

# **American Models Transforming European Universities. The Fulbright Program in the Netherlands, 1950-1990<sup>1</sup>**

*J.C.C. Rupp*

## ***Introduction***

The Fulbright Program is an academic exchange program that is a relatively autonomous part of post-war American cultural diplomacy. Since its very beginning, fifty years ago, the study of America and its achievements has been the heart of this worldwide exchange program. And ever since, the question was raised as to whether its cultural-diplomacy context would hinder or stimulate scholarly pursuits of American Studies. Internationalists claim that, on the long run, open and free academic exchange, - with an invisible hand -, would contribute substantially to a better understanding between nations and peoples and to a more peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world. In their view, the message of 'American Studies' is inherently implicated in academic exchange on whatever subject in whatever discipline.

Radical critics condemn the political context by emphasizing the cultural imperialism of American Studies. The Fulbright Program, just as the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation are supposed to have done in the Interwar period, would rather uncritically propagate the American way of life than stimulate serious reciprocal study of each others history and society and of growing interdependencies.

In this paper, it will be argued that the Fulbright Program can only add something substantial to what academic exchange normally does, when it explicitly goes political. The surplus or added value of official American Studies is depending upon the way it is organized and programmed, as a command economy or as a negotiation economy<sup>2</sup>, and political rather than cultural.

---

<sup>1</sup> A planned monograph in English will include a more extensive analysis of the history of the Fulbright Program in the Netherlands, 1949-1995. A first version was published as *Het Fulbright Programma Nederland*, Work in Progress, Nr 54, Amsterdam School for Social-Science Research, University of Amsterdam (Oude Hoogstraat 24, 1012 CE Amsterdam), February 1996. E-mail: rupp@pscw.uva.nl.

<sup>2</sup> A. de Swaan, *Uitgaansbeperking en uitgaansangst. Over de verschuiving van bevelshuishouding naar onderhandelingshuishouding*. (Inaugurale rede Universiteit van Amsterdam). Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, 1979.

In the first part of this paper, some information is given about the context, the history and the method of the Fulbright Program. It is primarily Europe-oriented to strengthen the Atlantic Alliance and for culturally legitimizing America's leading role in it. Proportionally, the Netherlands was one of the most important nations of the program, not only because of its high-standing technical and natural sciences in militarily-strategically significant areas such as nuclear physics, but also for reasons of its mediating role in the world of foreign diplomacy and scholarship. In the second part of this paper, the transformation of the Fulbright Program in the Netherlands, 1947-1997, will be dealt with. In the first period, the full emphasis was on the science of education, in the second period political sciences and political history stood central. From 1985 onwards, culturalized and depoliticized American Studies have been dominating the scene. Repoliticization of the Fulbright program in coordinated projects is pleaded for.

### ***American Studies, the Fulbright Program and American cultural diplomacy***

The US government had started with cultural diplomacy in the late 1930s in response to the cultural offensive launched by the Axis powers Japan, Italy and Germany in Asia, the Middle-East and Latin-America. At the State Department, a Division of Cultural Relations was established.

Intellectual imperialism, the imperialism of ideas, was at that moment just as serious a threat to the security and defense of the hemisphere as the possibility of a military invasion.<sup>3</sup>

In a sphere of 'internationalism', American private foundations such as the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation had been active in academic exchange ever since 1900, but it was obvious that more was needed and that public involvement was necessary. Liberal democracy and the New-Deal-economy appeared not to demonstrate naturally the superiority of the American civilization to the totalitarian regimes in Germany, Italy, Japan and the Soviet Union. A more encompassing cultural effort from the side of the federal government, backed by private organizations, was necessary.

That effort was also necessary at home. In the course of the 1930s a start was also made on American Studies in the US. At the universities of Harvard, Yale and Pennsylvania, Departments of American Civilization were established. One could not rely on the 'givenness' of the American political values and institutions. The socialization given by the family, political

---

<sup>3</sup> Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas. U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp. 35-36.

meetings and informal associations was insufficient. Serious study of the American society was necessary.<sup>4</sup>

During the Second World War a substantial growth was seen of studies of the 'American Character' and of other nations America dealt with during the war. Margaret Mead was one of the leading anthropologists studying the formation of the (democratic) American personality structure. At the request of the Office of War Information, her colleague Ruth Benedict carried out studies of Japan and of a number of European countries, the Netherlands among them.<sup>5</sup> The critical issue here was which kind of propaganda against the enemy would be the most effective and how American troops would have to behave in foreign countries in order to reduce to a minimum the chance of friction with the indigenous population.

After WWII, US foreign policy was primarily directed towards the foundation of a strong and stable Atlantic Alliance with Europe. The Fulbright Program had to legitimize America's leading role in this Alliance. Americans found in the Old World, but not only there, among the public elites and among leftist intellectuals in particular 'much misunderstanding and an appalling lack of knowledge and vision' about their country; in Europe it was questioned whether the US would be capable of leading the Free World, a situation from which the Soviet Union might easily profit. The European countries needed a 'reorientation'. Germany and Japan, who each were visited by a *US Education Mission*, needed 'reeducation'. A better understanding of America had to be formed.

Big interests were involved in the practice of the technical, medical and natural sciences, but exchange in these fields could not lead to a better understanding of each other's society. The social sciences and the humanities had to be engaged for the advancement of 'American Studies': the study of the American society, its history, its juridical and political system and its arts and sciences. 'American Studies' was meant as a demonstration of America's 'moral, spiritual and material strength' and its 'achievements' in all fields of society, and as an

---

<sup>4</sup> Philip Gleason, 'World War II and the Development of American Studies', *American Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (1984), pp. 343-358. David Tyack, 'Forming the National Character', *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 35 (1966), 29-41, p. 31. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Genius of American Politics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1953.

