Conclusion: Sites of exchange: locating mobility in Cold War internationalisms

Scott-Smith, G.P.; Matasci, D.; Ruppen Coutaz, R.

Conclusion

Sites of Exchange: Locating Mobility in Cold War Internationalisms

Giles Scott-Smith

Introduction

In her analysis of trends in internationalism after the Second World War, Sandrine Kott explores "to what extent the Cold War gave rise to one or more specific ways of expressing or structuring internationalism" and, in turn, makes use of internationalism "to re-examine the Cold War itself" (Kott 2017, p. 340).[1] For Kott, internationalism was foremost an ideological exercise – East and West both claimed a universal right for their respective systems of organization, looking to apply them across the South in particular:

> During the Cold War, rival universalisms structured national societies as well as international relations along ideological lines. Each internationalism was developed and performed discursively, defining its distinctiveness in the central debate that hinged on the tension between liberty and equality.
>
> (Kott 2017, p. 361)

Despite – or perhaps because of – this rivalry, a second characteristic of Cold War internationalism was that it could still achieve cooperation through novel forms of international organization, from the United Nations (UN) system to security agreements. A third aspect was that it necessarily involved the circulation of people, objects, and knowledge, facilitated and guided by these regional and global organizations. Education, in terms of both formal training programs and the shaping of life-experiences through consumption, media, and travel, was central to these processes. Versions of Cold War internationalism therefore generated new identities, agencies, and missions, and it did so in an era where travel – particularly long-distance, inter-continental travel – became relatively commonplace (Bechmann Pedersen and Noack 2019; Svik 2020).

This chapter will dig deeper into the third aspect mentioned by Kott: circulation. It will do so by means of an exploration of the meaning and significance of mobility, a social science concept that historians can apply to reconceptualize the lived experiences of their protagonists (Scott-Smith 2021). Mobility was crucial for all forms of educational internationalism. There was the mobility of

DOI: 10.4324/9781003247814-21

knowledge and values through processes of dissemination and transfer, facilitated through individuals and material culture (such as publications) as "knowledge and value bearers". Educational exchange programs created for the purpose of ideological or faith-based proselytizing, modernization, or nation building were prime vectors through which this could be achieved. Sites of mobility – specific educational establishments, training centers, summer camps, think tanks, and festivals – were equally important as the immediate context within which such transfers took place. This chapter will approach mobility through the idea of "Cold War cosmopolitanism" (Klein 2020). This puts forward the argument that mobility came to represent a certain idea of freedom, modernity, and progress with heavy ideological and modernizing overtones, contrasting those with mobility to those without and dividing the world along East-West, North-South, and intra-South lines. As Appadurai reminded us, "the capacity to imagine the future is unevenly distributed" (Appadurai 2004). Examples of educational internationalism from the Asia-Pacific region will be used to illustrate how mobility was central to modern, US-framed, Cold War-driven conceptions of the region as a region, and how individuals entered this cosmopolitan space and appropriated it for their own purposes.

The Relevance of Mobility

Mobility as a distinct field of study emerged out of sociology in the 2000s and was subsequently enhanced by geographers in the 2010s. While it refers to different dimensions – material, ideational – the emphasis here will be on the human aspect. In 2006 Sheller and Urry spoke of a new paradigm within the social sciences concerning "new mobilities". This encompassed the many traits that had been associated with globalization since the 1990s, ranging from cheap travel, increasing voluntary and forced migration, the spread of information via the internet, and the expansion of international trade and finance. Despite the inflation of personal, material, and ideational flows, Sheller and Urry argued that social science had failed to address "how the spatialities of social life presuppose both the actual and the imagined movement of people from place to place, person to person, event to event". In response, they posited "a broader theoretical project aimed at going beyond the imagery of 'terrains' as spatially fixed geographical containers for social processes". Crucially, they were not arguing that there was a transition to a post-state "flat" global environment. Modernity may have become "liquid", but this was still occurring between "zones of connectivity, centrality, and empowerment in some cases, and of disconnection, social exclusion, and inaudibility in other cases" (Sheller and Urry 2006, pp. 208–210).

Mobility, therefore, is much more than simply movement. Mobility represents practice, possibility, agency, emotion, and imagination. It is about not simply the number of interactions that may occur, but their meaning and significance, how that is framed by particular narratives or specific places, how people carry this with them, and how it shapes and frames their understanding and expectations

of the world. Hence "mobility exists in the same relation to movement as place does to location" (Cresswell 2010, p. 160). Location indicates a set of coordinates, a spot on the map, whereas a place is given a deeper meaning, holding emotional, cultural, or ideological significance. Also, and crucially: "Mobility is apparently symptomatic of the 'modern age'" (Burrell and Hörschelmann 2014, p. 4) in terms of in-built assumptions concerning flexibility, speed, and access, and the technological means to satisfy them. Cresswell refers to "constellations of mobility", whereby patterns, representations, and ways of practicing movement take on a collective meaning as a particular way of life, in this case the modern, or the "free" (Cresswell 2010, p. 160).

Sheller and Urry also referred to the importance of "embedded infrastructures" to ensure certain mobility flows, and that requires in turn economic resources, political interests, and – in some cases – ideological motivation (Sheller and Urry 2006, p. 210). This observation is important for understanding the particular flows and power relations at work in the mobility of knowledge. Here the work of Bruno Latour and Heike Jöns is useful for laying out an understanding of how knowledge accumulates in particular locations. Latour introduced the idea of "centers of calculation", whereby institutions of scientific merit are created through the focusing of resources at specific sites and the constant circulation of experts and materials through these places (Latour 1987; Jöns 2011). These centers therefore represent a close relationship between knowledge and power, and the capability to set out narratives of truth that are constantly reinforced by the further circulation of people and information, with these centers as central nodes.

