

900
Pro - 62

12-3-73

copy 1

Final Report

TRUSTEE PROGRAM REVIEW
COMMITTEE
THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

DECEMBER 3, 1973

CONTENTS

Staff Preface

The Rockefeller Foundation - A Brief History	Section I
The Program Committee of the Trustees - A Broad Agenda	Section II
The Review of 1972 - 1973	Section III
Administrative and Organizational Considerations	Section IV
Summaries of Statements of Programs	Section V
Summary of Expenditures, 1968 - 1972	Section VI

STAFF PREFACE

It is customary and reasonable that with a change of the Foundation's leadership a review of program directions and internal procedures would be undertaken. Such a review does not in any way reflect on previous administrations or activities, but rather is a logical part of the continuing evolution in the Foundation's attempt to meet its obligation and to address itself to society's needs.

The present volume is a report on the current status of this continuing process of review and reassessment. It indicates the thinking of the President and the staff concerning the immediate objectives of the Foundation and the guidelines for action over the next few years. As such it is a valuable and necessary part of our reporting to our Trustees as well as to the American people.

Reading this one can visualize the amount of time and effort which has been devoted to program review. In addition, however, many facets of Foundation activity other than the purely programmatic have been altered, and the officers and staff would like to call attention to these. Not revealed in a report confining itself chiefly to programmatic directions are many of the intangibles which inevitably have a large impact on the Foundation's function and its sense of mission. Yet these intangibles have been significantly re-ordered during the past year of review and discussion.

The delineation of program areas does not by itself indicate the mechanism of action within these areas. As presently organized, every such program is directed by an interdisciplinary committee, and staff intercommunication has been greatly improved. With such communication has come increased understanding and from joint discussions new ideas have been germinated. The numbers of outside consultants has increased, and their

appearance is a time for full staff participation. In addition, the full staff meets with the President at alternate week intervals for discussions of current problems and their solutions. The far-flung field staff has been contacted on a regular basis, and the field staff leaders are brought to the New York offices annually for sharing ideas and discussion of mutual problems. These procedural changes, minor as they might seem, have resulted in what has been called an "opening up" of the Foundation; it has certainly reunited the separate program areas.

While the Committee on Evaluation is discussed in this report, the spirit of honest self-criticism which lies back of it is more difficult to describe. Likewise, the reminder constantly held before us that we exist at the sufferance of the American people and that we are accountable to them represents more than a casual slogan, but is a concept which pervades our daily activity.

These and many other intangibles are not necessarily revealed by reading a discussion of programmatic guidelines, nevertheless they are both real and significant. Even if the present administration did not alter the direction of program activities by so much as a degree, through these intangibles it would still have contributed greatly to the Foundation's function and effectiveness. One may disagree with some of the proposed program directions; it is impossible to disagree with the current morale and spirit in which the program is carried out. Perhaps it must be experienced to be recognized. This brief introductory note is respectfully submitted by those who experience it the most.

The RF Officers and Staff

November 1973

TRUSTEES

W. Michael Blumenthal	Ben W. Heineman	John H. Knowles	Nevin S. Scrimshaw
Jane P. Cahill	Theodore M. Hesburgh	Mathilde Krim	Frederick Seitz
Douglas Dillon	Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.	Bill Moyers	Maurice F. Strong
Robert H. Ebert	Clark Kerr	John D. Rockefeller IV	Cyrus R. Vance
Robert F. Goheen	Lane Kirkland	Robert V. Roosa	Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
Clifford M. Hardin			

Ad Hoc Trustee Program Review Committee

Robert F. Goheen, Chairman	John H. Knowles
Cyrus Vance, Vice Chairman	John D. Rockefeller IV
Douglas Dillon	Robert V. Roosa
Theodore M. Hesburgh	Frank Stanton (through June 30, 1973)

Corporate Officers and Staff

Douglas Dillon, Chairman of the Board of Trustees	J. Kellum Smith, Jr., Secretary
John H. Knowles, President	Theodore R. Frye, Treasurer
Allan C. Barnes, Vice-President	Herbert Heaton, Comptroller
Kenneth Wernimont, Vice-President for Administration	Esther S. Stamm, Assistant Secretary
Sterling Wortman, Vice-President	Leo F. Bourne, Assistant Treasurer
Ellsworth T. Neumann, Assistant to the President	Webb Trammell, Assistant Treasurer
	Alexander Daunys, Assistant Comptroller
	Leo Kirschner, Assistant Comptroller

Program Officers and Staff (New York)

Agricultural Sciences

John A. Pino, Director
Clarence C. Gray III, Deputy Director
A. Colin McClung, Associate Director
John J. McKelvey, Jr., Associate Director
Lewis M. Roberts, Associate Director

Arts

Howard Klein, Director

Biomedical Sciences

John Maier, Director
Elizabeth B. Connell, Associate Director
Guy S. Hayes, Associate Director
Virgil C. Scott, Associate Director

Humanities

Peter H. Wood, Assistant Director
Michael Novak, Consultant

Natural and Environmental Sciences

Ralph W. Richardson, Jr., Director
Gary H. Toenniessen, Assistant Director

Social Sciences

Joseph E. Black, Director
Ralph K. Davidson, Deputy Director
Charles H. Smith, Associate Director
Michael P. Todaro, Associate Director
Elmore Jackson, Consultant

Conference Office

Jane Allen, Conference Officer

Fellowship Office

Robert L. Fischelis, Fellowship Officer

Information Service

Henry Romney, Information Officer

Section I

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION - 1913 TO 1972 - A BRIEF HISTORY

	<u>Page</u>
A Brief History of Important Decisions	3
Public Health and Medicine	3
New Fields of Endeavor	15
The Natural Sciences	17
The Social Sciences	20
The Humanities	22
Enter Agriculture	26
The Transition of the 50's and 60's	29
The Decade of the 1960's	34
Conquest of Hunger	37
University Development	41
Population	43
Equal Opportunity for All	47
Cultural Development	48
Quality of the Environment	52
Allied Interests	53
The Tax Reform Act of 1969	54

The Rockefeller Foundation 1913 - 1972: A Brief Review

John H. Knowles, M.D.

The Rockefeller Foundation was incorporated by an Act of the New York State Legislature, which Governor Sulzer signed on May 14, 1913. The statement of purpose was encompassed by the single phrase, "To promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." The Trustees held their first meeting on May 22, 1913, and a Constitution and By-Laws were adopted. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. was elected President.

From its inception, the Trustees of the Foundation stressed education and research as the means to their ends of promoting human well-being, heeding John D. Rockefeller's emphatic statement made in 1907: "The best philanthropy involves a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source." At the same time the Trustees underscored the Foundation's global concern for man's well-being.

Sixty years and 1.2 billion dollars of expenditure later,* the Trustees and the staff of The Rockefeller Foundation have conducted an exhaustive review of the past and present programs and policies of the Foundation to formulate a revised statement of program objectives and operating guidelines for the Foundation for the mid-1970's.

The last Foundation review of overall program and policy was conducted in 1958. Ongoing reviews have been conducted at meetings of the Trustees as new programs have developed and existing ones have been evaluated. With the election of a new Chairman of the Board in July 1971 and the arrival of a new President in July 1972, a complete, fresh staff review was initiated, and at the December 1972 Trustees meeting, the Chairman appointed a Program Committee of Trustees for the purpose indicated above. An interim report was presented at the meeting of the Trustees on April 4, 1973. In preparation for a final report to be made at the meeting of the Trustees in December 1973, a Special Meeting of the Trustees will be held on September 19, 1973, to discuss the material presented below.

It should be emphasized that the process of review and evaluation does not stop with the Program Committee's report to the Trustees in December 1973, for the process is a continuous one for both Trustees and staff. Not only should the Trustees be satisfied that our priorities and program emphases are optimally suited to fulfill the Foundation's mandated responsibility, but they should also be satisfied that the means employed to our

* A listing of the major recipients of Rockefeller Foundation grants from 1913-1972 is found in Table I, appended to this review.

ends are structured optimally for efficient management, ongoing review, and evaluation. How we are organized and operate become key issues in the circular process of setting goals, establishing priorities, implementing our decisions, and evaluating the results, while moving from the long-range to the immediate, from the general to the particular, and from the imprecise to the measurable.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF IMPORTANT DECISIONS:

Public Health and Medicine

"As medical research goes on, it will find out and promulgate, as an unforeseen by-product of its work, new moral laws and new social laws, new definitions of what is right and wrong in our relations with each other. Medical research will educate the human conscience in new directions and point out new duties." (Frederick T. Gates quoted in Fosdick, R. B.: The Story of The Rockefeller Foundation, New York, Harper Bros., 1952, p. 193.)

"But by 1920 the Foundation had to all intents and purposes been captured by the doctors, and while some grants were made in the following years for biology and cultural anthropology, the doors, although still ajar, were for the time being closed against practically everything except public health and medicine." (Raymond B. Fosdick, p. 193.)

In the decade between 1900 and 1910, John D. Rockefeller, under the influence of Frederick T. Gates, a Baptist minister, established three major philanthropies: The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (1901), the General Education Board (1902), and the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission (1909). With the incorporation of The Rockefeller Foundation in 1913 the Trustees, impressed with the dramatic success of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission in studying and eradicating hookworm disease in the South, moved quickly to incorporate the work of the Commission into the work of the Foundation.

Within a month after their first meeting in 1913, the International Health Commission of The Rockefeller Foundation was established (to be renamed the International Health Division in 1927). Encouraged by John D. Rockefeller's long interest in China, established largely through his missionary contacts and warmly supported by President Eliot of Harvard, who had made an extended trip to China, the Trustees moved early to consider an active interest in China. A Commission was established by the Foundation in February 1914 to study the needs for medical education and public health. Upon its report in October of the same year, the Trustees established the China Medical Board whose express aim was to provide for "the gradual and orderly development of a comprehensive system of medicine in China." Over the ensuing twenty-eight years some forty-five million dollars of Foundation funds were allocated to the health needs of the Chinese people and to the building of the Peking Union Medical College.

With the absorption of the Sanitary Commission and its Director, Dr. Wickliffe Rose, into The Rockefeller Foundation in 1913, the new International Health Commission with Rose at its head began to extend its activities to countries outside the United States for the purpose of eradicating hookworm. By 1915, after an extensive world tour, Rose had extended the orbit of interest beyond hookworm to other major parasitic and infectious diseases of the world, with particular emphasis on malaria, tuberculosis, and yellow fever. In addition to the rapid development of classic epidemiologic and public health activities, both in the southern United States and in many countries abroad, Rose led the Foundation into the systematic support of county health organizations in both developed and developing countries.

Together with the encouragement of local county health units, the Foundation also stimulated the growth and evolution of state and national health services. Advance money was used for pump-priming, with the understanding that state or national legislatures would appropriate money to carry on the work after the start-up costs were provided. Whether working in France in 1917 at the request of the French government on the problems of endemic and epidemic tuberculosis, or in the southern United States on the problems of yellow fever, or whether in more than 40 countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America where public health laboratories and departments of vital statistics were established, the work of the International Health Board gained tremendous momentum.

