

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

New York City College of Technology

2018

The Cultural Cold War and the New Women of Power. Making a Case based on the Fulbright and Ford Foundations in Greece

Despina Lalaki

CUNY New York City College of Technology

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ny_pubs/486

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

The Cultural Cold War and the New Women of Power. Making a Case based on the Fulbright and Ford Foundations in Greece

Despina Lalaki

The Author / L'auteur

Despina Lalaki is a historical sociologist and she teaches at the City University of New York, CUNY. She has published in peer-reviewed journals including *The Journal of Historical Sociology* and *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies* and various media such as *Al Jazeera*, *Boston Occupier*, *New Politics Magazine* and *Marginalia – Σημειώσεις στο Περιθώριο*.

Abstract

When in the 1950s C. Wright Mills was writing about the emergence of the new power elites he paid no attention to the presence of women in its midsts. He was not entirely mistaken. Yet there is a particular intertwining of the ideologies of leadership and masculinity which serves to maintain the status quo, the privilege of an elite and perpetuate preconceptions about political agency and gender. In an attempt to go beyond available models and predominantly masculine images of the postwar America the present article accounts for women's role in the postwar American efforts for cultural hegemony. It focuses on the cases of the American archaeologist Alison Frantz and Ekaterini Myrivili, a Greek cultural administrator and their work with the Fulbright Foundation and Ford Foundation respectively. This article seeks to stress women's role as professionals and members of status groups with great cultural capital responsible for the production and distribution of high-culture integral to the American Cold War efforts. Furthermore, the article contributes to the growing literature on the cultural Cold War in Greece.

Keywords: Cultural Cold War ; Gender ; Alison Frantz ; Ekaterini Myrivili ; Fulbright Foundation ; Ford Foundation.

Résumé

Lorsque C. Wright Mills écrit à propos de l'émergence de nouvelles élites de pouvoir dans les années 1950, il n'accorde aucune attention à la présence de femmes en son sein. Il n'a pas complètement tort. L'imbrication particulière des idéologies de *leadership* et de masculinité entretiennent le *statu quo* et perpétuent les préjugés sur l'action politique et le sexe. Afin d'aller au-delà des modèles disponibles et des images principalement masculines de l'Amérique d'après-guerre, cet article décrit le rôle des femmes dans les tentatives américaines d'après-guerre d'établir une hégémonie culturelle. Il examine le cas de l'archéologue américaine Alison Frantz et de l'administratrice grecque Ekaterini Myrivili, et sur leur travail pour la Fondation Fulbright pour la première et pour la Fondation Ford pour la seconde. Cet article entend mettre l'accent sur le rôle des femmes à la fois en



Despina Lalaki, « The Cultural Cold War and the New Woman of Power. Making a Case based on the Fulbright and Ford Foundation in Greece », *Histoire@Politique*, n° 35, mai-août 2018 [en ligne : www.histoire-politique.fr].

tant que professionnelles mais également comme membres de groupes au capital culturel important servant à la production et à la distribution de la culture américaine pendant la guerre froide. Par ailleurs, l'article entend contribuer à l'essor de la recherche sur la guerre froide culturelle en Grèce.

Mots clés : guerre froide culturelle ; genre ; Alison Frantz ; Ekaterini Myrivili ; Fondation Fulbright ; Fondation Ford.

Pour citer cet article : Despina Lalaki, « The Cultural Cold War and the New Woman of Power. Making a Case based on the Fulbright and Ford Foundations in Greece », *Histoire@Politique*, n° 35, mai-août 2018 [en ligne : www.histoire-politique.fr].

*“The higher reaches of the core class structure are overwhelmingly inhabited by males. It is the culture-production sector, above all, that connects women with the higher reaches of the stratification system”.*¹

War is understood as the quintessential manifestation of aggression and masculinity, qualities also perceived as rather complementary if not mutually constitutive. Men wage wars and fight battles. They build up military might on their way to grasping political power. Women take up the role of healers and peacemakers. They forge community togetherness and keep the national collective hearth warm. The well-entrenched stereotype got a new lease on life during the Cold War era. The political culture of the long 1950s put a new premium on masculine toughness while a new consumer domesticity that found expression in the image of the happy housewife – in essence an advertiser’s dummy² – became a “lipsticked symbol(s) of the superiority of American capitalism.”³

Gender relations and gender stereotypes have always been at the heart of cultural constructions of social and political identities and collectivities; they are central to most representations of conflict and contestation. During this period the gendered language of the Cold War reflected the radical social and cultural changes that the country was undergoing. The emergence of a mass society posed new dangers to male subjectivity demanding new qualities and skills often identified as unmanly and effeminate. Furthermore, changing racial and sexual relations challenged established ideals of manhood associated with white male dominance.⁴ Domestic and international politics were understood in gendered terms; a soft position towards domestic or international communism was equated with the feminisation and weakening of America while on the other side, a firm stance against communism – a radical right agenda in which liberals would also indulge – was the only guarantee against American emasculation. The sexually laden political thought and rhetoric of the Cold War – of masculine prowess and male belligerence, on the one side and feminine feebleness and fragility on the other – while reflecting a series of new political and cultural anxieties it has further obfuscated our view regarding women’s changing socio-cultural and economic position in the postwar years.

¹ Randall Collins, “Women and Production of Status Cultures,” in Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier (eds.), *Cultivating Difference. Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 213-231, 228.

² Eugenia Kaledin, *American Women in the 1950s: Mothers and More* (Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1993).

³ Helen Laville, *Cold War Women. The International Activities of American Women’s Organisations* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 4.

⁴ K.A. Cuordileone, “Politics in an Age of Anxiety”: Cold War Political Culture and the Crisis in American Masculinity, 1949-1960”, *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (Sep. 2000), p. 515-545. For a more detailed account see K.A. Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

In direct relation to the subject of this article, a growing number of studies document the massive influx of women into paid work following the end of the Second World War as well as their growing participation in the politics of the time. Unlike the media populated images of postwar suburban white middle-class blissfulness coupled with a cult of domesticity and true womanhood – images further corroborated by scholarly historical accounts – women's position in the postwar years and during the Cold War era is more complex and multidimensional. At a time when gender relations were undergoing some significant transformations it was merely nostalgia and longing for stability, tradition and conventional sexual relationships and division of labor that informed advertisement and media representations at large.

