CrossMark

Modern Intellectual History, 13, 2 (2016), pp. 507–523 © Cambridge University Press 2014
doi:10.1017/S1479244314000420

THE COLD WAR AS INTELLECTUAL FORCE FIELD

NILS GILMAN
Associate Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley
E-mail: nils_gilman@berkeley.edu

One of the most vibrant subfields of American intellectual history over the last fifteen years has been the history of the social sciences during the late twentieth century, a period when the size and quality of American social-scientific output grew explosively. Given that the major historiographic push to historicize this period of social science began in the 1990s, in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the declaration by some Americans of Cold War victory, it was perhaps inevitable that the geopolitics of the Cold War emerged as a major tool for accounting for what was distinct about the social science and broader culture of the postwar period. After all, wasn't it obvious that what made the 1990s different from the decades that came before it was the fact that the Cold War was over? And wasn't it further obvious that the bipolar geopolitics and nuclear night terrors of the Cold War had deformed everything they touched, not least the work of American social scientists? One marker of this obviousness was the transformation of the term "Cold War" from a noun describing (perhaps already too vaguely) a particular sort of geopolitical struggle into an adjective that could explain all sorts of extra-geopolitical activity.[1] By the turn of the century this adjectivalization of the Cold War had become something of a historiographic cliché, a blunt (if not lazy) way to historicize our immediate forebears. When John Lewis Gaddis chose to title his "rethink" of Cold War history *Now We Know*, he didn't even need to add *Better*.

[1] Although the term "Cold War" was used as an adjective in the early 1950s, it did not become common academic usage until the 1990s. Some early titles include Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley, 1997); and David H. Price, "Cold War Anthropology: Collaborators and Victims of the National Security State," *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 4/3–4 (1998), 389–430. Also notable in the linguistic shift was Hanna Holborn Gray's review of Andre Schiffrin's *The Cold War and the University* (1997) in *Foreign Affairs*, which performed the precise linguistic shift in its title: "Cold war Universities: Tools of Power or Oases of Freedom?"

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

More recently, however, some scholars have begun to question the causal weight that this first generation of scholarship ascribed to the Cold War in explaining the peculiarities of postwar American social science.[2] The implicit periodization provided by the moniker Cold War has become dubious in the face of sustained historical scrutiny: 1945 and 1989 may have seemed like obvious world-historical breaks to those who lived through them, but given enough historians and enough time, it would seem that even revolutions have a tendency to be replaced by an endless tyranny of historiographic continuity. As a result, many of the particular intellectual and cultural practices of the 1950s through 1980s that fifteen years ago might have been reflexively ascribed to the exigencies of the Cold War have now been traced to the 1930s or earlier, or have turned out to continue into the present day. All of this has led to more and more vocal questioning of the purported effects that the Cold War may have had on American intellectual life.

For scholars inclined to demand greater precision about the supposed explanatory value of the Cold War, two central questions stand out. The first has to do with the periodization of the phenomenon known as the Cold War: how and when did it begin, what were its essential features, when did it reach its zenith, and what were the circumstances of its resolution? The second has to with how the Cold War (however periodized) ramified out from the political and ideological struggle between politicians in Moscow and Washington to affect broader cultural and intellectual phenomena, in particular social science in the United States. It is in this historiographic context that we should read two first-rate collections of essays on the US experience of the Cold War, Joel Isaac and Duncan Bell's *Uncertain Empire: American History and the Idea of the Cold War* (hereafter *UE*) and Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens's *Cold War Social Science* (hereafter *CWSS*), which together bring together contributions from virtually all of the most important current historians of postwar American social science.[3] Surveying the results, what we see is that while these essays disagree about the periodization of the underlying geopolitical phenomenon of the Cold War, they evince a remarkable harmony concerning the salience of the Cold War in reshaping the social sciences in postwar America.[4] What I will

[2] David C. Engerman, "Social Science in the Cold War," *Isis*, 101/2 (2010), 393–400.

[3] Joel Isaac and Duncan Bell, eds., *Uncertain Empire: American History and the Idea of the Cold War* (New York, 2012); and and Hamilton Cravens, eds., *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature* (New York, 2012).

[4] This is all the more remarkable given many of the contributors are drawing their chapters from larger monographic projects, including Hunter Crowther-Heyck, *Herbert A. Simon: The Bounds of Reason in Modern America* (Baltimore, 2005); Howard Brick, *Transcending Capitalism: Visions of a New Society in Modern American Thought* (Ithaca, NY, 2006);

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attempt to do here is to lay out the broad contours of this emergent scholarly consensus.