Edwin Embree, Secretary of The Rockefeller Foundation from 1917 to 1924, wrote:

"The health work - doubtless the outstanding feature of the whole Foundation program to date - advanced under the imperturbable direction of Wickliffe Rose. He had adopted a formula at the beginning of the work which was to work only with government authorities, to concentrate upon rural sanitation, notably hook-worm, malaria and yellow fever, and to use convincing demonstrations in the control of these diseases as a means of persuading governments to adopt enlarged and more effective programs of general public health. He adhered to this program without variation. He was almost absurd in his commitment to the letter as well as the spirit of this platform. But on this narrow program he was extremely effective. He chose able lieutenants, gave them almost complete authority under the established policies, and stood by them handsomely. The results of the work were so definite and easily measured that he was able to convince his trustees, by showing of figures of decreasing sickness and death rates, that he was the big man around the Foundation offices. As Rose's prestige increased, he took on the outward habits of a god. In office discussions he never allowed himself to take part in the preliminary skirmishes, but toward the end of a conference, he summed up the whole matter, and his unquestioned ability in analysis, together with his solemn tones, established a precedent which grew almost into a fetish that Rose having spoken, nothing more need or should be said."

It became clear over a relatively short period of time that the major bottleneck to the widespread dissemination of the experienced work of the International Health Board was a lack of trained men. Therefore, the Foundation made a decision to support the development of schools of public health in the United States. The Foundation helped to build and endow the School of Hygiene and Public Health at Johns Hopkins University, officially opened in 1918. This was followed by a similar gift to Harvard in 1921. Similar grants were made to the University of Michigan and to a number of schools and institutions around the world, including Warsaw, Copenhagen, Madrid, Rome, Tokyo, Calcutta, Manila, and São Paulo. The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine was established and maintained with a total expenditure of 2.5 million dollars, beginning in 1922 and extending through 1953. It is almost impossible to measure the profoundly beneficial effect the establishment of such schools around the world has had on modern public health practices.

The early work of the International Health Commission established and solidified policies which exist to this day; namely, both support to individuals and institutions as well as the development of direct field operations through the Foundation's field staff. Most importantly, the fellowship program was established in 1917, and by 1970 nearly 10,000 individuals had been supported both here and abroad. The identification and training of leaders in many scholarly and scientific fields was recognized as one of the most important and enduring contributions that the Foundation could make, coupled with emphasis on the organization and stabilization of institutions to carry their work.

By the mid-1920's, with the resignation of Wickliffe Rose, a new emphasis was added to the functions of the Foundation which anticipated public recognition of its importance - the institution of basic laboratory research related to human disease. Working in close conjunction with The Rockefeller Institute, the Foundation established its own base laboratory in New York in facilities provided by the Institute. It was here that Wilbur Sawyer, Max Theiler and their colleagues developed the vaccine for yellow fever, work for which Theiler was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1951. The yellow fever vaccine is often considered one of the most important contributions of The Rockefeller Foundation in its first thirty years.

Extensive work on the control and eradication of malaria, with primary emphasis on attacking the Anopheles mosquito that transmits the disease, had become a prime concern of the Foundation in the 1920's. There are those who believe that the work of The Rockefeller Foundation in the complete eradication of the Anopheles gambiae mosquito, which was transported from Africa to Brazil in 1930, is as exemplary as that in yellow fever. What had been the scourge of Central Africa had become the scourge of Brazil, this particular species being the carrier of the most serious and often fatal form of malaria (the falciparum type), which frequently results in the dread "black-water fever." Under the leadership of Dr. Fred L. Soper, the field representative of the Foundation in Brazil, an extensive public health program in sanitary engineering which involved literally thousands of workers, was mounted in northern Brazil from 1938 to the end of 1940, at which time no evidence of the gambiae mosquito was to be found.

The strategy of the approach to yellow fever and malaria exemplified the Foundation's policy of involving itself in direct field operations as well as in the support of basic research through institutions and individuals outside its own staff. General W. C. Gorgas, the chief sanitary officer of the United States Army in Cuba, who had been quick to capitalize on Major Walter Reed's demonstration that yellow fever is transmitted by the Aedes aegypti mosquito, was named head of the Foundation's yellow fever commission in 1916. In addition to working in many Central and South American countries, a group was sent to West Africa and established itself in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1925 for the purpose of controlling the mosquito. Ultimately, there were three laboratories working on the basic problems of the disease in New York, West Africa, and Bahia, Brazil. The widespread efforts to control the carrier of the disease were remarkably successful but it was not until 1937 when, through the work of Wilbur Sawyer, Max Theiler and colleagues, the laboratories of the International Health Division of The Rockefeller Foundation began the production of the new vaccine developed from the now famous virus known scientifically as 17D. Between 1942 and 1946 there were thirty-four million doses of vaccine manufactured and distributed without cost to governments, health agencies and other official units throughout the world.

Space prevents any further description of the far-flung activities of the International Health Division. The Foundation's typhus team in Algeria in the 1940's; the early interest of the Foundation in various viral diseases culminating in the establishment of its Arbovirus Research team now housed at Yale University; the early interest in tuberculosis with the recruitment of Eugene L. Opie as a special adviser in 1928; the assault on

rabies in the state of Alabama with the establishment of a research laboratory near Montgomery; the early interest in schistosomiasis - all confirm the fact that the Foundation's reputation was firmly established on the basis of its public health work.

An important chapter in the early work of The Rockefeller Foundation in medicine and public health is its emphasis on medical education in the United States and abroad. We have noted the immediate decision of the Trustees in 1913 to emphasize medical education and public health work in China with the establishment of the China Medical Board in 1914. A signal event in 1910 was to have a profound influence on the program of The Rockefeller Foundation for some years to come. Just as Sir William Osler's book on the "Principles and Practices of Medicine" had profoundly influenced Frederick T. Gates leading ultimately to the creation of The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, so it was a report by Abraham Flexner entitled "Medical Education in the United States and Canada" which ultimately influenced the Foundation in the direction of medical education and its reform in the United States. The work of Abraham Flexner had been commissioned by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the report of his findings was to profoundly influence the course of medical education and medical practice for the ensuing half century. (Abraham Flexner's brother was Dr. Simon Flexner, the head of The Rockefeller Institute and a founding Trustee of The Rockefeller Foundation from May 22, 1913, to the time of his retirement from the Board of Trustees in April 16, 1930.) Supported by the newly established Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, the Flexner Report highlighted the glaring deficiencies of largely proprietary medical schools in the United States, and taking the model of Johns Hopkins and Harvard,

recommended the contemporary form of medical education with its emphasis on two years of basic science training, followed by two years in the clinical subjects. Depending heavily on the development of a full-time teaching staff, it emphasized university control and sponsorship of medical education. The General Education Board moved rapidly to implement the Flexner Report with large sums of money, and between 1919 and 1921 Mr. Rockefeller gave the Board forty-five million dollars. Although Frederick T. Gates violently opposed the first grants to state institutions, as contrasted with voluntary, private institutions, an important new policy of The Rockefeller Foundation was initiated with a grant to the University of Iowa in 1923 to establish its new teaching hospital and laboratories in a new site. Largely through the efforts of the General Education Board, most, if not all, of the leading medical schools in the United States were given grants between 1913 and 1929 - including such schools as Howard University, and Meharry (more than \$8 million) as well as Harvard, Columbia, Western Reserve, Cornell, Rochester, Duke University, Emory University and a number of state universities including those in Iowa, Colorado, Oregon, Virginia and Georgia.

In 1919 the Foundation established a separate Division of Medical Education with the express aim of aiding medical schools in various parts of the world. The first efforts of the newly created Division were directed to England where the desire to establish the full-time system of medical education recommended by the Flexner Report afforded opportunities to the Foundation. Work was supported at the University College Hospital School in London, and smaller grants were made to the medical schools of St. Bartholomew's

Hospital, St. Thomas' Hospital and the London Hospital. Extending its influence to Europe, medical schools at Strasbourg, Lyon and Brussels were supported by major grants. Similarly, extensive surveys made of medical education in all the Latin American countries led to a major grant to the medical school in São Paulo, Brazil. In time, large grants to Canadian medical schools in Toronto, McGill at Montreal and others were made, as well as grants to the American University of Beirut, the University of Sidney, and the Royal Medical School in Siam - giving the Foundation myriad opportunities to help establish modern medical education and research in many countries throughout the world.

In 1930 Dr. Alan Gregg became the Director of the Division of Medical Sciences of The Rockefeller Foundation. The name of the Division had been changed from the Division of Medical Education to the Division of Medical Sciences to emphasize the new focus on medical research and the training of medical teachers. The need for much more intensive effort in the field of biomedical research was anticipated by the Foundation, and antedated general public recognition of the need, which came later in the 1930's when the National Institutes of Health was established by the Federal Government. Alan Gregg exemplified the best attributes of the Foundation officer and established, to my mind, the fact that Foundation work qualifies fully as a profession. Possessed of a fine intellect, an ever-inquiring mind and a passionate intensity, he developed the knowledge and skills necessary for the profession of philanthropic foundation work. He combined expertise in medicine with the capacity to synthesize widely diverse and scattered sources of information and advice and to establish goals and priorities which in time were to show the prescience of his decisions.

He was an intellectual entrepreneur in the best sense of the word, and his influence was felt far beyond the mere role he played in the granting of specific sums of money. The combination of scholarship and action - of knowing and doing - with the ability to transmit and articulate ideas, gave him a unique position in American medicine.

Gregg moved rapidly to continue and strengthen the Foundation's interests in medical education, while he simultaneously analyzed the needs of medical research and the training of medical educators. The emphasis, once again, was on individual grants, scholarships and fellowships, and institutional support. A wide variety of projects and individuals were supported. Howard Florey was a Fellow of The Rockefeller Foundation in 1925-1926, and received ongoing support that ultimately culminated in his demonstration of the use of penicillin for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1945. Dr. Leonard Colebrook was supported in the 1930's for his research on the development of the precursor of sulfanilamide. Particular emphasis was placed on the fields of endocrinology and human heredity antedating the current intense interest in the subject. Support for a special committee of the National Research Council - the Committee for Research on Problems of Sex - received more than one million dollars over roughly a twenty-five year period for its multi-disciplinary approaches to the problems of sexual activity. The Rockefeller Foundation supported the work of Alfred Kinsey, which resulted in his book entitled "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male," published in 1948. The work of Elton Mayo at the Harvard School of Business Administration pioneered new studies in industrial psychology, and studied the marked effects of external influences on human

efficiency and human health. Such diverse developments as the Department of History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins; the Department of Legal Medicine at Harvard; and the Departments of Dermatology at Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania were established with Rockefeller Foundation support.

Perhaps the most intensive effort was made in the field of neuropsychiatry. Medical school and teaching hospital departments in that field were virtually nonexistent when Gregg set out to implement the policy of the Foundation to: (1) develop good teaching in medical schools with the integration of psychiatry into the general medical curriculum and, (2) to support scientific research in neuropsychiatry. New departments and teaching programs were established at the University of Chicago, Tulane, Duke, and Washington University in St. Louis. The Montreal Neurological Institute was established under the direction of Dr. Wilder Penfield with a major grant to McGill University. The Massachusetts General Hospital, a leading teaching hospital of the Harvard Medical School, was awarded a grant to establish the creation of a clinical department devoted to mental disease in general hospital practice. Neuropsychiatric research was supported at such diverse institutions as the Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts, Northwestern University, Tufts, Columbia, McGill, Harvard, and Cornell. Support of such research was not confined to the United States, and many institutions in Great Britain and Europe were also supported.