To this day the respective mediated images are firmly imprinted in our collective imagination complicating our efforts to understand the ways in which women became involved in the postwar efforts to respond to the political demands of the Cold War – of the cultural Cold War more specifically – and reshape the world according to the American image. For if wars are traditionally fought by men, in the cultural wars waged by the United States in the 1950s and 60s – on the grass roots level as well as on upper administrative levels of state or private organizations and institutions – women took up increasingly important roles.⁵ Women are disproportionately involved in the culture-production sector today. I argue therefore that it is important to trace that phenomenon back in the Cold War era and in the process challenge the emerging profile of the cultural cold warrior as another patriarchal structure.

Intellectuals, status groups and professionals with great cultural capital were the primary agents responsible for waging America's cultural Cold Wars by way of developing, disseminating and transmitting primarily products of high culture since these were understood to be free of politics and divorced from any didactic, moral or utilitarian functions.⁶ The objective of educational and cultural exchange programs was to challenge the Soviet bloc at a level on which it was understood to be most vulnerable – and in which the USA still had to prove itself – while targeting in the process mainly the intellectual elites.⁷

Studies on the subject focusing on policy-making have largely concentrated on male high profile intellectuals and administrators with little, if any, consideration for women who for the most part were responsible for the execution and implementation of policies on the ground. Systematic data on the subject are lacking. On the other side, the fields of education and culture as well as the sectors of formal cultural production and distribution traditionally have been more open to women, especially

⁵ A number of revisionist studies have challenged the image of domesticity and postwar American conservatism. See for instance, Joanne Meyerowitz (ed.), *Not June Cleaver. Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994) and Daniel Horowitz, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique: The American Left, the Cold War, and Modern Feminism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998).

⁶ Giles Scott-Smith. *The Politics of Apolitical Culture. The Congress of Cultural Freedom, the CIA and Post-War American Hegemony* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

⁷ Against a deep-seated fear of the masses amongst Europe's political, economic and intellectual elites the idea was, as Volker R. Berghahn argues in his book *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) to first sway intellectuals who would eventually draw in the rest of society.

women of the upper and middle classes for these were fields deemed more amenable and fitting to their nurturing and sensitive nature. I maintain that if we strain to look beyond the symbolic politics of the Cold War era articulated in gendered terms we may be able to identify women who played important roles in winning hearts and minds for the American polity. If traditionally the fields of culture and education have been more receptive and open to the entrance of women, it should come as no surprise if we come across some influential females so far largely neglected by the literature on the cultural Cold War. Some of the most prominent and powerful American philanthropic, cultural and educational institutions have been from early on staffed largely with women who might have worked away from the limelight without always, however, occupying the lower administrative levels. I maintain that it may be the case that some of these individuals were able to influence and steer policy in ways that have gone unnoticed.

Women's role as mothers and wives and grassroots Cold War organizers responsible for the transmission of traditional customs, mores and foundational ideas for the American postwar cultural offensive, has been receiving some long overdue attention.⁸ However, beyond the level of what we could identify as popular and mundane culture, women's role in the development and diffusion of high culture – cultural products broadly understood as of the highest aesthetic value most often identified with the upper classes or the status classes of a collectivity – is largely neglected. Based on two case studies and while expanding on a modestly growing literature on the subject this article seeks to better understand the ways and the terms in which women contributed to the postwar American cultural offensive promoting liberal democracy by ways of educational exchanges and various cultural programs between Europe and the United States. Embedded in trans-Atlantic networks of cultural and social elites which carried out the cultural wars⁹ – the publication of prestigious magazines, the organization of world class art exhibitions, high-profile international conferences, concerts and public performances, for instance, and the long-term program and institutional development at large –, women did not merely perform clerical work occupying the “front stage,” in Goffman's terms, of various programs and organizations. Women's involvement was not limited to the role of “first impressions management,” as Randall Collins explains the role of secretaries and other white-collar working-class female clerical workers who populated the American work force in the post war era.¹⁰ Middle and upper-middle class highly educated women like the two I discuss in this article – the

⁸ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015); Mary C. Brennan, *Wives, Mothers, and the Red Menace: Conservative Women and the Crusade against Communism* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2008); Michelle M. Nickerson, *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

⁹ On the partnership between the American government and private institutions see for instance, Interjeet Parmar, “Conceptualizing the State-Private Network,” in Helen Laville and Hugh Wilford (eds.), *The US Government, Citizen Groups and the Cold War: The State-Private Network*, London and (New York: Routledge, 2006); Frances Stonor Sanders, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York, The New Press, 2013); Giles Scott-Smith, *Western Anti-Communism and the Interloc Network: Cold War International* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

¹⁰ R. Collins, 1992.

American archaeologist Alison Frantz and Ekaterini Myrivili, a Greek upper-lever cultural administrator – were directly involved in the development and management of programs and institutions with long-lasting effects. The Fulbright Foundation in Greece, established in 1948 and the management of a Ford Foundation program in support of leftist artists and intellectuals during the Junta, largely the work of Frantz and Myrivili respectively, were clearly inscribed in the American cultural Cold War agenda and, as I suggest, have had an impact on the relationship between Greece and the United States.

In the present article I focus on the work of Alison Frantz and Ekaterini Myrivili not in order to trace any gender-specific ways in which they carried their influential work but to stress, depending on their professional and personal trajectories, the ways in which they swayed and directed the institutions and programs they built. Whilst this study examines only a small fragment of the long, complex and diverse professional life of the two individuals in discussion the choice of the particular case studies, of both the Fulbright and Ford Foundations is made on the basis of their importance for the post war intercultural relations between Greece and the United States. Other than pointing to the influential institutional work of female cultural workers during the Cold War era and challenging the patriarchal portrait of the cultural cold warrior with this article I wish to further contribute to the growing literature on the Cold War cultural battles which America waged in Greece.¹¹ Politics is always mediated by systems of cultural representation. However, it is only recently that we have started paying attention to the ways the political and economic relationship between the two states was culturally mediated during a crucial period for the United States when the need to symbolically legitimize itself as a civilizing force and preserver of the West's liberal democratic traditions was most urgent.

If Stalin Could Have Gone to Robert College or Columbia...

