INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Modern Art, Media Pedagogy and Cultural Citizenship: The Museum of Modern Art's Television Project, 1952-1955

Nancy Shaw

The Graduate Program in Communications,
McGill University,
Montréal, Québec,
March 2000

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial
fulfillment of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Museum of Modern Art's television project sponsored by the Rockefeller Brother's Fund between 1952 and 1955 was designed to educate a democratic and cultured citizenry through the principles and practices of modern art and liberal humanism. Through a close reading of four television programs, related policy documents and exhibitions, as well as critical, educational and promotional literature, this study will show how within the context of the MoMA's mandate and history, the television project was a decisive, yet highly troubled attempt to forge cultural citizenship through the burgeoning media of modern art and television. This exploration will establish how the television project was an integral aspect of the MoMA's efforts since World War II to situate modern art as essential to the formation of an international polity shaped around the promise of universality, yet dependent on upholding the primacy of free and creative individuals. In addressing such a challenge, this dissertation will contend that television was not necessarily antithetical to modernism, rather it was just one among an array of struggling forces falling within the rubric of the modern. Moreover, this analysis will consider the importance of culture in logics of liberal governance. In order to elucidate the dimensions of cultural democracy as they emerged through the MoMA's television project, this study will be shaped around a discussion of three components crucial to the formation and maintenance of citizenly conduct—civic education, democratic cultural communications, and cross-cultural governance. To these ends, a range of sources from the disciplines of Communications, Cultural Studies and Critical Artistic Studies will be drawn on in order to investigate the provisional links forged between modern art, media pedagogy, and cultural citizenship in the Cold War period.

Résumé

Le projet télévision du Museum of Modern Art, parrainé par le Fond des Frères Rockefeller entre 1952 et 1955 fût créé pour éduquer une citoyenneté démocrate et cultivé par les principes et pratiques de l'art moderne et de l'humanisme libéral. Par l'entremise d'une lecture assidue de transcriptions de quatre émissions de télévision, de documents de planification et d'expositions reliées à ces émissions, ainsi que la littérature critique, éducationelle et promotionelle, cette etude démontrera comment, dans le contexte de l'histoire du MoMA et de son mandat ce projet télé à de façon décisive et troublante, taché de forger une identité culturelle à travers les mediums épanouissants de l'art moderne et de la télévision. Cette exploration établiera comment ce projet télé fût partie intégrale des efforts du MoMA depuis la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale pour situer l'art moderne comme essentielle à la formation d'une politque internationale basée autour de la promesse d'universalité, mais dépendante de maintien de la primauté de l'individu libre et créatif. En adressant un tel challenge, cette dissertation interrogera le fait que la télévision n'était pas nécessairement antithétique au modernisme, mai qu'une force parmi plusieurs luttant au sein de la rubrique du moderne. De plus, cette analyse considèrera l'importance de la culture aux logiques de gouverne libérale. Dans le but d'élucider les dimentions de la démocratie culturelle telles qu'elles apparaissent à travers le projet télé de MoMA, cette étude se façonnera autours de trios constituantes cruciales à la formation et au maintient de la conduite du citoyen-éducation civique, communications culturelles démocratiques, et gouverne inter-culturelle. A ces fins, cette dissertation puisera dans des sources diversent telles que les disciplines des Communications, des Études Culturelles et de la Critique Artistique à fin d'examiner les liens provisoirs forgé entre l'art moderne, la pédagogie médiatique, et l'identité culturelle au sein de la période de la Guerre Froide.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the consequence of my longstanding engagement with the visual arts and writing communities in Canada and the USA. At McGill, thanks to the generous and unwavering support of my supervisor Will Straw, I have been able to develop a much greater understanding of the complex histories and regulatory environments contributing to the vexed relationship between Canadian and American culture in a global context. Monika Kin Gagnon and Martin Allor are to be duly thanked for their ongoing encouragement and insightful contributions to this project. I would also like to thank Janine Marchessault for her guidance early on.

Many friends and colleagues are to be thanked for their longstanding support. In Montréal, I would like to thank Scott MacFarlane, Petra Mueller, Peter Urquhart, Haidee Wasson, and especially Aurora Wallace. In Vancouver and elsewhere, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of Sabine Bitter, Louis Cabri, Jeff Derksen, Stan Douglas, Francois Houle, Catriona Strang and Mina Totino. Special thanks are extended to Deborah Axelrod, Barry Goldenberg, Lawrence Krause, Stephen Malamud, Susanne Shaw, and David Wilson without whom none of this would have been possible.

Throughout the course of this study, I have had the good fortune of receiving funding from The Centre for Research on Canadian Cultural Industries and Institutions, The Hugh MacLennan Memorial McGill Majors Scholarship Fund, and FCAR. I would also like to thank Michelle Harvey and Charles Silver at the Museum of Modern Art for their assistance.

I would like to thank my family: Susanne, John, Bob, Larry, Cathi, Ingrid, Daniel, Caitlin, Jodi, Bobby and Lauren who have fueled this endeavor with humour, excitement and generosity. Finally, and above all, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents Muriel and Dave whose contributions continue to be inspiring and immeasurable.

Introduction

> *...art is the indigestible event, in rupture with all cultural and institutional tendencies. ...The important thing in art is to render the conflict dialectical. ... Better yet: the important thing is to present or represent that which is irreconcilable in conflict... . However, the most decisive conflict to be rendered dialectical is not cultural conflicts that pit Arabs against French, then the meeting between the two, and finally their reconciliation in the discovery of their common humanity. Instead, I look to the Antigones of our time, which try to approach the truly irreconcilable points in the representation of man or the human, the things that separate the civilization of one from the other while dividing them against themselves.*
>
> *Etienne Balibar, 1997*

Writing from the perspective of the rapidly globalizing, post Cold War era amidst ever changing flows of diasporic populations, capitalist exchange and communications networks, Etienne Balibar analyses the reconfiguration of the once synonymous relationship between citizenship and the nation-state. Rather than searching for reductive resolutions, or for the source of universal humanity, Balibar suggests that art can be engaged to critically consider the conflicts and anomalies generated in the rapidly shifting articulations of globalization. This approach to art opposes aesthetic traditions where art constitutes the higher realm of the beautiful. Such traditions emanate from German Romantic writers like Schiller (Balibar, 1997: 790) and British Victorians like Matthew Arnold who presupposed that art would rehabilitate the ills of civilization. Uninterested in using it as a cure for social ills, Balibar considers art to be a form of distancing that challenges individuals to consider conflict and difference dialectically. In so doing, he suggests that art can potentially lead to a complex analysis of, for example, the conditions surrounding the formation and reconfiguration of the

relationship between an individual citizen and the larger governing order. Especially crucial to this endeavor, Balibar argues, is a consideration of what he calls the symbolic. Within the symbolic realm the institutional, legal and constitutional apparatuses that bind a society greatly determine what is considered to be right and wrong, human, and educational (1997: 780). Balibar adds that the symbolic constitutes a source of difference often dividing nations and individuals. Art is important insofar as it can elucidate the sources and effects of irreconcilable conflict in a dynamic and non-reductive way.

In taking into consideration Balibar's analysis of the relationship between art, citizenship and governance, it is the aim of this dissertation to look at how art has functioned as an ameliorative practice and a principle of reconciliation used to disavow symbolic difference, political conflict and socio-economic disparities. In rendering the ameliorative impetus of art dialectical, this study will move through both the discursive and nondiscursive contours of cultural citizenship and governance whose current configurations were emergent over half a century ago with the formation of international governing bodies such as the United Nations. This genealogy is designed to inform Balibar's query into the shifting dimensions of globalization in the post Cold War era conditioning the relationship between citizenship and the nation-state.

Shaped through the competing impetuses of modernization, modernism, liberal humanism and cultural democracy, this study of the relationship between

citizenship, cultural governance and art will focus on The Museum of Modern Art's television project sponsored by the Rockefeller Brother's Fund between 1952 and 1955. The television project was initiated to contribute to the museum's aims of incorporating artistic and communicational media into its program in order to educate audiences about the contemporary relevance of modernism. At the same time, the MoMA claimed it could potentially reach a larger public by utilizing television to broadly disseminate the lessons of its art education and exhibition programs. In so doing, the MoMA aimed to take part in the democratic distribution of the morally and spiritually uplifting ideals associated with modernist aesthetics.

Through a close reading of four television programs, related policy documents, and exhibitions as well as critical, educational and promotional literature, this analysis will show how within the context of MoMA's mandate and history, the television project was a decisive, yet highly troubled attempt to forge cultural citizenship through the burgeoning media of modern art and television. In part, the television project was indicative of a fleeting convergence of disparate, and irreconcilable interests that account, perhaps, for the project's short-lived duration. The television project was integral to the MoMA's efforts since World War II to situate modern art as foundational to the realization of an international polity shaped around the promise of universality, yet dependent on upholding the primacy of free and creative individuals.

This study draws on an array of sources from the disciplines of Communications, Cultural Studies and Critical Artistic Studies. These sources contribute to an analysis of how the Museum of Modern Art sought to integrate television into its exhibition and art education programs in order to rearticulate the relationship between the creative individual and the larger governing order during the Cold War. In gaining an understanding of modern art, it was assumed that the MoMA's ideal citizen could in turn contribute to the formation of an international polity devoted to universal peace and understanding. In addressing such a challenge, this dissertation will suggest that television was not necessarily antithetical to modernism, but it was just one among an array of struggling forces falling within the rubric of the modern. Moreover, this analysis of the MoMA's television project will assert that despite claims circulating through discourses of cultural policy and artistic practice in the 1950s implying that high modernists were politically complacent, the MoMA's contributions to this postwar polity were implicitly political in the attempt to forge a cultured citizenry through modalities of liberal governance. At the MoMA these politically strategic motivations, nevertheless, were circumscribed by the naturalizing claims of universality, modernist aesthetics and liberal humanism. Such an effort was to contribute to America's attempts to assert its influence internationally in the post 1945 world while containing reactionary and isolationist forces within the nation. In partaking in such efforts, the MoMA, in turn would be able to imbue modern art with a greater purpose while democratizing its uplifting potentials through the dissemination of these ideas via the mass media.

Through an analysis of such activities, it will become clear how the MoMA aimed to institute its programs and principles as an indispensable asset to a burgeoning world democracy conceived as a nation of nations in search of the universal in the particular. Within this prospect it will become evident, moreover, how art was utilized to either resolve, or disavow conflict and difference. For example, the short-lived alignment of forces constituting the MoMA's television project demonstrates how the MoMA's declarations about cultural democracy were at odds with their applications. The intent was to forge a citizenry who were on the one hand unique and autonomous—self-governing, yet on the other hand able to on their own volition commit to the larger governing order as if it were synonymous with their individual interests.

The initial impetus for this investigation resides with Raymond Williams' formational and cultural materialist analysis of modernism. In the *Politics of Modernism* (1989), Williams challenged well-entrenched assessments suggesting that modernism resided with those who coveted the formal dimensions of artistic media claiming their ability to express universal truths. In the process of attending to the veracity of artistic materials, modernist art works were to become homologous with larger universal truths considered to be pure and uncorrupted by political or social conflicts. Because art had the ability to ascend to the pure and the true, this condition was to be sought out in everyday life. In his formational analysis, Williams challenged the dominance of formalist

definitions of high modernism. He suggested that high modernism was a historically specific instance of artistic production related to many social, economic, and technological forces. For Williams, high modernism was not merely the realization of universal truth through aesthetic means. Modernist artists of many persuasions and mediums were at work, according to Williams, before, after and during this dominant moment of high modernism. As such, modernism was better understood as a series of advancing and retrenching impetuses, emerging and reforming throughout the modern period. According to Williams, these forces diverged and converged diachronically and synchronically with each other and in relationship to a plethora of discursive and nondiscursive forces. In order to account for the relations between and among those artistic forces associated with modernism, Williams argued for a formational analysis which would involve a close reading of cultural objects in the context of the larger social formation. Williams' formational analysis of modernism elucidated how the material and thematic organization of a work operated in the context of a competing array of determinations. A formational analysis is, therefore, able to avoid the formalist and abstract tendencies of textual criticism and sociological data. As Williams noted in an interview with Edward Said:

> It is a very long and difficult job, to carry through this very powerful task, which is to see how, in the very detail of composition, a certain social structure, a certain history discloses itself. This is not doing any kind of violence to that composition. It is precisely finding ways in which forms and formations, in a very complex way interact and relate. ... this... analytic task is difficult, because the questions are new each time. ... cultural theory is about the way in which the specifics of works relate to structures which are not works. (Williams, 1989: 185).

In addition to providing a method through which to analyze art in relation to other social determinants, Williams considered modernism in its emergent, dominant and residual formations configured in relationship to industrialization and urban growth. He linked modernist artistic movements to patterns of migration and immigration as they were affected by rapidly reconfigured dimensions of the city and the country since the 19th century. He linked modernization to a shift away from traditional ways of life towards a new and dynamic order of culture in the city. In the metropolis, for instance, this new and dynamic order necessitated that artistic formations organize themselves around various media. At the same time, much of the ensuing expression focused on the estranged, alienated, and distanced experiences of uprooted populations faced with the dynamic and fleeting relations of the city (1989: 45). At first, as Williams noted, modernists were an emergent formation critical of the social order. As these conditions were institutionalized and became more familiar, so too did the art which became less radical. After a time, modernist art came to be seen as an alternative and then eventually became a norm when advertising and commercial media incorporated modernist forms of representation (1989: 46-7).

Williams' formational analysis disrupts dominant definitions of modernism by presenting it in its various formations and in conjunction with a competing array of forces that were both historical and synchronic. Within this formulation, art isn't autonomous, reflective, or determinant. Rather, it is constituted in a dialectical,

and conflictual interrelationship with an array of conjunctural forces. Williams' formational analysis of modernism contributes to a rereading of the high modernist moment at the MoMA. High modernism at the MoMA, in light of a formational analysis, then, can be read as more than the realization of universal truth and artistic plenitude. It is produced out of the relationship between modernism's stated ideals and an array of discursive and nondiscursive elements leading to the troubled materialization of high modernist principles and practices.

Williams' writing on television further situates the troubled materialization of modernism in the MoMA's television project. Television, rather than representing the debasement of high modernist values, in this study, is situated as an agent of cultural democracy. As such, it operates as a form of mobile privatization which Williams defined in *Television, Technology and Cultural Form* (1974). As an agent of mobile privatization, television is ideally assumed to bind autonomous individuals located in their most intimate of realms—the suburban family dwelling—to the larger social order through its broadcast transmissions of information, and entertainment.

This formational analysis of modern media and art is conjunctural and concerned with the dynamic and disruptive processes of modernization leading to a close reading of texts, objects and performances in the context of a competing array of discursive and nondiscursive elements. These analytic procedures, in turn, lend insight into this dissertation's concern with exploring the ways in which modern

media and art are engaged in attempts to bind individuals to larger governing polities. In addition to drawing upon Williams' formational analysis of modernism, a consideration of Foucault's notion of governmentality engaged in debates about the role that culture plays in liberal forms of governance will be explored. Such an analysis is of value to this study because, in part, the MoMA's television project was designed to educate citizens through modes of cultural governance linking individuals to a liberal polity in the Cold War era.

Foucault defines governmentality as a predominant form of governance in the modern period (Miller, 1999: 14-18). Governmentality is constituted in the shift away from power associated with the sovereign as the transcendent embodiment of God. Since the Enlightenment, this form of power has been gradually replaced by modes of governance whereby individuals become loyal members of a polity by learning the appropriate modes of conduct acquired through institutions such as the family, school and museum. While these institutions contribute to the regulation of self-governing individual citizens, they also produce and disseminate knowledge about the populace crucial for effective governance. According to Bennett, in liberal forms of governance, culture is indispensable. As liberal democracy is founded upon the rights of the free and unique individual, the state has to appear to avoid interfering into the lives of citizens. Therefore, culture is constituted as an autonomous realm based around the sanctity of the individual. Nevertheless, through culture, governing bodies can intervene without appearing to do so.

According to Tony Bennett, since the 19th century, museum exhibits have been integral to the formation of the nation-state (1995: 66). Museums, through their visual displays, have proved invaluable to liberal regimes of cultural governance. Both educational and entertaining, they present a visual rendering of the social order designed to elicit allegiance through public instruction (1995: 68). Designed to elicit individual identification within the prescribed visual order, exhibitionary displays are intended to encourage individuals to internalize appropriate modes of conduct necessary to their competent performance as citizens. In so doing, these viewers legitimize the governing order through their voluntary participation. According to Bennett, liberal democratic polities "require not merely that the populace be governable, but that it assents to this governance...(1995: 87)."

The reliance on the role of culture in liberal democracies, as Bennett writes, is often instituted through the display strategies of museums—a formulation that has been contentious in debates about the role that policy plays in cultural studies. This debate is characterized on the one hand by those who like Fredric Jameson argue that policy studies are ineffectual because of the relative absence, and narrowly instrumental nature, of cultural policy in the US (Bennett, 1999: 13-14; Yúdice, 1999: 2). On the other hand, there are those like Tony Bennett who suggest that all forms of cultural opposition are without consequence unless they consider policy in their critical calculations (Miller, 1999: 79). According to Bennett, all forms of culture have rules of conduct and

thereby fall under the sway of policy. Therefore, the most effective role for cultural studies intellectuals to take, Bennett writes, is as cultural technicians able to locate culture as a field of governance rather than conceiving of government and culture as oppositional. As a result, Bennett suggests, cultural studies practitioners should endeavor to "modify the function of culture by means of technical adjustments (1999: 195)."

From Bennett's perspective, the analysis of policy and governmentality overdetermines all positions of critique and resistance. While invaluable for an analysis of many aspects of the relationship between cultural institutions and the state, in Bennett's initial formulations (1995, 1993), little space is left for dissent and critique. In their recent work on policy, Toby Miller (1999) and George Yúdice (1999) address the issue of dissent and criticality in the sphere of governmentality and cultural policy. Most significantly, the paradoxes of cultural policy and governance have been of longstanding concern to cultural studies practitioners, cultural communities, and communication scholars in Canada.

According to Toby Miller (1999: 17), liberal modes of governmentality are usually paradoxical. For example, paradoxes are produced in the gap between a regime's stated aims and the contradictory and biased application of these ideals which opens a space for critical intervention. As well, in these spaces governing bodies can adapt and adjust to change through reformist means designed to better realize their ideal standards as well as absorb and incorporate dissenting

interests. Those who do not act in the interest of reform are at odds with the standards of governance leaving them with the potential to become unruly agents (1995: 173-218) able to call attention to the exclusions, irreconcilable conflicts and contradictions produced by paradoxes of cultural governance. This form of intervention and criticality works within the apparatus of governmentality. It is not only located outside, or in opposition to the governmental apparatus (1999: 79). As will become evident throughout the body of this dissertation, while regimes of governmentality are often considered through studies of the discursive logics of official policy statements, the analysis of cultural governance can also occur in the critical considerations of the governing rationalities of, for example, art education programs, museum exhibitions, and television documentaries.

In assuming that governmental logics emanate from many sources, a more relevant study of liberal modes of cultural governance in the United States can be undertaken where, as Yúdice notes, there are few state policies concerning cultural democracy. Yúdice relates this absence to the libertarian nature of the American state that claims restraint in interfering in the everyday activities of its subjects. Moreover, in the US, policy making is driven by the pragmatics of powerful economic and political interests leaving little space for critical intervention (Bennett, 1999: 190; Yúdice, 1999: 1-2). While there is a relative absence of cultural policy generated by the state, culture is regulated through a competing array of channels. As Yúdice suggests, the state is involved in cultural matters only in times of economic, political, and military crisis of the

magnitude that threatens national security (1999: 22). No doubt the primary example of this impetus was operative during the Cold War when culture was used to legitimate America's political and economic influence on a world scale. Artists and scholars, art and education were fundamental to this effort because it was assumed that the allegiance of world citizens could be won not through economic, technological or political pressures, but through "respect and admiration for the Nation's highest qualities as a leader in the realm of ideals and the spirit (Yúdice, 1999: 20)." Therefore, according to Yúdice, in the USA cultural governance is by no means absent, but it is directed by the state only in times of crisis. Yúdice adds, that in these times, and in general, cultural governance is usually subtended by an uneasy and shifting alliance between the state, the corporate and non-profit sectors which are all imbued with a competitive and entrepreneurial ethos (Yúdice, 1999: 3).

As this dissertation will illuminate, in the case of the MoMA's television project, cultural governance was marshaled under the makeshift allegiance of competing forces such as The Rockefeller Foundation, American foreign policy, the United Nations and UNESCO. The policies, practices and material support of these institutions contributed to the MoMA's growth as a cultural institution proud of its ability to exist without state funding. Under these regulatory influences, the MoMA, through instances like the television project, aimed to foster a cultured and democratic citizenry while demonstrating its populist support measured through the fact that much of the museum's operations were supported by self-

generated revenues. The MoMA's popular and civic appeal was bolstered by the status of its trustees many of whom were either representative of industrial and financial empires like the Rockefellers and the Whitneys, or leaders of profitable communication and cultural industries such as CBS, *Life* magazine, and the Hollywood Studios.

In conjunction with Williams' cultural materialist approach to art and cultural formations, this study will benefit from the insights that artists, educators, scholars and activists in Canada have lent to the analysis of cultural policy and governance. Unlike in the USA, state-sponsored policy deliberations have operated as a primary site of cultural governance in Canada. For example, during the Cold War, deliberations over the role that modernism, cultural democracy, and liberal humanism were to play in securing Canada's position in the burgeoning international order was underwritten through the resources of the state. The most emblematic instance of this effort was the *Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-51*. For instance, after seeking input from many public and private constituencies, royal commissioners recommended that universities, museums, architecture, broadcast, and the arts should be developed to constitute a strong and unified national culture. This polity was to be comprised of a well-educated democratic citizenry committed to a distinct, yet internationally renoun national culture able to ameliorate the effects of modernization and war through the principles and practices of modernism and liberal humanism. Despite the commissioners' lofty

recommendations, their modernist approach to forming a nationally distinct citizenry was always vexed producing a plethora of contradictions leading to calls for both reform and critical transformation. Calls for reform and transformation were generated by a fundamental paradox of cultural governance. These paradoxes permeated debates about nation building in Canada that have been underwritten by the state, yet subtended by an array of interests ranging from government officials to the most critical of cultural practitioners.

The paradoxical state of cultural governance in Canada resides with what Maurice Charland (1986) has called technological nationalism. According to Charland, since confederation Canada, as a national polity, has been characterized by the state's attempt to forge geographical boundaries and cultural identity through the building of transport and communication networks. Within this logic of technological nationalism, the liberal state has attempted to bind a polity through the apparently neutral means of communication and transportation technologies (Charland, 1986: 198). In the absence of a more organic sense of national belonging, the state has fostered cultural identity through procedural means. As Charland suggests, an absence of national allegiance has weakened Canada's ability to resist encroachments on Canadian sovereignty by American cultural industries. As Allor, Juteau and Shepherd (1994) write, the effect of technological nationalism whereby the state has attempted to create a nationally homogeneous culture based on modernist and liberal humanist precepts has in actuality operated as a "history of substitutes."

For example, through technological nationalism a centralized national system has been built, but these infrastructures, once built, come to represent the public interest as the production of national industries and institutions addressing abstract entities. In effect, technological nationalism fails to engage actual citizens (Allor, Juteau, Shepherd, 1994: 32).

A critical reading of the contradictions and paradoxes of Canadian cultural nationalism as it emerged in the work of cultural studies practitioners and communication scholars in Canada informs this study of the MoMA's television project. In echoing these concerns, this dissertation will engage with an analysis of the logic of cultural policy, governance, and civic conduct. It will explore the idealist and universalist aims of modern governance, and how these aims were paradoxically structured and unevenly applied. In Canada, the state has taken a significant role in mediating contradictions and paradoxes of cultural governance. In the case of the MoMA, these activities occurred through the uneasy alliance of governmental organizations such as private philanthropies like the Rockefeller Foundation, and international entities such as the UN and UNESCO. In MoMA's case, therefore, efforts to engender cultural citizenship were as involved in the paradoxes of liberal governance as those of the Canadian state-sponsored cultural institutions. Nevertheless, in the MoMA's case, the contradictions and paradoxes were less obvious in the public sphere of the state-sponsored policy deliberations and more evident in the project's logics and limitations. In the effort to educate a cultured and democratic citizenry, the MoMA's television project

seems to be less reactive than those in Canada which, as Michael Dorland argues, have been designed to protect Canadian culture from American encroachments (1996: 344). Nevertheless, through his study of the historical bias of policy deliberations in Canada, Dorland reveals that the nationalist tenor of cultural governance has prevented an analysis of many pertinent issues. For instance, unaccounted for are the ways in which cultural industries in Canada have been engaged in efforts to align with, or mimic, American examples in order to be profitable or gain status and recognition (1996: 355). In applying Dorland's analysis of the historical bias of policy to a reading of the MoMA's television project, this study intends to illuminate the libertarian basis of cultural governance in the United States during the Cold War era.

As noted, this historical study is designed to contribute to a critical genealogy of the present which, as Berland and Straw write, is marked by an intermingling of the cultural and commercial spheres considered to be relatively oppositional until the rise to predominance of neo-liberal governing regimes in the 1980s. In the context of these neo-liberal reconfigurations intent on fostering internationally competitive cultural industries in Canada, great change has occurred at a rapid rate with little public deliberation (1995: 332-333). As a result, according to Berland and Straw, debates about cultural governance, citizenship and artistic practice have reasserted themselves in familiar sites of governmental display such as in museum and performing art centers (1995: 333, 334). In addition to serving as sites for cultural debate, Berland and Straw suggest that these sites

have been positioned as civic institutions serving to offset the debilitating effects of deindustrialization through their perceived ability to catalyze gentrification, tourism, and employment (1995: 333).

In order to contribute to a genealogy of the present, this study will, as Allor, Juteau, Shepherd suggest, analyze the productive tensions generated by the apparatuses of cultural governance serving as a site for both the legitimation of, as well as contestation about, the nature of liberal cultural governance (1994: 34). This study of dominant governing logics will consider how the MoMA's television project is rife with contradiction, paradox and failure which provides the potential for critical interrogations to take place within these very cultural formations and rationales. In Canada, this sort of activity has been part of a larger set of interventions developed by artists, activists, and intellectuals, as Allor, Juteau and Shepherd note, inside and outside of the cultural apparatus (1994: 34). Their aim has been to disrupt governing logics while challenging dominant models of nations, culture, and sovereignty (1994: 42).

Further informing this critical investigation of the MoMA's television project are studies of modernism, cultural citizenship and television conducted by Lynn Spigel (1998) and Laurie Ouellette (1999). Both studies are historical genealogies addressing recent debates about the fate of public service broadcasting in the United States. These genealogies illuminate the governing logics of public interest networks such as PBS in order to critique the limitations

and biases of the existing cultural institutions without jeopardizing their survival. In her study of the way that modern art was represented on television since the 1950s, Spigel attends to the intermingling of aesthetic and commercial logics associated with high and low. She argues that in the blurring of boundaries between the high and the low, American networks contributed to the production of an image of a modern, yet distinctly American form of national culture (1996: 315, 319). This articulation of the national, according to Spigel, was troubled in that it often utilized gendered and racialized stereotypes in order to familiarize Americans with modern art (1996: 322). After establishing the parameters of this postmodern blurring between commercial television and high art, Spigel articulates her concern about the limits of PBS's approach to culture which she characterizes as paternalistic. She argues that PBS is paternalistic in its attempts to reestablish the borders between high and low culture characteristic of the civilizing mission of cultural institutions like the museum (1996: 341). In order to construct a more effective public broadcast system, Spigel proposes that the reformulation of PBS must go beyond the complimentary logics of commercial television and public service channels as they have emerged since the 1950s.

Building upon Spigel's analysis of PBS is Ouellette's historical genealogy. According to Ouellette, while PBS was established to counter the commercial bias of network broadcast in the USA, its governing logics were designed to radically transform the limits of the networks' commercial rationales through education and information designed to imbue its subjects with citizenly modes of

conduct (1999: 77). As such, the troubled logic of, for example, PBS public affairs programs attempted to impart modes of conduct addressing civic leaders who could in turn become proficient in the procedures and deliberations of liberal democracy (1999: 63). At the same time, as Ouellette suggests, these programs were designed to educate those who were perceived to be politically radical or behaviorally deviant while offering a corrective to the emotional, violent and trivial subject positions thought to be generated by commercial network programs (1999: 78).

This study of the MoMA's television project draws on the contributions of Spigel and Ouellette while contributing a specific case study to their genealogies. As such this dissertation is situated as a cultural materialist reading of the artistic productions and governing logics associated with the MoMA's television project. It is a historical study of a formative moment of liberal cultural governance constituted through the modern media of art and television. At the same time, the discursive contradictions and vexed translations of these principles into practice are investigated in order to demonstrate the historical limitations of liberal articulations of governance, citizenship and modern media.