The Foundation's major interest in public health and medicine began to decline in the early 1950's. Alan Gregg had begun to withdraw from active work in the Foundation in 1950, and by 1953, three years before his statutory retirement, he left the Foundation to spend the remaining years of his life in

reflection and writing. In 1951 the Trustees decided to terminate the International Health Division. Amidst much grumbling, dire forebodings and misgivings, the public health and medical programs of the Foundation appeared to recede in importance, while another interest came to the fore. What had been said to be the domination of the Foundation's program by doctors in the first thirty years of its life, was passed to agricultural scientists and technicians for the next thirty years. During the phasing in of agriculture (with its origins in the early 1940's) and the phasing out of medical and public health interests, other programs began to receive increasing attention within the Foundation, which will be discussed below.

The first thirty years of The Rockefeller Foundation's life established certain policies which have guided its efforts to this day. First and foremost, the Trustees decried the phenomenon of "scatteration" and insisted on focused attempts, dealing with well-defined problems of the highest priority for human welfare over long periods of time. Secondly, the Foundation established its interest in international affairs. It would, from the outset, focus on domestic and worldwide efforts to "promote the well-being of mankind." Thirdly, it saw very early the virtue of having a direct operating responsibility in countries outside the United States and developed a fine field staff for that purpose, while it simultaneously understood the necessity to work through established individuals and institutions around the world through the mechanism of the fellowship and the grant. Fourthly, its program of fellowships and scholarships, initiated in 1917, gave recognition to the fact that individual

support is paramount to an enduring and spreading effect on human melioration. Only through trained and educated individuals could the advance of human welfare be achieved and the effects multiplied. Simultaneously, it recognized the need to support stable institutions, either by helping to establish new institutions, or in strengthening existing ones. Fifthly, it recognized the emerging professionalization of foundation work through the recruitment and development of able people who combine the scholarly depth of the expert with the activist conviction of the doer. Alan Gregg (and later Warren Weaver and George Harrar) epitomize the highest qualities and capacities of the professional foundation officer. Lastly, it recognized the enduring need for knowledge through long-range support of basic as well as applied research as contrasted with the support of services or ad hoc arrangements which albeit pressing, would at best remedy human suffering only transiently.

New Fields of Endeavor

"And generally let this be a rule, that all partitions of knowledges be accepted rather for lines and veins, than for sections and separations and that the continuance and entireness of knowledge be preserved. For the contrary hereof hath made particular sciences to become barren, shallow and erroneous; where they have not been nourished and maintained from the common fountain." (Sir Francis Bacon, The Advancement of Learning, Book 2, Modern Library Edition, Page 268.)

By the 1920's there were four Rockefeller boards in active operation: The Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board, the International Education Board, and The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. The Rockefeller

Foundation emphasized public health and medical education in the United States and abroad. The General Education Board, in addition to its work in medical education in the United States, was heavily involved in the problems of public education in the South; in addition, it carried on a small program in the arts and humanities. The International Education Board, which had been created by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in 1923, shared an interest in the natural sciences with the General Education Board. The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, which was founded in 1918, had by 1923, with the recruitment of Beardsley Ruml as its Director, set upon a course of support for research in the social sciences. Due to inevitable conflict amongst the various boards, as well as to serious overlapping and reduplication of interests and programs, a plan was adopted in 1928 which transferred many of the functions of the four boards to The Rockefeller Foundation. The natural sciences came from the General Education Board and the International Education Board, the social sciences from the Memorial, the humanities and the arts from the General Education Board, and the medical sciences from the General Education Board. As of 1928, The Rockefeller Foundation was composed of five divisions: the International Health Division, and the Divisions of the Medical Sciences, the Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities. As we have noted, the arrival of Alan Gregg as Director of the Division of Medical Sciences in 1930 was symbolic of the Trustees' intention to focus more heavily than ever before on science. The reorganization of The Rockefeller Foundation in 1928 had as its essential goal the advance of knowledge and, further, the premise of a structural unity underlying the new orientation of program. As Fosdick states: "It was not to be five programs, each represented by a division of

the Foundation; it was to be essentially one program, directed to the general problem of human behavior, with the aim of control through understanding."

(Fosdick, Page 142.)

The structural unity of knowledge was and is an indisputable fact, one the Trustees sought to emphasize by passing a resolution that Directors would be appointed for "groups of subjects," rather than for specific fields like the natural sciences, the social sciences, etc.; but truth and good intentions had little effect, and the fragmentation of the Foundation's activities continued for the coming years.

The Natural Sciences

The primary concern for the promotion of the fundamental sciences was established with the Natural Sciences Division under the new reorganization in 1928. Because of the interest of Dr. Simon Flexner as both Trustee of The Rockefeller Foundation and President of The Rockefeller Institute, the Foundation's concern had turned to support of the physical sciences. The need for the training of young scientists in modern research was widely recognized. With The Rockefeller Foundation providing the funds, the National Research Council agreed to select the Fellows and administer the program beginning in 1919. By 1950 a total of 1,107 persons had been trained under NR Fellowships with total appropriations over the thirty-two years of more than \$4 million. Three of the Fellows ultimately received Nobel Prizes, and some sixty-five were members of the National Academy of Sciences by 1950. Prior to World War II, over nine hundred Fellows had received NR Fellowships in the natural sciences, of whom more than one hundred and ninety worked in physics. As Gerald Holton has written to me:

"One can say unequivocally that The Rockefeller Foundation and its associated Education Boards were indispensable to the rise of quantum mechanics in the 1920's, and to the emergence and growth of nuclear physics in the 1930's. In addition, these agencies were largely responsible for the internationalization of physics in the 1920's, and for the establishment of the United States as a world leader in basic and applied physics by the 1930's. This last seems to be not known widely enough."

Of those pre-war Fellowships in physics, the work of the Fellows was carried out in thirteen different countries, with about one-third doing their work in the United States, and another third in Germany and England. (Enrico Fermi of Italy and Werner Heisenberg of Germany later received Nobel Prizes.) Niels Bohr's Institute for Theoretical Physics at the University of Copenhagen received support, and NRC and LEB Fellowships allowed a wide variety of young scientists to travel to Copenhagen for study. Support to the University of Göttingen allowed it to enlarge the Physical Institute and to erect a Mathematical Institute where many Fellows studied subsequently on Rockefeller Fellowships. In addition, due to early interest of the General Education Board, and following the new organization of The Rockefeller Foundation in 1928, further grants were made to improve the physical and biological sciences with major appropriations to the California Institute of Technology, Vanderbilt, Princeton, the Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory, and the University of Chicago. Subsequent grants were made to Harvard, the University of Texas and Stanford, while such women's institutions as Radcliffe and Wellesley were aided with grants to erect a science building or improve their curricula in science teaching.

In 1932, Warren Weaver, Head of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Wisconsin, was named Director of the Natural Sciences Division

of The Rockefeller Foundation. Like Alan Gregg, he enjoyed remarkable success as a foundation professional. Upon his recommendation in 1933, experimental biology became a field of primary interest to the Foundation. Emphasizing the application of quantitative techniques of mathematics, physics and chemistry to biological problems, the Foundation made early grants to Thomas Hunt Morgan, a geneticist, for biological research, and to Linus Pauling, who at that time was a physical chemist with no particular interest in biology. Later on, joined by George W. Beadle at the California Institute of Technology, an interdisciplinary team of chemists, biochemists, biophysicists, geneticists, and other biologists combined their efforts in multi-disciplinary approaches to the problems of human biology. Both Beadle and Pauling received the Nobel Prize for their work. Hans Krebs, who had been forced out of Germany for political reasons, was supported on a Rockefeller Fellowship at Cambridge University where he developed the so-called Krebs cycle, for which he later received the Nobel Prize.

By the late 1940's, the Foundation had appropriated some \$30 million for work in the natural sciences, of which approximately eighty percent was spent on experimental biology. In 1949, Warren Weaver wrote:

"The century of biology upon which we are now well embarked is no matter of trivialities. It is a movement of really heroic dimensions, one of the great episodes in man's intellectual history. The scientists who are carrying the movement forward talk in terms of nucleo-proteins, of ultracentrifuges, of biochemical genetics, of electrophoresis, of the electron microscope, of molecular morphology, or radioactive isotopes. But do not be misled by these horrendous terms, and above all do not be fooled into thinking this is mere gadgetry. This is the dependable way to seek a solution of the cancer and polio problems, the problems of rheumatism and of the heart. This is the knowledge on which we must base our solution of the population and food problems. This is the understanding of life." (Fosdick, Page 166.)

And, bear in mind Gerald Holton's following comment to me when he wrote to me October 26, 1971:

"Add to this the Foundation's gifts, specifically for the pioneering of large scale scientific instruments, including the large cyclotrons and other accelerators which opened a new era in atomic energy and the application of physics to biology in medicine. Then, of course, there is the two hundred inch Hale telescope on Palomar Mountain, a long-term investment made by the Foundation in 1928, which has paid off handsomely since it went into operation in 1948."

The Social Sciences

In 1914, the Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation, with the advice of Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard, hoped to establish an interest in social and economic research. The Foundation's first foray into the field was a disaster! Electing to approach the problem of industrial relations, the Foundation appointed W. L. Mackenzie King of Canada to be director of the project. Unfortunately, the Foundation's entry into the field coincided with the strike of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, culminating in the tragic Ludlow Massacre. The Federal Government immediately launched an inquiry and cast aspersions on the ultimate interests of The Rockefeller Foundation, because of the Rockefeller family's financial interests in the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. This unfortunate experience, coupled with Frederick T. Gates' antipathy to the social sciences, delayed the entry of the Foundation into the field until the merging of the interests of The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in 1928. In 1923, the Memorial elected to make the social sciences its chief interest, following the appointment of Beardsley Ruml as Director. Early grants were made to a number of universities to establish departments of economics and political science, and to organizations like The Brookings

Institution and the National Bureau of Economic Research. The Social Science Research Council was organized in 1923 to coordinate and stimulate research in the social sciences. Beardsley Ruml was actively identified with its founding and the new Council was patterned after the successes of the National Research Council in the physical sciences. The Memorial established social science fellowships through the Social Science Research Council analogous to the NR Fellowships in the physical sciences. When the activities of the Memorial were taken over by The Rockefeller Foundation in 1928, Beardsley Ruml retired and the fruitful programs which he had instituted were carried on by the Foundation. Further support to social science research organizations around the world was granted to such diverse institutions as the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Social Science Research Council, The Brookings Institution, the Netherlands Economic Institute, and the London School of Economics. Foundation aid was also given to the American Municipal Association and the American Public Welfare Association evincing interests in the problems of local government. The field of public administration received increasing attention as the need for trained public administrators in federal service mounted during the 1930's. Activities were instituted with the aid of Foundation grants to the Universities of California, Chicago, Harvard, Minnesota, and Virginia.

In addition to public administration, studies in population, international relations, economic history, and inquiries on nationalism and internationalism were supported. Substantial support was given to the economic section of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, the establishment of the Russian Institute at Columbia University in 1946, and to the Council

on Foreign Relations for its "War and Peace Studies." Grants to Princeton University for demographic research, for studies of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, for study of the phenomenon of Japanese resettlement in California during the early phase of the Second World War, and for research on such problems as civil liberties and moral and ethical determinants of human behavior rounded out the far-flung activities of this emerging interest of the Foundation. Most important, hundreds of fellowships were awarded in the social sciences, either directly by The Rockefeller Foundation or through the Social Science Research Council, to such important national figures as John Jewkes, Gunnar Myrdal, Philip E. Mosely, and Hugh Gaitskell. Of four Nobel Prize winners in economics, three were RF Fellows or grantees and the fourth (Paul Samuelson) was an adviser and consultant.