Applied originally for the purpose of reconstructing the accumulation of scientific knowledge through imperial networks, the concept of centers of calculation has also been applied to studies of the changing academic landscape through the impact of so-called "centers of excellence" attracting additional resources and consequently influencing the direction of research in national (and international) settings (Nair 2005; Hartog 2018). By focusing on the granting of resources, the establishment of a designated site, the importance of mobility to justify that site, and the narrative that justifies this exercise and is reproduced to maintain it, centers of calculation can be useful tools for understanding the influence of particular locations in the context of Cold War internationalism. Others have delved into the transnational mobilities of experts as agents of urbanisation and industrialisation under modernity (Rodogno et.al. 2014). The original people-centered mobilities paradigm has thus been expanded by adding attention for the circulation of knowledge, concepts, and practices in particular (geographical) settings (Jöns, Heffernan, and Meusberger 2017, p. 4).

The Paradigm of Cold War Mobility

The suggestion here is that there were identifiable forms of Cold War mobility that made that period distinct, in terms of the political implications of what

was being projected. These forms were infused with ideological understandings of mobility as an opportunity or as a threat, as an existing reality for some (the "kinetic elite", in Cresswell's well-chosen words) and a future aspiration for many. During the Cold War, mobile people were information carriers and status bearers, but they could also be either normative agents or forces of disruption, depending on the context. Framed by the ideological contest as presented by Kott, mobility became a paradigm for interpreting social life and shaping narratives that encompassed emotion, imagination, and memory.

This broad understanding of mobility has gradually filtered into approaches to Cold War history. The chapters of Byrne, Dumont and Suzarte, as well as Liu, all explore forms of educational exchange as channels of formal mobility aimed at knowledge transfer in the short term and social transformation in the longer term. Hof addresses the materiality of mobility, showing how knowledge for development purposes was made accessible in the form of mobile laboratories. This level of attention on the mobility theme also indicates a broadening of its applicability. The mobility of children is a strong theme here, with the chapters by Lövheim and Christian bringing into focus ways in which internationalist discourse and organization were brought to bear on younger generations (see also Honeck and Rosenberg 2014).

The orthodox anti-communist perspective regarding the Cold War period was always that the West represented movement and the East stasis, with the "Iron Curtain" epitomizing the restrictions on citizens. In this simple model, mobility represented freedom in and for the West and subversion in the communist world, it being associated with the circulation of ideas and images contrary to building socialism. There was much inventive agency by citizens to overcome the restrictive demands of the socialist state, for whom mobility was a threat to its very existence. From the 1950s and the Geneva summits through to the 1970s and the Helsinki Accords, and the 1980s and Reagan's "Mr Gorbachev, tear down this wall", mobility was at the heart of a narrative of freedom versus oppression.

This orthodox dualism has been challenged. While anti-communism provided the basis for some transnational organizations (see the chapter by Blatter), others such as UNESCO sought to transcend the Cold War divide by pursuing the cause of learning as a universal right for humanitarian progress. Others have directed attention to the important ways in which mobility was central for both regime legitimacy and social resilience in the communist world (Burrell and Hörschelmann 2014). Images of mobility, especially in the form of techno-utopianism, were key elements in socialist self-perception, as demonstrated by the importance of space exploration for depictions of Soviet futurism and the superiority of the socialist system (Maurer, Richers, Rüthers, and Scheide 2011). Hence, whereas mobility from a Western democratic-capitalist perspective was all about freedom and the realization of the self as a political and economic subject, mobility from a socialist perspective was all about solidarity and the realization of the self as a member of a community shaping history (see the chapter by Hong). Studies of socialist educational

internationalism have emphasized how students from Africa and Asia sought not only training but also the performative camaraderie and solidarity to be found at the large-scale youth festivals of the Soviet-led World Federation of Democratic Youth (see the chapter by Wagner; also Kotek 1996; Pence and Betts 2008; Koivunen 2016; Burrell 2011; Rutter 2013; Katsakioris 2019; Wilcox 2020). Whereas socialist mobility was geared, at least in theory, to access for all, capitalist mobility has always been fundamentally hierarchical, with forms of patronage being used to facilitate the overcoming of inequalities for the fortunate few.

This West-East dichotomy was mirrored by a North-South division, whereby the accelerating modernity of the industrialized nations was contrasted with the traditional "stasis, slowness, and immobility … ascribed to social and cultural 'others' living 'elsewhere', whose conditions of life change only gradually or at the hands of intervening forces" (Burrell and Hörschelmann 2014, p. 4). As Cresswell noted, "some of the foundational narratives of modernity have been constructed around the brute fact of moving – mobility as liberty and mobility as progress" (Cresswell 2010, p. 162). Mobility in the South was materializing only as a disruptive threat, as in the form of the urban guerrilla under Latin American authoritarianism, or the forced and voluntary migration of the post-Cold War period. Missing in this negative representation is the aspiration for better futures through mobility, be that through outwitting a more powerful enemy or overcoming physical obstacles (Guevara 1969; Löwy 2007). The narrative of *The Motorcycle Diaries*, chronicling "Che" Guevara's personal observations of Latin American poverty during a road trip across the continent, is here indicative of this alternative take (Keeble 2003). Studies of "subaltern mobility" in Africa and Asia have opened up the experience of gaining access to better futures through education on both sides of the ideological divide (Burton 2020). Several chapters, in particular that by Hana Qugana, explore the meaning of mobility from southern, postcolonial perspectives, transgressing the orthodox North-South hierarchy by instead emphasizing the linkages between nation-building, political subjectivity and citizenship, and the appropriation of the means for self-sufficient futures.

