgh, Halle of Cleveland, The Emporium of San Francisco, Bullock's of Los Angeles, and Scruggs-Vandervoort-Barney of St. Louis.<sup>468</sup>

Rockefeller, in his excitement after learning confidentially of this first step of the private sector to establish a regular flow of goods in both North and South directions, immediately contacted Jack Isidor Straus, President of R. H. Macy & Co.

---

<sup>465</sup> In the booklet, R. H. Macy & Co. noted that all merchandise, art included, was for sale. R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., Herald Square, New York. "Macy's Latin American Fair." New York: R. H. Macy & Co., 1942: 6.

<sup>466</sup> Memorandum "Meeting-Pan American Exhibition at Macy's, September, 1941." From Julian Street, Jr. to Robert Caldwell. April 18, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206.

<sup>467</sup> Latin American Artistic, Historical & Industrial Exhibition (D. Roditi & Sons, Inc. Casa de Compras Universales letterhead). March 31, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>468</sup> Letter from June Hamilton Rhodes to Wallace K. Harrison. July 15, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

Inc., to express his support for the project and to offer his help.<sup>469</sup> McClintock, also present at the meeting, likewise, called on Beardsley Ruml to offer the services of the OCCCRBAR Communications Division. Thus Rockefeller and McClintock came to sanction the whole commercial and cultural enterprise from the U.S. State's and his Office's point of view. Bringing together the two aspects of the OCCCRBAR—commercial and cultural relations, R. H. Macy & Co. was capitalizing on the fact that its very own treasurer was none other than Ruml, a close confidant of Rockefeller's, a member of "*The Junta*" which had advised him on his "Hemisphere Economic Policy" of 1940, and advisor to the CI-AA. Ruml in fact, had accompanied Rockefeller to the White House to present it to Harry L. Hopkins who in turn shared it with FDR leading to the creation of the OCCCRBAR as mentioned above.

Now that the OCCCRBAR had extended its help and assistance, an initial meeting with its staff was held on April 16, 1941 in which Julian Street, Jr., Secretary of MOMA represented the Office, Stanton L. Catlin represented the Art Section and Evans Clark represented the Music Committee. Executives from R. H. Macy & Co. Advertising and Foreign Sections including William H. Howard, Leo Martinuzzi and J. Goodwillie laid out the plan for the cultural component in which music concerts would be offered and original art by artists from Central and South America would be displayed and sold in the specially designed art gallery. The meeting had a dual purpose for the R.H. Macy & Co. executives. They wanted "to survey the available

---

<sup>469</sup>Letter from Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller to Jack I. Straus. April 2, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

material” in both music and art and in addition “seek the advice of the Coordinator’s Office on matters of general policy.”<sup>470</sup> In reality what R.H. Macy & Co. was after was a much larger strategic partnership between the private corporate sector and the U.S. State that would help them navigate those networks of regulated commercial and cultural circuits across the hemisphere that the Office was busy establishing at the very moment. R. H. Macy & Co. wished to tap into transportation and publicity contacts and to reach out to similar U.S. private corporations already doing business in South America such as General Motors, Grace Line, International Business Machines Company, International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, Moore-McCormack S/S Co., Pan American Air Lines, and the United Fruit Company.

In R. H. Macy & Co.’s desire to survey what was available attention turned to modern and contemporary art and particularly to Catlin who was asked to identify recent art exhibitions of South American art in New York commercial galleries. Given that Grace L. McCann Morley was still a consultant working for the OCCCRBAR, who coincidentally had just returned from South America where she had negotiated venues for the upcoming circulating exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*, Catlin offered to forward sections of a report she was preparing that could help them in their planning. Catlin would also forward the name of three or four art experts in each country to help R. H. Macy & Co. locally

---

<sup>470</sup> Memorandum “Meeting-Pan American Exhibition at Macy’s, September, 1941.” From Julian Street, Jr. to Robert Caldwell. April 18, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206.

with the selection of the art. He also recommended sending someone from the United States to buy the artwork and ship it back.

In the Fair organization and presentation, R. H. Macy & Co. foresaw a geographic division of Latin America between the Caribbean and Central American countries—known as the American Mediterranean—and the East and West Coast of South America. In fact, this designation alluded to ocean trade as well as travel patterns before commercial flights became the favored mode of transportation. This way in its planned three-week run, the Fair would highlight one region per week including their art and music through the art exhibition, lectures and concerts. And to execute the plan, R. H. Macy & Co would employ an “impresario” for staging the fair and for coordinating its publicity while serving as the liaison with the OCCCRBAR. This impresario would work with OCCCRBAR staff to publicize the event in Latin America, coordinate short-wave radio programs, select music and musicians to be featured, identify with Latin artists to assist with the gallery installation with Reynaldo Luza, Miguel Covarrubias and Ludwig Bemelmans mentioned. In deciding whom to hire as impresario, William Howard then Vice President for Advertising at R. H. Macy & Co. would consult with Henrietta Malkiel who at the time was affiliated with the OCCCRBAR working on ways to promote Latin American fashion.<sup>471</sup> Howard and Malkiel settled on June Hamilton Rhodes,

---

<sup>471</sup>This was a three-month appointment extended to six when the opening of the Fair was postponed. Memorandum from June Hamilton Rhodes to Wallace K. Harrison, July 17, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

the managing director of the Bureau of Fashion Trends in New York and a person who personally knew Eleanor Roosevelt.

With an original proposed opening date of September 15, 1941, the Fair and Art Gallery had to be postponed until January 1942. According to Rhodes, the postponement was due to the type of merchandise Roditi secured from his suppliers in South America. In explaining, Rhodes intimated that the sample was limited in choice, not varied enough, and not authentically South American but rather German and Italian-produced versions in the region. Rhodes concluded that unless someone from Latin America such as artists Covarrubias or Luza assisted them in selecting the merchandise, the Fair would end up with a similar selection done by Roditi and Martinuzzi, Executive Vice President of R. H. Macy & Co. in charge of Foreign Offices.<sup>472</sup> If the limited merchandise sample and cultural aspect of authenticity were of concern to Rhodes, the commercial fact that Roditi's suppliers were of German and Italian origin would be a much larger problem for R. H. Macy & Co.<sup>473</sup>

In its hemispheric security and defense objectives, the OCCRBAR had developed a black list of German and Italian commercial houses and individuals precluding U.S. companies from entering into business transactions with them. In fact, FDR had authorized the "Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals and Controlling Certain Exports" on July 17, 1941 invoking United States Code Title 50 of War and National Defense of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat 415) and amended on July 2,

---

<sup>472</sup> Memorandum. R. H. Macy & Co.- Roditi. Miss Malkiel to Mssrs. MacClintock, Francisco, and Phipps. July 8, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>473</sup> Ibid.

1940 (54 Stat. 714) in a period of unlimited national emergency and in the interest of national defense.<sup>474</sup> The Proclaimed List specifically targeted individuals, partnerships, association, corporations organizations under the term *persons* specifically those who were “deemed to be, or to have been acting or purporting to act, directly or indirectly, for the benefit of, or under the direction of, or under the jurisdiction of, or on behalf of, or in collaboration with Germany and Italy or a national thereof...”<sup>475</sup> In addition, “certain persons to whom, or on whose behalf, or for whose account the exportation directly or indirectly of any article or material exported from the United States, is deemed to be detrimental to the interest of national defense.”<sup>476</sup>

What this list did was seal the fate of German and Italian businesses in South American and other Central American and Caribbean countries and the people associated with them even local ones who would be treated as German or Italian nationals. The Proclaimed List included some 1,049 businesses and people in South America alone. Of these, there were approximately 289 businesses in Argentina, 48 in Bolivia, 262 in Brazil, 163 in Chile, 218 in Colombia, 35 in Ecuador, 13 in Paraguay, 79 in Peru, 100 in Uruguay, and 60 in Venezuela. What the Proclaimed List revealed was the extensive commercial network of German and Italian

---

<sup>474</sup> Signed by the Acting Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Acting Attorney General, The Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of Export Control and the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics the Proclaimed List had a provision that it would be updated. See *The Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals, Promulgated Pursuant to the Proclamation of July 17, 1941*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941.

<sup>475</sup> Section 1 (a). *Ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>476</sup> Section 1 (b). *Ibid.*

businesses in South America offering services ranging from electricity, radio communication and telephone, land transportation, commercial aviation, banking, chemical products and pharmaceuticals, photographic equipment, office machines, to food, clothing, crafts, and so on.<sup>477</sup> From a commercial perspective the U.S. State by blacklisting German and Italian companies was cutting the level of influence these had in the daily life of diasporic and national communities in each country. Moreover, it was not only cutting profits by limiting business, but also was controlling the flow of illegally traded products with continental Europe.

The new commercial defense regulations for doing business in South America in addition to the increased difficulty in trade, commerce and ocean transportation due to the European war supported the idea of a market bloc and economic zone that R. H. Macy & Co. was advocating. For the Art Gallery of the Fair, the postponement meant more time for planning, more support from the Art Section of the CI-AA, and access to their network of experts and artists, or so it seemed.

### **Grace McCann Morley and the Macy's Latin American Fair Art Gallery**

In the summer of 1941 as the OCCCRBAR under the National Council of Defense transitioned into the new CI-AA under the Office for Emergency Management, the Office contact for June Hamilton Rhodes shifted to Wallace K. Harrison, the new Chairman of the Cultural Relations Division. With Stanton Catlin abroad and out of the picture, the art support for the Fair naturally fell on the other

---

<sup>477</sup> Ibid.



members of the Art Section. They in turn wasted no time in referring the R. H. Macy & Co. project to Grace McCann Morley who in July was still working on the official report from her January-March 1941 trip to South America.

At the suggestion of the Art Section of the OCCCRBAR, June Hamilton Rhodes contacted Morley at the San Francisco Museum of Art for information on the contemporary art of Central and South America and suggestions for artists to be included in the Art Gallery. Rhodes wrongly assumed Morley's knowledge about the project, her awareness of the degree of involvement of the Art Section, and her recognition of Rockefeller's official backing. What came of it was a series of interesting exchanges between these two women from different geographic areas in the United States and disciplines that revealed specific conceptions of modern art, and the early construction of an art historical canon for the art from Central and South America in which "quality and taste" were of upmost importance.

Writing to Julian Street, Jr. of MoMA and of the Council of National Defense on July 3, 1941, Morley provided a terse summary of her communication with a certain Mrs. James Hamilton Rhodes who had frantically wired her asking for a list of Central and South American artists for the Macy project. Morley, in fact, was informing Street that Rhodes "apparently did not know much about art or about the Macy plan, and was generally unsatisfactory over the phone."<sup>478</sup> In view of this, Morley had assumed a position of art expert asking Rhodes for more information

---

<sup>478</sup> Grace McCann Morley to Julian Street, Jr. Council of National Defense New York. July 3, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

about the Fair's Art Gallery. Moreover, Morley let her know that she would be glad to help her, provided Rhodes paid for postage for all the Macy communication with her artists-friends in Central and South America. Morley made it amply clear to Rhodes that she did not believe in the Macy event nor was she interested in being part of a scheme which "was not thoroughly respectable artistically speaking."<sup>479</sup> Morley, realizing the commercial nature of the enterprise, has come to see it as a "merchandising show," and one from which she would protect her artists-friends' participation. Taking the letter as a "blast" from Morley, Street shared it with Harrison in Washington.<sup>480</sup>

After learning that the Fair and Art Gallery plans had been previously sanctioned at the very top of the CI-AA, Morley became a bit more cooperative. She was also now reassured in her knowledge, albeit shortly, that Charles Roditi was the purchasing agent in South America for R. H. Macy & Co. and not Rhodes, who was only in charge of coordination and promotion of the event. Although Morley intended to investigate Roditi, her main concern in the selection of modern art from South America was that those involved had the right qualifications of "good training and taste."<sup>481</sup> This idea of taste in this particular context of cultural production and legitimate works of art has been explored by Pierre Bourdieu in his social critique of the judgement of taste. He argues that "taste classifies, and it classifies the

---

<sup>479</sup> Ibid.

<sup>480</sup> Letter from Julian Street, Jr. to Wallace Harrison. July 10, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>481</sup> Letter from Grace McCann Morley to Julian Street, Jr. August 6, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

classifier.” He adds “Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make...”<sup>482</sup> Indeed, Morley’s words were markers of difference with Rhodes whom, without having met her, was already being classified as not knowing much about art, and thus having no art competencies or aesthetic disposition,<sup>483</sup> aided by the fact that she was involved in one of the lesser arts of fashion and design that could be taken as being less legitimate than works of art. And this was the difference between the two. Rhodes involved in the less intellectual aesthetics of dress and fashion whose consumption changed every season with new designs, styles, fabrics, patterns, colors, cuts, etc., was in a field that operated with different parameters of taste and distinction. Fashion, as Bourdieu argues, reveals a social hierarchy, values of self-representation and “characteristics of a position and a condition into a particular life-style, determining the value and importance accorded to social “connections”...greatest in the professions or the bourgeoisie of big business...as an opportunity to accumulate social capital.”<sup>484</sup>

In communicating with Rhodes Morley made clear how she classified herself. She wrote, “Contemporary work...needs someone with a thorough background in contemporary art and the ability to recognize talent as well as probable market possibilities.” She further added in relation to South America, “This contemporary

---

<sup>482</sup> Bourdieu, 1984: 6.

<sup>483</sup> Bourdieu defines aesthetic disposition as “the capacity to consider in and for themselves, as form rather than function, not only the works designated for such apprehension, i.e. legitimate works of art, but everything in the world, including cultural objects which are not yet consecrated—such as, at one time, primitive arts, or nowadays, popular photography or kitsh—and natural objects.” Ibid.

<sup>484</sup> Bourdieu, 1984: 202.

field is not an easy one, as it still lacks landmarks necessarily.”<sup>485</sup> Morley confided, “there are interesting and live modern movements everywhere. I have seen fine things but the work is not even. That is one reason why choice must be very carefully made.”<sup>486</sup> What Morley was saying was that “good training” did not mean what she called a conservative “died-in-the-wool academic,” but someone who, like her, would be open and interested in the new modern art movements and emerging artists that she considered to have the most appeal.

Perhaps taking this as an art exhibition rather than an art sale, Morley was relieved that it had been postponed until January 1942 giving more time to do a good show. It is not surprising then that Morley’s involvement with the R. H. Macy & Co. enterprise at this point was more of a limited role as advisor rather than helping in the organization by sending letters to her artist-friends in South America. She argued against it by expressing the high cost of air mail posting and the time spent writing letters in both Spanish and French. At the moment she lacked time due to her current work with ten countries (in Central and South America), lectures about Latin American art, and publications and articles. Rather than a large investment of her time in a project that she did not support, Morley instead recommended to Rhodes and R. H. Macy & Co. to use what was readily available in the United States. She suggested a group of paintings from Peru shown at the moment at the Newark Museum of Art, which were of good quality. She intimated

---

<sup>485</sup> Letter from Grace McCann Morley to June Hamilton Rhodes. August 5, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>486</sup> Letter from Grace McCann Morley to Julian Street, Jr. August 6, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

also that she would, by the time of the exhibition, have an artwork from a very good artist from Ecuador and from the young Colombian painter, Luís Alberto Acuña whose work she had in storage at the San Francisco Museum.<sup>487</sup>

To mend her relationship with the CI-AA Art Section in New York after her "blast" to Julian Street Jr. and aware that Harrison had seen it, Morley elaborated on her later communication with Rhodes, who she supposed got "her tempo from the manner in which fashions kaleidoscopically replaced one another."<sup>488</sup> She expressed her relief at the delay and her concern at what she considered a lack of plans by Rhodes. She was reassured by the involvement of Abbott's Art Section, which in fact was her own involvement. Regarding Roditi, she had found out that his wife was an art advisor for the government of Argentina (in fact it was Venezuela), and his father-in-law owned a large collection of European paintings, the largest in South America. But she intended to do more research on him to determine if he was a conservative in his art taste, or a person like her, interested in the latest trends that would indeed do more justice to modern art. This emphasis on the "training and taste" repeated throughout Morley's correspondence may be taken as someone preoccupied with protecting a canon that she in fact was beginning to construct on the West Coast as the foremost expert of South American art at the

---

<sup>487</sup> Letter from Grace Morley to June Hamilton Rhodes, August 5, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>488</sup> Letter from Grace McCann Morley to Julian Street, Jr. August 6, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

moment and that would be in evidence in the three exhibitions she would produce for the CI-AA in early 1942.

Although Morley's involvement in future conversations about the R. H. Macy & Co. Art Gallery was limited, when Rhodes approach Morley to list her name as part of the advisory committee of the Fair at Harrison's suggestion, Morley flatly refused the honor. She said, "Frankly, I don't know that my name is of any use to you, though I appreciate your asking me. I have the feeling that I do not like to appear except where I have been of definite help and where I am taking an active interest."<sup>489</sup> Of course, now that Rhodes had established a working relationship with the CI-AA, Rhodes let Harrison know she had done the due diligence of asking Morley to serve with the resulting negative response. That this may have had some repercussions at the time is not clear, although the CI-AA was also having its share of difficulties with Morley in what seemed to be a relatively straightforward contract with the San Francisco Museum of Art to organize three circulating exhibitions of contemporary Latin American art for small museums, colleges and universities as considered below.

### **The U.S. State and the Macy's Latin American Fair**

While the CI-AA saw in the merchandise exhibit a contribution to hemispheric commercial defense and cooperation, R. H. Macy & Co. instead saw it as a solution to the lack of European products including cigars, liquors, wines and

---

<sup>489</sup> Letter from Grace McCann Morley to June Hamilton Rhodes. November 24, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

Champaign and other goods on their shelves. R. H. Macy & Co. and Rhodes, as manager, badly wanted this advertising event linked to the Council of National Defense and the CI-AA without realizing that the Office was now under the Office for Emergency Management. By October 9, 1941 the exhibit merchandise display had been officially transformed into a "Latin American Fair."<sup>490</sup> During the luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on October 14, 1941, R. H. Macy & Co. publicly announced the Fair, and gave credit to the support received from the CI-AA by reading a congratulatory telegram that the CI-AA had prepared specially for the luncheon invitation in Rockefeller's name.<sup>491</sup>

Here was R. H. Macy & Co. as the pioneer in retail merchandise trade with South America. This was the first display and market for Latin American products for sale to New York customers. In addition to its pioneering effort, it wanted to "make a practical demonstration to retailers throughout the United States that merchandise can be bought in Latin America which is competitive with any in the world's market."<sup>492</sup> As plans continued for the 40,000 square-foot space on the fifth floor of its flagship store on Broadway and 34<sup>th</sup> Street, the exhibit design consideration came to be an architectural constructed view of Latin America as a dramatic backdrop with authentic "color and atmosphere." The stage setting was to

---

<sup>490</sup> Note to Mr. Harrison from dld. October 9, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>491</sup> Memorandum. Executive Office of the President. Office for Emergency Management. To Wallace K. Harrison from Henrietta Markel. October 15, 1941. Original copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder : R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432. The telegram read: "Best wishes for a successful luncheon in connection with the opening of Macy's Fair of the other American Republics. An undertaking such as yours can go a long way toward making us all conscious of the rich and beautiful things which the Republics to the South are to offer us. My heartfelt congratulations to all."

<sup>492</sup> Ibid.

feature a bricolage of regional colonial and modern architecture. The entrance to the space offered a juxtaposition of colonial gateways from Mexico with the San José Ranch Doorway and from Peru with the Arequipa Church doorway. Once inside the public encountered a republican Rio de Janeiro Fiesta Square, a pre-Columbian Temple of the Warriors in Chichén Itzá, the Rio modern Air Terminal and the Caracas museum of art as backdrops to the merchandise and art.

These contradictions in space and temporality in complex relations between the pre-Columbian and the colonial past and the modern present at the Fair's architectural setting as an "impression" of Latin America, in fact have been considered by Néstor García Canclini. In his questioning of the hybridity of nation-states of Latin America where tradition and modernity co-exist side by side, he argues that the region has been post-modern before being modern or "that for being the land of pastiche and bricolage, where many periods and aesthetics are cited, we have had the pride of being postmodern for centuries..."<sup>493</sup> This deliberate design can be taken as giving authenticity to the very nature of the region. And if this was the case, it gave additional validity to the cultural production of artists whose works of art for sale were to be presented in a mini version of the Museum of Fine Arts in Caracas designed by architect Carlos Raúl Villanueva in 1937 occupying an area of approximately 20 x 54 feet. This last was no coincidence given Roditi's links with

---

<sup>493</sup> García Canclini. 1995: 6.



Venezuela and the presence of Ruml in the R. H. Macy & Co. Executive Suite aware of the commercial interests of Rockefeller in Venezuela.<sup>494</sup>

The press release announcing the R. H. Macy & Co. Latin American Fair to the public mentioned the Fair as an example of the “good neighbor policy” explained in detail in this case as “pioneering a new market for the products of Latin America.”<sup>495</sup> Jack I. Straus, President of the company, also stated: “Never in history have the interests of North and South America been so intertwined...in working together for democracy, for political understanding, and for the development of cultural and trade relations so vital for the future security and prosperity for us all.”<sup>496</sup> If this was very much a reflection of what Rockefeller had in mind, what came after was what Straus had in his: “And to me, one of the most encouraging signs is the determination of North American business men [sic] to open up new markets for the products of Latin American countries. Not simply as substitute for European markets temporarily paralyzed, but as a permanent program of reciprocal trade.”<sup>497</sup> Indeed he imagined a trading bloc of American Republics.

The postponement of the Fair and Art Gallery took a surprising turn as art was concerned. Morley’s suggestion for an exhibition drawn from local available

---

<sup>494</sup> Blue prints of Fair, 5th Floor R. H. Macy & Co., Inc, NARA, RG 229 Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Information Press, Box 206, Folder: Macy Fair Pamphlet Distribution, EN-1432.

<sup>495</sup> R. H. Macy & Co., Inc. “Macy Announces Plans for Latin American Fair. » News From Macy’s Latin American Fair. October 15, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>496</sup> Speech by Jack I. Straus. Quoted in R. H. Macy & Co., Inc. “Macy Announces Plans for Latin American Fair.” News From Macy’s Latin American Fair. October 15, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>497</sup> Speech by Jack I. Straus. Quoted in R. H. Macy & Co., Inc. « Macy Announces Plans for Latin American Fair. » News From Macy’s Latin American Fair. October 15, 1941. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

artwork was challenging and not feasible given the volume R. H. Macy & Co. was anticipating. In fact, it contradicted the very vision of the sale event opened to hundreds of thousands of U.S. customers. Unbeknownst to the CI-AA and to the Department of State, R. H. Macy & Co. and Roditi, whose *D. Roditi and Sons-Casa de Compras Universales* had offices in most South American countries, had gone ahead and made arrangements for art consignments with the different states with the provision that each government selected the artists and art that they wanted to represent them and to sell. The CI-AA New York Office was alerted on October 16, 1941 by the shipping agent M. J. Corbett & Co. about a cargo shipment containing a loan exhibition for R. H. Macy & Co., which included fifty-six original paintings that would enter the United States as artworks and not as commercial samples under Paragraph 1807 of the Tariff Act of 1941.<sup>498</sup> Paintings and sculptures in fact were like the rest of the merchandise, on consignment for sale.<sup>499</sup>

A week after the fact R. H. Macy & Co. was to follow the proper diplomatic and commercial channels and state regulations. For it, Martinuzzi traveled to Washington and met with CI-AA staff and diplomatic representatives of several embassies who had already promised merchandise and art shipments and others who were still deciding. The CI-AA intervened in their favor with Harrison sending letters of support to foreign embassies in Washington, which highlighted the

---

<sup>498</sup> Letter from Charles Phipps to Charles A. McQueen. November 4, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder : R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>499</sup> Letter from Leo Martinuzzi to J.C. Rovensky, Chairman of the Commercial and Financial Division. October 28, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

importance of trade and “the flow of goods north and south.”<sup>500</sup> This very act inevitably linked the Fair to the CI-AA as an official initiative in the eyes of foreign governments. With ocean transportation becoming increasingly difficult with unpredictable sailing schedules, R. H. Macy & Co. also requested assistance for priority cargo space for a total of 200 outstanding merchandise boxes (3 x 3 x 6 feet) including artworks from South America and shipping priority with steamship companies Ward Line, Grace Line and Moore-McCormack Steamship Companies. The estimation included 70 cases from Brazil to leave the ports of Santos and Rio de Janeiro, 60 cases from Argentina leaving the port of Buenos Aires and a negligible cargo-wise average of one to five boxes from Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.<sup>501</sup> These were the same shipping companies scheduled to return the boxes that comprised the three versions of the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* in the first two weeks of December 1941. Once announced, the Macy’s Latin American Fair, as it became known, created great interest. As the company had predicted, department stores nationwide immediately wanted to emulate the Macy’s experiment more for the trade situation with Europe than for an interest in the actual wares. However, the emulation became more of a loan of a traveling commercial display borrowed from R. H. Macy & Co.

Although the CI-AA had indicated a possible interest in having a presence at the Fair as early as July 1941, it was only after the Japanese Attack on December 7,

---

<sup>500</sup> Form letter to embassies and legations. Panama, El Salvador, etc . October 22, 1941. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>501</sup> Letter to Leo Martinuzzi from George F. Foley. November 28, 1941. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder : R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

1941 and the entry into World War II that convinced them of the worth of having an information display panel. Thus the CI-AA participation was confirmed rather late on December 20, 1941. With Harrison, the architect of the Rockefeller Center and the soon to be Hotel Avila of Caracas on staff, the CI-AA submitted blueprints for the design of the display panel "The American Republics Work Together" on December 22 to Leigh Allen, Director of Displays for R. H. Macy for construction.<sup>502</sup> The CI-AA opted for having six informative smaller panels in the areas of activity in Latin America in communication, transportation, education, trade agreements, agricultural activities and industrial developments that were placed against a colonial wall.

In addition, Wallace also designed a tri-fold pamphlet for distribution at the Fair under the title of "The American Republics." It featured on its main cover panel two photographs of a bronze copy of Jean-Antoine Houdon's George Washington statue in a Miraflores Park in Lima, Peru and the Sally Jane Farnham bronze equestrian statue of Simón Bolívar in New York's Central Park. In the inside panels, the pamphlet provided a list of things the united American Republics did such as "develop natural resources; exchange goods; finance, industry and commerce, expand transportation, resist aggression, encourage art and science, improve health and welfare; develop mutual understanding; and build a lasting peace."<sup>503</sup> As an

---

<sup>502</sup> Memorandum. Harmon Goldstone To Mr. Levy, Re: Plans for R. H. Macy Exhibit. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>503</sup> Department M. Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. "The American Republics." Pamphlet. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office 12-26248-1. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

advertising brochure and with the U.S. now at war, the six-panel pamphlet of the United Americas operated as a printed mass communication device to increase publicly the visibility of the economic and cultural defense objectives of the CI-AA. When fully opened, the tri-fold pamphlet featured a production map of the Western Hemisphere *sans* European colonies with an emphatic title of “The Goods They Exchange.” While the United States featured icons of industrial machinery, iron and steel, and automobiles production, in contrast Latin America featured icons of agricultural and mineral raw materials such as bananas, coffee, sugar, sisal, cocoa, hides, linseed, wool, copper, gold, minerals, petroleum, zinc, silver, gems, and nitrates and other agricultural and mineral raw materials.

Maps to Benedict Anderson are also institutions of power (like museums) in processes of nation-building and national ideology.<sup>504</sup> Within the CI-AA’s ideas of unity, this map of the Western Hemisphere helped visualize a contiguous and interconnected economic region and a new territorial American space. Perhaps it is in the tri-fold pamphlet, is where the idea of an interconnected hemisphere with the driving power of a U.S. capitalism economic activity and market expanding in regional geographic area was first made public. The pamphlet was a visual aid for the R. H. Macy & Co. audiences to comprehend the beginning of a hemispheric transformation in anticipation to an emerging new world order. It insinuated the rise of a new structure of power of the U.S. State in a regionalization project that would reconfigure an industrial modernity and transform the American space. In

---

<sup>504</sup> Anderson, 1991: 163.

this regionalization of the hemispheric space and market was the integration through the technological advances of air transportation. A Douglas DC-3 plane icon circumnavigating an imaginary Equatorial line on the pamphlet's map called attention to new air travel and tourism industries by listing air time distances for flights originating in New York to capital cities throughout the Americas. The shrinking of space and time that air transportation promised over steamship routes was notable. In South America, Bogota and Caracas as the closest places to New York were only 1 ½ day away while Montevideo was 4 ½ days away in an expanding transportation circuit with routes once dominated by German and Italian airlines and now controlled by U.S. interests and national airlines. This regionalization strengthening the Inter-American system with new social transnational and interstate relations and new forms of economic modernity, if not empire, was supported by communications technologies at a moment of increased defense activity. At the end of December 1941 under changed world conditions, the CI-AA thanked Straus for pressing on with the plans for the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery. Harrison wrote "your going ahead with preview in spite of difficulties very desirable to this part of the government at this time. Anything you can do will be very much appreciated."<sup>505</sup>

Coinciding with the opening of the R. H. Macy & Co. Fair and Art gallery was the Third Consultative Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American

---

<sup>505</sup> W.K. Harrison to Jack I. Straus. December 29, 1941. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

Republics on January 15-28, 1942 in Rio de Janeiro to address the urgent topic of the Western Hemisphere and World War II. Declaring a continental solidarity in the observance of treaties, it reaffirmed that any act of aggression against one American state by a non-American state constituted an act of aggression against all. Therefore, Japan's Pearl Harbor attack to the United States was taken as a de facto attack to all. Among its forty-one conclusions, the Consultative Meeting recommended breaking diplomatic relations with the countries that were signatories of the Tripartite Pact (according to each state's procedures and laws). In addition it recommended addressing issues related to civil and commercial aviation, the severance of commercial and financial relations, the economic mobilization of American republics for strategic and basic materials resulting in a trade bloc, and plan for a transition to a post-war period as a readjustment of production and trade among others.<sup>506</sup>

Of course, the connection between the meeting and the Macy's Fair did not escape the attention of the CI-AA. In fact, it capitalized on the press coverage and publicity that it could bring in Rio de Janeiro.<sup>507</sup> The day after the initial meeting in

---

<sup>506</sup> The Meeting produced a final act with forty-one approved conclusions with some reservations. With Under Secretary of State Summer Wells heading the U.S. delegation, one approved conclusion about one sole country's international policy made it into the final Act: that of the United States foreign policy of the 'Good Neighbor.' Officially Wells reiterated 1933 FDR's diplomatic international and world relations position prescribing "respect for the fundamental rights of states as well as cooperation between them for the welfare of international society..." Final Act of the Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, January 15, to 28, 1942, Conclusion XXII, p. 39. Organization of American States. <http://www.oas.org/council/MEETINGS%20OF%20CONSULTATION/Actas/Acta%203.pdf> Accessed 6 March 2014.

<sup>507</sup> Memorandum to Mr. Spaeth from Mr. McClintock. January 5, 1942. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

Rio de Janeiro, the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery held an opening dinner at the Ritz Carlton Hotel which was previewed by international radio-broadcast. Against a backdrop of a changed world, World War II and the Consultative Meeting of Foreign Minister of the American Republics in Rio, the Macy's Latin American Fair opening became a well-attended diplomatic and political event with ambassadors, chargé d'affaires, embassy counselors, consuls, politicians, public figures, the wives of the U.S. Secretary of State and the U.S. Under Secretary of State with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mrs. Henry A. Wallace serving as Honorary Patronesses.<sup>508</sup> Distinguished guests were taken to New York from Washington in special train cars attached to the Pennsylvania Railroad train. Opening to the public the next day, the Fair became an instant success and a welcome temporary respite in a city preoccupied with war. It introduced manufactured goods to a new market that up to that moment had considered Latin America as the sole producer of raw materials and agricultural products. Instead the public encountered retail goods such as books, music records, leather goods, tin candlesticks, tin cigarette boxes, tin frames, copper ashtrays and cigarette boxes, decorative baskets and hampers, rugs, silverware, tableware, textiles, woodenware, hand-cut crystal, silver and gold jewelry, emeralds, diamonds, semi-precious stones, fur pelts and garments, ceramics, handicrafts, and art. In addition, a special section

---

<sup>508</sup> Under changed world conditions, the CI-AA was appreciative Jack I. Straus, as he had pressed on with his plans for the Macy's Latin American Fair. Soon Harrison was writing, "Your going ahead with preview in spite of difficulties very desirable to this part of your government at this time. Anything you can do will be very much appreciated." Letter from W. K. Harrison to Jack I Straus. December 29, 1941. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.



of wines, rums and cordials featured Argentine and Chilean wines, Peruvian pisco, Cuban rum, Mexican tequila, Brazilian Champaign and Havana cigars.

Given its setting and a new market of consumers, some of this merchandise had been designed specifically with a U.S. appeal in mind and specially produced with design specifications from the R. H. Macy & Co. Foreign Office including size, colors, and patterns to fit this new market. All products were selected and backed by the “quality and taste,” as a marker of distinction, that characterized the merchandise that R. H. Macy & Co. purveyed.<sup>509</sup> Moreover, The Travel Bureau—sponsored by Ask Mr. Foster Travel Agency, The Grace Line, the Moore-MacCormack Lines, Pan American Airways, Panagra and the United Fruit Co.—sold the promises of a charming and colorful vacation paradise of snowy peaks, sunny beaches, impenetrable jungles, lush vegetation, exotic fruits, fragrant spices all at a time of war when air travel required clearance from the Department of State and steamships were in the process of being requisitioned and adapted for war mobilization and use.<sup>510</sup>

In this pageantry of Latin America, a varied public program featured the life and culture of each country in poster images, daily showings of the CI-AA-produced film *Americans All*, concerts by the CBS Tipica Orchestra, and an assortment of performers and musicians. Attendance at the Macy’s Latin American Fair and Art Gallery was so high that Thursday, January 24, 1942 was estimated to be a record

---

<sup>509</sup> Macy’s Latin American Fair. Brochure. New York: R.H. Macy & Co. Inc., Herald Square, 1942: 8.

<sup>510</sup> These companies were listed as sponsors of the Travel Bureau in the brochure “Macy’s Latin American Fair.” New York: R. H. Macy & Co. Inc., Herald Square, 1942: 29.

day with 76,118 visitors. The total attendance between January 17 and 25, 1942 reached 386,319 people.<sup>511</sup> The success was such that the Macy's Latin American Fair as a staged impression of Latin America with an architecture which R. H. Macy & Co. itself called "a composite of a thousand authentic details,"<sup>512</sup> morphed into a wildly popular attraction. The use of rich textures and "authentic" colors such as Gaucho mustard, Quito purple, Belem pink, Rio mist, Inca orange, Amazon Jungle green, La Paz sun, and Andes white made it the most appealing to the general public.<sup>513</sup> Even the owner of amusement parks Luna Park at Coney Island visited, interested in purchasing the Macy's Fair with its Temple of Jewels, the Jungle, the Street of Silver, the Avenida 1492, the Market Place, The Coffee Finca, the Fiesta Square, Rug Mart, the Fair Arcade, and Art Gallery included.<sup>514</sup>

In fact, part of the high visitation was the novelty of the conversion of the R. H. Macy & Co. Herald Square store's Fifth floor into an indoor fairground's midway with stereotypical spaces, streets, and the sideshow attractions in the rotating art exhibitions and music performances. But more than entertainment, the fair met an urgent need to familiarize the public with new geographic locales of merchandise production. As a marketing and advertising campaign with the official participation of Latin American governments it appealed to the nascent middle class of New York

---

<sup>511</sup> Telegram. Edwin I. Marks to Wallace K. Harrison. Jan 23, 1942. Original. NARA, RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>512</sup> Macy's Latin American Fair. New York: R. H. Macy & Co. Inc., Herald Square, 1942: 9.