I

The question of periodization is central to the quarrel between Anders Stephanson and Odd Arne Westad that opens *UE*. Building on his pathbreaking work in the 1980s and 1990s on the genealogy of the idea of "Cold War,"[5] Stephanson engages in a broad interrogation and indictment of the slipperiness of the term and the concomitant sloppiness with which it has been applied to refer to virtually all aspects of international relations between 1945 and 1989. This view, he suggests, buys into the narrative of the Cold War promoted by the Reagan administration (and John Lewis Gaddis[6]), which argued that the Cold War followed directly from the Second World War, as the US confronted a second aggressive totalitarian foe after the first. While partisans of this view concede that a feckless generation of US leaders lost sight of the essential implacability of communism during the period of détente in the 1960s and 1970s, once Reagan came into power with a determination to call a spade a spade, the rollback of the Soviet Union became the natural culmination of the decades-long heroic ideological struggle between good and evil.

For Stephenson, virtually every aspect of this orthodox narrative—which approximates how US politicians and the mainstream media today present the Cold War—is wrong. In the first place, Stephanson argues, the Cold War was not the result of Soviet aggression, but rather began in 1947 when Walter Lippmann popularized the term in a review of George Kennan's "X" article. To Stephanson, the Cold War was primarily a discursive weapon deployed by those who wished to "put the United States into the world once and for all" and to "stamp out once and for all any postwar tendencies to 'isolationist' reversal" (*UE*, 26, 34). In other words, the idea of the Cold War justified the need for the

David Engerman, *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (Oxford, 2009); Joel Isaac, *Working Knowledge: Making the Human Sciences from Parsons to Kuhn* (Cambridge, MA, 2012); Joy Rohde, *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research during the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY, 2013); Mark Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics–Patronage–Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2013); and Jamie Cohen-Cole, *The Open Mind: Cold War Politics and the Sciences of Human Nature* (Chicago, 2014).

5 Anders Stephanson, "Fourteen Notes on the Very Concept of the Cold War," *H-Diplo* (May 1996), 1–21.

6 Notably in John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York, 2006)—a book Tony Judt waspishly characterized as reading "like the ventriloquized autobiography of an Olympic champion."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

United States to continue and extend its internationalist engagements. Some of Stephanson's sharpest writing comes in his unpacking of the discursive nuances and subtleties that the metaphor of a "cold" war offered to its proponents (esp. *UE*, 23–6). "Domestically, the Cold War was an always already assumed structure of aggression imposed by totalitarian Moscow that worked magnificently to render virtually impossible any opposition to Washington's desire to act everywhere" (*UE*, 34). In this respect, what we have in Stephanson is a quite traditional revisionist account of the origins and responsibility for the Cold War: above all, it was "an American project."

Second, according to Stephenson, the Cold War was over by 1962 with the Cuban missile crisis and the Sino-Soviet split, both of which undermined the aggressively ideological position of the US. Nuclear weapons turned out to be "an ideology killer" both because the physical stakes they produced seemed higher than their ideological ones, and because the logic of nuclear deterrence theory had nothing to do with the ideological nature of the adversary. Likewise, the Sino-Soviet split put paid to the notion of an undifferentiated totalitarian communist adversary, and opened up opportunities for the diplomatic triangulation, multipolarity, and forging of complex interdependence which would mark the next period of international history. For Stephenson, Reagan's revivification of Cold War rhetoric in the 1980s was merely the twitching of a phantom ideological limb, and the collapse of the Soviet Union was not so much a "victory" for the United States as it was the final closure of the revolutionary "short twentieth century" which began in 1917.

This chronology, which Stephanson admits he has been promoting without much success since the 1980s, sets up a rather scathing critique of Westad's Bancroft Prize-winning *The Global Cold War*, one of the most widely read pieces of Cold War historiography of the last decade.[7] For Westad, the Cold War cannot be reduced to "an American project" for hegemony (though it was that), but rather is best seen as an ideological struggle between two competing visions of modernization—a liberal–capitalist version promoted by the United States and a communist version supported by the Soviets. These particular ideological stakes came into sharpest focus in the 1970s, which for Westad were neither an interregnum of détente (as the orthodox view has held) nor a "post-Cold War" world (as described in Stephanson's revisionism), but rather represented the moment when the locus of the Cold War struggle shifted from the global North to the global South (above all, Africa), which became the site of proxy wars and competing development projects meant to promote or showcase the virtues of various versions of modernization.

7 Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge, 2005).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For Stephanson, however, Westad's narrative makes the mistake of taking what was an after-the-fact sideshow to the real (postwar) Cold War and treating it as if it reveals the essence of the conflict. As Stephanson sees it, Soviet and US interventions in the global South in the 1970s were not about the Cold War in any ideologically specific sense, but rather represented a familiar sort of European great-power colonial rivalry, of the sort which began in the fifteenth century and reached an apotheosis during the nineteenth-century "Great Game" between Russia and Britain for hegemony in Central Asia (*UE*, 42). Although he admits that these interventions "would not have happened without the Cold War," Stephanson still insists that they "should not be conflated with it" (*UE*, 43). To Stephanson the Cold War was defined by a certain US way of representing the Soviet adversary, and in his opinion Westad's redirection of the historiographic gaze away from the West evacuates the Cold War of its essential political meaning, namely as an effort on the part of the United States to extend its postwar geopolitical hegemony. In sum, dislocating the Cold War from its North Atlantic origins has the effect of making it disappear.