<sup>5</sup> Margaret Mead, *Keep Your Powder Dry: An Anthropologist Looks at America*. New York: William Morrow, 1942. Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. 1946. Philip Gleason, 'World War II and the Development of American Studies', *American Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (1984), pp. 355-358. See for Benedict's study of the Netherlands: Rob van Ginkel, 'Typisch Nederlands... Ruth Benedict over het 'nationaal karakter' van Nederlanders', *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, Vol. 18, Nr 2 (1992), pp. 37-63.

expression of the American 'belief in education to solve our problems'.<sup>6</sup> According to the designer of the program, Senator Fulbright, this was the principal aim of the program; the advancement of science and scholarship, in his view, were by-products.<sup>7</sup> He changed his views later on by voicing the opinion that 'the advancing of pure scholarship' was as important as the support of foreign policy, but the political context remained essential.<sup>8</sup> As such, the Fulbright Program is subjected to the fluctuations of the political climate and its contradictions.

The original intention of the Fulbright Foundations abroad was that it would be a purely American affair, similar to the study centres which after WWII with the support of the federal government were established by American universities all over the world; according to the principle that whoever finances is also in control of management and administration. But this idea encountered considerable opposition from the side of the French and also of the Italians. The French succeeded in effectuating a 'United States Educational Foundation in France' in which both countries were equally represented.<sup>9</sup> This method became a model for other nations. Reciprocity was elevated by the Americans to the founding principle of the Fulbright Program as a whole, implying among other things that co-financing by the partner nations was strived for. These and other procedures were implemented by the 1961 Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, the so-called Fulbright-Hays Act. The principles of reciprocity and voluntarism, which formed the cement of the Fulbright Program, acquired a material foundation in the course of the 1970s when binational agreements were concluded implying equal financial contribution by both countries and equal representation on the board. Nowadays, a similar binational agreement has been made with fifty of the hundred affiliated countries. In the course of the 1970s a division of tasks grew with the National Science Foundations of the affiliated countries (NWO in the Netherlands), meaning that those organizations came to deal almost exclusively with exchange in the medical, technical and natural sciences, including the NATO-scholarships, so that the full weight of the Fulbright Program could lie upon the humanities and

---

<sup>6</sup> Walter Johnson & Francis J. Colligan, *The Fulbright Program: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, p. 69.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 42.

<sup>8</sup> Philip H. Coombs, *The Fourth Dimension of Foreign Policy: Educational and Cultural Affairs*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964, pp. 51-52.

<sup>9</sup> Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas*, p. 141.

the social sciences.<sup>10</sup> The projects increasingly gained the character of cooperative enterprises, and since the 1980s not only American Studies but also Dutch (French,...) Studies were undertaken. From the Vietnam crisis the Americans had learned that *mutual* understanding between nations was necessary.

### ***Core nations of the program***

Originally, the Fulbright Program was Europe oriented. The strengthening of the Atlantic Alliance was the main issue. Peace and security necessitated not only control of developments in strategically important areas of technical and natural sciences research, but also reorientation of Western-Europe with respect to the United States. Since the 1960s other continents also became involved (see Appendix, Table 1). Nevertheless, Europe remained its most important subject, as Europe kept the Americans worrying. The Fulbright Program was also always centred on certain countries. These countries form the core countries of the program (see Appendix, Table 2). All these countries are, besides India, Japan, and Australia, European countries, and the three most important among them, England, France and Germany, are also core nations in the world of science. But the Netherlands and Norway - although semi-peripheric in the world of science - are important nations in the Fulbright Program too, if we take the number of inhabitants into account. The Fulbright Program is not a reliable reflection of the map of the scientific production in the world. Not only were - until recently - the former communist countries missing, but also three important 'Western' nations: Switzerland, Sweden and Canada. According to Ben-David, these countries, in addition to smaller nations like the Netherlands, belong to the semi-periphery of the world of science. They were succesful in sustaining their high level of higher education by maintaining good contacts with the world centres of 'higher learning'.<sup>11</sup> Sweden and Switzerland followed a strategy different from the Netherlands. Their neutralistic foreign policy was incompatible with a substantial Fulbright

---

<sup>10</sup> Only linguistics (since Noam Chomsky at M.I.T. developed his theory of the transformational generative grammar) and (general and experimental) psychology were succesful in acquiring a place both in NWO and in the Fulbright Program.

<sup>11</sup> Joseph Ben-David, *Centers of Learning. Britain, France, Germany, United States*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1977, p. 6.

Program.<sup>12</sup> The Fulbright Program is a political program in the sense that it supports the peace and security policy as defined in international treaties. The actual proposed expansion of NATO is accompanied by an intensive Fulbright Program in the former communist Eastern European countries.

***The significance of the Netherlands and Norway***

The Netherlands and Norway have played the part of important nations in the Fulbright Program. The reason has to be sought in the eminent role these nations in mutual cooperation have played after WWII in an academic field with great military-strategic importance, atomic physics. For the Americans, it was a matter of primordial interest to keep knowledge, materials (uranium and thorium) and technology in the field of nuclear physics within the Alliance and to hold a position of monopoly within the Alliance.

The Netherlands was also strong in mathematics (important for the development of computers), aircraft construction and agriculture<sup>13</sup>. Immediately after the war, two central research institutions were founded in Amsterdam: the Instituut voor Fundamenteel Onderzoek der Materie (FOM) and the Mathematisch Centrum. The Dutch government had given the highest priority to these fields of study and a National Science Foundation was constructed around these two research institutes. At the end of 1953, there was no longer a monopoly position held by the US in atomic physics. Besides the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom had managed to develop its own techniques, whereas the Netherlands and Norway were very close to that point. The Eisenhower administration changed US policy and offered its allies cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy, including financial support. In 1957, the Dutch, however, besides cooperating with the Americans in this field, opted also (in utmost secrecy and independent

---

<sup>12</sup> R. Lundèn & E. Asard, *Networks of Americanization*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksel International, 1992.