In her coverage of a transnational history perspective on the Cold War, Penny von Eschen examined the influence of transnational connections and the agency of those involved, particularly those movements that arose to challenge the colonial and ideological superstructures of international relations. She thus directed attention to "the US-sponsored transnational networks of modernization and development, and related educational, cultural, and religious projects; taken together these were rich sites of political formation for the arena of transnational anti-communism". In referring to the political forces that challenged this US-led system, she pointed out how transnational movements such as peace and anti-nuclear protests represented "a powerful dream space" for re-imagining inter-social relations (von Eschen 2013, pp. 453–454). This "dream space" was not the sole domain of the superpowers (Getachew, 2019). Nevertheless, the respective cultural capital of East and

West for shaping belief in – and motivation for – building a better future has been explored as a deeply powerful dimension to twentieth century, and particularly Cold War, history (Buck-Morss 2000; Romijn, Scott-Smith, and Segal 2012). The US and the USSR (and China) projected paths for future development to the Global South and proffered the means, expertise, and leadership to follow them. The means, expertise, and leadership were necessarily mobile. This created new forms of subjectivity that many could then aspire to.

US strategy in the Asia-Pacific aimed at fostering an image of a prosperous, upwardly mobile, stable set of Western-orientated nations securely safe from communist subversion. In this context, Cold War cosmopolitanism (as defined by Christina Klein) expressed "an ethos of worldly engagement" brought about by the US requirement for a non-communist "free Asia" in its ideological contest with the USSR and China. The US created or made use of existing networks of cultural and educational exchange to generate and enable the mobility of cosmopolitan elites. These figures benefited from these overlapping layers of patronage as vanguard players in shaping the culture and politics of the Asia-Pacific region in a Western-orientated guise. As role models, they expressed the privileges and norms of Western-style modernity through the media and in public life. Cosmopolitanism took on a wider meaning as a cipher for national progress as a whole. Developing the theme in relation to her work on South Korea, Klein described it thus:

> It engaged the ideals of individualism, personal freedom, and capitalist exchange and expressed a commitment to social and technological modernization along Western lines…. Cold War cosmopolitanism thus embraced rather than transcended nationalism. It privileged the knitting of ties – symbolic as well as material – among "free" nations that valued their own heritage and wanted to share it with others. As a historically specific form of cosmopolitanism, it can be seen as a cultural manifestation of the political ideology of "free-world" integration: it resonated with the dual impulses of nation building and bloc building that structured postwar Asia's political landscape. Many Asian intellectuals and cultural producers – eager to strengthen their nation's cultural output and to gain the respect of the "free-world" community – embraced Cold War cosmopolitanism as a worldview, a style, and a practice.
>
> (Klein 2017, p. 283)

Cold War cosmopolitanism created the impression of a vibrant, egalitarian, modernizing, autonomous community of democratic nations around the Asia-Pacific. To bring this subjectivity to life, multiple, overlapping networks of mobility involving both state and non-state actors were utilized. Despite often being ad hoc and uncoordinated in their approach – itself a sign of the vibrance of "free societies" – they provided a dense latticework of patronage to ensure transnational mobility as a strategic goal. This provided ample opportunities for contrasting "free movement" with closed and "backward" societies or

repressive regimes. It highlighted personal initiative as opposed to rigid, traditional social orders. It generated high-profile visibility for those who entered into the cosmopolitan "stream". Ultimately, both formal and informal forms of connectivity and exchange were built up over time in a region that lacked such channels of cultural connection. It is important not to fetishize this focus on mobility as if to buy into its fundamental inequalities. As one critic put it: "idealization of movement, or transformation of movement into a fetish, depends on the exclusion of others who are already positioned as *not free in the same way*" (Ahmed 2004, p. 152). The establishment of mobility infrastructures also entails the exclusion of others. The US-facilitated "dream image" of Cold War cosmopolitanism rested on the inequalities of capitalist exchange and ideological exclusion that enhanced patterns of exclusion within Western-orientated societies. As Sheller and Urry argued in turn:

> It is not a question of privileging a "mobile subjectivity", but rather of tracking the power of discourses and practices of mobility in creating both movement and stasis. [It] delineates the context in which both sedentary and nomadic accounts of the social world operate, and it questions how the context is itself mobilized, or performed, through ongoing sociotechnical practices…
>
> (Sheller and Urry 2006, p. 211)