Over the twenty years between 1930 and 1950, the Foundation spent over \$100 million on problems related to the development of the social sciences, both in the United States and abroad.

The Humanities

With the reorganization of various Rockefeller interests into The Rockefeller Foundation (1928), a Division of the Humanities was created in 1929. Anson Phelps Stokes, a Trustee of the Foundation, had frequently stated that "science is not dangerous if the humanities are also cultivated." He resigned in 1932, partially out of dissatisfaction with the sluggish development of the new program in the humanities. With the appointment of David H. Stevens as Director of the Division in 1932, the program began to take shape. The agenda for the Trustees meeting in the spring of 1933 stated:

"The past twenty years have seen a continuous rise in the material valuations of life which should make possible and, indeed, demand a corresponding rise in its spiritual and cultural values. The Humanities should contribute to a spiritual renaissance by stimulating creative expression in art, literature, and music; by setting and maintaining high standards of critical appreciation; and by bringing the intellectual and spiritual satisfactions of life within the reach of greater numbers. Beyond such benefits to the individual, the humanities should exert national and international influence for a reduction of racial prejudice. Ignorance of the cultural background of another people is at the root of many misunderstandings that are as harmful internationally as political and economic differences. That ignorance can be steadily lessened by an interchange of cultural values, by discovery of common origins for diversified national ideas and ideals, and by the interpretation of one cultural group to another." (Fosdick, Page 240.)

As Fosdick has noted, "This shift of emphasis from traditional humanistic research - a shift to interpretation rather than preservation - was a graduated process, and it was not until the mid-30's that it began radically to affect the expenditures of the Foundation." Fosdick both decried and appreciated the "aristocratic tradition of humanistic scholarship." One of the Trustees felt that the humanities were suffering from "what might be called the snobbishness of the classical tradition."

(Fosdick, Page 241.) In President Fosdick's review of The Rockefeller Foundation for 1937, he stated:

"From being aristocratic and exclusive, culture is becoming democratic and inclusive. The conquest of illiteracy, the development of school facilities, the rise of public libraries and museums, the flood of books, the invention of the radio and the moving picture, the surge of new ideas - and above all, perhaps, the extension of leisure, once the privilege of the few - are giving culture in our age a broader base than earlier generations have known....New interests are in the making - an adventurous reaching out for a fuller life by thousands to whom non-utilitarian values have hitherto been inaccessible....Any program in the humanities must inevitably take account of this new renaissance of the human spirit." (RF Annual Report, 1937, Page 50-51.)

During the 1930's, the Foundation embarked on a much-enlarged program which included grants to libraries in the United States and abroad, with fellowships in library administration and the development of new techniques for the dissemination of library material. Art education was stressed with grants to the Museum of Modern Art, while grants were also made to study the best use of radio and motion pictures. A grant to the Museum of Modern Art in New York established its film library. A grant to the American Film Center for its attempts to enter the field of educational motion pictures was declared a failure as the Center folded because of the high cost of production and its inability to generate public support. Grants to the American Council of Learned Societies and the Library of Congress were instrumental in strengthening studies of Far Eastern languages. Under the guidance of the ACLS, Foundation grants helped to develop the nucleus of the United States Army Language Training Program.

Interest in the performing arts was reflected in grants to Yale, the University of Iowa, and Western Reserve which helped to establish the modern development of theater and its objective study in the United States. Grants to the National Theatre Conference and to the Authors League of America allowed the Foundation to sponsor fellowships to aid young playwrights and directors. Tennessee Williams was one of the nascent authors aided by the Program. By the 1940's the Foundation's interest in drama in the United States was well established.

In the early 1940's, the Foundation turned its attention to the study of regional cultures in the United States. Grants were made to the

Texas State Historical Association, the University of Oklahoma, and the Huntington Library at Pasadena for the support of young scholars working on regional interpretations involving the Southwest. A grant to the University of Utah encouraged studies of the Mormon influence, and an appropriation to the Library of Congress enabled it to give grants in aid to workers in the fields of biography, folklore, and historical interpretation. A grant to support the research of Dumas Malone resulted in the first of what would be the finest volumes on the life of Thomas Jefferson.

By the late 1930's, the Foundation turned its attention to Latin American studies. Initially, this took the form of support to interested institutions in the United States. This was later expanded to include a variety of institutions in Latin America. The Foundation's most extensive grants in the humanities to Latin American institutions were made in Mexico, where the basic work of the National Institute of Archaeology and History, the College of Mexico, and the National University was supported. The National Institute has become a center of international training and research with specific reference to archaeology and anthropology; and the College of Mexico, founded in the 1930's, is a research center for the development of specialists in history, literary criticism, language, and demographic and economic studies. The development of studies in philosophy was aided at the National University.

Again, the importance of the Foundation's fellowship program is exemplified by the experience between the 1930's and the 1950's. During

this period more than 500 fellowships were awarded in the humanities, and 735 Fellows were appointed by outside institutions, notably the American Council of Learned Societies, with funds provided by the Foundation. For these fellowships, more than \$2.5 million was appropriated, and the individuals' work spanned everything from literature and philology to art, philosophy and archaeology. This scene had been well set for the enduring interest of The Rockefeller Foundation in the humanities.

Enter Agriculture - the 1940's

Major emphasis on agriculture in the Foundation's program did not develop until the 1940's. Prior to this, most of the effort was centered on the improvement of agriculture in China, which combined agricultural interests with those related to health, rural economic development, rural administration and general community work. The idea of integrated rural development stemmed from the early work of such Foundation field staff as Dr. Selskar M. Gunn and Dr. John B. Grant. The Program of Rural Reconstruction in China was initiated in 1935, and although it gained momentum rapidly in conjunction with exchange programs between Cornell and various universities such as Nanking and Yenching in China, the Program was engulfed in 1939 by the vicissitudes of war.

A casual comment to Raymond B. Fosdick in 1941 by Henry A. Wallace, then Vice President of the United States, resulted in what, over the next thirty years, would become the major contribution of The Rockefeller

Foundation to the "well-being of mankind throughout the world." Wallace said "If anyone could increase the yield per acre of corn and beans in Mexico, it would contribute more effectively to the welfare of the country, and the happiness of its people, than any other plan that could be devised." With the advice of a committee consisting of E. C. Stakman of the University of Minnesota, Paul C. Mangelsdorf of Harvard, and Richard Bradfield of Cornell, the Foundation embarked upon a special program of agricultural research and development in Mexico in 1943. J. George Harrar became the Foundation's Field Director for Agriculture and his capacity for leadership became immediately obvious when he recruited Norman Borlaug to work in the field of wheat research and Edwin J. Wellhausen in the field of corn research. Many years later, Dr. Borlaug received the Nobel Peace Prize for his work in establishing and propagating new varieties of wheat, which can be said to be the most important event in the so-called Green Revolution. The Mexican program began with an official invitation by the Government of Mexico, and a contract was signed between the Foundation and the Mexican Department of Agriculture. By 1958 the program in Mexico had been so successful that the Trustees approved the extension of the Foundation's agricultural program to Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, and India, with outreach activities into many other countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The first international agricultural research institute was created in 1960 in the Philippines in cooperation with the Government of the Philippines and the Ford Foundation, and this was quickly to be followed by the establishment of a total of five more institutes over the ensuing years.

The genius of the entire undertaking can only be described in principle, recognizing that it was the persons who worked on it who made the difference. The elements that made it successful were: (1) the program was instituted on the advice of a distinguished group of outside consultants (at a time when the United States government had a policy against work on some major food crops in other countries); (2) the work was instituted in the field by a field staff recruited directly by the Foundation, working closely with the government of the developing country; (3) the program's emphasis was on applied research and technology with a clearly defined goal, i.e., increasing food production; (4) extensive use was made of study awards to enable nationals to receive advanced training in the techniques and science of agriculture in the United States and elsewhere, always with the assurance that they would be employed on return to their own countries; (5) with initial successes, the second phase of institutionalization of the critical mass of expatriates and nationals was accomplished by support for existing schools of agriculture, and finally, the development of new institutes - the international agricultural institutes - recognizing the importance of research and extension services to many nations and regions of the world.

I have often said that if the Foundation had done nothing else in its history but play its role in the Green Revolution, it would have more than justified its existence. The model of the orderly scientific and technical development of modern agriculture is one that should serve the Foundation well in the coming years.

THE TRANSITION OF THE 50's AND 60's

In 1946, a Special Committee of the Trustees reviewed the programs and policies of the Foundation and stated "Our ends in terms of the following three broad categories of objectives are: (1) to understand human behavior, (2) to promote a better American national life, and (3) to facilitate international understanding and cooperation." This review was supplemented by another review in 1951, which led to the phasing out of the International Health Division and a change in the name of the Medical Sciences Division to the Division of Medicine and Public Health. In 1959, that name was changed to the Division of Medical and Natural Sciences, and for the first time in the history of the Foundation the word health did not appear in any of its divisions or programs. In 1970, the division was re-named the Biomedical Sciences.

The China Medical Board had concluded its work in China in the late 1940's and with this The Rockefeller Foundation terminated its direct support to China and its indirect support to the China Medical Board, which would go on with relatively modest resources to work in other areas of Southeast Asia. And, although its federal charter was retained, the General Education Board was diminishing its activities, subsequently expended all its funds, and made no further appropriations after 1964.

The Division of Agricultural Sciences began to grow apace and enjoyed early successes in Mexico under the tutelage of George Harrar. In 1955, the Trustees approved exploration in Southeast Asia of the possibilities of establishing an interest in rice production, both from the standpoint of basic research and for the purpose of advanced training of scientists and

technicians. By 1961 the Foundation had fifty field staff members working in Mexico, Colombia, Chile, India, and the Philippines.

Meanwhile the national and international scenes began to change rapidly. Large new sources of funds were established by governments, international organizations, industry, and several important new foundations, notably the Ford Foundation and the National Science Foundation, to support research and technical assistance.

The Ford Foundation, founded in 1936 and then largely confined to local projects in Michigan, became a national and international foundation in 1950. Between 1950 and 1972, it allocated more than \$4.2 billion to a wide variety of domestic and international programs. More and more, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations have found themselves working together, particularly on the international scene with specific reference to agriculture and university development.

The National Science Foundation, an agency of the Federal Government, was founded in 1950 to sponsor scientific research, improve science education, and foster scientific information exchange. In 1972, it allocated nearly \$600 million to a wide variety of scientific programs and projects. The National Institutes of Health of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare had grown in its support of both intramural and extramural research (largely extramural and mainly in the biomedical sciences) to an annual budget of over \$1.5 billion.

The World Bank, a specialized agency of the United Nations, was founded at the Bretton Woods Monetary and Financial Conference in 1944, and by the 1970's had become one of the most important sources of aid to the developing countries.

The idea of aid from the developed to the less-developed countries was an outgrowth of the Marshall Plan, which was established in 1947-48 (was later known as the International Cooperative Administration), and assumed its present form when the United States Agency for International Development was established in 1961. Subsequently, other nations would follow suit with the development of their international aid agencies.