The urgency was felt most acutely in Greece where following the war the threat of a communist takeover was very real. In 1948 the Democratic Army of Greece, the military branch of the Greek Communist Party (KKE) had reached the height of its power and the outcome of the raging civil war between the National Liberation Front (EAM), effectively led by KKE, and the British supported government that had ensued from the KKE-boycotted March 1946 elections still hung on a shoestring. On

¹¹ See for instance Stratis Bournazos, *Ο Πολιτισμικός Ψυχρός Πόλεμος και Congress for Cultural Freedom στην Ελλάδα* (The Cultural Cold War and the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Greece) (Athens: Antipodes, [Forthcoming]); Zinovia Lialiouti, "American Cultural Diplomacy in Greece, 1953-1968", *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (2017), p. 229-250; Despina Papadimitriou, «Το αίτημα της ειρήνης και οι προβληματισμοί των διανοούμενων: Από το Σχέδιο Μάρσαλ στη σύγκληση του Συνεδρίου για την Ελευθερία στην Κουλτούρα, 1947-1952» (The call for peace and intellectuals' scepticism: From Marshall Plan to the convening of the Congress for Cultural Freedom), in Thanasis D. Sfikas (ed.), *Το Σχέδιο Μάρσαλ. Ανασυγκρότηση και Διαίρεση στην Ευρώπη* (The Marshall Plan: Reconstruction and Division in Europe) (Athens: Pataki, 2011), p. 280-294; Ioannis Stefanidis, "Telling America's Story": US Propaganda Operations and Greek Public Reactions", *Journal of Hellenic Diaspora*, Vol. 30, No.1 (2004), p. 39-95.

August 24, 1946 Alison Frantz, previously member of the Allied Mission for Observing Greek Elections (AMFOGE) wrote to her mother: “The plebiscite is scheduled for a week from today. No one has any illusions about the outcome. It will probably be technically honest, in that the King won’t get 107% of the votes as he did last time, but only the very brave republicans will dare to vote. I’m glad I wasn’t involved in AMFOGE II.”¹² The restitution of the monarchy, an issue that had been polarizing Greek society since the early 1920s and was for years bringing any negotiations between the more moderate political forces to a standstill was forced upon the Greeks by Churchill’s myopic and colonial nostalgic vision. Until then the American government would watch from the sidelines.¹³ The subsequent intervention, however, following Truman’s proclamations was decisive. Fearing that the expansion of the Soviets’ influence in Greece would mean the fall of the whole Middle East, American advisors and administrators brought the whole Greek state apparatus under their direct control, openly maneuvered the Greek government, gave almost absolute control to the military, separating it from the political authority, and tolerated mass executions and the open persecution of the Left by a government which, in the American media, was often compared with the Nazis.¹⁴

The cultural front of the Cold War opened concurrently, if not before the beginning of the first proxy war of the era in Greece. As American embassies and legations around the world expanded their information and cultural activities creating positions of press and cultural attachés – a continuation of the wartime “government-to-people” propaganda programs –, Alison Frantz had taken up her position as Cultural Attaché at the embassy in Athens already in 1946. Her war experience as Junior Social Science Analyst for the Foreign Nationalities Branch (FNB) of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), a branch that was following European and Mediterranean ethnic groups living in the United States, as well as her intimate knowledge of the country as a long time affiliate of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA) would serve her well.¹⁵ The post was previously held for a brief year by Carl Blegen, one of the most eminent archaeologists of the Greek Bronze Age and Frantz’s supervisor at the FNB in Washington D.C. As the first unofficial Executive Director of the Fulbright Foundation in Greece Frantz, in close collaboration with her ASCSA colleagues, would be instrumental in capitalizing on the Fulbright Program in order to implement the Foundation’s objectives in Greece while also serving the School’s best interests.

¹² Alison Frantz Papers (CO772), Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections Princeton University Library. Correspondence, Box 8, Folder 10.

¹³ Lawrence S. Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece, 1943–1949: A Study in Counterrevolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).

¹⁴ Howard Jones, “A New Kind of War”: America’s Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Dennis Merrill, “The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity”, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No.1 (2006), p. 27-37; Amikam Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946–1949”, *Journal of Contemporary History* vol. 25, No. 4 (1990), p. 489-522. Foreign Ministry of the Hellenic Republic of Greece, *Η Ελλάδα στο Μεταίχμιο Ενός Νέου Κόσμου. Ψυχρός Πόλεμος – Δόγμα Truman – Σχέδιο Marshall*. (Greece on the Verge of a New World. Cold War: Truman Doctrine – Marshall Plan), Athens, Kastanioti, 2002.

¹⁵ Despina Lalaki, “Soldiers of Science – Agents of Culture: American Archaeologists in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (2013), p. 179-202.

The Agreement between the two states establishing the United States Educational Foundation in Greece (USEFG) under the provisions of Public Law 584 (the Fulbright Act), 79th Congress, was signed on April 23, 1948. After the Philippines Greece was the second country to sign such an agreement.¹⁶ The earlier Fulbright Act signed into law by Truman in August 1946 provided that surplus war equipment scattered around the world, which was valued at more than \$100 million, would secure the funds for the program. The funds generated overseas by the sale of the military surpluses would remain in the country of origin as a permanent endowment for bilateral exchanges, to be administered bi-nationally. And while it has been argued that the program's limits were solely determined by the pressures of the war surplus disposals, the Greek case stood out, for the Foundation was established in the midsts of a civil war on the one side of which stood a communist party.

“It [was] the responsibility of Americans to take the lead in the creation of a peaceful world,”¹⁷ Senator J. William Fulbright had told his audience at the College of William and Mary in 1946, assuming for the United States the leadership of western Christian civilization, if not of the world. Education and culture were understood as central in the world peace process. Confident in the power of the American education and culture at large Fulbright was once recorded saying that he had often thought “what a fine thing it would be if Mr Stalin or Mr Molotov could have gone to Robert College, or Columbia, in their youth.”¹⁸ Convinced about the attractions of acculturation in American values and ideas he further stressed the overlap of American interests and international disinterested co-operation. It became clear from early on, however, that the program was designed to implement the general aims of US foreign policy while avoiding “appearances of cultural imperialism.”¹⁹

The USEFG seven member board of directors set in place by August 1948 consisted of only two Greeks and five Americans.²⁰ United States negotiators had been instructed to reach agreements that would secure American majorities in the Foundation's boards and to keep them free from foreign educational control.²¹ The disproportionate representation of Americans on the board would change with an

¹⁶ The information is based on the Annual Report of 1982-3 available at ASCSA Archives, Administrative Records, Box 705/4, Folder 3. Somewhat of a different account is offered by the State Department: “It was one thing to have the Act on the books, quite another to put it on the rails. There were delays in negotiating executive agreements with other governments to set aside funds for the exchanges. It was more than a year before the first agreement, with China, was concluded, and after two years only four (with Burma, the Philippines, and Greece added) had been negotiated.” <https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright/history/early-years> [last accessed 1/20/2018].