Trans-Pacific Mobilities and Embedded Infrastructures

A mix of state and non-state actors combined to function as "transmission belts" for the cultural and educational internationalism that the US sought to promote across the Asia-Pacific region. As Cresswell noted, political interests always ensure that "mobility is channeled into acceptable conduits" (Cresswell 2010, p. 165). The public diplomacy apparatus of the United States Information Agency (from 1953) coordinated the official US government approach, and educational exchange was facilitated by the Fulbright agreements with participating nations, of which Burma and the Philippines were two of the earliest in 1947. The non-state apparatus of networks and "nerve centers" was extensive. The PEN International (Poets, Essayists, and Novelists), begun in London in 1921, was already promoting the cause of freedom of expression through literature across the globe before the Second World War and became an arena for cultural Cold War battles after it (Potter 2013; Stonor Saunders 1999; Vanhove 2022). The Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) sought to unite like-minded liberal intellectuals in a transnational community devoted to their opposition to restrictions on freedom of thought. Founded in 1950 with CIA guidance, it soon expanded across the Global South and intervened in the cultural battles that took place across the nation-building struggles of the decolonizing world (Coleman 1989; Grémion, 1995; Stonor Saunders 1999; Scott-Smith 2002). In 1951 it sponsored an Asian Conference on Cultural Freedom in Mumbai and

followed this up with "Cultural Freedom in Asia", held in Yangon in 1955. As with PEN, the mobility of ideas, materials, and personnel lay at the center of the CCF's *raison d'etre*, it being vital to provide a supportive transnational "home" for those who were often facing political pressures in their national contexts. Political circumstances often meant that "the very fact that autonomous, independent intellectuals could assemble to discuss the very nature of their polities without repression is telling" (Burke 2016, p. 85). Mobility could not be taken for granted. In the words of Raymond Aron, looking to sum up the CCF's ideals in 1962:

> One of the great merits of the Congress is to maintain, to restore, and to create intellectual communities that cut across barriers of profession and discipline. Intellectual life has a tendency to organize itself along narrow lines and specializations, and we, the Congress, represent a "trans-specialist community".[2]

Foremost of all such organizations was the Asia Foundation. Founded in 1951 as the CIA's Committee for a Free Asia, the Foundation has a public origin date of 1954, the year the name was changed to distance it from overt political intentions. Its current website states that it was created to "improve lives, expand opportunities, and help societies flourish across a dynamic and developing Asia", and the Asia Foundation from the very beginning was geared entirely to the promotion of Cold War mobility and how it was encapsulated in a vision of cosmopolitanism (Sangjoon 2017). As its website claims, the Foundation was all about "creating opportunities for education and exchanges to expose young Asian leaders to liberal political and market economy models".[3] The foundation was a perfect example of what Scott Lucas has referred to as a "state-private network" (Lucas 2002), with its website referring to its origins as a philanthropic apparatus led by "a group of forward-thinking citizens who shared a strong interest in Asia", but which worked hand in glove with both overt and covert arms of the US government (Price 2024; North-Best 2017).[4]

Big philanthropy – beginning with the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation, later joined by others – also played a crucial role in financing networks of expertise in the furtherance of regional integration (Berman 1983). Aside from the multiple education and training programs, a perfect example of philanthropic support for Cold War cosmopolitanism is the Magsaysay Award. Created in 1957 to honor the Philippino leader Ramon Magsaysay, who had died in a plane crash, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund established the award for "honoring greatness of spirit in selfless service to the people of Asia".[5] Since then, annual awards have been given under six categories: government service, public service, community leadership, journalism, literature, arts and creative communication, to which was added (since 2001) emergent leadership. In his study of the award, Rommel Curaming emphasized not only how it "promoted or advertised cultural constructs sympathetic to one side against another in the Cold War divide", but also that it exemplified

"the liberal conception, perhaps at the same time an exhortation, of the individual as volitional, able to take a difference and free to decide for oneself". These individuals above all personified processes of "enlightened modernization" for their communities and nations as a whole, finding "ways to smoothen transition from the traditional to the modern" (Curaming 2009, p. 136).

In terms of Sheller and Urry's reference to "embedded infrastructures", the United States also attempted to make full use of Hawaii as a Pacific midpoint of cultural mediation with Asia. In her study of the "gateway state", Sarah Miller-Davenport has focused on Hawaii as central to "a broader reimagining of US global authority" stretching across the Pacific. Hawaii was "America's 'bridge to Asia' [that] helped formulate new strategies for securing US cultural and economic influence in the decolonizing world" (Miller-Davenport 2019, p. 79). As part of this process, the East-West Center (EWC) was created in 1960 as an independent institution from the University of Hawaii for the purpose of facilitating academic mobility to and from the United States across the Pacific. At first organized around the Institute for Advanced Projects, the Institute for Technical Interchange, and the Institute for Student Interchange, in the 1970s these expanded to become institutes for population, communication, culture learning, technology and development, and environment and policy.

Performing Mobility

The United States Information Agency (USIA), Fulbright, PEN, the CCF, the Asia Foundation, and the EWC produced a latticework of cultural, intellectual, and educational connections that aimed to both maintain the United States as the central node for cultural references, knowledge transfer, and "ideological leadership" and at the same time break down cultural barriers between the nations of the Asia-Pacific themselves. Development training programs, coordinated through the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and its predecessors, were key vectors through which mobility was integral to the processes of modernization. In this way, these institutions collectively contributed to the overall goals of US Cold War security policy – to generate a greater level of regional cohesion among the anti-communist allies, which would in turn support the formal security alliances in place. This occurred both bilaterally, as with US-Japan relations, or collectively, as with the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO, 1954–1977), which also ran its own training and cultural programs to overcome suspicions and promote mutual recognition among its members (Cheng Guan 2021). Exploring this further by focusing on mobility enables a clearer sense to emerge of how those involved, at all levels, both experienced and performed these novel forms of connectivity and the places and processes involved. As Sheller and Urry argue, "there is a complex relationality of places and persons connected through performances" (Sheller and Urry 2006, p. 214).