This dissertation, furthermore, will delve into an issue briefly touched upon by Lynn Spigel. While Spigel notes that work done in critical artistic studies is an indispensable source for any investigation of the politics of Cold War culture, these studies inadequately consider the role of mass media and popular culture

(1996: 314). According to Spigel, due to the mass media's commercial biases, it is usually located in this literature as the monolithic other of modern art. Like Spigel's study, this investigation of the MoMA's television project is informed by the invaluable precedent of critical studies in modern art, yet queries this literature's consideration of the mass media. Social art histories of the period such as Serge Guilbaut's *How New York Stole Modern Art* (1983), for example, lend important insight into the gradual depoliticization of the New York School. Thus, Guilbaut accounts for how critics like Clement Greenberg associated with the once Trotskyite magazine *Partisan Review* and Abstract Expressionist painters like Jackson Pollock surrendered their popular front allegiances to become unwittingly aligned with the agendas of Cold War institutions of cultural governance. Recent re-readings of this high modernist moment initiated by Guilbaut have culminated in attempts to reinstate the tension between the aims of cultural institutions intent on absorbing dissent, and artistic practice. For example, on the one hand, T.J. Clark (1999: 371-407) has suggested that even at the height of the MoMA's support of high modernism, the work of emblematic artists like Jackson Pollock remained in an uneasy alliance with its institutional support. As Clark argues, the MoMA's promotion of Pollock's work was always at odds with the nature of his vulgar and abject compositions associated with Pollock's petit bourgeois class background. Thierry de Duve (1996: 199-280), on the other hand, extends Guilbaut's institutional analysis of modernist art by examining movements such as minimal art, conceptual art, and pop art that were critically opposed to the artistic conventions of high modernist abstraction. de

Duve argues that these artistic formations were intimately bound, albeit in a negative way, to the institutions, conventions and conceptual foundations of high modernism especially as it was formulated by Clement Greenberg and the Museum of Modern Art.

Even though studies such as Guilbaut's, de Duve's and Clark's present a radical critique of the New York School, they, like their subjects of critique, persist in considering the mass media and popular culture as the monolithic other of modernist art. As a result, projects such as the MoMA's television study would be considered by them to be anomalous instances. Contrary to the logic of these critical studies of modern art, this investigation considers the MoMA's television project to be an integral part of the museum's agenda to educate individuals in the citizenly virtues of modern art. Nevertheless, not unlike de Duve and Clark, this dissertation in attending to interrelations between artistic practices and museums is above all concerned with maintaining tensions between these entities. However, this investigation is less concerned with privileging—even in its failures—avant-garde art practice as appears to be the aim of de Duve and Clark's recent rereading of high modernism.

While not fully committed to privileging avant-garde artistic practices, this study, nevertheless, rejects reversals of this logic as evident in recent developments in museum studies. For example, Eileen Hooper Greenhill (1995) argues that the museum as a cultural institution is a site of intervention and democratization. She

suggests that since the neo-liberal era of the 1980s characterized by a withdrawal of government funding from cultural activities, the museum has had to become more accountable to its audiences (1995: 4). In turn, this has, according to Hopper Greenhill, forced them to be democratic—demonstrating their commitment to becoming institutions of education rather than remaining as cultural repositories (1995: 11). As such, she claims that museums function as communications media offering their resources as aides to community dialogue. She suggests how this democratization process can be directed through audience study research methods focusing on the interactive and reflexive relationships between the museum and its patrons. As such, she advocates using a consumption model of communication for the purposes of understanding how individual patrons make sense of their museum encounters. Most contentiously, Hopper Greenhill argues that it has only been since the 1980s that museums have been concerned with democratization and as such have engaged methods of audience analysis borrowed from communication and cultural studies (1995: 7-10). Over the course of this argument she claims that through their attempts at democratization, museums have become modalities of communication and sites for mediation situated to meet the needs and interests of a broad array of cultural communities (1995: 10). In claiming that the museum has only recently become an institution of cultural democracy, Hopper Greenhill overlooks the fact that institutions such as the MoMA have been engaged in democratizing practices for over 60 years. A closer reading of Hooper Greenhill's argument reveals that while she is cognizant of the changing historical conditions

that are forcing museums to adjust to new funding arrangements and social pressures, she is less open to the fact that as an apparatus of cultural governance, museums have since the Enlightenment, in different ways, operated as vehicles of democratization ever able to reform their activities in order to adjust to change.

In drawing from the logics and limitations of recent work in social art history and museum studies, this dissertation will consider the tensions subtending the relationship between artistic practices and their institutional conditions without privileging one element over the other. Toward such ends, this exploration of the relationship between art and institutions of cultural governance will be addressed in a critical and dialectical manner so that paternalist and reformist logics are not mistaken as radical interventions.

This analysis of the governing rationales and institutional arrangements involved in fostering cultural citizenship through modern art and media pedagogy will occur through a close reading of four of the television programs produced during the course of the MoMA's television project. Significantly, each of the programs discussed in this dissertation were produced in conjunction with the MoMA's 25th Anniversary celebrations held in 1954. In the spirit of encouraging cultural citizenship, the MoMA's anniversary ceremonies were inaugurated by eminent civic leaders such as the President of the United States, the Mayor of New York, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations whose speeches confirmed the

importance of modern art in the formation of a democratic world order. In pledging their support to the MoMA, these eminent civic leaders intended that governing practices in their association with the principles of modernism and liberal humanism could be uplifted and reformed.

In chapter one an investigation of the MoMA sponsored television programs *Dimension* (1954) and *The Family of Man* (1955) will demonstrate the MoMA's commitment to educating postwar citizens about the value of modern art crucial to the development of a flourishing cultural democracy. *Dimension* inaugurated the anniversary celebrations by presenting home viewers with a televisual tour of the MoMA's exhibition of its permanent collection. *The Family of Man* concluded the celebrations presenting a televised document of a photo-exhibit of the same name. *Dimension* was designed to illustrate the educational function of the museum's permanent collection. Through a discussion of this televisual documentary, it will become evident how at the MoMA, the modern artist was presented as an exemplary citizen. At the same time, a history of modern art was constructed to demonstrate its eternal, yet contemporaneous relevance while promoting art's ethical and humanitarian principles. This discussion of the function of the MoMA's permanent collection in fostering cultural citizenship will take into account not only the representation of this attempt on *Dimension*, but will also situate this impetus in the context of the MoMA's broader educational efforts, museum policy and links to larger governmental organizations such as the United Nations. In the process of linking the MoMA's programs with the

governmental efforts of the UN and UNESCO's, an analysis of the circumscribed logics subtending this comparison will focus on key articulations such as common humanity, cultural pluralism and cohesive polity. Moreover, an investigation of the attempt to situate learning and creativity as innate human traits and therefore used to claim the basis of citizenship and common humanity, will lead to a discussion of how it came to be that artists and intellectuals, modern art and education were instituted as primary agents in the postwar project of cultural governance.

To illuminate the contributions that the televisual document of *The Family of Man* made to this project of cultural citizenship, chapter one will also investigate MoMA's attempt to augment the educational purpose of its special collection with a picture of an international polity rendered in a photojournalistic format. A discussion of the multi-mediated presentation of *The Family of Man* which occurred through a museum display, an exhibition catalogue and televised documentary will focus on how these media were utilized to engender cultural citizenship as both educational tools and instruments of cultural diplomacy. *The Family of Man* served to elicit loyalty to Western forms of modernization through America's presentation of itself as an enlightened, noncoercive polity. Through an analysis of the discursive, representational, and institutional logics subtending this exhibition, it will become clear how *The Family of Man*'s claims to universality were compromised by its less visible production of paradox and contradiction. In all, as suggested in this chapter, *The Family of Man* in attempting to reflect the

governing order of the UN's Universal Declaration on Human Rights relied on discourses of humanism permeating the UN's policies on development and decolonization. On the other hand, the exhibitionary logic of *The Family of Man* depended on a rationale of media modernization assuming that progress and democracy could occur through the transmission of Western cultural values to emerging sovereign states. To such ends, as will be illustrated, exhibitions such as *The Family of Man* were based on the assumption that anyone who came into contact with the West's messages would automatically transform their conceptual schemas and modify of their behavior thereby instantly adapting to Western ways. Needless to say, such efforts were consequently less than constructive in their attempts to impose Western cultural values onto some projected image of the other—as was the case in *The Family of Man*.

Dimension and *The Family of Man* attempted to educate citizens presenting individuals with picture of universal humanity, and a lesson in civics through the promotion of the modern artist as a model citizen. These pedagogical displays, media demonstrations and citizenly performances were prefigured by the most successful of MoMA's television production, *Through the Enchanted Gate* (1952-1953) a series of art education programs broadcast over two seasons on the NBC network. Each episode was modeled after a typical children's art education class hosted by the MoMA's People's Art Center director and creator of *Through the Enchanted Gate*—Victor D'Amico. In chapter two, a close reading of *Through the Enchanted Gate* will show how in pedagogical terms, the MoMA aimed to

address children as the foundation and future of liberal democracy as well as citizens in the making. This was to be done through the demonstration of nondidactic approaches to art making that championed artistic process, materials, and formal endeavors over finished products and imposed meanings. As such, children were considered to be the foundation of liberal democracy because of their innate ability to learn and unfettered sense of creativity which if tapped at the earliest possible moment in the appropriate way would contribute to the formation of independent, yet civically minded citizenry able to make their own decisions. As will become evident, on *Through the Enchanted Gate* art education doubled as a performance in citizenship and a training ground where one could witness the emergence of independent, judicious, and modern subjects who were open to change and thereby able to resist coercive and authoritarian forms of governance and cultural communication.

The dimensions of cultural citizenship as they unfolded on *Through the Enchanted Gate* will be related to the role that concepts like democratic cultural communications and cultural rights played in the constitution and maintenance of liberal governance. In order to do this, a competing array of theoretical sources and policy documents will be analyzed in order to bring to light the specific position that the MoMA took with regard to the role that modern art and media would play in broader debates about educational television and public interest programming. At the same time, the case will be made that the MoMA's television project functioned as an historical instance produced out of the uneasy

interactions of an array of public service agencies, philanthropic organizations, regulatory bodies, and international bodies constituting that network indicative of the Cold War libertarian approaches to cultural governance in the USA. In an analysis of this regulatory context, special emphasis will be placed on the history and rationale of the television project in the context of the MoMA's history and mandate.

In chapter three a close reading of *The Japanese House*, a made for television documentary about a 17th century dwelling examines citizenly conduct as it is articulated through the rubric of cross-cultural governance. Built in the MoMA's sculpture garden in 1954, the Japanese exhibition house was a modernist exercise in governance designed in part to revise negative public opinion and racial stereotyping of an American military foe and industrial rival. Through a discussion of *The Japanese House*, it will become evident how under the auspices of international cultural exchange, the USA attempted to secure Japan as an anti-communist ally. This effort will be revealed through an analysis of the orientalizing discourses surrounding the activities, debates and representations constituting the television documentary and museum exhibition of the Japanese house.

Situated as an ancient precursor to the modern, the architecture, interior décor and cultural rituals associated with this dwelling were presented as if the house were an ancestor to modernist architecture. While this instance of proto-

modernity legitimated modernist architecture by linking it to an eternal order, it was also located as a source able to humanize the irrational aspects of modernization. Yet, while Japan was represented as a highly sophisticated nation, it was perceived by the West to be unable to modernize and become a cultural democracy. An investigation of this orientalizing logic, as it occurs filmically, architecturally and pedagogically in the rhetoric of cross-cultural governance will be related to the formalist and liberal humanist discourses surrounding *The Japanese House*. After exploring the assumptions that this never televised documentary about the Japanese house was the most aesthetically successful of the MoMA sponsored television productions, an analysis of the logic of cross-cultural governance will be extended. The focus here will to be convey how this orientalizing logic was perpetuated through debates led by Lewis Mumford over the MoMA's promotion of the International Style in modernist architecture. In addition, the paradoxes of cross-cultural governance will be illuminated in a discussion of the spatial rendering of international cultural democracy as it was proposed and realized in the building of the United Nations Headquarters in New York City. Accompanying this investigation will be a discussion of the sources and logics of philanthropic support for these endeavors. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of a 1956 audience survey conducted by the Bureau for Social Research conveying the perceived limits of the Japanese house as an exercise in cultural diplomacy. While noting the project's failures, this study reaffirmed the importance of artistic

and intellectual endeavors to the formation of democratic national citizenry and international polity.

In the pages to follow a close reading of the programs produced in conjunction with the MoMA's television study in the 1950s will show how these cultural productions were situated within the logics of liberal governance. As such, this analysis is organized around the rubric of three components crucial to the formation and maintenance of citizenly conduct: civic education, democratic cultural communications and cross-cultural governance. Specific emphasis will be placed on an analysis of the critical and the reformist dimensions of these processes. To this end, the dissertation will draw on a range of theoretical sources from the disciplines of Communications, Cultural Studies and Critical Artistic Studies in order to conduct a cultural materialist and formational analysis of modernism concerned with the governing logics regulating the relationship between modern art, media pedagogy and cultural citizenship in the Cold War period. This study, then, is intended to contribute to an historical genealogy of that vexed relationship between citizenship and the nation state which, as Balibar describes, is being rapidly reconfigured through the processes of globalization in this post Cold War era.

Chapter 1:

A Lesson in Civics: *Dimension* and *The Family of Man*

> *In modern international politics—aiming towards that world of order which now more than ever seems to be the only alternative to disruption and disaster—we have to approach our task in the spirit which animates the modern artist. We have to tackle our problems without armor of inherited convictions or set formulas, but only with our bare hands and all the honesty we can muster. And we have to do so with an unbreakable will to master the inert matter of patterns created by history and sociological conditions.*
>
> *Dag Hammarskjold*
> *Secretary-General of the United Nations*
> *Address on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of*
> *The Museum of Modern Art, New York*
> *October 19 1954*

Speaking on the occasion of The Museum of Modern Art's twenty-fifth anniversary, Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations argued compellingly that the world could learn great lessons from the modern artist. In following the example of the modern artist, world governors could potentially construct alternatives to societal chaos and the erosion of values that Hammarskjold related to the rise of mass culture (Hammarskjold, 1954: 8). According to Hammarskjold, modern art could contribute to a mature and balanced transformation of the subject from individual to citizen. Moreover, modern art and artists set an example for governmental organizations like the UN aiming to build a better world without depending on "inherited convictions" or "set formulas," "inert patterns of history and sociological conditions" (1954:10). In

modern art, as in modern governance, the search was for the salvation of the human spirit through the "basic elements of experience." While Hammarskjold conceded that art offered few answers and failed to transparently represent the world, he located modern art's uniqueness in it's "agnostic search" resulting in reevaluation of all cultural values (1954: 9).

Modern governance, in a fashion similar to modern art making, for Hammarskjold, could be best conducted through the negotiation of modern civilization's dilemnas. Citizens and art viewers could thereby acquire the tools to decide for themselves how to respond to ever-changing and challenging circumstances. By gaining insight into these modes of artistic reasoning, citizens, artists, and politicians would be educated to employ art as a form of cultural logic and truth which would rectify the failings of scientific and technical progress culminating in the irrationalities of war. Like the artist, politicians and citizens would become "seers and explorers" (1954: 9) able to learn about, and respond to, the world by using their senses, intellects and sensibility to negotiate a complex and dynamic postwar world order.

In deference to modern art and the artist, Hammarskjold concluded his address by suggesting that it might be "far-fetched" to speak about international politics in relationship to modern art (1954: 9). He even ventured to quote Ezra Pound's "Pisan Cantos." Quoting Pound was of great consequence as he had been a fascist supporter during World War II (Lynes, 1973: 350). Nevertheless, by

quoting Pound, Hammarskjold aligned himself with many modernists who supported this poet, not because they agreed with his politics, but because they believed that the aesthetic realm transcended the political realm of partisanship and ideological extremism. Hammarskjold, in presenting himself as a great humanitarian and cultured man, was able to distinguish between high art and politics. After all, as one newspaper reported, Hammarskjold's office was an "inner sanctum of art." His "highly sophisticated taste" made of his office a "small, select gallery of modern painting," complete with works by Picasso, Juan Gris, and Matisse among others (Grenauer, 1954).

What allowed Hammarskjold to discuss the relationship between modern art and international politics, he reasoned, was his proposal that governance operate on a higher level, in an idealized realm that engaged with more pure and morally sanctioned values and modes of human conduct. In effect, governance was to be uplifted in striving to engage with the aesthetic. Governance, therefore, would be placed in the transcendent position of producing universally applicable truths. At the same time, it would be sanctioned with setting legitimate standards of judgment. Therefore, when situated in the context of the way that both the United Nations and the Museum of Modern Art championed culture and education, Hammarskjold's address linking art and international government was prescient rather than unfathomable.

In order to examine Hammarskjold's provocative claims about modern art and governance, this chapter will analyze the relationship between the MoMA and UN's art and educational activities. An examination of the ways in which art, culture, education and governance were articulated will demonstrate how at this conjuncture it was assumed that an international polity would emerge through the formation of a well-educated and self-regulating citizenry whose liberal democratic logics were underwritten by the ethos of universality. To such ends, a discussion of two television documentaries—*Dimension* (1954) and *The Family of Man* (1955)—will reveal how these programs attempted to present the modern artist as a model citizen, and situate modern art within an evolutionary history of humanity while presenting a picture of common humanity for museum audiences to identify with and emulate. In turn, this effort will be related to the parallel efforts of UNESCO to achieve cultural democracy through the "development of humanism and the humanism of development (d'Ormesson, 1972: 111)."

According to Tony Bennett, modern forms of governance rely on cultural institutions such as the museum to engage the populace and inspire them to learn self-regulating modes of conduct. Bennett elaborates on Foucault's notion of governmentality whereby in the modern period power, rather than being located in a single, sovereign ruler, is distributed through an array of institutions and rationalities designed to know and regulate the population (Bennett, 1995: 67-75). Unlike Foucault's notion of carceral power whereby knowledge and training are used to control individuals, Bennett's notion of the exhibitionary

complex proposes that the social order is made visible to the individual viewer. In coming to know this order, viewers are transformed into citizens by taking up this power as their own. Power is thus participatory and self-regulating rather than panoptical and coercive.

The exhibitionary complex engenders citizenship by enabling broad and democratic access to, for example, museum display through its particular representations of the social order and in its performative function whereby spectators, in traversing these displays engage with modes of address teaching them how to modify and adjust their conduct (Bennett, 1995: 62). Hammarskjold hints at this mode of governance in his speech. As well, it was implicit in UN cultural policy and MoMA's art education programs. For example, on MoMA's *Dimension* and *The Family of Man*, two made-for-television documentaries, the exhibitionary complex is implicit in the strategies utilized to educate a broad-based populace in the virtues and conduct associated with modern art and the history of human culture. As a result, each and every individual is considered to have the potential to partake in activity that is civically oriented and by so doing prove the strength and efficacy of the liberal democratic system of Western governance. This system is constructed around individuals who through culture and education acquire appropriate modes of behavior thereby allowing them to internalize a public ethos while serving to mediate the individual's relationship to the state.

While *Dimension* and *The Family of Man* were televised documents of MoMA exhibitions, they also conveyed the potentials and dilemmas of using new communications media such as television to realize the museum's mandate of reaching and representing a universal spectrum of humanity. In the late 40s and early 50s the MoMA investigated the educative potentials of television. Television not only held out the potential of reaching more viewers in one broadcast than would see an exhibition during the entire duration of any given show, but it also was suited to represent the visual arts. Television was understood to be a visual medium able to disseminate aesthetic values to those without geographical and cultural access to the museum—especially citizens in their most private of enclaves—the suburban single-family dwelling. At this time, then, television was considered to be a new medium able to further the museum's universalist mandate. Yet, when examining the modes of conduct and particular histories represented through this liberal-democratic ethos, culture is positioned as not only politically ameliorative, but also as a contentious formation of education, culture and governance—a formation that Hammarskjold held out to be "the only alternative to disruption and disaster."

Fittingly, Hammarskjold's speech was one of several given by civic officials including the Mayor of New York and President of the United States. The overall theme of the opening ceremonies focused on situating the freedom of artistic creation as a fundamental human right foundational to a democratic, liberal society—a rhetorically charged message in 1954 at the height of the Cold War.

The television programs *Dimension* and *The Family of Man* were of significance as they documented the exhibitions that initiated and concluded a year of anniversary activities. *Dimension* marked the beginning of the anniversary celebrations by presenting television viewers with a selected tour of the MoMA's permanent collection constituting the inaugural anniversary exhibition. *The Family of Man* concluded the festivities by providing an abbreviated version of a photo exhibition of the same name designed to illustrate the history and unity of humankind as it emerged through spirit and emotion.

In *Dimension*, the visual arts were championed for their ameliorative capacity, longevity and potential to help viewers understand the modern world. In his introduction, *Dimension's* narrator proclaimed that

> If we look back down the tunnel of time we find it lined with the triumphs and failures of all men who have gone before. There are shameful sites and shadowed places, wars, persecutions, and, the lessons learned, we look on...onto the bright and burnished works of science, philosophy... and shining with a special glow: man's works of art (MoMA, 1954b).

According to the narrator, art gave dimension to human kind through the ages. As such, modern artists created provocative work relating to contemporary conditions filled with beauty, ugliness, utility, and grief. Above all, the narrator concluded, modern art is concerned with "Man."

These introductory remarks imbued art with a quasi-spiritual function, yet located it in a narrative of evolution propounding to produce culture expressing the essence of humanity. Not uncoincidentally, this trajectory of genesis and evolution was echoed in *The Family of Man*. Rather than situating art as an analogue of human essence as was done in *Dimension*, *The Family of Man* telecast utilized technologies of modern art and governance such as the museum exhibition and photographic essay to present a sense of human commonality. Human essence was rooted in cultural rituals and languages that although they varied, emanated from the evolutionary processes of the life cycle.

On *Dimension*, modern art was imbued with a history claiming art as the essence and pinnacle of human aesthetic and intellectual development. Nevertheless, this history was carefully distinguished as anti-art historical. As MoMA Director of Museum Collections Alfred Barr wrote, this was not a history of chronological progression or of national schools. This history was organized according to the stages of stylistic development so that art transcended the ordinary and everyday, while borrowing from its examples, and contributing to its improvement. This history was embedded in an evolutionary narrative of art's movement away from and toward social referentiality throughout the development of abstract painting. In rehearsing this history for viewers, *Dimension's* hosts Alfred Barr, MoMA Director Rene D'Harnocourt, and NYU Art Education Professor Robert Inglehart simultaneously instructed and invited viewers to learn how to read modern art. What was most important was how the

artist-citizen creatively and responsibly responded to, and constituted, the modern world through modes of conduct to be emulated by television viewers as they learned the history of modern art and understood how to engage with it. Emphasis here is on the performative. After all, as Barr suggested, the most important aspect of art was what it did to the individual viewer who looked at it. In the spirit of producing self-regulating citizens, for example, Barr stated that the viewer's direct experience of art took priority over officially sanctioned interpretations. For Barr, explanations of a work's thematic meanings were usually partial, descriptive and didactic. At the same time, they imposed meaning on viewers which violated the fundamental democratic premise that individuals have the right and intrinsic capabilities to decide for themselves what to think and believe.

On *Dimension*, art was considered to be about larger truths such as freedom of expression. Individual rights and freedoms represented more than private pleasures and desires. They belonged to the self-disciplined individual who directed "his" activity toward the public good. Sanctioning the primacy of these democratic principles through art education was acted out in a seemingly impromptu exchange between Professor Inglehart and a studio technician. The technician voiced his doubts about modern art and in so doing was supposed to represent the average middle-class citizen *Dimension* addressed. After a brief discussion with Professor Inglehart, although still skeptical, the technician appeared willing to consider the value of modern art. This vignette demonstrated

a governing ethos where according to Barr citizens could be honest and admit if they didn't like modern art. As Barr wrote, not everyone had to like the same thing especially since modern art aimed to help individuals understand the modern world (1956: 5). Art was not about superficial pleasures, nor was it intended to be didactic, prescriptive and sell goods. Art Education through the MoMA's permanent collection aimed to introduce audiences to new ways of seeing that until then had been relatively inaccessible. As in the case of the studio technician, it was assumed that once the general populace became familiar with the appropriate knowledge and modes of conduct, they would be more open to considering the potentials of modern art.

In keeping with these educational aims, *Dimension* guided viewers through the MoMA's permanent collection introducing three ways that modern art related to the social world. To begin with works such as Brancusi's bronze sculpture *Bird in Space* and Stuart Davis's tapestry *A Flying Carpet* were highlighted because they represented what was modern in the world through the imaginative use of form, color and composition. The works in this category were exemplary in that they first identified and them defamiliarized the habitual and taken for granted in everyday life. Next, examples of work in which principles of modern design had been applied to utilitarian objects were displayed. In order to examine how the aesthetic could improve everyday life, this segment presented examples such as the war posters of Ben Shahn, an architectural model of The Lever House, and objects such as a record jacket, Kleenex box and storage unit. Finally, as Alfred

Barr suggested, art was important not only in its application to, and imaginative representation of, the social world, but it was also important in itself—in its abstract rather than a referential relation to the world. As such, Barr identified two streams of abstraction. One trajectory culminated in the rational abstractions of artists such as Piet Mondrian. The other trajectory was characterized by the abstract painting of Wassily Kandinsky, which was considered to be more intuitive and spontaneous in its concern with unconscious drives.

On *Dimension*, the trends in modern art were not only presented to situate MoMA's permanent collection within a trajectory of stylistic evolution, but they were also geared towards illuminating to viewers that in learning this history, they were privy to a plurality of practices. This broad range of activity, moreover, was emphasized in that it was representative of a culture whose government did not dictate how art should be made, and by inference, how life should be lived. Artists, and through emulation viewers, were free to choose the ways in which they could proceed which allowed for an array of practices that were as varied as the modern world. The aim of *Dimension*, then, was in part intended to educate its audience in the ways that modern art was of ethical and eternal relevance to contemporary society. As such, art responded to, and shaped, modern life. According to Barr, art captured the spirit of the age before it was generally recognized by the people living in that age (MoMA, 1954b).

While *Dimension* offered only a brief half-hour introduction to the MoMA's collection, this telecast presented an abridged demonstration of the educational function of MoMA's permanent collection. A fuller explanation of this strategy was articulated in educational pamphlets such as *What is Modern Painting?* In the introduction and conclusion to *What is Modern Painting?* Alfred Barr discussed the attributes of cultural citizenship acquired through an understanding of modern art. These attributes of the artist-citizen, as Toby Miller suggests, had much to offer viewers. Cultural citizen's can learn from, for example, the

> ...excoriating, searing, uncomfortable but finally ameliorating liberal gaze of the artist. For the artist is a creature that can know us by being of us, but who stands away from the everyday cycles of accumulation and dispersal in order to see what we fail to be but might have it in us to become." (Miller, 1993: 96)

In keeping with Miller's observation, in *What is Modern Painting*? the artist was presented as a model citizen. According to Barr, the artist was "human like the rest of us" and therefore "he can't solve these problems except as one of us (1956: 5)." The artists, nevertheless, through art could lend insight into the complexities of the modern condition. "The artist is the antennae of the race," wrote Barr (1956: 5). He further characterized the artist as a pioneer not unlike the scientist and the inventor (1956; 5). Through their work, artists presented prophetic insights to those who were honest and willing to learn from what seemed difficult and unfamiliar. Barr wrote that those willing to expend the effort to engage with modern art would be able to distinguish between high culture and culture that involved quick and superficial gratifications in commercial

entertainments. Their hard work would be rewarded in that they would be able to enjoy an enriched life, which was in the words of Barr "a life more worth living (1956: 5).'

In learning to look at art "with a spirit of adventure" (1956: 5) art viewers were to be uplifted by a variety of experiences roughly falling into the three categories presented on *Dimension*. There was art that was poetic and lifted viewers out of their habitual ways of seeing. Art was also devoted to conveying the qualities of human life like vanity, devotion, joy and sadness. Finally, there was work that addressed the crucial problems of civilization such as the character of, for example, democracy, tyranny, industrialization, the subconscious and religion (Barr, 1956: 5). Not only did art engage at the level of both the details of the everyday and civilization, but art was also supposed to be of universal benefit because, according to Barr, it surpassed the problems of language. In a multilingual world, the only way difference could be understood was through the complicated and flawed process of translation. Barr wrote that in painting and its reliance on the visual there were "no foreign languages." There were only local variations that could be easily learned and understood internationally. Barr subsequently regarded modern art, as a kind of "visual Esperanto" which he claimed was truly universal and therefore "has special value in this riven world (1956: 5)."

By characterizing modern art as visual Esperanto, Barr suggested that an international spectrum of viewers could transcend disparity and dispute by looking at, learning from, and emulating the conduct of the cannon set forth in education materials such as *What is Modern Painting?* and *Dimension*. Accordingly, the artist and by implication the subject-citizen, could subscribe to the principles of modern art embodied in Barr's trinity of "Truth, Freedom, and Perfection (1956: 45-47)." According to Barr's principles of "Truth, Freedom, and Perfection," truth was not always factual for the artist. It could be arrived at through more figurative modes such as allegory, riddle, parable, metaphor, myth and dream. To gain access to this truth, the freedom of the artist was held up as a fundamental premise of liberal democracy. Artists were free because they created what they wanted and their drive towards truth emanated from inner necessity. Artists were at liberty and thus their freedom opposed totalitarian approaches to culture where art was made in accordance with the state's dictates.

With the artist's freedom, nevertheless, came the concomitant discipline and responsibility that the artist must engage. Barr wrote, "When men are free they must be disciplined. Only through the most severe self-discipline can man approach excellence from which all good artist's strive (1956: 46)." Here, art acted as an analogue for moral and ethical conduct. Such self-regulation on the part of the artist and the citizen related to the conditions necessary for cultural excellence and perfection. The artist's search for perfection was self-regulated

because it was supposedly driven by an inner passion. Moreover, in striving for excellence artists acted as their own judges. This search echoes Matthew Arnold's approach to culture (Miller, 1993: 26-27). That instead of constituting an edenic return to an originary moment before the fall from heavenly grace, perfection was something to be striven for in "Man" and in the future. This future oriented goal dislodged omniscient and fixed hierarchies. Nevertheless, the pursuit of perfection through beauty and harmony provided sufficient parameters, for Arnold, to manage and order an unruly populace through a democracy not of the mass, but a democracy of modern governmental institutions like those associated with the exhibitionary complex devoted to the creation of a well-rounded and educated citizenry.