<sup>513</sup> Colors used throughout the architectural stage of the fair as listed in Macy's Latin American Fair. New York: R. H. Macy & Co. Inc., Herald Square, 1942: 29.

<sup>514</sup> Letter from June Hamilton Rhodes to Nelson Rockefeller. January 29, 1942. NARA, Original. RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

consumers in both sight and sensation. Architectural elevation drawings indeed show a close attention to the original detail for backdrops for merchandise staging. This visual imagery and pseudo realism helped the audience to experience Latin America while the travel bureau representing travel agencies, airlines, steamships companies, and a proto multinational corporation promoted the nascent tourist industry to a region that shared with the United States “a common history, common problems and common hope for the future.”<sup>515</sup> With the U.S. at war, the architecture was an educational and marketing campaign to expand the visitors’ knowledge about the new economic region and trading bloc, to support new regional interactions, and to showcase the countries where R. H. Macy & Co. fine goods now originated.

Rather than a construction of an imagined Latin America, the architectural rendition of the backdrop with an amalgamation of actual places in the hemisphere served a different marketing purpose. Consumers were transported for a fleeting moment to new spaces, new experiences, and new geographic locales in Mexico City, Arequipa, Caracas, Rio de Janeiro, and Chichén Itzá. Thus R. H. Macy & Co. hopefully convincing them to purchase goods as souvenirs before leaving the store. With most merchandise sold by April 1942, the architectural display was disassembled, placed in storage, and the fifth floor of the store restored to its former retail use. The CI-AA 11 x 11 foot panel was requested back by the office and retouched for further

---

<sup>515</sup> Macy\*s Latin American Fair. New York: R. H. Macy & Co. Inc., Herald Square, 1942: 9.

use in public events such as Pan American Week in Chicago and a Booksellers Convention in New York.<sup>516</sup>

### **Modern Art as a Commodity at the Macy's Latin American Fair**

If the Fair was successful in most commercial and cultural respects with merchandise and concerts and music, in art it was less so. As Morley had correctly anticipated in her correspondence of July 1941, this was an art “merchandising show,” rather than an exhibition, with more than four hundred consigned artworks between paintings, sculptures, and works on paper for sale. The small gallery with irregular and opened walls in a space measuring 20 x 54 feet with an approximate area of 1,080 square feet, thus made necessary the rotation of exhibitions in correspondence to daily celebrations by country. For South American countries, it was Argentina on January 17, Bolivia on January 19, Brazil on January 20, Chile on January 21, Colombia on January 22, Ecuador on January 26, Paraguay on February 3, Peru on February 4, Uruguay on February 5, Venezuela on February 6 and to close Pan American Day on February 7, 1942. This rotation, in fact, hampered the gallery's art presentation and the sale of artworks by exposing each country's artwork for one day only and ultimately having not one but multiple exhibitions.<sup>517</sup>

---

<sup>516</sup> Memorandum on Macy Exhibit for Use in Chicago, From Garland C. Routt. April 7, 1942. NARA, Original. RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>517</sup> It is not clear how many countries sent artwork and how many participated in the Art Gallery. Given that some shipments did not make it beyond the New York customhouse. Listed in the brochure are: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Uruguay, Venezuela. See “Painting and Sculpture from Latin America, The Art Gallery. Macy's Latin American Fair. New York: R. H. Macy & Co., Inc. Herald Square, 1942.

Although announced as “the most comprehensive exhibition of painting and sculptures from Latin America ever assembled in the United States...[with] contemporary work selected by the governments of the countries exhibiting,”<sup>518</sup> the exhibition suffered from the inadequate gallery space and overpromises of circulating tours in the United States that never materialized. In fact other than World Fairs, this was indeed a comprehensive exhibition of contemporary artwork from countries in Latin America, which the Fair presented as such and not as a monolithic bloc under a “Latin American Contemporary Art” appellation. The Gallery brochure titled *Paintings and Sculpture from Latin America, The Art Gallery* further indicated this distinction. Taken as such, this exhibition as presented by country contested the very idea of a single modern Latin American art that Morley was advocating with the small exhibitions she was about to produce.

Unlike the plan that Morley had initially suggested to Rhodes of limiting the exhibition to artwork already in the United States, this event instead had grown to a large multi-nation art sale backed by each government with artworks as commodities or symbolic goods rather than a sample of national art by the most favored national artist(s). Behind this was the very realistic possibility at the moment of establishing a hemispheric market for art. In fact, artwork had been exported as commercial commodities as cargo along with other merchandise. Paintings and sculptures were like the rest of the merchandise, on consignment for

---

<sup>518</sup> Macy’s Latin American Fair, Jan. 17 1942, p. 7. Brochure. Original. NARA, RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

sale.<sup>519</sup> If Morley had initial concerns about this becoming a sample of conservative “groups that have the government ear and the government support,”<sup>520</sup> the number of artists and the multiple works in different media that each sent tends to contradict this position (Appendix D). The less rigorous and more open selection of artworks on consignment rather than as national museum masterpieces provided instead a more varied representation of artists, styles, and genres by each country. Of course, each state was acting in that capacity that William Benton had called “the state passing aesthetic judgment.”<sup>521</sup>

What makes this comprehensive exhibition notable is precisely the fact that the paintings and sculptures were commodities or marketable items and not museum pieces. And as such the selection by government officials was not as strict as if these were part of a circulating exhibition as the museum artworks of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* were. As a commercial sale of symbolic goods, the Art Gallery booklet listed artworks as “items”<sup>522</sup> with a total of 302 from South America from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay and Venezuela, and from Central America from Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico and Panama, which arrived prior to going to press. That the consignment of art response from each country went beyond any R. H. Macy & Co. expectation is evident in the number of

---

<sup>519</sup> Leo Martinuzzi to J. C. Rovensky, Chairman of the Commercial and Financial Division. CI-AA, October 28, 1941. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>520</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley to June Hamilton Rhodes, August 5, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

<sup>521</sup> Benton intervention in December 1940 planning meeting when it was suggested that the OCCRBAR dedicated a sum to purchase art from countries in South America, noted above.

<sup>522</sup> The text read: “Every item that had arrived before we went to press is included in this catalog.” “Painting and Sculpture from Latin America, The Art Gallery.” Macy’s Latin American Fair. New York: R. H. Macy & Co., Inc. Herald Square, 1942: n.p.

artists and the variety of artworks. That perhaps the store oversold itself as “the largest store in the world” is an apt way to put it.

This mass commodification of art at the hands of the R. H. Macy & Co. flagship New York Store is also interesting from the perspective of the monetary value and price that it assigned to each artwork that responded to a marketable practice of odd-pricing that the Straus family had introduced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century at the store.<sup>523</sup> In the *Paintings and Sculpture from Latin America, The Art Gallery* brochure item prices ranged from the low at \$4.49 to the high of \$4,999 for sculptures (Samuel Ramón of Chile and Maria Martins of Brazil respectively), from the low \$49.75 to the high \$4,999 for oil paintings (Marieta Botero of Colombia and Cupertino del Campo of Argentina respectively), and a single price of \$39.75 for pen and ink drawings by different artists (Flavio Rezende de Carvalho, Alberto da Veiga Guinhard, Roberto Burle Marx of Brazil) making this pricing system seem more like comparable merchandise rather than aesthetic value or artist name.

In fact, in the study of the economy of symbolic goods Pierre Bourdieu considers the art business as “a trade of things that have no price.”<sup>524</sup> Art is valued through a system of beliefs, which Bourdieu calls ideology of creation. The price of the artwork is not determined by production costs (materials + creativity + labor), but by a value assignment in a particular practice which operates with two

---

<sup>523</sup> R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., List of Deals. Lehman Brothers Collection-Contemporary Business Archives, Harvard Business School, Baker Library. [http://www.library.hbs.edu/hc/lehman/company.html?company=r\\_h\\_macy\\_co\\_inc](http://www.library.hbs.edu/hc/lehman/company.html?company=r_h_macy_co_inc) accessed 6 March 2014.

<sup>524</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production, Essays on Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993: 74.

producers—artist and dealer. This ideology of creation, according to Bourdieu, masks the role of the dealer who places the artwork in the market and, by vouching disinterest to his discovery, consecrates the artwork. In the cycle of consecration, the dealer with the recognized name and accumulated symbolic capital of “prestige” and “authority” consecrates the artwork with this own consecration. He is the one “who can proclaim the value of the [artist] he defends...and ‘invests his prestige’ in the [artist] case, acting as a ‘symbolic banker’ who offers as security all the symbolic capital he has accumulated.”<sup>525</sup> Despite the Art Gallery name of the space where art works were shown at the Fair, it did not operate within this ideology of creation as its value was assigned by the store itself rather than the creators or the state sponsors. Despite the prestige of the store, it operated in a different realm than art. R. H. Macy & Co. was not the dealer for the artists and art from ten countries that would imbue them with its prestige thus consecrating them. This was a circuit of trade goods rather than culture. And as such, this unprecedented shipment of art from Central and South American governments indicate the interest of countries to consider art as an exportable commodity more than a means to represent a national culture.

During 1942 artists from South America expressed their disappointment with R. H. Macy & Co. about the disposition of artworks purchased or borrowed after the Fair, the Art Gallery and its organization, the lack of accurate information with respect to sales and prices, and the number of artworks from Ecuador that

---

<sup>525</sup> Ibid. 1993: 77.



never made it past U.S. customs. And therefore were not included in the sale. In the middle of this was the CI-AA with the letters of support to embassies that tacitly had endorsed the Fair as a State-sponsored affair. As such, its name became affiliated with the Fair. Soon it found itself at the receiving end of complaints. One year to the day that the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery opened, the CI-AA was still dealing with finding a satisfactory resolution to the issue of the disposition of artworks.

As Porter McCray from the CI-AA Art Section noted, two artists whose works were incorrectly announced by R. H. Macy & Co. as sold, were now requesting that they be placed in a museum instead; the Argentinean government with a total of \$37,147.54 in consigned artwork could not comprehend why not a single piece had sold and now under risky war conditions did not want the artwork returned; three artists in Ecuador wondered why their artworks never left U.S. customs, were not sold, and why there were no attempts to return the paintings to them; painters in Colombia who sold their art complained about receiving less money than the sale price advertised in the brochure. Those who did not sell were surprised that there had been no efforts to show the artwork still in the United States in any museum or gallery.<sup>526</sup> In fact, the Art Section had considered artwork from the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery that had not been shown for additional traveling exhibitions. Alfred Barr and Stanton Catlin went to Macy's to look at the collection

---

<sup>526</sup> Memorandum. From Porter McCray to Wallace K. Harrison. January 16, 1943. File copy. RG229, General Records, Central Files, Box 206, Folder: R. H. Macy & CO Exhibition EN 1432.

of artworks that had not been exhibited during the fair and “were rather well impressed”<sup>527</sup> with what they saw but it is not clear what came of it and if the reorganization of the Art Section had any impact on the decision.

Unbeknownst to these various artists was the fact that this was a R. H. Macy & Co. merchandise affair and that although the CI-AA had offered its support and participated in it with a panel display, it had never entered into an official agreement of co-sponsorship with them. Therefore, this was causing avoidable problems as the CI-AA Art Section was now being associated with a program that was not its own. To solve the issue, the CI-AA reached out to the R. H. Macy & Co. executives in charge of the Latin American Fair and Art Gallery to solve what was becoming a hurdle in the otherwise cordial relations with the other American Republics and one that risked the reputation of the store in future inter-hemispheric commercial enterprises. What was in the minds of the CI-AA Art Section instead was the series of three exhibitions that were circulating in the East, West and Mid-region of the United States.

### **The CI-AA’s Contemporary Latin American Art Exhibitions in the United States**

Parallel to the planning of the R. H. Macy & Co. Latin American Fair and Art Gallery, the CI-AA in the fall of 1941 was busy preparing new contracts for nine small exhibitions of three sections each of pre-Columbian, colonial, and

---

<sup>527</sup> Olive Lyford to Grace McCann Morley. February 10, 1942. NARA, RG229, Box 365.

contemporary Latin American Art to be offered for circulation in the East Coast, West Coast and the Middle Western states of the United States at a rental fee of \$17 per section.<sup>528</sup> For the production of the contemporary exhibitions, the CI-AA was engaging the San Francisco Museum of Art and Grace McCann Morley to assemble, pack and deliver to the Museum of Modern Art three exhibition of the contemporary art of the “other American Republics.”<sup>529</sup> With this, the CI-AA was reaching out once again to MoMA to circulate them under Contract No. OEMcr-42 of October 1941 through its Office of Circulating Exhibitions, which had overseen the South American tour of 1941.<sup>530</sup>

Morley’s contract became a two-month protracted negotiation with the San Francisco Museum of Art asking about the specific role for Morley. She in turn questioned about who, in case of a catastrophic event or death, would organize the exhibition. The contract after much discussion was finally signed in January 1942. At Morley’s request, the contract with the San Francisco Museum of Art specifically

---

<sup>528</sup> The Pre-Columbian art and three of Colonial art were under contract with the Brooklyn Museum of Art.

<sup>529</sup> Contract OEMcr-51 for \$3,000 of January 7, 1942. What the \$3,000 contract entailed was for the San Francisco Museum to organize it, secure the artwork, and provide labels, descriptive panels and publicity for each exhibition.

<sup>530</sup> Entailed in this contract was the packing, transportation, unpacking, storage between venues insurance of the exhibitions, in addition to hiring personnel and covering expenses related to packing materials, travel of representatives, materials, office supplies, postage, salaries, photographs, publicity materials, and telephone, telegraph and cable expenses. The contract was to be terminated one year from signing or when the allocated monies were depleted. Contract No. OEMcr-42 for \$5,000 dated October 14, 1941. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: Museum of Modern Art OEMcr-42. Approvals of contracts were being requested as early as September 25, 1941 with funds coming from the Office for Emergency Management appropriations under the Act of July 3, 1941, Public No. 150, 77<sup>th</sup> Congress. Additional exhibitions of Pre-Columbian and colonial art were also planned. Letter from Dudley T. Easby, Jr. Assistant General Counsel, CI-AA to Sidney Sherwood, Office for Emergency Management. September 22, 1941. File Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 365. Folder: 3-Traveling exhibition of L.A. Art –Brooklyn Institute of Art, OEMcr-43.

stipulated in a clause that the exhibitions be organized under the “personal direction and supervision of Dr. Grace L. McCann Morley.”<sup>531</sup> Now with less than two months to organize three different sections of about twenty-five artworks each of the Contemporary Latin American Art before going to committed venues in February and March 1942, Morley did what she had suggested to R. H. Macy & Co. and June Hamilton Rhodes: use what was at hand.

With the production and identity of the three exhibitions solely in the hands of Morley, she selected about seventy-five artworks. For this she relied on artworks in the permanent collection of the San Francisco Museum of Art, dipped into her own personal art collection, and requested a few loans from MoMA. With a sample not yet complete, she approached California private collectors Else and Max Honigbaum, Colonel and Mrs. Erskine Wood, Mrs. Adolph Mack, Ricardo López, Louis Bonhote and Robert McNaught as well as East Coast private collectors William Berrien and Alfred Franklin. In addition, she solicited loans from artists Antonio Sotomayor of San Francisco; Luís Alberto Acuña of Colombia whose artworks were in deposit at the San Francisco Museum of Art awaiting an exhibition; Carlos Enríquez, Felipe Orlando and Amelia Peláez of Cuba through Mrs. Cordes of New York; Roberto Berdecio of Bolivia residing in the U.S.; and Nicolás J. Urta of Uruguay.

Morley was aiming at securing as wide a sample as possible that represented modern art of Central and South America as she saw it and conceived it. Aware of

---

<sup>531</sup> Contract No. OEMcr-51. Copy. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: OEMcr-51 San Francisco Museum of Art.

the limitation that twenty-five paintings, watercolor and works on paper each implied, Morley converted these exhibitions into educational tools for the small museums, colleges and universities where they would be shown. In the East Coast Section she included artists Onofrio Pacenza of Argentina, Berdecio and Sotomayor of Bolivia, Cândido Portinari of Brazil; Acuña of Colombia; Enriquez, Peláez and Wifredo Lam of Cuba; Eduardo Kingman and Humberto Estrella of Ecuador; Carlos Mérida of Guatemala; Francisco Dosamantes, José Clemente Orozco, Diego Rivera and Rufino Tamayo of Mexico; Julia Codesido of Peru; and Nicolás J. Urta of Uruguay. In the West Coast Section Morley also included Sotomayor and Berdecio of Bolivia; Flavio de Carvalho and Portinari of Brazil; Acuña of Colombia; Enríquez, Peláez, Felipe Orlando and Domingo Ravenet of Cuba; Kingman and Estrella of Ecuador; Mérida of Guatemala; Orozco, Rivera, Máximo Pacheco, Fermín Revueltas, Davis Alfaro Siqueiros and Alfredo Zalce of Mexico and Nicolás J. Urta of Uruguay, with no works representing Argentina or Peru and with a heavy leaning towards Mexican art. For the Middle Western States, as these states were referred at the time, Morley included artworks by Ernesto Scotti of Argentina; Berdecio and Sotomayor of Bolivia; Portinari of Brazil; Acuña of Colombia; Lam, Orlando and Peláez of Cuba; Estrella and Kingman of Ecuador; Mérida of Guatemala; Orozco, Pacheco, Revueltas, Rivera, Zalce of Mexico; Codesido of Peru; and Urta of Uruguay (Appendix E).

As organized with what was handily available, the three sections came to prioritize the artwork of Berdecio and Sotomayor as sole representatives of the modern art of Bolivia as they did for Acuña for Colombia, Mérida for Guatemala, and

Urta for Uruguay thus presenting a rather distorted view of each country's modern art developments and trends. Aware of this major fault, Morley added to each exhibition twelve additional 30 x 40 inch explanatory panels for each country that sought to present a more balanced and ample panorama of contemporary trends and art movements. In addition, she developed two-volume study books for each exhibition which contained comprehensive information on Central and South American countries, their contemporary art, biographical information on artists, a set of 52 slides and a script for a lecture. All this with the aim of educating an audience to which the exhibitions most likely presented their first encounter with the modern art of Central and South America.<sup>532</sup> In the organization of the exhibitions and curatorial processes Morley came to construct an idea of a modern "Latin American Art" with what she found available in the United States at her museum and in her personal collection, in those of her collector friends and artist-friends, and in MoMA. In this ambitious yet incomplete construction, Morley described the small exhibitions in terms of what she saw as important and representative of general trends. As such and with an educational identity, Morley was more interested in showing the most salient "modern and new" artistic tendencies within their particular contexts.

The explanatory introduction text to the exhibitions indeed reveals a very personal conception of modern "Latin American art" and "South American art" and

---

<sup>532</sup> Memorandum. Olive M. Lyford To Kenneth Holland, May 19, 1942. Original. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: OEMcr-51 San Francisco Museum of Art.

one that favored *Indigenism*<sup>533</sup> in its local varieties as a modern art movement. Morley characterized *Indigenism* as being “the more exotic...more interesting and fruitful art movements...taking their roots from the country itself.”<sup>534</sup> With this, Morley in contrast positioned the art in countries such as Argentina, Chile and Brazil as having decidedly adapted European influence. In conceiving these trends Morley was constructing a “Latin American art” in relation to life in each country. Morley, as a European-trained art historian, tended in her curatorial views toward novel approaches and authenticity that she described as art “taking its roots from the country itself, in all its variety.”<sup>535</sup> For Morley this approach was not radically different from U.S. art developments of Social Realism and American Scene movements such as those shown in the recent exhibition of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* in its tour in South America the year before.

How Morley conceived of *Indigenisms* as modern art movements was their higher level of complexity that required knowledge of the geographical, social and political context where they were being produced. In other words, to read the trend or movement one needed to have an art competency in order to decode the meaning. Complementing this view about what made *Indigenism* so attractive was that in its various incarnations in different countries, it was an authentic modern art

---

<sup>533</sup> For the most complete study on Indigenism as modern art, see Michele Greet, *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

<sup>534</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, RG229, Box 365, p. 2.

<sup>535</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, RG229, Box 365, p. 3.

movement of the Western Hemisphere, “its own original contribution.”<sup>536</sup> Within this idea of authenticity to Central and South America, Morley was looking through the eyes of the Mexican art of the 1920s and its “native pre-Columbian art tradition” in a setting of a country with a large indigenous population. In this construction, with Mexico as example, Morley was indeed glossing over the fact that the very Mexican art of the 1920s had been a government-sponsored art program whose visibility was afforded mostly by a few trained artists with deep knowledge about European art. In fact, Rivera engaged a cubist grid as an organizational device that had little to do with a Mayan or Aztec way of organizing the pictorial plane. In all its complexity, however, the Mexican mural movement had followed an ideological visual program of a new State with a nationalist narrative for the illiterate masses after a revolution that had destroyed both state and nation.

As South American modern art trends went, Morley saw the modern art of Peru as second after Mexico in a successful appropriation of its own cultural roots and usable past. In modern Peruvian art, it was the presence of an Incan and colonial cultural past and Indigenous populations in addition to a rich and varied topography that she described as having contrasting geographical regions of the Andes and the Amazons where peaks and valleys, tropical jungles, and deserts, provided inspiration for a peculiar Peruvian Indigenist modern art trend.

---

<sup>536</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, RG229, Box 365, p. 3.



Aware of the limitations that these small survey exhibitions for U.S. consumption, Morley positioned modern “Latin American art” in the context of a very extensive geographical terrain with “a more complex and diversified picture than all the countries of Europe.”<sup>537</sup> In trying to present a contemporary heterogeneous view under the homogenizing label of “Latin American art,” Morley tried to convey the variety of art as well as the rather marked characteristics of the countries and regions. This series of exhibitions were perhaps the first exhibitions of “Latin American art” geared towards small centers, groups, schools and universities with a rather marked educational undertone. As such, Morley saw these instructional exhibitions as a “foundation for a better understanding of these countries and of their people.”<sup>538</sup> However this identity of exhibitions as instructional and explanatory was masking a much larger concept of cultural defense that had started in its initial phase as unity and friendship in South America and now with the war was entering a new phase in the United States with an urgent need to come together for a common hemispheric defense.

From a curatorial perspective, in the twelve panels that complemented each exhibition, Morley’s narrative reveals more of her conception of the art that she positioned as reflecting the character of each individual country despite the homogenizing label of Latin American art. She said “...art in each case is in a very intimate and direct way the expression of these diverse conditions of geography, of

---

<sup>537</sup> Ibid. p. 3.

<sup>538</sup> Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, RG229, Box 365, p. 4.

climate, of pre-Spanish development, of population, origins and also of social, political and economic factors of great complexity.”<sup>539</sup> Even though the label was “Latin American art,” Morley stressed that the difficult term Latin America was “not a unity”<sup>540</sup> further explaining her use as “a convenient collective term for the many very different republics to the south of the United States...”<sup>541</sup> This was in fact, a contradiction to the very security identity the CI-AA wanted its programs to convey: that of unity and friendship.

Regionalizing the art of Central and South America under commonalities of a Latin heritage, rather than otherizing it as the CI-AA was doing by calling it “the art of the Other American Republics,” Morley was calling attention to the fact that the different trends responded to specific contexts and conditions. Paradoxically, she was stressing the point of difference and heterogeneity under a homogenizing term that lumped the art of nine countries in South America together. In her view of an authentic art in South America, she indeed privileged Peru as a country whose contemporary art had deep Indian heritage roots forming the foundation for Indigenist modern art. Given its large Indian population, Peru exemplified the *Indigenism* movement, which gravitated around José Sabogal, of Spanish descent, who was the director of the Fine Arts School in Lima where *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* had been shown and for which he was the main contact. Among his protégés were artists Julia Codesido, Teresa Carvallo, Paul Pro,

---

<sup>539</sup> Ibid. p. 16.

<sup>540</sup> Ibid.

<sup>541</sup> Ibid.

Camilo Blas, and Enrique Camino Brent whose art had “stylized, simplified, somewhat expressionistic tendency.”<sup>542</sup> After Peru, there were the other Andean countries with Indigenist modern art such as Ecuador and Bolivia.

In Bolivia and Ecuador Morley found a tendency for *Indigenism* given the large Indian populations and a cultural past and present that dominated everyday life. However, this trend was not as developed and not as successful or of the quality as in Peru. In considering the background of artists and the idea of authenticity, Morley differentiated between the picturesque and the indigenist in art. To her, artists who had European training or origins and may have been fascinated with indigenous subject matter would treat it “objectively and with detachment” in contrast to the “intimate and direct interpretation of the true ‘indigenistas.’”<sup>543</sup> However there was no mention of pure native (non Mestizo) artists treating Indian themes. In her analysis of Colombian art, Morley noticed a series of tendencies that directly reflected the life of an Andean country, which showed little of Indigenism in modern art despite the presence of an Indian subject matter in picturesque and colorful paintings, which did not explore any intimate feeling or spirit. Instead a more popular tendency and colonial roots informed the work of the anthropologist-turned artist Luís Alberto Acuña who recorded everyday life in countryside towns. In contrast, Venezuela and Cuba for Morley represented the Caribbean region one, which rather than a style, reflected a local and native tropical subject matter.

---

<sup>542</sup> Ibid. p. 48.

<sup>543</sup> Ibid. pp. 23-24.

Within this artistic perception Venezuela was seen as a tropical country with a busy business capital and an active cultural exchange with New York and Paris.

Writing in 1942, Morley's perceptions of the contemporary art of Argentina, Chile and Uruguay were of European cultural derivations tinted with a local flavor. She was finding Argentinean contemporary art under the influence of a marked French art and School of Paris. A smaller current that sought to break from this influence instead looked for national and local inspiration and sensitivity. She compared it to the "American Scene" and thus suggested the name of "Argentine Scene" as a significant movement for the work of artists such as Alfredo Gramajo Gutiérrez, Onofrio Pacenza, and Benito Quinquela Martín. Furthermore, her view on Chilean art saw it as retardataire and still influenced by impressionism and post-impressionism. She attributed this to be a reflection of the culture given the transplantation of population and culture from Europe. In the contemporary art in Brazil, Morley observed the European academic derivation in the more conservative city of Rio de Janeiro in contrast to the avant-gardism of a more experimental São Paulo with European influences of the School of Paris, German expressionism, abstraction, cubism and surrealism mixed with its own Brazilian roots.

Circulating through small museums, centers, schools and universities, the consumption of the exhibitions that Morley had called a "general and brief introduction to a new and interesting field of study,"<sup>544</sup> had quite a favorable reception with comments that ranged from "perfectly marvelous!...it is the most

---

<sup>544</sup> Ibid. p. 7.

significant art show we have had in several years”<sup>545</sup> at the University of Wyoming; “Exceedingly interesting and more educational than most exhibits”<sup>546</sup> at the Saginaw Junior League; to “The exhibition was a definite success and there was marked interest throughout the city in the Latin American Paintings” at the St. Petersburg League of Women.<sup>547</sup> If the reception of the three sections of the contemporary Latin American art across the country was a positive one, measured against the reception of the other six sections of Pre-Columbian and Colonial art put together by the Brooklyn Museum, the contemporary one did not fare that well. The CI-AA Art Section was not altogether convinced of the success of the Contemporary art exhibitions. By September 21, 1942, it was considering terminating the East Coast and Middle Western sections in January 1943 at the latest, as the CI-AA was “not finding the quality quite up to standard.”<sup>548</sup> This standard was guided by the activities of the Museum of Modern Art and was very much an East Coast constructed one that informed the Art Section given its close entanglements with MoMA as it executed the CI-AA contracts. What this idea of “quality up to standard” reveals is competing views of the West and East Coast in the construction of modern Central and South American art as a U.S. based “Latin-American art.” These views were based on curatorial practices, issues of taste, and the canonicity of a new

---

<sup>545</sup> University of Wyoming in Laramie, 2/42. “Comments sent in by exhibitors of Contemporary Sections of Latin American exhibitions.” NARA, RG229, Box 365.

<sup>546</sup> Saginaw, Michigan. 10/42. “Comments sent in by exhibitors of Contemporary Sections of Latin American exhibitions.” NARA, RG229, Box 365.

<sup>547</sup> Saginaw, Michigan. 10/42. “Comments sent in by exhibitors of Contemporary Sections of Latin American exhibitions.” NARA, RG229, Box 365.

<sup>548</sup> Letter from Olive Lyford to Elodie Courter. September 21, 1942. File copy. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: Arts.

emerging field of study evidenced by these early attempts at the interpretations of the art and the definitions of a aesthetic language with words such as “Indigenism” and “Argentine Scene” that Morley favored at the time. This was not a mapping of the field but the creation of one with Morley, and as seen in next chapter, with Lincoln Kirstein. If the standard of quality was one thing, the other factor was monetary consideration in their circulation in the United States given the war emergency and the scarce number of new bookings. Even though Morley had decided to waive all circulating fees, she was having little success in generating additional interest.

What the CI-AA seemed to be concerned with these issues of quality and standards was the intervention of MoMA and the retaking of the early control of the discourse of Latin American art with a much larger and varied collection that was to position the museum as a serious collector of the modern art of Central and South America as considered in the next chapter. At the heart of the problem had been the hurried organization and the choice from what had been very limited selection available at the time. With new artworks from South America, Cuba and Mexico entering the MoMA art collection at this very moment, it was much easier for the CI-AA and MoMA to make the decision to terminate the contemporary art exhibitions. However, they wanted to keep the East Coast section, add more works to it and keep on offering it as part of the inventory of circulating exhibitions.

These three exhibitions were by no means the only ones of the modern art of Latin America that MoMA was offering in the fall of 1942. In a list of Traveling

Exhibitions of Latin American Art in the United States dated October 1942 published by the CI-AA Art Section, MoMA was listed as offering *Argentine Monotypes, The Architecture of Brazil, Paintings and Drawings from the Museum's Collections*, and the exhibition of *Rivera, Orozco and Siqueiros*. In addition to these, there were twenty-four exhibitions being offered by the American Federation of the Arts, the American Institute of Graphic Arts, the Art Institute of Chicago, the International Business Machines Company, Mills College, the Pan American Union, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Riverside Museum, the Taylor Museum, the U.S. Office of Education, and the Western Association of Art Museum Directors of which Morley was part.<sup>549</sup>

### **A Nascent Field of Study**

In this big defense panorama, if the Macy's Latin American Fair and Art Gallery had brought attention to commercial possibilities including an expanded art market to the modern art of Central and South America in New York, the three sections of the exhibition of Contemporary Latin American art organized by Morley had created, in fact, with a targeted academic audience and general public, a great stimulus and interest in a "new field of study." It ushered in a demand for photographic images, prints and reproductions for teaching and for illustration and although those of Mexican art were more widely available, those for modern South American art were not. These, however, in a war economy were almost impossible

---

<sup>549</sup> In fact, The San Francisco Museum of Art was offering through the Association, an exhibition of Diego Rivera Drawings from its permanent collection. "Traveling Exhibitions of Latin American Art in the United States. 10/15, 1942." NARA, RG229, Box 366, Folder: Traveling Exhibition of L.A. Art-Museum of Modern Art OEMcr-42.

to supply given the curtailment of funds by the Bureau of the Budget, as they were not part of a direct war effort. The central repositories were the CI-AA Art Section, MoMA, the San Francisco Museum of Art and a few private personal collections. This awareness in a new field of study had led the University of Chicago Press to consider the publication of a book along the lines of Helen Gardner's *Art Through the Ages* that since its publication in 1926 had been the text book of choice for introductory one-year courses in art history. For this, the CI-AA was considering in August 1942 a proposal for a research project for Miss Gardner. Envisioned was a book on Latin American art with multiple images, the ones that unfortunately were difficult to find or secure at the very moment.<sup>550</sup> As a Rockefeller funded-university and with William Benton a member of the CI-AA Policy Committee and Vice-President of the University of Chicago, it was finding ways through its press to go beyond art monographs such as the one on Portinari published in late 1940-1941. In fact, the CI-AA was considering also private financing to create a centralized reference repository of photographic material on Latin American Art.

In parallel developments and to address this growing interest in the art of South America, the Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress was also interested in centralizing images and photographs by creating The Archive of Hispanic Culture for public use. Thus it would address the many requests it was receiving from universities interested in the emerging field of Latin American art. In

---

<sup>550</sup> Memorandum. Porter McCray to Mr. Benjamin. Subject: Proposal for a Research Project of Inter-American Art. Aug. 31 1942, NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: Arts.



fact, it was requesting the CI-AA Art section to transfer all its images to the archive. Likewise, Columbia University's Avery Architectural Library was interested in a publication in the field of arts and crafts of the Western Hemisphere defined as architecture, engineering, sculpture, painting, graphic arts, and the crafts.<sup>551</sup> The CI-AA Art Section, as part of its various projects, had been busy working on directories such as the "Preliminary Directory of the Field of Art in the Other American Republics" edited by Mildred Constantine, under the direction of Nina P. Collier, which was issued on April 1, 1942 as a reference guide. Its aim was to support programs of exchange by listing institutions, museums, publications, governmental and official organizations and museums in the field of fine arts, archaeology, anthropology and ethnology, as well as school of art, art galleries.<sup>552</sup>

Similarly, although of a confidential nature, Morley's Report was presented to the CI-AA's Art Section in March 1942. It was a compilation of her observations during her two-month trip to South America and Cuba in January-March 1941 as she made some of the preliminary preparations for the circulating exhibition of Contemporary North American Art. However, not limiting the information to the trip alone, Morley also included her observations from a previous spring 1940 trip to make arrangements for the Art section of the San Francisco World's Exposition in addition to other research she had previously conducted. Therefore, more than a

---

<sup>551</sup> Robert Hale Newton to Wallace Harrison. Columbus Day, 1942 (Oct. 12). Original. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: Arts.

<sup>552</sup> Mildred Constantine, Ed. *Preliminary Directory of the Field of Art in the Other American Republics*. Washington, DC: Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, April 1, 1942. NARA, RG229, Box 365.

report it was a modern art narrative about an art historian's perceptions of the contemporary art scene, the production by artists, existing museum and exhibition infrastructure in countries that she had visited in South America including Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela as well as in Central America and the Caribbean such as Costa Rica, Cuba, and El Salvador.<sup>553</sup>

Morley conceived the report as confidential and as a guide for the exclusive use of the National Council of Defense, members of the CI-AA's Committee on Art and now Art Section. However, in its purpose it became the first critical U.S. evaluation in of art in South America to serve as a guide for the interchange of art. In fact, Morley was cognizant that this indeed was not a well-known field in the United States or among the countries grouped under the term Latin America.<sup>554</sup> But at the same time, in her assessment she wanted to provide a frank view on the state of the artistic development. However, conceived as it was as part of a defense initiative, the report was concerned also on what ways to make a more favorable impression of the United States upon the cultural elites in South America. With her impressions and judgments, the confidential report was informed by comparisons between different countries to help in the understanding of the large region beyond Mexico, which up to the fall of 1940 had been culturally ignored.

---

<sup>553</sup> G. L. McCann Morley. *Art in Latin American Countries*. Report Submitted to the Committee in Art, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. March 1942. Lincoln Kirstein Papers, II.3, The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

<sup>554</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2.

Her suggestions for projects were in fact very personal assessments of possibilities and, as she explained it, the report was to serve as a foundation for any work that would come after March 1942. In fact, it was art “intelligence” or “fact-finding” for the purposes of assessing the cultural and visual art situation and development as part of the defense plan of the office. The 1942 report indeed included her observations through about six years of study and interactions with artists and art officials in the (Pacific) West Coast countries of Central and South America. That her background informed the perspective that she took in the evaluation was something that Morley came to understand.