<sup>13</sup> A nation that is not self-sufficient in food supplies, has no 'food security' and is dependent on other countries. The former Soviet Union regularly struggled with bad harvests, whereas the US had grain surpluses. With the revenues gained by selling these surpluses, the Americans financed the establishment in the postwar period of study centres of American universities all over the world.

from the FOM) for the independent development of nuclear energy technology, the so-called ultracentrifuge-method.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Reorientation of the Netherlands***

Choosing for cooperation with the American government and with American research institutes in such fields as nuclear physics, mathematics, aerodynamics and other strategic areas, would be possible only when the Dutch population as a whole and the universities in particular had a positive image of America. In the 1890-1940 period - when the Netherlands took a neutralistic course - the Dutch universities on their own had regained international fame in the technical and natural sciences. The abandoning of a neutralistic policy by opting for the Atlantic Alliance, and holding on at the same time to the independent development of the technical and natural sciences made the Netherlands a complicated ally. The United States Information Agency (USIA) and the Fulbright Program had to create confidence in American leadership and to demonstrate the advantages of cooperating with a free capitalist democratic America. The Netherlands too needed a thorough 'reorientation' on the US.

The aims of the United States Information Service (USIS) in the Netherlands were:

- a. To convince the people of the Netherlands of the sincerity and magnitude of the United States effort to maintain peace and successfully resist aggression if necessary, and of the important contribution that the Netherlands must make if that effort is to succeed;
- b. To present a clear picture of all aims and policies of the United States, showing that they are designed to promote better standards for all;
- c. To demonstrate that the United States is guided by the principles of the United Nations, and that it does not attempt to invade the rights of others;
- d. To increase a general understanding in the Netherlands of the United States, its people and its way of life, its institutions, national heritage and culture, and its achievements in all fields.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> A. Rip, *De ontwikkeling van nucleaire technologie in Nederland, 1945-1970*. NWO-subsidieaanvraag 1996. J.M. van Splunter, *Kernsplijting en diplomatie*. (Proefschrift Universiteit van Amsterdam). Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1993, pp. 183-84, 257.

<sup>15</sup> National Archives and Record Administration, 511.56/7-1151, From Amembassy, The Hague, to Department of State, 'Draft Paper for the Netherlands', July 11, 1951.

The fourth purpose of the USIS was identical to the principal aim of the Fulbright Program, an indication of the strong interwovenness with the work of the USIA. Moreover, lecturers and students were an important target group of the USIS.

The Netherlands preferred Atlantic leadership by the US and the UK to continental (French or German) leadership, but the American government was confronted in the Netherlands, though, with what were called neutralistic tendencies, and these tendencies became stronger as the Netherlands recovered economically.<sup>16</sup> They manifested themselves in all layers of Dutch society. The Dutch were particularly keen on being treated by Americans as equals and not as 'junior partners' in international organizations. Here, as it was thought, nostalgia for earlier days played a role, when the Netherlands was a world power and controlled the seas. But one should not forget that the Netherlands had a long democratic tradition, which was as deeply rooted as the American tradition. The Dutch people had seized their independence two centuries before America did and under much more difficult conditions. There was perhaps no people in Europe who stood ideologically closer to the US than the Dutch people.<sup>17</sup>

### ***The transformation of the Fulbright Program and its 'American Studies' in the Netherlands***

In the past 40 years, the Fulbright Program in the Netherlands demonstrated an interesting evolution, just as in other European core nations.

The Fulbright Commission worked with projects, in the field of the social sciences, in which the Americans felt superior, as well as in the field of the humanities, in which the Americans would like to demonstrate their abilities and potential. The discussion on the projects implied that from the Dutch side 'needs' were formulated in terms of disadvantages and deficiencies in certain areas. But, as was hastily added - as can be concluded from the annual report on the 1953-54 season - this did not imply that the Netherlands was not a highly developed nation. Its

---

<sup>16</sup> See for example: NARA, 511.56/1-2753, From Amembassy, The Hague, to Department of State, 'Semi-Annual Evaluation Report for the Netherlands', February 27, 1953; NARA, Suitland, 306 63A 190: 50-52, USIS Program in the Netherlands, 8/9/56; NARA, Suitland, 306 66A 1192:5, USIA, Revised Section V of the Country Plan for The Netherlands, 11/7/63; NARA, Suitland, 306 68A 4933: 125, From USIS/The Hague to USIA Washington, Country Assessment Report, Feb, 5, 1964. The Americans strived to convince the Dutch public that a strong Atlantic Community and the 'strategy for peace' was preferable to 'neutralism-pacifism'.

<sup>17</sup> NARA, 511.56/1-3053, From Amembassy, The Hague, to Department of State, 'Final Draft - Country Plan for the USIS Program, the Netherlands', January 30, 1953.

'needs' could not and should not be compared with the needs of the so-called underdeveloped countries. The Fulbright Program was 'cooperation in exchange of information and experience in scientific and cultural fields'. Indeed, the Netherlands lagged behind in 'social sciences' and its secondary education was too selective and the curriculum and the teaching methods were too outdated to fit the demands of reality and of modern educational philosophy. American scholars in 'educational psychology', 'curriculum development' and 'teaching methods' were welcome to share thinking on innovation plans for secondary education.

At the same time, as counterweight, a Project Humanities and Art History in particular was planned. This was a project in a field 'in which the Netherlands had much to offer and through which the Netherlands would become better informed about developments in the US in this field' (a view which is quite different, of course, from stating that America had a disadvantage in this field).

