

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

900
P & P
ENVIRON. SCIENCES

FROM: RWR

DATE: December 7, 1972

TO:

JHK		=
SW		Sn
RWR		MEP

COMMENTS:

*Good notes**My m 900 P & P*

SUBJECT:

Comments on Meeting of December 4-5, Williamsburg, Virginia

Points which I considered to be of major significance to officers that emerged during meetings with Trustees are the following. Those which are indicated by an asterisk were communicated to me by individual Trustees:

Cyrus Vance's statement of concern over our future balance of "operations" versus "appropriation activities" sparked noticeable comments from various Trustees and were very closely linked to other statements made by officers and Trustees concerning the establishment of any domestic field staff operations. This concern is not specific but rather it reflects ultimately a worry that we might become locked into heavy operational staff commitments, thus reducing our flexibility particularly as this relates to responding through grants to challenging opportunities.

Robert Goheen's comments to the effect that we should learn to use institutions more effectively is strongly coupled to Clark Kerr's comment that we avoid studiously any activity which would compete with or bypass university strengths.

Cliff Wharton also cautioned on increasing operational expenditures especially domestic operations versus grants or appropriations.

There was also a lively interest by Trustees including Cliff Wharton, on our categorization of interests examined by committees, i.e. would not lump women and youth into one category. You clearly indicated to him and other Trustees that this combination was artificial for committee consideration purposes only. Following

December 7, 1972

this it seemed to me that very clear signals were given by Trustees that youth including children from age five onward might be a special concern and should obviously be a concern at least until a thorough examination by officers of problems associated with children and youth have been considered. Your comments concerning problems associated with youth in this country did very much to clarify their thinking and alerted them to problems and opportunities.

Both Maurice Strong and Mr. Blumenthal expressed considerable interest in the social and public affairs role of business and the corporate problems which business face. I gathered that they feel these problems are not being met effectively through management and that due to a number of reasons including the size and complexity of hundreds of American business firms, this is taking on the dimensions of a national problem. One can say further that Maurice Strong's emphasis on the need to train specifically for management talent and statements by other Trustees along similar lines served to emphasize the need to examine, at least for our own satisfaction, the effectiveness of current educational programs in this country for management training. It seemed to me that Vernon Jordan's comments concerning assistance to newly elected minority group leaders to more effectively carry out their public service functions fall in the same broad category. There may be institutions which could meet these several and not necessarily conflicting needs through special support from us.

This is an interesting subject and not unrelated to problems we have faced abroad in developing the expertise required at the level of Deans of colleges, ministers of agriculture and public health, university administrators and so on. My own personal experience in Mexico and Latin America clearly signaled the needs for improved training of managers for broad gauge responsibilities..

Clifford Wharton asked the interesting questions of committee membership and identification of outside consultants brought in to advise individual committees and programs. You very effectively answered these questions but his third question asking what criteria were being used in choosing between and in recommending new issues for Rockefeller Foundation support requires a good deal of evaluation and explanation. I think of this particularly in relationship to our Hudson Basin experimental venture. This question is not at all unrelated to Maurice Strong's question, "why the Hudson Basin" in preference to other U.S. regions, but in Maurice Strong's opinion, if I read him right, he means in relationship to problems in the developing world.

Father Hesburgh as usual was very constructive and his recapitulation of many of our concerns into the single category of human development may modify our internal perspective on most of the issues with which we are grappling. As I recall, he enumerated five human development objectives

globally as (1) equal opportunities (2) quality of life (3) organization of life and activities (4) obstacles to development of fulfilling life and (5) problems affecting the unity of mankind. This is a remarkable, conceptual framework it seems to me and one which conceptually encompasses all of our present and proposed activities. In fact, one could imagine this being a title rationale for any foundation's efforts and even titles of specific program activities.

Following my presentation of "Quality of the Environment," several pointed questions and comments were made which will be directly and fully considered in our redraft of the Hudson Basin statement.

Dr. Seitz asked whether additional basic or fundamental knowledge was required not only for realization of Hudson Basin issues but also for environmental problems in general. My answer was that such research was required and that we would hope to support such work. However, there is an accumulation of knowledge that has not yet been applied in many instances.

Maurice Strong's question concerning the advisability of working intensively in the Hudson Basin when a major bond issue had just been passed by the state of New York for the environment clearly indicated to me that he missed the point of our discussion last week when I explained to him that the one billion, one hundred million dollar (\$1,100,000,000) bond issue just approved is for remedial clean-up and does not in any way address the fundamental causes of environmental deterioration. Incidentally, I am afraid that most New Yorkers do not understand that either.