In 1955, Dean Rusk, then President of the Foundation, noted several important changes on the domestic and international scene which had occurred since the Trustees Review in 1946 and would bear heavily on the future program of the Foundation. He listed the following:

1. Instead of hopes for an enduring peace following World War II, the Cold War had come into being with the "terrible threat" of large-scale atomic war always lurking in the background.
2. Totalitarian influences in the world had resulted in "a dangerous weakening in the concept of personal liberty and intellectual freedom." Rusk stated "a major problem for free democratic man is to find a tenable, modern concept of liberty, to develop practical procedures for assuring it, and to locate a satisfactory boundary between liberty and the restrictions which are essential to its successful defense."
3. The drive toward nationalistic self-determination had appeared on the world scene, particularly in those less-developed countries with non-Western cultural patterns.

4. A sudden and sharp recognition of the importance of the interrelationship between population growth and resources and the need to increase the world's food supply had come to the fore.
5. The development of large new funds, both public and private, amongst the developed countries of the world, and applied largely to the development of the less-developed countries, had altered radically the approach to social melioration.
6. The purchasing power of the dollar had declined by 35-40% between the period from 1946 to 1955.
7. The phasing out of the activities of the General Education Board and the new activities of an essentially independent China Medical Board were again noted.
8. Priorities among independent colleges, universities, and professional schools were shifting towards basic research because of the failure of their endowment income to provide necessary support and the anticipated need to enlarge facilities for both teaching and research to meet the on-coming wave of students, resulting from the post-World War II baby boom.

In 1955, Dean Rusk summarized the target areas of Foundation interest under three main headings: (1) Man's Physical Environment, (2) Man's Human Environment, and (3) Man's Moral and Aesthetic Values. Under the heading of Man's Physical Environment, he stressed basic biological and sociological research, as well as applied research, directed toward increasing

the world's food supply; support for the education of doctors and public health personnel, both in the United States and abroad; continuation of the research program in virus diseases; social research on the problems surrounding the delivery of medical care; and social research surrounding population problems, as well as basic research on the physiology and sociology of fertility.

Under the heading of Man's Human Environment Rusk stressed international studies which would include analyses of foreign policy decision-making, studies of emerging problems of international relations, studies of the United Nations system, and studies on general theories of international relations. He stressed the continuation of intercultural studies and an expansion of the Foundation's interest in area studies to include Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Under the heading Man's Moral and Aesthetic Values, he stressed increased support of the creative arts; of moral, legal, and political philosophical studies; and of religion and the study of moral values.

Of the most profound significance in Rusk's review was a definite "shift in the center of gravity of the Foundation's program toward the undeveloped countries." The reasons he gave for this were, first - the opportunity "for a high yield from Foundation investment in terms of the well-being of mankind." As important, he noted secondly that "the world situation in the second half of this century would be largely determined by what happens - politically, economically and culturally - in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and non-Communist Asia." He noted further that "interest in underdeveloped countries requires careful attention both to the

techniques of Foundation action and to the selection of countries for a primary interest. On the first point, the officers are conscious of the fact that it is difficult to make a lasting contribution to a particular country on too narrow a front. The Foundation's own experience, as well as that of the General Education Board in the South, tends to show that health, education, increased productivity and cultural enrichment move together." What had been noted over many years of the Foundation's life concerning the need for understanding the interdependence of all knowledge and the need for interdisciplinary approaches was once again reaffirmed and reinforced by Rusk.

Rusk's review in 1955 was to set the scene for George Harrar when he became the Foundation's seventh President in 1961. It recommended that the Trustees revise their policy and use funds from capital, in addition to the traditional use of income only, to achieve the Foundation's goals - antedating by more than a decade the pay-out requirement of the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Most important, it provided additional funds for the major new programs of the 1960's.

THE DECADE OF THE 1960's

When Dean Rusk was appointed Secretary of State in 1960, the Trustees elected George Harrar to succeed him. Like Alan Gregg and Warren Weaver, he epitomizes the finest qualities and skills of the professionals who work in foundations. But George Harrar was unique in another way: for the first time in the history of The Rockefeller Foundation a man who

had begun in the field - in this case in Mexico in the early 1940's - rose through the ranks to become President of the Foundation. Widely respected as a scientist, he had already proved his remarkable skills as an administrator. More than any other single individual, he deserves the full credit for the organization and ultimate success of the so-called Green Revolution. He combined the best qualities of the scholar and the activist, and it seemed natural for the Trustees to appoint him President. A man of almost unbelievable integrity and perseverance, he moved rapidly to consolidate the past gains of the Foundation and to reorganize its programs and policies for the 1960's. On the occasion of his retirement in July 1972, the Trustees took the unprecedented step of naming him a Life Fellow of The Rockefeller Foundation. The Annual Report for 1971 includes a ten-year review of the Foundation's activities under his leadership. In addition, Harrar had written a "program review and projection" during 1970. Both these sources have been invaluable to the present incumbent in his review of the activities of the Foundation.

We have noted the evolution of the Foundation's interests - from its initial emphasis on medicine and public health in both the developed and developing countries, stressing the operations of a field staff and support of epidemiologic and massive public health programs and the development of schools of public health, under the guidance of Wickliffe Rose and ultimately Alan Gregg; to the ascendancy of the natural sciences program under the tutelage of Warren Weaver, with its emphasis on the wedding of the physical and biological sciences, and its support of largely American and European institutions in the 1930's and 40's; to the gradual withdrawal of support of science and scholarship in Europe's great centers of learning

under the presidency of Dean Rusk, and the Foundation's new emphasis under Rusk on attention to the problems of food production and population control and to the reduction of conflict amongst the newly emerging nations in Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia. The beginning of the Foundation's profound and focused interest in agriculture came in Mexico in the early 1940's; that program reached great effectiveness during the 1960's under the presidency of George Harrar. As the Foundation's 1971 Ten-Year Review stated:

"With the exception of the program of the International Health Division, The Rockefeller Foundation had a long history of supporting science and scholarship for their own sake; now it opted for the application of already existing knowledge toward the well-being of mankind throughout the world. Harrar, in short, moved the Foundation from library and laboratory into the fields and streets."

The above statement is true, but incomplete, for during the decade under Harrar's presidency, the Foundation continued to emphasize the further acquisition of much-needed knowledge in the fields in which it was involved, through the support of basic research and of institutions of higher learning, both at home and abroad.

In September 1963, the Trustees adopted a short statement of policy which established five major goals for the decade of the 60's. In the less-developed countries of the world, the goals were the conquest of hunger and malnutrition and the development of a number of sorely needed universities. The stabilization of population growth would be emphasized both in the United States and abroad. The domestic goals were the achievement of equal opportunity for all and the development of the nation's cultural resources. Subsequently, in 1969, the Foundation adopted another goal -

to work toward the improvement of the quality of the environment in the United States. Stressing interdisciplinary approaches to the problems, the programs were titled: (1) Conquest of Hunger, (2) University Development, (3) Population, (4) Equal Opportunity for All, (5) Cultural Development, and (6) Quality of the Environment. In addition, there was a seventh category entitled "Allied Interests" where "spheres of activity closely related to its six pivotal interests" were supported - areas in which the Foundation had had a long-standing commitment, such as delivery of health care, virology research, schistosomiasis control, and improvement of international relations. The Foundation continued its long-standing sub-divisions based on academic interests and these numbered five: (1) the Agricultural Sciences; (2) the Arts and Humanities; (3) the Biomedical Sciences; (4) the Natural and Environmental Sciences; and (5) the Social Sciences.

A review of the 1960's and the accomplishments of the various programs of The Rockefeller Foundation is in order - necessarily a brief one, for the issues have been discussed in extensive detail in the Foundation's 1971 Annual Report.

Conquest of Hunger

The cycle of highly qualified field staff working in direct operations of The Rockefeller Foundation, followed by extensive fellowships and scholarships for promising young individuals in the countries involved, followed in turn by the institutionalization of the techniques and knowledge of those with the necessary skills and education either through the development

of new, free-standing institutions, such as the international agricultural institute, or the strengthening of existing institutions (largely agricultural departments within universities or agricultural colleges) - all finally followed by the assumption of responsibility by the host government in combination with the support of multinational consortia such as the various international banks and agencies for international development - which is nowhere better exemplified than in the results of the Conquest of Hunger program, provides us with a model for the future. Many of the leading figures in ministries of agriculture and departments of agriculture of many universities throughout Latin America, Southeast Asia, India, and Africa received their initial support through Rockefeller Foundation scholarships and fellowships. As a result of the cooperative program of The Rockefeller Foundation with the Government of Mexico, Dr. Harrar was able to report that food production there had doubled. In 1943 Mexico's 21 million people averaged 1,700 calories a day. As of 1963, its 37 million people averaged 2,700 calories per day. The Foundation's field staff over the twenty years of Harrar's work in Mexico was never very large; it reached a maximum of twenty staff members in 1956. Most of the activity was carried out by young Mexican men and women, some 700 of whom received one to three years of in-service training, while those who demonstrated outstanding ability were given opportunities through the scholarship and fellowship program to undertake graduate studies in the United States and elsewhere.

The story in India is even more dramatic. Embarking on a new strategy for the rapid development of agriculture the Indian Government utilized the high-yielding varieties of wheat developed in Mexico and the

short, stiff-strawed, high-yielding varieties of rice developed at the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines. In 1950-51, India produced fifty-one million tons of food grains, and this was increased to eighty-nine million tons in 1964-65. By 1971, the total food grain production had reached nearly one hundred and ten million tons as a result of planting some thirty-two million acres with the new and improved varieties of wheat developed in Mexico and rice developed at the International Rice Research Institute.

The institutionalization of the men and women and the techniques developed to use, refine and further develop the technical and scientific revolution in agriculture developed naturally. The International Rice Research Institute was established in 1960 in Los Baños, Philippines. The International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) was founded in 1966 by The Rockefeller Foundation and the Government of Mexico in consultation with the Ford Foundation. In 1967, the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) located at Ibadan, Nigeria, and the International Center of Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Colombia were established. These were to be followed by the International Potato Center (CIP) in Lima, Peru, and the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) located outside Hyderabad, India. An International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD) in Kenya will be established shortly.

In April 1969, key officials from fifteen national and international assistance agencies were invited by the Foundation to meet in Italy at the Bellagio Study and Conference Center. Included in the group were representatives from the Asian Development Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Bank

for Reconstruction and Development, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United Nations Development Programme, the British Ministry of Overseas Development, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Economic Commission for Africa, the French Office de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique Outre-Mer, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Swedish International Development Agency, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Ford Foundation. The aim was to share the latest information about agricultural developments around the world and the remarkable successes of the Green Revolution, as well as to share the outright fear that population growth was, in fact, outstripping the increase in food production. The pressing need for the expansion of new agricultural techniques was recognized for, at present rates of population growth, the world agricultural output would have to be doubled in eighteen years and quadrupled in thirty-six years. The need to expand the international agricultural institutes for further technical and scientific work and the training of a wide variety of individuals from the developing countries in the techniques most applicable to their soil, climatic and cultural needs was recognized.

As a result of this meeting the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, who had individually over the past several years provided the financial support for the international agricultural institutes were joined by some of the agencies mentioned above as well as others. By 1973, the budgets of the international agricultural institutes had increased to \$23 million as the contribution of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations became a steadily decreasing percentage of the total effort.

In order to insure the free-standing and international responsibility of the agricultural institutes, Boards of Trustees were structured with representatives from many countries with emphasis on those with specific need for agricultural development. Land was donated by the host government for the necessary research and technical facilities and experimental fields.

More recently, the Foundation has been active in the study of the economic consequences of modern agriculture, with specific attention to resultant unemployment and massive rural-urban migration. This has necessitated more attention to the development of labor intensive technology and to those "second generation" problems of credits, land reform, storage and distribution with specific reference to the small farmer.