The interpretation of the program in terms of projects was the result of *negotiations* between the American and Dutch members of the Board, having heard the wishes of the Dutch universities and American applications. The Dutch universities made it perfectly clear that they did not like the idea of being overrun by American students and scholars. The Americans, for whom a Fulbright scholarship was a tour on civic duty, had a mission in propagating 'the democratic method'. The Dutch did not have such a mission and goodwill between the Netherlands and the United States could only flourish in a sphere of exchange ruled by the principles of reciprocity and equivalence between the two nations. Those principles appeared to be open to more than one interpretation and they appeared to be adaptable to the demands of reality. In the post-Vietnam period, agreement was possible on a definition implying not only 'American Studies' by Dutch scholars but also Dutch Studies by American scholars. At that time the program had become binational, financially supported by the two countries on an equal base. Nevertheless, the program remained an American program in the sense that the projects remained directed towards the organization of the visits of American scholars to the Netherlands and not vice versa. The effectiveness of these projects in the long run is very well reflected in the growing interest taken by Dutch scholars in Fulbright scholarships in the humanities and social sciences (see Appendix, Table 3). At the beginning, the emphasis of the applications was on the technical and natural sciences. Only in the 1980s did the exchange in the humanities and the social sciences become the heart of the Dutch program and at that time two-thirds of the

scholarships granted to Dutch scholars were scholarships in these academic fields. As might be expected, for the American Fulbright scholars this percentage was reached much earlier.

In contrast with the established academic world, the American social sciences were quite popular among students, right from the beginning (see Appendix, Table 4); the Dutch Fulbright students demonstrated great interest in American society. The interest in American humanities grew very gradually until, in the 1980s, it became as great as the interest in American social sciences. The students also demonstrated considerable interest in American 'management and business administration', an area that has enjoyed relatively little respect in the Dutch academic world until the late 1980s. While the Fulbright Program for scholars (and international academic exchange as a whole) was almost completely a male affair until the 1980s, among Fulbright students quite a few are women from the beginning.

### *American Educational Psychology*

The Fulbright Program works with exchange-projects, aimed at the advancement of certain academic disciplines in the host country, in the hope of contributing in this way to a positive image of America. Some of these projects deserve special attention in this paper: education, political science and political history, and cultural studies. These projects were at the centre of the Fulbright Program for the Netherlands in the 1950s, the 1960s and 1970s, and the 1980s and 1990s, respectively.

The project teacher education<sup>18</sup> was the first project and it interplayed with the postwar discussion about the reform of secondary education in the Netherlands; a reform which was seen as necessary for facing the needs of a modern democratic society. Firstly, the Utrecht Institute of Teacher Education of L. Bunt was chosen for cooperation. The idea was that James S. Mersell of Columbia University would teach 'educational philosophy and methods' there during the 1954-55 season, whereas Bunt would prepare this visit in America the year before. Unforseen circumstances hindered the exchange with this institute. A year later another start was made with the Pedagogisch Didactisch Instituut of H.W.F. Stellwag, professor in pedagogics at the

---

<sup>18</sup> Teacher education was implemented in the Netherlands by law of 1952. For a long period of time, teaching was seen in the Netherlands as a vocation and as a gift that could only grow through practice to its full eminence. The first proposals for pedagogical-didactical training of teachers after WWI stirred many emotions and even more than the war did. Annie Romein-Verschoor, *Omzien in verwondering*. Amsterdam: Arbeiderspers, 1970, Deel I, p. 126.

University of Amsterdam. She would introduce the analytical-philosophical method in Dutch pedagogics.<sup>19</sup>

The great American effort<sup>20</sup> to help the Netherlands in reforming its secondary education, was most successful, however, in the sphere of 'educational psychology', in particular through developing methods of educational evaluation. In 1957, the first Dutch reading test was developed by staff members of the Paedagogisch Didactisch Institute in Amsterdam, under the supervision of F.B. Davis, professor in educational psychology at Hunter College, New York.<sup>21</sup> This initiative was welcomed by the Amsterdam professor in the methodology of the social sciences, A.D. de Groot, who was also acting director of the Research Institute for Applied Psychology (RITP). Under his leadership, the construction of learning tests and of methods of educational evaluation in general expanded enormously in the Netherlands.<sup>22</sup> The development of quantitative evaluations in education (and, later on, of criteria for the measurement of scientific production) is generally seen as one of the most important American influences on Dutch education. It is regarded by many as *the* symbol of Americanization of Dutch education and not as an entirely positive, hopeful symbol but rather as a negative sign.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> H.W.F. Stellwag, *'Situatie' en 'relatie'. Inleiding tot een filosofisch-analytische studie der pedagogische grondbegrippen*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1970.

<sup>20</sup> In the first period of the Fulbright Program nine American educationalists, and six as lecturer, came to Amsterdam, more than in any other discipline. Among them were: Frederick C. Gruber (Philosophy and Methods of Education, Pennsylvania), Clyde H. Coombs (Psychology, Michigan), Robert H. Beck (History and Philosophy of Education, Minnesota), Martin Levis (Education, Kansas), Robert H. Mathewson (Education, College of the City of New York), Fred E. Fiedler (Educational Psychology, Urbana-Washington, Seattle), Theodore L. Reller (Teacher Education, Berkeley) and Gordon Fifer (Educational Psychology, Columbia).

<sup>21</sup> United States Educational Foundation-Netherlands (USEF-N), Annual Report 1957, p. 23.

<sup>22</sup> De Groot could take over the initiative of the PDI because scholars in pedagogy and didactics in the Netherlands objected very strongly to the quantitative measurement of learning results. A.D. de Groot and R.F. van Naerssen, *Studietoetsen. Construeren, afnemen, analyseren*. Den Haag: Mouton, 1969, p. VII. De Groot completed his main oeuvre *Methodologie* (Den Haag: Mouton, 1961) during a stay of a year in the 1959-1960 season as a 'fellow' of the Institute for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University.

<sup>23</sup> Henk A. Becker and A.F. J. van Raan (Eds), *Kwaliteit in de wetenschap. Een meetbaar begrip?*. Leiden: DSWO Press, 1985, pp. 331-33; Henk A. Becker and Albert M.G. Beekes (Eds), *Loopbanen van mannelijke en vrouwelijke academici aan Nederlandse universiteiten. Een studie naar de ontwikkelingen tussen 1974 en 1986*. Utrecht: ISOR Press Universiteit van Utrecht, 1989, p. 4.