Westad's brief riposte to Stephanson provides the basis for a debate that many of the subsequent chapters of *UE* furtively engage. He finds Stephanson's attempt to police the boundaries of what "counts" as the Cold War to be not just a reductionist manifestation of a reflexive leftism, but in fact at odds with the tradition of revisionist scholarship begun by William Appleman Williams and continued by scholars like Marilyn Young—much of which has taken a catholic view of the diverse ways and places in which US power has attempted over the years to manifest itself, as well as the myriad forms of resistance that these efforts have encountered. While Westad agrees that the early phase of the Cold War may well have been "an American project," this is no reason not to acknowledge that the Cold War continued albeit in a more complicated and ambiguous fashion in the decades that followed, with reverberations down to the present day. Westad argues that the US-centric view of the Cold War cannot be sustained: more geographically, temporally and topically pluralist understandings offer the best and perhaps only way to move past the ideological and political framings provided by the original Cold War actors themselves. At bottom, the debate between Stephanson and Westad is over the inner meaning of the Cold War. For Stephanson, it was primarily a political tool in a postwar domestic US foreign-policy debate, with little essential meaning outside that political context. For Westad, by contrast, the Cold War (at least by the 1970s) was in a fact a material struggle between competing technical visions of how to achieve prosperity and modernity.

As with most debates over periodization, this one is a question of emphasis and proportionality, to be resolved by how fellow historians vote with their historiographic feet. Based on these two volumes, Stephanson appears to have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

some support: of the twenty-five articles, at least fifteen focus primarily on the period from 1947 to 1962 (give or take a year on either end) that Stephanson suggests represents "the" Cold War. While few scholars appear prepared to support the absolutism of Stephanson's periodization, there does appear to exist a kind of de facto scholarly consensus—perhaps driven more by archival accessibility than by rigorous theorizing—that "the Long Fifties"[8] was somehow the "coldwarriest" phase of the longer and more complex phenomenon of the Cold War, understood in Westad's more capacious formulation. Thus, even if we agree with Westad that the Cold War came in a congeries of flavors over time and "had not one but many endings,"[9] it does seem clear that it was during this specific fifteen-or-so-year span that certain features of the Cold War as a historical episode reached their purest form.[10]

What were these key features of this "short Cold War"? It seems to me that three were elemental: (1) an unchecked nuclear arms race (with all the attendant technical, psychological, political, and strategic implications); (2) the binary logic of the US–Soviet geostrategic rivalry, which morphed from a primarily European duel to a global one; and (3) the ideological battle for the hearts and minds of people worldwide over whether authoritarian communism or liberal capitalism represented the preferable form of (modernist) political economy. All three of these elemental features produced their most unbridled forms during the period from 1947 to 1962, and all three began to abate in intensity thereafter. With the fright of 1962 Cuban missile crisis in front of mind, the nuclear arms race began to be tempered by a series of treaties, beginning with the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and

8 M. Keith Booker, *The Post-utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s* (Westport, CT, 2002).

9 Odd Arne Westad, "Beginnings of the End: How the Cold War Crumbled," in Silvio Pons and Federico Romero, eds., *Reinterpreting the End of the Cold War: Issues, Interpretations, Periodizations* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 68–81.

10 The most explicit supporter here of Westad's periodization is Philip Mirowski, who contributed essays to both volumes, and who, like many economics-centric historians, is suspicious of the tendency to make the Cold War the dominant motif of the postwar period. Mirowski argues that the central dividing line in postwar history was the replacement around 1980 of the Fordist social state by a globalizing neoliberal model of capital accumulation—which had a direct impact on the social sciences in that it led the Cold War-motivated state funding of the social science to be replaced "by the neoliberal system of patronage that fundamentally challenged many of the epistemological and political principles of Cold War-era science" (*UE* 10). This seems dubious: even if we agree that the best way to periodize the intellectual history of the social sciences is by following the money, funding models were already shifting by the late 1960s. On funding models see Solovey, *Shaky Foundations*, and Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York, 2012).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

building to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks later in the decade and through the 1970s.[11] Likewise, the binary logic of the US–Soviet geostrategic rivalry also began to abate in the early 1960s, above all because the Sino-Soviet split complicated the dualistic framing of the struggle, and accordingly because of the gradual emergence of détente.[12] Finally, the sharp demarcation of a difference between the two forms of political-economic organization also blurred as various scholars and politicians began to underscore the similarities between the two systems, as well as attempting to find alternative forms, whether in the form of "socialism with a human face" in Eastern Europe, social democracy in the West, or the various hybrid forms of economic governance devised and implemented by the postcolonial states achieving independence during this period.[13]