¹⁷ Sam Lebovic, “From War Junk to Educational Exchange: The World War II Origins of the Fulbright Program and the Foundations of American Cultural Globalism, 1945-1950.” *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (2013), p. 280-312, 293.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 310.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 296.

²⁰ The first board consisted of Henry F. Grady, the American ambassador; Karl L. Rankin as chairman and counselor of the embassy; Alison M. Frantz, cultural attaché and long-time affiliate of the ASCSA; Dr. Bert Hodge Hill, director emeritus of the ASCSA; Colonel Daniel F. Wright of the Rockefeller Foundation and the World Health Organization; George Oikonomos, professor of the University of Athens; and Vassilios Krimbas, professor of the Superior School of Agriculture in Athens.

²¹ Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas: US Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 141.

amendment in 1951, when a ratio of 5 Americans to 4 Greeks was established, all appointed for one year but eligible for reappointment annually for an indefinite number of years.²² Ever since the Director of the ASCSA has always had a position on the USEFG board.

The makeup of the USEFG board offers an indication about its early intimate relation with the ASCSA, which would extend its help by making recommendations and to a great degree shaping the program of the Foundation. The first postwar decade was among the most prolific periods for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA). Founded in 1881 by a consortium of nine American universities and the support of leading businessmen the school was the first American overseas center designed to promote the study of Greek literature, the arts and antiquity²³. To this day it remains a privately funded, non-profit educational institution which over the years has also served as an American cultural hub in Greece and central nod in a complex network of inter-national political, economic and cultural relations between Greece and the United States. Ideally situated, if not strategically placed, the school sought every opportunity to capitalize on the political and economic attention that Greece was receiving at the end of the war and to strengthen its institutional position. The advice and opinion of some of its most prominent members, including Alison Frantz, a staff member of the Agora excavations since 1937, was actively sought by American governmental and private institutions in their efforts to re-engineer Greek society.²⁴

In 1948, Blegen was invited by Gordon T. Bowles of the Associated Research Council, Committee on International Exchange of Persons – responsible for the appointment of researchers, professors, lecturers and scholars in general at the post-doctoral level – to provide his insights on the educational environment of Greece and the place of the existing American institutions. Blegen identifying the challenges as well as the opportunities that the country had to offer explained all the ways the Greek educational system was tied to the Greek Ministry of Education, and the obstacles that this system presented for adding any instructors from the United States at the primary and secondary levels, at least. He emphasized that “at the moment... it is only at the university level that American teaching personnel can easily and without long negotiations be introduced into Greek institutions.”²⁵ He recommended that a chair of American History, Life and Culture, which had been established by law at the University of Athens a few years before, could be filled without many difficulties, not necessarily by a full professor.²⁶

²² ASCSA Archives, Administrative Records, Box 705/1, Folder 10.

²³ For the history of the School see Louis E. Lord, *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882–1942* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947) and Lucy Shoe Meritt, *History of the American School of Classical Studies 1939–1980* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1984).

²⁴ Despina Lalaki, “On the Social Construction of Hellenism. Cold War Narratives of Modernity, Development and Democracy for Greece.” *The Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 2012, p. 552-577.

²⁵ ASCSA Archives, Administrative Records, Box 705/1, Folder 1.

²⁶ See Natalia Vogeikoff-Brogan, “The Unsung Pioneers. The Contribution of the American School of Classical Studies,” in *60 Years in Greece. The Fulbright Foundation* (Publication prepared by USEFG for its 60th anniversary, 2008).

With regard to research Blegen identified the field of classical studies as the only one available, and he strongly recommended the ASCSA as the single serious research institution available in Greece at the time, “the only logical sponsoring institution.” While he identified the School of Liberal Arts in the University of Athens as another potential venue, Blegen was quick to point out that “the lecture courses are largely theoretical, library and other facilities are sadly inadequate and the language problem constitutes a difficult hurdle.”²⁷ Narrowing down the available opportunities for research in Greece, Blegen emphasized the excavation of the Athenian Agora, and recommended all eight archaeologists of the Agora staff who had applied for USEFG funding during the first year of Fulbright operations in Greece.

Blegen’s evaluations and comments, which were directly reproduced in the 1949 Annual Report of the USEFG were actually prepared by Alison Frantz.²⁸ While in effect the Executive Director of the Foundation at the time Frantz appeared to occupy the rather ungarnished backstage of the institutions she was affiliated with, most often behind the camera not in front of it. Mary Alison Frantz of New Jersey, educated at Smith College and Columbia University, where she received her doctorate with a dissertation on Byzantine art, would actually have a long career as “one of the foremost archaeological photographers of Greek sites and antiquities.”²⁹ She worked from 1939 until 1964 for the ASCSA and the Athenian Agora while she also collaborated with influential scholars and eminent art historians like Bernard Ashmole, Gisela Richter, and Martin Robertson photographing some of the most world-known art and architecture and shaping our vision of Greek antiquity. Frantz was awarded the Smith College Medal in 1967 and elected in the American Philosophical Society in 1973 yet her work on late antiquity and the study of the Byzantine and post-Byzantine materials of the Agora excavation, “the grubby period,”³⁰ as was known amongst the Agora staff, would never bring her the accolades that classicists colleagues and even prehistorians would receive. Accounting, however, for Alison Frantz’s career one should go beyond her contributions as a professional either in archaeology or photography. As I have argued elsewhere it is necessary to transcend the assumed complete separation of political and intellectual authority and direct our attention to the various ways that knowledge is employed and the various publics it serves.³¹ A fuller account of Frantz’s life work should credit and evaluate her contributions as what we could call “policy archaeologist,” institution-builder, and cultural expert at large.

Frantz’s report reached the State Department by way of Harold B. Minor, Chargé d’Affaires to the Secretary of the State Department and would have a lasting effect greatly benefiting the ASCSA and further conditioning the profile of the American applicants who would mostly come to Greece to study classics and archaeology. On 1 October 1948, Minor would write to the Secretary of the State Department that “language difficulties, lack of suitable library facilities and other handicaps make

²⁷ ASCSA Archives, Administrative Records, Box 705/1, Folder 1.

²⁸ ASCSA Archives, Personal Papers, Bert Hodge Hill Papers, Box 17, Folder 1.