A field of activity of particular importance that illustrates these processes well is mass media. During the Cold War, the US used its state-private public

diplomacy apparatuses to promote the values and practices of "free media" as a cornerstone of the development and maintenance of democracy. Mobility was here a central element, it being important to showcase the US approach to the media as business, as a site of technical innovation, and as the "fourth estate", as well as to lay the grounds for intra-regional best practice and experience-sharing exchanges amongst media professionals from the Asia-Pacific region. Studies of Cold War media are uneven in scope. Radio is covered extensively (Nelson 1997; Cummings 2009; Cummings 2010; Johnson and Parta 2010; Alexander et al. 2013), but the focus has largely been on US-USSR relations, with Europe as the focal point. Broader studies of the media and journalists have also largely stayed within the context of US-Europe-USSR relations (Jenks 2006; Roth-Ey 2011; Bastiansen and Werenskjold 2015; Magnusdottir 2019; Bastiansen, Klimke, and Werenskjold 2019; Fainberg 2020). Mobility is necessarily built into the functioning of media as a profession, not to mention the training of a journalist, a process that, as the chapter by Milford shows, could reveal tensions between clashing internationalisms. The US State Department and USIA made journalists a priority group during the Cold War, making use of exchanges such as the Foreign Leader and Specialist programs, and coordinating with philanthropy and universities in order to transfer and inculcate the desired values. From 1950 to the 1970s, the Multi-National Foreign Journalists Program was run by Floyd Arpan, first at Northwestern and then when Arpan moved to the School of Journalism at Indiana University in 1960, he took the program with him. Starting out with all-German (1950–1953) and then (1955–1957) all-Korean groups, the program went global, eventually bringing journalists and publishers from 71 different nations (of which 24 were from Asia) between 1950 and 1976 for a "work-study-travel program" that mixed instructional sessions in Indiana with work placement with a US newspaper and time for a free travel agenda. The link between freedom, training, and mobility was thus inbuilt, although this was not always clear for the organizers themselves, as the report from the 1962–1963 program shows:

> It was not an easy task to weld this highly variable group into a cohesive, workable unit and channel its diverse and vibrant personalities toward a common goal – an understanding of Americans and the American image on the world scene – while at the same time allowing for full and unhampered freedom for each man to pursue special interests, independent travel, and personal investigation of American life.[6]

Experiencing mobility, and its intrinsic connection to freedom, should itself have been the "instruction", but the need to achieve a "common goal" focused on "Americans and the American image" undermined this. Such heavy-handedness was of course partly driven by the need to provide evidence of "success" in order to ensure continuing funding. Efforts were certainly made to publicize the alignment of foreign journalists with US policy goals, in particular the reasons for pursuing the war in Vietnam, and the threats that this

alignment could bring.[7] But this also reflects an unease about too much mobility, especially about not being able to control it in the context of United States society itself. Race and gender were the decisive factors in this unease. The annual reports, which included anonymized clippings from the participants' own evaluations, regularly made reference – generally only in passing – to unfortunate incidents where racial prejudice had undoubtedly affected the mobility of the Asian invitees. Considering the fact that the participants were chosen exactly for their ability to share and spread their impressions of the United States to their respective networks and readerships, the tension between allowing mobility and controlling the message is painfully obvious.

Gender also generated issues that clearly marked out perceptions of acceptable and unacceptable mobility. In 1965, under the auspices of the State Department and in collaboration with the East-West Center, Experiment in International Living, and Theta Sigma Phi (from 1972 the Association for Women in Communications), the Asian Women Journalists Project brought nine reporters, editors, and columnists together from Australia, India, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand. The May to July program began with a week of seminars hosted by the EWC in Honolulu, followed by a group tour through California, Wyoming, Minnesota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington DC, before culminating in two weeks of "free time" for individual appointments. From a US public diplomacy perspective, the project marked a new step in recognizing the potential of women journalists as a specific group that could benefit (and benefit from) US soft power. *Life* editor Dora (Dodie) Hamblin, who delivered a paper on "Imaginative Communications", commented after the event: "I'm sure conferences would be equally valuable for male journalists, but since many publishing ventures (I quickly exempt Time Inc. from this category) are notably reluctant to let their lady journalists travel much, the need seems greater for women". Journalist Dorothy Lewis drew attention to the Multi-National Journalists and World Press Institute programs for men that included work placements lasting several months, something still not provided for women. Lewis also emphasized that the purpose of the project was to highlight the "common ground" that existed not just between "the United States and other free people" but also between their nations themselves "so that each country CAN be itself".[8] Mobility provided by the US was seen as the key to fostering awareness of national identity and regional compatibility, as well as a novel experience. In the words of *Indian Express* editor Aruna Mukerji, it was "an enchanted journey".[9] Each participant was asked to submit a discussion paper for the sessions at the EWC, which was then commented on by the Center's Amefil Agbayani (herself a Filippino). Her text is replete with an emphasis on Asia as a region in flux, the undertone being that it was on the expected path from tradition to modernity, with different parts moving at different speeds:

> From a survey of the papers presented by the Asian delegates, I found a forceful sense of movement, a sense of transition, as it were, of the woman journalist. While there is a general recognition, tacit or otherwise, that she has not fully arrived, her emergence is real and her importance is increasingly being felt.[10]