II

If there seems to be a rough consensus that the "purest" moment of the Cold War took place during (and indeed is central to the definition of) the Long Fifties, what then was the impact of the Cold War on the intellectual and cultural life of the United States during this period, and particularly on the social sciences? While it seems hard to disagree with Theodore Porter that "[s]ocial science from 1945 to the late 1960s seems very much bound up with the ideological and practical requirements of the Cold War" (*CWSS*, ix), what exactly does "bound up" mean? What were those "requirements"? (And who did the requiring?) To put it another way: to what extent did the US geopolitical rivalry with communism (of various sorts) actually *shape* particular kinds of social-scientific activity during this period, as opposed to merely providing an *idiom* for work that might have taken place otherwise? For Joel Isaac and Michael Solovey, the master metaphor for the impact of the Cold War is the tentative and complicated concept of "entanglement" (*CWSS*, 4, 5, 14, 15, 209, 267): in this formulation, the Cold War was not so much a determining (or overdetermining) element, dictating

[11] Vojtech Mastny, "The 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: A Missed Opportunity for Détente?" *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 10/1 (2008), 3–25.

[12] Odd Arne Westad, ed., *Brothers in Arms: The Rise and Fall of the Sino-Soviet Alliance, 1945–1963* (Stanford, 1998); R. Gerald Hughes, *Britain, Germany and the Cold War: The Search for a European Détente 1949–1967* (Oxford, 2007). For the periodization of détente see Maude Bracke, *Which Socialism, Whose Détente? West European Communism and the Czechoslovak Crisis of 1968* (Budapest, 2007), chap. 1; and Jussi M. Hanhimaki, *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War* (Washington, DC, 2013).

[13] Jeremi Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente* (Cambridge, MA, 2005); Wilfried Loth and George Soutou, eds., *The Making of Détente: Eastern Europe and Western Europe in the Cold War, 1965–75* (New York, 2007).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

outcomes and reactions, but rather represented a force field in which various possibilities for extending or resisting contemporaneous cultural, political, and socioeconomic power structures played out. Individual atoms might travel at seeming random through the space of the Cold War, yet the invisible force of the Cold War created field lines whose vectors define the topographic map of the intellectual and cultural life of the period.

The great value of these volumes rests on how they show the diversity of ways that this force field marked different US social scientists' work. The historiographic consensus appears to be that there were three basic ways (plus a fourth we'll come to) in which this force field shaped postwar social science:

- *First-order Cold War social science*. These were true "cold warrior social scientists" who worked on problems defined above as the elemental dimensions of the Cold War struggle, developing intellectual tools designed to help the United States in its struggle against the communist challenge. This would include work as varied as game theory at RAND and the modernization theories of Edward Shils, Lucian Pye and Walt Rostow, whose conceptualizations of "development" and "political culture" were weapons in the global struggle against communism.
- *Second-order Cold War social science*. This was social science that, while not directly involved with the core Cold War phenomena outlined above, can on substantive or methodological grounds be construed as resonating with the agenda of the Cold War as it was pursued in Washington. This includes everyone from fellow-travelling cold warriors, whose work was in some way (de)formed by and/or constructed in ways that supported the Cold War agenda, to scholarship that contributed to the broader "Cold War culture" of the time, for example by endorsing the repressive social and political tendencies of the period.
- *Third-order Cold War social science*. The most tenuous Cold War-related sort of social science consists of work that in some way arose as a result of the opportunities that the Cold War academy created, but that is not linked in a direct way to the ideological or political agenda of the Cold War.

This typology of Cold War social sciences suggests a kind of radiating effect, from a politically radioactive center, with some nearby fields and scholars clearly mutating as a result, and others, further afield from the core concerns of Cold War politicians and military planners, only lightly irradiated, with uncertain and at most mild effects, perhaps as attributable, or more so, to other epigenetic phenomena. This typology provides a useful way to sort the essays collected in these two volumes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

First-order Cold War social science

Across the two volumes, four essays in particular focus on social-scientific work that would not have taken the shape it did absent the Cold War. The first of these is David Engerman's essay on Harvard's Russian Refugee Interview Project. As the Cold War flowered in the late 1940s, the Department of Defense (DoD) became desperate for any and all the information it could get on how the Russians saw the world. To this end, the DoD engaged Harvard anthropologist and Department of Social Relations cofounder Clyde Kluckhohn and the Russian Research Center to canvass the ideas and opinions of hundreds of émigrés from Russia, which were synthesized in elaborate public reports. While the interest in the topic and the generous funding for this work was clearly "of" the Cold War, Engerman resists the claim that this meant that the US military was imposing its agenda on the academics. On the contrary, Engerman suggests, "The Refugee Interview Project reveals the 'academicization' of military life as much as it does the 'militarization' of academic life" (*CWSS*, 31): "Kluckhohn and his staff did not imagine government work as presenting any challenge to academic autonomy" (*CWSS*, 32). This was true, in the main, because the participating social scientists largely agreed with the anticommunist agenda of the US military and political establishment. Where conflicts did arise, Engerman shows, it was not so much between Kluckhohn and his military clients as it was among various factions in Washington—some of whom saw value in what the academics were producing, while others believed the hiring of college professors to be a waste of taxpayer money in both principle and practice. It was these intra-governmental disputes that led to the eventual withdrawal of DoD funding for the program in the mid-1950s.