Barr's principles of "Truth, Freedom and Perfection" operated as a modernist hybrid modifying the progressive and rationalist principles associated with Enlightenment rationality implicit to the French Republic's motto of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" with the sense of spiritual faith embodied in the Christian principles of "Faith, Hope and Charity." Easily added to these governing principles could be Matthew Arnold's tripartite scheme of "Culture, Self and State (Miller, 1993: 27)." This configuration of principles, in part, outlined the parameters of the relationship between artistic production, human conduct and democratic governance. From the motto of the French Republic emerged the valourization of the individual citizen as both the subject and source of governmental rule. Although the self-regulating citizen of the Enlightenment

rejected feudal and absolutist forms of rule imposed by the monarchy and Catholic Church, modernists in the post World War II world insisted on reviving principles of Christian thought to humanize the subject through focusing on passion and spiritual emotion. This move was supposed to rectify the failures attributed to the instrumentalized rationality of technocratic and scientized forces of modernization.

Arnold's precepts, although disavowed in Barr's trajectory because Barr associated the state with authoritarian forms of rule, were pertinent in that they conveyed the governmental process at work in the educational impetus of MoMA's permanent collection and Hammaskjold's address. In accordance with Arnoldian visions of the relationship between governance and culture, the pursuit of truth and perfection and the attempt to educate the populace in such pursuits were intended to shape the individual's self interests in a synonymous relation to the goals of state governance. Through culture, the individual and larger governing bodies could be synchronized into a harmonious and workable self-governing order. In Barr's trinity, freedom acted as a trope conflating the modes of conduct necessary to marshal individuals, institutions and discourses of governmentality into synchronization. Freedom was tempered by public responsibility and constituted a mode of conduct providing evidence of an advanced civilization. This culturally sophisticated society was further distinguished in its ability to tolerate dispute, and diversity. It could even risk allowing individuals to reason and make their own decisions—so strong was the

belief that the democratic system of governance was of a higher order of principle and conduct.

Barr's educational goals of realizing "Truth, Freedom, and Perfection" were given credence as a fundamental civic pursuit in the speech that President Eisenhower delivered at MoMA's silver anniversary ceremonies. To reinforce this sense of legitimacy, Barr quoted Eisenhower's speech in *What is Modern Painting?* (1956: 46). In this speech, according to one source, nothing was left to chance. Eisenhower's address just happened to be one of several versions written by a committee of MoMA officials and presented to the President to choose from (Lynes, 1973: 350). Not surprisingly, then, Eisenhower complemented Hammarskjold's message noting that the freedom of artists in their creative pursuits was a cornerstone of postwar liberal democracy. Because the freedom of the artist was taken to be a pillar of liberty in the Western World, it should be considered as a cultural right. This would allow people to "see, understand, and profit from our artists work." Moreover, according to Eisenhower, artists were to be protected from censorship allowing controversy to flourish. It was only through controversy that there could be progress and creative genius (Eisenhower, 1954: 2).

Through a mature balance between freedom and responsibility, citizens were able to then make wise, insightful, innovate and unique choices in the face of complexity and diversity. This sort of conduct, although challenging, was directed

away from radical social change. Instead, this self-shaping impetus was geared towards reform, social integration and moral development. In the actual course of Barr's art history of the modern, revolution was absorbed into the service of evolving stylistic shifts. As Barr wrote

> Art is always in a state of revolution, sometimes gradual or sudden. Just as in politics, revolutionary ideas in art are generally accepted and become part of conservative opinion that in turn has to defend itself against a new revolution (1956: 39).

Here, an evolutionary teleology was constructed whereby change and progress were positioned within the realm of the organic. Revolution was to occur on the level of stylistic shifts progressing through a life cycle. The new and revolutionary were to be rallied into an eternal evolutionary order able to incorporate dissent and difference perpetuated through a liberal, democratic and capitalist social order.

On *Dimension* and *What is Modern Painting?* art was situated in an evolutionary teleology not unlike that of the stages of the human life cycle. This history offered an alternative to narratives of progress whereby technological and scientific developments were thought to result in crisis and the ruins of war. In the development of modern art, rational enlightenment was to be redeemed in its association with the passions and a secularized form of spirituality. In *What is Modern Art?* and *Dimension,* the cycle of progress and ruin was replaced and rectified by a cycle of human development manifest in a movement of the

aesthetic away from, and return to, the social referent. In this cycle Picasso's *Guernica* (1937) stood as the pivotal work. As a response to the Spanish Civil War, it marked a moment of crisis and ruin. According to Barr, the painting presented social commentary through both abstract and realist means. Pictures of human devastation such as *Guernica*, Barr was careful to stress, were not propaganda pictures. They were works by "free men moved by great and terrible events...eager to tell the truth with the resources of modern painting (1956: 44)."

Prior to the war, Barr claimed that painting developed according to a revolutionary cycle of abstraction starting with the Impressionists and progressing through to Kandinsky and Mondrian. Again the movement was away from any reference to the world culminating in an increased reliance on the formal and imaginative (1956: 41). Nevertheless, the development of this form of abstraction, according to Barr, was simple in conception and meaning. Meaning was conveyed through form and colour. Human emotion, religion, politics, economics, and psychology were, for example, not addressed. Finally, postwar abstraction re-emerged as a culmination of the lessons learned from prewar abstractionists and Picasso's *Guernica*. Because progress had proven irrational, Barr wrote, postwar abstractionists distanced themselves from the social, yet they emphasized the human spirit situating their work as more than a formal exercise (1956: 43, 44).

Dimension, its history of modern art, characterization of the artist, and dissemination of this knowledge through educational materials contributed to the formation of a liberal-democratic rationale championing the autonomous, yet responsible citizen. The focus was on modes of conduct designed to negotiate the paradoxes of the postwar world. The most fundamental tenant of this material was governance through education and self-enlightenment serving as an alternative to the top-down dictates of totalitarian regimes that supposedly treated citizens as a naïve mass.

Moreover, *Dimension* and *What is Modern Art?* instructed viewers in modes of citizenly conduct through the interpretation of high art. Art was less about prestige, status, leisure and more about spiritual uplift. It was positioned to bring about ethical revelation able to bridge gaps between the technological, scientific, and aesthetic realms. Through an understanding of the modes of conduct surrounding high art—one was privy to cultural universality. Such aims were paralleled in UN cultural policies produced under the auspices of the United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization (UNESCO).

UNESCO too asserted that through culture international peace and security could be established. In principle, UNESCO championed culture because it was supposed that war began "in the minds of men (UNESCO, 1972: 19)." Through an appeal to the mind, peace could be realized. High culture was particularly valued in that it was said to appeal to the most noble of human instincts (1972:

16). Within the rubric of UNESCO's cultural policy—culture was no longer strictly associated with leisure, and class status. It was supposedly imbued with an ethical imperative devoted to improving man through the discovery of human essence.

As on *Dimension,* culture was linked to the beginning of time in UNESCO policy so that it would be seen as a legitimate tool through which to forge a postwar world order. After all, culture had a history "as old as man" and therefore was one of the earliest forms of international communication (d'Ormesson, 1972: 95). This rationale provided a burgeoning international organization such as the UN with logic through which to focus on, and build itself up around, cultural issues. Culture was given further impetus as it was positioned to ameliorate ideological antagonisms and the irrationalities of scientific progress. Rather than pitting science and technology against culture that during the war resulted in the near ruin of civilization, culture was situated as a universal value permeating the spheres of science and technology, rather than acting in opposition to them (d'Ormesson, 1972: 96).

Culture, furthermore, could enrich international understanding through the respect for, and knowledge of, a plurality of world cultures. Instead of acting as a homogenizing impetus, universal culture was understood as the sum total of national cultures—constituting a unity in diversity (1972: 97). High culture was considered to be particularly sensitive to these principles. For example,

according the UNESCO policy, literature and the arts were marked by a plurality of practices and the cultivation of difference. Therefore, dialogue was to be the privileged mode not uniformity. Through dialogue, obstacles to communication such as ideological difference, geographical distance, financial considerations, and habit were to be negotiated (1972: 97-98). Within UNESCO's policies and principles, culture was no longer considered as pleasure, leisure, and status. Culture, in terms echoing Barr's, became "a question of life and death (1972: 109)."

In its articulation of unity in diversity, this formulation of culture posed a number of dilemmas for the subject-citizen. Culture was all encompassing. It brought to light "the best that was thought and said" while allowing for the expression of controversy, strife and contradiction. A sense of history was to be asserted, but care was to be taken to avoid dwelling in the history of fear and devastation caused in the past. Individual autonomy was valourized, but not at the expense of good governmental organization thereby presenting an antidote to the dictates of totalitarian societies whereby the individual was supposedly overpowered by the so-called mass. In presenting these dilemmas, cultural citizens were to reconcile knowledge with wisdom, replace contempt with curiosity, and quell hatred with mutual knowledge. For the members of UNESCO, not unlike the art educators at the MoMA, culture took on a "new dimension" (1972: 108) in the postwar period.

UNESCO cultural policy and the history of modern art presented on *Dimension* both claimed to break with the recent past. Such claims were legitimized because they articulated a sense of history that was eternal, and evolutionary. The knowledge produced here was rooted in the order of the organic and ontological rather than contingent and conjunctural. In being distanced from the most recent past, these knowleges were situated as ahistorical and as such operated as a corrective to the failures of scientific and technological progress. This paradoxical move was made under the auspices of re-inflecting culture with essentializing terms like universality and humanity. While presented as something new, the programs and policies of UNESCO and the MoMA were in part related to the regular functioning of cultural institutions such as the museum in their claims to provide universal access, representation and education to the extended populations of democratic societies. Under the principle of broadening access, social order was exhibited in evolutionary displays where "Man" was presented as the outcome and pinnacle of this process. The governmental order of culture was then legitimized through its association with the eternal, organic and natural. Nevertheless, as Tony Bennett suggests, such ordering was historically specific, biased and exclusionary in terms of race, gender and class. As a result, the contradictions between the stated universal principles of the museum and its historical exclusions embedded within this governmental apparatus held out the potential for contestation, contradiction and criticism. As a result of these contradictions, readjustments could be made to better realize the governing principles and modes of conduct of the exhibitionary apparatus. Through

processes of incorporation and amelioration, policy and exhibitions provided temporary and contingent resolutions to contradictions and strife (Bennett, 1995: 46).

In the case of *Dimension* and *The Family of Man*, a break was made with the immediate past of war, economic depression, Communism and Nazism—a past filled with failures to realize the Enlightenment promise of universality. This proposed break was reform oriented rather than radical. The aim was to adjust, and retool forms of cultural display in order to adapt it to a changing postwar world. Effective governance in this discourse of reform occurred by rallying emergent formations to established cultural practices and governmental institutions (Allor & Gagnon, 1994: 37). As a result, in the guise of the new, as Miller argues, subjects are presented with knowledge and modes of conduct necessary to negotiate the contradictory and shifting requirements of liberal, democratic and capitalist order (Miller, 1993: ix).

The democratizing, humanizing and civilizing measures offered through UNESCO cultural policy and MoMA programs were, thus, oriented towards reform. As such, change was engendered and contained by situating culture, rather than biology, as the foundational essence of humanity. Culture was what everyone has in common even though it was expressed in a multitude of ways by a plurality of cultures. In presenting culture as the fundamental essence of humanity, 19th century narratives of evolution—themselves constituted as part of

the democratizing impetus of the museum—were overhauled to reconstitute and re-legitimize the ability of cultural exhibits to contribute to the education of self-regulating citizens. In the 19th century, the evolutionary ordering of history replaced the fixed, metaphysical orders of medieval Christianity and absolutist monarchies. Evolutionary narratives were thought to be democratic in their presentation of historical time and address to an abstract subject equivocally free and equal thus constituting a form of governance regulated through incorporation and education. As Bennett notes, this evolutionary order legitimated itself by encompassing all people, things and forms of life through time and across space (1995: 79). Evolutionary time presented history as the truth of Man (1995: 46)."Man" was located as the outcome of many evolving formations—from the geological formation of the earth, to the development of life, to the progress of life in its animal form through to the development of humanity. Progress was measured in stages ranging from the primitive to the civilized, the simple to the complex, and the physical to the intellectual. Through display practices, viewers were given access to the resources required to act out, and engage in, this particular vision of history. It was assumed that given this access, they would then be inspired to fashion themselves in light of this order and thereby contribute to its development (1995: 42, 44).

On *Dimension*, art was historicized according to stylistic developments which were simultaneously future oriented in that eternal value was articulated through modern art. Modern art was timeless yet forward looking because it produced

cogent, and precocious responses to contemporary situations by visualizing the invisible. Art, especially in its abstract form, was said to be detached from the impurity of the world imbuing it with the potential to achieve or discover what was authentic and common to humanity. In the context of the MoMA and the United Nations' efforts to create a form of international polity that was not nationalist, the ethos surrounding modern art practice was ideally suited to locating and promoting the essence of human conduct that appeared ideologically neutral. The artist was represented as an ideal citizen. The artist was visionary, took risks, and had the faith and convictions to depict what others were unable to see. Artists had the patience to realize that their prophecies would be recognized once the general populace was educated in modern ways of seeing.

In UNESCO policy and MoMA's *The Family of Man*, the universalist project of cultural democracy was oriented toward reform. The attempt was to rectify the failings of the most recent past by shifting the definition of the human away from genetic determinants to those that were cultural. In the process, these efforts were disassociated from competing discursive formations of evolutionary ordering. On the one hand, these postwar formations condemned those using evolutionary logic to legitimate a hierarchical racial order that, for example, lead to the genocidal campaigns of the Nazi's. On the other hand, this reformist logic was employed to dismiss those who were critical of the exclusionary biases of this liberal, democratic and capitalist order.

The problem of human culture and racial discrimination was most directly addressed in UNESCO's declaration on Race and Science (1950/1961). This declaration lends insight into the aims of the governmental logic associated with *The Family of Man.* In 1950 a committee of anthropologists, psychologist and sociologists gathered by UNESCO concluded that unlike in the prewar period, genetic differences were not important in determining social and cultural differences (UNESCO, 1950/1961: 496-501). In every group a rich variety of personalities and character types existed. The declaration proclaimed that if granted access to cultural resources, groups from different populations were proven to realize similar levels of achievement. Moreover, the declaration concluded that all humans were capable of learning the nature of mutual service and reciprocity. What was innate in humankind, according to this document, was the potential for cooperation because "man" was a social being who reached his fullest development in his interactions with fellow humans. This mode of social being was to be facilitated by "the one trait, which above all others has been at a premium in the evolution of man's mental character—educability (UNESCO, 1950/1961: 496)." Therefore, world peace could be achieved through the defining cultural characteristics of humankind—educability, independence and cooperation.

.

Soon after this statement was issued some biologists, physical anthropologists and geneticists took issue with the declaration. They claimed that it over-valued culture at the expense of science (UNESCO, 1961: 494). In order to comply with

its mandate of universality and democratic deliberation, the UN facilitated a meeting of dissenters allowing them to issue their own declaration released in 1951 (1961: 502-506). While the dissenters agreed that cultural difference was not biologically founded in the existing literature, they were unwilling to foreclose on the matter. They reserved the right not to discount that the biological characteristic they attributed to racial variation determined cultural difference.

Not only was there a move in this case to rectify the troubled relationships between race and culture, but also there was an attempt to reposition the enlightenment ideal of the family as the fundamental social unit governing the conduct of individuals from their most intimate relations to their most civic and public duties. The figure of the family also served to entice citizens to identify with, and subscribe to, liberal, democratic and capitalist modes articulated through the newly inaugurated sphere of international governance. So fundamental was the family to this postwar order that it was enshrined as an essential principle in the preamble to the United Nations Universal Declaration of the Human Rights and was the focus of MoMA's most popular exhibition *The Family of Man* (Anderson & Cummings, 1951: 5).

In establishing education and cooperation as the fundamental characteristics of humankind and the liberal, democratic ethos of international governance, *The Family of Man* addressed what was common in a polity constituted around a variety of cultures. This ethos was represented at the start of the televised

version of *The Family of Man*. The program began with images of a crowd of exhibition viewers milling around looking at pictures of their fellow man and at each other. This was the exhibition curator Edward Steichen's model polity constituted from individuals who gathered together "to form the multitude." As the TV narrator announced, "These are people working at the most common of human activities—people looking at people." In looking, these people who constituted the polity relied on visual recognition and identification to affirm their commonality and humanity. Through attention to the gaze of humanity in *The Family of Man*, Steichen represented an anthropological view of culture rather than one that was confined, as in *Dimension*, to the fine arts.

The approach to cultural anthropology in *The Family of Man* acknowledged cultural variation for the purposes of locating unity in basic human emotions such as love, grief, and devastation. This exhibition offered an alternative to earlier narratives of evolution represented by the family tree which hierarchically ranked civilizations from the most primitive to the most highly evolved. According to Anne McClintock, the family tree provided a vivid visual schema where progress was rooted in a biological order developing from the earliest stages of childhood through to adulthood. Anyone who was not male, white and in their prime was considered to be in an immature stage of development. Anyone who was not a white heterosexual male was linked to various stages of childhood development in the life cycle of human history. As such they were infantalized and positioned as primitive, ancient, or deviant (McClintock, 1995: 39).

Steichen's exhibition drew on notions of cultural relativism emerging in postwar approaches to anthropology that considered human life in ecological rather than in biological terms. An ecological study concentrated on the interrelation of living things with each other in their environment (Staniszweski, 1998). Anthropologist Harry Shapiro, a guest expert on *The Family of Man* telecast discussed the import of cultural relativism. According to Shapiro, it was the anthropologist's job to compare and understand different cultures. The goal was to discover the fundamental principles of human development and behavior. Despite difference in skin colour and hair type, Shapiro suggested that humanity was constructed according to the same basic biological pattern. While cultures might differ, all were united in their loyalty, courage, love and tenderness—especially in moments of strife or violence. Differences could be overcome—if viewers emulated Shapiro by studying other cultures in order to love and understand them. The search, then, was to discover cultural affinities. Resemblances, therefore, were evidence of the essential nature of humanity and demonstrated the capacity to transcend social and historical limitations. In keeping with Shapiro's proposition, Steichen wrote that *The Family of Man* was concerned with "human consciousness rather than social consciousness" manifest in "man's dreams and aspirations"...and the "flaming creative forces of love and truth and the corrosive evil inherent in the lie (Steichen, 1955: 5)."

This picture of humanity constructed in *The Family of Man* and articulated in UNESCO policy located its genesis in the human spirit of emotion, passion and cooperation. *The Family of Man* claimed to be humanitarian because it championed education, the family, and human rights all instruments of liberal democracy. In her role as a humanitarian, Eleanor Roosevelt made a guest appearance on the televised version of *The Family of Man*. According to Roosevelt, the world was troubled and so people everywhere were united in their concern for security and survival. Education, therefore, was the key to ending ignorance in this small and interdependent world. What linked citizens of this international order together was their allegiance to the family where everyone had the need for love, warmth, and understanding. Thus, as Roosevelt insisted, the passions of all people were alike despite differences in culture, language and manners. The human passions furthermore had the power to quell hunger, fear and isolation. Roosevelt added that faith and obstinacy were fundamental characteristics of the international family of Man while individual families were "the factories which re-nourish the world."

The Family of Man contributed to the articulation of universal cultural citizenship through a museum tour of common humanity. Steichen, in the introduction to the exhibition catalogue described his display as constituting "a mirror of the universal element [that] enters into the everydayness of life...a mirror of the essential oneness of mankind throughout the world." *The Family of Man* was of course a megalithic undertaking in its attempt to be universally comprehensive.

Over several years, Steichen and his associates culled through commercial photo-archives, private collections, and visited a multitude of photographers. In the end, according the Steichen, after looking at over two million photographs, they constructed their composite portrait of universal mankind out of 503 photographs by 237 photographers (Steichen, 1955: 5).

This overwhelming array of material was arranged into a series of spatial and thematic juxtapositions. As Steichen wrote, photographs were gathered from around the world for the exhibition and sought to represent

> "...the gamut of life from birth to death with emphasis on the daily relationship of man to himself, to his family, to the community and to the world we live in—subject matter ranging from babies to philosophers, from kindergarten to the university, from primitive peoples to the Councils of the United Nations. ...Photographers are concerned with man in relation to his environment, to the beauty and richness of the earth he has inherited and what he has done with this inheritance, the good and the great things, the stupid and the destructive things (Steichen, 1955: 45).

The televised broadcast of *The Family of Man* reflected the social order described in Steichen's curatorial statement. The telecast was thereby constructed around a montage of photos from the exhibit focused on rituals following from, for example, birth, marriage, and death. In the opening and closing montages hope and innocence were linked to childhood, while the heterosexual couple—their intimacies and reproductive capabilities were repeatedly represented. In an echo of the exhibition, the first half of the televised version of *The Family of Man* presented images of lovers, marriages, and childbirth. There were family scenes of children and their parents, children

playing, and a myriad of images of families from around the world. A second segment explored common human activity such as work, leisure, dancing and music culminating in picture of children playing ring-around-the-rosy which Steichen considered to be a universal game (Szarkowski, 1994: 13).

After establishing this idealized view of universalized humanity, there was a shift in tone from all that was considered to be good, common and constitutive of the family. First, war and destruction were symbolized by an image of the mushroom cloud from the hydrogen bomb detonated in the Asian Pacific island of Bikini Atol in 1954. This photograph was meant to symbolize the potential for the complete destruction of human civilization prevailing during the Cold War. This fear was underscored in a quote from Bertrand Russell accompanying the picture of the bomb blast. As Russell wrote

> ...the best authorities are unanimous in saying that war with hydrogen bombs is quite likely to put an end to the human race. ...there will be universal death—sudden for only a fortunate minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration (Steichen, 1955: 179).

Here, fear, crisis and the threat of cultural annihilation served as a dramatic turning point. Viewers were presented with choosing between destruction and survival. A tour through a series of photos of death and destruction in a section devoted to grief, famine, and genocide was framed by a concluding sequence of portraits of elderly couples, children and an image of a woman's lower torso adorned with flowers. The sequence symbolized feminine fertility, human longevity, hope and innocence and culminated in a photomural of the general

assembly of the United Nations. This image was of the family of Man in its grandest incarnation—as the ultimate pan-national family of nation-states deliberating in the UN General Assembly. Here, delegates were linked through their physical proximity and headsets providing them with access to multi-lingual translations of the proceedings. In the General Assembly, the delegates' confederation was dependent not only on the technology of translation, but also in their spatial proximity housed in the most modern of architectural spaces as well as through their commitment to the policies and principles of the UN. The delegates most fundamental commitment was noted in an excerpt from the UN Charter accompanying the photo stating the allegiance of members to "...save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," and to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights (Steichen, 1955: 184-185)."

Steichen's visual morality play offered viewers a tour through a variety of media such as the museum exhibit, the televisual montage, and exhibition catalogue photo-essay. The civilized order of the family in all of these renditions was linked to the land by labour, to the organic life cycle through reproduction and culminated in the intellectual and artistic productions distinguishing man from other forms of life. In representing fear and ruin, irrationalities and violence were presented so that they could be known, understood, and managed. This process of visualization was intended to contain and overcome fear and violence by giving viewers the opportunity to choose between the civilized order of the biological family and the governing kin of the United Nations—or death. The

exhibition, catalogue and television program all ended on an optimistic note. As the narrator stated: "The family is filled with awe when it beholds itself. For we the people live through every doubt and death." Therefore, in the face of adversity, the human spirit would prevail. Here, exhibition viewers were encouraged to conclude that the struggle between reason and unreason would by no means end, but by making these forces visible, the irrational aspects of humanity could be regulated into the humanitarian order of Western liberal democracy.

Steichen's itinerary doubled as a democratic model of polity. Its physical ordering literally reflected in visual terms several articles constituting the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Both the UN and MoMA stated their concern with the "destiny and dignity" of man in his "marvelous diversity (d'Ormesson, 1972: 101)." Individuals were to be united through their adherence to the charter of rights sanctioning the formation of self-regulating individuals through formal mechanisms and institutions guiding civic conduct such as universal education and suffrage. In *The Family of Man* the formal parameters of democracy were represented not only by the family (as stated in the UN Declaration of Human Rights Preamble and in Article 16), but also articulated in thematic sections devoted to education (Article 26), voting (Article 21), freedom of opinion and expression (Article 18), freedom from fear and want (Preamble), and the right to freely participate in cultural life (Article 27) (Anderson & Cummings, 1951: 6-28). In reflecting the constitutional order of the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights, *The Family of Man* presented exhibition viewers with a mode of citizenship through which the individual could identify with and commit to larger bodies of international governance such as the United Nations.

In a 1951 pamphlet designed to introduce American school children to the principles of good citizenship presented in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, two points are of considerable relevance. First, a discussion of the right to freedom of opinion and expression warned of the dilemmas of extending such freedoms through the new mass media of radio, television and motion pictures. Given their powerful capabilities to communicate over extended geographical distances and accelerated rates, the mass media were assumed to have the potential to both foster democracy and limit its growth. According to this educational pamphlet, care was to be taken in order to balance the ability of powerful Western countries such as the US with highly developed media institutions. Western mass media were considered to be able to unduly influence those with less developed resources who might as a result "reject their own ways of living (Anderson& Cummings, 1951: 21)." The authors of this pamphlet suggested that outside influences should be balanced with the development of equally effective domestic media. Jean d'Ormesson, a UNESCO representative characterized this approach to cultural transfer as "the humanism of development, and development of humanism (1972: 111)."

Combined with this sensitivity to the anti-democratic potentials of mass media, the authors' discussion of cultural rights risked reinforcing the dominating impositions of the modernization paradigm of culture and communication. For instance, Article 27 of the Universal Declaration states that everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of the community because culture was understood to be a means through which to achieve community cohesion and social belonging. Nevertheless, only certain forms of culture like those most closely associated with Bennett's notion of the exhibitionary institutions were mentioned. These included only institutions of potentially "uplifting forms of culture" found in the theatre, the public library, the concert hall, the art museum, in voluntary associations and sometimes circulating through the mass media (Anderson & Cummings, 1951: 28).

In *The Family of Man*, Steichen's approach to cultural relativism and linear modes of communication were inflected with the discourse of media modernization that the authors of the UN educational pamphlet warned against. Unlike the concerns voiced in the UN educational pamphlet, those agencies committed to *The Family of Man* were relatively blind to issues of cultural transfer and media dependency. Toby Miller (1993: 110-111) notes that the paradigm of modernization informed research and policy in the United States and at UNESCO in the 1950s and 60s. Directed at newly emerging sovereign states, the aim was to inspire such nations to reinvent themselves in the image of dominant Western cultures. Mass media were key in that they could affect the

swift transfer of codes of culture and conduct. This would supposedly entice citizens of these decolonizing nations to internalize Western codes as their own enabling them to fashion themselves in the image of the dominant culture. The emphasis on forging a common human essence to be found in the higher codes of culture left self-appointed cultural ambassadors like Steichen with the ability to represent and judge what should be considered common or deviant. There was no need to question such privilege because the articulation of humanist cultural values and liberal modes of citizenship claiming universality and authenticity disavowed concerns about exclusion and disparity. Steichen's exhibit employed a discursive logic associated with a higher order legitimizing itself in its association with aesthetic and human essences.

Steichen's picture of polity was both modernist in its emphasis on visible similarities and modernizing in its projections of an image of the dominant onto the other. In other words, Steichen combined modernist rationalities stressing the authenticity and universality of the human spirit with modernizing logics that homogenized cultures and were associated with technologically determinist views of mass media. Consequently these competing and mutually opposing discourses were suspended in the simplistic pictorial narrative and approach to representation articulated throughout *The Family of Man*. This attempt to ameliorate clashes between opposing logics paralleled the attempt to characterize cultural citizens as members of the fundamental governing order of the human family. Here the citizen was situated within a rubric of cultural

relativism where difference was organized as universal variation and ranked according to synchronic plurality rather than diachronic hierarchy as it was in 19th century logics symbolized by the family tree.

While it claimed otherwise, *The Family of Man* in its focus on common humanity constituted according to simplistic mixing of modernist and modernizing forces, glossed over a pattern of pictured differences evident in the show itself. Most evidently visible, yet disavowed was the gendered division of labour. Women were represented as nurturers, child bearers and lovers. Men were labourers, providers and public figures. Accompanying this gendered division was a racialized other. For example, rarely was anyone who was not white pictured in a state other than in poverty, or undress. They were usually represented in premodern settings of labour and domesticity. Consequently, Steichen's exhibition valourized Western, white patriarchy and heterosexuality as the unquestioned foundation of a universal social order.

Steichen's penchant for mixing the seemingly antithetical logics of modernism and modernization emerged through his longstanding career as a curator, commercial photographer and artist (Phillips, 1990: 273-275). He was a veteran of exhibitionary display and his expertise accounted for the mixing of representational strategies evident in *The Family of Man.* Before becoming head of the MoMA photography department in the late 1940s, Steichen organized several important photo exhibits for the museum designed to represent and elicit

patriotic identification. In both world wars he had been a documentary photographer for the US military. In the interwar period he acquired commercial and fashion photography experience working for *Vanity Fair* and *Vogue*. In addition to this varied experience, at the turn of the century he and Alfred Steigliz founded the photo-secessionists and Gallery 291 introducing the New York art world to European modernism (Szarkowski, 1994: 15). His appointment as head of photography proved the MoMA's commitment to art education. Steichen succeeded Beaumont Newhall who had set the terms for the history of photography—first as a history of photography's technological development and later as a story of aesthetic achievement (Phillips, 1990: 264, 266, 269). Steichen's appointment as curator was somewhat acrimonious because his approach to exhibition display was public relations oriented (1990: 273). For Steichen, photography was a form of persuasion exemplified by the then emergent photo-story magazines.