Agbayani went on to use the number of women journalists in their respective countries as a kind of cipher for indicating the overall level of social progressiveness, whereby "Hongkong and the Republic of China seem to have shown the most movement and optimism in this regard".[11] Since Taiwan was represented by leading sports writer and former national basketball player Gertrude Su Lee, Western in manner and a fervent anti-communist, this image was carried over into several of the media reports on the project.[12] Lee personified Cold War cosmopolitanism in journalism, a perfect role model in Western eyes. The participant who gathered the most attention from US officials, however, was Josefina Protacio of the *Manila Chronicle*. Self-confident and independent, Protacio had begun as the police reporter for her paper before moving to cover politics and was thus one of the few women to work on a "male" dossier. This set her apart from the rest of the group, and it drew contrasting reactions from the hosts. The State Department's Patricia Roberts, initially put off by this "attractive, energetic [and] somewhat erratic young woman", ultimately concluded that she "showed much initiative" in arranging her own schedule, with appointments in New York and Washington DC (such as with the FBI). Roberts' colleague Jeannette Litschgi was less complementary, regarding Protacio as "irresponsible and immature". In contrast to Roberts' praise for Protacio's ability to set herself up perfectly well in New York, Litschgi saw only that "on her own she did nothing remarkable professionally". The contrast between the two women observers is striking: one praising individual initiative and movement, the other regarding it as empty of meaning and irresponsible.[13] Protacio herself displayed further independence in her subsequent articles for the *Manila Chronicle*. She dissected the cultural undertones of Honolulu ("tourists are overwhelmed by Hawaiian informality, something the Americans took away from the natives and which, since then, has been used unwisely"), the ongoing civil rights struggle ("the fever of the Negro revolution is felt when you feel the pulse of America"), and – significantly – the war in Vietnam:

> American war propagandists in Saigon came up with statistics that since January this year, 27,000 North Vietnamese refugees have sought protective footing in the South. Vietcong reports say their volunteers have more than doubled. In this twilight of words, nobody knows who's padding.[14]

Through her behavior and writing, Protacio was performing her own US-style emancipation in ways that tested the limits of American tolerance. She took the advantages of mobility further than was intended by the apparatus that provided it. The episode is interesting for uncovering how the mindset and apparatus of US public diplomacy operated according to an image of "the free individual", but with racial and gender limitations just under the surface. The aim was ostensibly to break down stereotypes, but in doing so, others were revealed. As Cresswell has pointed out, mobility inevitably has its "frictions" (Cresswell 2010, pp. 166–167).

A final example of mobility as performance is provided by another Filipino, Filemon Tutay of the *Philippines Free Press*. Filing a five-part "Report on America" following his participation in the Multi-National Foreign Journalists program of 1963, Tutay wrote gleefully of the luxuries encountered on his trans-Pacific flight:

> "Mr Tutae" was in no mood to have his dinner just then. He thought he might sample all the brands of liquor aboard the huge aircraft. He started off with the inevitable Scotch with water, switched to brandy and then wound up with a couple of shots of champagne before he asked an attendant if he could have his dinner. Needless to say, "Mr Tutae" had a very delightful dinner in a well-appointed luxury air liner 27,000 feet over the Pacific. After he had sampled all the drinks aboard and all "on the house," he was entirely oblivious to all prospects of any brewing typhoon or tropical depression.[15]

For Tutay, it was essential to display to his readers the status of his invitation to attend the program, while at the same time mocking his hosts for misspelling his name. In doing so he was both pointing out his new-found prestige as a Cold War cosmopolitan and indicating that he was not taken in by the *faux* trappings of "mutual understanding". Mobility, for Tutay, was thus double-edged: it set him apart as a US-style "cosmopolitan", but it also opened him up to criticism for being "taken in". His carefully judged satire was an ideal way out.

Conclusion

There are many sides to educational internationalism, as this book amply demonstrates. From an orthodox perspective, it seems to fit perfectly within the well-traveled narrative of Western freedom opposing Eastern repression, and Northern knowledge being used to guide Southern development. Such approaches often miss the challenges and contradictions to long-standing state-based Cold War frameworks represented by internationalist causes and desires. Educational internationalism can be used exactly to deconstruct given understandings of agency and subjectivity, revealing hidden topographies of cultural, social, and political experience. Mobility is an ideal additional concept through which to unlock and explore those experiences and the emotions,

prejudices, and hierarchies they contain. By charting its specific uses to display versions of Cold War cosmopolitanism, mobility offers pathways for examining the lived realities of those caught in its spotlight and aspiring to its benefits. Mobility is about the chance for change and the possibilities for progress. As Cresswell has laid out, this introduces a new set of questions to shape the investigation:

> There is clearly a politics to material movement. Who moves furthest? Who moves fastest? Who moves most often? But this is only the beginning. There is also a politics of representation. How is mobility discursively constituted? What narratives have been constructed about mobility? How are mobilities represented?
>
> (Cresswell 2010, p. 162)

This is rich terrain for marking out a distinct field of enquiry. A focus on mobility can help us to define the scope, the effects, and the meanings of educational internationalism in both theory and practice. It can provide a fresh angle for (re-)exploring the wide terrain covered by the chapters in this volume. It is a valuable tool for disrupting and then reconstituting our understanding of "Cold War history" and what it meant for those who lived through it.