²⁹ Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, “Portrait of a Purist,” *Archaeology*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (January/February 1995), p. 58-64.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

³¹ Lalaki, 2013.

quite inadvisable the enrollment of any United States students to Greek Universities.”³² In the following years, this line of argument developed into an unofficial policy which would favor the ASCSA tremendously, almost bypassing the Greek institutions of higher education. Between 1949 and 1960 the American School would receive 68 out of the 83 Fulbright grantees in the graduate student category and 27 out of the 40 in the category of the research scholars.³³

Until 1952 USEFG sponsored two more categories, one for lecturers assigned to Greek universities and one for teachers assigned to American-sponsored schools. In 1953 the foundation added another category for teachers in Greek secondary schools, mostly for teaching English language. The processing of American grantees fell primarily to the Cultural Attaché, and later on the Executive Officer, who reviewed all applications from the United States before transmitting them to the sponsoring schools.

These first years of the USEFG’s structural organization and policy development were marked by significant opposition and long negotiation processes through which the ASCSA made every effort to draw the greatest benefits while also establishing itself in a position of influence. In this still fluid organizational environment the ASCSA would contest, circumvent or bend rules and policies of the Fulbright Program to meet its interests and fulfill its needs in research staff. Some of the issues over which the ASCSA would collide with the Board of Foreign Scholarships (BFS)³⁴ would be the election criteria, the issue of the renewal of scholarships, the project-oriented appointments, and the issue of authority on final decisions in the selection process.

Academic excellence paired with high scientific standards, over any other consideration, was one of the primary concerns as well as a source of pride for the School. It would also constitute, however, one of the strongest arguments every time it was called upon to exercise its institutional muscle. While the School recognized the enormous financial gain, it often lamented the fact that potential Fulbright funds played a significant role in its budget since it was seen as interfering with the selection process and compromising its high standards. The ASCSA would not refrain from expressing distress at not being permitted more direct involvement in the selection process, especially after Alison Frantz left her positions at the embassy and USEFG in November 1949, dealing a serious blow to the interests of the School.

It was not unexpected that Greece would draw a great number of applications in the field of classical studies, nor was it a surprise that the ASCSA attracted many American students. However, this was not an all-natural process, and the Fulbright in Athens as well as the American School played a role in this. The students who applied for classical studies, history or archaeology in Greece did not necessarily identify the institute with which they wished to study. It was then up to the USEFG to assign each student to the school where they could be better served, and for the short period that

³² Vogeikoff-Brogan, 2008.

³³ These numbers are based on the reports available at the ASCSA Archives, Administrative Records, Box 705/1, Folder 10.

³⁴ The Board of Foreign Scholarships (BFS) is a twelve member Board appointed by the President of the United States and is responsible for establishing worldwide policies and procedures for the Fulbright Program.

Alison Frantz was employed at the Foundation the decision was rather obvious. Upon the end of her appointment and the years that followed, the Director of the ASCSA, always on the board of the Fulbright in Greece, used all his persuasive power to gather the greatest number of candidates. In the spring of 1950, John Caskey succinctly explained the school's line of argument:

“I should not want to give the impression that the School was making an undue effort to gather all Fulbright scholars under its wing. It seems to me probable, however, that we could offer the necessary sponsorship and technical facilities more easily than could the University of Athens or other institutions in Greece³⁵.”

The line of argument that placed the American School in an advantageous position, namely its academic excellence and its fine libraries and research facilities, had a long life and multiple applications. It served to keep American students of archaeology away from the Greek educational institutions and the Greek students out of the American ones – a trend further accentuated by the preference for British and German institutions which had a long tradition in Greek antiquity studies. Provided that the archaeology departments of the Greek universities did not offer PhD degrees, until at least the mid-1980s, Greek students were not considered appropriately prepared to compete for a Fulbright scholarship, since according to the ASCSA, as well as the directives of the BFS,³⁶ some preparation on the graduate level was necessary. However, what was here understood as a universal standard of excellence actually neglected to take into consideration the substantial differences between the American and the Greek systems of higher education – the later offering higher specialization on the undergraduate level.

Surveys conducted in 1982-1983 show that the number of Greek students studying in the U.S. was the second highest among Western European countries, ranking slightly behind Great Britain and the majority, according to another survey conducted in the mid-1980s, was studying engineering, a trend that was rather common across European countries at the time. By the mid-1980s the imbalance between the Greek applicants to American universities, mostly for engineering and other 'hard' sciences against those who applied in the social sciences and the humanities was so pronounced that in 1986-1987 BFS threatened not to approve the proposed panel unless the imbalance was corrected³⁷. That year, four qualified applicants were found to be sent for graduate studies in archaeology in the U.S³⁸.

³⁵ ASCSA Archives, Administrative Record, Box 705/1, Folder 2. Letter from John Caskey to Patricia M. Byrne, Acting Administrative Officer, USEFG, dated April 10, 1950.

³⁶ Lebovic, p. 309.

³⁷ For the year 1986-1987, the USEFG received 22 applications in humanities and 57 in sciences/engineering.

³⁸ The applicants sent were Natalia Vogeikoff, today the Doreen Canaday Spitzer Archivist at the ASCSA, Maria Georgopoulou, Director of the Gennadius Library, also part of the ASCSA and Alexandra Kalogirou, a Program Officer at the Executive Unit of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture. Iphigeneia Dionysiadou, Head of the Documentation Department of the Benaki Museum was pointed out to me by Natalia Vogeikoff as her name did not appear in the archives I examined at the ASCSA.

Janus-Faced America and the Cultural Ice Age in Greece

Following the defeat of the communist insurgency, Greece had been securely brought under the American sphere of influence. A deep social divide, however, and lack of potent ideological alternatives, most clearly manifested in the establishment's anticommunist rhetoric, would dominate Greek public life for almost three decades following the end of the civil war. The identity of the right, but also of the center, would be largely consolidated based on a renewed and heightened 'Red Scare' and a return to 'traditional values' expressed in devotion to the nation, Orthodoxy and the institution of family – *πατρίς, θρησκεία, οικογένεια*.³⁹ The prewar political forces of the monarchy and bourgeois political parties would rally around national-mindedness – *ethnikofrosyni* – and seek to consolidate their power based on systematic fear campaigns and brutal political repression. Political prisoners were only gradually released. In 1962, more than sixteen hundred people were still in prisons and exile,⁴⁰ while the Communist party was outlawed until 1974. A strong paramilitary apparatus – *parakratos* – remained firmly in place throughout these years, undermining any efforts for democratic stabilization. Greece had not only been the first battleground for the Cold War but was firmly placed in the bipolar international politics of the times.⁴¹ Finally, in 1967, Greek parliamentarism would fully succumb, and for seven years the country would be ruled by a military junta.