Mr. Roosa's query concerning the advisability of the Foundation involving itself in any way in inter-agency activities can, I believe, be answered very positively. He did not seem to think that this was a reasonable role for the Rockefeller Foundation. Personally, I view it as a critical role and, in point of fact, it has been a role which the Foundation has played in the public health and agricultural field for decades; the role is that of strengthening and assuring that agencies both in this country and abroad can and do effectively and harmoniously collaborate in resolution of urgent problems. In the face of continued proliferation of agencies in this country concerned with the environment, I have become fully convinced and have been urged by leaders of federal, state and municipal agencies to help find the way out of inter-agency chaos and confusion, a role which an apolitical organization such as the Foundation may be clearly suited to undertake. Mr. Roosa queried that this Foundation should perhaps concern itself with the subsets of highly specific environmental problems rather than approach the complexity of the interlocking and interacting major issues in a region. This is precisely the shortcoming of most so-called environmental research being conducted in the world today. Someone must look at the interactions of the systems and attempt to coordinate, thus avoiding if possible unwanted and undesirable side-effects of specific Ad Hoc problem resolutions.

December 7, 1972

Mr. Moyer's question concerning repeated discussions of the University Development Program each, which apparently seemed to him like a rehash, has a ready reply; but perhaps his second question that another way of informing Trustees of continuing activities in this program and others may be found in development of brief, definitive statements presented in advance of meetings, which would give them more time to grasp the significance of multiple accomplishments and prepare them for action on further requests and approval of new thrusts.

I was disturbed by the suggestions that possibly hostile journalists be considered as an internal means of evaluation of program progress and effectiveness. I have no objection to utilizing disinterested and even presumed hostile evaluators. The use of journalists, who might and perhaps very likely would use the incomplete substance of their investigations to report in some other fashion to the American public on our activities strikes me as asking for a lot of trouble. Surely it would be possible to obtain fair, full and complete evaluations by individuals who would approach the task with a sense of confidentiality. Mr. Rockefeller's comment was interesting in this regard, which emphasized the need for developing some degree of continuity of personnel so that the work could be placed in proper perspective. This, however, faces a danger pointed out by you which is keeping such people involved in the evaluative process beyond the point at which they lose objectivity. Mr. Rockefeller further stated that in his opinion this was the most important topic on the agenda in these two days.

Clifford Wharton as a member of the Board of the Public Broadcasting Service flagged interesting conflicts which should be watched closely in the public media information and education field.

Your comments to us concerning the lengthy debate of RF public posture were very interesting, and I am delighted that the sense of the discussion was that this Foundation should be more viable and accountable to the American public. Your comments to us after the meeting also concerning the need for a prospectus on Rockefeller Foundation Illustrated struck a responsive chord. In working with my staff, we have sketched out half a dozen items in the field of environment, which might be included in such a prospectus.

I am sure we will all be alert in line with your comment for opportunities to work with the Council on Foundations and incidentally with other foundations at the same time striving to maintain our leadership role.

Personal discussion with Maurice Strong confirmed his high interest in conflict resolution. I am sure that his work with the UN and, most particularly, the Stockholm Program brought this sharply into focus. He elaborated on one such example, (a) the international water rights conflict between Iraq and Iran. National development plans are being undertaken by Iraq well in advance of similar plans and developments by Iran. This will surely trigger difficulties. Similar conflicts are certain to develop over

December 7, 1972

offshore resources development and, in fact, have developed in the field of air quality. (b) Maurice Strong also sees the need to legitimize and organize a scientific community in developing nations. I reviewed for him briefly this Foundation's activities in this regard with the World Health Organization, Pan American Health Offices, and the Latin American Association of Plant Scientists. This is obviously important but can best be done as a subset of problems related to a larger issue of environmental research or public health problem, an educational problem, etc. (c) He also urged that emphasis be placed on management, training of individuals, who have occupied key management positions or are moving to them. This reminded me of Mr. Jordan's comment concerning the newly elected Black officials without experience. (d) Maurice Strong also suggested that there may be need and opportunity for the development of a small conference and ongoing research capability at his new Nairobi headquarters.

CONCLUSION

There was a sense of sustained eager interest on the part of all Trustees that I talked to. They are to a man, I am sure, vitally interested in the recommendations that you will make to them in the immediate future concerning the many activities of committees and planned program modifications.

Trustees Rockefeller, Harden, Scrimshaw, Hesburgh, all expressed interest and excitement concerning our "Quality of the Environment" program and the new directions, which we so briefly outlined for them. You are to be highly complimented for the conduct of the program and your personal bravery and fortitude in expressing so many issues, which are largely unresolved by staff at this point to the Trustees. My feeling that they expressed a highly quizzical attitude throughout the meeting I interpret as a strong positive sign of deep interest and willingness to be of personal and collective assistance to us.

R. W. R.

/cah