Notes

1 See her full study of this phenomenon in Sandrine Kott, *A World More Equal: An Internationalist Perspective on the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2024).
2 Munich, Ludwig-Maximilian University, Lasky Center for Transatlantic Studies, Melvin Lasky Papers, Correspondence: Michael Josselson, Raymond Aron, Zurich, February 1962, insert in Michael Josselson to Melvin Lasky, 19.11.1964.
3 See www.asiafoundation.org (accessed 12 May 2022).
4 "The Foundation was established in 1954 entirely by and at the initiative of the US Government, with all support coming from the Government. The many prominent trustees … were recruited and agreed to serve only as a public service." CREST, FOIA Electronic Reading Room, U. Alexis Johnson, "Memorandum for Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, The White House", 07.06.1969, https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/loc-hak-1-5-33-8.
5 See https://www.rmaward.asia/ (accessed 12 May 2022).
6 Fayetteville AK, University of Arkansas, Archive of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, special collections (hereafter ECA), box 157, folder 20, 1962–1963 Multi-National Foreign Journalist Project, Final Report, 31.01.1963.
7 ECA, box 158, folder 7, press release, Asian journalists find Americans united behind Vietnam effort, 29.04.1966. USIA chief Leonard Marks brought attention around the same time to the death of Vu Nhat Huy, editor of the *Chinh Luan* newspaper in Saigon, and outspoken participant in the Multinational Journalists program of 1965. Marks reported that Huy was killed for refusing to change the attitude of his publication toward the communists. Address by Leonard H. Marks, Director, U.S. Information Agency International Radio and Television Society Newsmaker Luncheon, New York, 11.02.1966, FRUS 1917–1972, Vol. VII, Public Diplomacy 1964-68.

8 ECA, box 157, folder 23, Dodie Hamblin to Roy Larsen (USIA Director), 07.06.1965; ECA, box 157, folder 23, Dorothy Lewis, The Role of Women Journalists in Developing International Understanding.
9 ECA, box 157, folder 25, Aruna Mukerji, America through Asian Eyes, n.d. [1965].
10 ECA, box 157, folder 25, Amefil Agbayani, Asian Women Journalists, May 1965.
11 ECA, box 157, folder 25, Amefil Agbayani, Asian Women Journalists, May 1965.
12 ECA, box 157, folder 23, 2001, Chinese wept when she stepped from the helicopter, *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, 26.05.1965; Asian Journalists to View Life of City, *Chattanooga Times*, 13.06.1965.
13 ECA, box 157, folder 25, Patricia Roberts, evaluation of visit, 24.08.1965; Jeannette Litschgi, Asian Women Journalists Project, Escort Report.
14 ECA, box 157, folder 25, Jeanette Litschgi to Myrtle Thorne (Dept. of State), newspaper articles of Miss Josefina Protacio, 12.06.1965.
15 ECA, box 157, folder 15, Filemon Tutay, Report on America, Pt 1, *Philippines Free Press*, 14.12.1963. Part 5 describes in equally comic fashion the breathless tours and endless briefings at US military bases in Hawaii, NORAD, and Colorado.

References

Ahmed, S. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Badenoch Alexander et al., eds. 2013. Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2004. "The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition". In *Culture and Public Action*, edited by R. Rao and M. Walton, 59–84. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bastiansen, Henrik, Martin Klimke, and Rolf Werenskjold eds. 2019. *Media and the Cold War in the 1980s: Between Star Wars and Glasnost*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bastiansen, Henrik, and Rolf Werenskjold, eds. 2015. *The Nordic Media and the Cold War*. Gothenberg: Nordic.

Bechmann Pedersen, Sune, and Christian Noack, eds. 2019. *Tourism and Travel during the Cold War: Negotiating Tourist Experiences across the Iron Curtain*. London: Routledge.

Berman, Edward. 1983. *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 2000. *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Burke, Roland. 2016. "'Real problems to discuss'; The Congress for Cultural Freedom's Asian and African Expeditions, 1951–1959". *Journal of World History* 27, no. 1: 53–85.

Burrell, Kathy. 2011. "The Enchantment of Western Things: Children's Material Encounters in Late Socialist Poland". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36, no. 1: 143–156.

Burrell, Kathy, and Kathrin Hörschelmann. 2014. "Introduction". In *Mobilities in Socialist and Post-Socialist States: Societies on the Move*, edited by Burrell and Hörschelmann, 1–22. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burton, Eric. 2020. "Decolonization, the Cold War, and Africans' Routes to Higher Education Overseas, 1957–65". *Journal of Global History* 15, no. 1: 169–191.

Cheng Guan, Ang. 2021. *The South East Asia Treaty Organization*. London: Routledge.

Coleman, Peter. 1989. *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe*. New York: Free Press.

Cresswell, Tim. 2010. "Towards a Politics of Mobility". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28, no. 1: 17–31.