### *Political Science*

In the 1964-1984 period of the Netherlands Fulbright Program, equivalence and reciprocity were defined in terms of the interests shared by the Netherlands and the US in strengthening the Atlantic Alliance and in shaping a United Europe.<sup>24</sup> The political sciences, including international law and international relations, and 'governmental studies', were at the centre of this period. In the beginning of this period, in 1964, it was not only the project American Studies that was devoted to the political sciences, but even the Fulbright Program as a whole.<sup>25</sup>

The aim was: 'to build up strong research and teaching institutes in International Studies, Atlantic Affairs and European Integration in both the Netherlands and the United States'.<sup>26</sup> In the 1950s seven American professors in these sciences had already done orientating work in the Netherlands and as a result the University of Nijmegen established - more or less coincidentally - a lasting relationship with Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.<sup>27</sup> In the 1960s, attention was directed toward the universities of Leiden, Amsterdam and Tilburg, whereas in the beginning of the 1970s an attempt was made to introduce governmental studies at the University of Groningen. The University of Utrecht never had a department of economics and political sciences.

From the side of the Americans great interest was demonstrated in research in Soviet and East-European law at Leiden University and in comparative political research led by Hans Daalder. Daalder, in cooperation with the American scholar Robert Dahl and the Norwegian Stein

---

<sup>24</sup> The Atlantic Alliance was regarded by successive Dutch governments not only as a response to the communist threat, but also as a counterweight against a possible revival of the 'German danger' and to prevent a possible French dominance on the European continent. H.W. van den Doel, 'Nederland en de Verenigde Staten na de Tweede Wereldoorlog', in: H.W. van den Doel, P.C. Emmer and H.Ph. Vogel, *Nederland en de Nieuwe Wereld*. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1992, p. 290.

<sup>25</sup> USEF-N, Program Proposal 1966 (formulated in 1964). [Program Proposals were formulated and sent for approval to the Board of Foreign Scholarships (BFS) in Washington, D.C., two years beforehand]. For the second project 'Education' only one teacher was asked, for a project 'Social Sciences' one researcher in clinical psychology, whereas it was said about projects such as Project III 'General Exchange', Project IV 'Economy', and Project V 'Humanities' that they could only be effectuated 'in so far as money would be provided from other sources' (but from the Fulbright Program, JR).

<sup>26</sup> USEF-N, Program Proposal 1971 (formulated in 1969), p. 15.

<sup>27</sup> Nijmegen had requested a guest professorship for Heinrich A. Rommen, who held a position at that time at a catholic college. He was seen as not good enough, though, by the BFS, until he was appointed professor at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C, a bulwark of American Thomist-Aristotelism. With this university a relation of cooperation was established. In 1958-59 Karl H. Cerny held a guest professorship in Nijmegen, whereas in 1966-67 L. Schlichting held a similar position in Washington, D.C.

Rokkan carried out comparative research, that would win great fame, in political systems in the Smaller European Democracies Project.<sup>28</sup> Although very important founding work was done by him, Daalder was to concede all honors to Arend Lijphart for designing a theory on the 'consociational democracy', or 'the politics of accommodation'. A theory about minorities-democracy which would be seen as equivalent to the until then normative Anglo-American 'majority-democracy'.<sup>29</sup> Lijphart, who had studied under a Fulbright Scholarship in the 1955-56 season, wrote his dissertation in Berkeley and got his PhD in Yale in 1967. The following year he was appointed professor of international law at Leiden University, but soon, in the 'brain drain' period, he would accept a position in the US and would settle down there permanently. Daalder emphasized the international nature of the political sciences, but the development of a widely respected alternative for the Anglo-American model of Western democracy in a nation that never demonstrated very great interest in political theory and in political history was a great success, surely on a theoretical level. But it also assured a certain independency of Dutch scholarship with respect to American scholarship.<sup>30</sup> In the course of the years a lot of renowned American political scientists would come to lecture in Leiden and to cooperate in comparative research projects. Some American researchers and students, Herman van Gunsteren among them, would later on hold a professorship in Leiden.

From the end of the 1960s until the mid-1970s, Hans Daalder would welcome the American Fulbrighters and give a talk on 'Government and Political Life in the Netherlands'. That was the period in which the exchange of teachers and students almost completely fell apart. Partly because of the cuts since 1962 in the Fulbright Program, but most of all because of the War in Vietnam and the student movement. Participation in the Fulbright Program was not very attractive in those days, neither for Americans nor for citizens of the partner nations. In 1975 the American Galen Irwin, who at that time held a position as lecturer in Daalder's department, took over Daalder's task in welcoming American Fulbrighters.

---

<sup>28</sup> H. Daalder, 'The Netherlands: Opposition in a Segmented Society', in Robert Dahl ed., *Political Oppositions in Western democracies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966, pp. 188-236.

<sup>29</sup> H. Daalder, 'The consociational theme', [1974], in: *H. Daalder. Politiek en Historie*, edited by J.Th.J. van den Berg and B.A.G.M. Tromp. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 1990, pp. 362-377.

<sup>30</sup> The irony of destiny will that Lijphart developed his theory when the Pillarization of the Dutch society came to an end. However, the rationale and the importance of the consensual minorities-democracy was demonstrated.

### *American Political History*

In 1950, the board of the United States Educational Foundation-The Netherlands had discussed for the first time the state of affairs at the Dutch universities with respect to the development of Departments of American Studies.<sup>31</sup> Until then, the University of Amsterdam was the only Dutch university at which a course in Americana was given, and this was a social science course. The Amsterdam sociology was high-quality sociology, given as it was by Arie N.J. den Hollander, professor of sociology and director of the Amerika Instituut at the University of Amsterdam.<sup>32</sup> It was the USIA's ambition to get established a chair in American history and literature as well. It took until 1963 to realize this aim, when J.W. Schulte Nordholt was appointed associate professor and in 1966 as professor in the history and culture of North-America at Leiden University.