The human aspect of military technology is another case where social science was brought to bear on elemental Cold War concerns. In his *CWSS* essay "Maintaining Humans," Edward Jones-Imhotep shows that a "reliability crisis" in the electronic systems for Cold War-related weapons systems generated an intense and anxious focus by industrial sociologists and technologists on the figure of the maintenance technician. Technological failure became seen as a problem not just of machines, but of the limits of the men administering the machines. Like Jones-Imhotep, Sharon Ghamari-Tabrizi is interested in how the Cold War affected the engineers and human operators involved in an elemental aspect of the Cold War effort, and specifically how those involved in manning postwar air defenses found their cognitive and perceptual apparatus reoriented to deal with the peculiar and novel stresses and requirements of preparing for nuclear Armageddon. Fixed in a state of "anxious vigilance" (*UE*, 274), atomic warriors had to be able to deal with the mind-numbing boredom of endlessly doing nothing while at the same time remaining prepared at a moment's notice

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to follow orders that would bring human civilization to an end. Building a continent-wide air defense system capable of performing such a task required the production and testing of closely coupled "man–machine systems" in which human performance could be tracked and tested down to the most minute details—work that was undertaken at the System Research Laboratory of the RAND Corporation, rather than in the psychology or engineering departments of universities.

The focus of Joy Rohde's essay for *CWSS* is the Special Operations Research Office (SORO), a DoD-funded think tank established in 1956 at American University that sought to illuminate the complex social processes involved in the creation of stable, democratic nations through any means necessary, including everything from rural and community development schemes to psychological warfare and counterinsurgency programs. For Rohde, SORO was exemplar of what she calls "the gray area" that emerged during the Cold War,

> a growing network of government research institutes, think tanks, and research consulting firms that fed off the Cold War national security budget. The landscape of the gray area included Pentagon-supported, quasi-academic institutes such as RAND; private, nonprofit research offices such as Herman Kahn's Hudson Institute; and for-profit research corporations that competed for government contracts, such as Ithiel de Sola Pool's Simulmatics Corporation. (*CWSS*, 141)

SORO's in-the-shadows role would burst into the public eye in 1965 when it was revealed to be at the center of Project Camelot, a proposal to study sources of social instability in Latin America with a view to countering demands for radical reforms. While this sort of project might have been uncontroversial five years earlier, with the heating up of the Vietnam War such academic–military collaboration was soon represented as a kind of suborned espionage and as such in violation of academic ethics. Amid a storm of public controversy, American University was forced to divest from SORO, which chose to incorporate instead as an independent research outfit. While Rohde is quick to side with those who would condemn such collaborations, the real value of her work is to show that while the attack on social scientists' collaboration with the national security state was effective in driving such collaboration off-campus, it did nothing to end the actual work. All it did was move the site of this collaboration from the "gray" to the "black" zones, where even less oversight was possible. "By the early 1970s," she concludes, "the knowledge that the national security state used for decision-making was not less but more opaque" (*CWSS*, 148).

Second-order Cold War social science

The second category of Cold War social science outlined in these books includes work that, while not directly addressing the core dimensions of the Cold War, as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the first-order Cold War social science, was in more indirect ways related to the broader "Cold War culture" of the period. For example, Marga Vicedo takes on the vexed contemporaneous views of maternal love. While she admits that these ideas were not "generated or caused in a direct way by the Cold War," she nonetheless insists that "the ideological and social conditions associated with the Cold War provided the framework within which specific views about the role of emotions in personality formation, including mother love and love for mother, could flourish" (*CWSS*, 234). Interestingly, her exemplary form of Cold War maternalism was not the one expressed by the ardent anticommunist Philip Wylie, whose *Generation of Vipers* (1942) had excoriated the smothering "momism" that he said curtailed sons' masculinity, and who after the war would attack anyone who disagreed with him as a covert Red. Instead, Vicedo considers the paradigmatic form of Cold War maternalism to be the "functionalism" that emerged in the 1950s that urged a more caring and affective relationship between mothers and children. According to Vicedo, this naturalization of the mother–child dyad "resonated deeply with Cold War concerns about the importance of recognizing the power of socialization, while also assuming natural boundaries that would defeat Socialist or Communist beliefs about the complete modifiability of human nature" (*CWSS*, 244). From this perspective, Margaret Mead's *Childhood in Contemporary Culture*, while more "liberal" than Wylie's anti-momism, continued the same naturalization, with all its attendant repressions. As Vicedo concludes,

> Establishing international supremacy seemed to depend upon the erection of an internal social order that would assure stable citizens capable of withstanding the lure of communism and subversive ideas ... The construction of a nexus between mother love, emotional maturity, and the stability of a democratic order was a Cold War affair. (*CWSS*, 245)