Her views were informed by an European training as she had studied in France, the European art of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. Morley had taught at Goucher College in Baltimore before joining the Cincinnati Museum of Art as a curator. From there she went on to organize and direct the San Francisco Museum of Art and its contemporary art program. It was here that she and MoMA concurred in the exploration of the sources and currents of modern art and the contemporary world scene. Her geographic location and the celebratory San Francisco World’s Fair had put her in contact with the art of countries in Central and South America as mentioned above.

In her aesthetics, Morley favored emergent yet promising artists with creative work in different styles, in her words, “that does not always fit into the

accepted fashionable movement of the day.”<sup>555</sup> In fact, Morley was interested in a more contemporary and non-academic art as well as discovering and nurturing new talent. Given her experience in San Francisco, she was conversant with all modern styles, including abstraction and expressionism favoring in South America the avant-garde of the Pacific Basin. That she had begun to see contemporary art of South America as living art and having “quality and flavor of its own,” “in process of formation,” and “as distinct from European inspiration”<sup>556</sup> she readily acknowledged in the report.

This construction of Latin American Art as uniquely her own and distinct from European Art and academic art indeed tinted her report. In fact, she mentioned that up to March 1942 she still was “the only person somewhat experienced in the field of contemporary art, interested keenly in it and concerned with the museum, exhibition and collecting point of view, who has visited any large proportion of the Latin-American countries with the deliberate intention of discovering as much about their contemporary art as possible...”<sup>557</sup> She was obliterating any work that Caroline Durieux and Stanton Catlin had achieved to date.

However, of note is that her views helped shape part of the ongoing yet nascent discourse. As I discuss in the next chapter, the other views that came to balance this narrative were those of Lincoln Kirstein who traveled to South America

---

<sup>555</sup> G. L. McCann Morley. “Art in Latin American Countries. Report Submitted to the Committee in Art, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.” March 1942, p. 6. Lincoln Kirstein Papers, II.3. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

<sup>556</sup> Ibid. p. 6-7. LK, II.3. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>557</sup> Ibid., p. 11-12. LK, II.3. MoMA Archives, NY

for a period of about five months in May-October 1942. With the imminent transfer of future art projects to the Department of State's Division of Cultural Relations, the CI-AA Art section ended the circulation of the last of Morley's Exhibitions of Latin American Art on May 27, 1943.<sup>558</sup> The Art Section in fact under the Science and Education Division was transferred to the Division of Cultural Relations at the Department of State after June 30, 1943, which had a limited budget and a more narrowed purpose.<sup>559</sup> In the transition period, among its advisory committee for art beginning on January 16, 1943, the Department of State counted with a good number of CI-AA and MoMA-associated actors including John E. Abbott, Stephen Clark, René d'Harnoncourt, Grace McCann Morley, Francis Henry Taylor, George C. Valliant and others such as George Biddle, Robert Wood Bliss, and Daniel Catton Rich to advise it "regarding the stimulation of artistic interchange among the American republics and the coordination of activities in this country which concerns Inter-American art."<sup>560</sup> In fact, the Department of State would involve the National Gallery of Art and its newly created Inter-American Office, which Porter McCray oversaw after 1943.

However, Morley continued her research on the modern art developments in South America while maintaining contact with a set of new actors at the CI-AA and

---

<sup>558</sup> Olive Lyford, Executive Secretary, Art Project to Theodore D. Starr. May 27, 1943. NARA, RG229, Box 365. Folder : 3-Traveling exhibition of L.A. Art -Brooklyn Institute of Art, OEMcr-43. Letter refers to the disposal of boxes for traveling exhibition project. They already fulfilled the purpose so the CI-AA leaves disposal at hands of the Brooklyn Museum.

<sup>559</sup> Memorandum. June 18, 1943. From Kenneth Holland to J.A. Bush. NARA, RG229, Box 367. Folder: Creative Achievements of the U. S. Exhibitions for Distribution in the O.A.R. SE-1367.

<sup>560</sup> Press Release No. 31. U.S. Department of State. January 16, 1943. NARA, RG229, Box 365, Folder: Arts.

later at MoMA: René d'Harnoncourt who in July 1942 had become the Acting Chairman of the Art Section replacing John E. Abbott. Likewise, Porter McCray had become Secretary replacing Stanton L. Catlin who in the summer of 1942 after being drafted in the Army had been invited to teach at the Universidad de Chile where he went with their blessing and with a military mission to provide intelligence on the German population and Chilean Fascist sympathizers.

Morley was invited as the modern South American and Latin American art expert to the Conference on Studies of Latin American Art at the Museum of Modern Art held in New York on May 28-19, 1945. She had continued with her investigation of trends and tendencies that now she saw as transforming into regional schools marked by an Indian inheritance in contrast to imported European influences and styles. Most importantly in reference to that nascent field of study, by 1945 Morley was still seeing the need for better source materials and richer publications and a larger number of persons to research and work to create further knowledge to complement a more global view of contemporary and modern art which to her "the field of study of contemporary art is not complete without adequate investigation of Latin American art."<sup>561</sup> Three years after her report to the CI-AA, she continued stressing the importance of considering each country's art within its proper national context and the need for scholarly monographs, brochures, illustrated books to continue understanding the modern art of South America.

---

<sup>561</sup> Grace Mc Cann Morley. "Contemporary Regional Schools in Latin America." Elizabeth Wilder, ed. *Studies in Latin American Art: Proceedings of a Conference Held in the Museum of Modern Art New York, 28-31 May 1945*. Washington DC: The American Council of Learned Societies, 1949: 82-88.

This was a construction and a canonization from the perspective of a single individual in the West Coast. It was constituted as a parallel yet different discourse from what was going to emerge from the East Coast and from the keeper of modernism itself with the Latin-American modern art collection of artworks acquired in the summer-fall of 1942 in South America by Lincoln Kirstein considered in the next chapter.

## THE ART OF DEFENSE, THE DEFENSE OF ART: LINCOLN KIRSTEIN AND THE ART ACQUISITION TRIP TO SOUTH AMERICA, 1942

By early December 1941 the U.S. State in tandem with the private sector had laid down the initial foundations for a hemispheric cultural circuit and network of artists and institutions in South America with the first U.S. circulating exhibition, *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. As the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA henceforth) continued to wage a war of cultural defense in South America against the threat of a German and Italian totalitarian propaganda and cultural influence, plans for an extended network involving U.S. and South American museums were being thought out at the moment. South-North exhibition exchanges were being seriously considered between Chile and the Toledo Museum of Art and Ecuador and the Worcester Museum of Art in an envisioned program that would connect South American countries with U.S. museums other than MoMA.<sup>562</sup> However, the changing world conditions with the entry of the United States into a war of global proportions impinged on the future art activities of the temporary defense agency. With the State now transformed into a full-fledged Warfare State after December 8, 1941, the CI-AA had to reorient its defense policies to actual war

---

<sup>562</sup> Due to the war, only the Chile-Toledo Museum of Art exchange would be implemented in March 1942.



policies. Thus the CI-AA priorities, goals and objectives came to be revised and prioritized for the new war emergency.

If the U.S. State at Rockefeller's urging had finally assumed a commercial and cultural presence in South America, albeit one of temporary defense through the CI-AA, this model of State-funded cultural defense initiatives was soon to revert to one that economically depended heavily on private money. This chapter considers Lincoln Kirstein's art acquisition trip to South America on behalf of MoMA in the summer-fall of 1942 to acquire modern artworks in South America for its permanent collection while at the same time masking a military intelligence gathering mission. At first glance this may seem as the hybrid State-private sector's cultural initiative in a phase-two of a project that sought to make known the culture of South American countries in the United States. However, it was indeed more than that. In fact, I would argue that in addition to being an acquisition trip and a military intelligence mission, it was also a continuation of a commercial and cultural strategy to establish a modern art market circuit sanctioned by the very modern art museum. Although the CI-AA art model reverted to one heavily dependent on the private sector, the state's presence continued to loom large in the solidification of these regulated cultural circuits and flows.

In his trip, Kirstein was not only purchasing modern art. He was observing conditions and making recommendations for the establishment of an art market to support artists. As such, he was merging the cultural with the commercial. This trip was indeed an intervention to assess the state of the modern and contemporary art

in South America and to lay the ground for a future market, which originally supported by the U.S. State was to follow along the lines of existing CI-AA sponsored economic programs to buy surplus raw materials. However, the war and the contradictory intervention of the legislative branch of the U. S. State through Congress changed course towards a private initiative of the Coordinator himself to continue his vision for a U.S. plan for Latin America in the post-war period.

The days immediately after December 7, 1941 found a CI-AA Office re-evaluating its art initiatives while acknowledging that it should “double all cultural efforts and speed up their execution, but with new accent tuned to new developments.”<sup>563</sup> In the examination of CI-AA cultural efforts in mid-December 1941, its programs were deemed to be long-term and were thus placed within an alphabetical category of Class D as promoting hemispheric understanding and unity.<sup>564</sup> The CI-AA Art Section had at the time been looking at classifying paintings as exchange texts to be bought in the U.S. and distributed in South America and vice versa following the book exchange model that Monroe Wheeler had established in its Publications Section.

---

<sup>563</sup> Quoted in Rowland, 1947: 92. Original in “Minutes of Executive or Policy Committee meeting, December 9, 1941.”

<sup>564</sup> The alphabetical classification positioned projects that had immediate defense significance as Class A; projects with direct propaganda as Class B; projects that had an immediate effect on sympathy towards the United States as Class C. Rowland, 1947: 92.

In addition, given the militaristic priorities of a now warfare state with a conversion of the U.S. economy to one of war production,<sup>565</sup> the budgetary freedom and decision power that the CI-AA may have enjoyed in FY1940, under the National Council of Defense, and FY1941, under the Office for Emergency Management, would soon come to an abrupt end. Beginning with FY1942 the CI-AA budget now required Congressional approval. In the national defense congressional appropriation meetings for FY1942, art projects came to the fore. Catlin would years later recall a delegation of the House Appropriation Committee visiting Chile and seeing the U.S. exhibition in Santiago in the fall of 1941. When members of this same delegation met for appropriation meetings, they called on Rockefeller and asked him to justify such expenditures for art projects under the emergency conditions of the war.<sup>566</sup> If there had been plans for Durieux to use CI-AA monies to purchase art in Argentina to be presented to museums in the United States on behalf of the U.S. State back in the fall of 1941, after the CI-AA appropriations testimony and under the new conditions of war emergency these plans were now totally out of the question for the duration of the war and for the temporary emergency agency itself.

---

<sup>565</sup> In his Fireside Chat of 29 December 1940 on the "Great Arsenal of Democracy," FDR foresaw Axis aggression as the condition for the transformation of the United States into a "militaristic power on the basis of a war economy." Op cit.

<sup>566</sup> Oral history Interview with Stanton L. Catlin, 1989 July 1-September 14, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. Op. cit.

## **The Largesse of the Private Citizen at the Head of the CI-AA**

If the recent eighteen month-long relationship between the U.S. State and the private sector had been one in which the State contracted public monies to a private corporation to execute cultural defense projects, there was now an inversion. The private sector would provide the money to execute a broad art acquisition plan that benefited national security and culture and at the same time facilitated the cover for an intelligence military operation of the CI-AA and the American Intelligence Service. Who better to undertake it than multi-lingual Lincoln Kirstein whose significant cultural interventions in literature, American ballet and dance, and contemporary art were well acknowledged at the time. At age twenty-one Kirstein, along with undergraduate schoolmates Edward Mortimer Morris Warburg (of the banking Warburg family) and John Walker III, had come up with the idea in December 1928 to establish the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art. The Society not only counted with the support of Harvard's art history and museum studies professor Paul Sachs (of banking Goldman Sachs family) and the backing of a moneyed and scholarly board of trustees that included his brother Arthur Sachs, John Nicholas Brown, Felix Warburg, Philip Hofer, and Arthur Pope, but also had been widely recognized and credited as the forerunner of the Museum of Modern Art in New York founded in late 1929.

With a more urgent mission within changed priorities and conditions of war and defense, the work of the CI-AA became strikingly different from a year before when plans had been implemented to circulate the exhibition of U.S. contemporary

art as a strategy of defense to present the United States to South America. Now at the beginning of 1942, with the success and accomplishments that the exhibition achieved, or partially achieved depending on the country and venue, a new set of conditions under a global conflict would come to dictate new measures and new contexts. Although MoMA had been a State contractor in a War of Defense since 1940, the shift in world conditions in December 1941 forced its Board of Trustees to introspectively look for new identities and roles. MoMA's Annual Report of 1940-1941, issued in December 1941, presented a picture of itself in a model of a "museum as a dynamic force in a democracy,"<sup>567</sup> and active in "...furthering accord in the Western Hemisphere by bringing before the public of both North and South America the cultural achievements of the twenty-one American Republics."<sup>568</sup> Writing these words was none other than MoMA's President, John Hay Whitney who had a first-hand account in his role as the CI-AA's Moving Pictures Division Chairman while being deeply involved with the commercial and defense initiatives of the film industry in South America. There was no doubt that the museum in its daily operation had been affected by the cultural defense partnership with Rockefeller's CI-AA and was now questioning its role in society at a time of war. MoMA came to see itself in a dual role of having a regular educational program

---

<sup>567</sup> John Hay Whitney. Foreword by the President: The Basic Concept, the Accomplishment, the Significance. *The Year's Work: Annual Report to the Board of Trustees and Members of the Museum of Modern Art for the Year July 1, 1940-June 30, 1941*. New York: William E. Rudge's Sons, December 1941: 3.

<sup>568</sup> Ibid.

while at the same time supporting national defense and strengthening national morale through modern art.

In the same annual report, Alfred Barr noted that the appointment of then MoMA president Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller as Coordinator of a temporary federal defense agency steered the museum towards a hemispheric interest. As he stated, “partly because of his interest, partly because it offered a new field for exploration and exhibition the Museum had already been concerned with Latin America”<sup>569</sup> which in reality amounted to limited acquisitions and exhibitions of modern art from Mexico and of Brazil’s Cândido Portinari. However Barr, rather than revealing the defense nature of the last eighteen-month collaboration between the museum and the U.S. State with the National Council of Defense and the Office for Emergency Management, chose to sanitize the joint work as part of a convenient diplomatic rhetoric of a “Latin-American good neighbor policy” that masked the national defense cultural offensive of the OCCCRBAR and CI-AA and one which Rockefeller had called a “loosely term policy” preferring democracy instead as mentioned above. Of course, this was the choice of words for a museum that did not want to reveal its work as a contractor for the National Council of Defense and Office for Emergency Management.

Moreover, making an effort to separate the museum from the CI-AA, Barr also noted that the work done for the Art Section was not officially part of the

---

<sup>569</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Report of the Director: What Good is Art in a Time of War? What Good Are Art Museums? Ibid. p. 5.

museum work but was “actually, a voluntary contribution made to the defense effort over and above the Museum’s normal activity.”<sup>570</sup> What he failed to mention was that through the National Council of Defense’s contracts MoMA had received until July 31, 1941 the amount of \$62,062.07.<sup>571</sup> However, the museum had not been limited to international war related activities with Latin America alone. In fact it had been busy showing exhibitions such as *Britain at War* and *War Comes to the People* in New York. If these were Barr’s views on the role of the museum as its Director, Rockefeller instead in his view as a trustee, former President and member of the family that co-founded it, had become more convinced of the museum in the role that he had told FDR in his letter of acceptance in August 1940, as “rendering effective assistance in the work which you have asked me to undertake.”<sup>572</sup> In these efforts, he also saw himself in that dual role of an unsalaried federal employee heading the CI-AA and as a benefactor of the arts as a private citizen.

In the communication of December 23, 1941 reporting the appointment of James T. Soby as the Director of a new MoMA Armed Services Program to investigate what the museum could do to support the State and its military units, Abbott reminded Rockefeller of his offer of the previous week to establish a purchase fund for Latin American art to be administered by the museum’s

---

<sup>570</sup> Ibid. p. 6.

<sup>571</sup> Audited Financial Statement. The Year’s Work: Annual Report to the Board of Trustees and Members of the Museum of Modern Art for the Year July 1, 1940-June 30, 1941. New York: William E. Rudge’s Sons, December 1941: 23.

<sup>572</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to FDR, August 16, 1940. Op. cit. Rockefeller Archive Center.

acquisitions committee.<sup>573</sup> In fact, Rockefeller had already given instructions the day before to Philip Keebler in the Rockefeller Family Offices to transfer stock valued at \$24,849 to the Museum of Modern Art as a gift to purchase art from the other American Republics.<sup>574</sup> By December 29, 1941, two certificates totaling three thousand two hundred (3,200) shares of Capital Stock of Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, Inc.,<sup>575</sup> had been transferred to MoMA.<sup>576</sup> In acknowledging the gift, Abbott expressed how interested he had been for the government or the museum to purchase art from the other American Republics. In his letter, he stated, "I am delighted that your personal generosity has made it possible for the museum to carry out such a program."<sup>577</sup> Although plans for Durieux to acquire artwork in Argentina with CI-AA FY1942 never came to fruition, Rockefeller indeed found a way to achieve the same goals with his own money while securing artworks forming the largest collection of Latin American art to date at his family's museum.

---

<sup>573</sup> John E. Abbott to Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Latin American Affairs. NAR Personal Projects, December 23, 1941, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-Series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401. Rockefeller Archive Center. Members of MoMA's Acquisition Committee in December 1941 included: Edward M. M. Warburg, Stephen C. Clark, Mrs. Simon Guggenheim and James T. Soby.

<sup>574</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to Philip Keebler, Room 5600. December 22, 1941. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-Series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center. Coincidentally, in the same letter, Rockefeller was also asking for advice to give \$25,000 to each of his children. This act for MoMA and for Latin American art in view of his plans for his children perhaps could be construed as how important MoMA and art in Latin America was dear to him as a child.

<sup>575</sup> Socony-Vacuum Oil Company was the name resulting in the 1931 merge between the Standard Oil Company of New York and Vacuum Oil Company that created the third largest oil company in the world.

<sup>576</sup> John E. Abbott to Philip Keebler, December 29, 1941. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-Series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>577</sup> John E. Abbott to Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. January 14, 1942. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-Series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.



In opting for Kirstein as the person to acquire artworks in South America, Rockefeller, through MoMA, selected someone who was deeply involved with the arts and was closely known to the tight-knit MoMA family. Now at age 35, Kirstein was a member of a circle of young trust-funded people who gravitated toward MoMA and Rockefeller including Whitney, Warburg and Edgar Kauffman. And also increasingly involved in the group was DC-based Austrian-born ex-Count René d'Harnoncourt, then Manager of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, one of the new Deal agencies created in the Department of the Interior to revive Native American arts and crafts. Kirstein, an intellectual with a wide range of interests in the visual, performing and literary arts, is better known for his work in the performing arts as the father of American Ballet and as an author. However Kirstein's interventions in the visual arts as curator and scholar have not yet received the same level of attention and scrutiny as his other interests.<sup>578</sup> In considering his objective modern art assessments and critical perspectives found in his unpublished diary and trip reports to MoMA one can arguably place him as one of the first art historians of the art of Latin America in the United States. His essay "Latin American Art Introduction: From the Conquest to 1900" in the MoMA catalog "The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art" was considered the first survey in its class published in English, but I may add in any language at that moment.<sup>579</sup> In fact, this

---

<sup>578</sup> Gustavo Buntinx has been conducting research on Kirstein's trip. He did present a paper on Kirstein's South American trip at one of the U.S. CAA conferences. However, my many attempts to contact him in Peru where he resides, were unsuccessful and so were those of Alejandro Anreus.

<sup>579</sup> Of course the question comes to Grace McCann Morley. She did write a comprehensive report of March 1942 based on her trip in South America in January-March 1941 that was confidential in

points to the very origins of the construction of a “Latin American art” originating not in the region but in the United States and at MoMA with this published publication.

That Abbott, Clark and Rockefeller chose Kirstein had to do with his art background, his curatorial experience and his view of modern and contemporary art. In fact, Kirstein’s many pursuits in his youth and while at Harvard as an undergraduate student had included the co-founding in 1927 of A Harvard Miscellany a small modernist literary magazine whose mission was, in the words of its co-founder Varian Fry, to bring “to the consciousness of Harvard the recent developments in art and literature it seems to us to be ignoring, to its own cost.”<sup>580</sup> After a few numbers, it changed names to Hound & Horn<sup>581</sup> and started featuring commissioned work, submissions and reprints by the foremost modernist writers and critics of the day, illustrations by such artists as Picasso, Lachaise and photographs by a young yet undiscovered Walker Evans in addition to film criticism.

Parallel to these endeavors, Kirstein also became interested in modern art and by the end of 1928 he was envisioning the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art to “display modern works that neither the Boston Arts Society nor the Fogg had

---

nature and for the exclusive use of the CI-AA office. Kirstein consulted it as he was preparing for his MoMA trip. The difference is his actual acquisition trip and the resulting book that was considered as the first of its class, or “may well be the first publication in English of a survey of the pictorial arts of Latin America during the previous three centuries, *considered as a whole*, and with frequent reference to our own art—a subject so vast, so complex and so unexplored that his short piece takes on the character of a pioneer venture.” Alfred Barr, Foreword in Lincoln Kirstein, *The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943: 3.

<sup>580</sup> Varian Fry quoted in Mitzi Berger Hamovitch, Ed., *The Hound & Horn Letters*, Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1982: 6. Among the featured writers were T.S. Elliot, Henry James, George Santayana, Henry Adams, etc.

<sup>581</sup> Named after Ezra Pound’s *The White Stag*.

been willing to show.”<sup>582</sup> Kirstein, Warburg and Walker III, presented pioneering exhibitions such as Buckminster Fuller’s Dymaxion House, Modern Mexican Art (Rivera and Orozco), Modern German Art (Max Beckmann, George Grosz, Paul Klee and Oskar Kokoshka), International Photography (Berenice Abbott, Edward Weston, Alfred Stieglitz, Walker Evans), and Alexander Calder’s wire Circus (built on site), which were later reproduced in much larger formats at both the newly opened MoMA and at the Wadsworth Athenaeum.

With MoMA, Kirstein had enjoyed a long association dating back from the spring of 1930 when he was appointed to the Junior Advisory Committee of which a slightly younger Nelson Rockefeller was chair. In fact, in 1932, Rockefeller had handpicked Kirstein to organize the exhibition *Murals by American Painters and Photographers*,<sup>583</sup> which caused such a scandal as a Bolshevik communist propoganda leading to several MoMA trustees to resign in protest. However, it was the exhibition and not Kirstein whom they disliked. A few months later Barr was confiding in him his desire to create a movie department and have Kirstein direct it. He accepted. However, Kirstein soon came into the realization that his true passion and calling was securing a home for a permanent ballet in New York. This was a task that he happily undertook and after two years he was opening the School of American Ballet with Warburg, George Balanchine, Vladimir Dimitriev and himself as school principals. It was through dance that Kirstein had become involved with

---

<sup>582</sup> Martin Duberman, *The Worlds of Lincoln Kirstein*, New York: Alfred Knopf, 2007: 61.

<sup>583</sup> MoMA Exhibition Number 16, May 3-May 31, 1932.

the OCCCRBAR in the spring of 1941. In 1936 he had founded the Ballet Caravan, which after four successful season-tours had closed down in December 1939.

Rockefeller, under his cultural plan for the OCCCRBAR, had asked Kirstein to revive the ballet company under the new name of American Ballet Caravan and had offered the company a contract for \$95,000 for a six-month tour in South America.<sup>584</sup>

Just like the exhibition under a Committee on Museums, Rockefeller also asked Kirstein to “pretend to have no connection with the government...”<sup>585</sup> in his acquisition trip. Rockefeller came to view the trip as having “tremendous importance” and thus he offered to contribute financially from his own private money.<sup>586</sup> In fact, Kirstein was in a dual mission to purchase modern art, gather intelligence on U.S. diplomatic corps and members of the new committees of an expatriate civil society which Rockefeller was setting up to help with CI-AA defense efforts, and also locating German texts vital for war defense.

As MoMA and the CI-AA coordinated details for this newly private-funded project in the spring of 1942 (that fell outside the State’s budgetary allocation and contracts), Rockefeller wrote to Abbott on April 4, 1942 recommending that the museum, through an additional transfer of \$3,000 to the Inter-American Fund from him, cover Kirstein’s trip and acquisition expenses including purchases, transportation and insurance. The U.S. Warfare State was fully invested in this trip

---

<sup>584</sup> Duberman, 2007: 360-361. The American Ballet Caravan featured a troupe of thirty-five dancers and eleven support staff among them George Balanchine under a National Council of Defense contract that was signed on March 17, 1941. Its first presentation was in Rio de Janeiro in June 1941.

<sup>585</sup> Duberman, 2007: 361.

<sup>586</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to John E. Abbott. April 4, 1942. LK, 7-F. MoMA Archives, NY.

with the Department of State facilitating priority status for Kirstein's air transportation and mobilization in South America. This collaboration of the State, private institution and private citizen albeit serving as one-dollar a year man, was a new model that sought to advance not only the U.S. State military objectives, but also to further the private sector's desire for a strong relationship in a region that would become the focus of Nelson Rockefeller's economic activities post-war and the U.S. State's hegemonic commercial and political activities.

Communicating with Rockefeller on April 22, 1942, Abbott sought to clarify the CI-AA's own objectives for Kirstein's trip to South America while thanking him for his offer to underwrite the trip. This was a larger conversation between Stephen Clark as Chairman of MoMA's Board, Abbott as its Executive Vice President, and Kirstein. Abbott needed specific information on the official nature of his trip as it referred to the CI-AA to determine the museum's own policy for the trip.<sup>587</sup> MoMA became the sponsor of Kirstein's trip requesting the appropriate visas for ease of circulation to the New York-based Consulates of Brazil, Argentina and Chile. The Museum positioned the trip from a perspective of conducting surveys of art, architecture, libraries, schools, and museums to gather information that would facilitate future plans for international cultural cooperation.

So invested was the CI-AA, that on April 29, 1942 Rockefeller saw the trip in certain terms as having "a significance to this Office in that [Kirstein] will personally

---

<sup>587</sup> John E. Abbott to Nelson A. Rockefeller, April 22, 1942. Copy. Early Museum History: Administrative Records, II.15.b. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

renew his relationships with the intellectual leaders whom he met during his visit to the other American Republics last year, under a project sponsored by the Coordinator's Office."<sup>588</sup> But in times of war, this connection with the intellectual leaders or elite social class meant that Kirstein having been in South America in 1941 in times of peace would have no problem navigating the various social circles in the countries that he would visit and taking note of conditions, political climate, and enemy fascist elements and sympathizers among them. Critical to the success of the CI-AA was the urgent need of nurturing those elite intellectual leaders and converting them into allies of the United States. In considering Max Weber's conception of class and status in which he argues that "social honor, or prestige, may even be the basis of political or economic power, and very frequently has been..." and "'classes,' 'status groups' and 'parties' are phenomena of the distribution of power within a community,"<sup>589</sup> these intellectual and elite classes that Rockefeller was eager for Kirstein to cultivate were the ones holding the power key to the future success of a U.S. economic private restructuration of a hemispheric community.

How Rockefeller was framing this trip was as psychological warfare that the state at war was now engaged in. For him, Kirstein's trip was significant not only for the museum and its collections but for the CI-AA now waging an open front cultural propaganda war against the Axis forces through its Division of Information. The intersections of MoMA art acquisition plan and the CI-AA psychological warfare and

---

<sup>588</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to John E. Abbott. April 29, 1942. LK, I.F. MoMA, Archives, NY

<sup>589</sup> Weber, "Politics as Vocation Lecture, p. 4., op. cit.

intelligence gathering were being confirmed by the very fact that Rockefeller through the CI-AA was requesting the Department of State for air transportation priorities for Kirstein in what he referred as a mission “to serve his Government in the form of a talking campaign for which he is fully qualified.”<sup>590</sup> He did not reveal the mission he had given Kirstein to report on the diplomatic staff at the different embassies and legations, nor his need to locate the German military and intelligence texts. In his request to the Department of State, Rockefeller was using the power the U.S. State had vested in him as Chairman of the Committee on Inter-American Affairs whose members were the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture and Commerce. A power, which in time of war translated into the right to use force, which according to Max Weber, the State “ascribed to other institutions or to other individuals only to the extent to which the state permits it.”<sup>591</sup> In fact, the force for Rockefeller was the one needed intellectually to approach the groups of power. He was deriving the power to solicit not from his economic standing in society which in time of peace could have had a significant meaning, but rather the power from a war agency controlling for the State the means of domination, a cultural and commercial domination.

### **The Inter-American Fund and Modern Art in South America**

Now with \$24,849 of funds available for the purchase of Latin American Art, Kirstein, Barr, Clark and Abbott finalized details for the acquisition trip over dinner

---

<sup>590</sup> Rockefeller to Abbott. April 29, 1942. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>591</sup> Weber, “Politics as Vocation Lecture,” op. cit.

at the University Club in New York on May 5, 1941. A few days after, Clark took the opportunity to share with Rockefeller his belief that MoMA now “should be able to get together the best collection of contemporary Latin American art that has ever been made.”<sup>592</sup> In fact, Clark, Abbott and Rockefeller were envisioning a Department of Latin American Art in which the new art acquisitions from South America would come to form the core of its collection along with other artwork to be acquired in Cuba and Mexico by Alfred Barr, Jr., and Edward Warburg. For the Department, Kirstein would be the person outlining ideas for its organization and writing the proposal, which, with Rockefeller’s blessing, would go to the MoMA Board for approval.<sup>593</sup> In fact, as being conceived, its purpose was to use the visual arts in relations with Latin America not only by MoMA, but also by other institutions and government agencies to advance the work already started by the CI-AA in a new public-private partnership.

In drafting the trip contract letter for Kirstein, Abbott stipulated a set budget with allocations coming from the Purchase Fund in the amounts of \$5,000 for traveling expenses and \$12,500 for the purchase of works of art.<sup>594</sup> In the same contract letter, additional stipulations for a similar acquisition trip to Cuba and Mexico to be undertaken by Barr, Jr. and Kaufmann stipulated \$1,000 for travel

---

<sup>592</sup> Stephen C. Clark to Nelson A. Rockefeller. May 7, 1942. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>593</sup> “Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art in The Museum of Modern Art.” p. 1. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>594</sup> John E. Abbott to Lincoln Kirstein, May 11, 1942. Contract. Accepted and signed by Lincoln E. Kirstein. EMH, II.15.b. MoMA Archives, NY.



expenses and \$1,500 in cash for the purchase of paintings.<sup>595</sup> The remainder of the \$24,849 or \$4,849 was to be put in reserve until further plans were developed, meaning for the envisioned Department.

As Kirstein was about to embark for his trip to South America, MoMA's President John Hay Whitney also provided a bearer's letter requesting on behalf of the museum trustees, assistance in his task of "conducting a survey of art, architecture, libraries, museums and educational institutions for the purpose of assembling information which will contribute to our knowledge of the culture of the country and will lead...to our further cooperation within cultural fields."<sup>596</sup> This shift in MoMA itself rather than the CI-AA spurring the initiative of the survey had in mind the interest of knowledge and scholarship to support the new collection. With his first stop in Brazil, Kirstein lost no time in acquiring artworks for the MoMA collection. In a letter to Barr of June 19, 1942, he detailed his visits to artists' studios, purchases and some commissioned work in Rio de Janeiro. However, he was telling Barr that these purchases he was aware had to go through the committee, as he wrote: "for refusal from your permanent collection."<sup>597</sup>

Kirstein's criteria for acquisitions considered modern art as the art of living artists who in their work "have tried to assert their feeling for their time and place; artists, who in fact have attempted to declare independence from traditional European expression – or who, on whatever base or roots, express what they have

---

<sup>595</sup> Ibid. In addition, Barr would have access to an additional \$2,500 in trade-in value of some artworks from Mexico that the museum would de-accessioned.

<sup>596</sup> John Hay Whitney to Whom It May Concern. May 11, 1942. EMH, II.15.b. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>597</sup> Kirstein to Barr, June 19, 1942. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

known best by virtue of their birth or bringing-up.”<sup>598</sup> What this pointed out was Kirstein’s philosophy in selecting art that would not be an imitation of a foreign trend but representative of a geographic region in the world. In fact, this run parallel to how Morley was conceiving modern art of South America as seen in the previous chapter. Spending close to a month in Brazil, Kirstein assessed Brazilian contemporary art production and trends both in Rio and São Paulo. Moreover, Kirstein, and MoMA, were interested in recent production and trends. This was a choice that tended to overlook at that very moment significant artists from the 1920s Brazilian modernism such as Tarsila do Amaral, Anita Malfetti, Rego Monteiro, Emiliano de Cavalcanti, Ismael Nery. In fact, these absences help to illustrate this selection philosophy as Kirstein found Tarsila’s then artistic production to not amount to much, Di Cavalcanti’s religious art bad, and since Nery had died in 1930 he was out of consideration.

Instead in his acquisitions he favored Alberto de Veiga Guignard, José Pancetti, José Bernardo Cardoso Junior, Heitor dos Prazeres, Georgette Pinet, Tomás Santa Rosa Junior, José Morais, Percy Deane; and in São Paulo from Paulo Rossi Osir, Francisco Rebollo Gonzalez, Lucci Citti Ferreira, and Emilio Sousa. Of major artists as Lasar Segall, he suggested purchasing artwork with monies from the Special Purchase Fund given the range of prices of \$2,000 and above.<sup>599</sup> Kirstein sent a cablegram to Alfred Barr on June 10, 1942 indicating that Segall was offering five

---

<sup>598</sup> Lincoln Kirstein, “Latin-American Painting: A Comparative Sketch.” *The Museum of Modern Art, 1943*: 3. In Lincoln Kirstein *Latin American Art Notes*. LK, II.1. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>599</sup> Excerpt of Letter from Lincoln Kirstein to Mr. Barr. June 19, 1942. Typed copy. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

large paintings on the war series which he compared to Picasso's *Guernica* for \$2,500. Barr in reply told Kirstein that the committee would not decide without seeing photographs or description. These paintings were never acquired.<sup>600</sup>

Kirstein described Segall not in glowing terms as someone who would not sell easily as his major preoccupation was the five large paintings. Visiting his studio, Kirstein concluded that his Brazilian period of the 1920s was "exotic and poor."<sup>601</sup>

Moreover, as part of his planning for the Department of Latin American art, Kirstein was closely observing the artistic panorama with ideas to make future interventions as part of its future exchange activities. In Brazil, he noted the overshadowing fame of artist Cândido Portinari and his strong links to the Brazilian State to the point that it was obscuring some of the emerging artists from whom Kirstein was acquiring artworks such as Veiga Guignard, Behring, dos Prazeres, and Gonçalves, Citti Ferreira, Rossi Osir. He noticed a need for artists' materials and also identified a need to offer small art commissions to sustain artists' production. In addition, he detected a dire need for reproductions of masters that could perfectly well be pulled from the collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, MoMA and the newly established National Gallery of Art's Mellon Collection as a way to counter the expanding influence of what he called a "extremely retardative"<sup>602</sup> Rio de Janeiro School of Fine Arts in other parts of the country

---

<sup>600</sup> Cablegram, June 10, 1942. Lincoln Kirstein to Barr. And reply by Barr. Copy. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>601</sup> Ibid.