Characteristic for the image of America that existed in the 1950s in the Netherlands and, in a way, also characteristic for the Netherlands, was W.J. Schulte Nordholt's book *Het volk dat in duisternis wandelt: de geschiedenis van de negers in Amerika*, (A people walking in darkness: the history of the negroes in America), published in 1956.<sup>33</sup> Schulte Nordholt, history teacher, poet and psalmrymer, was stimulated to write this book by J. Presser, professor in modern history in Amsterdam and author of *Amerika*, a book that he wrote during the war and that was published in 1949. Granted a Fulbright scholarship, Schulte Nordholt had the opportunity to do research for his book at two 'traditionally black colleges': Howard University and Fisk University, and at the Vanderbilt University. The book was, as he says apologetically, not a sociological essay such as *The American Dilemma* by the Swedish scholar Gunnar Myrdal,<sup>34</sup> a book published in 1949, but a historical account; it was not a scientific enterprise, it had no

---

<sup>31</sup> USEF-N, Program Proposal 1952 (formulated in 1950).

<sup>32</sup> This Institute was established in 1947, at the same time as the Rusland Instituut (Sovjet Union Institute).

<sup>33</sup> J.W. Schulte Nordholt, *Het volk dat in duisternis wandelt: de geschiedenis van de negers in Amerika*. Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1956.

<sup>34</sup> In 1936 B.J.O. Schrieke, educated in orientalism and the highest official responsible for education in former Dutch India, had published a book *Alien Americans. A study of race relations*. (Viking Press, New York). He was invited by the American Julius Rosenwald Fund in the US to study 'Negro life and education, especially in the Southern states, on the basis of my extensive but quite different experience with education and race relations in the Orient'. This book drew far less attention than Myrdal's book. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma. The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper, 1944. H.W. van den Doel, P.C. Emmer and H.Ph. Vogel, *Nederland en de Nieuwe Wereld*. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1992, pp. 261-263.

footnotes, but the reader who was interested in the details could get the acknowledgments from the writer nonetheless. The history of the 'negroes' in America was the story of 'the tension between great dreams of human beings and bitter reality, of disappointments and possibilities, and finally of guilt and reconciliation'. When writing the book he often had the feeling that it dealt with all minorities, of whatever stigma. 'We from the Netherlands' appeared to be able to speak easily about these things, 'we comfortably and loudly tend to condemn those who discriminate'. However, 'if only we had ten percent negroes, we would have the same problem; anti-semitism that sometimes prevails here proves it.'<sup>35</sup> A rather daring statement for that period in Dutch history.

In the 1960s, the USIA paid special attention to Schulte Nordholt.

ISIS officers spent considerable time developing close personal contacts with Dr. Schulte-Nordholt because he is no doubt the single most important and influential person among the target audiences. He is the newly-installed lecturer in North American Culture at the University of Leiden; he has considerable influence in leftist intellectual circles; he was once considered the spokesman of neutralist-pacifist groups; he is very close to labor leaders and to the Protestant clergy. Until about a year ago, Dr. Schulte Nordholt was often extremely critical of the United States with regard to race relations and US defense policies. We gave him the material to re-study the progressive tradition in America as represented by Lincoln, Roosevelt, Kennedy and Johnson, and eventually interested him in coming to terms with the necessity for a strong Atlantic Community so that he is now a sympathetic interpreter of American history, present conditions and the 'strategy for peace'. Besides teaching courses in American history and literature at the university, he has published an anthology of U.S. historic writings and, at USIS's urging, has written a new Dutch language history of the U.S. In addition, he has written frequent positive articles on American political and cultural scenes and events for (...) the intellectual periodical *Wending*, the influential daily *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, and the otherwise left-wing intellectual weekly *Groene Amsterdammer*. (...) He has even drafted speeches for government ministers.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> J.W. Schulte Nordholt, *Het volk dat in duisternis wandelt*, p. 10.

<sup>36</sup> NARA, Suitland, 306 68A 4933, USIS/The Hague to USIA Washington, Country Assessment Report, Febr. 1, 1965, pp. 1-2.

From 1973 onwards, the Humanities project included American Studies and Dutch Studies: 'to further the study of civilization aspects of either country through literature, history, social studies, art and philosophy'. This new definition of reciprocity and equivalence reflected the change in the formal relationship between the two nations with respect to the Fulbright Program, a change that took place in all European countries. From 1972 onwards, the Dutch government contributed financially to the program equivalent to the American government.<sup>37</sup> The USEF-N was renamed the Netherlands America Commission for Educational Exchange (NACEE) and the composition of the Commission also changed. From then on the Commission had two honorary presidents, not only the American Ambassador, but also the Dutch Minister of Education; the Commission had as many American as Dutch members. Furthermore, a Dutch professor was always included in the American delegation.<sup>38</sup> These events coincided - not accidentally - with the 25th anniversary of the Fulbright Program.

Historically speaking, it is a contingency that the year in which the Fulbright Program became 'binational' fell in the period that was the all-time low in the relations between the United States and the Netherlands. The political relations between the two nations were not good in the 1970s and at home the American administration had to face strong opposition too. The student exchange suffered the most from these conditions. Whereas in the period 1950-59 yearly on average 61 Dutch students (among whom 21 women) went to the US, and in the 1960-67 period 48 (among whom 15 women), in the 68-75 period the number went down to 33, among whom 7 women.

In the 1970s in the Humanities Project all attention was diverted to the preparations for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution in 1976, and of the diplomatic ties between the Netherlands and the new Republic in 1982. The French Fulbright Commission proposed in 1972 a multinational project, in which predominantly European(!) specialists would do research

---

<sup>37</sup> The budget was back on the nominal level of the first years (US\$ 250,000), but the costs of living had raised very strongly in the mean time.