A more ambiguous case is proposed by Kaya Tolon's "Future Studies: A New Social Science Rooted in Cold War Strategic Thinking" in *CWSS*, which addresses the postwar rise of futurism and scenario planning. The latter began as an exemplary form of first-order Cold War social science, as a game-theoretical tool developed by Hermann Kahn at RAND for "thinking the unthinkable" concerning how nuclear war could come about and play out. By the 1960s, however, futurism had moved beyond (if not quite transcended) these origins, as futurists focused on social, economic and environmental problems with little, if any, apparent connection to the Cold War. Although Tolon does not discuss this, futurism eventually would exercise its greatest influence not among military war-gamers but in the space of corporate planning. Led by the French polymath Pierre Wack, an oil executive at Royal Dutch Shell, corporate scenario planning would marry the Cold War-inspired methods of RAND to the mysticism Wack

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had learned during World War II in Paris at the foot of the Greco-Armenian philosopher Georges Gurdjieff,[14] producing an interdisciplinary foresight method which continues to be used in corporate circles down to the present day.[15]

Those who focus on second-order Cold War social science tend to emphasize not just the longer aftermaths of these ideas, but also the deeper historical antecedents. For example, in *CWSS*, Hamilton Cravens emphasizes that the contours of postwar social science were cast during the interwar period, rather than being the exclusive result of the Cold War. First, the professionalization of social science was completed during the interwar years, with the academy emerging as the central site for social criticism and the development of reformist ideas. Second, the lineaments of the behavioral revolution were laid down in a variety of disciplines in the 1930s—with many disciplines focusing on measuring human behavior under defined circumstances, from psychologists like Clark Hull and John Dollard, to economists like Wesley Mitchell and Simon Kuznets, to political scientists like Charles Merriam and Harold Lasswell. Third, the shift in conceptualization of the relationship between the individual and the group that became dominant after the war was already coming into its own during the interwar period; that is, the rise of the concept of "systems," in which both nature and society were conceived of as a set of hierarchical, interconnected networks of relative rather than absolute relationships. Finally, the quantitative turn, which would become so dominant after the war, was already on the horizon before the war, not just in the survey research work being pioneered by Paul Lazarsfeld at the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia, but also in the increasing mathematization of economics.[16] What World War II added was a collaborative ethos, as well as "an engineering, problem-solving mentality" (*CWSS*, 123) that

[14] On the interwar mystic roots of corporate scenario planning see Art Kleiner, *Age of Heretics: A History of the Radical Thinkers Who Reinvented Corporate Management* (San Francisco, 2008).

[15] Celeste Amorim Varum and Carla Melo, "Directions in Scenario Planning Literature: A Review of the Past Decades," *Futures*, 42/4 (2010), 355–69. See also Alex Soojung-Kim Pang, "Global Scenarios: Their Current State and Future" (2011) – a paper (perhaps tellingly?) prepared for the US Naval Postgraduate School.

[16] Although Hunter Heyck's essay in *CWSS* explains how certain postwar social scientists (especially economists), led by Herbert Simon, came to adopt a view of humans as reduced to their function as "choosers," one thing that's missing from these volumes is a serious account of what was arguably the single most important process in postwar social science, namely the ascension to hegemony of economics. The final triumph of neoclassical economics over institutional economics took place during this period, in ways that Mirowski and Amadae have shown were closely linked (in the first order) to the Cold War: S. M. Amadae, *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy* (Chicago, 2003); and Philip Mirowski, *Machine Dreams: Economics Becomes a Cyborg Science* (Cambridge, 2002).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

displaced speculations about the nature of and possibilities for what Walter Lippmann had called, in a tellingly prewar title, *The Good Society* (1937).

Joel Isaac's contribution to *CWSS* drills into one of Cravens's foci, asking how "small group interactions" emerged as a unifying master concept for the postwar behavioral sciences. For Isaac, as for Cravens, this shared focus was not a product of the Cold War per se, but rather an outgrowth of the search for a metalanguage that could underpin a universal social science: "One of the convictions that animated social scientists of the postwar era was the belief that a general theory or 'conceptual scheme' would unify the constituent disciplines of the behavioral sciences" (*CWSS*, 81). Small group interactions were an excellent focus for such an ambition, because they could be observed in multiple settings, both in the wild and in the lab, and permitted a kind of technical precision in description that larger metacategories did not. Isaac shows how this effort to shoehorn specific instances into various small group "ideal types" led to the proliferation of elaborate charts, tables, and models that aimed to identify precise and generalizable observations. The result, however, was to redirect the social-scientific inquiry away from questions which had been the bread and butter of more critical forms of social research. While this might seem to confirm clichés about this period's uncritical and conformist style of social science, Isaac demurs, suggesting instead that this drive toward formalism represented the development of epistemological trends that were already gestating before the war, and which had been brought into focus by the experiences of collaborative social-scientific work during the war. However, it also seems reasonable to believe that the postwar growth in popularity of this sort of methodological formalism owed more than a little to the subtle support it gave to mainstream Cold War political views.