<sup>602</sup> "Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art" LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

including Bahia, Belem, Bello Horizonte, Porto Alegre, Recife, Santa Caterina, Santos and São Paulo. While in São Paulo, Kirstein had an incident with Oswald de Andrade as he decided not to purchase any of his son's artwork (Oswald de Andrade filho 1914-1972) as he considered him an inferior painter. The result was a complaint from Andrade to the consulate and a threat to kill Kirstein. The incident had repercussions on his São Paulo purchases, which at the end were very limited.<sup>603</sup>

Kirstein had to ship artwork back to New York. For that the museum recommended consigning every shipment to W. J. Byrnes & Co. and to use the established network of people and custom agents with whom the museum had worked with in the 1941 exhibition. Since the circuit and network had already been established, he would be working with L. Figueireda & Cia in Brazil, Pedro Mosso in Argentina, Hardy and Company in Valparaiso, Nicolas Delgado in Quito and Hermanos De J. Puig Verdaguer in Guayaquil and Erosa Fernandez & Cia. In Montevideo. In those established and regulated cultural flows and networks what the shipping of artworks entailed was meeting the export regulations and customs including consular invoices, certificates of originality and lists of contents on each case. Artworks should have one valuation and frames another one. To facilitate customs clearance Kirstein was to instruct his agents to group together similar objects as each category had a different duty tax rate. Caricatures and cartoons

---

<sup>603</sup> Lincoln Kirstein, "Memorandum of Trip to Latin America Illustrating Previously Stated Political Conclusions: (May-October 1941-42): p. 8. Report. LK, 1.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

were taxed while graphic art could enter duty free under Paragraph 1631 and painting and sculpture as long as it was not “collages or abstract art sculpture” could enter free of duty under paragraph 1807 provided signed certificates of originality by artists.<sup>604</sup> The exporting of the artwork was cumbersome and bureaucratic. Shippers and artists certificates of originality had to be done on American Consular Form No. 253 and certified by a U.S. consul. To assist him, MoMA was telling Kirstein to get assistance from Byrnes representatives and customs brokers.<sup>605</sup>

After Brazil, Kirstein traveled to Uruguay where a new contemporary art gallery was about to open at the American Library in Montevideo. According to Kirstein, this would facilitate a dedicated space for artists where they could sell their art. Due to the location, he was optimistic that the U.S. State would support it economically. However, permeating the overall Uruguayan art scene was a lack of resources. His impression of artists in Uruguay was that they showed great talent despite the dire economic conditions at the time.<sup>606</sup> As artists went, he noticed the sons of Joaquín Torres-García—Augusto and Horacio—whom he described as “extremely gifted; the whole family desperate poor.”<sup>607</sup> Kirstein was evaluating art and the art scene to make recommendations for the future department and for Uruguay he was to recommend on the proposal sending art materials as well as creating an artist-in-residence educational post at the new gallery.

---

<sup>604</sup> Shipping Instructions. Copy. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>605</sup> Memo to Mr. Abbott from Miss Dudley. July 14, 1942. Copy. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>606</sup> Ibid. p. 14.

<sup>607</sup> Ibid.

Further correspondence with Barr on July 19, 1942 posted from Buenos Aires, shows a similar routine for Kirstein, visiting artists and purchasing art works by Juan Antonio, Aquiles Badi, Héctor Basaldúa, Antonio Berni, Norah Borges de Torre, Horacio A. Butler, Ramón Gómez Cornet, Raquel Forner, Alfredo Guido, Manuel Angeles Ortíz, Juan Antonio Ballester Peña, Onofrio A. Pacenza, Juan del Prete, Attilio Rossi, Raúl Soldi, Lino Eneas Spilimbergo, and Demetrio Urruchúa.<sup>608</sup> Kirstein described having seen Francis Taylor, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and member of the Committee on Museums in Buenos Aires and having a conversation that revealed a conflicting competition for funds for his colonial art projects against Kirstein's modern art ones.

In his observation of art conditions in Buenos Aires, rather than a possible future material aid, Kirstein instead was drawing attention to a new gallery of independent artists that included U.S. trained architects Eduardo Sacristo and Ricardo de Bary Tornquist. This was welcomed news, as the gallery would counter the influence of the established *Los Amigos del Arte*, which he characterized as being "openly pro-Vichy and covertly pro Axis."<sup>609</sup> In addition, he had identified artists such as Demetrio Urruchúa and Lino Eneas Spilimbergo for further support given that they had fallen out of favor with the government.

Chile, still under Catlin's personal spell and success with the exhibition of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*, had extended an invitation to him to teach

---

<sup>609</sup> "Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art" p. 15. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

a U.S. modern art course at the Universidad de Chile. Since he had already been drafted, the U.S. Army allowed him to travel and teach provided he passed on intelligence on fascist sympathizers at the university, a role not very different from Kirstein's military mission. What Kirstein saw in the art scene in Santiago differed from Rio, Buenos Aires and Montevideo. Rather than initially visiting artists, who coincidentally just had just participated in the *Chilean Contemporary Art* exhibition at the Toledo Museum of Art in March-April 1942, Kirstein was requesting to Abbott to send the names, addresses, prices and titles of all artwork purchased from the Chilean show so that he would not duplicate efforts and visit other studios instead. What MoMA and trustees had purchased in Toledo were a painting by Israel Roa "The Painter's Birthday," oil for \$650 and a sculpture by Raul Vargas "The Dancer-Ines Pissaro" a terracotta sculpture for \$300.<sup>610</sup>

Kirstein was at the moment also interested in providing support to the independent art journal Revista FORMA, which had suffered from manipulation at the hands of the School of Fine Arts at the Universidad de Chile, the same sponsor of the exhibition and about to be Catlin's employer. In terms of art, Kirstein was to suggest the creation of a double collection of folk arts and crafts, one to go to MoMA and another one to be bought by the U.S. State to be presented to the Chilean State. This was an ironic view of the current state of the arts in Chile, of which Kirstein stated, "the only healthy contemporary art in Chile is its popular folk art."<sup>611</sup> But

---

<sup>610</sup> Kirstein to Abbott. July 19, 42, copy with notations for reply to Kirstein. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>611</sup> Ibid. p. 15.

considering MoMA's 1930s track record of exhibitions on modern expressions including popular folk art, this view indeed filled its institutional collecting vision.

A comparable situation was observed in Peru, where Kirstein recommended a similar course. As he came to see it, popular folk art and crafts as art expressions were rapidly disappearing due to neglect at the prioritization of the Inca and Colonial past which he saw as serving "generally to reinforce the cultural prestige of the already fanatically reactionary pro-Falange, pro Hispanidad, Anti-U.S. small but powerful upper class."<sup>612</sup> Kirstein was predicting a future shift to a popular government that would in turn take pride in the prestige of popular art despite being what he called democratic expression ignored by Church and State as a mixed mestizo "Cholo manifestation." To form this double collection of popular art, one for MoMA and another one for the U.S. State to present to the Peruvian State, Kirstein was proposing none other than José Sabogal, head of the School of Fine Arts and local organizer of the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. His rationale was that once the government could see the prestige the collection would bring in the United States, it would be more readily accepted and displayed with pride. This alluded to Anderson's analysis on nationalism and the role of museums as institutions of power. This idea of validation and prestige through the United States was a bit doubtful given the mild reception of the exhibition in the fall of 1941 and the perception of U.S. intervention in the Peru-Ecuador War in favor of the latter. In addition, Kirstein was identifying the need for art materials and art

---

<sup>612</sup> Ibid. p. 16.



instruction for artists in the cities and towns of Arequipa, Cajamarca, Cuzco, Lima and Puno.<sup>613</sup>

Ecuador, like Uruguay, would similarly benefit with U.S. support for a new gallery at the America Institute, which the U.S. Legation had just opened in Quito. In addition to the need for art materials which U.S. Minister Boaz had identified in her meeting with Grace Morley in early 1941 and support to artists like Oswaldo Guayasamin. Kirstein instead referred to Guayasamin as “...unique for his country, has incredible energy, paints non-stop, is modest and very adaptable,” and predicting a bright future ahead for him, Kirstein added, “He will be the national artist (and hence a political figure) in his country before he is 30.”<sup>614</sup> Like Peru, an Andean country, Kirstein was likewise recommending photographic documentation of folk arts and research into folkloric music and dances before these disappeared.

Having visited the northern part of Ecuador, Kirstein found the region interesting and stranger. His visit was now turning towards folk art that was fast disappearing by what he called the “usual teamwork of church and state.”<sup>615</sup> At the end of his South American trip, Kirstein had realized the enormous prestige that MoMA held throughout South America facilitated through the printed catalogs exchange and the Time and Life profiles Henry Luce had published. He was not revealing his association in this trip as not to inflate art prices and not create problems. That was fueling his desire for the department and at the same time was

---

<sup>613</sup> Due to the disappearing folk art tradition, a photographic survey and documentation as well as research in dance and music were also warranted as part of the new Department’s projects.

<sup>614</sup> Ibid: 17.

<sup>615</sup> Kirstein to Abbott, Sept 1, 1942. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

seeing it that under the Department of State it would accomplish in five years a much larger network with what he foresaw as having a gallery in “25 S. Am. cities and an influence that is absolutely stupendous.”<sup>616</sup>

At the end of his acquisition art trip in South America, Kirstein spent a total of \$8,757.62 in paintings and an additional \$4,725 in a film purchase in Brazil, folk art, photographs, books, and shipping expenses.<sup>617</sup> These artworks would soon be exhibited in the spring of 1943. But before this could happen, Kirstein needed to complete a proposal for a new department at MoMA. The outcome of Kirstein’s acquisition trip went beyond paintings. He compiled reports on each artist and studio that he visited providing an account and rationale for his selections, and recommendations for artworks to be considered by MoMA.

### **A Latin American Art Department for MoMA and for the State**

Now at the end of August 1942 and in his last days in Ecuador, Kirstein was becoming increasingly concerned with the proposal for MoMA’s Department of Latin American Art. Although work on the plan had started in April 1942<sup>618</sup> with the direct involvement of Abbott, Clark and Kirstein while maintaining Rockefeller fully informed, Kirstein’s travel to South America had delayed its completion until the fall of 1942. The interesting aspect of the proposal for the Latin American Art Department was that it would not be under MoMA per se, but under the supervision of a newly reorganized and aggrandized Department of State’s Division of Cultural

---

<sup>616</sup> Ibid. p. 2.

<sup>617</sup> Memorandum. Lincoln Kirstein to Ione Ulrich, December 31, 1942. LK, 7-E. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>618</sup> John E. Abbott to Nelson Rockefeller. April 22, 1942. EMH, II.15.b. MoMA Archives, NY.

Relations which would absorb the CI-AA Art activities beginning on July 1, 1943.

Thus MoMA would assume a role of a hybrid private yet public entity functioning as a cultural and education ideological state apparatus or as one of the specialized institutions that Louis Althusser defines to be in the private domain “double ‘functioning’” by repression (war) and ideology (American culture).<sup>619</sup>

A close reading reveals that informing the proposal was Kirstein’s views of Art as a totality. He provided a rather pragmatic definition in his proposal: “Viewed realistically, Art (that is—all manifestations of the creative human impulse in the plastic arts, music, literature, architecture, theatre or the film) is of prime importance in maintaining the prestige of our government during the war and of enlarging and consolidating it with the peace.”<sup>620</sup> In addition, his observations described South America where culture, unlike the United States was at the hands of the State, centralized in often conservative Ministries of Education and Ministries of Public Instruction and Public Works in which the state agencies such as National schools of fine arts and Museums of fine arts, national libraries and archives, museums of archaeology supported a state discourse. Kirstein’s argument was that “anyone...can reconstruct quite accurately the essential psychological security, spiritual atmosphere and political orientation of the nation.”<sup>621</sup>

---

<sup>619</sup> Louis Althusser. *The State Ideological Apparatuses*, 1969-70.

<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm> accessed 11 October 2011.

<sup>620</sup> “Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art.” p. 1. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>621</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2.

Now, Kirstein was positioning MoMA as what FDR had proposed in his 1939 speech: the national museum as the citadel of civilization—the temple that guarded civilization working with each state in Latin America to bring prestige upon themselves. Kirstein had come to see the 1941 exhibition and the 1942 acquisition plan as experimentation of a warfare state that fortunately lacked a centralized agency dictating and controlling cultural policy. Now, with the status of MoMA as a contractor at the service of the warfare state through the CI-AA, Kirstein was proposing a long-term plan for the fine arts in Latin America on the foundation of the previous initiatives and engaging agencies.

With a Department of Latin American Art, MoMA would bridge the private and state realm by continuing its work during the war and beyond. In the proposal, Kirstein noted, “it has been proposed that the Museum of Modern Art establish a Department of Latin American Art to encompass some, if not indeed a large portion, of this work.”<sup>622</sup> With no clarification as of who had proposed it, he stated,

The prestige of the museum, due to its long established central organization, its famous new building, permanent collections, changing and traveling exhibitions, its unique Film Library with many travelling programs, its departments of Architecture, Industrial Design, Dance Archives, and its present War Artists Program is universally known and respected, even in remote sections of Latin America, due in great part to the extensive circulation of its comprehensive illustrated and extremely successful group exhibition of North American Art accompanied by its representatives all over these republics in 1941.<sup>623</sup>

---

<sup>622</sup> Ibid.

<sup>623</sup> Ibid. pp. 2-3.

This ambitious and overstated presentation of the prestigious museum with a “universal” reputation and now with a wide outreach in all corners of Latin America, indeed tended to support the argument that MoMA as a strategic partner of the U.S. State, would be less suspicious of its cultural and art intentions than a U.S. State agency. Indeed, this was exactly what *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* had achieved by covering up the work of the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA with the Committee on New York Museums as the main sponsors of the exhibition. The proposal positioned MoMA as “a unique and irreplaceable position of political and professional purity to effect a broad cultural program.”<sup>624</sup>

As Kirstein continued his trip in South America, he sent a new letter to Abbott in early September in which he was sharing the latest draft and was asking him and Stephen Clark to look it over and make corrections before personally going to Washington to present it to Charles Thomson of the Division of Cultural Relations at the Department of State who had to approve it and clear with the Department itself.<sup>625</sup> Kirstein had been in contact with Rockefeller while traveling in South America. As a multi-agency and foundation effort, Kirstein was responsible for raising the funds and notifying agencies to include their share in their budget. As such the plan involved funds from Rockefeller, the Department of State, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation and other with interest in Latin American culture. With an initial budget of \$500,000 for the period between

---

<sup>624</sup> Ibid. p. 3.

<sup>625</sup> Kirstein to Abbott. September 1st Cali, Colombia [1942]. LK ,7-F. MoMA Archives, NY.

1943-1946, the price was indeed steep given the priorities of a warfare state and a war economy. This included in the first year alone a budget of \$125,000 for a division of Plastic arts and also of music.<sup>626</sup> The idea of prestige was interwoven in the proposal for the U.S. State by comparison to the failure of cultural British efforts in Argentina, Chile and Peru that was bringing disregard to the nation.

However one hurdle in the plan was that the trustees at MoMA had not seen the plan and now in September Kirstein was writing Abbott to push the proposal through the proper channels to get approval before it could be derailed by competing agencies such as Francis Taylor of the Metropolitan Museum for archaeology rather than art projects or as Kirstein called it “Colonial and Vice-Regal Art; Death and Tombs.”<sup>627</sup> In contrast, what Kirstein was focusing on was a more contemporary period and in particular “for the present and future orientation of popular culture towards our living democratic policy.”<sup>628</sup> From his point of view, the Museum would assume a more hemispheric role “to stir there our gifts for their own uses, backed and directed by us. We will have the prestige of helping them...they will never like us. But they will like us more when they see we

---

<sup>626</sup> The total for the plastic arts division would be \$25,500 for salaries and expenses + \$55,500 for local projects in 20 Republics. An additional \$39,000 for the music program for (director’s salary, assistant for radio, performance of works, recordings, publications of works and local projects) and given the war \$5,000 for local expenses (shipping and insurance). “Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art” p. 20-21.” LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>627</sup> Kirstein to Abbott. September 1st Cali, Colombia [1942]. LK, 7-F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>628</sup> Ibid.

innocently want to get their best exportable products which is their popular art and music.”<sup>629</sup>

This was a move towards the solidification of a cultural hegemony by the United States in South America with symbolic goods, which according to Kirstein were “the only bases for exportable prestige.”<sup>630</sup> This view of the arts representing the face of the nation was something that had been planned with the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. Within this exportable prestige, arts played a role of distinction, as patrons, as collectors and with national institutions such as schools of fine arts, museums, libraries and archives, similar venues where the exhibition had been shown. The role of art in politics—as seen in WPA and the post-1933 Federal Arts Program in Chapter I, was something with which U.S. was now familiar. With the three sections of the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*, art had become the face of the United States within a temporary agency for national security and defense. What Kirstein was proposing was the continuation of the momentum gained by the work of the Art Section and the OCCCRBAR and CI-AA cultural and commercial relations program. More than fine arts, he was bringing together the commercial aspect of culture and the cultural aspect of commerce.

As outlined, the ultimate objectives of the Department of Latin American Art would be to work as a supranational entity supporting states in the development of

---

<sup>629</sup> Ibid

<sup>630</sup> “Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art” p. 2. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

the arts, stimulating new talent, nurturing emerging artists who would “enhance the prestige of the local countries towards a greater feeling of national pride and spiritual security.”<sup>631</sup> Kirstein saw the arts playing a big role as the face of the nation with gifted and recognized individuals in the arts who would travel and thus carry with them ideas and intelligence information to serve the interests of the United States. As part of a cultural hegemony, the Department would indeed support the “spiritual prestige” of the U.S. State (State defined as an individual and endowed with spiritual and physical characteristics) as it replaced European influence in the Americas including that of England, Germany, Spain, Italy, and France.

The organization of this Department of Latin American Art at MoMA as proposed, would include a steering committee, an active advisory committee and staff from the museum. In fact, the organizational chart for the department reveals an attempt for Rockefeller through the museum to continue being involved in an area of activity that the Department of State was taking away from the CI-AA. As proposed, the Central Steering Committee would have as members Charles Thomson, Chief Cultural Relations Division at the Department of State; Rene d’Harnoncourt, Assistant Coordinator at the CI-AA; Lincoln Kirstein for MoMA; and Charles Seeger, Director of the Inter-American Music Institute at the Pan-American Union. Although this central steering committee reflected a state presence, it paled in comparison with what was being proposed for the “Active Advisory Committee.” Among names circulating were: Gustavo Durán of the Inter-American Music

---

<sup>631</sup> Ibid. p. 5.



Institute at the Pan American Union; Lewis Hank of the Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress; René d'Harnoncourt, General Manager of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the Department of the Interior; William Berrien in the Humanities Department of the Rockefeller Foundation; Henry Allen Moe, President of the Guggenheim Foundation; John Walker III now Curator of Paintings at the National Gallery of Art (Mellon Collection opened in 1941); and Francis Henry Taylor, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The staff at MoMA would include Stephen Clark, Chairman of the Board, Alfred H. Barr, Director, Permanent Collection; Monroe Wheeler, Director of Exhibitions and Publications; Elodie Courter, Director of Traveling Exhibitions (no longer circulating exhibitions); Lincoln Kirstein, as Director of the Department of Latin American Art, Luís de Zulueta as Assistant to the Department, and Francis Hawkins, Secretary of the Museum. Missing from this list were OCCRBAR and CI-AA veterans such as Stanton Loomis Catlin and John Hay Whitney who had been drafted into the War.

The point of this department was to create a permanent entity that would supersede the temporary emergency agency that was the CI-AA and take advantage of the permanence of the Department of State. From the very conception, this indeed would be an arm to continue the security work for the State sustaining the idea of unity that had already started and the continuation of a now warfare state propaganda against all European powers including Britain. In fact, the Department would have representatives in all countries some local nationals and some U.S.

diplomats in the newly created positions of Cultural Relations in U.S. Embassies and U.S. Legations.

Indeed this was a program geared towards aggrandizing the State while MoMA continued its work as a contractor as it had done to date both in art and music. In fact, what Kirstein was proposing as a possible three-year plan of activities was an ambitious program to support artists, to create a permanent art infrastructure that had to do more with a private sector model rather than the states themselves. What the Department was set out to do was to consolidate efforts and to guide them for the next three years. This was a follow up to the tasks given to the consultants to identify projects that could be done locally. Now that communications were restricted due to the war, mail had to go through censors and approved and the commercial steamships had been requisitioned by the State for military transport.

However, MoMA was key in this conception of the department as its membership would be extended to people in Latin America and its services provided including free catalogs, invitations to exhibition openings, tours, etc. extended to a much larger constituency. In the operational aspect of the Department with volunteer representatives in each country, expenses would go to the development of the program itself. Of course adding music to the proposal was a bit of a stretch for a museum that was more into the visual arts than the performing arts despite the presence of the Ballet Archive that Kirstein himself had presented to the museum. Kirstein's rationale to include music in the proposed

Latin America Art Department was MoMA's 1940 presentation of the *20 Centuries of Mexican Art* exhibition public programs in which Mexican composer Carlos Chavez had presented in its auditorium a program featuring pre-Columbian, colonial, republican and contemporary music. Likewise, during the New York World's Fair in 1939, the museum had invited Brazil musicians participating in the Fair to perform in its new auditorium. In addition, Kirstein had just identified new composers and works, studied the South American music monopoly by Italian Casa Ricordi, and the viability of having folklore conferences. He was positioning music as one of the media, which had a most influential capability in a permanent U.S. hegemonic presence in a nascent cultural industry.

Returning to the United States in October 1942, Kirstein sought out the advice of René d'Harnoncourt who by October 1942 was on his way to becoming the acting Chair of the Art Section of the CI-AA. D'Harnoncourt's comments on the proposal were informed by his work as General Manager of the Indian Crafts Board at the Department of the Interior and his previous experience as a buyer of crafts in Mexico for Fredrick W. Davis' antique store, the Sonora News Company. He had been the curator of the American Indian crafts exhibition at the San Francisco World's Fair and more recently in 1941 had curated the exhibition Indian Arts of the United States at MoMA. It is important to consider here that d'Harnoncourt would be appointed by Rockefeller as Vice President of Foreign Activities at MoMA in 1944 and its Director in 1949. Therefore his comments about the proposal acquire a

different weight given that context and the residuals that would appear in the 1940s and 1950s including the Museum of Primitive Art and MoMA's International Council.

D'Harnoncourt came to see the proposed Department as one way to continue the work of the OCCCRBAR/CI-AA Art Section beyond June 1943 when it would cease to exist as part of Rockefeller's Office. He noticed that the Department's goals and objectives were to carry on the cementing of the mutual understanding through art, which following MoMA's definition included painting, sculpture, architecture, and industrial arts. In addition, it was to support the development of museums in the Western Hemisphere by supporting the organization of collections, archive and photographic files, traveling exhibition programs, and the publication of monographs and reproductions. With the nascent U.S. cultural industry in South America spurred by Whitney's own efforts with the film industry and Hollywood in which he had commercial interests, the proposed Department would have a more ample role in the "development" of a visual arts industry in the hemisphere by supporting the procurement of tools and art materials, teaching resources, providing assistance "in the creation of a better local and Inter-American market,"<sup>632</sup> and continuing with the traditional cultural relations models of interchange with artists, students, art critics.

D'Harnoncourt indeed looked at the short and long term benefits from the State perspective not only as a way to improve the negative connotation of the United States as the Industrial Colossus of the North, despite the industrialization of

---

<sup>632</sup> René d'Harnoncourt to Lincoln Kirstein. October 17, 1942. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

handicrafts, as well as a way to a more imperialistic view to replace the “cultural dependency on Europe with self confidence and establish faith in the people’s share in the uniting of the Hemisphere under a democratic order.”<sup>633</sup> An important component in the proposal was the establishment of technical assistance by which the Department would support the creation of permanent collections of pre-historic, colonial and folk art in cultural centers, rather than just being limited to collections of modern and contemporary art. From the point of view of future cultural industries, the Department as proposed, would support further economic analysis for the development at a larger commercial scale of manual arts and crafts through national agencies within the government and at the hemispheric level, an Inter-American coordinating entity. But perhaps more notable in this early attempt at industrialization was the U.S. State “assistance in merchandising and styling.”<sup>634</sup>

At the end of October 1942, the proposal made its way officially to Stephen Clark’s desk as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of MoMA, despite his being involved with it in its conception and development. However, MoMA’s Board did not vote favorably for the proposal. Instead of creating a Department of Latin America that would forever be an entanglement of a private corporation with the Department of State and other federal agencies in activities that went beyond modern art, Clark on behalf of the Trustees offered Kirstein the title of the museum’s consultant on Latin-American Art on October 26, 1942. The reasoning behind it was

---

<sup>633</sup> Ibid.

<sup>634</sup> Ibid.

that at the lack of a budget to establish the Department, the museum could still gain from Kirstein's expertise in the field. Clark's letter of appointment expressed the hope that Kirstein would "accept this honorary position so that we [MoMA] may benefit from your knowledge and experience."<sup>635</sup> This was a symbolic position for someone who had contributed a great deal of influence, knowledge and scholarship to modern art.

Although funds were not available to start a Department that had to do more with the State than with the museum, Clark was very impressed with the work Kirstein had done with acquisitions in South America and he let Rockefeller know. There was no mention as to the Mexico or Cuba acquisitions as it was no secret that Clark did not agree with Barr's acquisitions or art preferences, nor was he his biggest fan. In a letter on November 10, 1942, Clark wrote to Rockefeller:

Our contacts with Latin-America will ultimately be of tremendous value to us. I am greatly impressed by the job Lincoln Kirstein did for you on his recent trip. He has succeeded in getting a surprising number of good pictures and with these acquisitions we shall have the greatest collection of contemporary Latin-American art in the world. In my judgment, Lincoln Kirstein has more of a flair for contemporary art than anyone else connected with the Museum.<sup>636</sup>

But if the Department of Latin American Art had been shelved by MoMA Trustees due to lack of a budget, Kirstein was busy announcing to Argentinean and Brazilian artists the Brooklyn Museum's upcoming 12<sup>th</sup> Biennial Watercolor

---

<sup>635</sup> Stephen C. Clark to Lincoln Kirstein. October 26, 1942. LK, I.A. MoMA Archives, NY. Stephen Clark as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of MoMA stated, "We have no provisions in our budget for setting up a Latin-American Department..."

<sup>636</sup> In "Extract from Stephen Clark's letter to NAR - Nov. 10'42 filed in 138.615 re gift of Socony-Vacuum Co. Stock. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-Series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Exhibition in April-May 1943. He was also busy with Clark, Abbott, and d'Harnoncourt and with Rockefeller's blessing forming a "skeleton South American department through which [they] hoped to keep alive the various contacts..."<sup>637</sup> in addition to continuing work "toward the formulation of our long term policy of cooperation with the other American Republics."<sup>638</sup> And as if this was not enough, they were also planning a folk art proposal to help establish folk art museums in Lima, Bogota, Mexico City and Santiago.<sup>639</sup> In fact, this was an idea that also had the support of Rockefeller. He had contributed a wider selection of South American art to MoMA's collection which had been described as art "by untutored painters, Sunday craftsmen, the local Rousseaus of Rio, Quito, Bogota, and Santiago"<sup>640</sup> representing more of a tourist trade market. A few years later, a U.S.-based and Rockefeller supported museum would also be founded in New York under the name of The Museum of Primitive Art.

### **Modern Art and Clandestine Operations in Times of War**

Both of Kirstein's trips to South America first in 1941 with the American Ballet Caravan and with MoMA in 1942 had a military intelligence gathering component in concert with the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA. Kirstein not only had previously tried to enlist in the Coast Guard unsuccessfully due to poor eyesight, but also he had approached the U.S. Naval Reserve's intelligence unit only to be rejected

---

<sup>637</sup> John E. Abbott to Nelson Rockefeller, November 24, 1942. LK, 1.D. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>638</sup> Ibid.

<sup>639</sup> Lincoln Kirstein to Kennett Wasson. November 24, 1942. LK, 7-E. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>640</sup> Lincoln Kirstein. "Latin Americans at the Museum of Modern Art." typed document. LK, I.A. MoMA Archives, NY.

as not being a third generation American. Kirstein's Grandfather Edward Kirstein had been a German Jewish immigrant who in May 1848 had come to the United States as an exile from the Kingdom of Prussia. His father born in the United States was an executive in the Filene's Department Store in Boston.<sup>641</sup> By 1942, Kirstein's military service classification was a Class 2-A married. As a way to serve his country, Kirstein had personally looked out for Captain Harding of the A.I.S. after being advised by George Dudley who worked with Wallace K. Harrison now second in command at the CI-AA. In fact, Rockefeller was using Kirstein's 1942 trip as a covert operation to gather information on German clandestine actions by a networks of Axis agents in the Nazi hot bed that South America was now becoming. Reporting to Captain William Barclay Harding, Chief, Operations and Contact Section, American Intelligence Service (A.I.S), Kirstein was charged with making close observations in key countries in South America: Brazil, Argentina, Chile.<sup>642</sup>

Part of Kirstein's tasks was to handwrite chatty letters addressed to Frances Hawkins at MoMA<sup>643</sup> thus providing details that in fact reported his observations on local conditions and the true political engagement of members of embassies and coordinating committees that the Office was setting up to facilitate its work in the region. This manner of informal yet detailed communication passed undetected

---

<sup>641</sup> Kirstein came from a well to do family and had attended Phillips Exeter Academy, the Berkshire School in Sheffield, Massachusetts and Harvard College graduating in 1930 with a Bachelor of Science Degree. He spoke French and Spanish fluently.

<sup>642</sup> Kirstein and the American Ballet Caravan also visited Panama, Guatemala and Mexico in 1941.

<sup>643</sup> Kirstein wrote letters from Rio on June 2, Buenos Aires on July 8 and 13, Lima on August 21, Bogota on September 8, 1942. The letters are at MoMA's Archives. However they are not available to the public for consultation at the moment (spring 2014). Lincoln Kirstein Papers, Series III- Correspondence with Frances Hawkins 1941-1944.



through mail censors. Once received in New York by the CI-AA's Art Section, they were forwarded to Rockefeller in Washington D.C. who shared the reports with the American Intelligence Services.

Kirstein's new mission in 1942 was a more personable approach to intelligence gathering with direct conversation with artists, intellectuals, and U.S. Embassies and U.S. Legations personnel to determine allegiances to the totalitarian fascist European powers and to observe how the U.S. diplomatic corps was helping or hindering the CI-AA defense efforts. In explaining the CI-AA aspect of Kirstein's trip to MoMA, Rockefeller noted, "the continuance of these relationships will have a propaganda importance and will be of assistance in our psychological war effort."<sup>644</sup> Now at a moment of war, the purchase of art became the perfect cover for an intelligence-gathering trip that received clearance from the Department of State and priority for plane travel at a moment of war. To combine the art purchase and this mission for his office, Rockefeller presented this trip as a service to the U.S. State "in a form of a talking campaign."<sup>645</sup> Adding credence to the trip were letters of introduction by John Hay Whitney, President of MoMA and now a captain in the U.S. Army Air Forces in the Office of Strategic Services, and by Father Robert Ignatius Gannon, S. J., at the time the Jesuit President of Fordham University.

Arriving in Rio de Janeiro in May 1942, Kirstein narrated his views of an authoritarian corporatist country that had adopted a neutral position (at least until

---

<sup>644</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to John E. Abbott, April 29, 1942. LK, I.F. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>645</sup> Ibid.

August 1942 when it caved in to U.S. pressure) under the dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas who had been in power since the revolution of 1930.<sup>646</sup> The U.S. Ambassador Jefferson Caffery was as much disliked as he was well connected. Conducting naval intelligence by locating recently published German military books that were not in any library in the United States, Kirstein asked Caffery to introduce him to the U.S. naval and military attachés at the Embassy, a request that was simply refused. Instead he was only allowed to talk to the chief of the naval mission. At this critical time in 1942, there were no ranking admiral or general as Caffery had managed to have one recalled and one retire. In his interactions with the Embassy and the Coordinating Committee, Kirstein noted a lack of coordination and imagination in accomplishing the tasks of the Office. The radio program was ineffective, the press program controlled by the Embassy, the film program had not started yet despite a very public presence of Orson Welles in Rio cut short by Phil Reisman, Executive Vice President of the film studio R.K.O.

Spending six weeks in Argentina in June and July 1942, Kirstein encountered a country in the midst of a political crisis as President Roberto Ortíz had resigned for health reasons and acting President Ramón Castillo had decided to continue a position of war neutrality, which in fact would go on until March 1945. All the time keeping a low profile about his MoMA affiliation, Kirstein was busy locating the German military books that he was unsuccessful in finding in Brazilian libraries. In

---

<sup>646</sup> In the 1930s Vargas had supported the *O Estado Novo* program to build the new modern State shifting its economy from agrarian to an industrial one in an authoritarian corporatist model.

Buenos Aires, he opted for posting advertisements in German local newspapers until he found a Swiss book dealer who ordered them from Germany directly.

With this out of the way, Kirstein was now working to resolve an issue for the Pan American Union Music institute and the monopoly of Casa Ricordi, a blacklisted Italian firm. At stake was breaking the music cartel of the Italian Casa Ricordi now operating under a disguised name of “Casa Ricordi Americana” based in Argentina which controlled all music publishing and rights to classical and Brazilian music.

Kirstein’s views of the U.S. situation in Argentina was one of an urgent need for a permanent policy post-war for commerce and market, hemisphere unity and defense, and cultural solidarity to counter what he saw as “the closed mediaevalism [sic] of Hispanidad and all it stands for.”<sup>647</sup> He intimated that the CI-AA propaganda campaign was not being successful reaching the intended audience of the ruling class to shape perception, as Rockefeller local committees composed of American expatriates and businessmen were highly ineffective. The United States basically was caught in the middle of a local conflict between a U.S.-averse upper class of *terratenientes* (landowners) and a future industrialization which put the former in direct opposition to U.S. plans for a reform of Argentina’s economic base and structure. The United States was seen as a market competitor as Argentina ranked among the 10<sup>th</sup> largest economies and richest countries in the world. With the British Blockade, Argentina and the United States were competing for the same markets. Its neutrality was seen as a strategy to regain post-war European markets.

---

<sup>647</sup> Lincoln Kirstein to Major Sherlock Davis. August 1, 1942. LK, 1.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

The challenge for the United States, as Kirstein observed, was to reach this class with U.S. propaganda for public opinion shaping. This was a segment of the Argentinean population that he described as lacking foresight at the hopes of industrialization seen as a treat to their own economic class due to a possible rise of lower classes. As Kirstein came to see it, the *terrateniente* upper socio-economic class was in need of indoctrination to the benefits of industrialization. For the middle class, what was needed was a dose of U.S. advances in science and technology innovation in medicine, chemistry, and engineering to counter what Germany was doing in Argentina. Kirstein perceived the real weakness to be the fact that the U.S. State was not strongly presenting its views on a democratic society, open market economy and representative politics. Compared to Germany, the U.S. was showing neither a social nor a military superiority given that it had just joined WWII six months before and still was without any “marketable military victories.”

Although Kirstein had been involved in the arts, he had come to realize that what the U.S. Embassy in Argentina needed was not a new cultural attaché but a scientific one. In fact, Kirstein was now of the view that “the literary fields and the arts in general...should be left to themselves as journalists as a group are more susceptible to our interests.”<sup>648</sup> The lack of outreach by U.S. agencies including Agriculture, Commerce, Interior with their publications and reports reflected the absence of reference materials in Argentinean libraries. Kirstein also noticed the differing approaches to a propaganda war in which Germany’s indirect yet specific

---

<sup>648</sup> Ibid. 2.

methods were successful compared to American and British direct yet general methods, which inevitable made the Argentinean people more suspicious of neo-imperial intentions. If Rockefeller had recruited the small civil society and corporate sector to his Office cause under the name of coordinating committees, these were proving highly ineffectual with a campaign of handouts and publications in English rather than in Spanish that created more harm than good. It wasn't the language, it was the content. Behind this was a Department of State that had assumed a position of not getting involved in local politics. And although the radical sector in Argentina was pro-United States at the moment their political power was negligible. Kirstein came to wonder if "Argentina is a battlefield accidentally bloodless? Further questioning if "in battle are we little gentlemen."<sup>649</sup>

Kirstein even had suggestions to improve the odds in favor of the United States in this Argentinean battlefield. Among his suggestions were an Argentine-North American Library complete with all U.S. reference material and published reports, reviews, bibliographical magazines and technical journals.<sup>650</sup> In addition, he was suggesting the publication and distribution of a political and economic weekly in Spanish, a monthly technical summary, popular editions of books, politically-oriented U.S. language schools, the CI-AA publication En Guardia in film, radio programming but not the *Amigos inolvidables* which Kirstein found to be "not

---

<sup>649</sup> Ibid. 4.