Steichen's approach to photography in *The Family of Man* was championed because it appeared to temporarily resolve conflicts between those who supported modern art and those who characterized modern art as unpatriotic and treasonous. As such *The Family of Man* was one the few cultural productions associated with modern art able to escape the wrath of ultra conservative Americans who like Senator Dondoro of Michigan attacked modern art for being a Communist plot designed to infiltrate and subvert Western democracy. Dondoro, for example, repeatedly attacked modern art in the press and through

elaborate speeches he made in the US Senate between 1949 and 1956. He accounted for this claim by presenting extensive lists of modern artists with alleged communist affiliations. Even such liberal democratic organizations as the UN and UNESCO were accused of being infiltrated by Soviet forces. For example, according to Dondero, on the very wall of the UN's assembly chambers sat a mural painted by Ferdinand Leger—an artist who of all things had many communist sympathizers present at his funeral (Dondero, 1956: 3). More troubling to Dondero was the fact that several modern artist such as Picasso with reported communistic leanings had been commissioned to produce work for the about to be completed UNESCO headquarters in Paris (1956: 3). So great were Dondero's efforts, that some painting exhibitions whose international tours had been supported by the US government were cancelled.

On the one hand, this climate of attack prompted figures such a Barr and d'Harnoncourt on every possible occasion to discuss how the practices and principles of modern art were synonymous with those of liberal democracy (Barr, 1952, 1956). The realm of modern art in being set apart from the partisan world of politics maintained a higher and more virtuous level of value and conduct. Modern art according to Barr and d'Harnoncourt was beyond ideology. Modern art constituted a model of democratic conduct and good governance. In this context modern art was to be more appropriately judged on its aesthetic merit rather than according to its artists' political affiliations. An accelerated program of touring international exhibitions organized by the MoMA and sponsored by the

Rockefeller Foundation between 1952-55 paralleled Barr and d'Harnoncourt's campaign to defend modern art against right wing attacks. This program was legitimated according to a rationale championing international cultural citizenship. As one newspaper report summarized

> The singular felicity of a program of this sort arises from the fact that the artists need to know no barrier of nationality or language. They speak the universal tongue and it can be universally learned and loved. Concepts of beauty may vary with changes in time and place, but the impact of those concepts upon human beings is one of the world's enduring constants. It reaches across oceans just as it has reached across centuries. No one who has felt it can be stranger to another who knows its spell ("Art Exchange," April 1953).

Steichen's exhibition was grandiose not only in the number pictures presented, but it was expansive in its global sweep. The exhibition was extensively disseminated through a variety of media such as film, photography, print, and broadcast. Besides the CBS *Family of Man* special, Steichen made several promotional and guest appearances on public affair programs. Claims were made that ¼ of a million catalogues sold within three weeks of the show's opening. Ten editions of the exhibition toured internationally well into the 1960s. It was shown over a 150 times in politically strategic places around the world (Sandeen, 1995: 95; Staniszewski, 1998: 20). In its multi-mediated distribution through the United States Information Agency (USIA), *The Family of Man* also operated as a tool of international diplomacy. Before each showing an extensive publicity campaign was sponsored by the USIA. The USIA also distributed promotional films translated into several languages. In disseminating *The Family of Man*, Steichen mirrored the strategies of mass media, yet with the intention of

reforming these media to facilitate democratic association and education on an international scale.

Given this context of suspicion about modern art, it is significant that the American government was able to send *The Family of Man* on an extensive, almost decade long tour sponsored by the United States Information Agency. From the USIA's perspective, *The Family of Man* had the potential to persuade the people of the world that liberal democracy was inherently superior to Communism. The exhibition was considered to be important because its common-sense address supposedly embodied the voice of universal humanity and would therefore be understood by all citizens of the world (Staniszewski, 1998: 37). Such an address could demonstrate the superiority of America as a modern polity formed not through didacticism, prescription and coercion, but through free will and understanding.

Media provided technological channels through which the filial ties of world citizen could be unified in organic and harmonious plenitude. In other words, by virtue of merely having physical access to *The Family of Man*, world citizens would automatically absorb its intended message. Here, the transmission theory of communication operated through the assumption that the exhibition itself could gather individuals together into an extended family strengthened in its representation in a picture story format. Utilized by such popular magazines such as *Life*, the photo story conveyed typically emotional messages that were

transmitted through visual immediacy and graphic composition. Simplified narratives of strife and anxiety were theatrically invoked and then reframed with positive imagery and resolutions. In adapting these techniques of representation, Steichen treated photography as a universal language that dissolved linguistic barriers and was therefore best able to express the essentials of the human spirit. Photography, for Steichen, was a way of knowing and feeling the world directly through the prelinguistic, and affective openness of the visual. In this function, photography qualified as that form of visual Esperanto that Alfred Barr linked to painting.

Reinforcing the modernizing impositions of *The Family of Man* was Steichen's conception of photography as a linear and transparent form of representation. For instance, as Alan Sekula (1984: 78, 95) argues, in *The Family of Man* photographs were treated as truthful and realist representations. As such, the mechanical apparatus of photography supposedly captured both the ineffable and the empirical detail of the natural world. This form of documentation could grasp the essential order of the human spirit and passions that escaped notice in the everyday. Photography, in capturing truthful essence, was to present the self-evident, universal and essential truths of culture. These assumptions lead to the construction of an audience as a unified populace. This audience—no matter where its members lived in the world—was supposed to be able to automatically grasp or be easily educated by what was presented to them. Participation followed for those who could identify with the premises of Steichen's show and

follow through on what they learned by incorporating these lessons in civic conduct into the practice of their everyday lives. On the home front, the use of photography and television held out the potential to reach nuclear family members residing in the newly burgeoning suburbs. As such, all were able to receive broadcast messages, but were without the means of answering back. Unlike most modernists who were dismissive of mass media because they associated it with crass commercialization or the downfall of democracy, Steichen employed it to familiarize audiences with his message about the oneness of man. He imbued mass media with the potential to educate audiences in the aesthetic lessons rooted in beauty, harmony, and understanding.

In their respective attempts to perform modes of citizenly conduct able to link individuals to a polity in the postwar period, *Dimension* and *The Family of Man* engaged exhibitionary logics articulated through cultural institutions such as the museum and broadcast media. Each program offered an alternative to the version of televisual democracy and citizenship displayed to the nation in broadcasts of the McCarthy hearings (Sandeen, 1995: 95). The McCarthy hearings were theatricalized show trials rendering the democratic process as the forced acquiescence of citizens to authority and fear mongering. During telecasts of the McCarthy hearings, the accused were to prove their citizenship by confessing to spurious accusations of political wrongdoing and affiliation. During these trials, fundamental democratic rights to freedom of association and expression, as well as proper legal representation were suspended. The accused

were tried according to carefully paced sessions designed to coincide with rigidly defined network schedules. As a result, those being tried were represented as either confessing to, or being accused of, wrongdoing. Whether they were guilty or not—the accused appeared so to the audience. Any defense of the accused's innocence—if it occurred at all—was rarely allowed to take place on the air.

The telecasts of the McCarthy hearings were far from the ideals of governance and aesthetic uplift that Hammarskjold opined at the MoMA's 25th Anniversary celebrations. He hoped that governance in its association with modern art would transcend partisanship and ideological extremism. In Hammarskjold's vision, culture was universal and had the capacity to end strife, discrimination, violence and war. It was within this context that *Dimension* presented the modern artist as a model citizen while educating audience members in civic modes of conduct based on the principles, practices, and history of modern art. This strategy paralleled UNESCO's goal of achieving democracy through the development of humanism. As a complement to this prospect, *The Family of Man's* picture of common humanity projected an image of an international polity combining both the paradigm of media modernization criticized in UNESCO policy while using discourses of humanism circulating through the UN's policies of development and decolonization. In *The Family of Man* and *Dimension* democratic citizenship was to be elicited through the "educability" of the human spirit and creative expression.

In *Dimension,* the televisual rendering of cultural democracy and citizenship was circumscribed by the poor quality of the broadcast image and the ineffective use of the medium resulting in a didactic address situating viewers as passive and uncritical. Thus, the very representational modalities that Barr and D'Harnoncourt dismissed as antimodern were reinforced. Discourses of cultural relativism, universality and humanism in *Dimension* and *The Family of Man* further limited the MoMA's vision of televisual democracy focused on bringing those outside its sphere of influence into contact with modern art for the purposes of imparting civic modes of conduct through cultural education. Those who did not identify with, or were considered to be non-Western or unmodern were positioned as other. Yet, they, like children, had the potential for uplift given access to agents able to shape their intrinsic sense of inner passion, human spirit and creativity. In keeping with this logic, *The Family of Man* concluded with an image of a young boy and girl holding hands walking off into a bucolic garden setting—as if all contradictions and struggle productive of these postwar models of international cultural democracy and citizenship had been resolved rather than perpetuated.

Chapter 2:
Through the Enchanted Gate:
Art Education as Democratic Cultural Communication

A living culture is not one which is content with droning away sheltered from yesterday's revolutions and past innovations; it must remain on the lookout for everything appearing on the threshold of life, in a world which is forever new. In this respect, particular attention should be paid to two categories, chosen without any discriminatory intention; creative artists and young people.

Jean d'Ormesson
Former Deputy Secretary-General of the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Sciences
UNESCO, 1972

But I believe our greatest opportunity lies in that much abused medium of television. That vicious little box sits in practically everybody's living room and has taken possession of the mind of America. But television can be used for good as it can bring aesthetic experiences into every classroom, art center and home.... It may be no accident that the century which sired the atom and hydrogen bombs also discovered the creative child. It may be no accident that the so-called 'average man' discovered the value of creativity ...and that men and women by the thousands are finding satisfaction and spiritual strength in the pursuit of art. ...Art may therefore be the salvation of modern man, but only if children—all children—have the benefit of true aesthetic experiences...Art is more than a fad...! It is in these days of hot threats and cold wars—a human necessity

Victor D'Amico
Director of The People's Art Centre
And Co-producer of Through The Enchanted Gate
Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1954

Through the Enchanted Gate (1952-1953), the Museum of Modern Art's first and longest running television series, was devoted to educating youth through the creative potentials of modern art. On the program children were encouraged to freely explore and experience modern methods of art making. In allowing for the child's aesthetic sensitivities to emerge, it was assumed that at an early age children could learn to be flexible, yet stable individuals able to facilitate both the flourishing of the arts and by implication secure the future of a humane liberal democracy dependent on principles like freedom of expression, imagination and individual initiative. *Through the Enchanted Gate* offered its viewers a brief glimpse at cultural citizenry in the making. The child's imagination illuminated the authentic nature of humanity, and therefore, the foundation of culture and civilization. In linking the education of the child's creative imagination to the foundation of modern art and postwar democracy both MoMA and UNESCO engaged culture as a mode of governance encouraging individuals to take up the aims and activities associated with the greater good as vital interests of their own. This enabled viewers to contribute to that living culture and threshold of life UNESCO representative d'Ormesson rooted in the development of creativity and youth (1972: 110). All of this could be accomplished through the newest of mass media—television—constituting an instance where communications pertained to education and cultural governance rather than to profit or propaganda.

In order to reveal the dimensions through which the MoMA sought to address children as emerging cultural citizens, this chapter will analyze the discursive

logics subtending the production of *Through the Enchanted Gate* in the context of the MoMA's art education program and relationship with the National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC). After establishing why two formerly antithetical cultural institutions such as a museum and television network chose to collaborate on children's art programming, the role that historical and theoretical premises of democratic cultural communication and cultural rights played in the formation of citizenly conduct will be introduced. A close reading of how these premises were performed on *Through the Enchanted* Gate will be followed by an analysis of a debate about the value of art education that took place at a UNESCO sponsored television workshop. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of the particular position that the MoMA took in broader debates surrounding the role modern art and media would play in educational and public interest broadcast.

Broadcast on NBC New York affiliate WNBT, each program of *Through the Enchanted Gate* was conducted as if it were a regular art class sponsored by The People's Art Center at the Museum of Modern Art. In order to be as realistic as possible, the stars of the show were teachers, students and parents who participated in MoMA art classes. Victor D'Amico, the art center's director was not only responsible for the show's production, but also made featured appearances each week to discuss with students, their parents and the broadcast audience some of the relevant implications of their art-making activity. In keeping with its liberal democratic rationale, *Through the Enchanted Gate*

claimed to address children regardless of their innate talents, proven ability or prior experience. According to D'Amico, art education programs should be enjoyable and allow children to develop at their own pace in a cooperative and uncompetitive atmosphere.

As the first and most successful television series the MoMA produced, *Through the Enchanted Gate* aired weekly between May and August 1952 on Sundays at 12:30. A second series was broadcast between February and June 1953 on Saturdays at 5:30. The book *Art for the Family* was based on this series. *Through the Enchanted Gate* reflected the MoMA's overriding commitment to art education that began with the establishment of an autonomous program at the museum (D'Amico, 1951a, 1945, 1941). Since the end of the war the program operated under the auspices of The Veteran's Art Center committed to allowing all those affected by the war to engage in creative activity in ways that were personally therapeutic and socially reconstructive. In 1948 the education department changed its name to The People's Art Center and continued to offer classes, exhibitions and activities for all ages. In many ways *Through the Enchanted Gate* was a crystallization of the art center's philosophy. The People's Art Center, D'Amico wrote:

> ...subscribes to neither the indoctrinary methods of the academic schools of the past, nor to the laissez-faire methods of many so-called progressive schools. It endeavors to make the individual aware of the fundamentals of art integrated with his own ways of learning. Art has the function of serving the individual's need for expression and at the same time expanding his horizon of the achievements of the masters of both the present and the past. There is no

> attempt to make artists out of either children or adults, but it is believed that those who have the ability are better prepared by the individual approach (Chamberlain, 1955: 779).

Apart from the MoMA's general commitments to education, The People's Art Center distinguished itself by stressing the importance of creative expression for the emotional and mental growth of children (D'Aminco, 1951a: 4, 8). For adults, creative activities were designed for the purposes of pleasure and the release of tension. The center aimed to support public and private school teachers in the integration of the principles of creativity into their pedagogical approach. Moreover, the public was encouraged to understand the importance of creative experience. The People's Art Center's education program was organized according to age. In the 3 to 5 age group, children were given a basic introduction into media, materials and artistic ideas for the purposes of learning to make creative and direct expressions. Design, group projects and the ability to explore, organize and communicate feelings and ideas were the focus of classes for children 6 to 12 years old. Teenagers were introduced to projects of growing complexity which were complimented by a study of art works in the museum. For adults, creative projects were designed to give a sense of personal satisfaction and cultural enrichment. The aim was to address amateurs as intelligent and creative citizens rather than as dilettantes and hobbyists.

Reflecting on *Through the Enchanted Gate's* purpose, D'Amico noted that the program accomplished more that he thought was possible (1954b). He was pleased to discover that home audiences would learn so much about modern art

just from watching television. D'Amico measured the show's success by the quality of the work that viewers sent to him after each episode and from comments solicited from parents and teachers remarking on their children's progress. According to D'Amico, the implications were tremendous. Any child with access to a TV could receive "the best training available" especially for those who lived in places without access to progressive art education. Museum educators were excited by this prospect that would allow them to more adequately fulfill their mandate of educating the public about modern art. Moreover, programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate* could counteract out dated and didactic methods of teaching.

For the broadcast industry, the challenge of producing programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate* with cultural institutions such as the MoMA, gave them the opportunity, according to D'Amico, "to render one to the greatest services to childhood and the future of the USA (1954b)." Through art education, broadcasters had the opportunity to improve the quality of their programs. Instead of only offering mindless and profit oriented entertainment as many cultured critics of mass media accused television broadcasters of promoting in the 1950s, American network producers could contribute to the greater good by televising stimulating and creative programs that would address children with the aim of activating their imaginations.

As well as making the case that broadcasters could profit morally and culturally by engaging with modern art educators, D'Amico argued that through the creative education of children, liberal democracy as a whole would flourish. In a letter to his colleague Ted Cott an executive at NBC, D'Amico wrote that art education on television should focus on developing each child's sense of individuality through encouraging them to explore new media and artistic techniques (D'Amico, 1951b). This would lead to the development of their capabilities for acting and thinking constructively—characteristics integral to the formation of a democratic and independent populace. This effort could be disseminated on a grander scale given the expanded scope of television's communicative potential leading D'Amico to insist that TV was "the greatest educative force of our time (NBC, 1952)." Television's potential to foster emotional and intellectual growth through programs devoted to art education, as well as its potential to provide programs that were both entertaining and educational contributed to this mass media's democratic prospects.

In a press release about *Through the Enchanted Gate*, NBC announced its interest in the democratic potentials of mass communications. Collaborating with the Museum of Modern Art on this production was of civic value, according to the press release, in that it encouraged the creative use of young people's time and offered an alternative to addressing audiences as passive viewers. After agreeing with a comment made by Nelson Rockefeller that "[t]here had never been a period of greater public participation and interest in creative and cultural

life of our country," a WNBT station manager pledged to approach television as a public and community service (NBC, 1952).

With the production of *Through the Enchanted Gate* two formerly antithetical institutions such as the art museum and television industry were momentarily aligned in promoting the democratic potentials of culture and communications. Through access to modern art education, audience members and classroom participants were to acquire flexible, and responsible modes of conduct enabling children and their parents to respond to, and create, new and innovative forms of culture that UNESCO representative d'Ormesson proclaimed were essential for the growth and vitality of civilization. On *Through the Enchanted Gate* many issues regarding communication were addressed. On a technical level because the show was not intended to represent finished works of art, *Through the Enchanted Gate* avoided the limitations of television as a medium of aesthetic communication because its emphasis lay with revealing the creative process rather than showing finished works of art. At the time it was technically unfeasible to show finished works of art because the poor quality of the television image hampered the true-to-life presentation of painting and sculpture. As a result, the individual television viewer's perceptual experience was greatly reduced compared to the first hand quality of experience possible in the gallery. Moreover, the emphasis on teaching children to engage with artistic media and materials over and above learning mimetic forms of representation was indicative of the intrinsic capability of modern art to provide alternatives to instrumental and

didactic forms of communication thought to undermine the individual's autonomy and creativity. These were qualities essential to the creation of a democratic cultural communications productive of innovative and self-regulating individuals.

Television, MoMA trustee Nelson Rockefeller argued, was of crucial concern for it was the latest and most dynamic means of communication. Television was potentially a democratic medium of communication able to distribute to all citizens forms of education and culture necessary for individual enrichment. As such, Rockefeller asserted, creative and cultural endeavors were no longer the property of any one group (1952: 2-3). The broadcast of programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate* aimed to democratically distribute values and modes of conduct associated with creativity and the fine arts. This could be done by rearticulating the relationship between artistic media associated with high culture and mass media associated with commercial and authoritarian interests. In putting mass media into the service of modern art education on *Through the Enchanted Gate*, these formerly antithetical realms were positioned as educational and democratic forms of communication. Paul Litt (1992: 84-5) suggests that such a move was necessary to rid high culture of its undemocratic and exclusionary bias in order to prove its value for democratic forms of governance. This could be achieved by associating the fine arts with activities such as the acquisition of knowledge and insight gained through exploration, reflection and intellectual growth. Here, high culture was treated as a form of democratic education where individuals come to know themselves and the nature

of their social existence. Moreover, Litt writes, high culture in its democratic guise would then "open to the individual the path to self-improvement leading to intellectual freedom." In its association with the democratizing potentials of culture and education, programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate* could perhaps counteract anxieties associated with the fear that mass culture might weaken independent thinking fundamental to a liberal democratic society.

Emphasis on artistic expression and education as forms of communication vital to the growth of democracy was a common premise uniting the educational endeavors of MoMA and the cultural policy of the UN in the postwar period. It could be argued that this sense of communication relates to Tony Bennett's (1995: 61-62) notion of exhibitionary rationalities of power that in the case of democratic cultural communication facilitates self-governance through common understanding achieved in dialogue between interacting subjects who become citizens by their ability to participate in such communicative activity. Communication, therefore, was situated as a foundational premise of democracy emphasizing processes associated with learning, creativity, and understanding. Within this communicative logic, the ability to change or establish cultural traditions, which in this case are humanist and were to be learned at the earliest possible age, are necessary for the formation of new and vital forms of cultural governance. This process of governance could be democratically distributed by, for example, education and mass media. Through these channels, the humanist values of art were thereby distributed to more people who could adapt and enrich

their lives. In return, these subjects could contribute to society by securing the growth of democratic cultural communication.

In *The Long Revolution* (1961) and *Communication* (1962) Raymond Williams suggested how art and education might be vital to governance rooted in democratic cultural communications. His writing on this subject was in part intended to offer a broader account of deterministic theories of mass communications that situate technology as the cause of change—either extending or prohibiting the growth of cultural democracy. Instead, Williams suggested that communication is based on creativity, learning and culture. All three elements are constitutive of a democratic society—they are a whole way of life. This definition of culture as communication allowed Williams to adjust established conceptions of society articulated in political and economic terms such as power, government, property, production and trade (1962: 18). As a form of communication, society, Williams wrote, is articulated through "[t]he struggle to learn, describe, understand and educate [which] is a central and necessary part of our humanity (1962: 19)." In this vision of democratic society, art is no longer the property of an elite and paternalistic minority. Art becomes a "common inheritance"(1962: 96) made widely available as on *Through the Enchanted Gate* through education and the mass media. Art is of particular importance to the constitution of cultural democracy in that it solicits active responses and leads to new forms of experience able to disrupt habit and routine. According to Williams,

the biggest threats to the growth of a relevant and vital culture are habit and routine (1962: 100).

Communication, creativity and education constitute democratic forms of interaction and governance. In establishing that creativity and communication are integral to, rather than separate from, society Williams suggested that they offered a way of living dependent on, and related to, change and stability operating through and across perceptual, interpersonal, and governmental relationships (1962: 111). Art is part of ordinary social life: "It is a particular process in general human process of creative discovery and communication (1961: 37)." We learn to see, and organize perceptual experience through creative activities constitutive of a vital living culture (1961: 17-18). Creative communications, Williams insisted, are acquired through learned skills and productive of a unified community better able to understand, and therefore live more successfully in its environment (1961: 23, 38).

The aim of MoMA's art education program as represented on *Through the Enchanted Gate* was to foster creativity in children and adults of all ages. Art was understood to be a process and vital form of life rather than a precious object. As a complex form of communication concerned with learning, discovery and change, modern art and media as they were treated at the MoMA and on *Through the Enchanted Gate*, were less concerned than Williams with creating a social democratic order based on commonality and community. The intent was to

forge a sense of democracy based on the development of the human spirit—a sort of secular form of revelation. By developing children's sense of creative expression, Victor D'Amico suggested that each child's innately unique sense of individuality would be elicited leading the way to the formation of an integrated self. In this endeavor, art, in D'Amico's words, constituted the highest form of expression because it hailed the human spirit. Valourizing this process of self-discovery through creative expression, for D'Amico, was the foundation of all education. In developing greater sensitivity towards the aesthetic qualities of the everyday world and human behavior, art could operate as a form of communication able to articulate the most profound ideas and emotions of the individual. As a result, creativity was integral to human welfare as it constituted the very core of life and living. Art education on *Through the Enchanted Gate* was aligned pedagogically with progressive art educators concerned with process, action and interactive expression designed to develop each child's sense of personal vision, discovery and invention (Morgan, 1995: 154).

In order to develop aesthetic awareness, unique expression, and perceptual sensibility—each episode of *Through the Enchanted Gate* presented educative activities designed to immerse children in unique aesthetic experiences. For example, on episodes devoted to painting a sound and exploring tactility—perceptual sensitivity was explored by encouraging children to represent one sense in the form of another. In these episodes students were to render their impressions of sound and touch in visual media. Imagination and awareness of

everyday visual environments were explored in programs devoted to space design and the city. In episodes devoted to family portraits, paper magics, Easter hats and party masks children used ordinary materials found around their households in innovative and non-representational ways.

Designed to facilitate the development of the child's unique individuality and self reliance through creative processes, *Through the Enchanted Gate's* format mimicked the creative learning process as it was understood in progressive pedagogy. Each episode opened with the show's narrator inviting class participants and viewers alike to cross the threshold of the enchanted gate to explore the magical realm of the imagination. All involved filed through a metal archway shaped as a human silhouette surrounded by dazzling objects and dangling mobiles. The set recreated the Children's Holiday Carnival held each Christmas at the museum. At the carnival children were invited into a specially decorated space to play and make art projects while their parents were given the rare opportunity to observe their children's creative activity from a separate viewing area (D'Amico: 1951a: 12). The aim of the holiday carnival was to orient children to the museum as well as allow students who wouldn't ordinarily attend art classes to take part in progressive art education. At the same time, parents, through their observations, could learn how to engage children in creative activities at home. To elicit home viewers participation in the development of their creative individuality, each episode of *Though the Enchanted Gate* approximated the pedagogical itinerary of the children's carnival or a typical art class. Each

period began with play and discussion guided by a teacher who prepared the children for art making activities. For example, in the space design episode the teacher asked students to close their eyes and imagine themselves and other objects as if they were flying through space. After a brief discussion comparing each child's imaginative experience, the children moved to their workstations to render their wonderings in material form. On another program exploring tactility, children were encouraged to describe their impressions of objects through their sense of touch which they later rendered in visual form.

On every episode of *Through the Enchanted Gate*, art teachers Mrs. Maser and Miss Wilson demonstrated their progressive teaching methods. They interacted with each student on an individual basis. They were careful to never to judge children's work. They commented on the unique aspects of each student's work while inspiring students' to further realize their individual approach to creative expression. Implicit to their pedagogy was the assumption that no two children ever considered a subject or materials in the same way. At the end of each episode, Victor D'Amico addressed parents concerns and discussed examples of work that viewers made at home while watching the show. He encouraged parents to emulate the teacher's conduct by being good listeners, expressing interest in their children's projects, and asking questions relevant to each child's individual concerns. D'Amico was intent on distinguishing the educational and activity oriented intentions of *Through the Enchanted Gate* from commercial forms of entertainment and passive viewing habits. *Through the Enchanted Gate*,

he insisted, was a program for doing, not for watching. The intent was to equip children with the inner resources to create, and thereby contribute to the resolution of societal problems. Moreover, by gaining self-consciousness and emotional integration through the development of perceptual sensibilities, children at an early age would acquire the resources of cultural citizenship.

On many levels the MoMA and the United Nations had relatively parallel approaches to democratic cultural communications. However, unlike Williams, the UN and MoMA were dissociated from socialist formations of democratic governance. Instead emphasis was placed on the development of the individual's innate creative abilities—the basis of communication and conduct essential to the peaceful and democratic functioning of society. One expression of this approach to cultural citizenship was articulated in the language of human rights as enshrined in the UN charter—securing for each citizen the right to culture, communication and education. Whereas *Through the Enchanted Gate* could be construed as a televisual performance dramatizing the creative education of self-governing individuals, instruments such as the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights codified the rationale of liberal humanist discourses of the citizen's democratic relationship to a postwar international order of interdependent, self-determining nations.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was a central element in a postwar strategy of international governance. Its realization and development was

strongly directed by American foreign policy and UNESCO between 1945 and 1960 (Koshy, 4: 1999). On a moral level, human rights were to ameliorate past discriminations where citizenship and sovereignty were mediated by imperializing forces. According to Wallerstein, since the 19th century, citizenship was granted to those who were civilized constituting a logic of worth measured in terms of race and gender (1995: 1170). Those deemed uncivilized were considered to be racially impure, of the wrong-sex and in need of reform and cultivation. After the Nazi directed genocides of World War II, for the UN, UNESCO and the USA, human rights were instituted as a formal mechanism of governance designed to rectify the discriminations of the past (Koshy, 1999: 3). The Declaration considered all citizens to be free and equal in both the nation-state where they resided and as members of the international "human family"(Saba: 1972: 231). Implicit to this assumption was a sense of social commonality which was thought to reside in the human spirit and creative expression. These were innate traits that could be shaped and strengthened though education, culture and communication. Nevertheless, the universal application of human rights was limited to those subjects who could best subscribe to humanism—a formation of cultural citizenship where agency was taken up by those with the most well developed sense of the human spirit.

This logic of citizenship was implicit in the production of *Through the Enchanted Gate*, MoMA's commitment to art education and new media, as well as the concept of culture as communication. All entailed logics of power manifest in

exhibitionary rationalities and institutions where through the production, distribution, and acquisition of knowledge and culture—individuals constituted themselves as self-regulating citizens able to internalize, perform, and create the values and modes of governance necessary to sustain larger governmental systems. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and UNESCO were instituted to protect, and promote the importance of principles establishing liberal humanist logic as the foundation and agency through which a democratic world order would be negotiated. Moreover, because this postwar approach to democracy was grounded in culture, education and communication, it was through these modalities that the spirit and passions of each citizen's innate expression of the human spirit could be evoked. Therefore, for the first time, culture, communication and education were instated as rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Since the Enlightenment, Immanuel Wallerstein suggests, democratic governance has been negotiated through two provisions—the recognition that change is inevitable and that the people whether as individuals or collectives are sovereign (1995: 1162). Both the UN and MoMA in the immediate postwar period, it seems, employed liberal humanist rationales in their approach to culture, education, communication and human rights. According to Wallerstein, liberals were amenable to change unlike conservatives who resisted it and socialists who tried to accelerate and apply change to their radical aims. Conservatives preferred that sovereignty remain with those who upheld the

continuities of tradition and thereby reinforced well-established cultural hierarchies. Socialists who demanded radical change, realized it could occur when the people were encouraged to exercise their sovereignty in order eliminate governing structures and institutions responsible for inequity, disparity and exploitation. A liberal approach, Wallerstein explains, usually has less substance in its vision of sovereignty and change than Conservatives and Socialists. Liberal governance depends on formal and procedural mechanisms designed to regulate change at a moderate pace through reform-oriented goals guided by experts and the intelligentsia. In discourses of liberalism, change supposedly occurs only in the name of better realizing and adjusting the democratic aims of the governing order. Sovereignty is exercised through the proxy of educated and cultured citizens (1995:1164-1165).