The prime variables for improving the quality of life in the developing countries throughout the world remain increased food production and population control. There is much to be done and further opportunities in both these areas of Foundation interest, and these will be described in the results of the Trustees Program Committee Review conducted during 1972 and 73.

University Development Program

As stated in the President's Ten Year Review and Annual Report of 1971:

"If The Rockefeller Foundation can be said to have a single pre-eminent interest historically, it is the development of institutions to train professional people, scientists and scholars in the applied disciplines, who in turn will train succeeding generations of students, advance the state of knowledge in their fields, and respond to their countries' needs. The founding or developing of twenty-two public health schools during the 20's and 30's is one example; its interest during the 50's in inter-cultural or area study centers such as Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies is another."

As stated previously, a profound change in the direction of the Foundation's activities occurred during the mid-1950's under the presidency of Dean Rusk. Increasing attention would be paid to the plight of the developing countries with specific reference to food production, and therefore economic development, and the need for improved and increased educational opportunities. In addition to its agricultural program, The Rockefeller Foundation set its highest priority in the field of education in developing countries on the development of universities. Concentrated efforts were applied in the field of public health and medicine, agriculture, and the social sciences (with specific reference to departments of economics) within those universities where the Foundation was invited to work by the host governments. During the 60's, support was given to some ten institutions abroad, and of these, five reached high levels of accomplishment and are now functioning as regional centers of academic strength: - the University of Valle in Colombia, the University of the Philippines, the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, the three universities in East Africa, and three institutions in Bangkok, Thailand. Centers of strength were developed in medicine and public health at the University of Valle in Colombia, economics and agriculture at the University of the Philippines, economics at Ibadan and East Africa, and economics, agriculture, and public health in Bangkok.

As we look to the future, we simply must continually ask the question, "Education for what?" As education becomes institutionalized and established, such institutions and their faculties may look more inward than outward to the real needs of the country which they have been structured to serve. Similarly, in those countries which now have well-established universities run by

their own faculties, a major obstruction to the further advance of the country's educational program may be a marked bottleneck to qualified candidates for admission to higher education at the level of primary and secondary education. How to keep the educational and research process geared to the immediate needs of the developing countries becomes a prime consideration just as it has become one of contention in the developed countries in recent times. Another very important question for the Foundation in the 70's is whether or not the Foundation should phase completely out of those universities, such as the University of Ibadan and the three universities in Bangkok, or whether, and at the specific request of the universities and their governments, we should maintain our interest in extension of academic capability to work on integrated rural development with defined population groups. Finally, how can we achieve more rapidly the same degree of success in the institutionalization and gaining of multilateral support in the field of education that the experience in agriculture has demonstrated?

Population Program

It is no longer necessary to argue that the prime variable in the capacity to meliorate human misery is population growth. Excessive rates of population increase contribute directly to malnutrition and disease, divert resources away from economic development, and lead to chronic urban and rural unemployment. The marked increase in food production achieved over the past twenty years has been outstripped and exceeded by population growth in many regions of the world. Illegal abortion is endemic in many of the less-developed countries, and it is quite clear that individuals will resort to such measures,

regardless of the cost to conscience or health. It is unnecessary to repeat the dismal statistics. In the first century A.D. the world's population stood at 250,000,000. It took 1800 years to reach 1 billion people and this more than doubled in the next 145 years. Another billion was added in the last 30 years and today there are more than 3 billion people on our increasingly crowded planet. This figure will double over the next thirty-five years or at roughly a rate of an additional 1 billion people every eight years. India is adding a million people each month to its population and its population now exceeds the combined populations of Latin America and Africa. At present rates of growth, the world's two largest countries, China and India, would add 1 billion to their present huge populations by the year 2,000. Over the next thirty-five years the Philippines will add 60,000,000 human beings to their present population of 40,000,000 if the present growth rates persist. The most important achievement that The Rockefeller Foundation could hope for in the next thirty years is to reach the point of population stabilization and essentially zero population growth in its own country as well as the other countries of the world. Nutrition would improve, disease would diminish, agricultural and economic development could then improve the standard of living much more rapidly, and all countries would be able to devote much more of their energy and resources to the development of those institutions which serve human welfare, e.g., health, education, and justice. Pollution in all its deadly forms would be diminished. The quality of life would be vastly improved.

Prior to the 1960's The Rockefeller Foundation had declined to develop a major program devoted to the issues of population control, but it did help to

found and continues to support The Population Council, established by John D. Rockefeller 3rd in 1952. Grants had also been made in the medical and natural sciences to fundamental studies on reproduction and fertility, to say nothing of the support of Kinsey's studies on human sexuality. International training in demography had been supported at Princeton University's Office of Population Research. However, it was not until 1963 that the Trustees established a Population program. Simultaneously, widespread recognition of the fundamental issue of population growth resulted in a much increased effort on the part of governments and private organizations. Unfortunately, only a handful of American foundations have focused on the issue. At the moment only the Ford, Rockefeller, and Scaife Foundations have major programs in the area of population.

Over the past ten years the RF Population program has focused on fundamental research in reproductive biology, the development at the technical level of more effective contraceptives, the education and training of professionals, and the support of delivery systems involving family planning services. Increasingly, the Foundation's attention has turned to the developing countries, and three international meetings on the general subject of population problems have been held with marked success at Bellagio, the most recent one in May 1973. With the aid of the Foundation, centers for the study of reproductive biology have been set up in a wide variety of American institutions - including Harvard, Yale, the University of North Carolina, and the University of California, San Diego. A joint program for support has been undertaken with the Ford Foundation for research in the legal and social science aspects of population problems.

In a world which has relied heavily over the past three hundred years, and particularly the past half century, on inevitable progress through science and technology with an unshaken belief in technological fixes, we now find ourselves coming more and more to the realization that there will never be developed the perfect technology. And, therefore, while we will continue our emphasis on scientific and technological advance, we believe that it is important to pay more heed to the social, economic, and cultural determinants of reproductive behavior and family size. In contradistinction to the 1940's it is now much more acceptable both in the United States as well as abroad to pay attention to these traditionally sensitive areas of human behavior. I would like to repeat, however, that we will not opt out of support for further scientific and technological advance which will now include a much heavier emphasis on the social sciences and humanities as contrasted with the biological and natural sciences. Whether or not there will be opportunities to institutionalize population centers on an international base similar to the experience with the agricultural institutes is a moot question. We shall work increasingly to interdigitate knowledge and availability of family planning services with interests in food, nutrition, public health, education, and economic development, with special reference to rural areas where the majority of the people in developing countries still reside. Finally, because of the inextricable and direct relationship between population and health, and because we think we have new opportunities in the field of public health, we have recommended to the Trustees that once again a definite program labeled "Health" be included in the Foundation's efforts. Therefore, the new program will be named Population and Health.

Equal Opportunity Program

Every time the bell tolls for the psychic, social, or somatic death of an individual because of his lack of opportunity, or because of his frank oppression at the hands of majority groups, the bell tolls for all humanity. The Rockefeller Foundation and the other Rockefeller philanthropies - principally the General Education Board - had had a long historic interest in, and commitment to, the plight of minority groups with specific reference to the black American. Early on, the General Education Board made extensive grants to black colleges, universities, and land-grant colleges in the South, while it simultaneously paid attention to the problems of primary and secondary education. Over the 58 years of its existence, about \$62.5 million (of a total of \$325 million) was contributed to the cause of Negro education in the South.

In 1963 the Trustees authorized a new program entitled Equal Opportunity, whose first objective was to open the doors of the finest universities to minority group students. By 1967, however, the agony and frustration of black Americans had boiled to the top and violence and retribution became the order of the day. In December 1967 the Trustees and program officers agreed to concentrate on three major areas of effort:

- 1) improving elementary and secondary schools in urban areas, particularly the inner-city;
- 2) training and providing for the upward mobility of community leaders among all minorities - but with specific reference to blacks;
- and 3) studying the origin and nature of urban ghettos with the ultimate aim of helping in their abolition.

Simultaneously, increased effort was made to find and support new community coalitions as well as the existing organizations

structured for the benefit of black Americans - namely, the NAACP and the National Urban League. In 1970 an internship program for minority-group school administrators was begun by the program officers.

This has been one of the most difficult areas in which the Foundation has hoped to contribute. With our relatively meager resources, as contrasted with the awesome magnitude of the problem, the Foundation can only hope to help where it can, realizing that the symbolic significance of its interest may be as important, or more important, than the actual sum of money expended. Nonetheless, an extensive review of the whole effort has been made and will be reported later on in this report. It is particularly important in the early 1970's that the Foundation reaffirm its commitment to the issues of Equal Opportunity, for there is a present danger that the Second Reconstruction, which began in the 1950's, may collapse and that this country's commitment to equality may suffer a setback similar to the one that followed the First Reconstruction a hundred years ago. This will take every effort and the most creative genius we have available to us to decide how we may make the maximal contribution to the necessary goal of Equal Opportunity For All.

Cultural Development Program

In the 1960's the Cultural Development program was instituted by the Foundation and combined its interests in both the arts and the humanities. These disciplines require quite different skills and knowledge but both speak to the human condition and both attempt to improve the quality of life, enhance self understanding, and quicken the ethical and aesthetic sense.

With respect to the humanities, it may be true that even if God is not dead, the humanities may be. As Harrar himself said in 1970, "For a good many years the Foundation supported a division of the Humanities and retrospective judgments of the value of this program are diverse." As noted before, the Foundation did give considerable aid to individuals and institutions through its Humanities program. The interests ranged over a broad landscape from history through linguistics, archaeology, anthropology, music, literature, and drama. During the 1960's increasing attention was paid to the humanities which was now placed under the broad term "Cultural Development." More assiduous attempts were made to support the reinterpretation of America's cultural heritage, specifically with reference to the experience of various minority groups. In addition, attempts were made to join the humanities with the traditional concerns of scientists in order to foster interdisciplinary approaches to the question of ethical and moral concern about science and technology.

Abraham Flexner, writing in 1928 on "The Burden of Humanism," stated:

"I am urging a broader, deeper, and more fearless conception of humanistic studies - urging that, without interfering with the specialized or scientific interests of the archeologist, the paleographer, or the historian, humanism should, further, charge itself with the appreciation of the present as well as of the past, of the value of science, of the value of industry, of the soundness, comprehensiveness, justice, fairness, worthwhileness of government, ours, yours, other nations'. Scholars are prone to take pride in withdrawing from the world of their own day; they let it alone; and the world is, in my opinion, much the worse for that... The ultimate control of the physical and social forces which the last two centuries have released depends therefore on an assertive humanistic spirit."

The same could be said today, but with even more confidence, as philosophers and humanistic pursuits generally seem to have withdrawn from the present and future in despair, if not a safe retreat to more mathematical and particularistic approaches. Although I am sure it has been said many times before in the history of man, I would be inclined to say again that at no time in our nation's history, or indeed the world's, has it been more important to reaffirm certain values and ethical standards. If we could only bring some moral ordering to our priorities on the need for knowledge and the best uses of technology, the world would be a far safer and sounder place in which to live. Over the 1960's the Cultural Development program enjoyed many significant advances, particularly in the field of the arts. In the overall program, however, the humanities did not receive as much attention or effort.