<sup>650</sup> With management preference given to former recipients of Rockefeller and Guggenheim grants and those who had lived and trained in the United States.

unforgettable, but unforgivable,”<sup>651</sup> better FDR’s hemispheric broadcasts comparable to those of Hitler, grants to doctors and professors, control of news, and keeping better tabs on the goings and comings of key people as part of intelligence. That the German and Italian presence in Argentina was large due to years and years of migration, Kirstein also saw the need to expand the Proclaimed List beyond import and export firms. As detailed as these observation about the U.S. failing presence in Argentina were, Kirstein soon found himself in hot waters as William Griffiths, cultural attaché in Argentina took them as an insult even requesting the Department of State to exclude Kirstein from Argentina.<sup>652</sup>

Upon his return to the United States from his MoMA-paid trip to South America to purchase art in mid-October 1942, Kirstein completed and handled his intelligence assessment of the fast changing perception in Latin America of the Warfare State that was becoming the United States. In his report Captain William Barclay Harding of the War Department’s Military Intelligence Service, Kirstein’s political views provided a bleak assessment of how the United States was perceived as the real enemy rather than any totalitarian German, Italian or Japanese regime at the time. And if the United States occupied the front position, Britain was not a far second in a perception of exploiting imperialism. He wrote: “The United States is now (October 1942) considered the real (not the apparent) enemy of local national autonomy by the opposition (revolutionary) generation, far more than the German

---

<sup>651</sup> Report to William Barclay Harding. October 27, 1942. LK, 1.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>652</sup>Ibid.

and the Japanese, in every Latin-American country.”<sup>653</sup> Taken from the perspective of national autonomy, this imperialistic positioning of the United States by a young population segment that included a broad spectrum of military personnel, members of labor unions, religious group and anti-religious intellectuals would seriously affect any post-war economic expansionary plans. The imminent problem that the United States was facing was that any of these groups could be in government after the war. The bigger problem in his political conclusions was the lack of a coherent foreign policy because of the deep rift that existed at the Department of State between Cordell Hull and Sumner Wells.

As a diplomatic situation it was one that as Kirstein put it “was precipitated by the dishonest and naivete [sic] of the ‘Good Neighbor’ policy which never realized that trade-agreements could not be implemented in war-time, or that the colonial status is distasteful even to persons of mixed blood, high cheeked-bones, straight hair, or dark skin...”<sup>654</sup> Added to this diplomatic fiasco was the official position of non-intervention in local politics that the Department of State had decided to assume leaving at chance the support of future generations at the lack of a coherent foreign policy.

---

<sup>653</sup> “General Political Conclusions.” Not dated (October 1942). LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>654</sup> Ibid. Point VI.

## **The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art Catalog and Exhibition**

A man with immense energy and wide intellectual preoccupations, Kirstein was at the end of November 1942 busy writing the history of South American painting to go along the exhibition of the artworks that he had just acquired and those that Barr and Kauffman purchased in Cuba and Mexico in the summer of 1942. In fact, MoMA in the spring of 1943 would come to celebrate it as “the most important collection of contemporary Latin-American art in the United States, or for that matter in the world (including the sister republics to the south),<sup>655</sup> with an exhibition slated to take place from March 30 to May 2, 1943 on the second floor of the museum.<sup>656</sup> Referring to the book in progress, Kirstein stated, “this it the first time that such a history had been undertaken in English and, as far as I know, no similar book exists in Spanish or Portuguese.”<sup>657</sup> But war rationing was encroaching upon publication projects and this one was no exception. By January 1943 MoMA was being cautioned about war requisition of metals and chemicals used to create plates and illustrations for books. The museum was asking Abbott and Kirstein to make sure what was needed for the catalog was indeed necessary and could be used more than once. If the history of Latin American art essay was once a much larger project, it now became a special board-bound publication of about 100 pages with prints and text on the same page. Kirstein wrote to

---

<sup>655</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. “Foreword.” 1943: 3.

<sup>656</sup> Memorandum. Latin-American Publication. Wheeler to Kirstein et al. January 18, 1943. LK, 7-E. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>657</sup> Lincoln Kirstein to William L. Shurz, Acting Chief, Division of Cultural Relations, Department of State. December 16, 1942. LK, 7-E. MoMA Archives, NY.



Rockefeller on February 17, 1943 to tell him how satisfied he was with the catalog of the Latin American collection while regretting not having directed the organization of the exhibition due to his reporting to the Army that very day.<sup>658</sup>

Kirstein was indeed on a path to become one of the main actors in the history of Latin American art. In fact, he had been active since his return from South America curating exhibitions of Argentinean artist Demetrio Urruchúa and Chilean artist Luís Herrera Guevara. He brought these to the attention of Rockefeller, the first one as “one big discovery” and the other one as a lead from d’Harnoncourt.<sup>659</sup> Although MoMA could not exhibit them given its already set schedule, its Department of Circulation Exhibitions would place them on tour in the United States after May 1943. Listed on the CI-AA Art Section comprehensive list of Latin American Art exhibitions in the United States of January 15, 1943, Urruchúa’s exhibition was described as a collection of fifteen monotypes in color and black and white in a small exhibition “of great distinction” that revealed influences of David Alfaro Siqueiros while depicting “the anti-Nazi attitudes of a talented young artist”<sup>660</sup> which was being offered at a rental rate of \$25 for a period of three weeks. An additional Kirstein curated exhibition on view in April 1943 at the Durlacher Gallery in New York, was to feature twelve paintings of Herrera Guevara of streets

---

<sup>658</sup> Lincoln Kirstein to Nelson Rockefeller, February 17, 1943. LK, 1.D. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>659</sup> Barr expressed to Kirstein that Urruchúa was indeed “one big discovery.” Lincoln Kirstein to Nelson Rockefeller, February 17, 1943. LK, 1.D. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>660</sup> “Traveling Exhibitions of Latin American Art in the United States. 1/15/1943.” NARA, RG229, Box 1209, Folder: Art 1942 Traveling Exhibitions of L.A., Art for Smaller Centers of US.

and plazas of Santiago in a “primitive style” at a lower rental rate of \$15 for three weeks.

For the museum and for the artists Kirstein had just met a few months before in South America, his war draft meant a break of established contacts and a slowing down of the momentum he had built towards art exchanges. However, times were also changing and although 1941 had been a year to make the United States known to South America, and 1942 the year to make South America known to the United States, the museum in 1943 was beginning to observe a shift of public interest in things military at a much wider level. What Kirstein called a “first broad view of contemporary Latin-American plastic art seen as a whole,”<sup>661</sup> did have an impact with the exhibition and catalog. That the war and the State created the need later impinging on it, there is no doubt. Because of the war and the draft not only was Kirstein not able to organize the exhibition, nor publish a larger text on the history, but also his planned public programs including a lecture series of eight parts accompanying the exhibition came to be reduced to four and then cancelled altogether. Kirstein now in Europe with the Third Army had already resigned his honorary title of Consultant of Latin American Art at the Museum of Modern Art.<sup>662</sup>

Although Kirstein could not curate the larger Latin-American exhibition at MoMA because of the end of his draft deferment, he continued to be interested in art and in organizing exhibitions. In fact, once he settled at Fort Belvoir in Virginia as a

---

<sup>661</sup>“Preliminary Draft of A Plan for the Formation of A Department of Latin American Art.” p. 7. LK, I.B. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>662</sup> Duberman, 2007: 390.

private in the 2nd ECA Regiment for his military training, he began to organize exhibitions of American Battle Art for the National Gallery Art where his old Harvard Society of Art co-founder John Walker III was curator, and the Library of Congress and now writing a proposal for a National War Art Museum in Washington, D.C. In early 1944 he was recommended to the U.S. Arts and Monuments Commission, but given his rank as Army Private he only managed to get an assignment as an art specialist in early June 1944. Kirstein now in Europe with the Third Army had already resigned his honorary title of Consultant of Latin American Art at the Museum of Modern Art.<sup>663</sup>

By 1944 Kirstein was already considered along with Morley one of the foremost experts in Latin American art. He was in direct contact with Concha Romero James and Leslie Judd Switzer of the Pan American Union's Office of Intellectual Cooperation for a publication project. They asked Kirstein to submit a list of twenty-five names for a series of monographs on Latin American artists and suggestions for possible authors and art critics from South America.<sup>664</sup> In his reply, Kirstein did mention the project "to be very close to my heart," suggesting names from Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, while mentioning that countries such as Bolivia, Colombia and Venezuela had no artists.<sup>665</sup> On March 6,

---

<sup>663</sup> Duberman, 2007: 390.

<sup>664</sup> Letter from Leslie Switzer, Division of Intellectual Cooperation to Private Lincoln Kirstein, October 25, 1944. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, AMA-Art Museum of the Americas Archives.

<sup>665</sup> Letter from Private Lincoln Kirstein to Leslie Switzer, December 25, 1944. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, AMA-Art Museum of the Americas Archives. Kirstein suggests nineteenth century Prilidiano Puerreydon, Juan Manuel Blanes, Pedro Sivori, and Pedro Figari. For twenty century artists he names Demetrio Urruchúa, Horacio Butler, Alfredo Guido, Cândido Portinari,

1945, Switzer invited Kirstein to write the monograph on David Alfaro Siqueiros.

For it Kirstein was planning to include the text of two articles on Siqueiros that had appeared in Magazine of Art with twenty photographs in an essay of 3,500 words.

<sup>666</sup> Kirstein enthusiastically accepted the project, which followed closely the MoMA Bulletin in size and typeface with the only stipulation that his essay be accompanied by a dedication “for ABH Jr.”<sup>667</sup>

Kirstein had been stationed in London during the 1944 Blitz, and then transferred to Paris and finally in January 1945 he had been promoted to assistant (as Private First Class) to Captain Robert Kelley Posey, an architect by training and Art and Monuments Officer in General Patton’s 3<sup>rd</sup> Army in Nancy, France. Both Posey and Kirstein would follow army combat front line troops marching towards Luxembourg and Southern Germany in search of Nazi damaged and looted art. It was Posey and Kirstein who recovered a ca. 1350 wall tempera painting of the annunciation in the Priory Church of Mont Saint Martin on the Luxembourg border,<sup>668</sup> and the most important cache of all: Hubert and Jan van Eyck’ *Adoration of the Lamb* or *Ghent Altarpiece* ca. 1430 which they found in a salt mine full of

---

Alejandro, Rivera, Orozco, Siqueiros, Guayasamin, Reynoso. As for authors he suggested Juan Gorell, María Rosa Oliver, Robert Smith, Elizabeth Wilder, Daniel Catton Rich, José María Quimper, and Grace McCann Morley as long as Alfred Barr approves the subject to channel her enthusiasm to a worthy and not deserving cause.

<sup>666</sup> Letter from Leslie Switzer to Lincoln Kirstein, March 6, 1945. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, AMA-Art Museum of the Americas Archives, The list that Switzer compiled in 1945 included by order of popularity: José Clemente Orozco, Diego Rivera, David Alfaro Siqueiros, Oswaldo Guayasamín, Cândido Portinari, Carlos Mérida, Mario Carreño, Amalia Peláez, Rufino Tamayo, Joaquín Torres-García, Lasar Segall, Julia Codesido, Manuel Guerrero Galván, Ruiz, Luís Alberto Acuña, Antonio Berni, Horacio Butler, etc.

<sup>667</sup> Letter from Lincoln Kirstein to Leslie Switzer, April 15, 1945. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, AMA-Art Museum of the Americas Archives.

<sup>668</sup> Duberman, 2007: 397.

explosives in Alt Aussee near Salzburg along with paintings by Fragonard, Watteau, Vermeer, Bouts, Da Vinci, Brueghel, Raphael, Veronese, and Michaelangelo's Madonna from Bruges and others in one of the most notable recovery of stolen art.<sup>669</sup> Kirstein also helped set up the Central Collecting Point for looted art in Munich and was given an honorable discharge in September 1945.

Writing to Switzer on July 9, 1945 on a "nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartai" stationery, Kirstein shared with her plans for his return from the war including lectures with a title of "How the U.S. Army saved European Art," in U.S. museums and later on a tour of Latin America provided the Inter-American business still existed, to "show photos showing how we respect the culture of the West."<sup>670</sup> Helping his cause was the description according to him by the New York Times "as the most intellectual enlisted man in the army," and him describing himself as having "the rank of a Pfc. and am covered with combat stars and grey hair, what is left of it."<sup>671</sup>

After two years in the Army, Kirstein was happy to see World War II come to an end, at least in Europe. He was a changed man with new and old art interests. He was soon named to MoMA's Board of Trustees and renewed his passion for ballet with the founding of the Ballet Society in 1946. What happened to the Siqueiros

---

<sup>669</sup> Duberman, 2007: 401-403. Also See Lynn H. Nichols, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1995.

<sup>670</sup> Letter from Lincoln Kirstein to Leslie Judd Switzer, July 9, 1945. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, AMA-Art Museum of the Americas Archives.

<sup>671</sup> Ibid.

monograph is not clear given that the Pan American Union project suffered from war rationing of printing paper. A few of the monographs were printed and distributed in other countries. It was not until 1946 when the first monographs were published in the United States and by then Kirstein was already immersed in other projects.

What Kirstein did with his trip to South America and the proposal for the Department of Latin American Art was to solidify a regulated cultural circuit and the network of actors whom he had met in the summer of 1941 and with whom he renewed acquaintance in 1942. These also included those whom Morley, Catlin, Durieux and the Lewises had met earlier. His close observations and writings about the art scene in the countries he visited, however, provided a more comprehensive assessment of art within the objectives of the CI-AA in its post-war cultural and commercial possibilities. But at the same time he also brought this idea of art not only as defense but also as the prestige of the nation-state, which would be deployed shortly as part of the Cold War Fight with Abstract Expressionism as a sign of freedom in the United States. In South America, Kirstein with the Latin American Art Fund established an incipient and limited market and discovered new talent. Kirstein played a pivotal role in the construction of a “Latin American Art” and with his purchases a role in the construction of a canon that was effective during the war years and those immediately after. That the taste of art changed and that Barr’s torpedo kept advancing post-war in the seas of modern art, of course meant a shift in taste and definitions of what modern art in Latin America signified in the United

States. With changes in art and taste, the organic and growing museum collection also transformed deciding through de-accessions as the canon of modern evolved.

Rather than established artists, Kirstein concentrated on mostly emerging artists to provide a more panoramic view of the latest developments of modern art in South America not by trend but by aesthetic ideas of quality. In his essay for the catalog, Kirstein presented modern art by country following closely the art taxonomy that MoMA employed while providing a hemispheric modern art view with contrasting examples of U.S. art that afforded a more ample conception of a modern art than what Morley had done. She had simply limited her views to Central and South America and trends of *Indigenism* and a mix of European and local influences. While in South America, Kirstein became conscious of a planetary unity and that to him constituted a new world condition. He wrote “today, with the world shrunk by war, airplane and radio, an interpenetration of creative influences is effected without the time-lag of a hundred-years ago,”<sup>672</sup> Thus perceiving large changes in the next ten years and the constitution of a new stage in globalization and in new cultural flows and networks.

---

<sup>672</sup> Kirstein, *Latin American Painting: A Comparative Sketch*, 1943: 2. . LK, II.1. MoMA Archives, NY.

## MODERN ART: CULTURAL FLOWS AND NETWORKS

In taking modern art as a cultural object or artefact to reveal its role as a strategic tool of U.S. national defense during 1940-1943, I have looked at its “story” or “biography”<sup>673</sup> to examine the forces that produced and shaped it at a moment in which the U.S. State, as container of a national U.S. culture, had completed a process of reconstituting itself as a modern industrial state after the crisis of capitalism of 1933-1939. In this new reconstituted U.S. State, culture achieved a centrality in shaping a new nation with a deepening of values of freedom and democracy and an unprecedented acknowledgement of modern art and artists as part of a national life with a significant social function. Modern art came to occupy an increasingly important role in the social formation of a more distinguished nation with a State preoccupied with issues of taste and education. Culture helped to reorganize the national space supporting the establishment of an infrastructure of cultural centers and museums, public and educational programs, and the expansion of a national network for circulating educational exhibitions to help raise standards of taste in the nation. Thus the U.S. State began to see modern museums in a civilizing role and modern art, as the art of living artists, as a means to bring prestige to the new State. Counting with a museum that FDR already considered a “citadel of civilization,” and

---

<sup>673</sup> du Guy et al., 1997, p. 2.



a modern art infused with a spirit of freedom and reflecting a progressive contemporary life, art became a carrier of an ideology of freedom and democracy and a propaganda tool for the state and nation in 1939-1940.

With changing global conditions and with a view to a hegemonic position in a new world order, the U.S. State set eyes in a hemispheric integration by dependency in a process of expansion of U.S. capitalism with a commercial and cultural regionalization that secured and protected U.S. interests. Culture again became critical to the expansion of U.S. interests, ideas, values, and way of life. The challenge became how to penetrate a region where a U.S. presence was almost negligible? Armand Mattelart has pointed out the role of networks as a way to structure space and life and “circulate civilization.” In fact, it was matter of replicating a national model of restructuring of economy and culture at a much larger international hemispheric scale and by networking South America attempt to restructure space and life at a time of war with what Mattelart calls an Americanization—a massive indoctrination campaign or “an imperial intervention of a new non-colonial kind”<sup>674</sup> in which “influence always spreads out from the tutelary center that imposes its worldview on the diverse peripheries.”<sup>675</sup>

The Private Sector, with and represented in Nelson A. Rockefeller, was critical in the appropriation of modern art by the U.S. State with new advertising models, ideas, social identities that reflected the power and class relations as it

---

<sup>674</sup> Mattelart, 2000: 25.

<sup>675</sup> Mattelart, 2000: 31.

reached the elites in South America. Although modern art was encoded with an identity of the values that the State represented, it also highlighted its alliance with capitalism. In fact, capitalism and modern art went hand in hand in that commercial and cultural relations defense program of the agencies Rockefeller headed. Would the role of art been different if some other public servant had been at the helm of the emergency agencies? There is no doubt. Rockefeller not only brought his social capital but his economic and cultural networks at a moment of a global shift to advance his personal vision and interests for a future U.S. State. In fact, he called attention to both the role of the state as the engine of capitalism and the centrality of culture to the state and capitalism. In thinking of these economic and cultural networks, and using Peter Dicken model that sees “the connections of economic and power relations”<sup>676</sup> at the level of processes “connecting ‘actors’ or ‘agents’ (firms, states, individuals, social groups, etc.,) into *relational structures* at different organizational and geographical scales”<sup>677</sup> Rockefeller constituted networks of individuals such as *The Junta* (Ruml, Crane, Harrison, Robertson, Rovensky, Hutchins, Benton) to help him outline his hemispheric defense commercial and cultural vision and to sell it to the U.S. State at the moment that it was considering a similar defense plan of action. He also created the additional network of the *The OCCCRBAR Advisory Policy Committee* (Caldwell, Benton, Luce) to help him produce the vision in the office and imbue the cultural aspect of his office with the right

---

<sup>676</sup> Dicken, 2003: 3.

<sup>677</sup> Ibid: 14.

ideology to maximize results at establishing the initial hemispheric presence. Complementing it was the *OCCCRBAR and CI-AA Art Section* (Abbott, Morley, Barr, Catlin, Courter, Lyford, Durieux, Lewises, Clark, Kirstein) to implement the cultural aspect of that defense vision and to create the initial inroads into a much larger future cultural presence and future interventions by him. Supporting these networks were his *Family Firms* (Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, the Standard Oil Company, the University of Chicago, the Museum of Modern Art, the Rockefeller Foundation). These relational structures organizations were key to carry out that program of commercial and cultural penetration at a new geographical scale.

When the functions of the Art Section of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs were transferred to the Department of State's Division of Cultural Relations on July 1, 1943, the Section had executed since its inception in 1940 at least fourteen modern-art related contracts with the private sector and federal agencies funded by the very military appropriations from the National Council of Defense (active 1917-1921, 1940-1941)<sup>678</sup> and from the Emergency Fund of the President and Congressional Appropriations for the Office for Emergency Management (active 1940-1944). In considering how modern art became a tool for national defense in South America in the years 1940-1943 I have looked here at three case studies involving modern art contracts with the Museum of Modern Art and the San Francisco Museum of Art and with Caroline Durieux and Lewis Riley III.

---

<sup>678</sup> President Wilson established the Council of National Defense with Section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1916 as an emergency agency to coordinate resources and industries for national defense. It suspended its operations in 1921. In 1940, FDR reactivated the council with a similar structure and role.

These in turn have touched lightly and tangentially with other contracts involving Blake-More Godwin's Survey Trip to Chile (OEMcr-31), the Toledo Museum of Art Chilean exhibition (OEMCr-79), and René d'Harnoncourt Field Study and Report on Latin American Arts and Crafts (PNDCar-23).<sup>679</sup>

In considering the empirical case studies of *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* and the role of Catlin, Durieux and the Rileys as well as the case study of Lincoln Kirstein acquisition trip on behalf of MoMA, these two include important components of observing conditions, reception and life that came to inform a much larger defense perception of the U.S. State. Thanks so a particular set of strategies more common to the private sector, these two projects were able to gauge the circulation and consumption while depending on the state for a regulation of routes and ways. The third case study now located in the United States, with the R. H. Macy & Co. and Morley-curated exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American art offered instead a conception of a particular construction of a "Latin American art" limited to resources at hand or to those consigned for sale by governments for a

---

<sup>679</sup> As part of this count of fourteen projects, I have also included projects involving museums such as the Hemisphere Solidarity Poster Competition (OEMcr-74), Industrial Design Competition (NDCar-29), Brazil Builds (SE1447), American Federation of the Arts' Magazine of Art (SE 1439); Jo Davidson art commission for a series of sculptured portrait busts of South American presidents at the suggestion of FDR (NDCar-46 and SE 1278). These were additional contracts that given a larger study would indeed provide a richer understanding of the depth and scope of this art involvement as the U.S. State waged a war of defense in South America. In addition to modern art, the Art Section also originated contracts for the Andean Institute (NDCar-52), Creative Achievement of the United States (SE1367), Mercedes Gibson Fellowship (SE1278), Guatemala Fair (OEMcr-40), Exhibition of Pre-Columbian Art-Brooklyn Institute (OEMcr-43) and Exhibition of Colonial Art (OEMcr-69). "Contracts and Projects Authorizations." NARA, RG229, Box 1217: Folder: Contracts and Projects Authorizations.

short commercial enterprise that tested the reception of it as something novel, exotic and colorful. However, these are important as part of the early institutionalization in the field as a contribution to what Morley herself called “the new and exciting field of modern and contemporary Latin American Art.” Although Morley attempted to present a much wider view with the complimentary panels of other works to show a bit more breadth and scope, they indeed suffered from a limited budget, size and choice.

With a rather small presence of the United States in the countries in South America, the Office, as these art projects indicate, had an important role in creating the cultural circuits and flows that connected South America with the United States. Although the terms cultural circuits and flows are used widely as part of a globalization lingo of free borders, erosion of state power, the case studies here indicate that these cultural circuits on which the art, people, ideas circulated were at all times state-regulated via customs, border, taxes, tariffs, maritime and aerial routes, etc. As seen through the art activities, the Office followed a private sector business model selling American values with what can be considered as a propaganda campaign that used advertising techniques. This cultural strategy was meant to change U.S. perceptions and among the dominant elite.

In exploring how modern art became a tool of national defense in 1940-1943 in South America, I have taken the year 1933 as the historical starting point of this dissertation. In doing so, my purpose has been to grasp a much wider look on how the U.S. State, the private sector and modern art came to intersect during 1940-1943

in art activities in South America spearheaded by the Office of the Coordinator of Cultural and Commercial Relations Between the American Republics which after one year was superseded by the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. In my view the year 1933 constitutes a significant historical marker as a point of break with the past and the beginning of a reconstitution and the re-construction of a new or modern U.S. state, a new social structure and nation that came to inform the conception of a new modern art. Projecting this into a global arena, 1933 also marks the beginnings of an ideological fissure between the United States and Germany with the former having democracy as its main guiding value, and the latter one totalitarianism to rise to state power.

As planned in the spring and summer of 1940, the Office was a temporary emergency agency responding to very specific U.S. State war concerns about the German relentless march toward the domination of Europe, Africa and, what was perceived as an imminent threat, South America and the Panama Canal to control world commerce and transportation. These were particular conditions that had to do with war preparedness with the view to protect the security and the international position of the United States. In looking through this lens of security, this was a program of cultural defense despite a conflicting initial name of the agency rather than cultural relations. Therefore, my point has been to see this intervention as one of cultural security that informed the construction of the Office's Art Section and its programs.

In taking modern art as the cultural object through which to look and understand this particular moment of 1940-1943, and as it became a tool of national defense, I have taken into consideration that modern art was embedded within the larger commercial and cultural relations defense program and never by itself. And it is this particular action of defense that came to inform its production, identity, representation, regulation and consumption. And by the same token, it is the point of cultural defense that differentiates the use of modern art in the programs of the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA from the other cultural relations and intellectual cooperation currents that existed at the time with the Department of State and the Pan American Union. However, its projects accomplished very specific security goals in a battleground against German totalitarian culture.

As such, this dissertation contributes a new perspective to cultural exchanges that have been and continue to be framed within the terminology of diplomacy and international relations in the phrase “Good Neighbor Policy” widely used and rarely defined. It is an ambiguous catch-all phrase that conveniently served the very agency of the Department of State that was not reformed in the inter-war years. International relations were not the priority for FDR as the State faced a crisis of immense proportions as he stated in his March 1933 inauguration speech. In fact, this was an old Department of State at times detached, at times attached to old policies of the 1920s, such as the Good Neighbor Policy with origins in the previous administration, and with a frame of reference that in times of emergency and war did not respond. Change occurred in the Department of State with the resignation of

Sumner Wells in October 1943 and Cordell Hull in November 1944, which brought to an end an old era of diplomacy marred by internal dissent and conflict between the longest serving Secretary of State and his Under Secretary. Its total and complete reformation would come immediately after WWII as it absorbed war information agencies and expanded to accommodate the new international relations of the atomic State and now world superpower. Coincidentally, among these agencies was the Office of Inter-American Affairs, whose name had been changed from CI-AA in 1944 when Rockefeller left to serve as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. The CI-AA had already ceded art activities in mid 1943 as it refocused in other areas to address the war emergency needs in South America.

The inextricable nexus between the cultural and the commercial was all along part of the post-war outlook in Rockefeller's proposition of June 1940 (Hemisphere Economic Policy memo of June 14, 1940). This was a vision for the international hegemonic positioning of the United States in politics, trade, and security with a hemispheric presence to create a prosperity based on cooperation and dependency. These hemispheric goals of economy and defense was what the cultural program supported: the absorption of surplus agricultural and mineral commodities and control of their management and production; elimination of tariffs to aid flow trade; U.S. private investment to develop sources of raw materials for U.S. consumption; financial and trade assistance from the U.S. private sector; a comprehensive government consular personnel overhaul and increase given its limited staff; the co-administration of the program by integrating private and



government sectors and interests through an advisory committee under a coordinated scheme; and a parallel cultural, scientific and educational hemisphere program that would use government funds in a non-traditional and unprecedented way.<sup>680</sup>

Once these goals made it into the actual formulation of programs for the OCCCRBAR superseded only in name and not structure or function by the CI-AA, the Art Committee and Section became part of a much larger operation with activities in culture, communications, commercial development of basic economy, and trade and finance for hemispheric defense against totalitarian forces seeking to break an imagined unity in order to conquer South America. By 1940 the South American German, Italian, and Japanese diasporic communities established in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and fueled by waves of European migration to the Americas were well established. Their concentrated power in small business, commerce and trade in countries such as Brazil, Argentina and Chile, and to a lesser extent the others, was perceived to be a “hemisphere fifth column,” or a threat from within, in a war for world domination. On the much larger business side, the presence of banking, electricity, communications, air transportation, and import-export companies such as Allgemeine Elektrizitäts-Gesellschaft Aktiengesellschaft (AEG), Sociedad Colombo Alemana de Transporte Aéreo (SCADTA), Condor Ltd., Accumulatoren Fabrik, AGFA, Boehler Steel, German-Atlantic Bank, Deutsche-Sudamerikanische Bank, Banque

---

<sup>680</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller, “Hemisphere Economic Program,” op. cit. 1940.

Francaise et Italienne pour L'America du Sud, Bayer, Deutsche Lufthansa, Importzione Bella, Italiana Laniera, Krupp Steel, Lloyd Norte Aleman, Mercedes Benz, Siemens, Skoda, Thyssen Lametal, Ferrostaal among others which in 1941 landed on FDR's Proclaimed List, added more to that perceived threat in a vulnerable geographic area in which the United States had a limited presence. The cultural aspect of this fifth column war to win the hearts and minds of the diasporic populations involved an anti-U.S. propaganda campaign through Axis controlled schools, cultural centers, press, free news access, radio, and motion pictures that had started well before 1940. The British blockade was cutting of markets for agricultural, mineral and strategic materials trade that affected the financial and economic conditions of countries thus risking internal turmoil creating the perfect conditions for an Axis aggression.

The creation of the Office thus met specific needs of the U.S. State for expansion and hemispheric defense with goals to maintain a hemispheric unity and a hemispheric economy disrupted by war in Europe. It was part of the war preparedness effort and once the U.S. became engaged in WWII, it became a war agency. As such it was charged with defense rather than a foreign policy formulation or determination. With its hemispheric focus it consulted with the Department of State on its own art projects during 1940-1943. At the view that art and culture would fall into a long-term project and as a temporary agency it transfer its responsibility for these activities to the Department of State on July 1, 1943. Therefore, these very specific art interventions are embedded in a very particular

context of security and in a very temporary agency that served very specific goals to the U.S. State. I examine its residuals at the Department of State below.

This orientation to a hemispheric cultural and commercial defense focus indeed points towards a process of hegemonic regionalization and globalization with a commercial and cultural neo-imperialist occupation that established networks for a much larger U.S. business presence. The plan that Rockefeller initially presented with implications for U.S. economy and markets, politics and society and culture, and although it had a hemispheric consciousness and unity, it also had a neo-imperialist and U.S. centric view. He was foreseeing the geo-political organization of the world and a new post War order. In fact it was in 1944 when the terms “globalism” and “globalize” were coined within a framework of a planetary democracy and scientific humanism<sup>681</sup> that foresaw a post-WWII rebuilding project with a new system of thought in politics, economy and society in which technology (airplanes, television, radio) would bring people together and “universalize (globalize) principles for all mankind” (Reiser and Davies, 1944: 56, 211-212, 219).

In attempting this hemispheric geopolitical consciousness, the United States through a modern art, was introducing a view into the life of the capitalist State. At stake was the protection of his own interests in hemispheric markets, flows and exchanges of goods, additional services to the “other” or “sister” republics. There

---

<sup>681</sup>Reiser and Davies defined Scientific Humanism as “the doctrine that men, through the use of intelligence directing the institutions of democratic government, can create for themselves without aid from ‘supernatural powers’ a rational civilization in which each person enjoys security and finds cultural outlets for whatever normal human capacities and creative energies he possesses.” (1944: 212).

existed the Proclaimed List of German, Spanish, Italian businesses that were to replace by force or will by the few U.S. subsidiaries or by local companies backed by U.S. capital including German and Italian airlines and maritime routes. This idea of control through inter-dependence had a political realist theory tint to it when taking the U.S. State as one under a constant threat and potential of war. There is no doubt that the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA guided by private sector staff was trying to reorganize the hemisphere economically, socially and culturally to facilitate its future industrial “development” and “progress,” two of the key words for modernizing state and society by the United States.

The pioneering hybrid state-private sector interventions in modern art and in South America met the need for flexibility in an emergency and a short-term intervention. It in fact contributed a new model for the use of modern art already infused with values of democracy as art and the state evolved parallel and intersecting since 1933. Constructed through the WPA and though FDR’s State its reflected the cherished values of democracy whole serving as the carrier of taste and civilization. With modern art constructed from a New York perspective, the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA helped to re-define its art canon by providing a better understanding through its reception and consumption in South America. At the same time it provided the fresh ground on which the field of a U.S. constructed Latin American modern art would grow.

The idea of art as a cultural object in a war effort in this intervention positions it as a pioneering test run for modern art in the arsenal of democracy. In

fact, it positions it in the right place and at the right time of the December 1940 FDR Fireside and the approval of plans for *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*.

## **Residuals of Modern Art Interventions by the U.S. State and Private Sector, 1943-1967**

### **I. Modern Art, Actors and the U.S. State post-CI-AA**

After July 1, 1943 the Department of State's Cultural Relations Division, soon to be known as the Cultural Cooperation Division, became in charge of the long-term art projects in the Western Hemisphere. However, the Department soon realized that the Division could not do this alone. It awarded a grant-in-aid of \$30,000 to the National Gallery of Art to set up the Inter-American Office to act as a clearinghouse for all information on inter-American art exhibitions, programs, and activities.<sup>682</sup> Opening on January 21, 1944, with Porter McCray as chief, formerly with the CI-AA Art Section, the Inter-American Office mission was to administer, maintain and expand "a program of artistic exchange with the other American republics."<sup>683</sup> Now in Washington and with a different museum partner, the U.S. State was basically, as McCray put it, re-establishing and continuing the work that the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA had pioneered between 1940 and 1943. This, as a residual, followed a similar model in which exchanges was highly emphasized and with the similar plans that

---

<sup>682</sup> Inter-American Office, National Gallery of Art. "Traveling Exhibitions of Latin American Art. A List of Titles and Sources of Exhibitions Now Available for Circulation in the United States." Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, January 1946.

<sup>683</sup> Advisory Committee on Art, Division of Cultural Cooperation, Department of State. Minutes of Meeting of May 26 and May 27, 1944 at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. p. 10. EMH, II.13. MoMA Archives, NY.

were not implemented exhibitions showing the culture and art of the American Republics. These plans as they referred to South America were, however, subjected to war transportation restrictions. The office, with McCray at the helm was to centralize, from the point of view of the U.S. State but not the Pan American Union, all information related to Inter-American art exhibitions and activities.

This constituted the official entry of the Department of State in the field of Inter-American art and into the field of art itself.<sup>684</sup> In fact, the Department of State questioned was not altogether sure about this new role. This challenged the very arrangement that had existed in cultural relations between the private sector and the U.S. State prior to the establishment of the cultural defense offices of the OCCCRBAR and the CI-AA. It came to ask if this intervention could create rivalry in the government taking away what had traditionally been non-governmental functions. As a response, the Advisory Committee in Art made the strong suggestion to the Department of State in May 1944 to “encourage relations in all fields of art between the United States and other countries as a major means of contributing to better understanding between people.”<sup>685</sup> Moreover, it was recommending that it “should be extended to all countries with which the United States maintains relations and strongly endorses the enabling legislation to that effect.”<sup>686</sup> With this, modern art as a tool of defense was now given the power to also become a tool of

---

<sup>684</sup> Advisory Committee on Art, Division of Cultural Cooperation, Department of State. Minutes of Meeting of May 26 and May 27, 1944 at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. p. 17. EMH, II.13. MoMA Archives, NY.

<sup>685</sup> Ibid. p. 19.