The MoMA and UNESCO's approach to cultural rights and freedoms, and democratic cultural communications in the immediate post war period was associated with liberal humanist discourses of the cultural citizen and democratic polity. Contrary to these institutions' rhetoric about creating peace and understanding, human rights and cultural communication were often used as logics able to negotiate a number of tensions produced by, on the one hand, historical exclusion, and the other hand, by the circumscribed logics of humanism, cultural relativism, and individualism applied with the intent of better realizing democracy and universality. One attempt directed toward resolving this dilemma was UNESCO's promotion of international intellectual communications

in its endeavors to educate about, and promote the application of, human rights on an international scale. According to UNESCO representative Charles Frankel, in a world where extraordinary developments in communication have led to closer interdependence between nations differing in their culture, development, resources and living standards, something had to be done to embrace the benefits of change while avoiding cultural homogenization associated with modernization (1972: 46). As a form of dialogue, it was assumed that international intellectual communications could promote understanding between cultures and thereby protect difference under the auspices of cultural pluralism. Human rights and culture as communication could regulate the individual's affiliation with others. Human rights would guarantee access to education, culture and communication—the tools necessary for the development of good citizens whose minds were considered to be the source of change. Whether this change was oriented toward good or evil all depended on the quality of education, and culture to which one had access.

In the sphere of contemporary culture and communications it seems that the MoMA's approach to art and education paralleled the governing logics of UNESCO cultural policy. This is significant given the low priority that cultural policy received in the United States where resistance to state intervention prevails except in the case of war or economic crisis (Yúdice, 1999: 22). For example, during the Cold War culture, communication and education were officially sanctioned in order to morally legitimize the US's claims to world

governance. This rationale was later summed-up and codified in Public Law 89-209—legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Arts. According to this law:

> The world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon world wide respect and admiration for the Nation's highest qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and the spirit (Yúdice, 1999: 20).

At the same time as the logic of cultural rights bolstered American efforts to win the Cold War through its promises of liberal democracy, a free market economy, and cultural human rights and freedoms, within the United States modern art and rights were both accused of being a Communist plot threatening to infiltrate and undermine American democracy (Koshy, 1999; Dondero, 1956). Given this climate of the international celebration of, and national disdain for, modern art and human rights, it is not surprising that those involved with the MoMA disassociated themselves from such reactionary condemnation that lead many on the international front to regard American culture as parochial and anti-modern. In attempting to associate with the modern, it was logical that the MoMA look toward an international organization such as the UN. Ironically, the UN's promotion of universality and cultural democracy was largely shaped by the dominance of American interests prevailing in the organization's formation between 1945 and 1960. After all the UN, as a new and international organization, was less hampered by reactionary, isolationist and libertarian forces, granting it the mobility to enshrine culture, education and communication as fundamental human rights in its Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The commitment to democratic cultural communication and human rights such as freedom of expression able to facilitate the growth of a vital contemporary international governing order motivated many MoMA and UNESCO education oriented activities. One such event was the 1954 UNESCO sponsored television producers workshop. According to some reports, controversy raged over the fate of democratic cultural communication (MacAgy, 1955; Paulu, n.d.). A screening of *Through the Enchanted Gate* prompted such contention at an event that a UNESCO TV program specialist Henry Cassirer suggested was intended to promote international cooperation (1954, 370-372). For UNESCO, television was one of the latest and perhaps most effective ways to promote international peace and understanding. Television could enhance international cultural communication by allowing those not able to travel to gain an appreciation of people and ways of life in other countries (Paulu, n.d.).

True to its mandate, UNESCO was committed to exploring the potentials and limits of communication media at its three-week study course for professionals interested in learning more about the potentials of educational and cultural broadcasting. This was one of the first gatherings of its kind organized on an international scale. While the controversy over *Through the Enchanted Gate* tested the universal applicability of the MoMA's approach to art education through mass media, it also allowed for a reaffirmation of the governing logics linking education, culture and liberal democracy.

For the Soviet delegate to the UNESCO television workshop Sergei Vassiljevitch Novakovski—a Moscow based producer—*Through the Enchanted Gate* was detrimental to young people. It exposed them to Western decadence in art. According the Novakovski, *Through the Enchanted Gate* was full of "uncontrolled emotion" prompted by the emphasis on spontaneous expression and discovery of the child's inner imagination (MacAgy, 1955: 170-172). The values it promoted were antithetical to the Soviet approach to art education based on the ability to learn technique and craft allowing artists to emulate masterworks. A mix of discipline and genius, not innovation and freedom, was the foundation of good painting able to represent the best of Soviet life in a realistic and optimistic way.

As one delegate noted, nothing galvanized the UNESCO workshop more than the Soviet delegate who prompted impassioned responses from delegates like CBS producer of Public Affairs Perry Wolff and MoMA observer Douglas MacAgy. In their rebuttals to the Soviet delegate, Wolff and MacAgy reiterated the role that art should play in a democratic society while outlining the educative potentials of television to foster aesthetic sensibilities and a cultured citizenry. Wolff countered the Soviet's critique of the MoMA's approach to art education by suggesting that the freedom of artistic expression was fundamental to democratic societies because art constituted a society's dreams even if they were controversial and irrational (MacAgy: 1955, 172). To support such vital activity, artists must be granted respect, material support and individual autonomy.

According to Wolff, broadcasters had great responsibility in this endeavor. As well-educated individuals with a sense of good will toward society, educational broadcasters and producers of cultural programming were, in part, cultural trustees who should constantly "attempt to uplift public standards (1955: 174)." At the same time, this attempt to improve public standards should be done with the notion that at its best television could "mirror" the democratic endeavors of the polity back to itself (1955: 174). Programs such as *Through the Enchanted Gate* encouraged viewers to identify with its premises, and therefore inspired them to improve their aesthetic tastes and modes of conduct.

Nevertheless, Wolff admitted that his vision of cultural democracy was far from realized given the commercial orientation of American network broadcasting (MacAgy, 1955: 175). Unlike Williams' approach to cultural communication that was critical of paternalistic attitudes towards mass culture, Wolff, like many broadcasters claimed that the television industry was acting in the public interest because it catered to the audience's demands. He suggested that the so-called vulgar nature of network programming would disappear when the public's taste changed (1955: 175). It was the job of broadcasters and cultural programmers, therefore, to contribute to uplifting standards of taste through the presentation of such high quality work like *Through the Enchanted Gate*. Broadcasters and program producers could rectify this situation by becoming cultural citizens. Like the artist, Wolff argued, they could become exemplary citizens not by dictating what the public should like, but by setting an example (1955: 176). Ideally

broadcasters could produce programs and engage in forms of conduct free from censorship while trusting the public to engage with the humane values of the artist according to their own needs.

For Douglas MacAgy, director of the MoMA television study, programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate* provided an example of a successful collaboration between network broadcasters and those knowledgeable about cultural standards and education such as museum educators and curators. Cultural democracy, MacAgy wrote, could occur when broadcasters unable to engage the cultural standards of museum officials cooperated with visual arts experts who were usually unsuccessful in presenting their ideas in broadly accessible ways. The aim of MacAgy's study and the UNESCO workshop was to end this mutual disdain of broadcasters and museum officials through better communication and cooperation.

In fostering children's individuality through the exploration of creative intuition and experience, both broadcasters and museum officials hoped to present modern art in a way that countered the Soviet delegate's characterization of it as antisocial, alienating, and decadent. While the value of individual expression and discovery was emphasized, this form of art education did not in the least foster "uncontrolled emotion." MacAgy insisted that the education of individual creativity was socially situated and ethically motivated. According to MacAgy, creative discovery was always done in the company of those with related aims and

attitudes thereby rendering creativity and art education as a means of democratic expression and communication "...a language which comes somewhere along the line of growth before the ready acceptance of the crystallized contours of discourse (MacAgy, 1955: 242)."

Communication through artistic and broadcast media able to express the not yet rigidly entrenched contours of discourse operated as an overarching logic characterizing the negotiation of tensions generated through the historical formation and application of governmental policies, and programs related to the use of new media like television at the Museum of Modern Art and the United Nations. Since its inception in 1929, MoMA officials were committed to introducing a broad public to the potentials of modern art and media. As the first museum in North America devoted to the modern, the goal was to make the new and unfamiliar palatable for the American public while enticing this public to take up the cultural values and citizenly virtues of modern art as their own. In these aims, the MoMA distinguished itself from cultural institutions that served as repositories for the preservation of precious and rare objects. As stated in the MoMA's charter, the museum was committed to "encouraging and developing the study of the modern arts and the application of such arts to the manufacture of practical life and the furnishing of popular instruction (Packard, 1938: 5)." As an institution aiming to engage with, and articulate, what was contemporary, it seemed logical that every effort be made to incorporate new media such as film, architecture, design and photography.

In 1938 art educator Artemis Packard released the results of his study intended to advise MoMA officials about the direction the museum should take after a decade of rapid growth. Packard reaffirmed and elaborated the MoMA's founding principles. The museum could best contribute to society by bringing the high standards of critical discrimination associated with the fine arts to bear on the shape of the visual environment as well as on the type of behavior and activity conducted in these environments (1938: 9-10). In bringing the values and practices of modern art to bear on life and visa versa, the MoMA could contribute to the education of cultural citizens able to adapt to ever changing modern contexts while strengthening the individual's unique personality (1938: 69). This was not the type of education concerned with the factual transmission of knowledge. In incorporating new media such as film, photography and television, MoMA aimed to be relevant and up-to-date while gaining legitimacy for its activities by undertaking endeavors intended to support society at large, addressing the public's needs, and attempting to shape well-educated and cultured subjects (1938: 80). Moreover, according to Packard, the MoMA's concern with communication, modern art and media was invaluable because these elements contributed to humanist endeavors that supposedly transcended all political, racial and economic barriers. In this universalist ethic, the modern arts and media were to serve as a common ground upon which all nations of the world stood united. In this capacity, the modern arts and media were deemed vital to the survival of civilization (1938: 108). As Packard wrote, the modern arts

and media could create a sense of integrated cultural identity and at the same time protect against claims of nationalistic sentiment and politically motivated encroachments (1938: 108).

In the case of television, MoMA officials were excited because for the first time they had access to a medium of communication that could reach audiences on a scale beyond the museum's walls. They hoped that the democratizing potentials of broadcast could result in mass comprehensibility while avoiding complicity with the perceived threats associated with the mass media such as the eradication of individual initiative and self regulation necessary to the functioning of a vibrant liberal democracy. The commercial and propagandistic uses of mass media could be counteracted by art education as it was represented on *Through the Enchanted Gate*. In a 1948 MoMA report on the future of television and the visual arts, museum officials looked forward to the day when television would "multiply the museum's usefulness by bringing it to a larger public that didn't have the time or faculties to visit the museum (MoMA, 1948: 2)." Through this new method of reaching the public, MoMA might gain the added advantage of using television to introduce potential audiences to gallery exhibitions. This background would enrich potential audience members' experience of visiting exhibitions because they would be given background material on the context of works displayed (1948: 3). At this time, in the earlier phases of its development in relationship to the MoMA's program—the justification for television's value as a new medium for communication was associated with that given by Iris Barry founder of the

MoMA's film library. Unlike the more conventional art forms such as painting, drawing and sculpture, new communications media such as film, and television were assumed to have the power to influence not only the arts, but also society at large. As a result of this sociological and aesthetic import, Barry argued, there was the need to consider and understand these new media because they were characteristic of contemporary culture and had a "profound influence on the attitude and life of viewers (1948: 5)." The report concluded that like photography and film before it, television should be treated as a new entrant into the field of the visual arts.

Through the Enchanted Gate was the first substantial realization of the museum's efforts to use television in a way that coincided with its idealized potentials circulating through discourses about democratic cultural communication. In a large part, the program was considered a success because it was presented as a network series, and it by-passed the aesthetic limitations of the black and white television screen. Moreover, on *Through the Enchanted Gate* children were taught the principles of modern art through non-didactic methods geared to developing unique and integrated personalities. Through creative expression, the development of the integrated, creative, and responsible child was encouraged. Everyone involved wanted to produce more programs like *Through the Enchanted Gate*. Such an endeavor, Sidney Peterson co-director of the MoMA's television project noted, legitimately concerned an institution like

MoMA dedicated to communication which "until television remained a concern about communication on or within our own walls (Peterson, 1953)."

As a cultural institution concerned with problems of communication, exploration and incorporation of new media, MoMA officials were naturally excited by the potentials of television for the purposes of education, dialogic interaction, and understanding. Television could contribute to the production and distribution of creative expression necessary for the growth of a relevant living culture able to protect human welfare and secure peace and governmental order. Since its earliest experimental broadcasts with American networks like NBC and CBS, the MoMA was concerned with integrating television into its program. As early as 1939 telecasts of exhibitions, and the demonstrations of artistic techniques were broadcast on NBC ("Telecast," 1940: 19). In the period following these initial broadcasts, there was much discussion about television, but little could be done because of the war. In the immediate postwar period, MoMA officials often advised the networks, lent them objects from the museum's collection, and made guest appearances on talk shows to discuss the latest exhibition or design issue. According to one history of the period written on the occasion of the MoMA's 25th Anniversary by publicity director Betty Chamberlain, most of the programs the MoMA contributed to at this time were aired during the day, were directed towards women and highlighted subjects such as home furnishings, art education and domestic architecture (1955: 788). There was much talk about broadcasting works collected in the MoMA's film library. However, permission to broadcast

was never obtained from rights holders because the film industry came to recognize the profits they could make by broadcasting old movies on commercial stations ever-in-need of programs (1955: 784).

During the early years of MoMA's involvement with television programming, production values were experimental and often deemed amateurish. Relatively few people had television sets in their homes, and the networks were preoccupied with consolidating their national infrastructures. Between 1948 and 1952 the network system was consolidated while the number of households with television sets grew from 172,000 in 1948 to 15,300,000 in 1952 (Welch, 1999: 98). Moreover, during the same period the number of UHF on air stations grew from 50 to 108 despite the freeze on new channel allocations (Sterne, 1999: 515). With the tremendous growth of the television industry, concern arose over the fate of the public interest providing for education and the distribution of information necessary to sustain a democratic populace in ways not accounted for in commercially oriented entertainments. These conditions and others prompted the Federal Communications Commission, a national regulatory body, to initiate a ban on channel allocation. At the same time, those interested in the use of television for educational purposes enjoyed some recognition in their lobbying efforts. In addition, greater concern was directed towards producing better quality programs both in production values and in the social values associated with art and education.

The principle of the public interest ever-present in discussions of broadcast policy and legislation is a provision imbued with the logic of governmentality. In the United States it was first included in the 1927 Radio Act and gave the Federal Radio Commission (later to become the Federal Communications Commission) the power to regulate the airwaves. Among other things, the commission was responsible for channel allocation (Welch, 1999: 103). Channel licenses were usually granted or revoked after a hearing into the qualifications of applicants who were judge according to their ability to realize certain criteria embodied in notions such as the public interest, convenience and necessity (1999: 103). Early on the public interest was shaped to negotiate the state's conflict of maintaining its legitimacy by securing a semblance of democratic governance over the air waves while catering to the influential and profitable interests of corporate communications networks (1999:104). As a result, such an abstract and vaguely defined concept like the public interest regulated the contradictory aims of fostering democratic citizenship through programs devoted to education, culture, and information while subscribing to market logics which claimed to serve the public interest through minimal regulation. In a market rationale, freedom of expression and good citizenship were defined according to the logics of consumption and competition, technological progress and the accumulation of capital (Sterne, 1999: 521).

By the early 1950s the educational lobby in the United States had gained experience navigating the contradictory realm of public interest and commercial

network broadcasting. The educational lobby experienced a number of setbacks in their attempts to get a portion of the broadcast spectrum for educational endeavors. Efforts to establish provisions for educational radio were organized under the auspices of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters in the 1930s. In 1934, the NAEB failed in its request to have 25% of the radio spectrum set aside for educational broadcast. By 1938 some provisions were made for education, but those involved with the NAEB couldn't afford to set up stations (Welch, 1999: 111).

During the early 1950s, FCC hearings were held and the educational lobby was successful in having 20% of the UHF spectrum—over 200 channels set aside for education (Allison, 1953; Gould, 1952; "TV Educational," 1953). Once again though these noncommercial groups couldn't fund their own stations. This lead to proposals for a ten-station state supported educational network for New York. The Board of Regents, a governing body responsible for the funding and regulation of education applied to the New York state legislature for support ("Proposal by the Board," 1952). According to many newspaper reports, the proposal enjoyed great support even from the commercial networks. Nevertheless, in 1953 Governor Dewey rejected the proposal. A state-run educational television network, in his words, was not the best use of public funds. He was adamant that the commercial networks could better accommodate educational television ("Setback," 1953).

Coinciding with the controversy over educational television and the libertarian, free enterprise ethos surrounding the application of public interest provisions was the MoMA sponsored television study and the production of *Through the Enchanted Gate* (MacAgy, 1955). When considered in relationship to the debate over educational television and the public interest, evidence of a particular formation of governmental logic emerges through exhibitionary institutions such as the museum and television—logics that were both at odds and yet engaged with commercial and non-profit rationalities. The MoMA sponsored television project was first introduced by Nelson Rockefeller and later substantiated by Rene d'Harnoncourt. Through their rationalizations, it is clear that the MoMA was interested in educational programming, but first many obstacles had to be overcome which would be addressed through the course of the research project.

First and foremost, the MoMA was faced with negotiating the public interest rhetoric of network scions like CBS President William Paley. Paley was committed to the cause of modern art. He was a long-standing MoMA trustee who became the museum's president in the late 1960s. Moreover, he was an avid collector of modernist painting and sculpture. With regards to serving the public interest, Paley wrote:

> The Public must be kept fully informed if we are to achieve the remote blueprints of a democratic peace and equal opportunity for the pursuit of happiness (Welch, 1999: 104).

The rhetoric of public interest helped to legitimize the networks' monopoly of the airwaves while giving them the aura of acting democratically. In the network's rationale, any criticism of its programming in terms of catering to debased commercial interests rather than ennobled cultural standards could be thwarted through the networks' claim to defend the public interest by giving their audiences the kind of programming they wanted (1999: 106, 111). A program's popularity was measured according to market logics. Programs that attracted the greatest number of viewers would gain lucrative advertising sponsorships. Whereas MoMA officials invoked the language of rights and creative freedom in defense of its reformist approach to modern art through the discourse of liberal humanism, the networks invoked this language to legitimate their broadcast monopoly while dismissing criticism about the cultural standard of their programs. Any such criticism, the networks charged, was elitist and censored freedom of expression.

In memos she sent to Rene d'Harnoncourt, Betty Chamberlain (1951, 1952) summarized the MoMA's response to the Board of Regents proposal for a state-run educational broadcast network. The MoMA supported the proposal because it was clear that independent, noncommercial organizations would not have the resources to start and sustain their own stations. Nevertheless, MoMA representatives felt that the public interest would be compromised if state governors were able to impose their ideas about programming and pedagogy. Moreover, they were concerned that elected officials, if they had the chance,

would lean towards safe and conservative forms of culture rather than supporting the new and innovative elements of contemporary art. After all, modern art had so far been a target of Republican censorship. To protect itself against censorship, the MoMA supported the Board of Regents' recommendation that 20% of the UHF spectrum should be reserved for education with the provision that commercial stations should also be responsible for funding and supporting educational television. Moreover, the MoMA stipulated that those responsible for regulating the educational network should have no say in the production of programming or approach to pedagogy and culture. The liberal fear of state involvement articulated through the rhetoric of protecting creative freedom was also evident in the way MoMA officials characterized their forms of institutional support. In the 25th Anniversary year-end report, MoMA President William Burden (1956: 4-8) stressed that the museum did not receive state funding. He was pleased to note that most of MoMA's operating funds were self-generated from museum attendance and activities. In addition, it was the goal of the museum to reduce its reliance on philanthropic support. According to this rationale, the museum would be more democratic if it was funded by self-generated revenues providing evidence of the public's support of the institution. Moreover, self-generated revenues would secure the MoMA's democratic ethos lessening the likelihood that the state and private philanthropies would influence programming or impose their values on the museum's creative freedom.

The MoMA's attempts to negotiate the tension between educational, political and commercial rationales embedded in debates about the public interest was reinforced by Douglas MacAgy in his final report on the television project. He wrote that the state-run educational network was valuable in so far as it held out opportunities for inexpensive production, yet was limited because low budget programs would probably only engage a small audience (1955: 37). These efforts would be further hampered by the fact that this programming would most likely depend on conventional forms of representation that were conservative and expository—relying on classroom techniques which didn't translate well into the new medium of television (1955: 101). At the MoMA, MacAgy argued, programming should place thought and imagination above conventional approaches subscribed to by both educational and commercial interests (1955: 98). As a result of the museum's experience with new media and ever-expanding audiences, MacAgy suggested that the MoMA effectively produce programs that would succeed on both educational and commercial networks. According to MacAugy, "programs dealing with the visual arts should hold on to an audience on its own merits (1955: 211)." Through arguments such as these, the MoMA claimed to have purchase on the public interest in its efforts to enlighten and uplift its audiences through innovative cultural programming in a free market system.

In many ways the final report of the television project reflected upon MoMA's attempt to better mediate the realization of cultural democracy and universality

surrounding its incorporation of new media in a way that modified market logics of the commercial media while adhering to liberal humanist discourses of organizations such as the United Nations. The prospect of incorporating television into the MoMA's program was first hinted at in Nelson Rockefeller's speech to the Committee on Art Education in March 1952 (Chamberlain, 1955: 790). Rockefeller stated that television was integral for making the means of creative and cultural enlightenment available to all. In addition, the production of relevant cultural programming could quell the concerns of the nation's leaders who were upset with the quality of television transmitted into the homes of Americans. He stated that the heart of the problem existed between commercial broadcasters who knew how to appeal to large audiences, but had no idea about their audience's interest in cultural subjects. Those in the field of art and education had "access to the vast and fascinating cultural resources of our nation and world," but they had not yet learned how to use television effectively (Rockefeller, 1952).

Soon after Rockefeller's address to the Committee on Art Education, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund allocated $150,000 to the MoMA to conduct a three-year study into the uses of television. Rene d'Harnoncourt introduced the television project at a meeting of MoMA trustees (Chamberlain, 1955: 790). The aim of this project, according to d'Harnoncourt, was to discover the conditions under which commercial broadcasters and museum officials could collaborate to produce substantial programs devoted to the education of cultural citizens

conversant in the values of modern art. Research would be conducted into the strengths and weakness of existing programs about art. In addition, the MoMA would produce programs in conjunction with the networks. Particular attention was to be placed on understanding and developing the psychological and aesthetic qualities of the broadcast medium. The educational value of these programs was to be manifest in their stress on the contribution art made to living. All broadcasts were to be recorded on kinescope. In turn, the kinescopes were to be distributed via the MoMA film library for use in schools, parent meetings and other relevant voluntary associations allowing the museum to broaden its base on a national and international scale. A final report would be produced announcing the results of the television project which would then be circulated as a guide for other art educators.

The television project, like all of MoMA's endeavors was fundamentally concerned with how art and communications technologies could mediate the modes of conduct constitutive of a democratic form of liberal humanism. In the opening pages of his report, MacAgy reaffirmed the MoMA's role in this project. He argued that since the 19th century the museum had been a public institution like television able to mediate the cultural experiences of larger audiences (1955 6, 8). As a result, museums were involved in democratizing activities because they offered an expanded audience access to formerly exclusive realms of culture. Because it granted access to a broader audience, the museum was conversant with everyday issues and attitudes. As a public institution, its

founding aim was to address the varied interests of a contemporary public while balancing this with its commitment to preserving a "sanctuary of mind" respectful of the history of art and connoisseurship (1955: 4-5). MacAgy reaffirmed the commitments of the Packard report to the founding principles of the museum. Education, modern art and scholarship were to be understood as complimentary forms committed to uplifting societal norms and individual behavior. Television could extend this project because of its ability to engage an ever-greater cross-section of society (1955: 9-10). Of particular interest was the ability of television to address viewers in their homes that had until now been relatively difficult to access through visual media (1955: 12). In its engagement with television, MacAgy suggested, the MoMA had the opportunity to develop appropriate forms of mediation and audience address able to encourage the development of creative and self-sufficient individuals. They could do so through forms of mediation that were not didactic, nor expository, allowing audience members to, out of their own volition adapt these principles, forms of communication and action as their own. In so doing they become unique and creative individuals—the foundation of a so-called free and democratic society.

The degraded quality of the TV image that hampered the viewer's interaction with the work of art, according to MacAgy, was a major obstacle to the democratic fashioning of television (1955: 19, 24). Moreover, network broadcasters who used inappropriate assumptions about their audiences' viewing habits, limited the formation of viewers as self-regulating creative subjects. MacAgy claimed that

the museum was better able to understand the broadcast audience because its motives were not necessarily commercial, nor instrumentally oriented. As well, the museum could better stimulate the television audience's aesthetic sensibilities because it claimed to understand the "aesthetics of common place acts" that could "lead beginners to a set of expectations to which works of art yield (1955: 25)."

In not being bound to practical gains and commercial profits, the museum had the ability to critique and discover new ways of using television that took the medium into account. As a medium, MacAgy wrote, television was an "unresolved art of representation" constructed around a myth of immediacy claiming to represent the world to viewers as unmediated reality—as nature and as truth (1955: 56). In fact, this approach to representation, MacAgy suggested, was compensatory. It focused on reducing the psychological distance that the television screen constructed between viewers and the represented object. He argued that the rhetoric of immediacy was utilized, in part, to make home viewers feel that they were being personally addressed and therefore able to identify with the on-screen action. According to MacAgy, the rhetoric of immediacy was usually used to motivate viewers to consume or act instrumentally (1955: 57-58).

At the same time, according to MacAgy's report, the television screen created distance, detaching viewers from active participation (1955: 63). He noted that these passive and habitual viewing habits were often reinforced by

representational conventions evoking immediacy such as close ups, frontal shots (1955: 67), and especially show hosts whose personal taste and charisma were considered to be overbearing. Through their explanations, show hosts often told viewers what to think about, for example, art work (1955: 61). Such behavior prevented television viewers from learning according to their own experience, reflection and active looking. MacAgy speculated that if used to more aesthetically oriented ends, televisual distance could disrupt habitual modes of thought, feeling and behavior by highlighting "novelty and wonder which broadcasting techniques wear down (1955: 58)." Such detachment could disrupt commonplace interpretations and keep audiences perceptually alert. In eschewing the utilitarian, representational and expository modes of televisual immediacy, MacAgy claimed that viewers would transcend to an aesthetic frame of mind (1955: 68). This frame of mind aimed to engage home audiences in better ways of creative living enabling them to become active citizens and operate outside of the habitual and utilitarian realms of commerce and mass culture. Through the arts, television viewers could become aesthetically alert to their environments. Thus a form of television could emerge to focus on learning, communications and creativity.

After only a year, the MoMA's television project encountered many difficulties in its attempts to produce competitive commercial programming that would attract large audiences regardless of the museum's claims to be able to more effectively address the needs and desires of its audience. As repeatedly emphasized, most

detrimental to this project was the inability of broadcasters and museum officials to collaborate on programming. By early 1953, according to a report by a Rockefeller Brother's Fund officer (Bates, 1953), those working on the MoMA television project were forced to change their strategy because efforts to advise network producers on how to improve their programs had sorely failed. In fact, the positions of the museum and networks were so fundamentally at odds that those involved with the MoMA project decided to shift focus and concentrate on developing proposals and pilots rather than trying to work directly with the networks.

While *Through the Enchanted Gate* was one of the only television programs produced by the education department, and the only successful series produced by The Museum of Modern Art, during the course of the MoMA's three-year television project several proposals were developed focusing on the ways that art could enrich everyday life (Bates, 1953; Chamberlain, 1955: 794-96). Few of these projects reached fruition as the MoMA lacked the resources to do anything more than develop ideas for network pilots. These projects focused on the child, the city, and the home. *They Became Artists* was an animated program designed to introduce a lay audience to art through a view of famous artists as children. It was assumed that viewers in the early stages of learning about art might be less intimidated after seeing programs about famous artists in their earliest stages of development. Two episodes were developed, one on Marc Chagall and another on Rauol Duffy. *They Became Artists* never aired because Marc Chagall

threatened the MoMA with legal action. He didn't want his life to be portrayed in the way that producers of the program proposed.

Programs like *Point of View* and *The Wall* aimed to break with habitual ways of looking in the city. They approached the city as a work of art—bringing attention to both the old and the new in relevant and contemporary ways. *Point of View* focused on the aesthetics of overlooked objects in the city such as manhole covers and the decorative tops on skyscrapers. *The Wall* was never made and *Point of View* was never released. MoMA officials felt that in the end they could not endorse the production of *Point of View* because it did not meet their aesthetic standards. Next to *Through the Enchanted Gate*, the most popular television activity involved appearances on talk shows by MoMA's design advisor Edgar Kaufman (Chamberlain, 1955: 795). A series *Design* was planned, but never realized (MoMA, 1953b). The concept grew out of exhibitions of manufactured goods held at the MoMA and Chicago Merchandizing Mart. These displays were to introduce viewers to the aesthetic and practical dimensions of good design.

It is significant that given all of the limitations of the MoMA's experiments with, and research about, television that *Through the Enchanted Gate* was broadcast on network television for a sustained period of time. Perhaps its success related to the fact that children and education provided issues that the networks and nonprofit cultural institutions could momentarily engage with in a cooperative

fashion to address concerns surrounding governing rationalities such as democratic cultural communications, the public interest, and creative rights and freedoms. All were instruments having the potential to contribute to the formation of the cultured citizen while linking this subject to the larger governing order such as the nation state, and international polity of the "human family." On *Through the Enchanted Gate*, this was attempted in ways that were non-didactic, able to deal with the unpolished production values of TV and used the new medium to disrupt passive viewing habits. Through the democratic distribution of humanist values and practices associated with the fine arts, moreover, the populace would be uplifted and creative individuals would be instated as the foundational agency of an international governing order. In this configuration, art, in D'Amico's words, would become a "human necessity" as an active process constitutive of the formation of a vital, contemporary civilization.