In the arts component of the Cultural Development program, and specifically in the performing arts, the story is encouraging. The program in the arts emphasized the creative individual, whether it be the writer, the composer, the choreographer, or those who create the environment for the artist's work; namely, the entrepreneur. Here again the Foundation's measurable contributions surround the individual, whether it be in the initial support of Elma Lewis and her School of Fine Arts in Boston, or whether it be Joseph Papp and the development of the Public Theater.

Notwithstanding the cultural boom which took place in the 1950's and the 1960's in the United States, the per capita expenditure on the arts in this country is lower than that in any developed country.

In 1956 The Rockefeller Foundation, along with the Ford Foundation, granted assistance to the development of the new Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, in a sense the symbol of the reawakening of interest in the performing arts in the United States. Of even greater moment was the unprecedented commitment by the Ford Foundation of some \$232,000,000 in grants and projects in the arts from 1957 to 1971. Public recognition of the importance of the arts resulted in Governor Rockefeller's successful persuasion of the New York State Legislature to create a Council on the Arts in 1960 which by 1970-71 had allocated on an annual basis some twenty million dollars for the State Art Council to disperse. The significance of the Lincoln Center, the Ford Foundation's major commitment; the success of New York State's assuming public responsibility for the development and support of the arts; plus a Rockefeller Brothers Fund report in 1965 entitled, "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects," coupled with a volume by two Princeton economists Bowen and Baumol entitled The Performing Arts - The Economic Dilemma in 1966, did much to hasten the national recognition of the value of the arts and to provide the necessary support. The National Endowment for the Arts was established in 1965, and by 1972 it had made grants totaling \$26,500,000 to groups, individuals, and state art councils.

The Rockefeller Foundation had added increasing emphasis to its own interests in the arts, when in 1964 a special program was developed under the Cultural Development banner. Norman Lloyd, then Dean of Oberlin and formerly of The Juilliard School, was named Director in 1965 - the first appointment of an artist to a position of directorship in the arts in a major foundation. It was against this backdrop of the renaissance of public

and private interest in the arts that the Foundation undertook its review of the Cultural Development program. This is reviewed later in the report of the Program Committee of the Trustees.

Quality of the Environment

In 1969 the Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation established a new program entitled the Quality of the Environment. Along with the relatively sudden public recognition of the dangers of excessive population growth came the unhappy realization that pollution and destruction of the environment had become a major issue in industrialized countries. Excessive pollution, drastic ecological imbalances, and the extinction of a variety of plant and animal species called for a new level of responsibility for the fragile balance of the planet's ecosystem. Soon to follow was general recognition of the problem with the establishment by the United States Government of its Environmental Protection Agency in December 1970. The Stockholm conference sponsored by the United Nations in 1972 riveted the world's attention to this ever increasing problem of degradation of the environment. The Foundation initiated a relatively modest program which would focus on the training of individuals and the setting of priorities on needed knowledge through the support of research by a wide variety of environmentalists concerned with everything from waste disposal to air pollution, to the search for biodegradable pesticides, to support of interdisciplinary efforts aimed at examining entire regions and their ecological balance. The statement was made in the Annual Report for 1971, that, "The quality of life is deteriorating faster than institutions can organize the interdisciplinary studies and train

the many specialists who are needed to arrest its impairment." As 1973 opened, an extensive review by the program officers suggested new departures for the Quality of the Environment program, which would concentrate efforts on the entire needs of a defined region. Other research supported by the Foundation was aimed at the problems of disposal of animal and industrial wastes, the economics of environmental protection, the training of individuals who would be able to structure and implement public policy, and the problems of pesticide and fertilizer residues as contributors to water and soil pollution.

Allied Interests

Finally, an amorphous group of interests was placed under the term Allied Interests, including such issues as the concern for the delivery of health care, virology research, schistosomiasis control, and improvement of international relations. Toward the end of Dr. Harrar's stewardship, it was decided to terminate support of research in delivery of health-care problems, and to phase out arboviral research support, with the transfer of the arbovirus unit to Yale University and the various field stations around the world to other organizations. Significant, but relatively sparse, contributions were made to the issues of improving international relations with grants to the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, and to the Institute for the Study for International Organisation of the University of Sussex. A 1970 grant to The Brookings Institution continued support for its project of inviting young social science scholars to take part in its

foreign policy studies program. The program in schistosomiasis control, which included the Foundation's pilot program and field staff on the island of St. Lucia in the West Indies, reached its fifth year in 1972. Almost hidden from view in the Allied Interest category, it nonetheless was and is an extremely important part of the long-range attempts of The Rockefeller Foundation to control one of man's most dreaded diseases, which, in fact, is increasing in incidence around the world; the program has been incorporated into the new program in Population and Health.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Like many other institutions and establishments which were challenged during the 1960's to justify their existence and increase their social responsibilities, so too the foundations faced difficulties. Just as the populist revolt of the 1890's challenged the concentration of wealth in the hands of the Eastern establishment, so too the neo-populist revolt of the late 1960's challenged the foundations. Indeed, the rhetoric and hyperbole were strikingly similar to that which greeted John D. Rockefeller's unsuccessful attempt to gain a federal charter for The Rockefeller Foundation. Nonetheless, as Dr. Harrar himself has noted, the foundations were guilty of complacency and indeed were poorly equipped to withstand the assault of public scrutiny. As the storm clouds gathered, a Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy was structured at the urging of John D. Rockefeller 3rd. Peter G. Peterson, then Chairman of the Board of Bell & Howell, chaired the Commission, which began its deliberations in 1969. Meanwhile, the Tax

Reform Act of 1969 established rigorous prohibitions on self-dealing (of which far too many of the 26,000 foundations in the United States had been guilty), and established pay-out provisions which stand currently at 4.375% of assets. In addition, a surtax of 4% annually on the income and capital gains of the foundations was established. Perhaps the most important result of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 was the demonstration of an unbelievable lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of the American people with respect to the functions and accomplishments of the major foundations, and the real suspicion and outright hostility with which many of the major foundations were viewed. The Peterson Commission filed its report in 1970 and in concluding its "Recommendations to Foundations" sounded a note of warning:

"Looking ahead, we believe the Foundation world could become the recipient of additional and even more restrictive public and legislative disfavor at both the national and the state level if it does not move with sensitivity and vigor to anticipate abuses and problems that remain, improve its future performance, and broaden the public's understanding of that effort."

Contrast this caveat with the statement of the Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation on its fiftieth anniversary in 1963, the very year that the present programs of The Rockefeller Foundation under George Harrar's presidency were established.

"The role of a private Foundation is in meeting contemporary human need. A private Foundation can take initiative; it can pioneer; and by mustering available knowledge and human competence, it can identify causes and experiment with solutions. It can move without the political complications created when governments are involved with other governments. It can encourage cooperative effort across national and political boundaries. It can bring a high order of individuality and diversity of viewpoint into the field of human betterment. It can provide a decentralization of social initiative and responsibility. And it can enlist the interest and support of vigorous, enterprising, and public-spirited benefactors."

I can say unabashedly, because I had absolutely nothing to do with it, that I believe that statement to be a magnificent statement of purpose. Furthermore, I believe the caveat of the Peterson Commission quoted above is a very clear mandate for all foundations - that is, to improve our performance, develop an informal and enthusiastic constituency, and to prove by our efforts that we are a unique instrument for social amelioration.

But, as Douglas Dillon said before The Tax Institute in Washington, D.C. on December 2, 1971:

"Taken as a whole, the provisions in the 1969 Tax Reform seem to signify a decision by the Congress that it no longer feels that giving to private non-profit institutions is as important as it has been for the last half century. If this is so, and if private giving fails to keep pace with the growth of our economy, the results will be significant and indeed, to my way of thinking, most unfortunate."

Indeed, as Mr. Dillon noted, private philanthropy accounted for more than \$18 billion in charitable giving in the year 1970, and this was an all-time record. However, he pointed out in the years between 1960 and 1968 individual contributions had actually declined as a percentage of adjusted gross income - a decline of almost twenty percent. Similarly, although corporate giving almost doubled during the same period, the percentage of taxable profits given charity increased only $\frac{4}{100}$ one-hundredths of one percent to a total of 1.15%.

Clearly, the American people and/or their elected representatives had chosen to forget, or perhaps never knew of the uniquely American institution of private philanthropy on which the entire private voluntary sector depends in large measure. Similarly, the idea of pluralistic approaches and the virtues of heterodoxy in a democracy as it struggles to resolve its problems had been lost sight of, as the rush to find the promised land through

legislation and expansion of governmental functions proceeded apace, particularly during the 1960's, when all-time records were set for federal legislation with attendant massive increase in federal programs and federal spending. The Amendment to our Constitution which established the Income Tax in 1913 also stimulated the idea of private philanthropy through deductions from taxable income. The resultant establishment of American foundations was and is absolutely unique to Western civilization and over the years has provided the financial underpinning for a multiplicity of voluntary associations of people gathered together to improve the quality of life in their regional communities. It was against this background of the social turmoil of the 1960's, which was almost unprecedented in the history of the United States, that the Trustees and Program Officers of The Rockefeller Foundation undertook an extensive review of their programs, policies and administrative arrangements.

TABLE I

MAJOR RECIPIENTS OF RF GRANTS

1913 - 1972

(In Millions)

In the US

1. China Medical Board of New York	\$ 27.0	
2. Harvard University	26.7	
3. Yale University	19.5	
4. Johns Hopkins University	18.4	
5. University of Chicago	18.3	
6. Rockefeller University	18.1	
7. General Education Board	15.5	
8. Lincoln Center for Performing Arts	15.0	
9. University of California	13.4	
10. Social Science Research Council	13.4	
11. Columbia University	13.2	
12. Population Council	12.3	
13. National Research Council	12.1	
14. American Red Cross, Washington	9.3	
15. Cornell University	8.3	
16. Stanford University	8.2	
17. National Bureau of Economic Research	7.6	
18. American Council of Learned Societies	6.2	
19. Princeton University	5.9	
20. University of North Carolina	5.7	
21. United War Work Fund	5.0	\$279.1

In Foreign Countries

1. Peiping Union Medical College, China	17.9	
2. University of London, United Kingdom	16.1	
3. American University of Beirut, Lebanon	11.5	
4. CIMMYT, Mexico	11.1	
5. University of Valle, Colombia	10.8	
6. IRRI, Philippines	8.6	
7. CIAT, Colombia	6.6	
8. University of Ibadan, Nigeria	5.7	
9. University of Oxford, United Kingdom	5.5	
10. McGill University, Canada	5.2	99.0

Total 31 Grantees

\$378.1Total Amount of Appropriations to Recipients in US,
Including Administration

\$ 699.

Total Amount of Appropriations to Recipients in Foreign
Countries476.

Total 1913 - 1972

\$1,175.

SECTION II

THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE OF THE TRUSTEES: A BROAD AGENDA

1. General objectives:

It is intended that the Program Committee will

- (a) review existing programs and other areas of new - or renewed - interest for the Foundation together with the process of setting goals and the means of implementing policy;
- (b) as a part of this undertaking, consider also the staff's review of internal administration matters including organization, evaluation, grants in aid, information services, intellectual rejuvenation, etc.; and
- (c) on the basis of these reviews, work with the President to formulate a revised (updated) statement of program objectives and operating guidelines for the Foundation for the mid-1970's.

An interim report will be made to the Trustees by the Program Committee at the April 1973 meeting of the Board and a special meeting of the Board on September 19 will continue the deliberation. A final report will be made at the December 1973 meeting. The final report, revised as need be by the full Board, should either itself become or serve as a basis for a public document that can be used to inform interested persons of the Foundation's work and intentions under its new leadership.