Third-order Cold War social science

Similarly skeptical about the causal impact of the Cold War on the social scientists he looks at is Michael Bycroft, whose essay in *CWSS* examines the rise of the field of "creativity" research among postwar psychological researchers. The primary motivation, by all indications, was a backlash of cognitive psychologists led by the likes of Jerome Bruner, Allen Newell and Herbert Simon against the behaviorism of B. F. Skinner. The former saw the Skinner as having a reduced the humans to engines responding to external stimuli, whereas they were concerned with how the human mind solved problems that in their view were rooted in a fundamental creativity, such as language acquisition. Among these cognitive psychologists, there developed two camps, humanists and instrumentalists: the former "treated creativity as an end in itself and a solution to social and psychological problems" whereas the latter "treated it as a means to an end and a solution to problems in education and industry" (*CWSS*, 203). Both devised tests to see whether people

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were creative. Humanists like Frank Barron did so in order to assess whether people had a "tolerance for ambiguity" and thus made good democrats; the instrumentalists created tests to identify people who would be original thinkers for government and industry. To what extent was any of this psychological research related to the Cold War? Bycroft doubts whether it is possible "to read Cold War cultural narratives into" these tests (*CWSS*, 208). Yes, "Cold War concerns may have directly motivated creativity researchers to apply [factor analysis] to creative traits," but Bycroft regards it as useless to try to identify "Cold War-specific political assumptions behind a test in which subjects are asked to name as many uses as possible for a brick, or to list as many words as possible starting with 'e'" (*CWSS*, 209). At the end of the day, they were developing a generalized science of creativity, and the Cold War was mere distant background for the development of these ideas.

For social-science fields and topics that cannot be linked to the ideological or political agenda of the political architects of the Cold War, perhaps all that can be said with confidence about the relation of this work to the Cold War is that it was made possible by the funding-related opportunities that the Cold War afforded. But even in such cases, it's not easy to separate out the impact of the Cold War from other factors. As Philip Mirowski points out, Cold War funding largess "should be situated firmly within the boundaries of World War II, due to the unprecedented incursion of military funding and organization into knowledge production" (*CWSS*, 65): it is difficult (and perhaps pointless) to disentangle which social-scientific practices were outgrowths of phenomena that began during World War II and which were autonomous effects created by the geopolitical circumstances of the Cold War. Still, there is no question that the Cold War helped to justify the funding of a great deal of social-scientific research which at minimum would have developed more slowly absent federal dollars. This impact affected even work with no discernible connection to the Cold War.

The enabling impact of DoD money on Noam Chomsky's early work, as Janet Marten-Neilsen's piece in *CWSS* points out, is exemplary in this respect. Chomsky would, of course, emerge as perhaps the most prominent public critic of first-order Cold War social science,[17] and of US foreign policy during the last third of the twentieth century more generally, but he was always forthright about how his early work was funded by the DoD, which in the 1950s was interested in basic linguistics and computer science research which it hoped would enable the creations of automated translation machines, which it hoped in turn would

[17] Most notably with the period-defining essay "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," *New York Review of Books*, 23 Feb. 1967; as well as "Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship," originally delivered as a lecture in 1968 and then published in *American Power and the New Mandarins* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), 23–158.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make it easier to track the scientific publications of East German and Russian adversaries. Chomsky was more than happy to take the government money, and used it to develop a linguistic theory that would survive the Cold War (and which turned out, perhaps unintentionally, though no doubt happily from Chomsky's point of view, to be useless to the US military). In the late 1960s this military patronage declined, and much more funding began to come from the National Sciences Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, but there is no evidence presented here that this shift in patronage shaped the content of the research being conducted by US social scientists.

Counter-Cold War social science

Finally, a fourth category of "Cold War social science" exists, which should more properly be called "counter-Cold War social science"; that is, social science that explicitly challenged the premises and presuppositions of the Cold War. As Daniel Matlin points out in his survey of postwar black intellectual life in *UE*, it is impossible to read postwar African American intellectual history as an instance of "Cold War determinism." Far from replicating the Cold War terms that cast America as a force for good in the face of the communist evil, black intellectuals like Ralph Ellison or Albert Murray interrogated the complacencies of postwar liberalism, and later radical black intellectuals such as Amiri Baraka would offer a frontal assault on America's Cold War project as nothing more than an extension of its domestic history of racial oppression.

A great value of Solovey and Isaac's collection is that it does not eschew focusing on such "counter-Cold War" figures—notably Nadine Weidman's excellent essay on Ashley Montagu, whose career as an academic anthropologist was derailed by the McCarthy hearings, but who then reinvented himself as a public intellectual who preached the peace-loving nature of man, while describing women as superior bearers of this essential human quality.[18] Beyond Montagu, many other "Long Fifties" social researchers engaged in empirical and theoretical work that was critical of the normative and epistemic pressures of first- and second-order Cold War social science. Some mentioned in passing in these volumes include Karl Polanyi, Robert Redfield, Marshall Sahlins, Noam Chomsky, William Appleman Williams and Immanuel Wallerstein, not to mention others such as C. Wright Mills, Paul Goodman, Alvin Gouldner, William Whyte, or Paul Baran: all doing high-quality social science during the Cold War that was actively critical of "Cold War social science." That these scholars were able to build careers despite standing