In situating art as "human necessity" and children as future citizenry in need of creative education, *Through the Enchanted Gate* was a performance of cultural citizenry in the making. At the same time, the cultural policy, research, administrative and intellectual debates surrounding the museum's approach to the new medium of television constituted discursive attempts to better realize the museum's mandate of universality. The project of achieving cultural universality, nevertheless, was ever in need of negotiating, incorporating, finding temporary resolutions to the tensions, contradictions, and contestations ensuing from the particular governmental logics it subscribed to. As a temporary resolution to the

needs of creating cultured citizens and a democratic governing order better able to realize cultural democracy—*Through the Enchanted Gate*—although it was the most successful of MoMA's attempts at television, was unable to find a commercial sponsor and was therefore cancelled after only two seasons.

Chapter 3
The Japanese House:
A Modernist Exercise in Cross-Cultural Governance

The Museum has chosen a Japanese building for its third House in the Garden because of the unique relevance to modern Western architecture of traditional Japanese design. The characteristics which give Japanese architecture this interest are post and lintel skeleton frame construction; flexibility of plan; close relation of indoor and outdoor areas; the ornamental quality of the structural system.

Arthur Drexler, Curator
Japanese Exhibition House
Summer 1954

Perhaps the most thoroughly satisfying effort made by the television project...was the filming of the Japanese house in the museum garden. ...No effort was made to dwell on the technicalities of the house as differentiated from other Japanese houses, but rather to convey some of the feeling that was universally experienced by visitors to the house. In terms of television, the film was, in actuality, a documentary, but a documentary of the kind which permitted the elimination of reportage of any sort and which moved very slowly through mood. ... The idea was to present the television audience with something a little out of the way—that something, however, being set in a frame of reference with which people would be familiar. In this case, audience curiosity was piqued by the setting—New York City—and, at the same time, the viewer was urged to go beyond familiarity on an excursion into the area of contemplation.

Douglas MacAgy, Director MoMA Television Project
The Museum Looks in on TV, 1952-1955

It can be assumed that one of the goals (or at least hopes) of those who sponsor intercultural exhibits is to develop in the audience more "favorable" attitudes toward the country whose products are being shown. Implicitly there are a number of assumptions which may or may not be well founded. On the one hand, it is assumed that anti-Japanese sentiments exist in the audience, primarily because of World War II, but also because of other traits frequently ascribed to the Japanese (they are cruel, fanatic, imitative, they manufacture cheap and shoddy goods, etc.). On the other hand, it is assumed that the audience will draw some inferences from the products shown as to the character and culture of the people who created them, in the process either revising previously held unfavorable or indifferent views, or at least reinforcing latent feelings of sympathy.

From "The Japanese House: A Study of its Visitors and Their Reactions."
Bureau of Social Research, Washington, 1956

Although never broadcast on network television, *The Japanese House* (1955) was considered the most artistically successful of the Museum of Modern Art's Rockefeller sponsored television productions. As an experiment in documentary filmmaking, director Sidney Peterson's twenty-minute made-for-television movie was assumed to be unlike other MoMA television ventures because it poetically evoked the mood of the modern (MacAgy, 1955: 272). As the least expensive and most bureaucratically unencumbered of the MoMA's television productions, *The Japanese House* was made for well under three-thousand dollars and was shot on 16mm black and white film with one camera and two lights. Implicit to Peterson's attempt to use artistic and communication media in an economical and innovative manner was the aim of forging a democratic and cultured citizenry. This chapter will analyze, therefore, how the making of *The Japanese House* contributed to the production of a populace conversant in modes of conduct commensurate with the liberal humanist ethos associated with the museum's media, art education and exhibition policies and programs. To begin with, a close reading of the never televised documentary *The Japanese House* will be conducted in the context of America's attempts to secure Japan as an anti-communist ally in the postwar period. This was an exercise in cultural exchange designed to revise negative public opinion and racial stereotyping of a military foe and industrial rival in America. The aim here is to examine how citizenly conduct and provisions for cultural democracy were articulated through the rubric of cross-cultural governance. An investigation of the rhetoric of cross-cultural governance as it occurs filmically, architecturally and pedagogically will

be related to the orientalizing logic subtending modernist and liberal humanist discourses. The orientalizing logics underpinning discourses of cross-cultural governance will be further explored in the debates about modern architecture that took place at the MoMA and in the construction of the UN headquarters in New York City. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of how an audience survey of the Japanese exhibition house reaffirmed the integral role of the principles and practices associated with modern art in the production and maintenance of a culturally democratic world order.

In its characterization as both a work of art and an educational tool, *The Japanese House* took as its object of representation a seventeenth century house for a scholar built during the museum's twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations. This traditional domestic structure, the subject of a museum display called *The Japanese Exhibition House* (1954-5) was the third in a series of homes built in the MoMA's sculpture garden. Sponsored by the MoMA's architecture department, displays like *The Japanese Exhibition House* were to offer a model environment presenting design ideas intended to impart to viewers suggestions about how to improve their domestic environment and by inference their lives—including their contributions to a humane and democratic civic culture. While the other homes in the sculpture garden were distinctively modernist and designed by Western architects, *The Japanese Exhibition House* was unique because it was built with the intention of representing to American audiences nonwestern and premodern modes of living.

Situated as an ancient precursor to modernism, the Japanese house was intended to provide museum goers, and by extension television viewers, with a true to life viewing experience in order to encourage identification with, and support for, the practices and principles embodied in this display. Through access to such a realistic exhibit, it was hoped that museum audiences could gain an understanding of a "foreign" culture, an aim paralleling the United Nation's promotion of models of development dependent on modernist and liberal humanism. These were principles and practices whose emergent formations could be legitimized through association with eternal and enduring cultures. In this case, the modern was substantiated because its origins were rooted in the ancient cultures of Japan.

In its presentation of a traditional Japanese house, the MoMA, moreover, signaled a shift in its architecture department's longstanding promotion of the International Style—a rationalist approach to modern architecture heavily criticized because of its failure to take human needs and context into account. With the end of the war and the perceived need to situate culture as a realm through which the instrumentalizing rationalities of the machine age could be humanized, MoMA officials felt the necessity to adjust their approach to architecture. Towards such ends, *The Japanese Exhibition House* provided the ideal venue through which to modify the mechanistic, dehumanizing tendencies

of the International Style with the spiritual and organic ideas underpinning the MoMA's presentation of premodern Japanese architecture.

Arthur Drexler, *The Japanese Exhibition House's* organizer emphasized in his curatorial statement that the MoMA's approach to the promotion of modern architecture was to be humanized in its affinity with the traditions of Japanese home building (Drexler, 1954). Not coincidentally, according to Drexler, these building traditions shared fundamental characteristic with modern architecture. These similarities included the use of a "post and lintel skeleton frame construction; flexibility of plan; close relation of indoor and outdoor areas; [and] the ornamental quality of the structural system (Drexler, 1954)." In short, Drexler's comparison of the modern home with this premodern Japanese structure imbued it with a highly ordered sense of design expressive of spiritual integration—principles and practices valourized in discourses of postwar cultural democracy.

By way of elucidating the MoMA's attempts to reform its approach to modern architecture through displays such as *The Japanese Exhibition House*, Sidney Peterson's experimental television documentary served as both educational and aesthetic proof that the MoMA was shifting its strategy. Peterson's filmic rendering of the Japanese house highlighted Drexler's attempt to associate the modern with the ancient. To do so, Peterson structured his documentary through a series of antimonies. He compared and contrasted the East with the West, the

organic with the mechanistic, and the cosmopolitan with the particular, thus reinforcing a hierarchical dichotomy valourizing Western culture as modern and universal while positioning Eastern culture as highly civilized, yet unable to enter the modern age. Filmically, these antimonies were heightened in the quick and dramatic cuts between the home's exterior and interior. For instance, appearing as a repeating motif was a sequence of shots benignly juxtaposing images of New York skyscrapers either framing the exhibition house or reflected in the house's garden pond. On the interior, viewers witnessed MoMA patrons' awkward attempts to learn ancient domestic rituals such as taking off their shoes before entering the house, or sitting on cushions in unfurnished surrounds. Through these seemingly innocuous comparisons, Peterson attempted to lead his audience on a journey of enlightenment urging viewers "to go beyond familiarity on an excursion into the area of contemplation (MacAgy, 1955: 273)."

In order to emphasize the process-oriented nature of this journey of contemplation and enlightenment, Peterson led viewers through the house via the tentative view of a mobile, hand-held camera. Peterson's itinerant tour of the house was oriented by a spare narration and allusive musical composition (MacAgy, 1955: 272-3). For example, punctuated by the film's jazzy, atonal score, the narrator reported that although the house was constructed from traditional building techniques, its realization was dependent on feats of modern industrial ingenuity. Through the expertise of modernist architect Junzo Yoshimura and his team of scholarly and technical specialists, the Japanese

house was designed and constructed in Japan by traditional craftsmen and materials in 1953. Upon its completion it was dismantled and shipped to America in over 700 crates. When it arrived in New York, the house was refabricated by specially trained Japanese carpenters dressed in supposedly premodern attire who participated in ritual ceremonies associated with traditional house design (Drexler, 1955: 262; Museum of Modern Art, 1954c).

This elaborate, highly technical feat of constructing and reconstructing the Japanese house in the garden and its telefilmed representation—formally structured as a poetic evocation—presented Japan as a highly civilized culture, but one that was suspended in its ancient traditions. This contemporary representation of Japanese culture as ancient precursor to the modern was promoted as an exercise in cultural diplomacy that coincided with the visit of Japanese Premier Shigeru Yoshida to the United States to negotiate trade agreements and military support (Yoshida, 1954; Ike, 1954; Japanese House, 1954; Schmidt, 1954). This exercise in cultural diplomacy was supposed to present a positive image of Japan in order to elicit national support for American foreign policy directed toward securing Japan as a Cold War ally for the purposes of countering Communist gains in China, Korea and Vietnam. The aim of these cultural exchange programs was to justify the USA's economic and military intervention in Japan (Penn, 1998: 2). This was no small feat given that these two formidable powers had always been bitter military enemies and industrial competitors. This condition was exacerbated by the dropping of the bomb on

Nagasaki and Hiroshima and with the internment of Japanese-Americans during the war.

It is telling that the traditional Japanese house built in the MoMA sculpture garden was reminiscent of dwellings built for scholars in the 16th and 17th centuries. In addition to serving as a mode of cultural exchange designed to reverse negative racial characterizations of Japanese culture, the presentation of a scholar's house historically located the origins of the modern system of democratic governance dependent on well-educated, cultured individuals. At the same time, the emphasis on education and the presentation of higher cultural values in the home perhaps had the effect of imparting modes of etiquette commensurate with good citizenly conduct in the domestic sphere. Special emphasis was placed on how citizens might regard and display art at home, and how everyday activities could be elevated through the aestheticized rituals of tradition. In attending to how aesthetics and intellection could improve an individual citizen's domestic surrounds, this exhibition and its filmed document attempted to locate the home and the family as a primary site of cultural governance.

Circumscribed by the logic of liberal humanism and high modernism, the democratizing impetus of an exhibition and made-for-television documentary like *The Japanese House* was largely educational. It was assumed that exhibition goers and television viewers would benefit from the experience they would gain

given access to situations where they could view aesthetically sound forms of modern décor and design. From such experience, museum curators and educators hoped that individual citizens would recognize the authentic values of modern art. They, therefore, would be propelled to engage with this proposed way of life that was supposed to be enlightening and able to penetrate every good citizen's surrounds. This attempt to democratize the principles and practices of modern art, it could be argued, was crucial to the democratic ethos of modern nations whose institutions championed the sanctity of the individual. According to these liberal principles, governing institutions had to appear to respect the autonomy of the social sphere—or civil society as it is referred to in liberal discourse. Nevertheless, according the Tony Bennett, in order to govern effectively through the management of its populace, culture had to be engaged as a form of social regulation and reform (1999: 10-11). Culture, therefore, was viewed as an effective means of governmental regulation. It could be engaged in the service of upholding the liberal commitment to the individual's rights to freedom. Culture, in the rationale of liberal reform, then, was celebrated because in valorizing the creative individual, provisions were made for the performance of democratic citizenship which could occur given "a varied set of means through which the freedom arising from the autonomy of society [could] be subject to direction and regulations (Bennett 1999: 11)."

With *The Japanese Exhibition House,* this logic of regulation and cultural reform was articulated under the auspices of cultural diplomacy aiming to ameliorate the

troubled conflicts that had escalated between American and Japan since World War II. In the context of American Cold War foreign policy, the aim was to enlist Japan as an anti-Communist ally. But in order to achieve this goal, centuries of ill will, racist stereotyping and social and economic exploitation had to be reversed quickly. To such ends, many cultural and educational programs were set-up and sponsored by American government agencies and private philanthropists such as the Rockefeller Foundation. In the case of *The Japanese Exhibition House*, cultural exchange was enacted through the mixing of the aesthetics of high modernism with the recovery of modern antecedents in premodern Japanese domestic architecture. This effort was designed to elicit peace and understanding through the presentation of aesthetic affinity between two powerful economic and military enemies in order to sway public opinion in America.

The principles of common humanity and aesthetic universality articulated in the MoMA's attempts to educate cultured citizens were not exactly as value free and nondiscriminatory as the MoMA organizers had proclaimed. In actuality, the application of the principles of universality, creative freedom and modernization were uneven. Committed to universality and modernization in their attempt to undo the injustices of the past, the MoMA following the UN's example, envisioned culture to be a universal realm designed to reverse prewar conceptions of human nature and social hierarchy as biologically fixed and racialized. In shifting the assessment of governance to terms favoring cultural pluralism and relativization, it was argued that a more orderly, humane and

peaceful international polity would emerge. Yet, in the historical application of these ideals, rather than addressing structural exclusions, only the most evident disparities would be targeted for reform leaving structural inequality to persist.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein, rather than being opposed and mutually exclusive, in liberal, democratic economies the application of apparently progressive principles such as those associated with cultural pluralism (including concepts of universality, modernity, and creative freedom) are troubled because of their symbiotic dependence on racialization and gendered practices (Wallerstein, 1990: 39). Wallerstein argues that this rationale is used to justify contradictory applications of governing logics circumscribed by, for example, liberal humanism and modernism (1990: 42). Within this particular application, the universal is located in the particular so that, for instance, an international polity can be built out of that which is common and considered to promote human growth. Within this rationale, every individual and culture is considered to have the potential to ascend towards the universal through learning. It is, therefore, the duty of those in possession of such culture to impart their knowledge to those who they perceive to be less developed. Especially suited to this governing impetus, Etienne Balibar argues, are educational institutions such as the family, school, and museum (1990: 356-7). In this rhetoric, those who do not aspire, or fail, to realize their humanity are regarded as failures. Often failures are explained in terms of racialized or gendered cultural characterizations (Wallerstein, 1990: 49).

Therefore, cultural qualities that are not considered to be modern and universal are characterized as thwarting human growth and retarding progress. As such, these characteristics are regarded as anachronistic and are targeted for reform. This is done through what Bennett calls strategic normativity where values associated with the modern and universal are mobilized and applied to the reform of the perceived shortcomings of other cultures (Bennett 1999: 92). Rather than eliminating discriminatory practices as, for example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proposed to do on a constitutional level, activities associated with *The Japanese Exhibition House* subscribed to governing logics that were antimonous and binary in order to regulate contradictory applications of cultural democracy (Wallerstein, 1990: 51).

Permeated by an aura of hushed reverence, the Japanese house exhibition appeared to present an experience of the essential spirit of humanity. Unlike many nations emerging into sovereignty in the post 1945 era, Japanese culture was considered by Westerners to be highly cultivated—spiritually, intellectually and aesthetically. Nevertheless, these qualities were located in the premodern past, positioning Japan—a rapidly modernizing nation—as an ancient civilization which the West should study in order to decipher its exotically coded wisdoms. As Wallerstein, following from Edward Said, suggests, this projection of otherness and ancient wisdom onto Asian cultures is a form of orientalism (Wallerstein 1990: 45). In disavowing the contemporary conditions of Japanese

modernity, the culture of Japan is characterized as protomodern, yet unable to progress because according to the West's racialized projections, Japan is hampered by its exotic nature, ethnic homogeneity, and conformist mentality.

The itinerary of *The Japanese Exhibition House* and the made for TV documentary, therefore, was designed as a performance in citizenly education. While appearing benevolent in its claim to spiritualize the modern and machine-age aesthetic of the International Style, this display presented a highly contentious reform-oriented image of the other without actually addressing its racialized discriminations. This troubled exercise in cultural citizenship was structured around a series of juxtapositions designed to educate American audiences about what was familiar in the strange and exotic elements of Japanese culture. For Sidney Peterson, the most relevant way to express this condition was through formally innovative means directed towards familiarizing the West with the alleged strangeness of the East while appropriating Eastern themes to humanize the modern. In undertaking this project, Peterson hoped to familiarize his audience with the formalist aspects of modernist aesthetics by presenting them in conjunction with the documentary format. At the same time, he hoped to refunction the documentary format so it would be aesthetically relevant for televisual presentations.

Moreover, Peterson characterized his efforts at televisual education and experimental documentary as fugitive—a quality he most closely associated with

the aesthetic condition of music (Peterson, 1955: 101). Of all of the aesthetic disciplines, music was considered by many to be the purist in its artistic pursuit. Supposedly music had the ability to produce an experience of harmony and beauty—an experience simulated in the fleeting and fragile moment of performance. According to Peterson, the fugitive aesthetic was perfectly suited for television—a medium that the MoMA television project so clearly established as unable to realistically portray the experience of viewing art objects. In approaching television as a fugitive media, producers such as Peterson treated TV as a form of modern art. As such, television could represent the fleeting processes associated with an expressive experience of modernist aesthetics. In its ability to aspire to the fugitive, Peterson, borrowing from the writing of the art historian Erwin Panofsky, likened television's aesthetic characteristics to those of the mannerist period of the 17th century, an era coinciding with the origins of *The Japanese Exhibition House* (Peterson, 1955: 46).

For Peterson, the modernist and the mannerist were artistic styles related to periods of societal transition and uncertainty (Peterson, 1955: 46). Both modernist and mannerist compositions were characterized by shallow space, and shifting perspective, as well as disjunctive and transmuting imagery (1955: 47). According to Peterson, this was a space of continuous revision and disjointed time connotative of epochal crisis. The shallow space of the screen along with a perspective that permutated with camera movements was evidence of a representational logic analogous with mannerism. This logic allowed Peterson to

claim that while it was virtually impossible to replicate the experience of viewing art objects in a museum, television could be treated as a modern form of art because of its sense of space, its concern with *nowness*, and its editing and compositional possibilities (1955: 82). Television, like modernist art, was concerned with processes of discovery. According to Peterson, for modern art and television the real subject of representation was the picture's own composition (1955: 82). Moreover, television was thought to have much in common with child-like forms of creativity that were fleeting and concerned with processes of discovery (1955: 82).

As well as writing about the fugitive and mannerist character of television and art in the modern period, Peterson noted that he was determined to use documentary film in a way that was relevant to both television and art education (1955: 89). Film provided broadcasters and museum curators with the opportunity to gain more control over their subject matter given that this medium allowed for greater editing possibilities and better image resolution (1955: 118). The documentary format could also benefit from its association with the principle of modernist art making and the contingencies of the televisual medium. In a letter to Rene d'Harnoncout, Peterson (1953) recounted that the problem with the documentary format as institutionalized by filmmakers such as Paul Rotha in the 1930s was that it was a didactic form of communication. Conventional documentary formats presented education and information in a manner that was topic oriented and addressed viewers didactically and literarily, thus ignoring

other visual and aesthetic dimensions of meaning. This bias led to a conflict between those concerned with the aesthetic and those concerned with the delivery of authoritative moral messages. According to Peterson, this historical development resulted in a division between those who were concerned with the aesthetic and therefore relinquished social responsibility, and those who he characterized as the simple, philosophically naïve realists who were dedicated to the doctrine of social realism (Peterson, 1953).

In his report for the MOMA's television project, Peterson (1955) argued that the MoMA could not afford to embrace the omniscient, authoritarian voice of documentary filmmaking. Yet, at the same time those concerned with the civilizing potentials of modern art, he insisted, should not relinquish their civic responsibility by ignoring social issues associated with the documentary format. The role of the modern documentary should be democratic and foster the values associated with modernist aesthetics and therefore should avoid authoritarian and didactic modes of address (Peterson, 1955: 126). The modernist documentary, Peterson suggested, should convey authenticity and common experience—allowing citizens to experience art rather than have their tastes dictated to.

In addition to resembling art in its fugitive compositional frame, Peterson argued that the appropriate way for the museum to address its televisual audience was through representing the museum as a personality rather than as an architectural

entity as had been done in programs like *Dimension* and *The Family of Man*. Given television's penchant for championing charismatic personalities, the museum could present itself as an engaging persona. Nevertheless, the museum should not present itself as a superficial, charismatic figure, but as an individual "as flexible and contradictory as man himself" appearing able to "resolve the complexities which make the present seem divided against itself (1955; 126)." In presenting itself as a complex humanist persona and ameliorative agent, television should, as Peterson suggested, focus on human interaction rather than finished works of modern art and architecture.

In *The Japanese House*, Peterson had the opportunity to realize some of his theories about how the principles of modern art making could contribute to the production of relevant televisual documents that were both educative, yet aesthetically modernist. Thus, Peterson structured his made-for-television rendering of *The Japanese Exhibition House* to emulate the itinerary of an ideal, yet average exhibition viewer—who in touring the exhibition house and its grounds was to come to understand the importance of the aesthetic principles in the practices of everyday living. For the most part, Peterson's experimental documentary simulated the average MoMA patron's tour of the house with a verbal narrative, visual sequencing, and musical score able to orient television viewers through this audio-visual rendering of the physical exhibition space.

Constructed through a sequence of quick cuts emphasizing visual plays on light and dark, *The Japanese House* was organized around an array of visual cues reinforcing the film's thematic search for the ancient in order to understand the strangeness of the other. For instance, the film's atonal score accompanied the recurring visual motif of New York skyscrapers reflected in the stillness of the Japanese house's garden pond. These visual and sonic motifs marked different phases of the museum visitor's tour. This televisual tour began with a multitude of museum visitors milling about in front of the house in poses suggestive of their curious attempts to understand the house's plan and the ways of living that took place within. Here, a sense of the wide range of visitors that toured the house was conveyed. Visitors included the most ordinary young middle-class couple and culminated with the most powerful dignitaries and cultural philanthropists such as the Japanese President Yoshida, MoMA director Rene d'Harnoncourt, as well as MoMA trustee and instigator of the Japanese house exhibition, John D Rockefeller III.

In being taken on a tour of the house, the hypothetical television viewer was to be guided by the show's narrator whose function mimicked that of exhibition curator Arthur Drexler's (1954) exhibition pamphlet. The narrator guided visitors through the house focusing on how the physical design of the space contributed to an aesthetically sound lifestyle. As well as making the strange familiar, the exhibition and television documentary aimed to humanize architecture associated with the MoMA's promotion of the International Style. Repeatedly, the

International Style had been criticized for its dogmatic emphasis on form and function which supposedly negated the human and organic. In many circles, the International Style was synonymous with LeCorbusier's dictum that the home should be a "machine for living." In this logic, any architectural undertaking that was not integrated structurally or materially was considered blasphemous. Despite great criticism, the MoMA adhered to the promotion of the International Style until the end of the war (Matthews, 1994). At this time, the MoMA began to entertain the repeated calls for the modern to incorporate humanizing elements associated with the organic, nature and spirituality (Penn, 1998: 1-2). Nevertheless, in attending to the organic and spiritual, the MoMA and some of its critics were careful to distance themselves from those who wished to revive romantic building forms irrelevant to the modern in that they harkened back to a bygone era (What's Happening, 1948:3).

The Japanese Exhibition House was one of the strongest indications that in the realm of architecture, the MoMA was addressing fears about the destruction of civilization associated with the atomic age and the Cold War. Through attention to the aesthetic and educational values of modernism, *The Japanese House* literally took viewers on a tour of this physical environment to suggest that while a search for the humane aimed to modify the modern, it did not compromise the emphasis on structure and form.

As an ideal environment able to foster and intellectual ways of living, *The Japanese Exhibition House* was designed by the modernist architect Yoshi Yoshimura. Yoshimura was commissioned by Arthur Drexler to approximate the design of a 17th century home which according to the narrator of *The Japanese House* "might be built by a scholar, priest, or government official"...that is "someone with the training and leisure for reading and writing (Museum of Modern Art, 1954d)." The intent was to show how the home promoted a contemplative way of life. Its ability to foster intellection was integrated into the home's structural features. The house was constructed according to a "shoin-zukuri" which meant the desk way of building. That is, the house's structure centred on a core feature—a desk which characterized the function of the inhabitants major preoccupation.

In Peterson's television documentary, next to the desk, the most unique element was the house's roof. According to the program's narrator, the roof was something that was universal to all homes, yet was unusually regarded by the Japanese as an expressive element. The roof's beauty, the narrator informed us, was found in its shapes, proportions, modeling and texture. The roof was thought to be expressive, moreover, because it was not structural. It was supported by the post and lintel structural cage which acted as the dwelling's frame.

Although it may have seemed strange to most American viewers, the home's interior displayed a rigorous and economical relationship between the form of the

house and the contemplative function of everyday activities. Unlike most Western homes, in the Japanese house, the elements of daily living were stored away. There were few pieces of freestanding furniture. For example, instead of chairs, home dwellers sat on cushions. Rice straw mats measuring 3x6 feet covered floors. Each room's size was determined by the straw mat's dimensions. Yet, in order to make the strange, familiar, the narrator added that the "Japanese sense of the fitness of things" was integral to the 20th century taste for open interiors, plain surfaces which was "a Japanese idea which we have begun to develop in our own way (MoMA, 1954d)."

In presenting this highly ordered, yet uncluttered interior, the film's narrator declared that art was ritually regarded in the Japanese house. For instance, in this multifunctional, flexible interior a distinctive alcove had been set aside for the display of artworks. In the alcove, home dwellers could view one piece of art at a time in contemplative seclusion. Under these conditions, the narrator noted that the artwork was regarded for its contemplative value instead of for its decorative utility. Rather than hanging art in the home "strung along the wall without a rationale," in the Japanese house, art was not presented to match the furniture, but was to be regarded in seclusion in order to enjoy, as the narrator declared, "arts delicate and subtle effects (MoMA 1954d)."

Adding to the spiritual significance of this domestic site, the narrator recounted how ritual ceremonies involving food, dress, tea, and flower arrangements were

typical of Zen Buddhist practices. Most characteristic of the ritualized ceremony surrounding everyday practices associated with this house was that they were, above all else, contemplative and involved discipline and precision. In addition, attention to an ordered sense of interior design was extended into the outdoors. For example, the highly formalized arrangements of vegetation and groundcover were evident in the white sand that was raked into patterns similar to those that served to symbolize the purified state of temple courtyards.

The MoMA's house exhibits received much publicity because they claimed to present exemplary displays of everyday forms of living. These exhibitions claimed to address individuals and their families as cultural citizens by encouraging them to improve their homes according to modernist aesthetic standards. The press coverage of the houses designed by Gregory Ain (1949) and Marcel Breuer (1950) included reports about the homes' affordability, and on the MoMA's success in securing mortgages to facilitate the building of these modern domestic designs (Chamberlain, 1955: 681). Tips were given on where to purchase the displayed materials and accoutrements, as well as how to interpret such modernist spaces. The only difference between the two homes appeared to be that the Ain House was designed as a prototype for a middle class suburban development of prefabricated dwellings while the Breuer House was intended for a more upscale and pastoral location. Moreover, while critics felt that the living room of the Breuer House was questionably dominated by a television, the Ain House avoided this travesty by eliminating a television

altogether. This was considered to be a good thing as it would encourage family members to engage in supposedly more culturally edifying past times such as reading (About the House, 1950). Educational materials accompanying the exhibition explained how each plan and its materialization would improve the living conditions of cultured citizens (Exhibition House, 1949).

Most press reports surrounding the Japanese house also focused on how the exhibited environment provided an invaluable lesson in the improvement of domestic taste and cross-cultural diplomacy. The house served as the backdrop for many fashion shoots and controversy raged over the fact that the MoMA's promotion of sparse interior décor might not be in keeping with the spirit of the modern domestic American economy (Penn, 1998: 5). The promotion of sparse interiors might discourage consumer spending leaving manufacturers and retailers to suffer in the process. This led some critics of the Japanese house to declare that the "less is more" ethic of modernism was really very anti-American (Penn, 1998: 6).

An exception to these discussions addressing consumer interest was Lewis Mumford's column in *The New Yorker* (1954). Mumford's primary concern was to engage in debates about whether the MoMA's exhibition houses succeeded in humanizing the International Style. To say that Mumford was elated about *The Japanese Exhibition House* is an understatement. He declared in *The New Yorker* that *The Japanese Exhibition House* was one of the most commendable

presentations of domestic architecture the MoMA had yet to undertake. He added that it was one of the best exhibitions to take place in New York since the display of a Frank Lloyd Wright Prairie House at the Guggenheim a year earlier. Both homes, Mumford argued, were examples of domestic dwellings that while presenting the best aspects of modern design and building techniques, offered organic and humane alternatives to the logic of functionalist design.