<sup>38</sup> The first commission composed according to the new procedures had as American members: the Cultural Affairs Officer of the American Embassy (USIA), the American Consul General, the managing director of Chevron Nederland, the European manager of Continental Carbon Company in The Hague, and H. Wijnberg, professor in organic chemistry in Groningen. The Dutch members were: F.A.M. Alting van Geusau, professor in the law of international organization in Tilburg, J. Bruyn, Amsterdam professor in art history, J.M.G. Thurlings, Nijmeegs professor in empirical sociology, H.A.J.M. Vrijhoef, Head of the Department International Relations of the Ministry of Education, and J.J.N. Rost Onnes, Head director of Algemene Bank Nederland.

in US into the mutual influences between the US and the other nations at the time of the American Revolution. The Netherlands had an important part to play in this project, in particular in the after effects of the Revolution and as it had been one of the first nations to have acknowledged the American Republic and to establish diplomatic ties with it. In 1973, the Fulbright Commission in the Netherlands initiated a project on the occasion of the bicentennial of these diplomatic ties.<sup>39</sup> The Leiden professor J.W. Schulte Nordholt as a Dutch specialist in American history was to head the Dutch part of the project.<sup>40</sup>

The Vietnam War and the new social movements led to a thorough rethinking of American society and of the role America had to play in the world. This time it was America itself that needed reorientation. The commemoration of the American Revolution was dominated by this issue. Improving the reciprocal relationship and strengthening the Atlantic Alliance demanded reciprocal serious study of each other's society. In this period, the Fulbright Commission defined the equivalence of the two nations in terms of 'common roots' and 'shared values' of the Dutch and American civilization as well as their distinguishable characteristics and achievements.

The Bicentennial led to a reappraisal of the American revolution compared with the French Revolution and in this context also of the Dutch so-called Batavian Revolution, that had followed the American but had preceded the French Revolution. Simon Schama, educated at Cambridge and professor at Harvard at the Center for European Studies, published his book about the *Revolution in the Netherlands 1710-1813: Patriots and Liberators* in 1977.<sup>41</sup> This book was criticized by Dutch historians in a somewhat irritated way, but they overlooked Schama's intention to demonstrate the independent significance of the Dutch revolution - which in his view was a lot more and lasted far longer than the short Batavian upheaval- against the background of shifts in world-political relationships. With his book, Schama disputed the dominant underrating of the Batavian revolution (and of the American) and the overrating of

---

<sup>39</sup> The Netherlands America Commission for Educational Exchange (NACEE), Annual Program Proposal for the Program Year 1975 (formulated in 1973).

<sup>40</sup> Schulte Nordholt made his entree in the Fulbright Board in 1977 and would remain a member until his retirement, in 1983, the year of the U.S. Bicentennial.

<sup>41</sup> Simon Schama, *Patriots and Liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands 1780-1813*. New York: HarperCollins, 1977.

French history. In the trail of R.R. Palmer and Jacques Godechot<sup>42</sup>, he regarded the Dutch revolution as taking part in the 'Atlantic revolution'.

As preparation for the Bicentennial, Schulte Nordholt published his *Voorbeeld in de Verte. De invloed van de Amerikaanse Revolutie in Nederland* (Distant Example. The Influence of the American Revolution in the Netherlands) in 1979.<sup>43</sup> The title not coincidentally bears strong reminiscences of Annie Romein's *Vaderland in de verte* (Distant Fatherland)<sup>44</sup>, her historical novel on Hugo de Groot, the exile in Paris, for whom the 'vaderland in de verte' the dream was of peace on earth, and of a peace-loving, religious conflict-avoiding nation. The American revolution had been a relatively peaceful revolution. A couple of years earlier, in 1971, Schulte Nordholt in *De Negerrevolutie in Amerika* (The Negro Revolution in America) had indicated that, in his view, the destiny of mankind was in the hands of American history. Now he attempted to demonstrate that the influence of the American revolution on the events in the Patriotic period were of the greatest significance. On the occasion of the commemoration of the French Revolution he would return to that issue once again.<sup>45</sup>

In 1982 the 'bicentennial of Dutch-American diplomatic relations' was commemorated, prepared as it was since 1975 by Schulte Nordholt. On this occasion a book was published, edited by him and his American colleague Robert P. Swieringa of Kent State University.<sup>46</sup>

The period in which political science and political history stood central in the Fulbright Program and also in its American Studies Projects was ended by the commemoration of the bicentennial of the US Constitution, to which two remarkable publications were devoted.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Jacques Godechot, *La grande nation, L'expansion révolutionnaire de la France dans le monde, 1789-1799*. Paris, 1956; R.R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959-1964.

<sup>43</sup> J.W. Schulte Nordholt, *Voorbeeld in de Verte. De invloed van de Amerikaanse revolutie in Nederland*. Baarn, 1979.

<sup>44</sup> Annie Romein, *Vaderland in de verte*. Nijmegen: Thieme, 1948.

<sup>45</sup> J.W. Schulte Nordholt, 'Het tertium comparationis - De Nederlandse Revolutie tussen de Amerikaanse en de Franse in', in: S.W. Couwenberg (red.), *Opstand der Burgers*. Kampen: Kok, 1988, pp. 53-66.

<sup>46</sup> *A Bilateral Bicentennial*, edited by J.W. Schulte Nordholt & R.P. Swieringa. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, 1982. Swieringa would continue his research in 1984 under a Fulbright scholarship in Leiden.