Continuous American intervention on the side of the establishment was based on the premises that the containment of communism and subordination of national interests to NATO's imperatives were amongst the top priorities of Greece. Yet in the 1950s the relationship between the two states was seriously bruised over the Cyprus question. The American support to the British efforts to suppress the island's anti-colonial struggle and political unification with Greece – a long time concern of Greek and Greek-Cypriot nationalists – led to considerable friction. Riots in Patras in the fall of 1955 and attacks against the British Institute and the U.S. Information Service in Athens raised concerns. On May of 1956, in the midst of protests and unrest and while the Greek newspapers were asking why the American government was sending jazz instead of arms, Dizzy Gillespie would arrive in Athens to ease tensions. In the first goodwill jazz tour organized by the State Department Gillespie would travel all over southern Europe, the Middle East and south Asia to facelift the American cultural profile – deflecting also criticism for racial discrimination and

³⁹ As Stratis Bournazos points out, the identification of *ethnikofrosyni* solely with the right is a later construct for which responsibility lies with the Panhellenic Socialist Party (PASOK) which sprung out of the center-right and anti-communist 'tradition' while refashioning itself into a center-left party. See Stratis Bournazos, "Το Κράτος των Εθνικόφρονων: Αντικομμουνιστικός Λόγος και Πρακτικές" (The State and the National-minded: Anticommunist Logos and Practices) in C. Hatziosif (ed.), *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας του 20ου Αιώνα. Ανασυγκρότηση – Εμφύλιος – Παλινόρθωση 1945-1952* (History of Greece in twentieth century. Reconstruction – Civil War – Restoration), Athens, Bibliorama, 2009, p. 9-49.

⁴⁰ Voglis Polymeris, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners During the Greek Civil War*, New York, Berghahn Press, 2002, p. 223.

⁴¹ See Sotiris Rizas, *Η Ελληνική Πολιτική μετά τον Εμφύλιο Πόλεμο. Κοινοβουλευτισμός και Δικτατορία* (The Greek Polity after the Civil War. Parliamentarism and Dictatorship) (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2008).

lynching of African Americans in the U.S. – and counter Soviet propaganda, especially in the non-aligned, emerging nations. Athens was his last stop where in addition to the scheduled performances he offered one free evening to students. The same people who protested American foreign policies in the morning and attacked American cultural institutions that evening cheered and carried Gillespie shoulder high closing the nearby streets at the center of Athens⁴² later on.

On the Greek side Gillespie's visit was most certainly coordinated by Ekaterini Myrivili, Assistant Cultural Attaché at the American Embassy in Athens from 1951 to 1969. The cultural offense that the United States would launch following the war could not be left in the hands of ambassadors and the existing American cultural institutions abroad. There was an urgent need for cultural workers and specialists devoted exclusively to the task of winning hearts and minds and countering Soviet depictions of the United States as a cultural black hole and the land of fierce racial discrimination. Myrivili, a law school graduate from the University of Thessaloniki with a degree in comparative literature from the University of Athens – at a time when even high school education, especially among women in Greece, was the prerogative of a fraction of the population – would have a long career in arts administration and culture. Initially she was primarily responsible for the music department of the American Embassy's library where she would first meet and befriend a great part of the Greek avant-garde that would visit the library, which was open to the public, to listen to classical music, opera and jazz not widely available in the market.⁴³ During her tenure at the Embassy, however, Myrivili would take up a much broader set of tasks. She was responsible for radio programming for Greek Public Radio (EIP) broadcasting the music available at the so-called "Music Room" of the library and adaptations of American theatrical plays; she collaborated with all state cultural and educational institutions – some of them with international appeal like the Athens Festival – organizing various seminars, art exhibitions, concerts and performances; she directed the Leader Grantees program sending scholars and artists for three-year visits to the United States. As of 1962 she was also responsible for the cultural program of the Hellenic-American Union while for a long period she was also the Editor-in-Chief of the *Fulbright Review*. Under the auspices of the American Embassy, she would visit the United States on various assignments expanding her professional network as well as her knowledge of the American cultural and literary scene.⁴⁴

In one of our interviews, Myrivili would remember her work at the "Music Room" with great nostalgia as in those times it represented a beacon of light and hope in the midst of political oppression and great conservatism, while various cultural revolutions were raging in Europe and the US. In a brief account of her work at the

⁴² For more on jazz and the cultural cold war see Lisa E. Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy. Promoting America in the Cold War Era*, Jackson, University Press of Mississippi, 2013 and Penny M. Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World. Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

⁴³ «Το Μουσικό Δωμάτιο» (The Music Room), an interview with Ekaterini Myrivili, *Ελευθεροτυπία*, Saturday 23 October, 2010.

⁴⁴ The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 3, Folder 3. Curriculum Vitae – Αικατερίνη Κασμάτη Μυριβήλη, Ιούλιος 1992.

United States Information Service (USIS) she would later write: “The US for the Greeks after the war represented all the democratic ideals, particularly after the failure of the British interference in Greece. I dare say that our work at the C.O. was at the very center of cultural activities in Athens. Around us they gathered the most creative artists, including several leftists. All this work, the result of efforts lasting twenty years, was destroyed in a night. At the beginning the indifference and tolerance and later the military support of the Nixon administration created hostile feelings in the Greek people towards America.”⁴⁵ Ekaterini Myrivili would remain in the employ of the American Embassy until 1969, when for political reasons she submitted her resignation. Subsequently, from 1970 until 1976 as a Consultant for the Ford Foundation in Greece she would run a program which primarily supported individual artists and intellectuals who faced censorship and often open persecution by a regime which not only vied to repress freedom of speech and freedom of expression, but also imposed a chauvinistic aesthetic largely summarized by the slogan, “Greece of the Hellenic Christians.”⁴⁶

Lowry McNeil, Vice President of the Ford Foundation at the time, also Director of its Arts and Humanities program and known in the United States as ‘Mr. Arts,’ during a survey trip in Europe in 1967, came to see first hand the grim realities for culture and the arts in Greece:

“I went to six countries; deliberately chose one iron curtain country, Czechoslovakia, Western Europe and Greece. When I got to Greece I found that under the [George] Papadopoulos dictatorship it was not only a question of state support and tourism support being withdrawn from everything except the most arteriosclerotic things like the National Theater, the National Opera, the National Academy of Fine Arts, none of which meant anything, but that artists and humanists were being fired all over the place or told that they were no longer a painter, they were a clerk in a sub-basement of a post office or something. And I realized that under these circumstances there’s going to be an ‘Ice Age’ in any ferment about the arts and humanistic scholarship in a country which is rather important despite the small population, and certainly symbolically carried the freight of culture – and I’m not talking about the Periclean Classical Age, but all the way through Byzantium⁴⁷.”