<sup>686</sup> Ibid.

diplomacy in U.S. foreign relations. The grant-in aid for the National Gallery of Art office continued in 1946 with an additional grant-in aid of \$35,000 and \$21,600 for the first half year of 1947.<sup>687</sup> In this year, McCray moved to the Museum of Modern Art to take on the former job of Elodie Courter as Director of Circulation Exhibitions adding to his title in the 1950s the new International Programs.

After WWII ended it was William Benton who carried the ideas of the office to the Department of State. Participating since the first planning meetings of the OCCCRBAR's Advisory Policy Committee, William Benton became one of the key actors in the strategic vision and design of the cultural defense program heavy in advertising and marketing techniques, a background he knew well and to one Harold Lasswell contributed. In August 1945 as Rockefeller was fired from his post of Assistant Secretary of Latin American Affairs, Benton was being named Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs to consolidate the war information programs and reconverted them into a peacetime information operation or propaganda program at the Department of State. Among them were the very Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA, formerly OCCCRBAR and CI-AA), the Office of War Information (OWI) and the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency, which altogether amounted to 12,000 employees that needed to be reduced to about 3,500 in a new International Information Service that would provide a view to the life and values of American life and the aims and policies of the U.S. State and

---

<sup>687</sup> Dennis Harper, "Advancing American Art: Leroy Davidson's 'Blind Date with Destiny,'" in Scott Bishop et al. *Art Interrupted: Advancing American Art and the Politics of Cultural Diplomacy*, Atlanta: Georgia Museum of Art, 2012, p. 10.

the re-education of occupied Germany and Japan.<sup>688</sup> This was something that the exhibition *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana* had tactically done in its aims towards South America as a tool for national defense. Now Benton was about to move from projects of cultural defense to programs of cultural diplomacy.

With this experience, Benton naturally saw U.S. modern art as an important component of his new responsibilities in an information and cultural exchange program for foreign policy and international relations including a role in the establishment of the of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). In the spring of 1946 the State Department, through the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, began to acquire artworks by U.S. modern artists under the supervision of Joseph Leroy Davidson, visual arts specialist in a program named “Advancing American Art.” Its plan was to purchase artworks and organize a series of circulating exhibitions that would travel the globe via Latin America, Europe and Asia to show the modern art of the United States and to promote democracy, in a model that recreated the 1941 OCCCRBAR/CI-AA exhibition.<sup>689</sup> Benton was again addressing the same concerns about the United States that the OCCCRBAR Art Section and Policy Committee confronted in its planning in October-December 1940 in what constituted the test-run for a much

---

<sup>688</sup> Sidney Hyman, *The Lives of William Benton*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969, pp. 306-315.

<sup>689</sup> I am making this connection and assertion here. There have been two exhibitions on the Advancing American Art program, one in 1984 curated by Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia Mecklenburg: *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the Department of State 1946-1948*. Exh. Cat. Montgomery Museum of Fine Art, 1984 and more recently *Art Interrupted: Advancing American Art and the Politics of Cultural Diplomacy*. Exh. Cat. Atlanta: Georgia Museum of Art, 2012. I thank Andrés Navia for bringing this exhibition to my attention.



larger global circuit for art. Benton saw the Advancing American Art as a “testimony, to all those abroad who thought of the United States as a nation of materialists, that the same country which produces brilliant scientists and engineers also produces creative artists.”<sup>690</sup> This was a first personal account reference to the development of the atomic bomb that had been produced in the Metallurgic Laboratory at the University of Chicago in May 1945 where he served as Vice President. As such, he knew all along about the research of the Manhattan Project and in his new post he was to make meaning of the atomic power to the public and popularize the knowledge about it.

With a total of seventy-nine oil paintings and seventy-three watercolors at a purchase cost of \$49,912, the Advancing American Art five-year tour opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, just as the 1941 exhibition had done in April of that year. After closing in New York in late 1946 one section of the exhibition composed of oil and watercolor paintings went to Paris and then to Czechoslovakia on its European and Asian tour and the other section of oil paintings going to Cuba and Haiti on its way to South America. What followed was a barrage of negative commentary from conservative artists, exceeding criticisms by a press that characterized it as un-American and a waste of taxpayers’ money, a disgusted national public that condemned artists as Communists, and a House Appropriation Committee that found the modern artworks to be “a travesty upon art.”<sup>691</sup> If FDR

---

<sup>690</sup> William Benton, “Vernissage: Advancing American Art.” *Art News*, 45 (October 1946): 19.

<sup>691</sup> John Taber, Chairman of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, Feb. 4, 1947 quoted in Dennis Harper, “Advancing American Art: Leroy

had seen modern art as a carrier of civilization and values, Truman, instead, saw modern art and abstraction as "'scrambled egg' school of art"<sup>692</sup> and "merely the vaporings of half-baked lazy people."<sup>693</sup> In the month of April 1947, the tour was cancelled, the exhibitions recalled from Czechoslovakia and Haiti to Washington, Davidson fired, the position of visual arts specialist abolished, the art program liquidated, and the 152 artworks declared and auctioned off as war surplus by the War Assets Administration. Benton left the Department of State in September 1947, later joining the U.S. Senate in 1949 where he introduced a resolution to expel Joseph McCarthy in 1951. He was U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO from 1963 to 1968.

## II. Modern Art and the Private Sector

After the exhibition *The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art* at MoMA, featuring the artworks acquired by Kirstein in South America and Barr and Kauffman in Cuba and Mexico, closed on May, 9 1943, the museum organized the circulating exhibitions *Paintings from Latin America in the Museum's Collection* and *Paintings from Ten Latin American Republics*, which traveled to twelve venues in 1943-1945 and to nine venues in 1943-1944 respectively.<sup>694</sup> In 1948, however, a number of these artworks made their way back to South America in an exhibition

---

Davidson's 'Blind Date with Destiny,'" in Scott Bishop et al. *Art Interrupted: Advancing American Art and the Politics of Cultural Diplomacy*, Atlanta: Georgia Museum of Art, 2012: 21.

<sup>692</sup> Harry Truman quoted in Dennis Harper, "Advancing American Art: Leroy Davidson's 'Blind Date with Destiny,'" in Scott Bishop et al. *Art Interrupted: Advancing American Art and the Politics of Cultural Diplomacy*, Atlanta: Georgia Museum of Art, 2012: 23.

<sup>693</sup> Truman to Benton quoted in Harper, *Ibid*: 23.

<sup>694</sup> "The Museum of Modern Art: Circulating Exhibitions 1931-1954." *The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin*, v. 21. No. 3/4, p. 22.

especially organized to be shown at the Museo de Bellas Artes de Caracas and to coincide with the inauguration of Venezuelan President Rómulo Gallegos, where Rockefeller had significant investments. The exhibition *Exposición panamericana de pintura moderna*, featuring forty artists and fifty-six paintings and works on paper, opened on February 16, 1948 was organized by a new actor in the field, José Gómez Sicre, a visual arts specialist in the Office of Intellectual Cooperation at the Pan American Union in collaboration with Dorothy C. Miller curator of MoMA. The artwork that Kirstein had purchased in South America, now sanctioned by the canon of modern art, was to pay a visit under a new moniker of “Pan American” modern art. The exhibition included artworks by artists from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay and Venezuela in addition to artists from the “American Mediterranean” such as Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, and Dominican Republic. Making it a true Pan American exhibition given its organizer, United States was also included among them Darrel Austin, Stuart Davis, Robert Motherwell and Arthur Osver. What is important with this residual is that it established a new collaboration between the Pan American Union, soon to be Organization of American States (post April 1948), and the Museum of Modern Art.<sup>695</sup>

In fact, Gómez Sicre would go on to organize again with Dorothy Miller a similar exhibition in the fall of 1948 under the title *32 artistas de las Américas*, which

---

<sup>695</sup> “Exposición de obras de 32 artistas de las Américas.” Pamphlet. Santiago: Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes, 30 mayo al 14 de junio de 1949.

would revisit in the early months of 1949 the very circuit that the 1941 *exposición de la pintura Norteamericana* had blazed. Gómez Sicre sold the idea to the very same steamship companies that had transported the 1941 exhibition. For this he emphasized the MoMA-OAS partnership asking Grace Line to transport the four or five boxes and in addition requested Pan American-Grace Airways (Panagra) a complimentary trip for him as the person accompanying it in exchange for all publicity in Bogota, Quito, Lima, Santiago and other cities. This was finally the exhibition with the Latin American expert at its helm. Although Grace Line and Panagra accepted both transportation for artworks and Gómez Sicre, the U.S. State objected to the free ride on the plane and therefore, through the Civil Aeronautics Board it refused him permission.<sup>696</sup> This showing of the MoMA Latin American Collection opened, in fact, of a new set of circuits with the very people who would be the actors of the 1950s and 1960s art exchanges centered in Washington, DC and gravitating around Gómez Sicre. The exhibition ultimately positioned Gómez Sicre as the expert of Latin American Art in the United States in the eyes of South Americans while cementing a collaboration with MoMA that had started in March 1944 when the museum presented his exhibition *Modern Cuban Painters*.

Although the Inter-American Fund figures prominently in Lincoln Kirstein's catalog of the 1943 exhibition "The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art"<sup>697</sup> as the source of anonymous private funding that made possible the

---

<sup>696</sup> Telegram from Philip Wallach to José Gómez Sicre, December 30, 1948. José Gómez Sicre Papers, Box 17, folder 17.3, Art Museum of the Americas Archive,

<sup>697</sup> Alfred H. Barr, "Foreword," 1943, p. 3-4.

purchase of artworks in South America, Mexico and Cuba for the MoMA permanent collection, there is not much mention of this fund afterwards except to reveal that the funder was none other than Nelson Rockefeller. However, in finding the residuals of the Latin American Purchase Fund itself beyond this initial intervention of a gift of 3,200 shares of capital stock of Socony-Vacuum Oil of December 29, 1941,<sup>698</sup> one finds a periodical replenishment of the fund with additional Socony-Vacuum Oil shares of capital stock and monetary gifts up until the year 1967. As such, Nelson Rockefeller through the Inter-American Purchase Fund continued supporting an art market and museum collecting of South American art for close to twenty-five years. The first of the replenishments took place on April 22, 1942 in the amount of \$3,000 to cover expenses related to Kirstein's trip,<sup>699</sup> with subsequent gifts of 1,000 shares of Socony-Vacuum Oil on December 30, 1943,<sup>700</sup> stocks valued at \$5,374.93 on December 9, 1953,<sup>701</sup> \$5,000 in cash on May 24, 1960,<sup>702</sup> \$5,000 in

---

<sup>698</sup> John E. Abbott to Philip G. Keebler. December 29, 1941. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>699</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to R. H. Wilkins, April 22, 1942. Rockefeller Archive Center, NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>700</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller to Stephen C. Clark, December 30, 1943. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>701</sup> Memorandum, Nelson A. Rockefeller to Philip F. Keebler, December 9, 1953. NAR Personal Projects, Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center. Mention of cash value in Letter from Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson Rockefeller, May 13, 1960. Rockefeller Archive Center, NAR Personal Projects, Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400.

<sup>702</sup> Louise A. Boyer to Alfred H. Barr, Jr. May 24, 1960. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

cash in January 14, 1964,<sup>703</sup> \$5,000 in cash in 1965,<sup>704</sup> and \$10,000 on September 27, 1966.<sup>705</sup>

These gifts to the Latin American Purchase Fund continued to support an expansion of the collection of the museum as it referred to art of Central and South America. In correspondence between Barr and Rockefeller, the changing perception of art coincides with the rise of interest in the region again. In November 1953, Barr mentions that they are considering the purchase of an Armando Reverón found in Venezuela through the help of José Gómez Sicre. In 1960, Barr mentions the interest in Latin America as “reviving” and having purchased since 1953 about forty-five paintings, sculptures and drawings and prints by Ramírez, Bermúdez, Krajcberg, González-Goyri, Cuevas and others.<sup>706</sup> In July 1963 Barr mentions of new purchases between 1960 and 1963 of a total of forty-two artworks by artists from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela.<sup>707</sup> In 1965, Barr again makes reference to a shift in popularity of new artists from Argentina in a field that was previously dominated by Brazilians and purchasing art by Julio Le Park and Eilson and by young artists residing in the United States such as

---

<sup>703</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson A. Rockefeller. April 8, 1965. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>704</sup> Memorandum. Louise To: The Governor, Subject: Inter-American Fund for the Museum of Modern Art. September 20, 1966. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>705</sup> Letter from Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson Rockefeller, September 27, 1966. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>706</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson Rockefeller, May 13, 1960. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>707</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson Rockefeller, July 24, 1963. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Lasansky, Bonevardi, Abularach and Rayo.<sup>708</sup> In 1967, Barr reported purchases of a Posada scrapbook, and works by Julio Le Parc, Carlos Cruz-Diez, Antonio Seguí and Agustín Fernández.

In parallel developments, Rockefeller also established the Latin American Folk Art Fund with a gifts of 1,000 Socony-Vacuum stock valued at \$10,800 on January 23, 1943<sup>709</sup> with an additional 1,000 stock of Socony-Vacuum on December 30, 1943<sup>710</sup> valued at \$10,808.28<sup>711</sup> for additional purchases of folk and indigenous art. Writing in 1967, d'Harnoncourt, since 1949 MoMA's Museum Director, inquired about the disposition of the balance of this fund after purchases that he and Kirstein did for Rockefeller. A balance of \$7,179.35 in the folk art fund was transferred to Latin American Art Fund, thus increasing its balance to \$11,871.07 at a time when Barr, Elaine Johnson and Waldo Rasmussen were of the opinion that young artists in South America were doing very interesting work.<sup>712</sup>

It was the Museum of Modern Art which almost ten years after the ending of the CI-AA considered a new program for circulating exhibitions abroad. With a proposal by Wallace Harrison and Porter McCray and with the blessing of Nelson

---

<sup>708</sup> Alfred H. Barr, Jr. to Nelson A. Rockefeller. April 8, 1965. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1400, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>709</sup> Clark Letter, Feb 4, 1943, NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>710</sup> NAR to Clark, December 30, 1943 Rockefeller Archive Center, NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401. Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>711</sup> D'Harnoncourt to NAR, August 23, 1967. NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>712</sup> OK Good Idea, NAR. Hand noted on margin. Rockefeller Archive Center, NAR Personal Projects, Record Group 4, Series MoMA, Sub-series: Inter-American Fund, Box 142, Folder 1401.

Rockefeller as President and René d'Harnoncourt as Vice President of Foreign Activities, the museum requested a five-year \$125,000 grant to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund to expand the existing Department of Circulating Exhibitions to include an international component that would facilitate the presentation exhibitions of the most recent developments in contemporary art in the U.S. and abroad. Its mission was none other than the promotion of "international understanding and mutual respect." In repurposing the model of the old CI-AA Art Section, the expanded program would utilize the very same infrastructure from the 1940-1943 of the Department of Circulating Exhibitions under McCray. What this program was recreating the hybrid model that existed for that short period of 1940-1943 but with the inversion that MoMA was initiating it and was seeking the support of foreign government in a different war with the same old techniques. Not surprisingly, the sleepy network of actors and model was being re-activated as Rockefeller was again involved with the U.S. State as a Special Assistant to President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the formulation of Cold War Strategy.

The International Program was launched in July 1952 with the exhibition *12 Modern American Painters and Sculptor* at the Musée d'Art Moderne. John Hay Whitney, now Chairman of the Board of Trustees, stated: "we at the museum believe that modern American art has a special contribution to make in the exchange of creative ideas, and that the presentation of our best achievement can enhance the



vigor of cultural life throughout the world.”<sup>713</sup> No longer was the museum controlling the narrative of modern art at a hemispheric level, It was now controlling it at the global level on the very foundations of its history as a U.S. State defense agent and contractor between 1940-1943.

---

<sup>713</sup> MoMA Press Release No. 33. April 24, 1953.

**APPENDIX A**

<b>North American Contemporary Painting Exhibition Itinerary in South America &amp; Cuba</b>		
<b>WEST COAST CIRCUIT</b>	<b>EAST COAST CIRCUIT</b>	<b>NORTH COAST CIRCUIT</b>
Santiago, Chile Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes September 6- October 5, 1941 Port of Entry: Valparaiso	Buenos Aires, Argentina Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes July 3-August 1, 1941 Port of Entry: Buenos Aires	Bogotá, Colombia Biblioteca Nacional July 16-August 20, 1941 Port of Entry: Buenaventura Land transportation to Venezuela
Lima, Peru Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes November 5-30, 1941 Port of Entry: El Callao	Montevideo, Uruguay Galería del Teatro Solís August 18-September 18, 1941 Port of Entry: Montevideo	Caracas, Venezuela Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes September 28-October 20, 1941 Port of Exit: La Guaira
Quito, Ecuador Universidad Central del Ecuador November 15- December 7, 1941 Port of Entry: Guayaquil	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil Museu de Belas Artes October 15-November 15, 1941 Port of Entry: Rio de Janeiro	*Havana, Cuba  November 18-December 15, 1941 Port of Entry: Havana
Source: Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, Folder: Arts; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.		

## APPENDIX B

<b>LIST OF ARTWORK IN 1941 EXHIBITION</b>		
ARTIST	TITLE	LENDER
Atherton, John C.	The Backyard*	Julien Levy
	Object Construction**	Julien Levy
Austin, Darrell	Catamount*	Modern Art
	The Stream*	Pearls Gallery
Beal, Gifford	The Spotlight*	Art Institute of Chicago
	Fisherman*	Whitney Museum
	The Circus at the Hippodrome*	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
Bellows, George W.	Demsey and Firpo*	Whitney Museum
	The Sand Cart*	Brooklyn
Bennett, Rainey	Caripito Village**	Metropolitan
	Caracas Country Club, First Tee**	N/A
Benton, Thomas Hart	Homestead*	Modern Art
	Roasting Ears*	Metropolitan Museum
	Louisiana Rice Fields*	Brooklyn Museum of Art
Billings, Henry	Lehigh Valley*	Whitney Museum
Bishop, Isabel	Nude*	Whitney Museum
	Two Girls*	Metropolitan Museum
Blanch, Arnold	Swamp Folk*	Brooklyn Museum
Blume, Peter	Landscapes and Poppies*	Metropolitan Museum
	The Light of the World*	Whitney Museum
	Study for Parade**	Modern Art
Bohrad, Aaron	Landscape Near Chicago*	Whitney Museum
	Farm Ruins**	Brooklyn
	Chicago Street in Winter**	Whitney
	Frame Houses**	Metropolitan Museum
Bouche, Louis	Jane and Tuffy*	Metropolitan Museum
	Stamford Harbor*	Whitney Museum
Breinin, Raymond	One Morning**	Modern Art
	Filling Station at Night**	Brooklyn Museum
	Interior with Ancestor**	Downtown Gallery
Brook, Alexander	The Sentinels*	Whitney Museum

	Morning Light*	Whitney Museum
	The Traffic Muse*	Newark Museum
Burchfield, Charles E.	Winter Twilight*	Whitney Museum
	Old House by Creek*	Whitney Museum
	November Evening*	Metropolitan Museum
	Ice Glare**	Whitney Museum
	The False Front**	Metropolitan
	Six O'clock**	Syracuse Museum
	February Thaw**	Brooklyn Museum
Cadmus, Paul	Venus and Adonis*	Midtown Gallery
	Gilding the Acrobats*	Midtown Gallery
Campbell, Charles	Texas Boudoir**	Whitney Museum
Carroll, John	Draped Figure*	Rehn Gallery
Carter, Clarence Holbrook	Immortal Water*	Whitney Museum
	The Guardian Angel**	Whitney Museum
Castellon, Federico	Two Sisters**	Weyhe Gallery
	Two Women**	Weyhe Gallery
Cikovsky, Nicolai	Candlewood Lake**	A. A. A.
	Pine Trees**	A. A. A.
Coleman, Glenn O.	Downtown Street*	Whitney Museum
	The Mirror*	Whitney Museum
Cook, Howard Norton	Canyon in Winter**	Weyhe Gallery
	Windswept Pine**	Weyhe Gallery
	Aspen Forest**	Weyhe Gallery
Corbino, Jon	Harvest Festival*	Grand Central
	The Circus Tent*	Canajoharie
Corcos, Lucille	Afternoon in the Zoo**	Whitney Museum
Criss, Francis	Astor Place*	Whitney Museum
	"El" 1939 Version*	Assoc. American Artist
Curry, John Stewart	Spring Shower*	Metropolitan Museum
	The Flying Codonas*	Whitney Museum
	View of Madison*	Assoc. American Artists
Davis, Stuart	Summer Landscape*	Modern Art
	House and Street*	Whitney Museum
De Martelly, John Stockton	No More Mowing*	Assoc. American Artists
Dehn, Adolf Arthur	Sea and Rocks**	Brooklyn Museum
	White Leghorns on the Hudson**	Metropolitan Museum
	Lake Mead**	A. A. A.
	Approach to Boulder Dam	A. A. A.
Demuth, Charles	My Egypt*	Whitney Museum
	From the Garden of the Chateau*	Whitney Museum

	Stairs, Provincetown**	Modern Art
	August Lilies**	Whitney Museum
	The Acrobats**	Modern Art
Dickinson, Preston	Still Life—Bread and Fruit*	Whitney Museum
	Industry*	Whitney Museum
Dike, Philip Latimer	Old Domingo Mine**	Metropolitan Museum
Du Bois, Guy Pène	The Battery*	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
	Meditation*	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
Edie, Stuart Carson	The Mask**	Brooklyn Museum
Eilshemius, Louis Michel	Sunburst*	Valentine Gallery
	Woodland Brook*	Valentine Gallery
Evergood, Philip Howard	Through the Mill*	Whitney Gallery
Fausett, William Dean	Vermont in Late Autumn**	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
	Landscape**	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
Feininger, Lyonel	Manhattan I*	Buchholz Gallery
	The Beach**	Brooklyn Museum
	The Island**	Buchholz Gallery
	The Cutter “Fremad II”	Buchholz Gallery
Fiene, Ernest	Skyline Under Brooklyn Bridge*	Assoc. American Artists
	Dyckman Street Church*	Whitney Museum
	Low Clouds, Adirondacks**	Brooklyn Museum
	Lake George, Evening**	A. A. A.
	Lake George**	A. A. A.
Free, Karl R.	Finale**	Whitney Museum
	Entry of the White Horse**	Whitney Museum
French, Jared	Summer’s Ending*	Whitney Museum
	Three Women and a Life Guard*	Mrs. Ogden Phipps
Gasparo, Oronzo	The Coal Silo**	Boyer
	Italiopa**	Modern Art
Glackens, William J.	Girl in Black and White*	Whitney Museum
	The Green Car*	Metropolitan Museum
	The Drive, Central Park*	Cleveland Museum
Gorky, Arshile	Argoola*	Modern Art
	Painting*	Whitney Museum
Greene, Balcolm	The Ancient Form*	Modern Art
	The Blue World*	The Artist
Gropper, William	Homeless*	Metropolitan Museum
	The Hunt*	Metropolitan Museum
	Old Tree and Old People*	Whitney Museum
Grosz, George	New York Harbor**	Metropolitan Museum
	Trees and Underbrush Cape Cod**	Metropolitan Museum

	Dune Country, Cape Cod**	Metropolitan Museum
	Punishment**	Modern Art
Guglielmi, O. Louis	The Tenements*	Downtown Gallery
Hart, George Overbury	The Bahamas**	Whitney Museum
	The Merry-Go-Round, Oaxaca, Mexico**	Modern Art
	Horse Sale—Trying the Horses**	Modern Art
	Fruit Packers, Tehuantepec, Mexico**	Modern Art
Hartley, Marsden	Ghosts of the Forest*	Brooklyn Museum
	The Old Bars, Dogtown*	Whitney Museum
	The Spent Wave*	Modern Art
Hartman, Bertram	Telephone Building**	Whitney Museum
Henri, Robert	Storm Tide*	Whitney Museum
	Moira*	Canajoharie Gallery
Hiler, Hilaire	Pouter Pigeons**	Modern Art
Hogue, Alexandre	Drought-Stricken Area*	The Artist
	Erosion No. 3—The Crucified Land*	The Artist
Hopper, Edward	Early Sunday Morning*	Whitney Museum
	Night Windows*	Modern Art
	Box Factory, Gloucester**	Modern Art
	House on Pamet River**	Whitney Museum
	Lombard's House**	Whitney Museum
	The Mansard Roof**	Brooklyn Museum
Horter, Harle	Gloucester Docks**	Whitney Museum
Hurd, Peter	Anselmo's House*	Macbeth Gallery
	Boy from the Plains*	Roy Neuberger
	Ranch near Encino*	Macbeth Gallery
Jones, Joe	Threshing*	Metropolitan Museum
	Wheat*	A.C.A Gallery
Kane, John	Crossing the Junction*	Valentine Gallery
	Prosperity's Increase*	Wm. S. Paley
Kantor, Morris	On the Beach*	Metropolitan Museum
	Skyrocket*	Whitney Museum
Karfiol, Barnard	Hilda*	Whitney Museum
	Seated Nude*	Modern Art
	Christina*	Carnegie
Keller, Henry George	A Drowsy Company**	C. W. Kraushaar Gallery
	Bird Rock, California**	Whitney Museum
Kent, Rockwell	Winter*	Metropolitan Museum
	Shadows of Evening*	Whitney Museum
	Toilers of the Sea*	Sam Lewishon

Kingman, Dong	A Morning Picture**	N/A
	From My Roof	Modern Art
Kroll, Leon	Nude, Babette*	Whitney Museum
	Cape Ann*	Metropolitan Museum
	Road Through the Willows*	Whitney Museum
Kuhn, Walt	The Blue Clown*	Whitney Museum
	Adirondack Guide*	Mr. & Mrs. W. A. Harriman
Kuniyoshi, Yasuo	I'm Tired*	Whitney Museum
	Self Portrait as a Golf Player*	Modern Art
	I Think So*	Albright Art Gallery
Lawson, Ernest	High Bridge*	Whitney Museum
	Central Park, Winter*	Oliver James
	Winter*	Brooklyn Museum
Lee, Doris Emrick	Catastrophe*	Metropolitan Museum
Levi, Julian E.	Shrimp Scow on Barnaget Bay*	Metropolitan Museum
Levine, Jack	The Syndicate*	Downtown Gallery
	The Millionaire*	David L. Podell
Lewandowski, Edmund D.	Industrial Composition**	Brooklyn Museum
	Ventilators**	Downtown Gallery
Luks, George Benjamin	Eleanor*	N/A
	Hester Street*	Brooklyn Museum
MacIver, Loren	Ashe Street Blooms*	The Artist
	Garden Labyrinth*	The Artist
Mangravite, Peppino	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A
Margules, De Hirsh	Present and Past, Gloucester**	N/A
	Crow Village, No. 5**	The Artist
	Blue Boats**	The Artist
Marin, John	Pertaining to Deer Island— The Harbor, No. 1**	Metropolitan Museum
	Sunset**	Whitney Museum
	Franconia Range—Mountain Peaks**	Metropolitan Museum
	Camden Mountain Across the Bay**	Modern Art
Marsh, Reginald	Why Not Use the "L"?*	Whitney Museum
	Gaiety Burlesque*	Mrs. Hendrick Eustis
	The Bowl*	Rehn Gallery
	High Yaller*	Mr. & Mrs. John S. Sheppard
	Grand-Tier Box**	Metropolitan Museum
	Memories of the Stork Club**	Rehn Gallery

Martin, Fletcher	The Embrace*	Midtown Galleries
	Tomorrow and Tomorrow*	Midtown Galleries
Mattson, Henry Elis	Wings of the Morning*	Metropolitan Museum
	Spring*	Whitney
	Open Sea*	Thomas J. Watson
McFee, Henry Lee	Crow with Peaches*	Whitney Museum
	Still Life with Striped Curtain*	Metropolitan Museum
Mechau, Frank	Dangers of the Mail*	Modern Art
	Pony Express*	Modern Art
Miller, Barse	The Newborn**	Brooklyn Museum
	Mill at Island Pond, Vermont**	Ferargil Gallery
Miller, Kenneth Hay	The Fitting Room*	Metropolitan Museum
	Business of the Day*	Rehn Gallery
O'Keeffe, Georgia	The White Flower*	Whitney Museum
Palmer, William C.	Fossil Hunters**	Midtown Gallery
	Fisherman's Cove**	Midtown Gallery
Peirce, Waldo	Haircut by the Sea*	Metropolitan Museum
	Breakfast in the Barn*	Midtown Gallery
Pike, John	Favorite Spot, North Carolina**	Ferargil Gallery
	Tree Perch, North Carolina**	Ferargil Gallery
Pleissner, Ogden M.	Haystacks Near the Railroad Ranch*	Macbeth Gallery
	Nebraska Farm**	Grand Central
Poor, Henry Varnum	The Disappointed Fisherman*	Metropolitan Museum
	The Pink Table Cloth*	Cleveland Museum
	Boy with Bow*	Newark Museum
Prendergast, Maurice B.	Promenade, Gloucester*	Whitney Museum
	The Cove*	Whitney Museum
	The East River**	Modern Art
	Central Park, 1901**	Whitney Museum
	The Bridal Path, Central Park**	Whitney Museum
Sample, Paul Starrett	The Road to Berlin Corners**	Brooklyn Museum
	Whitcomb's Mill**	Ferargil Gallery
Schnakenberg, Henry Ernest	Morning Doves*	Metropolitan Museum
	Conversation*	Whitney Museum
	A Pastoral Landscape*	Kraushaar Gallery
Schreiber, Georges	Second Balcony**	Whitney Museum
	New Orleans Night**	Metropolitan Museum



	5 A.M., Elko, Nevada**	Metropolitan Museum
Sepeshy, Zoltan L.	In the Day's Work*	Midtown Gallery
	Afternoon Skiing*	Nebraska Art Assoc.
	Wheat**	Midtown Gallery
	Lake Crystal**	Midtown Gallery
Shan, Ben	Handball*	Modern Art
Sheeler, Charles	River Rouge Plant*	Whitney Museum
	Bucks County Barns*	Modern Art
	Bucks County Barn**	Whitney Museum
Sheets, Millard	Hog Lot**	Brooklyn Museum
	Black Horse**	Whitney Museum
Siporin, Mitchell	Eviction**	Downtown Gallery
Sloan, John	Backyards, Greenwich Village*	Whitney Museum
	Pigeons*	Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Smith, Jacob Getlar	The Widow's Garden**	Midtown Gallery
Soyer, Raphael	Office Girls*	Whitney Museum
	Window Shoppers*	A. A. A.
	Fourteenth Street Midinette*	A. A. A.
Speicher, Eugene E.	Marianna*	Whitney Museum
	The Mountaineer*	Stephen C. Clark
Spencer, Niles	Near Avenue A*	Modern Art
	The Green Table*	Whitney Museum
Sterne, Maurice	Inez*	Samuel A. Lewisohn
	Girl in Blue Chair*	Modern Art
Walkowitz, Abraham	Isadora Duncan I**	Modern Art
	Isadora Duncan II**	Modern Art
Watkins, Franklin C.	Soliloquy*	Whitney Museum
	Summer Fragrance*	Corcoran Gallery
Weber, Max	Music*	Brooklyn Museum
	Chinese Restaurant*	Whitney Museum
	Straggly Pines*	Metropolitan Museum
Whorf, John	Rainy Night**	Milch Galleries
	The Cabin, Tennessee**	Brooklyn Museum of Art
	The Thaw**	Milch Galleries
	Rainy Day**	Whitney Museum
Wyeth, Andrew	The Sea Captain's House**	Macbeth Gallery
	From Mt. Kearsarge**	Macbeth Gallery
Zorach, William	Maine Landscape**	Whitney Museum
	Robinhood Cove, Maine**	The Artist
	Malden Island, Maine**	The Artist
	The Bridge at Arrowsic**	The Artist
*oil painting, **watercolor		

**Source:** "Paintings to Be Divided into Three Exhibitions for Circulation in South America," Early Museum History: Administrative Records, V1b. The Museum of Modern Art Archives,

**COMPARATIVE TABLE OF ARTISTS IN EXHIBITIONS**

<b>EAST COAST A: ARG, URU, BRZ</b>	<b>EAST COAST B: ARG, URU, BRZ</b>	<b>WEST COAST: ECU</b>
Atherton, John, Object Construction**	Atherton, John, Backyards*	Beal, Gifford, Hippodrome
Bennett, R., Caracas Country Club, First Tee**	Austin, Darrell, The Stream*	Blanch, Arnold, Gente en los Pantanos
Benton, Thomas Hart, Louisiana Rice Field*	Beal, Gifford, The Spotlight*	Breinin, Raymond, Morning
Blume, Peter, Landscape and Poppies*	Bellows, George, Dempsey and Firpo*	Burchfield, Charles, False Facade
Bohrod, Aaron, Chicago Street in Winter**	Bishop, Isabel, Two Girls*	Campbell, Charles, Texas Boudoir
Bouche, L., Jane and Tuffy*	Blume, Peter, Study for Parade**	Cikovsly, Nicolai, Candlewood Lake
Breinin, Raymond, Filling Station, Night**	Bohrod, Aaron, Frame Houses**	Corcos, Lucille, Afternoon at the Zoo
Burchfield, Charles, Six O'clock**	Breinin, Raymond, This Was My Sister**	Davis, Stuart, Summer Landscape
Caroll, J, Drapped Figure*	Brook, Alexander, Sentinels*	Dehn, Adolf, Boulder Dam Fence
Castellon, Federico, Two Women**	Burchfield, Charles, November Evening*	Demuth, Charles, Provincetown Stairs
Cook, Howard, Windswept Pine**	Burchfield, Charles, February Thaw**	Dike, Philip, The Old Mine
Corbino, J, Harvest Festival*	Cadmus, Paul, Venus and Adonis*	Fausett, Dean, Landscape
Davis, Stuart, House and Street*	Carter, Clarence, Immortal Water*	Feininger, Lyonel, Manhattan
Dehn, Adolf, White Leghorns on the Hudson**	Cikovsky, Nicolai, Pine Trees**	Fiene, Ernest, Clouds, Adirondacks
Demuth, Charles, August Lilies**	Coleman, Geo., Downtown Street*	Gasparo, Oronzo, Italiopa
Dove, Arthur, Electric Peach Orchard*	Cook, Howard, Aspen Forest**	Gugglielmi, O. Louis, Neighborhood Houses
Edie, S., The Mask**	Criss, Francis, Astor Place*	Hart, George "Pop," Carrousel, Oaxaca, Mexico
Feininger, Lyonel, The Island**	Curry, John Stewart, View of Madison*	Hopper, Edward, Pamet River House
Fiene, E. Dyckman St. Church*	Dehn, Adolf, Lake Mead**	Kantor, Morris, The Rocket

Fiene E. Lake George, Evening**	Demuth, Charles, My Egypt*	Kuniyoshi, Yasuo, Asi lo creo
French, J., Summer's Ending*	Demuth, Charles, Acrobat**	Lee, Doris, Catastrophe
Glackens, Wm., Drive, Central Park*	Du Bois, Guy Pène, Meditation*	Lewandowski, Edmund, Industrial Composition
Greene, B., Ancient Form*	Eilshemius, Louis, Woodland Brook*	Luks, George, Hester Street
Gropper, William, Homeless*	Feininger, Lyonel, The Beach**	Margulis, De Hirsh, Crow Village
Grosz, George, Dune Country, Cape Cod**	Fiene, Ernest, Lake George**	Marin, John, Sunset
Hart, George "Pop," Horse Sale: Trying the Horses**	Free, Karl, Finale**	Miller, Barse, The Newborn
Hartman, B., Telephone Building**	Gasparo, Oronzo, Coal Silo**	Miller, Kenneth H., El salon de prueba
Henri, Robert, Storm Tide*	Gorky, Arshile, Argula*	Palmer, William C., Fossil Hunters
Hogue, A., Drought Striken Area*	Grosz, George, Punishment*	Pleissner, Ogden, Nebraska Farm
Hopper, Edward, Night Window*	Hart, George "Pop," Fruit Packers, Tehuantepec**	Sample, Paul, Berlin Corners Road
Hopper, Edw., Lombard's House**	Hartley, Marsden, The Spent Wave*	Schreiber, George, Night in New Orleans
Hurd, P., Boy from the Plains*	Hopper, Edward, The Mansard Roof**	Sepeshy, Zoltan, Crystal Lake
Kane, J., Prosperity's Increase*	Horter, Earle, Gloucester Docks**	Siporin, Mitchell, Desahucio
Keller, H.G., Bird Rock, California**	Jones, Joe, Threshing*	Sterne, Maurice, Girl Sitting
Kent, R., Toilers of the Sea*	Kantor, Morris, On the Beach*	Walkovitz, Abraham, Isadora Duncan
Laning, Edw., Under the Bridge*	Karfiol, Bernard, Christina*	Weber, Max, Pines
Lawson, E., High Bridge*	Kingman, Dong, A Morning Picture**	Whorf, John, Rain at Night
Lewandowski, E., Ventilators and Water Tanks**	Kroll, Leon, Road Through the Willows*	Wyeth, Andrew, Mount Kearsage
Luks, George, Mrs. Gamley*	Kuhn, Walt, The Blue Clown*	Zorach, William, Malden Island, Maine
Marin, John, Franconia Mountain Peaks**	Kuniyoshi, Yasuo, Self Portrait as Golf Player*	PERU
Marsh, Reginald, Why Not Use the El?*	Levi, Julian, Shrimp Scow on Barnegat Bay*	Mangravite, Peppino. Girls combing her hair
Martin, F., Tomorrow and Tomorrow*	Levine, Jack, The Syndicate*	Breinin, Raymond, Morning
McFee, H., Still Life with	MacIver, Loren, Garden	Sheets, Millard O. Black

Striped Curtain*	Labyrinth*	Horse
Mechau, F., Pony Express*	Mangravite, Peppino, Family Portrait*	Sheeler, Charles, Bucks County grain storage
Miller, B., Mills at Island Pond**	Margules, DeHirsh, Blue Boats**	
Pike, John, Favorite Spot, No. Carolina**	Marin, John, Camden Mountain Across the Bay**	
Poor, H.V., Boy with Bow*	Marsh, Reginald, Memories of he Stork Club**	
Prendergast, Maurice, The East River**	Mattson, Henry, Wings of the Morning*	
Sample, P., Whitcomb's Mill**	Miller, Kenneth Hays, Business of the Day*	
Schnakenberg, H., Mourning Doves*	Peirce, Waldo, Breakfast in the Barn*	
Sepeshy, Zoltan, Afternoon Skiing*	Pike, John, Tree Perch**	
Sloan, John, Pigeons*	Prendergast, Maurice, Promenade, Gloucester*	
Smith, J.G., Widow's Garden**	Prendergast, Maurice, Central Park 1901**	
Soyer, R., 14 <sup>th</sup> St. Midinette*	Rosenthal, Doris, La Grafonola*	
Speicher, E., Mariana*	Schmidt, Katherine, Laurel and the Pink Flower*	
Spencer, N., Near Ave. A*	Schreiber, George, Second Balcony**	
Watkins, F, Fire Eater*	Sepeshy, Zoltan, Wheat**	
Weber, M., Chinese Restaurant*	Sheeler, Charles, Bucks County Barn*	
Whorf, J., Thaw**	Sheets, Millard, Hog Lot**	
Wyeth, Andrew, Sea Captain's House	Walkowitz, Abraham, Isadora Duncan #1**	
Zorach, Wm., Maine Landscape**	Whorf, John, Rainy Day**	
	Zorach, Wm., Robinhood Cove, Maine**	
* Oil on canvas, **watercolor		
<b>Source:</b> NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1213, Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects, Exhibits. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.		