<sup>47</sup> *The early republic: the making of a nation - The making of a culture*, edited by Steve Ickrigill. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1988; *The US constitution: after 200 years*, edited by Rob Kroes and Eduard van de Bilt. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1988. An earlier volume about political and social problems should also be mentioned: *Neo-conservatism: Its Emergence in the USA and Europe*, edited by Rob Kroes and Maarten van Rossum. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1984

### *The Culturalization of American Studies*

In the course of 1983, the Fulbright Program in the Netherlands was evaluated rather thoroughly in Washington, D.C. In the background were the political problems associated with the stationing of cruise-missiles on Dutch soil. In 1981 and 1983, mass protest had risen up against this policy, a protest that would have its climax in 1985 with the largest peace movement demonstration ever in the Netherlands. The once so loyal ally had become a risk factor and 'Hollanditis', as Walter Laqueur called the events in 1981, became a threat for other NATO-partners.<sup>48</sup>

The American response to this situation was, among other things, a cultural diplomacy offensive in the form of the Fulbright Program. A whole series of distinguished chairs in American Studies were established; in 1983 the ('prestigious') John Adams Chair in American Civilization, for American scholars teaching American history, social sciences, foreign policy, economy and government at Dutch universities. A couple of years later, the Walt Whitman Chair (in intellectual history, literature, civilization and the arts) was established and in 1990, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Thomas Jefferson Chair for a 'junior scholar'.

The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) had since the 1970s stimulated American Studies in the Netherlands by providing one or two scholarships per year for Dutch academics to carry out advanced research at an American university in American Studies. These scholarships are financed cooperatively by the NACEE and the Ford and Mellon Foundations. Besides the ACLS American Studies scholarship for American Studies in the US for a Dutch scholar, in 1985, on the occasion of 40th anniversary of the Fulbright Program, an even more 'prestigious' Grotius Visiting Fellowship was instituted for research in the US that would be of interest for Europe as well as for the US.

Most important was the shift in the content of the programs, conferences and publications of the Departments of American Studies. The programs were what could be called *culturalized and depoliticized*. Strong empirical evidence for this thesis can be given by the contents of the NASA-conferences and the series of NASA books since 1985. The subjects are: cultural change in the US, apocalyptic imagination, anti-americanism, American photographs in Europe,

---

<sup>48</sup> Walter Laqueur, 'Hollanditis. A new stage in European neutralism', *Commentary*, Vol.72, No.2 (August 1981), pp. 19-26.

Hollywood in Europe, consumption and American Culture, small-national cultures vis-à-vis in the US, American culture in the Netherlands, American modernism, multiculturalism, 'writing' nation and 'writing' region in America, connecting cultures, cultural transmissions and receptions, and, most recently, beat culture and beyond. Apparently, after the Vietnam period and the early 1980s crisis, American Studies and its scholars and students have turned away from political and social problems. This is not a typical Dutch phenomenon, neither for Dutch historians nor for Dutch sociologists nor for other political and social scientists. It is a general trend, both in the United States and in Europe. Recently, Steven Brint and Russell Jacoby<sup>49</sup> demonstrated that American intellectuals, lacking ideals, have been turning away from debating publicly political and social issues ever since the early 1980s and have been advertising themselves as experts on a cultural terrain (art, religion, literature and science), that is growingly dominated by capitalist market forces. The debate about politics and society has been seriously impoverished. This trend is reflected in the 1980s and 1990s discussion of the possibility of bringing the Fulbright Program under the auspices of The Smithonians (recently, the Program was relocated to where it started, in the State Department).

### ***Conclusion***

The culturalization of American Studies implicates that *differences* between the nations and within nations are emphasized over and over again. These studies are, at best, fascinating, but they do not have the surplus or added value of *integrative* political studies. I would like to plea strongly for *repoliticizing* of the projects. Political and social issues and shared political and social interests should be the focus of the program. A research program should be formulated not in dividing cultural but in *integrating* political and social terms, including social and political history.

One of the current central issues is the political integration of Europe; a monetary union, let alone an independent European Defense and Security System, cannot be reliable and effective,

---

<sup>49</sup> Steven Brint, *In an Age of Experts. The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. E.g. Russell Jacoby, *The Last Intellectuals. American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books, 1987; Christopher Lasch, *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995.

unless it is based upon a proper, supranational, balanced, European democracy. In a Towards a European Constitution Fulbright Project historians, political philosophers as well as social scientists might design the most appropriate form of constitution and democracy for a larger Europe.<sup>50</sup> Small-nations-minorities democracies such as the Netherlands with its Poldermodel of consensus politics and its long tradition of international law and arbitration, can set an example for the construction of such a genuine European political system.

A Post-Communism Project could challenge Dutch scholars and students to join American and British colleagues who are supporting the rise of democracy in East European Countries. Unfortunately, after WWII, in contrast with Anglo-American policy, Dutch academics turned their back on Germany and on German scholars and did virtually nothing to help the German nation to rebuild its democracy and its scholarship.<sup>51</sup> With communism defeated, the Dutch people should not make the same mistake, but do what it is able to do by helping the former Communist countries in building up their democracy. In the long run, exchange of scholars and students is one of the most important means in building up mutual trust and respect, in particular when scholarships are granted for a minimal stay of six months.

Finally, a shared Fulbright interest is the problem of immigration, including the history of slavery and colonization. Academic exchange is the major cement of the formation of transnational societies, beyond provincialism, nationalism and ethnicism. The Fulbright Program is an ideal context for interdisciplinary projects aimed at defining forms of transnationalism<sup>52</sup> and its corresponding citizenship, as a Re-Enlightenment Project for the next century.

---

<sup>50</sup> David Held, *Models of Democracy*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1987; John Dunn, *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

<sup>51</sup> See Jan C.C. Rupp, *Van oude en nieuwe universiteiten. De verdringing van Duitse door Amerikaanse invloeden op de wetenschapsbeoefening en het hoger onderwijs in Nederland, 1945-1995*. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgeverij, 1997; from the same author: 'Nederland worstelt met kwaad oorlogsgeweten', *Trouw*, 1 mei 1998, p. 11.

<sup>52</sup> David A. Hollinger, *Postethnic America. Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books, 1995; A. de Swaan, *Volgende les: de Amsterdamse sociale wetenschap na 50 jaar*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers, 1998.