In response, the program which McNeil would initiate in close collaboration with Myrivili lasted for eight years, awarding grants to a total of ninety-four individuals and eleven organizations and institutions in the fields of painting, sculpture, graphic arts, creative writing, translation, literature, theater, film, music, musicology, dance, architecture, history, archaeology, art history, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology. Almost \$7,000,000 was awarded to these grantees during this period –

⁴⁵ The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 3, Folder 3.

⁴⁶ For more on the Greek military junta, see Vangelis Karamanolakis (ed.), *Η Στρατιωτική Δικτατορία* (The Military Dictatorship) (Athens: Ta Nea, 2010); Kostis Kornetis, *Children of Dictatorship. Student Resistance, Cultural Politics, and the ‘Long 1960s’ in Greece* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013); Alkis Rigos, Serafeim I. Seferiadis and Evanthis Chadzivasileiou (eds.), *Η ‘Σύντομη Δεκαετία του ‘60. Θεσμικό Πλαίσιο, Κομματικές Στρατηγικές, Κοινωνικές Συγκρούσεις, Πολιτισμικές Διεργασίες* (The ‘Short’ Decade of the ‘60s. Institutional Context, Party Strategies, Social Conflicts, Cultural Processes) (Athens: Kastanioti, 2008).

⁴⁷ Lowry McNeil, Ford Foundation Archives, Oral History Project.

the largest amount awarded any country outside the United States over the same period.

On the Greek side, the program was almost single-handedly run by Ekaterini Myrivili. On the American side, it was Marcia Thompson, a Program Officer at the Ford Foundation for thirty years involved from the outset in the formation and development of the Foundation's program in the Humanities and the Arts. Yet it was Lowry McNeil who would be publicly hailed as the "the single most influential patron of the performing arts that the American democratic system has produced," according to his *New York Times* obituary. Classically educated, a firm believer in individual humanism, ideologically rooted in the short-lived agrarian socialist movement that sprung in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century, he saw the lights of free artistic expression going out under the oppressive dictatorial regime in the country that gave civilization to the world; so he initiated this rather peculiar program for the Foundation in Greece, supporting mostly individuals as opposed to organizations and institutions, while making politically an explicitly left turn and rupturing in the process a number of collective publishing and artistic efforts.⁴⁸

For a long time the program maintained a rather low profile for which it would come under attack by the Greek Left, which subsequently became embroiled in a virulent public debate largely defined by a strong anti-American rhetoric. The philanthropic work of the Foundation, focusing particularly on individual artists and intellectuals "of democratic leaning" – poets like Elytis, Sachtouris and Karouzos, authors like Tachtsis, filmmakers like Angelopoulos and Voulgaris, scholars like Kakridis, Maronitis and Manolis Chatzidakis, in other words the Greek intellectual avant-garde of the time⁴⁹ – would divide public opinion and drive a wedge into the camp of the Greek Left, which was already suffering the effects of the 1968 split between the KKE that remained loyal to the Soviet Union's policies and the KKE that would follow the nascent Eurocommunist line.

The reactions were generally mixed if not at times outright polemic. The newspaper *To Vima* – a center-left paper at the time – wrote on November 14, 1970:

"America, the US, is a huge geographic, economic and human expanse crossed by conflicting currents. It is like Janus, a giant with two faces – one side marked by retrogression and the other turned toward progress. The two faces, the two currents coexist. Next to the advocates of the Vietnam war, or of the totalitarian regime spread all over the world, there are the young who get killed in the University campuses, the thousands of people who believed that the Kennedys would bring radical changes, and there is also the most advanced artistic scene with emancipated theater and cinema...

⁴⁸ Christos Mais, «Σφαίρες απο Ζάχαρη»: Το Ίδρυμα Φορντ και η Ελληνική Διανοήση,» ('Sugar Bullets': The Ford Foundation and Greek Intelligentsia), *Η Εφημερίδα των Συντακτών*, July 2, 2017. <http://www.efsyn.gr/arthro/ithiko-kyros-ston-gyposo> (last accessed 1/20/2018).

⁴⁹ See Elena Hamalidi, Maria Nikolopoulou and Rea Walden, "A Second Avant-Garde Without a First: Greek Avant-Garde Artists in the 1960s and 1970s" in Sascha Bru et al. (eds.), *Regarding the Popular: Modernism, the Avant-Garde, and High and Low Culture* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), p. 425-445; Dimitris Papanikolaou, «Κάνοντας κάτι παράδοξες κινήσεις: Ο πολιτισμός στα χρόνια της Δικτατορίας» (Culture in the Years of Dictatorship) in Karamanolakis, 2010, p. 175-196.

One of the largest institutions, entirely independent from the official political authority, the FF, appears on the side that stands for progress...⁵⁰

The leftist press, which was proliferating at the time after the controlled liberalization that the military regime had employed, was largely of different opinion. *New Targets*, a monthly Trotskyist publication, was outright polemical:

“It would be ridiculous to have us believe that the Ford Foundation, a non-profit organization, is indeed seeking the advancement of mankind through its philanthropic activities, when in fact it accomplishes two purposes, prestige and publicity for the Ford industry and tax evasion. Therefore only the bourgeois press could call the Ford Foundation, the other face of Janus, the good face of America... The Ford Foundation, under the mask of philanthropy, is serving American imperialism...”⁵¹

More specifically on the acceptance of grants by leftist artists, intellectuals and scientists, the magazine suggested that this reflected “the ingenious efforts on the part of American imperialism to influence and to control the avant-garde intellectuals.”

Anti-American feelings, not solely among the left, reached an all-time high after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the fall of the Junta – largely supported by the American government throughout its years in power – in the summer of 1974. In protest, a number of Greek professionals returned PhDs granted by American universities to the American embassy in Athens. The theatrical group Nea Poreia called on all Greek intellectual and scholar grantees of the Ford Foundation to renounce their grants. Yet, in some quarters there were efforts to draw distinctions between the American political and economic establishment and the liberal America, the America of the civil rights movement and the American people, workers, blacks, Mexican Americans, the intellectual avant-garde who fought for socialism and justice. Leftist anti-Americanism was further qualified by literary figures like Tahtsis, who denounced what he called an ‘intellectual Jerusalem’ of purism and of harboring strong feelings of guilt while ignoring the new global realities, or by Nikos Poulantzas, the leading authority in neo-Marxist philosophy, who drew attention to the dangers of essentialism and isolationism:

“Supposing that they are right, and that the CIA has succeeded in infiltrating all levels of American society, it has then also succeeded in infiltrating Western Europe (grants to Universities, scientific centers, etc), as well as Eastern Europe, hence, in order to preserve Greece’s absolute purity, Greeks should close its doors to all scientific and cultural communication and exchanges in all cultural and scientific fields, not only with the United States but all of Europe, both East and West.”⁵²

On a different note, D.N. Maronitis, the distinguished philologist and Ford Foundation grantee who had been imprisoned and actively persecuted by the regime, deeply appreciative, wrote in an album honoring Lowry McNeil: “In November 1971, after nine months of solitary confinement in military prisons I gradually became

⁵⁰ The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 1, Folder 1.