Mumford (1950) was not particularly enamored with the Ain and Breuer exhibition houses, even though, they, like the Japanese house were concerned with constructing a flexible, open plan, an integrated relationship between indoors and outdoors as well as utilizing structure as ornament. For Mumford, the Ain and Breuer houses were unable to succeed in even in their own functionalist terms. Mumford declared that like most Western modernist architects Ain and Breuer were "victim[s] of [their] own mechanical formlessness (1950)." For example, they used glass walls and sliding partitions in ways that blocked ventilation, passageways, and the flow of indoor spaces into the outside landscape. Privacy, storage and room divisions were also ineffectively addressed. In the older protomodern Japanese house, Mumford (1954) insisted, form and function were not divorced from human needs and natural surrounds. According to Mumford (1954), the very beauty and simplicity of the Japanese house derived from the ways in which form and function rendered beauty intended to foster quiet repose through the selective stripping of human requirements to their essentials. Integral

to this process was the refinement of detail and the ability to take pleasure in natural materials of wood and stone.

Mumford, despite his great appreciation of the Japanese house, nevertheless, held orientalizing views towards Japan in a fashion similar to many of his foes who championed the International Style. He was quick to point out that the essential aesthetic qualities of the Japanese house had veritably disappeared in the cultures of modern Japan. As Mumford wrote, the "Japanese themselves are rapidly losing their grip on traditional ways of living (1954)." These values, he added, had been in decline since the late 19th century at "a moment when the Japanese were showing a hideous strength in their attempt to physically Westernize (1954)." Since this time, Mumford added, "the contemporary Japanese find themselves not worthy of these aesthetic refinements (1954)."

While these traditional ways of living represented by the Japanese house were apparently little in evidence in modern Japan, Mumford urged his readership not to despair. For he was pleased to report that the foundation of more organically oriented building practices permeated the work of mid-Western architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright and the West Coast-Bay Region architects like Maybeck and the Greene Brothers. Mumford claimed that architects such as these could build homes necessary for the "survival of civilization." A few years prior to his review of the Japanese house, Mumford wrote that the survival of civilization was, in part, dependant on whether citizens chose either the more organic or the

more mechanistic approach to modern architecture. Depending on which form won out, Mumford insisted, civilization could

> ...either commit suicide on an inconceivably large scale, or it may develop the foundation of a new civilization, the first efforts of the modern style will be seen as indicative of that greater humanism and universalism which can be achieved (What's Happening, 1948: 19).

Mumford's approval of the Japanese house was significant in that it marked a decisive shift because for years the promoters of modern architecture at the MoMA had been at odds with Mumford. Evidence of their departing points of view began when Mumford lobbied to have Frank Lloyd Wright included in the MoMA's inaugural exhibition devoted to the International Style (Matthews, 1994: 52). For MoMA officials, Frank Lloyd Wright was controversial. Although his interiors were modernist with flexible, open plans, Wright was reprimanded because of his inability to carry this approach through to the dwelling's exterior. Moreover, Wright's commitment to the dramas of romantic individualism proved to be an anathema to those committed to the development of a pure, streamlined modern American architecture. Eventually Mumford convinced MoMA curators to include Frank Lloyd Wright in their inaugural exhibition (Matthews, 1994: 52). They did so reluctantly, conceding to Mumford that Wright was modern in his approach to structure, materials and form. While they admitted that Wright set an important precedent, they insisted that he was of the past (Matthews, 1994: 48). In the postwar period, this longstanding debate between the MoMA and Mumford was eclipsed. At this time, the MoMA's educational goals were redirected toward the formation of an international polity committed to fostering the humanizing and

democratizing potentials of modern art to secure peace and good government. This shift in outlook, in part, explains why the organic, tradition oriented ethos of the Japanese house would find its place in the sculpture garden of a modern museum who for years righteously defended more machine-oriented logic of the International Style.

One of the major indicators of the MoMA's shift in perspective was the 1948 MoMA sponsored symposium "What is Happening to Modern Architecture?" Devoted to debating Mumford's challenges to the International Style, architects from around Europe and America presented their positions on the subject. According to a 1947 *New Yorker* article that served as the object of debate for this symposium, Mumford wrote that he didn't

> ...propose to join the solemn gentlemen who, aware of this natural reaction against a sterile and abstract modernism, are predicting a return to graceful stereotypes of the eighteenth century. Rather, I look for the continued spread, to every part of the country, of that native and humane form of modernism one might call the Bay Region Style, a free yet unobtrusive expression of the terrain, the climate, and the way of life on the Coast. That style took root about fifty years ago in Berkeley California...and by now it is simply taken for granted; no one out there is foolish enough to imagine that there is any other proper way of building in our time. The style is actually a product of the meeting of Oriental and Occidental architectural traditions, and it is far more truly a universal style than the so-called International Style of the nineteen-thirties, since it permits regional adoption and modifications. ....The change that is now going on in both Europe and America means only that architecture is past its adolescent period with its quixotic purities, its awkward self-consciousness, its assertive dogmatism (What's Happening, 1948: 3).

The Japanese Exhibition House was a culmination of the debate between the East and West coast advocates of modernist architecture in the USA so marked

by Mumford's arguments. Most fortuitous was Mumford's comments about the meeting of the Orient and the Occident that needless to say imbued every aspect of *The Japanese Exhibition House* and Peterson's made-for-television documentary.

This orientalizing impetus, as has been noted, has a long tradition in modernist practice. For American modernists, as some architectural critics suggest (McNeil, 1992), the orientalizing fascination with Japanese architecture began in the late 19th century when traditional Japanese structures were presented at world fairs in, for example, Philadelphia and Chicago. Upon viewing Japanese pavilions, modernist architects and designers were inspired to travel abroad. The most often cited beneficiary of this practice was Frank Lloyd Wright who was indelibly influenced after viewing the Japanese pavilion at the 1886 Chicago World's Fair (Penn, 1998: 7). Soon after, Wright traveled to Japan to study its culture and execute architectural commissions. Wright was one in a long line of Western modernists such as Bruno Taut and Richard Neutra who traveled to Japan. According to Peter McNeil (1994: 282), architects like Wright, Taut and Neutra perpetuated the orientalizing impetus of the West. While in search of the precursors to the modern, these modernist often overlooked, or openly disdained modern Japanese culture. As MacNeil notes (1994: 282), since the Megi Restoration in the late 18th century in a fashion similar to the rest of the industrializing world, the building of telegraph lines and railways, for example, were indicative of the rapid pace of modernization in Japan. At the same time,

many Western architects trained in the modern tradition despised Japanese modernization. They blamed the contemporary Japanese populace for annihilating the eternal values of ancient culture. As they saw it, it was the business of Western modernists to search for traces of traditional Japanese culture in order to claim these quickly disappearing traditions (1994: 281). In subscribing to the tradition of orientalizing Asian cultures in the building of the Japanese house, the MoMA perpetuated these internationalizing strategies of cultural governance substantiated by agencies such as the UN and UNESCO in the postwar world. In this logic of international cultural governance, the search for the universal in the particular conveniently facilitated the West's incorporation of rapidly modernizing, yet non-Western cultures while ameliorating their challenges to the West's liberal, democratic and capitalist ethos.

In the logic of international cultural governance, Japanese culture was not fully modern according to Western standards because the nation's culture was perceived to be homogeneous, highly regimented and unable to secure individual rights and freedoms. Especially troubling for Westerners was the perception that the Japanese were unable to engage in culturally democratic practices associated with liberal humanism and cultural pluralism. Japan, therefore, became a primary target for reform. Cultural exchange and development programs sponsored by American government agencies and private philanthropies subscribed to these orientalizing views of Japan. Much evidence

of this attitude was present in the Rockefeller Foundation's philanthropic interventions into Japan in the postwar period.

Coincidentally, along with The Japan Society, the Rockefeller Foundation had a great hand in instigating *The Japanese Exhibition House*. The display was presented, nevertheless, as if it were a peace offering from the people of Japan positioning the Japanese as the aggressors who must repent for World War II atrocities. To emphasize the Japanese public's support of this project, the *Bulletin of the American-Japan Society* (A House, 1954) noted that funding for this project was raised by public subscription from donations made by over 239 bankers, corporations, and individuals in Japan.

While its activities were rather circumscribed by the postwar military occupation of Japan, the Rockefeller Foundation became more active in Japan after the signing of the 1951 peace treaty. They funded many cultural programs and exchanges in America and Japan with the aim of improving the image of the Japanese in America. At the same time, the foundation supported cultural and educational programs designed to foster democracy in Japan. As well as initiating *The Japanese Exhibition House* an idea which emerged in a 1950 meeting with Chikao Honda, the President of Mainichi Newspaper (A House, 1954), John D. Rockefeller III organized a US tour of Japanese art and design objects in 1953 (Penn, 1998: 3). He also commissioned Japanese house architect Yunzo Yoshimura to build a teahouse at Rockefeller Center and the

Governor's mansion in 1974 when Nelson Rockefeller became the Governor of New York State. In 1958, John D. Rockefeller III was instrumental in moving *The Japanese Exhibition House* to Fairmount Park in Philadelphia where to this very day it remains open for public inspection.

While these were just a few of the cultural exchanges organized to sway American public opinion, in Japan the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored many educational and cultural activities to encourage democratic citizenship. Of concern to the Rockefeller foundation representatives in Japan, according to Reiko Maekewawa (1997), was that during the war and under Japan's military occupation activities necessary for securing the foundation of cultural democracy and orienting Japan to the international arena had been neglected. With the signing of the peace treaty between Japan and the West in 1951, Rockefeller representatives prepared to undertake democratizing activities in a way that would quell Japanese resentment and potential rejection of Western ways. In particular, to be avoided were didactic and authoritarian approaches to education and reform. Therefore, the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored programs which supported the rebuilding of libraries and the development of education. As well, there was an attempt to integrate scholars, educators, artists and journalists into the international community through research, travel, and training (Maekewawa, 1997: 117). It was assumed that such activity would prepare the ground for the realization of democracy via the production and dissemination of culture in a way that valued individual autonomy while providing channels through which

governing bodies could regulate the populace. According to Maekewawa, a lot of the Rockefeller's philanthropic activity in Japan was constructed around the goal of "think[ing] about the role of communications in democratic life (1997: 118)."

This rationale of democratizing cultural communications extended not only through the Rockefeller Foundation's philanthropic activities in Japan, but it resonated throughout the world after the war through agencies such as the UN, and UNESCO. This rationale also permeated the MoMA's television project and contributed to the development of Communication Studies in the United States. As Bill Buxton has shown, the Rockefellers' concern with issues surrounding the public interest and political persuasion through the mass media accelerated during the Second World War into the Cold War era. During this period, according to Buxton, the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored workshops, conferences and research projects which came to define the role that Communications studies would play in efforts to achieve cultural democracy in the Cold War world (Buxton, 1994: 188-191).

This direction, Maekewawa notes, was followed in Japan through the promotion of empirically based research methods employed to quantify psychological and social characteristics of a populace, or a media audience. This communications oriented research was designed to discover any given populace's likes and dislikes. In coming to know these aggregates and related indicators, researchers hoped to acquire the tools to better regulate, for example, broadcast audience

size, voting behavior, and democratic conduct at home, in the museum and at school (Maekewawa, 1997: 122). The development of this type of communications research resonated with the tradition of what Foucault has called population politics. Invaluable to not only to the Rockefeller Foundation, but also to an array of governing agencies and individuals, information about the populace would contribute to the effective application of, for example, foreign policy, education and cultural programs. The result of such endeavors, it was assumed, could instill democratic citizenly conduct, prevent the infiltration of media by propagandists, and contribute to the decentralization of government in favor of local autonomy and self-determination (1997: 125). In the spirit of fostering democracy through individual creativity, the Rockefeller Foundation even went so far as to sponsor creative writing programs "whereby creative activity could be made more vigorous, mature and effective." By engaging individuals in creative endeavors and respecting the writer's freedom, it was assumed that individuals would be able to resist mass oriented, or ideologically partisan, authorities (1997: 125).

Under the auspices of democratic cultural communications, it was argued that the risks of newly emerging sovereign states and premodern ancient cultures acting in either unpredictable ways or being incorporated by the Soviet influence could be lessened. Activities devoted to fostering democratic cultural communications held out the tools to streamline the behavior of individual citizens and national polities without appearing to infringe upon individual

autonomy and rights to self-determination. This recurring theme dominated speeches made at the opening ceremonies of *The Japanese Exhibition House* where fittingly MoMA's Vice Chairman Henry Allen Moe and Renzo Sawada, Japan's permanent observer to the UN and eminent member of The Japan Society, declared that the exhibition house would forge international understanding through beauty and thereby create cross-cultural ties (A House, 1954). According to Vice Chairman Moe, such ties were necessary so that

> ...what differences there may be between men will be as nothing, if each of us understands those things that are wrought by each of the other of us...(A House, 1994).

The effort to forge an international polity based on harmony, beauty and understanding was further underwritten by the Rockefeller's in their contribution to the construction of one of the grandest postwar modernist architectural edifices devoted to governance, The United Nation's Headquarters in New York City.

According to a report issued by the UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie in 1947, the architectural rendering of the United Nation's Headquarters was to reflect the democratic rationale and constitution of the United Nations (United Nations, 1947:17). It was to be a spatial rendering of international polity that would be neither utilitarian nor monumental. It would be designed to emulate the universality of human gesture and action constituting " a symphonic rendering of a complicated association of ideas (1947: 74)." In keeping with the architectural renderings of temples and shelters, Secretary-General Lie wrote, the

headquarters would be composed through a symphony "dominated by the intellectual goal of good work," realized through the blending of modern principles combining the beautiful, functional, and economical (1947: 74). The headquarters was to accommodate a wide array of human needs while respecting aesthetic values to the same extent that objective material needs were championed (1947: 74). In bringing the material and aesthetic into harmony, a basic plan would emerge whereby the building's governing elements would provide a space for sound and fair democratic decision-making. Through harmony and proportion, this architectural composition was to create a reassuring image worthy of a governing body able to guide the world to its harmonious, peaceful destiny. In fact, like the Japanese house, the UN Headquarters, if successful, might project an image "of uncluttered order in the heart of a great city (1947-74)." New York City, considered by many to be a microcosm of international polity was the preferred setting for such an edifice. Meanwhile, the image of order emanating from the headquarters was to provide an image of good governance able to surmount urban blight and chaos. In a letter announcing his intention to donate the East River site upon which the UN Headquarters would be built, John D. Rockefeller III described New York as an urban environment uniquely able to support the UN. According to Rockefeller, "New York is a center where people from all lands have been welcomed and where they share common aspirations and achievements (1947: 90)."

As an international crossroads of peace and good citizenship, the realization of the UN Headquarters in New York was somewhat less of a symphonic organism than the UN Secretary-General Lie predicted. There were a plethora of vested political interests at play. Many felt that it was essential that the UN be located in New York. Not only did the city emerge intact after the war, but also it was supposedly untouched by the ravages of communism and fascism. Most importantly, situating the UN Headquarters in one of the largest American cities would ensure that the USA would be more committed to the UN than it had been to the League of Nations. Many attributed the failure of the League to the isolationist character of American foreign policy which prevented the USA from endorsing the League's charter, or adhering to conditions of the organization's membership (Bartos, 1994: 16).

In the process of planning, over fifty design proposals were considered by architect Wallace K. Harrison director of the international committee responsible for UN Headquarter's design (United Nations, 1947: 8). Harrison, a longstanding MoMA trustee and member of the television committee, had experience in managing such large-scale projects. He had overseen the design of Rockefeller Center and was instrumental in securing the East River site from real estate developer Zeckendorf who hired Harrison to refashion this site in the image of Rockefeller Center—a testimony to Zeckendorf's entrepreneurial might (Bartos, 1994: 11). At this time, the East River site was an abattoir overrun with stockyards and meatpacking plants (1994: 13). In securing the site, largely due to

the Rockefeller family's purchase of it for $8.5 million and subsequent donation of it to the city of New York, the competition between city planners, and real estate developers from across the nation to build the headquarters in their locales was put to rest.

Critics of architectural modernism such as Lewis Mumford could not forego the opportunity to comment on the Rockefeller's donation of the site and the image of governance that the UN's architectural edifice projected. Mumford noted that far from achieving the symphonic image of democratic cultural citizenship that Secretary-General Lie hoped for, the headquarters plan failed, in his eyes to negotiate a transition between the intimate and monumental—creating an absence of human scale (Bartos, 1994: 18). Mumford's critique reinforced Frank Lloyd Wright's comments. Wright characterized the headquarters as a glorification of negation—as a deadpan box lacking any expression as to the nature of the importance of the governing activity that occurred within the building (1994: 17). This led Mumford to level comments related to his disdain for the International Style's rationalist designs. He criticized the final rendering of the headquarters for portraying an image of international governance that was dehumanized by functionalist logic of bureaucracy and the managerial revolution (1994: 18). No doubt, Mumford's impression of the UN Headquarters was at odds with the humanized image of peace and harmony that the headquarters was supposed to represent.

Rather than making good on its promise of creating a liberal humanist utopia, Mumford suggested that the architecture of the UN Headquarters presented an image of the future frozen solid in the contradiction of the present (Bartos, 1994: 19). Such contradictions were further evident in Mumford's assessment of the philanthropic arm of monopoly capitalism underwriting the headquarter site, as well as in the treatment of modern artists and architects involved in the project as less than equal citizens of this international polity. With regard to the nature of philanthropic support, Mumford wrote,

> And it was bad symbolism to let Mr. Rockefeller get mixed-up with the United Nations headquarters. Mr. Rockefeller is a benevolent philanthropist who at one moment restores forgotten colonial capitals and at another presents the City of New York with a handsome public park. But to some of our more difficult brothers overseas, Mr. Rockefeller is monopoly capitalism, and the fact that it was his, and not the City of New York or the federal government, who gave this site to the United Nations will not, unfortunately, lessen their suspicions and animosities. (Bartos, 1994: 18).

On the one hand, the democratic ethos of the UN Headquarters was circumscribed by the specter of real estate speculation, civic boosterism and monopoly capitalism. And on the other hand, citizens' rights to individual, creative autonomy, as well as, freedom of speech and association were compromised in the treatment of artists and architects associated with the building of the UN Headquarters. Many aesthetic principles and choices were negated due to highly politicized contingencies. The plan and rendering of the headquarters was circumscribed by a series of compromises related to the committee design process which in the words of Mumford was indicative of a bureaucratic rather than a modernist approach to creativity. Moreover, Harrison was further

constrained in his choice of architect for the project because of the issue of national citizenship. For example, it was reported that Harrison's first choice of architect was Alvar Aalto because he was able to combine the human and organic with the rational and modernistic in his work. Aalto was a Finnish national and was therefore ineligible to participate in the project because Finland was unable to qualify for UN membership (Bartos, 1994: 12). Other favorites of Harrison's included Mies van der Rohe and Walter Gropius, but their participation was out of the question since they were German citizens.

The final rendering of the headquarters design was understood to be a composite of ideas drawn from the design committee of which Ernest Cormier was the Canadian representative (United Nations, 1947: 3). With regard to the array of submissions synthesized for the final design, many argued that the contributions of Charles Le Corbusier representing France on the headquarters' committee and Oscar Niemeyer of Brazil were most distinctive. Nevertheless, the necessity to design by international committee prevented the full acknowledgement of their contributions and in part neutralized both Le Corbusier and Niemeyer's commitments to the acontextual, rationalist dictates of the International Style. Most vexed in his contribution to the UN Headquarters was Oscar Niemeyer who in 1948 was denied a visa to enter the United States for the purposes of giving lectures at Yale because of his alleged Communist affiliations (What's Happening, 1948). A similar fate awaited Ferdinand Leger, the artist Dondero condemned for his Communist affiliations. He too was denied entry into

the United States to execute the mural he had been commissioned to paint on the wall of the UN General Assembly. Uninterested in perpetuating controversy surrounding the censorship of the Diego Rivera mural for Rockefeller Center because it included images of Lenin, the Rockefellers who commissioned Leger's work decided to honor their commitment (Bartos, 1994: 9, 15). Since Leger's mural was abstract and without any politically contentious symbology, it was fairly safe to execute. Therefore, a compromise was made and an assistant was hired to carry through with Leger's plans. Whereas the ideals of international citizenship were in some cases circumscribed by their sources of philanthropic support rooted in, as Mumford described it, the robber baron tactics of monopoly capitalism, in other cases they were limited in that cultural citizens' aesthetic autonomy and creative rights were denied on the grounds of national and political affiliation.

While the potentials for universal citizenship embedded in the idealized plan for the UN headquarters were far from realized, an audience survey measuring the impact of the MoMA's Japanese house concluded that this effort in cross-cultural governance was also limited. The audience survey conducted by the Bureau of Social Research in Washington (1956) set out to discover if the exhibition had in fact inspired museum-goers to become good citizens through the lesson of protomodern Japanese building techniques. The MoMA intended to help forge an improved image of Japan in the USA by way of reforming Americans' negative stereotypes of the Japanese. Nevertheless, this reform-oriented impetus was

unconcerned with undermining the established and racialized cultural order. The intent was to foster a more positive view of the Japanese—an exercise that was dependent on a hierarchy of racialized characteristics, albeit positively viewed, yet situated as quintessentially unmodern and in need of reform. If Japan was to move toward universality and cultural democracy, according to this logic, it would have to do so in a way defined by historically specific contingencies surrounding the formation of cultural programs and politics at institutions such as the MoMA, UNESCO, and the UN in the post 1945 era.

In the survey, researchers concluded that art was limited in its ability to foster cross-cultural communication "...through the concreteness, and realism of the house and garden...giving visitors a sense of familiarity with a strange culture (Bureau of Social Research, 1956: 2)." This conclusion was based on questions about whether the show had in fact reversed "anti-Japanese sentiment because of WWII and traits characterizing the Japanese as 'cruel, fanatic, imitative, producing cheap and shoddy goods'" while encouraging viewers to "draw inference from the products shown...of a highly cultured civilization that produced them (1956: 41)." In trying to discern if these effects had indeed been realized, the survey's authors discovered that although many museum visitors liked the house, they dissociated it from Western ways of living. Many found the house was not appropriate for a Western climate and culture (1956: 14). Many liked the house for its sparseness, graciousness, and lightness. They found the house to

be peaceful, uncluttered and contemplative. In short, museum patrons associated the house with positive values (1956: 14).

Nevertheless, the house was considered to be a failure in terms of forging affinities between the two cultures. Rather, cultural characteristics were referred to in terms of strangeness and difference characterizing the Japanese as other. Difference was identified a residing in the home's simplicity, absence of material possessions, as well as its formality, austerity and lack of concern for comfort (1956: 47). And as such, many reported that they would have difficulty in seeing how their daily activities and family routines would fit into the regime of this domestic environment. The report's authors discerned that many exhibition goers didn't like the kitchen, bathroom, and lack of furniture. The garden was characterized as being artificial, small, ornate and not suitable for any vigorous kind of activity (1956: 31). Tellingly, many visitors were unaware that they were looking at a 16th century house, and therefore, were unable to relate to what they thought was a contemporary upper-middle class home—distinctly unmodern in its plumbing and kitchen facilities (1956: 25).

Another significant finding of the survey suggested that the staging of *The Japanese Exhibition House* at the MoMA limited the type of visitor who went to the exhibition. Almost all of the survey respondents were regular MoMA patrons. They were relatively young, upper-middle class, and well-educated (1956:13). Therefore, there was little surprise, the researchers noted, when many of the

survey participants were reported to have refused to generalize about Japanese culture from what they saw in the exhibit (1956: 53). Nevertheless, a majority reported that they had learned little they hadn't already gleaned from travel, and the media (1956: 52). While most reported having a positive attitude towards Japanese culture, there were a few respondents who noted that the exhibition reinforced their negative views of the Japan due to its perceived rigid class structure, marginalization of women, and limited freedom for children (1956: 52). This minority assumed that in general Japan was a backward, unmodern country (1956: 52).

The overall positive sense of Japanese culture, the survey noted, was on the one hand attributed to the tolerant disposition of exhibition viewers given their status and level of education. On the other hand and more significantly, researchers claimed that their results indicated that very little was achieved in this cultural exchange—not because exhibition viewers were so enlightened, but because on the whole, they speculated, Americans—even the most cultured—were unable to understand another culture's everyday activities from the objects of artistic culture (1956: 53).

Therefore, a major subtext of the survey was that *The Japanese Exhibition House* failed because even the most sophisticated of citizens versed in the higher values of cultural democracy, liberal humanism and modernism, were unable to benefit from the lessons of this cultural exchange. The attempt to

convey the universal qualities of Japanese culture to Americans through the modes of conduct and meaning embodied in the fine arts failed to promote a sense of affinity and commonality between the two cultures (1956: 61). As the Bureau of Social Research concluded, modern art successfully conveyed aesthetic meanings, but there were few indications from this experience that citizens could be encouraged to make moral inferences about other cultures' whole way of life from their artistic productions alone. This assumption was gathered on the basis that the exhibition goers which the Bureau canvassed said they would have learned more about Japanese culture if there had been better educational material accompanying the exhibition (1956: 3). Especially irritating to the survey takers was the fact that many respondents suggested they would have learned more if they had been taken on explicitly didactic tours, and if the exhibition site had been more realistically animated. Apparently, the viewing of static objects of art and architecture posed a poor substitute for the experience of seeing people at work in their actual environment. To these ends, many respondents noted that they would have learned more if the MoMA had furnished its exhibit with a live Japanese family clothed in period attire enacting the daily rituals associated with traditional ways of living (1956: 39, 61).

In order to address the perceived failure of *The Japanese Exhibition House* as an exercise in cross-cultural understanding, the overriding message of the survey's conclusion was one of reform. In the event of this exhibition's failure, the principles and practices of cultural democracy based on aesthetic autonomy and

individual creative freedoms, according the researchers, should not be abandoned in future exercises of international exchange. The aim of future endeavors should rather attempt to better realize the principles and practices of cultural citizenship associated with liberal humanism and aesthetic modernism. To such ends and implicit to the report's conclusion was the recommendation to devote more resources to the development of modern art and art education. Increased resources would help the American public to uplift its cultural standards to the level of countries "where more recognition is given to artistic facets of culture (1956: 61)." This effort was to enable, for example, regular citizens to have "different reactions so that they could form value judgments about foreign people on the basis of their artistic production (1956: 61)."

The survey further concluded that at the time of *The Japanese Exhibition House*, Americans were not yet "ready to empathize or substitute their imagination for solid fact (1956: 61)." In order to rectify this situation, empathy and imagination would have to be encouraged and articulated through nondidactic forms of creativity rather than through fact and descriptive explanations. This survey, in its conclusion therefore, was evidence of the importance placed on culture in governmental modes of regulation extending through every aspect of the MoMA's television project, related exhibitions, art education and media programs. These activities paralleled the UN, UNESCO, and the Rockefeller Foundation's attempts to instigate democratic cultural communications.

In attempting to foster cross-cultural understanding through the modern arts and media, projects such as this audience survey, *The Japanese Exhibition House* and its televisual rendering set about to gain knowledge of the strengths and limitations of cultural citizens. Such knowledge could then be used to subtly direct Americans towards realizing the benefits of higher standards associated with the fine arts. At the same time, the intent of such activity was to impress upon governing institutions and the populace at large that the intellectual and creative artist were exemplary citizens. The cultural expertise of these citizens was to be encouraged and valourized in order to better realize the ideals of liberal democracy. Citizens who subscribed to this mode of cultural democracy did so through individual identification and free will thought to lead to the recognition of larger truths and human commonalities—the binding elements of a modern international polity. At the same time, in this approach to government, the cultural operated as a form of regulation attempting to ameliorate the highly circumscribed application of universal rights and freedoms while not appearing to do so.

The television project, related exhibitions and art education programs designed to foster cultural citizenship through the principles and practices of modern art had limited effects. After the television project's final reports were released in 1955, there is little existing in the MoMA's records to indicate the direction the museum took with regard to incorporating broadcast media into its program. There are two exceptions. In the early 60s, the film department sponsored an

exhibition of so-called Golden Age programs thought to be of aesthetic relevance to the modern because they televised stage plays valued for their gritty realism and social commentary (Griffith, Seldes, Venza, 1963). This exhibit attempted to recover aesthetic traditions supposedly lost by the early 60's in an industry demonized because of the Quiz Show Scandals and its focus on commercial profits (Boddy, 1990). In addition to this exhibition, television made a brief return to the MoMA's agenda in the late 1960s. The museum's Junior Council under the direction of William Paley secured donations of made for television documentaries about modern art and artists to inaugurate the MoMA's television archives (MoMA, 1967; "Preserving," 1967). While these documentaries still exist in the MoMA's film archives, no attempt was made to develop the collection after this initial effort.

Conclusion

In *Communications* (1962), Raymond Williams insisted that art, culture and the media were integral to the formation and maintenance of society because it was through these modes of communication that society was described, shared, modified and preserved (18-19). Therefore, according to Williams, creative expression and learning were central to the way that the social was articulated, challenged and modified. Because new forms of communication arose in conjunction with modern governance, Williams added, they often contributed to the emergence of unforeseen opportunities and conflicts while aiding in the regulation of expanding democracies (18). This conception of the relationship between social formation, communications and cultural governance led Williams to query competing versions of cultural democracy embodied in theories of mass culture. Any claims to democracy made by proponents of mass culture, Williams argued, were limited in that they mistook paternalistic and commercial logics of communication for democratic forms (116, 124). In the process, cultural democracy was defined solely in terms of protecting individual freedom, and therefore dismissed as coercive and authoritarian any form of communal or state activity (116). This meant that the social and governmental were set in opposition to the individual and cultural resulting in a version of democracy far from Williams' social democratic ideals. According to Williams, democracy would be achieved when each individual could freely, equally and responsibly contribute to, as well as benefit from, the greater social good (120).