## APPENDIX C

<b>List of Books Exhibited at <i>La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana</i></b>
Audubon, John James. <i>The Birds of America</i> . New York: McMillan, 1937.
Barnes, Albert C. <i>The Art of Painting</i> . New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.
Barr, Alfred H. Jr. <i>Picasso: Forty Years of His Art</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1939.
Berenson, Bernard. <i>The Drawings of Florentine Painters</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
Boswell, Peyton, Jr. <i>Modern American Painting</i> . New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1939.
Brownell, Baker and Frank Lloyd Wright. <i>Architecture and Modern Life</i> . New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.
Burroughs, Alan. <i>Art Criticism from a Laboratory</i> . New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1938.
Cahill, Holger and Alfred H. Barr, Jr. <i>Art in America</i> . New York: Halcyon Press, 1935.
Castro Leal, Antonio et al. <i>Twenty Centuries of Mexican Art</i> . New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1940
Cheney, Sheldon. <i>A World History of Art</i> . New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939.
Craven, Thomas. Ed. <i>A Treasury of American Prints</i> . New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939.
Craven, Thomas. Ed. <i>A Treasury of Masterpieces from the Renaissance to the Present Day</i> . New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939.
Darby, Delphine Fitz. <i>Francisco Ribalta and His School</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938.
Davidson, Morris. <i>Painting for Pleasure</i> . Boston: Hale, Cushman and Flint, 1938.
Douglas, Frederic II, and René d'Harnoncourt. <i>Indian Art of the United States</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1941.
Evans, Walker. <i>American Photographs</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1938.
Flexner, James Thomas. <i>America's Old Masters</i> . New York: Viking Press, 1939.
Gardner, Helen. <i>Art Through the Ages</i> . New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936.
Goldstein, Harriet and Vetta. <i>Art in Everyday Life</i> . New York: Macmillan Company, 1941.
Goldwater, Robert J. <i>Primitivism in Modern Painting</i> . New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.
Greene, Theodore Meyer. <i>The Arts and the Art of Criticism</i> . Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
Hamlin, Talbot Faulkner. <i>Architecture Through the Ages</i> . New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1940.
Hefter, Leon and Joseph. <i>Graphic Design</i> . New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936.
Hoffman, Malvina. <i>Sculpture Inside Out</i> . New York: W.W. Horton and Company, 1939.

Jacobs, Lewis. <i>The Rise of the American Film, A Critical History</i> . New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939.
Kennedy, Ruth Wedgewood. <i>Alesso Baldovinetti</i> . New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
McAndrew, John. <i>Guide to Modern Architecture in the Northeast States</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1940.
MacCurdy, Edward. <i>The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci</i> . New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939.
Mayer, Ralph. <i>The Artist's Handbook of Materials and Technique</i> . New York: Viking Press, 1941.
Miller, Dorothy. <i>New Horizons in American Art</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1936.
Newhall, Beaumont. <i>Photography: A Short Critical History</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1938.
Poore, Charles. <i>Goya</i> . New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938.
Pope, Arthur. <i>An Introduction to the Language of Drawing and Painting</i> . Vol. 1: The Painter's Terms. Vol. 2. The Painter's Modes of Expression. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
Richards, Charles R. <i>Art in Industry</i> . New York: MacMillan Company, 1929.
Rourke, Constance. <i>Charles Sheeler, Artist in the American Tradition</i> . New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1938.
Stites, Raymond S. <i>The Arts and Man</i> . New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941.
Tietze, Hans. <i>Masterpieces of European Painting in America</i> . New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.
Updike, Daniel Berkeley. <i>Printing Types</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.
Venturi, Lionello. <i>History of Art Criticism</i> . New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, 1936.
Wehle, Harry B. <i>Fifty Drawings by Francisco Goya</i> . New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1941.
Wethey, Harold E. <i>Gil de Siloe and His School</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.
Wheeler, Monroe. <i>Modern Painters and Sculptors as Illustrators</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1936.
Wingert, Paul. <i>The Sculpture of William Zorach</i> . New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1938.
Zigrosser, Carl. <i>Six Centuries of Fine Prints</i> . New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1937.
The Museum of Modern Art. <i>Art in Our Time</i> . New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1939.
Hispanic Society. <i>Handbook: Museum and Library Collections</i> . New York: Trustees of the Hispanic Society, 1938.
<i>The New Standard Encyclopedia of Art</i> . New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1939.
<b>Source:</b> Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 1213, Records Concerning Exhibits and Related Projects, Exhibits. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

## APPENDIX D

<b>R. H. MACY &amp; CO LATIN AMERICA FAIR ART GALLERY-SOUTH AMERICAN ARTISTS</b>			
<b>ARGENTINA ARTISTS</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Ballester Peña, Juan A	Amén	oil	\$1499
	Soneto de la lectura romántica	oil	\$1799
Basaldúa, Héctor	Naturaleza muerta	oil	\$1119
Bellocq, Adolfo	El incendio	oil	\$699
Beristayn, Jorge	El retrato del Doctor Arce	oil	\$799
	Nocturno	oil	\$499
Bernardo, Mane	Tarde gris	watercolor	\$149
	Azoteas de Buenos Aires	watercolor	\$179
Berni, Antonio	Jujuy	oil	\$4,999
Borraro, Luís	Arroyo Sarandi	oil	\$999
	Riachuelo	oil	\$899
Butler, Father Guillermo	Paisaje de las Sierras de Córdoba	oil	\$999
Carnacini, Ceferino	Camino del bajo	oil	\$2,999
	Fiesta en los ranchos	oil	\$2,999
Castagna, Rodolfo	Paisaje de Córdoba	oil	\$799
	Nafragio	oil	\$699
Campos. Molina	Sun Fishing	gouche	\$149
	The Boss	gouche	\$119
Daneri, Eugenio	Boca del Riachuelo	oil	\$999
	Camino de la quinta	oil	\$999
Del Campo, Cupertino	El ombú	oil	\$4,999
	Los Eucaliptus	oil	\$2,999
Donnis, Cayetano	L'arrives du Paquebot	oil	\$1,699
De Larranaga, Enrique J.	Paisaje del Mar del Plata	oil	\$1,799
Faggioli, Juan Carlos	Tormenta en Capilla del Montes	oil	\$599
	Paisaje de Capilla del Monte	oil	\$599
Franco, Rodolfo	Playa de Santa Elena	oil	\$349
	Puerto de Novgorod	oil	\$499
Gigli, Lorenzo	Convaleciente	oil	\$999
	Gazel	oil	\$149
Gramajo Gutiérrez, Alfredo	Retablo de Jesús	oil	\$3,499
	Indios de Carnaval de Simoca	oil	\$4,499

Guido, Alfredo	Viejo Mollo	oil	\$3,999
Jarry, Gastón	Basket Ball	oil	\$1,199
Larco, Jorge	La Hamaca	watercolor	\$399
	Viejos Barcos	watercolor	\$399
López Buchardo, Próspero	Verano	oil	\$1,999
López Claro, César	Durmiente	oil	\$999
López Naguil, Gregorio	Aguaribay	oil	\$499
Lynch, Justo	Bruma	oil	\$699
Mazza, Raul	Plaza Garay	oil	\$699
Pacenza, Onofrio	Esquina Roja	oil	\$599
Pettoruti, Emilio	Sandías	oil	\$2,999
Prando, Alberto	El Camio	oil	\$999
	Moulin de la Galette	oil	\$999
Ripamonte, Carlos R.	Amigos del Potrero	oil	\$1,999
	La Tapera	oil	\$3,999
Rodríguez, María de S.A.	Decanso	tempera	\$799
Rossi, Alberto	La Vieux Maitre	oil	\$199
Russo, Raúl	Bodegón	oil	\$999
Soto Acebal, Jorge	La sombrilla azul	oil	\$1,499
Spilimbergo, Lino Eneas	Suburbio de Buenos Aires	oil	\$599
	Figuras	oil	\$699
Victorica, Miguel C.	La modelo mirandose	oil	\$2,999
Wiess de Rossi, Ana	Marisa	oil	\$199
<b>BRAZIL ARTISTS</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Borsoi, Gerson	O Morro	oil	\$699
Bulcao, Athos	Flores	oil	\$149
	Composição	oil	\$279
	Back Stages No. 1	watercolor	\$49.75
	Bacl Stages No. 2	watercolor	\$49.75
Correira da Costa, Iignes	Flores	oil	\$99.75
	Retrato de criança	oil	\$379
Cavalleiro, Henrique	Carnaval Antigo Brasileiro	tempera	\$259
	Orchideas	tempera	\$99.75
De Carvalho, Flavio Rezende	Pintura No. 1	oil	\$449
	Pintura No. 2	oil	\$249
	Drawing No. 1	pen and ink	\$39.75
	Drawing No. 2	pen and ink	\$39.75
De Albuquerque, Giorgina	Cabloco	oil	\$498
	Mercado	oil	\$489
Do Amaral, Tarsila	Paizagem	oil	\$349
	Carnaval	oil	\$389
De Araujo, Pedro Correia	Mimosa	oil	\$499
	Janette	oil	\$489



	Tampinha	oil	\$429
	Mulher de Pescador	oil	\$389
	Composicao de Modelos No. 1	pencil	\$79.50
	Composicao de Modelos No. 2	pastel	\$79.50
	Croquis de Modelos	pencil	\$79.50
Deane, Percy	Retrato de Minha Irma	oil	\$249
	Drawing No. 1	pencil	\$39.75
	Drawing No. 2	pencil	\$39.75
Da Veiga Guinhard, Alberto	Retrato No. 1	oil	\$489
	Retrato No. 2	oil	\$379
	Ouro Preto No. 1	pen and ink	\$39.75
	Ouro Preto No. 2	pen and ink	\$39.75
De Rocha Miranda, Alcides	Rociero	oil	\$429
	Auto Retrato	pencil	\$149
	Mae D'Agua	pencil & crayon	\$39.75
	Criança	pencil	\$149
Graciano, Clovis	Flores No. 1	monotype	\$29.75
	Mulher Aventado Café	monotype	\$19.97
	Criança	charcoal	\$29.75
	Flores No. 2	monotype	\$29.75
	Sanfoniero	charcoal	\$19.97
	Danza de Caipiras	charcoal	\$19.97
	Mulher	pen and ink	\$9.97
Machado de Moreas, José	Natividade	oil	\$389
Meira, Oscar	Natureza Morta	oil	\$479
	Cabeça de Cristo	watercolor	\$289
Marx, Roberto Burle	Natureza Morta Dom Pe Crista de Galo	oil	\$789
	O Carroussel	oil	\$598
	Flores	oil	\$699
	Natureza Morta com Moringa del Norte	oil	\$398
	Peixes e Barquinhos	oil	\$429
	Natureza Morto com Pano de Retalho	oil	\$579
	Natureza Morta (Flores)	oil	\$598
	Vendedoras de Peixe	oil	\$749
	Drawing No. 1	pen and ink	\$39.75
	Drawing No. 2	pen and ink	\$39.75
	Drawing No. 3	pen, ink, wash	\$39.75
Machado Ahmes de Paula	Auto Retrato	oil	\$389
	Composicao	oil	\$149
Martins, Madame [Maria]	St. Francis	wood	\$4,999

	Samba Dancer	wood	\$999
	Figure	wood	\$999
Portinari, Cândido	Morro	oil	NFS
Pancetti, Jose	Ponta D'Areia No. 1	oil	\$749
	Ponta D'Areia No. 2	oil	\$749
	Menina com flor	oil	\$289
Sclair, Carlos	Composicaoos con Candieiro	pastel	\$279
	Aura	oil	\$279
	Menina pulando corda	pen and ink	\$69.50
	Elza	pen and ink	\$59.75
<b>CHILE ARTISTS</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Aliaga, Alfredo	No title	oil	\$79.50
Barrientos, Hugo	No title	oil	\$89.75
Burchard, Pablo	No title	oil	\$369
Caballero, Jorge	No title	oil	\$369
Caceres, Hector	No title	oil	\$249
Cortes, Ana	No title	oil	\$149
Carracci, José	No title	oil	\$389
Danitz, Beatriz	No title	oil	\$139
	No title	oil	\$74.75
De la Fuente, Gregorio	No title	oil	\$189
Eguiluz, Augusto	No title	oil	\$149
	No title	oil	\$98.75
González, Edith	No title	oil	\$129
Humerres, Roberto	No title	oil	\$298
Lira, Armando	No title	oil	\$149
	No title	oil	\$169
Mori, Camilo	No title	oil	\$589
Molieari, Berta	No title	oil	\$149
Morales, Fernando	No title	oil	\$98.75
Miranda, Ramón	Niño y perro	ceramic	\$12.97
	Servant	ceramic	\$24.97
	Bolivian	ceramic	\$24.97
	Children	ceramic	\$24.97
	Barredora	ceramic	\$8.97
	Small Town	ceramic	\$16.97
	Peasant	ceramic	\$24.97
	La cantora	ceramic	\$149
	No title	sculpture	\$149
	No title	sculpture	\$24.97
Perez, Matilde	No title	oil	\$74.75
Peblete, Aida	No title	oil	\$129
Perotti, José	No title	oil	\$129

	No title	oil	\$129
	No title	ceramic	\$398
	No title	ceramic	\$398
Puye, Inés	No title	oil	\$298
Quevedo, Manuel	No title	oil	\$139
Roa, Israel	No title	oil	\$498
Roma, Samuel	No title	ceramic	\$1398
Roman, René	No title	oil	\$129
Santelices, Raúl	No title	oil	\$94.75
Strozzi, Luís	No title	oil	\$369
Tupper, María	No title	oil	\$94.75
Tortero, Luís	No title	oil	\$129
<b>COLOMBIA ARTISTS</b>			
<b>COLOMBIA ARTISTS</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Abril, Julie	Indio de Sibudey	Wood	\$298
Acevedo Bister, Inés	Virgen campesina	Tempera	\$249
Acuña, Luís Alberto	El vaquero	oil	\$249
	La espigadora	oil	\$249
Albarracín, Josefina	Campeño	Wood	\$1689
	Cabeza de muchacho	Stone	\$798
Arenas Betancourt, A.	La minera	Wood	\$249
Ariza, Gonzalo	Rio	oil	\$249
	Roca	oil	\$249
Barba, Ramón	Un guerrillero	wood	\$2199
	Jacob el mendigo	wood	\$2199
Botero, Marieta	Fuente de pueblo	oil	\$79.75
	Paisaje	oil	\$49.75
Cajiao, Alicia	Vacaloca, fiesta popular	oil	\$249
	Vendedoras	oil	\$249
Correa, Carlos	Retrato del Dr. C. Uribe Piedrahita	oil	\$749
	La hermandad de la caridad	Watercolor	\$289
	La diosa de los sinafanes	watercolor	\$149
Cuervo Borda, Teresa	India con la batea	oil	\$449
	Indita	oil	\$449
Díaz Vargas, Miguel	Frutas del trópico	oil	\$1399
	Vendedores de ollas	oil	\$1399
Fajardo, Julie	Mercado de pueblo	oil	\$149
	Llanos del Tolima	oil	\$149
Gómez Campuzano, R.	Misa en la hacienda	oil	\$889
	Rancho	Oil	\$449
	Campeño sabanero	oil	\$449
Gómez Jaramillo, I.	Madre en el trópico	oil	\$289
	Caballo	Oil	\$229

	Muchacha	oil	\$289
	India Guajira	oil	\$289
	Paisaje en el trópico	oil	\$229
Iriarte, Alberto	La dama del caballo	oil	\$149
Kraus, Erwin	Mamancanata, Sierra Nevada	oil	\$129
	Sabana de Bogotá	oil	\$129
Martinez Delgado, S.	El que volvió	oil	\$889
Moreno Otero, Domingo	Rio Saravita	oil	\$449
	La punta del Llano	oil	\$449
Neira, Alonso	Estudio	wood	\$229
Ospina, Marco A.	Campesinas Boyacenses	oil	\$229
Ramírez Fajardo, A.	Fiestas populares	watercolor	\$149
	Día de mercado	watercolor	\$149
Rodríguez, José Domingo	Indiana	marble	\$1189
Rodríguez, Hena	Copla popular	wood	\$589
	India talla	stone	\$369
Rozo, Rómulo	Atlas ternuras	bronze	\$229
	Mestiza Yucateca	bronze	\$229
Reyes, Carlos	Venus indigena	wood	\$449
Silva, Guillermo	El Pastelillo, Cartagena	oil	\$98.97
	Flores	oil	\$109
Trujillo, Magnenat S.	Composición	oil	\$749
	Pastora	oil	\$749
Vergara, Dolcey	En el corral	oil	\$289
	Pasando el río Cauca	oil	\$289
<b>URUGUAY</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Amezaga, Eduardo	La escuela	oil	\$489
Barradas, Rafael	Paisaje Hospitalet de Llobregat	oil	\$789
Barradas, Simone L. de Perez	La virgen y el niño	oil	\$949
Bazzurro, Domingo	Paisaje	oil	\$749
Cuneo, José	Paraiso bajo la luna	oil	\$989
Desimone, Alfredo	El patio	oil	\$529
Dura, Alberto	A pleno sol	oil	\$749
De Arzadum, Carmelo	Avenida L' de Julio [sic]	oil	\$789
Pesce Castro, César A.	Escalera rústica	oil	\$449
Rose, Manuel	Bañistas	oil	\$1399
Rufalo, Carlos Roberto	Mañana de sol	oil	\$289
Urta, Nicolás	Naturaleza muerta	oil	\$589
<b>VENEZUELA ARTISTS</b>	<b>Title of Artwork</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Price</b>
Arroyo, Miguel Castillo	Caballos	oil	\$89.50

Brandt, Mary	Girasoles	oil	\$149
	Paisaje	oil	\$69.50
Enriquez, Cesar Ludert	Naturaleza muerta	oil	\$79.50
Firgau, Emilia	Cayenas	oil	\$149
González, Rafael Ramón	Los morros de San Juan	oil	\$199
	Los morros de San Juan	oil	\$169
Gómez, V. Garcia	Girasoles	oil	NFS
González, Pedro Angel	Arrabel de La Guaira	oil	\$289
Mamón, Anita	Paisaje oleo	oil	\$89.75
Monasterios [Rafael]	Calle de Barquisimeto	oil	\$179
Narváez [Francisco]	El pequeño marino	watercolor	\$159
	La bella del barque	tempera	\$189
	Arboles	oil	\$249
Otero, Alejandro Rodríguez	Orchids	oil	\$179
Pardo, Mercedes	Paisaje	oil	\$69.50
Schlaugeter [Eduardo]	Orchids	oil	\$179
Tovar, Eulalio Toledo	Paisaje	oil	\$169.50
<b>Source:</b> "Paintings and Sculpture from Latin America, The Art Gallery." New York: R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., 1942.			

**APPENDIX E**

<b>CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICAN ART, EXHIBITION #1, EAST COAST (SECTION C)</b>				
<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ARTIST</b>	<b>TITLE + INSURANCE</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LENDER</b>
Argentina	Onofrio Pacenza	Marine \$200	oil	Anonymous/SFMA
Bolivia	Roberto Berdecio	Chaco Girl \$150	Duco/panel	Robert McNaught SF
		Peasant Woman \$100	watercolor	Ricardo Lopez, SF
	Antonio Sotomayor	Huayno \$75	watercolor	Artist
Brazil	Cândido Portinari	Head MoMA	monotype	MoMA
Colombia	Luís Alberto Acuña	Drape and Nude Indian Figures in a Landscape \$250	oil	Artist
		The Annunciation as Visualized by the American Indian \$50	Pencil drawing	SFMA
Cuba	Carlos Enríquez	Bulls Working \$25	watercolor	Artist/Cordes NY
	Wilfredo Lam [sic]	Abstract Composition	opaque w/c	MoMA
	Amelia Peláez	Still Life: Fruit \$350	oil	Artist/Cordes NY
Ecuador	Eduardo Kingman	Procession \$100	oil	Anonymous/SFMA
		Head of an Indian \$5	woodcut	Anonymous/SFMA
	Humberto Estrella	Indian Figure \$10	chalk	Anonymous SFMA
Guatemala	Carlos Mérida	The Beach \$50	watercolor	SFMA
Mexico	Francisco Dosamantes	Woman Making Pottery \$10	lithograph	SFMA
	José Clemente Orozco	Franciscan Friar and Indian \$35	lithograph	SFMA
		Mexican Landscape \$50	lithograph	SFMA
		Five Heads: The Scientist	watercolor	Elisa & Max Honigbaum CA

		\$250		
	Diego Rivera	The Forge \$60	Ink drawing	SFMA
		Head of an Indian Woman \$95	Chalk drawing	SFMA
		Portrait of Ignacio Sanchez \$750	oil	Colonel & Mrs. Erskine Wood CA
	Rufino Tamayo	The Window \$100	oil	SFMA
Peru	Julia Codesido	Landscape, Arequipa \$150	oil	Anonymous/SFMA
Uruguay	Nicolás J Urta	Clouds \$100	oil	Artist
<b>Source:</b> Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, p. 8-11. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.				

<b>CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICAN ART, EXHIBITION #2, WEST COAST</b>				
<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ARTIST</b>	<b>TITLE + INSURANCE</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LENDER</b>
Bolivia	Antonio Sotomayor	Andeans \$75	watercolor	Artist
	Roberto Berdecio	Aymara Indian \$100	pencil	Ricardo Lopez SF
		La Tapada, Lima	watercolor	Louis Bonhote, SF
Brazil	Flavio de Carvalho	Nude \$100	oil	William Berrien NY
	Cândido Portinari	Figures MoMA	lithograph	MoMA
		Migratory Family MoMA	lithograph	MoMA
Colombia	Luís Alberto Acuña	Portrait of a Lady \$250	oil	Artist
		The Sculptor's Workshop \$200	crayon	Artist
		Titular Gods of the Chibchas \$300	oil	Artist
Cuba	Carlos Enríquez	Pond Ghost \$25	watercolor	Artist/Cordes NY
	Amelia Peláez	Fruit \$350	oil	Artist/Cordes NY
	Felipe Orlando	Road through the Palms \$25	watercolor	Artist/Cordes NY
	Domingo Ravenet	Landscape MoMA	oil	Anonymous
Ecuador	Humberto Estrella	Allegory of Our Feudalism \$10	Chalk caricature	Anonymous/SFMA

	Eduardo Kingman	Defense of the Land \$5	woodcut	Anonymous/SFMA
Guatemala	Carlos Mérida	Four Figures \$25	watercolor	SFMA
Mexico	José Clemente Orozco	Head with Noose: The Rebel \$250	watercolor	Else & Max Honigbaum CA
		Mexican Pueblo \$50	lithograph	SFMA
	Máximo Pacheco	Landscape \$35	pencil	SFMA
	Fermín Revueltas	Landscape \$75	watercolor	Elise & Max Honigbaum CA
	Diego Rivera	Girl's Head \$200	watercolor	Else & Max Honigbaum CA
		Mother and Child \$300	oil	SFMA
		Woman's Head \$50	chalk	SFMA
	David Alfaro Siqueiros	By the Prison Gate \$250	oil	Mrs. Adolph Mack
Self Portrait \$25		lithograph	SFMA	
Alfredo Zalce	Pueblo Scene \$60	watercolor	Elisa & Max Honigbaum CA	
Uruguay	Nicolás J. Urta	The Harbor Montevideo \$100	oil	Artist

**Source:** Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, p. 98-101. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

<b>CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICAN ART, EXHIBITION #3, MIDDLE WESTERN STATES</b>				
<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ARTIST</b>	<b>TITLE + INSURANCE</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>	<b>LENDER</b>
Argentina	Ernesto Scotti	Portrait of a Farmer \$200	oil	SFMA
Bolivia	Roberto Berdecio	Head of a Leader \$100	duco on paper	Artist
	Antonio Sotomayor	Chola \$75	watercolor	Artist
Brazil	Cândido Portinari	Blind Man and Son MoMA	monotype	MoMA
Colombia	Luís Alberto Acuña	A Boy, A Horse and a Somber Landscape \$200	oil	Artist
		Two Figures \$60	oil	Artist
		The Wild Boy \$50	pencil	Artist
Cuba	Wifredo Lam	Abstract Head MoMA	opaque watercolor	MoMA
	Felipe Orlando	Cuban Tobacco Plantation \$25	watercolor	Artist/Cordes NY
	Amelia Peláez	Still Life \$350	oil	Artist/Cordes NY
Ecuador	Humberto Estrella	Intellectual Fauna: American Group \$10	chalk caricature	Anonymous/SFMA



	Eduardo Kingman	Mother and Daughter in a Landscape \$250	oil	Albert Franklin, MA
		For the Funeral \$5	woodcut	Anonymous/SFMA
Guatemala	Carlos Mérida	Study in Curves \$200	oil	SFMA
Mexico	José Clemente Orozco	Head: The Worker \$250	watercolor	Else & Max Honigbaum CA
		Mexican Soldiers \$50	lithograph	SFMA
	Máximo Pacheco	The Gateway \$50	pencil	SFMA
	Fermín Revueltas	The Huts \$75	watercolor	Else & Max Honigbaum CA
	Diego Rivera	Indian Girl with a Coral Necklace \$750	oil	Colonel & Mrs. Erskine Wood CA
		Portrait of Michael Goodman \$100	Chalk drawing	SFMA
	Alfredo Zalce	Men Cutting Trees \$60	watercolor	Else & Max Honigbaum CA
Peru	Julia Codesido	Colla Indian \$150	oil	William Berrian NY
Uruguay	Nicolás G. Urta	Uruguayan Landscape \$100	oil	Artist

**Source:** Grace L. McCann Morley. Study Book, Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art. NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 365, p. 145-149. National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

## APPENDIX F

<b>CONTRACT OEMcr-51      Signed with SFMA on January 7, 1942</b>	
<b>Exhibition No. 1, Section C: Contemporary Painting</b>	<b>Initial Circulation: 2/4/1942</b>
Montgomery Museum, Montgomery, AL	Feb 16-Mar 4, 1942
Rollins College, Winter Park, FL	Mar 10-28, 1942
League of Women Voters, St. Petersburg, FL	April 6-25, 1942
Wesleyan College, Macon, GA	May 1-14, 1942
Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA	May 19-June 5, 1942
Lincoln School, NY	July 1-25, 1942
Art Association of Newport, RI	Aug 5-30, 1942
Section held in Newport—Circulated as a MoMA exhibition for a fee + transportation	
Robert Hull Fleming Museum, Burlington, VT	Oct 1-15, 1942
Bucknell University Christian Association, Lewisburg, PA	Oct 22-29, 1942
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY	Nov 12-Dec 3, 1942
Greenwich Public Library, Greenwich, CT	Dec 8 -28, 1942
Wesleyan University, Middleton, CT	Jan 15-Feb 5, 1943
George Walter Vincent Smith Gallery, Springfield, MA	Feb 14-March 7, 1943
Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA	March 14-23, 1943
Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA	April 1-22, 1943
Exhibition was sent to SFMA for dismantling	
<p><b>SUMMARY:</b>            Exhibition with six shipping cases: 9 oils, 8 watercolors and 7 drawings and prints            “represent in typical and excellent quality examples of art of Argentina Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay, with individual plastic covered explanatory labels.”</p> <p>Supporting Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve 30” x 40” panels with photographs and descriptive labels for: Argentina, Bolivia-Ecuador (Andean Countries), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba-Venezuela (Caribbean Countries), Mexico frescoes, Mexico Easel painting, Peru, Contemporary Architecture, Prints, Maps of Latin American countries.</li> </ul> <p>Supplementary Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two volume illustrated study book and set of slides, lecture, and publicity material.</li> <li>• Total of 36 items for display.</li> <li>• Insurance Value: \$3,315 plus 3 artworks from MoMA under their insurance</li> </ul> <p>Circulated by the Museum of Modern Art</p>	

<b>Exhibition No. 2. Section C</b>	<b>Initial Circulation: 2/16/1942</b>
Tacoma Art Association, Tacoma, WA	March 8-28, 1942
Seattle Art Museum, Seattle, WA	April 8-May 3, 1942
Pomona College, Claremont, CA	June 1-21, 1942
Mills College, Oakland, CA	June 28-July 28, 1942
<b>SUMMARY:</b> Exhibition in five shipping cases: 9 oils, 10 watercolors, 8 prints and drawings “represent typical and excellent quality examples of art in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Uruguay, with individual plastic covered explanatory labels.” Supporting Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve 30' x 40" panels with photographs and descriptive labels 30" x 40" panels with photographs and descriptive labels for: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba-Venezuela (Caribbean Countries), Mexico frescoes, Mexico Easel painting, Peru, Contemporary Architecture, Prints, Maps of Latin American countries</li> </ul> Supplementary Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two volume illustrated study book and set of slides, lecture, publicity material</li> <li>• Total of 36 items for display</li> <li>• Insurance Value: \$3,310 plus 3 artworks from MoMA under their own insurance</li> </ul> Circulated by the San Francisco Museum of Art	
<b>Exhibition No. 3, Section C: Contemporary Painting</b>	<b>Initial Circulation: Feb. 1942</b>
University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY	Feb. 1942
Women's City Club, Detroit, MI	March 8-25, 1942
Sewanake High School, Floral Park Long Island, NY	April 13-17, 1942
Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, VA	April 24-May 24, 1942
Harlan Co. High School, Harlan, KY	May 26-June 17, 1942
Wisconsin Union, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI	July 12-Aug 8, 1942
Milwaukee Art Institute, Milwaukee, WI	Aug. 24-Sept. 26, 1942
Saginaw Junior League, Saginaw, MI	Oct. 5-19, 1942
Alexandria Art League, Alexandria, LA	Oct 29-Nov 19, 1942
Rochester Memorial Art Gallery, Rochester, NY	Jan 22-Feb 12, 1943
Art Renaissance Club, Oklahoma City, OK	April 1-22, 1943
Returned to San Francisco Museum of Art for dismantling.	
<b>SUMMARY:</b> Exhibition in six shipping cases: 10 oils, 8 watercolors and chalk drawings, 5 prints and drawings “represent in typical quality examples of art in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay, with individual explanatory labels.” Supporting Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve panels with photographs and descriptive labels, 30" x 40" panels with photographs and descriptive labels for: Argentina, Bolivia-Ecuador (Andean Countries), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba-Venezuela (Caribbean Countries), Mexico frescoes, Mexico Easel painting, Peru, Contemporary Architecture, Prints, Maps of Latin American countries.</li> </ul>	

Supplementary Materials:

- Two volume illustrated study book and set of slides, lecture, publicity material
- Total of 35 items for display.
- Insurance Value: \$3,460 plus 2 artworks from MoMA under their own insurance

Circulated by the Museum of Modern Art

Source: NARA, Office of Inter-American Affairs, General Records, Central Files; Record Group 229, Box 366 Folder: Mrs. Morley Exc. 1, 2, 3 National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

## APPENDIX G

Country/Artist	Title	Medium
<b>ARGENTINA</b>		
Antonio, Juan	Estancia	gouache
Badi, Aquiles	Moroccan Café	gouache
	On Reverse: Figures	pen and ink
	Fiesta en la Escuela/School Tableau—San Martín's Birthday	gouache
	Spanish Café	gouache
Ballester Peña, Juan Antonio	Nino Dios/ Epiphany	watercolor and India ink
Basaldúa, Héctor	The Ball	gouache
	Expreso Villalonga	gouache
Berni, Antonio	Club Atletico de Chicago/ New Chicago Athletic Club	oil on canvas
	Seated Boy	oil on canvas
	Red Head	monotype
	Head of a Girl	monotype
Borges de Torre, Norah	Ninas Espanolas/Children	gouache
	Semana Santa/Holy Week	gouache
Butler, Horacio A.	El Camelote: Tigre	oil on canvas
Carrié, Clara	The Angel Musician	aquatint
Castagna, Rodolfo V.	Women by the Sea	drypoint
Demichelis, Nélica	Heads	lithograph
Forner, Raquel	Desolacion/Desolation	oil on canvas
Gómez Cornet, Ramón	Chanquito/Head of a Boy	oil on canvas
Guido, Alfredo	Descanso/Stevedores Resting	tempera
	Bruno Marchieri, The Buffon of Santa Fe	lithograph
	La muerte del Liyera/Death on the Highway	lithograph
Lasansky, Mauricio	Figures	etching
López Anaya, Fernando	Mermaid	aquatint and etching
Melgarejo Muñoz, Waldimiro	In the Ring	color etching
	El Pericón	color etching

Ortiz, Manuel Angeles	In the Open Country	brush and ink
	In the Open Country	series of lithographs
Otero Lamas, María Catalina	The Picnic Lunch	drypoint
	Fisherwomen	mezzotint
Pacenza, Onofrio A.	Street Corner of San Telmo	oil on canvas
	End of the Street	oil on canvas
Pettoruti, Emilio	The Verdigris Goblet	oil on canvas
Prete, Juan del	Figures	oil
Rossi, Attilio	Paisage de Buenos Aires	tempera
Soldi, Raúl	Street in San Martín	tempera
	Nude	gouche
	Two Figures	monotype
Spilimbergo, Lino Eneas	Figure/Seated Woman	tempera on burlap
	Head of an Indian	monotype
Urruchúa, Demetrio	Guerra/The New Order	monotype
	La muerta/The Girl with the Knife	monotype
	Cabeza/The Beast and the Axe	monotype
	Cabeca/The Serpent	monotype
Vaisman, Aida	Girl with Flowers	drypoint
Veroni, Raúl	Head	drypoint
<b>BRAZIL</b>		
Behring, Edith	Head of a Negro	drawing
	Negro Head	drawing
Cardoso Junior, José Bernardo	Still Life with View of the Bay of Guanabara	oil on paper
Citti Ferreira, Lucci	Negro Mother and Child	oil on canvas
Deane, Percy	The Lovers	pencil
Dos Prazeres, Heitor	Night of St. John/St. John's Day	oil on canvas
De Veija Guignard, Alberto	Study for Ouro Petro	pen and ink
	Ouro Petro	tempera on board
Moraes, Jose	N/A commissioned	drawing
Pancetti, José	Self-Portrait	oil on canvas
Pinet, Georgette	Academia Parreiras	oil on cardboard
Rebollo Gonsales, Francisco	Suburb of São Paulo	oil on composition board
	Backyards	oil on panel
Rossi Ossir Paolo	The Beach	oil on panel
	Frute de Cande	oil on panel
	Night of St. John	tile panel
Santa Rosa Junior, Tomás	Brazilian Musicians	drypoint
	The Blind Musician	tempera on panel
Sousa, Emilio	Itanhean	tempera on panel
<b>CHILE</b>		
Herrera Guevara, Luís	Snow Storm at the University	oil on canvas
Matta Echaurren, Roberto	Drawing	pencil and crayon
	Listen to Living (Ecoutez Vivre)	oil on canvas

Macias, Joaquim	Nicaraguan Animal	Etching
Roa, Israel	The Painter's Birthday	oil on canvas
Vargas, Raúl	The Dancer, Inés Pissarro	terra cotta
Acuña, Luis Alberto	Maguey	Oil on canvas
Ariza, Gonzalo	Landscape of Bogotá	oil on canvas
	Clouds over the Savanna	oil on canvas
Kraus, Erwin	The Spring/Ravine	watercolor
	Savanna	Oil on canvas
Ramírez Fajardo, Alfonso	Landscape	watercolor
	The market/Fiesta	watercolor
<b>ECUADOR</b>		
Anhalzer-Fisch, Olga	Ecuadorian Woman/Indian Girl	Gouache and India ink
Guayasamin, Oswaldo	Head of My Brother	oil on wood
Heredia, Luis Alberto	Fiesta at Pomasqui/Plaza at Pomasqui	oil on canvas
Montenegro, Julio	Solidarity	pen and watercolor
	Field	pen and watercolor
	To Work Is to Pray	pen and watercolor
Paredes, Diógenes	In the Wind/Threshers	Gouache on cardboard
Blas, Camilo	Sifting Wheat	Tempera on paper
Carvallo, Teresa	Fiesta	Oil on panel
Codesido, Julia	Tapada	Oil on panel
	Crucifixion	Oil on panel
Reinoso	St. Rose of Lima	watercolor
	Landscape	oil
	Landscape	oil
Sabogal, Jose	Cholo Ayacuchano	Oil on panel
Sacco, Carmen	Selva	Oil on cardboard
	The World at War	Oil on cardboard
Urteaga, Mario	Burial of an Illustrious Man	oil on canvas
Alexandro, E.	N/A	watercolor
Lazarini, Gustavo	Aunt Juliana	watercolor
	Old Woman	oil on wood
Pereyra, Ramon	Martin Fierro	oil
	Southern Scene	oil
Pollieri de Viana, Amalia	N/A	drawing
Torres Garcia, Augusto	Portrait	oil
	Still Life	oil
Torres Garcia, Horacio	N/A	oil
Torres García, Joaquín	The Port	oil on cardboard
<b>Source:</b> Information drawn from Lincoln Kirstein, <i>The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art</i> , New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943.		