Cummings, Richard H. 2009. *Cold War Radio: The Dangerous History of American Broadcasting in Europe, 1950–1989*. London: McFarland & Company.
Cummings, Richard H. 2010. *Radio Free Europe's "Crusade for Freedom": Rallying Americans behind Cold War Broadcasting, 1950–1960*. London: McFarland & Company.
Curaming, Rommel. 2009. "The Rhetorical as Political: The Ramon Magsaysay Award and the making of a Cold War Culture in Asia". In *Dynamics of the Cold War in Asia: Ideology, Identity, and Culture*, edited by Tuong Vu and Wasana Wongsurawat, 127–143. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Fainberg, Dina. 2020. *Cold War Correspondents: Soviet and American Reporters on the Ideological Frontlines*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Getachew, Adom. 2019. *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Grémion, Pierre. 1995. *Intelligence de l'anticommunisme: le Congrès pour la liberté de la culture à Paris (1950–1975)*. Paris: Fayard.
Guevara, Ernesto. 1969. *Guerilla Warfare*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Hartog, Sigrid. 2018. "Towards a Topological Re-assemblage of Education Policy? Observing the Implementation of Performance Data Infrastructures as 'Centres of Calculation' in Germany". *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 16, no. 1: 134–150.
Honeck, Mischa, and Rosenberg, Gabriel. 2014. "Transnational Generations: Organizing Youth in the Cold War West, 1945–1980". *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 2: 233–239.
Jenks, John. 2006. *British Propaganda and News Media in the Cold War*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Johnson, Ross A., and Parta, Eugene R. 2010. *Cold War Broadcasting: Impact on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
Jöns, Heike. 2011. "Centre of Calculation". In *The SAGE Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, edited by J. A. Agnew and D. N. Livingstone, 158–170. London: Sage.
Jöns, Heike, Michael Heffernan, and Peter Meusberger. 2017. "Mobilities of Knowledge: An Introduction". In *Mobilities of Knowledge*, edited by Jöns, Heffernan, and Meusberger, 1–19. Cham: Springer.
Katsakioris, Constantin. 2019. "The Lumumba University in Moscow: Higher Education for a Soviet-Third World Alliance, 1960-9". *Journal of Global History* 14, no. 2: 281–300.
Keeble, Alexandra. 2003. *The Motorcycle Diaries: Notes on a Latin American Journey*. Melbourne: Ocean Press.
Klein, Christina. 2020. *Cold War Cosmopolitanism: Period Style in 1950s Korean Cinema*. Oakland: University of California Press.
Klein, Christina Klein. 2017. "Cold War Cosmopolitanism: The Asia Foundation and 1950s Korean Cinema". *Journal of Korean Studies* 22, no. 2: 281–316.
Koivunen, Pia. 2016. "Friends, 'Potential Friends', and Enemies: Reimagining Soviet Relations to the First, Second, and Third Worlds at the Moscow 1957 Youth Festival". In *Socialist Internationalism in the Cold War: Exploring the Second World*, edited by Patrick Babiracki and Austin Jersild, 219–247. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Kotek, Joel. 1996. *Students and the Cold War*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Kott, Sandrine. 2017. "Cold War Internationalisms". In *Internationalisms: A Twentieth Century History*, edited by Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin, 340–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kott, Sandrine. 2024. *A World More Equal: An Internationalist Perspective on the Cold War*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
Löwy, Michael. 2007. *The Marxism of Che Guevara: Philosophy, Economics, Revolutionary Warfare*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lucas, W. Scott. 2002. "Mobilizing Culture: The State-Private Network and the CIA in the Early Cold War". In *War and Cold War in American Foreign Policy 1942–62*, edited by D. Carter and R. Clifton, 83–107. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Magnusdottir, Rosa. 2019. *Enemy Number One: The United States of America in Soviet Ideology and Propaganda 1945–1959*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Maurer, E, J. Richers, M. Rüthers, and C. Scheide, eds. 2011. *Soviet Space Culture: Cosmic Enthusiasm in Socialist Societies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Miller-Davenport, Sarah. 2019. *Gateway State: Hawai'i and the Cultural Transformation of American Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Nair, Preetha. 2005. "Native Collecting and Natural Knowledge (1798–1832): Raja Serfoji II of Tanjore as 'Centre of Calculation'". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 15, no. 3: 279–302.
Nelson, Michael. 1997. *War of the Black Heavens: The Battles of Western Broadcasting in the Cold War*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
North-Best, Emma. 2017. "The Stolen History of the CIA and the Asia Foundation". *Muckrock*. https://www.muckrock.com/news/archives/2017/nov/02/taf-1/
Pence, K. and P. Betts, eds. 2008. *Socialist Modern: East German Everyday Culture and Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Potter, Rachel. 2013. "Modernist Rights: International PEN, 1921–1936". *Critical Quarterly* 55, no. 2: 66–80.
Price, David. 2024. *Cold War Deceptions: The Asia Foundation and the CIA*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
Rodogno, Davide, Bernhard Struck, and Jakob Vogel, eds. 2014. *Shaping the Transnational Sphere: Experts, Networks, and Issues*. New York: Berghahn Books.
Romijn, Peter, Giles Scott-Smith, and Joes Segal, eds. 2012. *Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Roth-Ey, Kristin. 2011. *Moscow Prime Time: How the Soviet Union Built the Media Empire that Lost the Cultural Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Rutter, Nick. 2013. "Look Left, Drive Right: Internationalisms at the Sofia World Youth Festival of 1968". In *The Socialist Sixties: Crossing Borders in the Second World*, edited by Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, 193–212. Bloomington: Indiana.
Sangjoon, Lee. 2017. "The Asia Foundation's Motion-Picture Project and the Cultural Cold War in Asia". *Film History* 29, no. 2: 108–137.
Scott-Smith, Giles. 2002. *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the CIA, and Postwar US Hegemony*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Scott-Smith, Giles. 2021. "Some Notes on Mobility". *Diplomatic History* 45, no. 3: 604–610.
Sheller, Mimi, and John Urry. 2006. "The New Mobilities Paradigm". *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 38, no. 2: 207–226.
Stonor Saunders, Frances. 1999. *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta.
Svik, Peter. 2020. *Civil Aviation and the Globalization of the Cold War*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Vanhove, Peter. 2022. *World Literature after Empire: Rethinking Universality in the Long Cold War*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Von Eschen, Penny. 2013. "Locating the Transnational in the Cold War", In *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War*, edited by Richard Immerman and Petra Goedde, 451–468. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilcox, Emily. 2020. "When folk dance was radical: Cold War *Yangge*, world youth festivals, and overseas Chinese leftist culture in the 1950s and 1960s", *China Perspectives*, no. 1: 33–42.