In his discussion of social democratic ideals and the actually existing form of democracy associated with mass culture theories, Williams declared that a truly democratic approach to communications had yet to materialize (1962: 120). Williams' writings on communication are provocative in the context of this dissertation given that they appeared almost a decade after the MoMA's experiments with television. According to Williams' conceptual schema, the MoMA's efforts to engender citizenly conduct and cultural governance corresponded to theories of culture and communications associated with mass-media. At the MoMA, as in mass theories of communication, democracy was understood to emerge through an aggregate of self-regulating individuals whose cultural rights precluded collective or state-driven intervention. At the same time, a tolerance of diversity was encouraged, but this diversity was assessed according to resemblances and thereby avoided issues of difference and exclusion. In other words, in the MoMA's approach to cultural democracy and civic conduct, creative freedoms were granted solely to the autonomous individual. As a result, the social and communal aspects of democratic polities were dismissed as forms of rule that were didactic and authoritarian.

While Williams' definitions of democratic culture and communication were at odds with cultural democracy as it was articulated during the course of the MoMA's television project, it would be less fruitful here to focus on whether cultural democracy, on the one hand, has ever existed in its social democratic

form, or on the other hand, if this is an impossible goal tainted by adverse forces. As had been suggested throughout this dissertation, a more productive analysis of the dynamics of citizenship and governance could involve an investigation of the dialectic tensions of governmental modalities as they are articulated through art, communication and culture. As such, this allows for an historical analysis of the paradoxical logics and structural dynamics at play in the juxtaposition of, for example, Williams' yet to be realized socially democratic ideals, and the circumscribed applications of liberal cultural governance permeating the MoMA's television project.

As Etienne Balibar (1998; 1997) suggests, a dialectical investigation of competing governing logics in relationship to their shared claims of universality facilitates a productive form of critical analysis and intervention. Attention to the vexed and paradoxical logics of cultural governance accounts for the fact that claims made for universality and democracy are integrally dependent on the inclusions and exclusions of identity formation—processes that according to Balibar must be constantly scrutinized. In order to better achieve the goals of universality and democracy, it must be acknowledged that they are truly partial in their applications and therefore must be constantly contested. Contestation allows for the fuller articulations of universality and democracy, freedom and equality which, as Anderson (1998: 281) writes, is integral to Balibar's insistence on engaging a dialectical process for challenging the circumscribed applications of cultural rights. This logic was at play in the MoMA's contribution to the Cold

War project of governmentality where the museum, while refusing partisanship and ideological engagements, conducted activities that were integral to the project of liberal cultural governance. This particular approach to cultural governance aimed to shape and manage a diverse array of individuals by noncoercive means of identification acquired through education, the museum and the family. In this reading, a discussion of universal principles and their partial realization contributes to the kind of dialectical analysis that Balibar associates with art. In this approach, as he sees it, the aim is to locate irreconcilable and divisive differences, as well as contradictory and paradoxical logics of governance because is within these dynamics of governmentality that the competing impetuses of reform and critical transformation operate.

As has been noted, it has been the aim of this dissertation to examine the integral role that art, culture and communication play in liberal apparatuses of governmentality in the USA in the fifties. This research draws upon recent policy debates in Communications and Cultural Studies concerned with locating the paradoxes and contradictions governmental principles and practices—whether they reside in official policy statements or in other discursive or nondiscursive formations such as the museum exhibition or television documentary. Especially pertinent is a study of American cultural institutions. Until recently, there has been a paucity of this sort of research in the United State due to the relatively absent role that the state has taken in the area of cultural policy. Nevertheless, cultural governance flourishes in the United States, as this study suggests, in the

uneasy alliance of competing forces present in governmental discourses, practices and institutions. This study of governmentality further serves to inquire into the conditions that situated high modernists associated with the Museum of Modern Art as vital contributors to the formation of a liberal democratic polity while they claimed to eschew partisan and ideological affiliations. Their contribution to the formation of cultural democracy permeated every aspect of the MoMA's television project as has been demonstrated through the close readings of the museum's television programs in the context of exhibitions, policy debates and cultural exchanges.

As this dissertation has sought to document, the policy and practices surrounding the MoMA's attempts to incorporate television was part of the museum's larger aim of constituting itself as a culturally democratic institution. In order to investigate such efforts, this dissertation has considered the MoMA's approach to cultural governance as a series of negotiations ever in need of developing provisional resolutions to the paradoxes and conflicts produced by these cultural dynamics. The mediation of contradictions and paradox, as has been shown, occurred throughout the MoMA's television project. This effort, moreover, was marshaled through three dimensions of cultural governance—civic conduct, democratic cultural communications and cross-cultural governance. As such, it has been suggested that the MoMA's contributions to the project of liberal governance were designed to encourage voluntary association, self-regulation and a tolerance for diversity. Emerging from these programs were a set of

practices and principles presenting the artist as an exemplary citizen. At the same time, a history of modern art was constructed in order to legitimate modern artistic activity as a cultural right as well as an ameliorative and universal form of human expression. In the process, citizenly conduct and cultural governance based on principles of modernism were to contribute to the formation of cultured subjects. Particularly coveted in this prospect was the child's unfettered and innate sense of creativity and learning. If tapped at the earliest possible moment and educated in the appropriate way, youthful subjects could be formed as flexible, yet stable individuals. Cultured citizens were to emerge, then, with inner resources, self-consciousness and emotional integrity. In addition to privileging art and art education for their ability to shape perceptual sensibilities, art was conceived as a vital form of life and complex mode of communication concerned with learning, discovery and change. In addition to contributing to the development of the individual's citizenly conduct, this form of cultural communication was thought to be best able to represent and interpret other cultures. This pluralist and relativising approach to the formation of an international polity culminated at the MoMA in the projection of Western values onto the other—a highly compromised approach to cultural exchange designed to secure anti-communist allies through racialized and gendered rationalities while asserting America's dominance in the Cold War world.

This attempt to historically situate and dialectically analyze the MoMA's engagement with liberal governance through modern art, media pedagogy and

cultural citizenship has been furthered by a formational analysis of modernism. As such, high modernist claims to universal expression are queried and located as a specific formation of the modern situated among a variety of competing and converging cultural configurations that coincided with the rise of industrialization and the metropolis. In borrowing from Williams' formational analysis of modernism, the aim has been, furthermore, to attend to the ways that the then emergent media of television related to modernism not only in relationship to market logics, but also in the context of governmental rationalities. In considering television as one in a plethora of struggling forces within the modern, this dissertation is intended to contribute to studies of high modernism by accounting for the complicated and troubled ways that mass media such as television related to art, education and culture. Such a perspective avoids dismissing television as the monolithic other of high culture because of its commercial determinants.

The aim of this study of cultural citizenship and governance, then, has been to contribute to recent genealogies addressing the relationship between the citizen and the nation-state in the context of rapidly reconfiguring global relationships driven by increased and shifting flows of people, goods, media and capital. This prospect has been broached through an examination of the rationalities of power manifest in exhibitionary display associated with the Museum of Modern Art's television project between 1952 and 1955. The television project, in part, as has been duly noted, was concerned with encouraging the formation of cultural citizens who could internalize and perform modes of conduct necessary to

sustain larger societal orders. In examining the paradoxical and contradictory aspects of such discursive logics, it becomes evident that while the MoMA attempted to contribute to the project of liberal governance intent of forging universal peace, order and unity, in actuality, projects such as the television study were rife with disjuncture, contradiction, exclusions and anomalies. The attempt to achieve cultural universality through increased international connectivity, as this case reveals, has resulted not in the creation of unity and harmony as was predicted. As a result, the project of cultural universality instigated by institutions such as the MoMA over 50 years ago can inform recent developments where, as Balibar notes (1998: 218-20; Anderson, 1998: 282), in the post Cold War era of rapid globalization such attempts have accelerated rather than ameliorated difference, conflict and exclusion thus necessitating ever-critical attention to the vexed relationships subtending the arena of cultural governance and citizenship.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor. (1954) "How To Look at Television." *Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*. No. 8 (Spring): 213-235.

"About the House." (1950) *The New Yorker* (July, 22).

"A House of Old Japan in the Heart of Manhattan." (1954) *Bulletin of the American-Japan Society* (July-August).

Allison, Gordon. (1953) "TV Education Network Depends on State Funds." *New York Herald Tribune* (February 18).

Allor, Martin and Michelle Gagnon. (1994) *L'État De Culture: Généalogie Discursive Des Politiques Culturelles Québécoises*. Montréal: GRECC.

Allor, Marty, Danielle Juteau and John Shepherd. (1994) "Contingencies of Culture: The Space of Culture in Canada and Quebec." *Culture and Policy*. Vol. 16, No.1: 29-44.

"American 'Modern' Owes Much to Japanese Design." (1955) *Riverside California Enterprise* (January 16).

Anderson, Amanda. (1998) "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity." In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Anderson, Howard and Howard Cummings. (1951) *The UN Declaration of Human Rights: A Handbook for Teachers*. Washington: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education.

"Art Exchange Plan is Financed By Rockefeller Brothers Fund." (1953) *New York Herald Tribune* (April 7).

"Art Exchange." (1953) *New York Times* (April 7).

Balibar, Etienne. (1998) "The Borders of Europe." In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 216-232.

Balibar, Etienne. (1997) "Globalization/Civilization 1 & 2." In *Politics-Poetics: Documenta X, the Book*. Ed. Catherine David. Stuttgart: Cantz: 774-799.

Balibar, Etienne and Immanuel Wallerstein. (1991) *Race, Nation and Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso.

Balibar, Etienne. (1990) "The Nation Form: History and Ideology." *Review*, XIII (Summer): 329-61.

Barclay, Dorothy. (1953) "Art for the Family—Via Television." *New York Times* (April 12).

Barr, Alfred. (1956) *What is Modern Art?* New York: The Museum of Modern Art.

Barr, Alfred. (1952) "Is Modern Art Communistic." *The New York Times Magazine* (December 14).

Bartos, Adam. (1994) *International Territory: The United Nations, 1945-95.* London: Verso.

Bates, Robert. (1953) "Memorandum—Educational Television Progress Report, April 21." Folder 1198, Box 136, Cultural Reports Record Group 1112E Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller (OMR), Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Centre, North Tarrytown, New York (RAC).

Bennett, Tony. (1999) *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London: Sage.

Bennett, Tony. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum*. New York: Routledge.

Bennett, Tony. (1993) "Useful Culture." In *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in Theory and Research*. Eds. Valda Blundell, John Shepherd, and Ian Taylor. New York: Routledge.

Berger, Meyer. (1954) "Museum Acts to Save its Good-Luck Carp After Two Die—A Devout Doll." *New York Times* (October 4).

Berger, Meyer. (1954) "Buddhist Sect Here Has 300 Members, Some of Them G.I.'s Who Married Japanese Girls." *New York Times* (April 23).

Berland, Jody and Will Straw. (1995) "Getting Down to Business: Cultural Politics and Policies in Canada." In *Communications in Canadian Society*. Ed. Benjamin Singer. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

Bleshi, Rudi. (1955) *Fifty Years of Modern Art: A Report for The Museum of Modern Art*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Boddy, William. (1990) *Fifties Television: The Industry and its Critics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

"Buddhist Ceremony Blesses Japanese House at Museum." (1954) *New York Herald Tribune* (April 23).

Burden, William. (1956) "Letter From The President to The Members Of The Museum of Modern Art." *The Museum of Modern Art Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Year Final Report*. New York: Museum of Modern Art: 4-8.

Bureau of Social Research, Inc. (1956) *The Japanese House: A Study of its Visitors and Their Reactions*. Washington: Prepared by The Japan Society.

Buxton, William. (1994) "From Radio Research to Communications Intelligence: Rockefeller Philanthropy, Communications Specialists, and the American Policy Community." In *The Political Influence of Ideas: Policy Communities and the Social Sciences*. Eds. Alain G. Gagnon and Stephen Brooks. Westport Connecticut.

Cassirer, Henry. (1954) "Educational Television—World-Wide." *The Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television*. Vol. 8 No. 4: 367-374.

Chamberlain, Betty. (1955) "History of the Museum of Modern Art, 1939-1954." Typescript. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY: Early Museum History (EMH) Box 2, File 21.

Chamberlain, Betty. (1952) "Memo to Rene D'Harnoncourt." (April 11) MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18, File 3.

Chamberlain, Betty. (1951) "Memo to Rene d'Harnoncourt regarding the FCC Hearings." (July 25) MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 19, File 12d.

Charland, Maurice. (1986) "Technological Nationalism." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*. X, 1-2: 196-220.

Clark, T.J. (1999) *Farewell to an Idea: Episode from a History of Modernism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Crow, Thomas. (1998) *Modern Art in the Common Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

D'Amico, Victor. (1960) "Art, A Human Necessity." Address to the National Committee on Art Education. Typescript: MoMA Pamphlet Files.

D'Amico, Victor. (1955) "What is Creative Teaching?" *School Arts* (January): 3-8.

D'Amico, Victor. (1954a) *Art for the Family*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

D'Amico, Victor. (1954b) "Statement on *Through the Enchanted Gate*." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH: Television Project III Box 18, File 3.

D'Amico, Victor. (1953) "TV Activities of the Department of Education." MoMA Archives, NY: Rene d'Harnoncourt Papers (RdH) [AAA: 2930; 1300]

D'Amico, Victor. (1951a) "Creative Art for Children, Young People, Adults, and Schools." *The Bulletin of The Museum of Modern Art*. 19 (Fall): 4-20.

D'Amico, Victor. (1951b) "Letter to Ted Cott." (April 25) MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18, File 3.

D'Amico, Victor. (1945) "Art for War Veterans." *The Bulletin of The Museum of Modern Art*. 12 (September).

D'Amico, Victor. (1941) "Modern Art for Children: The Educational Project." *The Bulletin of The Museum of Modern Art*. 9 (October): 3-10.

de Duve, Thierry. (1996) *Kant After Duchamp*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.

Dondero, George. (1956) "UNESCO—Communism and Modern Art." *Congressional Record of the United States of America*. (July 20): 1-7.

Donnelly, Tom. (1954) "Pardon Me While I Push This Wall Away." *Washington News* (July, 6).

Dorland, Michael. (1996) *The Cultural Industries in Canada*. Toronto: Roland Lorimer and Company Ltd.

D'Ormesson, Jean. (1972) "Culture." *In the Minds of Men*. UNESCO: Paris.

Doss, Erika. (1991) *Benton, Pollack, and the Politics of Modernism: From Regionalism to Abstract Expressionism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dowler, Kevin. (1993) *An Historical Inquiry into the Political and Cultural Context for the Emergence of a Television Aesthetic in the Nineteen-Fifties*. Montreal, Concordia University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

Drexler, Arthur. (1955) *The Architecture of Japan*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Drexler, Arthur. (1954) "The Japanese Exhibition House." New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Eisenhower, Dwight. (1954) "Freedom of the Arts." *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art*. Vol. 22, Nos. 1-2 (Fall-Winter): 2.

"The Esthetic Discipline: a Traditional Japanese House." (1954) Progressive Architecture (December).

"Exhibition House in New York Features Douglas Fir Plywood." *British Columbia Lumberman* (July).

Exhibition House: Gregory Ain. (1949) New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Ferguson, Jean. (1953) "Museum Curator to Take a Japanese House to N.Y." *Nippon Times* (February 7).

Fine, Benjamin. (1953) "Education in Review: Arguments for and Against State-Supported Television Network are Presented." *New York Times* (January 25).

Frankel, Charles. (1972) "Introduction: International Intellectual Communication and Cooperation." *In The Minds of Men.* UNESCO: Paris.

Gould, Jack. (1952) "Radio and Television: Modern Art Museum's 'Through the Enchanted Gate' Encourages Children at Home to Display Talent." *New York Times* (May 14).

Gould, Jack. (1952) "End Of the Freeze." *New York Times* (April 20).

Grace, Nancy. (1954) "Japanese House." *Louisville Courier Journal* (July 21).

"Grant Will Spur Exchange of Art." (1953) *New York Times* (April 6).

Grenauer, Emily. (1954) "The UN Inner Sanctum of Art: Secretary-General Hammarskjold has made his office a small, select gallery of modern painting." *New York Herald Tribune* (July 18).

Grenauer, Emily. (1959) "Art and the Rockefellers." *Today's Living* (April 5).

Grenauer, Emily. (1954) "Art and Artists." *New York Herald Tribune* (June, 27).

Griffith, Richard, Gilbert Seldes and Jac Venza. (1963) *Television: USA 13 Seasons.* New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Guilbaut, Serge, ed. (1990) *Reconstructing Modernism: Art in New York, Paris and Montreal, 1945-1964.* Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Guilbaut, Serge. (1993) *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gullin, Jane. (1995) "The Museum of Modern Years." In *Victor D'Amico: Art as a Human Necessity*. Japan: Child Welfare Foundation.

"A House of Old Japan in the Heart of Manhatten." (1954) *Bulletin of the American-Japan Society* (July/ August).

Hughes, Alice. (1954) "Japanese Films Entice U.S. Filmgoers." *Corning Leader* (July, 2).

Hughes, Alice. (1954) "Teahouse Geisha Is Giving Thanks to Modern Kimono." *Fort Worth Evening Star Telegram* (April, 9).

Hughes, Alice. (1953) "U.S. Decorator Says Orientals Plan Homes for Spiritual Lift." *Buffalo Courier* (October 23).

Huxtable, Ada Louise. (1954) "Japanese House: Isn't it Peaceful!" *Arts Digest* (September 15).

d'Harnoncourt, Rene. (1950) "Museum Director, Points Out it Can't Flourish Under Dictatorship." *The St. Louis Dispatch* (October 26).

Hammarskjold, Dag. (1954) "The World of Modern Art." *The Bulletin of The Museum of Modern Art* (October): 8-10.

Higgins, John. (1999) *Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism*. New York: Routledge.

Hitchcock, Henry Russell and Arthur Drexler. (1952) *Built in the USA: Post War Architecture*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Hitchcock, Henry Russell and Philip Johnson. (1932) *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Hoggart, Richard. (1978) *An Idea and Its Servants: UNESCO from Within*. London: Chatto & Windus.

"Ike Set to Offer Yoshida U.S. Aid." (1954) *New York Journal* (November, 7).

"Importing a Japanese House." (1954) *New York Herald Tribune* (March, 17).

"Imported From Japan: 17th Century Home." (1954) *New York World-Telegram and Sun* (February, 26).

"Japanese House." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 20, File 13.

"Japanese House is Seen by Tokoyo Prime Minister in Heart of New York." (1954) *The Cincinnati Enquirer* (November 8).

Jones, Arthur. (1953) "Memo Regarding the Museum of Modern Art Television Research Project." (September 9). Folder 1, Box 60, Grants Record Group 4 Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

Keller, Dale. (1957) "Living With Nature." *Los Angeles Times* (March 24).

Kuh, Katherine. (1961) "The Unhappy Marriage of Art and TV." *Saturday Review.* (January 21): 61.

Layton, Latryl. (1955) "From the Old Came the New: Japanese Exhibition House Reassembled in New York's Museum of Modern Art." *Fort Worth Press.* (July 22).

Le Corbusier, Charles. (1946) *United Nations Headquarters.* UN: New York.

Levin, Meyer. (1954) "I Cover Culture: The Book of Tea." *Long Island City Star Journal* (July, 14).

Litt, Paul. (1992) *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Koshy, Susan. (1999) "From Cold War to Trade War: NeoColonialism and Human Rights." *Social Text* 58 vol.17, no.1(Spring).

Lynes, Russell. (1973) *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of The Museum of Modern Art.* New York: Atheneum.

MacAgy, Douglas. (1957) "The Museum on TV—Art at Second Hand." *Art In America* (March).

MacAgy, Douglas. (1955) *The Museum Looks in on TV 1952-1955.* New York: Museum of Modern Art.

MacDonald, Dwight. (1953) "Profiles: Action on West Fifty-Third Street." *New Yorker* (December 12 and 19): 48-82 and 35-72.

Maekawa, Reiko. (1997) "The Allied Occupation, the Cold War, and American Philanthropy: The Rockefeller Foundation in Post War Japan." In *Philanthropy and Cultural Context: Western Philanthropy in South, East, Southeast Asia in the 20th Century.* Eds. Soma Hewa and Philo Hove. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of American, Inc.

Matthews, Henry. (1994) "The Promotion of Modern Architecture by The Museum of Modern Art in the 1930s." *Journal of Design History*. Vol. 7, no.I: 43-59.

McAndrews, John and Elizabeth Mock. (1946) *What is Modern Architecture?* New York: Museum of Modern Art.

McClintock, Anne. (1995) *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest.* New York: Routledge.

McNeil, Peter. (1992) "Myths of Modernism: Japanese Architecture, Interior Design and the West, c. 1920-1940." *Journal of Design History*. Vol.5, No.4: 281-294.

Miller, Joy. (1954) "Jap Granddaddy of Ranch Style." *Syracuse Herald-Journal* (July 30).

Miller, Toby. (1999) *Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and Popular Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miller, Toby. (1993) *The Well-Tempered Self: Citizenship, Culture, and the Postmodern Subject*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Mock, Elizabeth. (1945) *Built In the USA Since 1939*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Morgan, Carol. (1995) "From Modernist Utopia to Cold War Reality: A Critical Moment in Museum Education." *Studies in Modern Art #5: The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century Continuity and Change.*: 151-173.

Morely, David, and Kevin Robbins. (1995) "Techno-Orientalism: Japan Panic." In *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscape and Cultural Boundaries*. New York: Routledge.

Mulhern, Francis. (1979) *The Moment of Scrutiny*. London: New Left Books.

Mumford, Lewis. (1956) *From the Ground Up: Observations on Contemporary Architecture, Housing, Highway Building and Civil Design*. New York.

Mumford, Lewis. (1954) "Windows and Gardens." *The New Yorker* (October, 2).

Mumford, Lewis. (1950) "Not for Internal Use." *The New Yorker* (August, 26).

"Museum 'Crowns' Japanese House: Buddhist Music, Decorations, Priests Mark Raising of Ridge Pole Off 54th Street." (1954) *New York Times* (April, 23).

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1967) *The Television Archive of the Arts: A Project of the Junior Council.* New York: MoMA.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1954a) "Progress Report: Television Project." (October) Folder 1, Box 60, Grants Record Group 4 RBF. Rockefeller Family Archives. RAC.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1954b) "Script for Dimension." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18 File 3.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1954c) "Press Release No. 42: The Japanese House." (April 23) MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 20 File 13.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1954d) "Script for *The Japanese House.*" MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 20 File 13.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1954e) "Memo: 30th Annual Convention of the National Art Education Committee." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18 File 8c.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1953a) "Report on the Museum's Television Activities Since January 1, 1952. (June 25) Folder 1, Box 6, Grants Record Group 4 RBF: Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1953b) "Proposal For Television: Good Design." (Spring) MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18 File 3.

Museum of Modern Art, New York. (1948) "Memo: Television and the Visual Arts." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 20 File 22."
National Committee on Art Education (1958) *The Art in Education: 16th Annual Conference.* New York: Museum of Modern Art.

NBC—WNBTV (1952) "Press Release, Through The Enchanted Gate." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 18 File 3.

Newhouse, Victoria. (1989) *Wallace K. Harrison Architect.* New York: Rizzoli.

O'Doherty, Brian. (1962) "Art on Television." In *The Eighth Art: 23 Views on Television Today.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 109-115.

"'Old Japan' In New York." (1954) *Huntington Herald Dispatch* (November, 8).

Orton, Fred and Griselda Pollock. (1982) "Avant-garde and Partisans Reviewed." *Art History.* Vol. 4, No.3: 305-27.

Ouellette, Laurie. (1999) "TV Viewing as Good Citizenship? Political Rationality, Enlightened Democracy and PBS." *Cultural Studies* 13 (1): 62-40.

Packard, Artemas. (1938) "A Report on the Development of The Museum of Modern Art." Typescript. The Museum of Modern Art Archives: Reports and Pamphlets, Box 3.

Parker, T.H. (1954) "West 54th Meets East." Hartford Courant. (July, 4).

Parton, Margaret. (1954) "Japanese Home Seen at Museum." *New York Herald Tribune*. (June, 21).

Paulu, Burton. (n.d.) "Draft Report, UNESCO TV Producers Course." MoMA Archives, NY: EMH, Television Project III Box 20 File 25.

Penn, Katherine. (1998) "MoMA's Japanese House in the Garden: American Interest in Traditional Japanese Design in the 1950s." Unpublished Paper.

Pepis, Betty. (1954) "Japanese House Gets Praise Here: Serenity is Stressed by the Visitors to the Garden Unit of Museum of Modern Art." *The New York Times* (August, 9).

Peterson, Sidney. (1955) *The Medium*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, Unpublished Report.

Peterson, Sidney. (1953) "Letter to Rene d'Harnoncourt." MoMA Archives, NY: RdH [AAA: 2930; 1300].

Phillips, Christopher. (1987) "The Judgement Seat of Photography." In Annette Michelson ed. October: The First Decade. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

"Pine Breeze." (1954) *The New Yorker* (June 19).

"Preserving Our Artistic Heritage." (1967) *TV Guide* (July 1): 23-24.

"Proposal By the Board of Regents for the Allocation of Television Channels for Educational and Cultural Programs. (February 21, 1952). Folder 1199, Box 136. Cultural Interests Record Group 1112E OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

Richardson, Theresa and Donald Fisher, eds. (1999) *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthroply*. Stamford Connecticut: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Rockefeller, Nelson A. (1952) "Speech Before the Committee on Art Education, Saturday, March 22 1952." Folder 1253, Box 124, Activities—Speeches Record Group 1114A Nelson A. Rockefeller Papers (NAR Papers), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

Rockefeller, Winthrop. (1953) "Statement by Winthrop Rockefeller at Hearing in New York City on January 14, 1953, Before the New York State Temporary Commission on the Use of Television for Education Purposes." Folder 1198, Box 136, Cultural Interests Record Group 1112E, OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.

Ross, Andrew. (1989) *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Saarinen, Aline. (1954) "Our Cultural Pattern: 1929—and Today: Twenty-five years of the Museum of Modern Art reflect deep changes in the nation's taste." *New York Times Magazine* (October 17): 24-25; 66-67.

Saba, Hanna. (1972) "Human Rights." *In the Minds of Men*. UNESCO: Paris.

Sandeen, Eric J. (1995) *Picturing An Exhibition: The Family of Man in 1950s America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Sandeen, Eric J. (1986) "The Family of Man at the Museum of Modern Art: The Power of the Image in 1950s America." *Prospects Quarterly Review of Education* (12): 367-389.

Schwantes, Robert. (1955) *Japan and Americans: A Century of Cultural Relations*. New York.

Schmidt, Dana Adams. (1954) "Yoshida is Greeted in Washington by $100,000,000 U.S. Aid Plan." *New York Times* (November 8).

Sekula, Alan. (1984) "The Traffic in Photographs." *Photography Against the Grain: Essays and Photo Works, 1973-84*. Halifax: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design: 77-101.

"Setback for Educational TV." (1953) *New York Herald Tribune* (February 26).

"Shoeless Feet Tour Museum." (1954) *Oklahoman* (June 21).

Slack, Jennifer Daryl. (1996) "The Theory and Method of Articulation in Cultural Studies." In *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Eds. David Morely and Kuan-Hsing Chen. New York: Routledge.

Soby, James Thrall. (1957) "Art on TV." *Saturday Review* (April 13): 29-30.

Spigel, Lynn. (1996) "High Culture in Low Places: Television and Modern Art, 1950-70." In *Disciplinarity and Dissent in Cultural Studies*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar. New York: Routledge.

Staniszewski, Mary Anne. (1998) *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Steichen, Edward. (1955) *The Family of Man*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art.

Sterne, Jonathan. (1999) "Television Under Construction: American Television and the Problem of Distribution, 1926-62." *Media, Culture & Society*. Vol.21: 503-530.

Streeter, Thomas. (1996) *Selling the Air: A Critique of the Policy of Commercial Broadcasting in the USA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Szarkowski, John. (1994) "The Family of Man." *Museum of Modern Art Studies in Modern Art* (4): 38-54.

"Telecast." (1940) *The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin*. Vol.8, no1: 19.

"TV Education Network Depends on State Funds." (1953) New York Herald (February 19).

UNESCO. (1961) *The Race Question in Modern Science: Race and Science*. New York: Columbia University Press.

UNESCO. (1972) *In the Minds of Men: UNESCO 1946-1971*. Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations. (1947) *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations by Secretary-General on the Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations*. New York: United Nations.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1995) "The Insurmountable Contradictions of Liberalism: Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples in the Geoculture of the Modern World System." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 94:4 (Fall): 1161-1178.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1990) "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World System." *Theory, Culture and Society*. Vol 7: 31-55.

Wasson, Haidee. (1998) *Modern Ideas About Old Films: The Museum of Modern Art's Film Library and Film Culture*, 1935-39. Montreal, McGill University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

Welch, Jim. (1999) "Shaping the Box: the Cultural Construction of American Television, 1948-1952." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*. Vol 13, no.1:97-117.

"What's Happening to Modern Architecture: A Symposium at the Museum of Modern Art." (1948) *The Museum of Modern Art Bulletin*. Vol. XV, no. 3 (Spring).

Williams, Raymond. (1996) *The Politics of Modernism*. London: Verso.

Williams, Raymond. (1981) *Politics and Letters*. London: New Left Books.

Williams, Raymond. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Raymond. (1974) *Television, Technology and Cultural Form*. London: Fontana Collins.

Williams, Raymond. (1962,1973) *Communications*. London: Penguin.

Williams, Raymond. (1961) *The Long Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Williams, Raymond. (1958, 1989) "Culture is Ordinary." In Fobin Gale, ed. *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialisms*. London: Verso: 3-18.

Williams, Raymond. (1958) *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.

"World is Tapped for Design Ideas." (1954) *The New York Times* (April, 5).

"Yoshida at Capital for 6-Day Visit." (1954) *New York Herald Tribune*. (November, 8).

"Yoshida Meeting With Gov. Dewey." (1954) *New York World-Telegram and Sun* (November 6).

Yúdice, George. (1999) "The Privatization of Culture." *Social Text* 59 Vol.17 no 2 (Summer).