## APPENDIX H

<b>Paintings from Latin America in the Museum's Collection</b>	<b>Circulation 1943-1944</b>
Art Gallery of Toronto, Toronto, Canada	Oct 15-Nov. 12, 1943
William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City, MO	December 1-29, 1943
Denver Art Museum, Denver, CO	January 12-Feb. 9, 1944
Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, PA	Feb. 26-March 25, 1944
Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, Columbus, OH	April 11-May 9, 1944
San Francisco Museum of Art, San Francisco, CA	May 26-July 3, 1944
Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo, NY	Nov. 3-24, 1944
Women's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC	Dec. 5-20, 1944
Rollins College, Winter Park, FL	Jan. 2-23, 1945
Isaac Delgado Museum of Art, New Orleans, LA	Feb. 5-26, 1945
Wilmington Society of Fine Arts, Wilmington, DE	March 8-April 1, 1945
J. B. Speed Art Museum, Louisville, KY	April 14-May 5, 1945
Organized and circulated by MOMA. Fee: \$250 for 3 weeks 97 artworks, 98 pictures labels, 10 title labels, 9 explanatory labels	
<b>Paintings from Latin America Museum's collection small version</b>	
Amherst College, Amherst, MA	Feb. 1-22, 1946
Art Institute of Zanesville, Zanesville, OH	March 8-28, 1946
Museum of the Cranbrook Academy of Arts, Bloomfield Hills, MI	April 12-May 2, 1946
Pomona College, Claremont, CA	May 16-June 6, 1946
Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA	June 20-July 11, 1946
Oglebay Institute, Wheeling, WV	July 25-August 1946
Organized by MoMA. Fee: \$75 for 3 weeks	
<b>Paintings from Ten Latin American Republics</b>	
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI	July 25-August 15, 1943
Illinois State Museum, Springfield, IL	Sept 4-24, 1943
Art Association of Indianapolis, John Herron Art Museum, Indianapolis, Indiana	Oct 3-24, 1943
Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute, Utica, NY	Nov 3-24, 1943
Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH	Dec 3-24, 1943
Rochester Memorial Art Gallery, Rochester, NY	Jan 7-28, 1944
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA	Feb 19-March 11, 1944



Person Hall Art Gallery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC	March 25-April 15, 1944
North Carolina State Art Society, Raleigh, NC	April 29-May 20, 1944
Circulated by MoMA, Fee: \$75 for 3 weeks.	
<b>Source:</b> Drawn from listings in the "The Museum of Modern Art: Circulating Exhibitions 1931-1954." <i>The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin</i> 21.3/4, (Summer 1954). Print.	

## REFERENCES

- Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1969. Print.
- Adam, Peter. *Art of the Third Reich*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1992. Print.
- Adams, James Truslow. *The Epic of America*. Boston: Little, Brown, and company, 1931. Print.
- Adorno, Theodor W. "Culture Industry Reconsidered" (Trans. Anson G. Rabinbach). *New German Critique*, 6 (Fall 1975): 12-19.  
<[http://www.icce.rug.nl/~soundscapes/DATABASES/SWA/Culture\\_industry\\_reconsidered.shtml](http://www.icce.rug.nl/~soundscapes/DATABASES/SWA/Culture_industry_reconsidered.shtml)>
- Adorno, Theodor and Max Horkheimer. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception."  
<<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/adorno/1944/culture-industry.htm>>.
- Almond, Gabriel A. "Harold Dwight Lasswell, 1902-1978, A Biographical Memoir." Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1987.  
<http://www.nasonline.org/publications/biographical-memoirs/memoirs-pdfs/lasswell-harold.pdf>.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Web. 11 October 2011.  
<<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>>.
- Americas Society. *Hemispheric Venture: Thirty Five Years of Culture at the Americas Society*. New York: Americas Society, 2000. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

- Anderson, Perry. *The Origins of Postmodernity*. London: Verso, 1998. Print.
- Anreus, Alejandro. "Contra-notas: Irreverent Thoughts and Questions on Latino and Latin American Art." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 34.1 (Spring 2009): 263-275. Print.
- . *Orozco in Gringoland: The Years in New York*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2001. Print.
- Anreus, Alejandro, Diana L. Linden, Jonathan Weinberg. *The Social and the Real: Political Art of the 1930s in the Western Hemisphere*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006. Print.
- Ausfeld, Margaret Lynne and Virginia Mecklenburg. *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the Department of State 1946-1948*. Exh. Cat. Montgomery, AL: Montgomery Museum of Fine Art, 1984. Print.
- Bales, Peter. "Nelson Rockefeller and his Quest for Inter-American Unity." Diss. SUNY Stony Brook, 1992. Print.
- Barnett, Holly. "The Necessity of Pre-Columbian Art: U.S. Museums and the Role of Foreign Policy in the Appropriation of Mexican Heritage 1933-1944." Diss. University of California, Los Angeles, 1993. Print.
- Barnet-Sanchez, Holly. "Aestheticizing the Pre-Columbian Past: Exhibitions Sponsored by the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1940-1945." Paper presented at the College Art Association Annual Meeting, February 12, 1988. Print.
- Barr, Alfred H. Jr. *Painting by Nineteen Living Americans* (December 13, 1929-January 12, 1930). Exh. cat. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1929. Print.
- . "Modern and 'Modern.'" MoMA Press Release, 1933-1934, No. 52.
- , ed. *Painting and Sculpture in the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1942. Print.
- . *What Is Modern Painting?* Introductory Series to the Modern Arts, No. 2. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943. Print.
- . Foreword to *The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art* by Lincoln Kirstein, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943: 3-4.

- . *Painting and Sculpture in the Museum of Modern Art 1929-1967*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977. Print.
- . *Travel Diaries to Cuba and Mexico. Papers*. James Findley MoMA 1982. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Barr, Margaret Scolari. "Our Campaigns: Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and the Museum of Modern Art: A Biographical Chronicle of the Years 1930-1944." *The New Criterion*, special summer issue, 1987: 23-74. Print.
- Barrett, John. *The Pan American Union: Peace, Friendship, Commerce*. Baltimore, Munder Thomsen Press, 1911. Print.
- Basilio, Miriam et al., eds. *Latin American and Caribbean Art: MoMA at El Museo*. Exh. cat. New York: El Museo del Barrio, 2004. Print.
- Bear, Donald J. "Easel Painting in the WPA/FAP: A Statement and a Prophecy." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1975. 133-137. Print.
- Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Print.
- Bee, Harriet S. and Michelle Elligott, eds. *Art in Our time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2004.
- Benton, William. "Vernissage: Advancing American Art." *Art News* 45 (October 1946): 19. Print.
- Bevins, Charles Irving. *Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America, 1776-1949: Multilateral, 1931-1945*. Volume 3. United States: Department of State Publication 8484, Released November 1969. 372-374.
- Bliven, Bruce. "Gone Tomorrow." *New Republic*, 98 (17 May 1939): 40-42. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Translated by Richard Nice). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984. Print.
- . *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. and introduced by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. Print.

- Bryman, Alan. *The Disneyzation of Society*. London: Sage Publications, 2004. Print.
- Cahill, Holger. *American Sources of Modern Art*. Exh. cat. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1933. Print.
- . "American Resources in the Arts." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 33-44. Print.
- Caldwell, Duncan. "A Biography of Robert Granville Caldwell, Jr., Part I – Spy Catcher." Web. 23 Aug. 2013.  
[http://duncancaldwell.com/Site/Spy\\_Catcher,\\_My\\_fathers\\_biography.html](http://duncancaldwell.com/Site/Spy_Catcher,_My_fathers_biography.html)
- Callcott, Wilfrid Hardy. *The Western Hemisphere: Its Influence on United States Policies to the End of World War II*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968. Print.
- Carnegie Corporation Project. Reminiscences of René d'Harnoncourt (1969), 67 pp., in the Oral History Collection of Columbia University.
- Cherrington, Ben M. "American Intercultural Activities," *Phi Delta Kappan*. 24.3 (Nov. 1941): 97-98. Print.
- Cobbs, Elizabeth. *The Rich Neighbor Policy, Rockefeller and Kaiser in Brazil*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992. Print.
- Cockcroft, Eva. "Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War." *Art Forum* 12.10 (June 1974): 39-41. Print.
- Corn, Wanda M. *The Great American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915-1935*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2001. Print.
- Constantinou, Costas M. "Communications/excommunications: an interview with Armand Mittelart." Fifth Estate Online. <http://www.fifth-estate-online.co.uk/comment/Mattelart-intervie%5B1%5D.pdf>
- Craven, David L. *Art and Revolution in Latin America, 1910-1990*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. Print.
- Culver, John C. and John Hyde. *American Dreamer: A Life of Henry A. Wallace*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000. Print.
- Davis, Stuart. "Abstract Painting Today." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by*

- Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 121-127. Print.
- . "American Artists' Congress." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 249-250. Print.
- . "Abstract Art Today—Democracy—and Reaction" First draft of August 11, 1939. *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975: 122. Print.
- "Declaration of Montevideo." December 1933. The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. New Haven: Yale Law School, Lilian Goldman Law Library (online). 13 March 2011. [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam03.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam03.asp).
- "Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation; December 21, 1936." The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. New Haven: Yale Law School, Lilian Goldman Law Library (online) Accessed 13 March 2011. [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam07.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam07.asp)
- Delpar, Helen. *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1992. Print.
- Dewey, John. *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1927. Print.
- . *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee Books, 1934. Print.
- Dicken, Peter. *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: The Guilford Press, 2003. Print.
- Dorfman, Ariel y Armand Mittelart. *Para leer al Pato Donald*. 6ta edición. México: siglo veintiuno editores, 1973. Print.
- . *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic* (trans. David Kunzle). New York: International General, 1975. Print.
- Du Guy, Paul et al. *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage Publications and the Open University, 1997. Print.

- Duberman, Martin. *The Worlds of Lincoln Kirstein*. New York: Knopf, 2007. Print.
- Einstein, Albert. "Speech at New York World's Fair, April 30, 1939." Video. 2 June 2012. <[vimeo.com/28281530](http://vimeo.com/28281530)>.
- Erb, Claude Curtis. "Nelson Rockefeller and United States-Latin American Relations, 1940-1945." Diss. Clark University, 1982. Print.
- Espinosa, J. Manuel. *Inter-American Beginnings of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy, 1936-1948*. Historical Studies, Number 2. Washington, DC: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, 1976. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981. Print.
- Fox, Claire F. "The Hemispheric Routes of 'El nuevo arte nuestro': The Pan American Union, Cultural Policy and the Cold War." *Hemispheric American Studies: Essays beyond the Nation*. Ed. Robert Levine and Caroline Levander. Rutgers University Press, 2008. 223-248. Print.
- . "The Pan American Union Visual Arts Section and the Hemispheric Circulation of Latin American Art during the Cold War." *Getty Research Journal* 2 (2010): 83-106. Print.
- . *Making Art Panamerican: Cultural Policy and the Cold War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Print.
- Franc, Helen M. "The Early Years of the International Program and Council." *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: At Home and Abroad*. Studies in Modern Art, No. 4. New York: MoMA, 1994. Print.
- Frank, Waldo. *The Rediscovery of America*. New York: Scribner, 1929. Print.
- García-Canclini, Néstor. "Las industrias culturales en la crisis del desarrollo en América Latina." *Encuentros, Centro Cultural del BID* 43 (Oct 2001-April 2002): 39-56. Print.
- . *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. Print.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism, New Perspectives on the Past*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983. Print.

- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. Print.
- Giunta, Andrea. *Vanguardia, internacionalismo y política: Arte argentino en los años sesenta*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2001. Print.
- Goldman, Shifra. *Contemporary Mexican Painting in a Time of Change*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981. Print.
- . *Dimensions of the Americas: Art and Social Change in Latin America and the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. Print.
- Goodyear, A. Conger. *The Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years*. New York: A. Conger Goodyear, 1943. Print.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. Ed. Forgacs, David. New York: New York University, 2000. Print.
- Grandas, Ludy. "Latin American Cultural Studies, A Field in Its Own Right?" George Mason University Ph.D. Cultural Studies Field Statement, 2005, unpublished manuscript. Print.
- . "Nation, State, and Citizenship in Latin America." George Mason University Ph.D. Cultural Studies Field Statement, 2005, unpublished manuscript. Print.
- Greenberg, Clement. "Avant-Garde and Kitsch." *Partisan Review* 6.5 (1939): 34-49. Print.
- Greet, Michele. "Painting the Indian Nation: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Ecuadorian Art, 1920-1960." Diss. New York University, 2004. Print.
- . *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009. Print.
- Haines, Gerald K. "Under the Eagle's Wing: The Franklin Roosevelt Administration Forges an American Hemisphere." *Diplomatic History*, 1.4 (Fall 1977): 373-388. Print.
- Hamovitch, Mitzi Berger. *The Hound & Horn Letters*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1982. Print.



- Harper, Dennis. "Advancing American Art: Leroy Davidson's 'Blind Date with Destiny.'" *Art Interrupted: Advancing American Art and the Politics of Cultural Diplomacy*. Ed. Scott Bishop et al. Atlanta: Georgia Museum of Art, 2012. Print.
- Harr, John Ensor and Peter J. Johnson. *The Rockefeller Century*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1988. Print.
- Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.
- Herrera, Olga U. "Theories of Globalizations." George Mason University Ph.D. Cultural Studies Field Statement, unpublished manuscript. Spring 2010. Print.
- . "Modern and Contemporary Latin American Art." George Mason University Ph.D. Cultural Studies Field Statement, unpublished manuscript. Spring 2010. Print.
- . "Of Art and Intellectual Cooperation: The Pan American Union 1936-1948." Paper presented at Constellations: Past Present, and Future Directions of the Art Museum of the Americas Symposium, OAS Art Museum of the Americas, Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.
- Hurlburt, Laurance P. *The Mexican Muralists in the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989. Print.
- Hyman, Sidney. *The Lives of William Benton*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. Print.
- Indych-López, Anna. "Mural Gambits: Mexican Muralism in the United States and the 'Portable Fresco.'" *The Art Bulletin*, 89.2 (June 2007): 286-304. Print.
- . *Muralism without Walls: Rivera, Orozco, and Siqueiros in the United States, 1927-1940*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. Print.
- Inter-American Office, National Gallery of Art. "Traveling Exhibitions of Latin American Art. A List of Titles and Sources of Exhibitions Now Available for Circulation in the United States." Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, January 1946.
- James, Jack and Earle Vonard Weller. *Treasure Island, "The Magic City," 1939-1940; The Story of the Golden Gate International Exposition*. San Francisco: Pisani Printing and Publishing Company, 1941. Print.

- James Webb Young Papers, 1927-1984. Finding Aid. J. Walter Thompson Company Archives: James Webb Young Papers, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University. Web. 23 Aug. 2013. <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/findingaids/jwtyoung/>.
- Jenkins, Nicholas, ed. *By With To & From: A Lincoln Kirstein Reader*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1991.
- Kellogg, Florence Loeb. "Art Becomes Public Works." *Survey Graphic* 23.6 (June 1934): 279. Print.
- Kert, Bernice. *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*. New York: Random House, 1993. Print.
- Kirstein, Lincoln. *The Latin-American Collection of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943. Print.
- . *Mosaic: Memoirs*. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1994. Print.
- Kozloff, Max. "American Painting During the Cold War." *Art Forum* 11.9 (May 1973): 43-54. Print.
- Kuznick, Peter J. "Losing the World of Tomorrow: The Battle Over the Presentation of Science at the 1939 New York World's Fair." *American Quarterly* 46.3 (Sept., 1994): 341-373. Print.
- La More, Chet. "The Artists' Union of America." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 237-238. Print.
- Latin American Exhibition of Fine and Applied Art*. Exh. Cat. New York: United States New York World's Fair Commission, 1939. Print.
- Laswell, Harold D. *Propaganda Technique in World War I*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1971. (Reprint of 1927 original publication) Print.
- . *Psychopathology and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930. Print.
- Luce, Henry R. "The American Century." *Life* 17 February 1941. 61-65. Print.
- Ludins, Eugene. "Art Comes to the People." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the*

- 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project.* Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1975. 232-233. Print.
- Lynes, Russell. *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art.* New York: Atheneum, 1973. Print.
- McMahon, Audrey. "A General View of the WPA Federal Art Project in New York City and State." *The New Deal Art Projects: An Anthology of Memoirs.* Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1972: 74-75.
- Marquis, Alice Goldfarb. *Alfred Barr, Jr.: Missionary for the Modern.* Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1989. Print.
- Mattelart, Armand. *Networking the World, 1794-2000* (Translated by Liz Carey-Libbrecht and James A. Cohen). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000. Print.
- . *Mapping World Communication: War, Progress, Culture* (Translated by Susan Emanuel and James A. Cohen). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994. Print.
- Miller, Dorothy and Alfred H. Barr, eds. *American Realists and Magic Realists (with statements by the artists and an introduction by Lincoln Kirstein).* Exh. cat. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1943. Print.
- Miller, Toby and George Yudice. *Cultural Policy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002. Print.
- Morgan, Carol. "From Modernist Utopia to Cold War Reality: A Critical Moment in Museum Education." *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change.* Studies in Modern Art, no. 5. New York: MoMA, 1995. 150-173. Print.
- Morgenthau, Henry. "Objectives for the Program." Section of Painting and Sculpture, Public Works Branch, Procurement Division, Treasury Department. Bulletin No. 1. Washington, DC (March 1, 1935): 3-4.
- Morley, Grace L. McCann. "Inter-American Cooperation in Art." *The Museum News* 19.9 (1941): 11-12. Print.
- . "An Introduction to Contemporary Peruvian Painting with Notes on the Artists." *Quarterly Bulletin (San Francisco Museum of Art)* 2.2/4 (1942): 16-39. Print.

- Morris, Joe Alex. *Nelson Rockefeller: A Biography*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. Print.
- Morsell, Mary. "The Exhibition Program of the WPA/FAP." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 229-231. Print.
- Mumford, Lewis. *American Taste*. New York: Grabbon Press, 1929. Print.
- Musée du Jeu de Paume-Paris. *Trois siècles d'art aux États-Unis: peinture, sculpture, architecture, art populaire, photographie, cinéma*. Exh. cat. Paris: Editions des musées nationaux, Mai-Juillet, 1938. Print.
- Museum of Modern Art. "Publicity for Organization of Museum, August 1929." Press Release. Accessed 7 April 2012.  
[http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press\\_archives/1/releases/MOMA\\_1929-31\\_0001\\_1929-08.pdf?2010](http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/1/releases/MOMA_1929-31_0001_1929-08.pdf?2010).
- . Alfred H. Barr, Jr., "Modern and 'Modern.'" MoMA Press Release, 1933-1934, No. 52.
- . "President Roosevelt Speaks on Program Inaugurating new building of Museum of Modern Art Wednesday Night, May 10." MoMA Press Release 39426-12. April 27, 1939.
- . *The Year's Work: Annual Report to the Board of Trustees and The Corporation Members of the Museum of Modern Art for the Years June 30, 1939-July 1, 1940*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1940. Print.
- . *The Year's Work: Annual Report to the Board of Trustees and Members of the Museum of Modern Art For the Year July 1, 1940-June 30, 1941*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1941. Print.
- . *La pintura contemporánea Norteamericana*. Exh. cat. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1942. Print.
- . *What is Modern Architecture?* Introductory Series to the Modern Arts, No. 1. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1942. Print.
- . "The Museum of Modern Art: Circulating Exhibitions 1931-1954." *The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin* 21.3/4, (Summer 1954). Print.

- . *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: At Home and Abroad*. Studies in Modern Art, No. 4. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1994. Print.
- . *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change*. Studies in Modern Art, No. 5. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1995. Print.
- National Archives and Records Administration. *Records of the Office of Inter-American Affairs, Inventory Group 229*. By David P. Anthony, Compiler. Washington: National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, 1973. Print.
- National Archives. "Guide to Textual Records Pertaining to American Cultural and Informational Foreign Policy." Washington, DC: National Archives, November 2000 (RG 59 #1). Print.
- Nichols, Lynn H. *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.
- Ninkovich, Frank A. *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. Print.
- . *Germany and the United States: The Transformation of the German Question since 1945*. Twayne's International History Series, No. 2. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995. Print.
- . "The Currents of Cultural Diplomacy: Art and the State Department, 1938-1947." *Diplomatic History* 1.3 (July 1977): 215-238. Print.
- O'Connor, Francis V. *Federal Support for the Visual Arts: The New Deal and Now*. A Report on the New Deal Art Projects in New York City and State with Recommendations for Present-Day Federal Support for the Visual Arts to the National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC, October 1968. Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, Ltd, 1971. Print.
- , ed. *The New Deal Art Projects: An Anthology of Memoirs*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1972. Print.
- , ed. *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Boston: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1975. Print.
- Official Guide Book*. New York: Exposition Publications, Inc., 1939. Print.

- Oles, James. "For Business or for Pleasure: Exhibiting Mexican Folk Art, 1820-1930." *Casa Mañana: The Morrow Collection of Mexican Popular Arts*. Ed. Susan Danly. Amherst: Mead Art Museum, 2002. 11-29. Print.
- Ospina, Adriana. "Institutional Structure (OAS) and Historiography of the Visual Arts Section and Its Activities." Paper presented at the College Art Association Conference, February 12, 2014, Chicago. Unpublished.
- Pan American Union. "Recent Exhibits of Latin American Art in the United States." *Bulletin of the Pan American Union* (March 1940): 136-146. Print.
- Paquette, Cathleen. "Public Duties, Private Interests: Mexican Art at New York's Museum of Modern Art, 1929-1954." Diss. University of California, Santa Barbara, 2002. Print.
- Pike, Frederick. *FDR's Good Neighbor Policy: Sixty Years of Generally Gentle Chaos*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. Print.
- Platt, Susan Noyes. *Art and Politics in the 1930s: Modernism, Marxism, Americanism, A History of Cultural Activism During the Depression Years*. New York: Midmarch Arts Press, 1999. Print.
- "Present Minister to Bolivia, Dr. R. G. Caldwell, Appointed Dean of Humanities Division." *The Tech* 59.3 (February 14, 1939): 1, 4. Web. 22 Aug. 2013. <http://tech.mit.edu/V59/PDF/N3.pdf>.
- The Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals, Promulgated Pursuant to the Proclamation of July 17, 1941*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941. Print.
- R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., Herald Square, New York. *Macy's Latin American Fair*. Brochure. New York: R. H. Macy & Co., 1942. Print.
- Ramírez, Mari Carmen. "Brokering Identities: Art Curators and the Politics of Cultural Representation." *Thinking about Exhibitions*. Ed. Reesa Grenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne. London: Routledge, 1996. 21-36. Print.
- Reich, Cary. *The Life of Nelson A. Rockefeller: Worlds to Conquer 1908-1958*. New York: Doubleday, 1996. Print.

- Reiser, Oliver L. and Blodwen Davies. *Planetary Democracy: An Introduction to Scientific Humanism and Applied Semantics*. New York: Creative Ace Press, Inc., 1944. Print.
- Ritzer, George. *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2000. Print.
- Rivas, Darlene. *Missionary Capitalist: Rockefeller in Venezuela*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002. Print.
- Rockefeller, Stephen C. "John Dewey, Spiritual Democracy, and the Human Future." *Revisioning Philosophy*. Ed. James A. Ogilvy. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992. 165-190. Print.
- Rockefeller, Sr., John D. *Random Reminiscences of Men and Events*. New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1909. Print.
- Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Culture*. London: Sage Publications, 1992. Print.
- . "Globalization and Cultural Analysis." In David Held and Anthony McGrew, *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*. Ed. David Held and Anthony McGrew. London: Polity Press, 2007. Print.
- Rodó, José Enrique. *Ariel*. Translated with an Introductory Essay by F. J. Stimson, Late United States Ambassador to Argentina. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company/Riverside Press, 1922. Print.
- Roob, Rona. "Alfred H. Barr, Jr.: A Chronicle of the Years 1902-1929." *The New Criterion* special summer issue, 1987: 1-19. Print.
- Rosenberg, Emily. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982. Print.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 3 September 2012. <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14473>>.
- . Second Fireside Chat, May 7, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 30 September 2012. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14703>
- . "Fireside Chat," June 28, 1934. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley,

- The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 19 September 2012.  
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14703>
- . "Fireside chat (Recovery Program)," July 24, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 30 September 2012. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14488>
- . "Fireside Chat." October 22, 1933. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 30 September 2012.  
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14537>
- . "Fireside Chat," September 30, 1934. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 19 September 2012.  
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14759>
- . "Fireside Chat," April 28, 1935. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Accessed 19 September 2012.  
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=15046>.
- . "Address delivered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a nation-wide broadcast which marked the opening of the Museum's new building on May 8, 1939." Print.
- . "Fireside Chat No. 16." [Arsenal of Democracy]. December 29, 1940. Web. 13 September 2012.  
 <<http://xroads.virginia.edu/~1930s2/time/1940/fdrsena.html>>.
- Rothschild, Lincoln. "The American Artists' Congress." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1975. 250-252. Print.
- Rowland, Donald W. *History of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Historical Reports on War Administration*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1947. Print.
- Saab, Joan A. *For the Millions: American Art and Culture Between the Wars*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004. Print.
- Sadlier, Darlene J. *Americans All: Good Neighbor Cultural Diplomacy in World War II*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012. Print.
- Saunders, Francis Stonor. *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and*



- Letters*. New York: New Press, 2000. Print.
- Scandura, Jani and Michael Thurston, eds. *Modernism Inc.: Body, Memory, Capital*. New York: New York University Press, 2001. Print.
- Sealander, Judith. *Private Wealth and Public life: Foundation Philanthropy and the Reshaping of American Social Policy from the Progressive Era to the New Deal*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Print.
- Siber, William L. "Why did FDR's Banking Holiday Succeed?" *Economic Policy Review* 15.1 (July 2009). Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Accessed 3 March 2012.  
<<http://www.newyorkfed.org/research/epr/09v15n1/0907silb.html>>
- Shapiro, Samuel, ed. *Cultural Factors in Inter-American Relations*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968. Print.
- Smith, David. "Modern Sculpture and Society." *Art for the Millions, Essays from the 1930s by Artists and Administrators of the WPA Federal Art Project*. Ed. Francis V. O'Connor. Boston: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1973. 90-92. Print.
- Storr, Robert. "No Joy in Mudville: Greenberg's Modernism Then and Now." In *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High & Low*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1990: 161-190. Print.
- Taylor, David A. "What's the Deal about New Deal Art?" *Smithsonian.com*, May 19, 2009. <<http://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/Whats-the-Deal-about-New-Deal-Art-.html>>.
- Tomlinson, John. *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991. Print.
- . *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity, 1999. Print.
- Varnadoe, Kirk. "The Evolving Torpedo: Changing Ideas of the Collection of Painting and Sculpture of The Museum of Modern Art." *The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: Continuity and Change*. Studies in Modern Art Series, No. 5. New York, MoMA, 1995. 12-73. Print.
- Vernon, Raymond. *Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises*. New York: Basic Books, 1971. Print.

- Walsh, Kenneth. "The First 100 Days: Franklin Delano Roosevelt Pioneered the 100-Day Concept." U.S. News and World Report, Feb 22, 2009.  
<http://www.usnews.com/news/history/articles/2009/02/12/the-first-100-days-franklin-roosevelt-pioneered-the-100-day-concept>
- Weber, Nicholas Fox. *Patron Saints: Five Rebels Who Opened America to a New Art, 1928-1943*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995. Print.
- Wellen, Michael Gordon. "Pan American Dreams: Art, Politics, and Museum-Making at the OAS, 1948-1976." Diss. University of Texas at Austin, 2012.
- Werner, Paul. *Museum, Inc: Inside the Global Art World*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2005. Print.
- Whitaker, Arthur P. *The Western Hemisphere Idea: Its Rise and Decline*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1954. Print.
- Whiting, Cécile. *Antifascism in American Art*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Wilder, Elizabeth, ed. *Studies in Latin American Art: Proceedings of a Conference Held in the Museum of Modern Art New York, 28-31 May 1945*. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies, 1949. Print.
- Wilk, Christopher. Ed. *Modernism: Designing a New World 1914-1939*. Exh. cat. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2006. Print.
- "William Benton." *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2013. Web. 23 Aug. 2013.  
 <<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/61209/William-Benton>>.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Long Revolution*. Harmandsworth, England: Penguin, 1961. Print.
- Wood, Bryce. *The Making of the Good Neighbor Policy*. New York: Columbia University, 1961. Print.
- . *The Dismantling of the Good Neighbor Policy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985. Print.

## Oral Histories

Barr, Margaret Scolari. Oral history interview with Margaret Scolari Barr concerning Alfred H. Barr, 1974 Feb. 22-May 13, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Catlin, Stanton Loomis. Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. 1989, July 1-September 14, 1989. Conducted by Francis V. O'Connor for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. Transcription.  
<http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-stanton-l-catlin-5454> Accessed 10 December 2013.

D'Harnoncourt, René, Columbia Oral History, Carnegie Corporation, Part I. Series VI. Columbia University, New York.

Morley, Grace McCann, Oral history with Suzanne Riess, UC Berkeley, 1960 (electronic).

Warburg, Edward M.M. Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

### **Archival Collections**

Leslie Judd Ahlander Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington, DC.

Alfred H. Barr Jr. Papers, Archives of American Art (on microfilm, loaned from MoMA), Washington, DC.

William Benton Papers, University of Chicago Special Collections, Chicago, IL.

Stanton Catlin Papers, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas Libraries, Austin, TX.

José Gómez Sicre Papers, AMA | Art Museum of the Americas, General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, Washington, DC.

José Gómez Sicre Papers, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas Library, Austin, TX.

Lincoln Kirstein Papers, Latin American Art Notes, The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York, NY.

Early Museum History. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York, NY.

Nelson Rockefeller Papers, The Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs Files, National Archives, College Park, MD.

Smithsonian Institution Archives. Office of the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts.

U.S. Department of State Files, National Archives, College Park, MD.

## BIOGRAPHY

Olga Ulloa Herrera received a Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree and a Master of Arts in Art History from Louisiana State University. She has worked at the Smithsonian American Art Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, the University of Notre Dame, and is currently affiliated with the University of Illinois at Chicago as Director of the Washington DC Office of the Inter-University Program for Latino Research (IUPLR). Olga is the principal investigator of the Washington DC Documents Recovery Project (2012-2015), part of the *Documents of 20th-Century Latin American and Latino Art: A Digital Archive and Publications Project* at the International Center for the Arts of the Americas in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. She has published essays and reports on Latin American and Latino art and is the author of *Toward the Preservation of a Heritage: Latin American and Latino Art in the Midwestern United States* (University of Notre Dame, 2008). She is a contributor to *Las villas olvidadas: Hualque, Rere, Florida, Yumbel y Copiulemu* edited by Andrés Muñoz Pedreros (Valdivia, Chile: CEA Ediciones, 2011).