[18] On the Cold War and Montagu see also Susan Sperling, "Ashley's Ghost: McCarthyism, Science, and Human Nature," in Dustin Wax, ed., *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War: The Influence of Foundations, McCarthyism and the CIA* (Ann Arbor, 2008), 17–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

against the normative order of the Cold War not only shows the limits of the hegemony of that order, but also signals the moral failings of those who chose, voluntarily, to use their careers to support that order, both in its support for US power abroad and in its validation of a personally conservative, politically gradualist liberalism at home. Resisting the pressures of the Cold War entailed career risks, but it was no death sentence: it seems fair, then, to suggest that the willingness to question Cold War social-science nostrums is a measure both of contemporary scholars' intellectual independence and of their moral and political courage. Options other than collaboration were in fact available.

Howard Brick's essay in *CWSS* focuses on some of the scholars who took up such options. Brick rightly points out that the "familiar story" of Rostovian modernization theory as the dominant mode of neo-evolutionary thinking in the postwar period has tended to overshadow the insights and legacy of neo-Marxist scholars like Eric Wolf and Sidney Mintz, who already in the 1950s were dissenting from modernization theory and in the 1960s would emerge as leaders of anti-Vietnam War "teach-ins." The alternative historical narratives proposed at these happenings didn't just spring out of thin air in 1965, but grew out of a systematic critique of the metahistorical world view offered by modernization theory. The University of Chicago's Robert Redfield, Michigan's Leslie White and Illinois's Julian Steward adopted many of the same binaries as modernization theory, but questioned the assumption that the displacement of "primitive" cultures in favor of urban and industrial ones represented an unalloyed good. Much of this theorizing was rooted in the long-term, collaborative research project in Puerto Rico that took place from the late 1940s through the early 1960s. These scholars understood very well the absurdity of defining Puerto Rico, which had been a dependency of the United States for half a century with innumerable links to the mainland, as a "traditional" society untouched by modernity. Formally, this work was a classic piece of big "Cold War social science": ambitious, collaborative, long-running, federally funded and led by charismatic intellectual leaders. But substantively and politically, these projects reached very different conclusions from those being arrived at by social scientists at MIT or in SORO, belying any easy link between "Cold War social-science methodology" and Cold War political ideology. By the 1960s, scholars like Eric Wolf were warning against the developmental models being offered by both the Soviets and the Americans. Though at this stage they didn't quite know what this alternative might be, many of these scholars, Brick suggests, "were assuming a 'Bandung' worldview, the notion of anticolonial rebellion as an independent, almost 'third camp' position in world politics" (*CWSS*, 165). This work would culminate in Immanuel Wallerstein's world systems theory, which itself was emblematic of what Brick calls the "world turn"—a rubric he uses to winch together such diverse figures as Wallerstein, Lester Thurow, Robert Reich and Frederic Jameson.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press

III

There were also subtler linkages: methods, assumptions and epistemologies that buttressed postwar US elites—what the New Left would come to call "the Establishment" (echoing British left critics from the late 1950s, who coined the capitalized term to describe Oxbridge elites). These include laments about the irrationality and anti-intellectualism of the masses, a concomitant instinctual suspicion of political populism, a subsequent belief that only a technocratically administered society could be a safe and stable one, and a commitment to the idea that quantitative and technological means could enable such a benevolently controlled social order. That all of these were dominant features of postwar US social science is indubitable, but the question this volume poses is whether it is fair to call these things "Cold War" social science. To put it counterfactually, how much of this was an artifact of the Cold War proper, and how much would have appeared even absent the global ideological competition with the Soviet Union and communism? The answer that both these volumes suggest to the latter question is "quite a lot." As David Engerman has argued elsewhere,[19] much of the social science of the postwar period is better thought of as being "in" the Cold War rather than "of" the Cold War. More specifically, many of the things that we think of as characteristic of "Cold War social science"—such as large-scale collaborative work, problem-oriented interdisciplinarity and overweening confidence—are in fact best seen as legacies of World War II. That view helps us to understand why, as World War II faded into the rearview mirror, these features dimmed too.

What these two volumes tell us is that we now have developed a firm sense of the explanatory limits of the Cold War as a factor in US social science. But if that is the case, we are still left with the unpleasant fact that the epistemologically arrogant, socially repressive, and politically subdemocratic qualities so often ascribed to "Cold War social science" were very much there. But if we no longer wish to ascribe their presence to the pressures of the Cold War geopolitics or even to some more ephemeral "Cold War culture," then we must instead reckon with a more unpleasant possibility: that these features were and perhaps still are far more embedded in American life than the tidy moniker "Cold War" has allowed us to believe. This indeed is what "we know now."

[19] David Engerman, "Social Science in the Cold War," *Isis*, 101/2 (2010), 393–400.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244314000420 Published online by Cambridge University Press