⁵¹ The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 1, Folder 2.

⁵² The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 1, Folder 3.

accustomed to stones and trees again. McNeil Lowry immediately sought me out. I remember his eyes. They read beneath my skin as if I were made of glass, the lineaments of a race deserving a better fate. Then he wept, like only brave men weep, and gripped my hand. And so I found my way back to people after that long search among the stones and the trees.”⁵³

In Conclusion

When in the 1950s C. Wright Mills was writing about the emergence of the new power elites, he paid no attention to the presence of women in its midsts. He was not entirely mistaken. In trustee boards and boards of directors in the foundations which proliferated after the war the corporate, political and often military elites – corporate lawyers and investment bankers, political advisors and policy-makers, individuals often with interchangeable commanding roles at the top of dominant institutional orders, possibly all men – would casually mingle and network, argue, debate and decide not only the future of the country but the future of the world promoting a vision which was distinctly American in origin, markedly internationalist in outlook, and conspicuously forceful in its application.

The Ford Foundation, for years the largest and one of the most influential foundations in the world, with global reach and special interests in economic empowerment, education, human rights, democracy, the creative arts, and Third World development, to name only a few, is a good choice of an organization where one can sample Mills’s power elite, its worldwide effects but also the gender politics that underline it. Concerning the Board’s character, Lowry McNeil, who first joined the foundation in 1953 to head its education program, became the Director of its Art and Humanities programs in 1957, Vice President in 1964, and retired ten years later, had the following to say: “the first and most obvious impression for a newcomer in 1953 was the existence on the Board of the Ford Foundation of a private government. Here were a group of men running what had been avowedly and deliberately proclaimed as a post-war-oriented reconstruction world leadership group. One had the feeling, in sitting in a meeting of the Board of Trustees, that the trustees, individually and collectively, concerned themselves with the largest possible brush, whether they were thinking about the economic development of Burma, Ghana or the Middle East... What I am saying is that the first impression one had was a group of men who elected themselves or their successors to the Board who used a public trust through private philanthropic funds, who, in effect, enjoyed the position of cabinet ministers around a central nucleus in an allegorical private government... There was nobody in the room who had not been in an influential post either in the government or in a university or in the press ... There was hardly a name that came into any context of any discussion to which we all did not have the key. I have to assume that this same feeling permeated the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations.”⁵⁴

⁵³ The Gennadius Archival Collection, The Ford Foundation Archive, Box 3, Folder 2.

⁵⁴ Lowry McNeil, Oral History Project, Ford Foundation Archives. Some of the most illustrious names that staffed the Foundation’s board between the 1950s and late 1970s were those of Paul Hoffman,

There is a particular intertwining of the ideologies of leadership and masculinity which serves to maintain the status quo, the privilege of an elite and perpetuate preconceptions about political agency and gender. In an effort to draw the profile of the “Cultural Cold Warrior” it is important to look beyond these board rooms and further account for women’s role in the American efforts for cultural hegemony, which as I maintain, was hardly confined in the lower ends of the American government administration and its private agents – Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford among other smaller scale foundations and organizations. As the few available studies suggest women were active participants in the promotion and propagation of the American postwar agenda while these efforts were further assisted by non-American nationals, as in the case of Ekaterini Myrivili, who worked on the ground to promote liberalism and anti-communism. American women’s work, either as members of associations and private organizations or as higher level employees of the American government and its satellite private institutions, had an instrumental role to play advancing the American cultural offensive abroad often exercising great agency and drastically influencing the direction and the nature of the programs they would undertake.

Alison Frantz, alongside her colleagues at the ASCSA, was able to establish the School as a key participant in the selection process of the applicants and channel a great part of the resources made available by the Foundation to the School. Inadvertently in the process they even undermined some of the Fulbright’s main objectives, namely the transmission of American values to a wide populace. The ASCSA, traditionally reproached for insularity and a certain disconnectedness from both the Greek archaeological community but also the general Greek public – despite its many credentials and seriousness of academic purpose – was probably not the ideal cultural conduit for the Fulbright Foundation in Greece. Furthermore, Frantz’s work for the School as well as the Foundation confirms the idea that cultural inclinations and trends – the graduate applicants’ preference for classical studies in Greece – are enabled and perpetuated by actual individual and institutional practices.

To fully evaluate the effects of the relationship between the ASCSA and the USEFG, and even more so the impact of the latter in Greek political culture and society at large more systematic research and study is needed. Yet, Alison Frantz’s work suggests that the agency exercised on the ground by those responsible for the implementation of American policies abroad should be taken into account and their practices closely examined if we wish to fully grasp the American postwar project of cultural hegemony. Similarly Ekaterini Myrivili’s work further confirms the hypothesis that women, especially women with greater cultural and social capital like herself and Alison Frantz held some great institutional power. The cooptation of the Greek leftist intelligentsia – a practice widely institutionalized around Europe and beyond through the systematic activities of The Congress of Cultural Freedom, for instance, as well as other projects and organizations – served the American interests in Greece undermining anti-Americanism and communism. Furthermore, however, I

H. Rowan Gaither, Henry T. Heald, McGeorge Bundy, John Jay McCloy, Shepard Stone, Robert McNamara, and George Kennan among others.



Despina Lalaki, « The Cultural Cold War and the New Woman of Power. Making a Case based on the Fulbright and Ford Foundation in Greece », *Histoire@Politique*, n° 35, mai-août 2018 [en ligne : www.histoire-politique.fr].

would argue that it had a strong impact on the careers of the individuals funded and the post-Junta cultural scene.

The cases of Alison Frantz's and Ekaterini Myrivili's professional careers suggest the need for further research which will work beyond the available models and predominantly masculine images of the post war America. A closer examination of a wider range of positions and roles in the history of the cultural Cold War would deliver, I believe, a more complex picture of the organization of power and the emergent networks of social elites at the time, national as well as trans-national.