2. Recent background:

The last formal review of the overall program and policy of the RF was conducted in 1958. Ongoing reviews have been conducted at the annual meeting of the Trustees as new programs have developed and existing ones have been evaluated. With the election of a new Chairman of the Board, and the arrival of a new President in July 1972, a complete,

fresh staff review was initiated, and at the December 1972 Trustees' meeting, the Chairman appointed a Program Committee of the Trustees for the purpose indicated above.

The initial phase of the staff's review has been completed and a general summary of the work done was presented to the Board of Trustees at their meeting in Williamsburg in December 1972. The following brief recapitulation of major ideas about the program which have emerged from the staff's review to date is intended to assist the Trustees Program Committee as it begins its own review.

3. The global perspective:

On the international scene, malnutrition, rapid population growth, ill-health, unemployment and abject poverty, ignorance, and inadequate educational and training opportunities continue to plague the less-developed countries. The gap between developed and developing countries continues to widen, and despite the miracles of the Green Revolution, population growth outstrips the increase in food production. Rapid urbanization finds large segments of the population without vital human services. The actual incidence of conflict within and among nations has increased, while the potential for major conflict expands in the race for economic development and the resultant competition for increasingly scarce natural resources. In the United States, support for the U.N. and U.S. AID has wavered.

Therefore, it is recommended that:

- the Conquest of Hunger Program be maintained and strengthened, with special emphasis on the "second generation" problems of the Green

Revolution. Second generation problems surround the issues of distribution of food, nutritional status, rural-urban migration, employment and income distribution, and rural development with specific reference to the plight of the small farmer;

- that more attention be directed to defined populations in rural areas of the LDC's by interdisciplinary teams specifically concerned with health and nutritional status, population problems, education and training, and economic development. This may require some additional field staff in the areas of population, economics, and public health. Attaching these interests to the existing international agricultural institutes as well as more active support of various institutions and individuals in the LDC's whose aims are interdisciplinary will be actively explored. While we believe that the Foundation should be more active in areas of nutrition, rural economic development, health, and population problems in the LDC's, there remain specific technical and scientific problems related to agriculture and human nutrition, the solutions to which the Foundation should continue to pursue. These include animal diseases such as trypanosomiasis in Africa, the legumes as a prime source of protein for human consumption, aquaculture, cotton production (implications for employment, trade, and nutrition), and other specific areas.

The University Development Program will remain a vital interest of the Foundation with increasing emphasis on "Education for Development." More attention will be paid to the continuum of primary, secondary, and higher education and to the more rapid utilization of knowledge for improving the quality of life of the people of the developing countries; in

addition to its traditional interests in the social sciences, medicine, and agriculture, more attention will be paid to development of the arts and humanities in the universities where the Foundation works; new types of curricular development will be explored with the goal of relating the educational process more clearly and directly to the problems of the people of the LDC's.

A new, exploratory program in Conflict Resolution in International Relations should be developed. The times are pressing. Suffice it to say that the world spends \$200 billion annually on arms and \$8 billion for aid to the developing countries. A number of events indicates that this may be a particularly propitious time for increased (and renewed) attention to this field.

The Population Program will remain a significant interest of the Foundation, but with increased emphasis on the social, economic, moral, and cultural determinants of population growth and on educational as contrasted with purely technological services. We will increase our efforts in the support of such work in the developing countries, which may require some increase in the Foundation's field staff. On the domestic scene, we will continue to focus on the development of centers of excellence in reproductive biology and population problems with a prime emphasis on developing the sorely-needed scientific and administrative leaders of tomorrow. Integration of population programs into medical education will be stimulated. Our work will continue to be done largely through universities and established institutions such as the Population Council, although field work in (experimental)

family planning services will probably increase. Humanistic (philosophical and moral) concerns surrounding population controls (such as abortion) will be stressed and such inquiry will be stimulated in conjunction with the Cultural Development Program.

4. The U.S. scene:

On the domestic scene, major issues are those of inequality of opportunity reflected in inadequate access to education and training, health, and legal services. Chronic unemployment, abysmal health statistics, lack of civil rights, gross injustice to minority groups, steadily-increasing crime rates, inequality in the distribution of income and wealth, and rising welfare rolls remain grinding problems for the United States. Massive federal programs initiated during the "Great Society" movement of the 1960's have accomplished much good, but the electorate seems reluctant to vote for their continuance, as social degeneration and inexorably rising taxes seem to outstrip social melioration. Our traditional belief in inevitable progress through science and technology is fading rapidly as we confront mounting pollution, urban decay, crime, and persistent inequality. As an industrial civilization turns the corner to a service society, we find ourselves poorly equipped economically and politically to save ourselves through effective social action. The complexities of managing government at all levels and the development of social policy finds us poorly equipped to relate economic, legal, political, moral, and cultural concerns to the human behavior of an ethnically and racially diverse population. All service "industries" (health, environment, government) suffer from a lack of excellence in administration.

As the 1960's shade into the 1970's, America may be in the process of re-discovering herself as manifested by the youth movement, the recognition of the persistence and real strengths of cultural (ethnic and racial) pluralism, and the increasing perception that moral and ethical concerns are of prime importance to the decision-making process. Therefore we believe that:

- while the Foundation cannot cover the waterfront of scientific and social problems, it must seek to be knowledgeable about the particulars of social movements and change and to understand their significance. This will require a small group of individuals who constantly monitor major social and cultural movements, have up-to-date knowledge of state and federal programs, and have detailed knowledge of economic research as it relates specifically to human services (welfare, health, education, housing, transportation, employment, legal (civil rights)). This same group might be responsible for the development of a small number of new programs which could in due course develop into major interests of the Foundation - namely, Public Policy and Administration, and Conflict Resolution in International Relations. In both of these programs, the common thread is the need for more effective development of leaders in public policy and management (at both the national and international level) - who understand and can relate the complexities of social melioration and human behavior to the political process. The new "Special Interests and Explorations" designation will replace the "Allied Interest" category of the Foundation. Another Special Interest would be concerned with Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China.

- the Foundation must renew and reinvigorate its historic commitment to Equal Opportunity and specifically to the eradication of poverty and injustice among minority groups with special attention to blacks - the number one example of gross oppression by white America. In addition to our present programs we are actively exploring the possibilities of a major addition in rural-urban development in the South - and we hope during 1973 to present new approaches to the reduction of the social and economic injustice suffered by blacks over two centuries of American life. We will also look for opportunities - albeit on a much smaller scale - among other minority groups - Chicanos, Indians, women, children, the "white ethnics." (Mexican-Americans should not be doomed to relive the black experience - and successful resolution of either of their problems can help the other.)

- the Cultural Development Program must be retained and strengthened with additional staff. The arts and humanities tell us who we are, who we have been, where we are disjointed, and what we might become. The perceptual and expressive concerns of the arts must become more central to general education. The moral and ethical concerns of the humanities must weave a thread through all our deliberations - both in our daily work and in our ultimate decisions as to who and what we support. There is a significant groundswell of interest and concern at all levels and age groups of our country (and the world) with the moral ordering of our priorities as a people and a nation. The Foundation must foster and encourage the movement to understand and rediscover ourselves - our historic beliefs and values, our diversity, our very purpose. Scientific and technological developments have lost their moral determinants, and a new quest for values to direct such

undertakings bespeaks the search for meaning in individual and national life. The Foundation must stimulate and encourage a greater awareness of the need for a spiritual dimension to one's existence, a greater level of self-understanding, and for the inculcation of moral and ethical determinants in place of the technological fix. The grasping and groping for meaning bespeaks the unrest of the times, particularly among youth, and may signal a religious reawakening. The Foundation has a vital role to play in an area which most foundations and universities and government have shunned.

5. Other issues pending:

The Quality of the Environment Program has undergone intensive review and will be presented soon to the Program Committee. The Equal Opportunity Program will be reviewed later in 1973 in conjunction with the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Rural-Urban Development in the United States.... An Ad Hoc Committee on Children and Youth will report during 1973.

It is paradoxical that the Foundation has no program labelled "Health" at the moment, particularly when its earliest and most important contributions were in the field of health. The programs in population, experiments in health services, and the schistosomiasis program bear directly on health. Broadly conceived, so do the programs in Conquest of Hunger, Quality of the Environment, Equal Opportunity, Cultural Development, and University Development. Conceptually and organizationally we will review our existing efforts in the biomedical sciences with an eye toward developing a significant program labelled "Health." We have a special problem here for a wide variety of reasons including the entry of several new foundations specifically and solely interested in domestic health concerns; the central position of government in the support of biomedical science

and in the financing and delivery of health services; and our own emerging priority of concern with social science and the humanities, public policy and management - as contrasted with support of further scientific research and technological development. At the moment, we are focusing on children and youth, the issues of health education and preventive medicine, the plight of schools of tropical medicine, increasing our commitment to health activities in the LDC's, the effects of environmental pollutants on health, and the continuance of the schistosomiasis program in St. Lucia. It is suggested that the Population program be re-named Population and Health recognizing the obligatory relationship of the two subjects while also designating our historic interest in health as a definite program within the Foundation.

In due course we expect to present the Trustees with a unifying theme and rationale for our programs and the priorities we are recommending to them. It should be recalled that the process of review of setting priorities and of evaluation does not stop with the Program Committee's Report to the Trustees in December 1973, for the process is a continuous one for both Trustees and staff. The Program Committee should be satisfied that the internal organization of the staff is structured optimally to fulfill the responsibilities of an ongoing review and evaluation. For these purposes we will present the work of our various Ad Hoc Committees concerned specifically with administrative matters.

January 1973

John H. Knowles, M.D.

SECTION III

THE REVIEW OF 1972 - 1973

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Historic Strengths of the Foundation's Policy	6
What's in a Name?	16
The Results of the Program Committee and Staff Review	19
Administrative and Organizational Review	19
Reviews of Programs	26
Program Objectives	27
Projected Budgets	34
Table: Estimated Expenditures 1974 - 1978	36
Conclusion	41

Introduction

"Pride goeth before a fall. All our efforts will promote only disaster if they are not done in the humility appropriate to our ignorance, never forgetting that we have not made the earth or the heavens above it." (Chester Barnard, Annual Report of the R.F. - 1948.)

* * *

"It is my general belief that a foundation is at best a catalyst, a generator, as well as a giver of funds. Changing the metaphor from chemistry to biology, it operates as an enzyme. A foundation's main virtues should be vision and courage. It should do what no one else will do, or does not dare to do, or does not have the means of doing. Its programs should be new, imaginative and creative, even though there are some old, tried and true activities that still need basic support. Education is the main one of these. In general, it should be hoped that foundations will pioneer and support activities that will later receive greater and more massive support from public funds. It should also illuminate problems so that solutions are more evident in the public order. It should try to get at the heart and substance of problems rather than play around with peripheral realities and effects, instead of causes. All of this is easy to say and hard to accomplish."
(Personal correspondence, Theodore Hesburgh to John H. Knowles, August 8, 1972.)

* * *

The process of review is as important as the purpose of review.

The questions asked are as important as the answers. Indeed, in the current age of numeracy and the computerized cost-benefit analysis, the questions may be more important than the answers (sometimes unavailable), which are combinations of head, heart and intuition. In fact, we are passing from an era of hard science and material measures into an era which is more concerned with the

soft sciences and human behavior where there is a paucity of measurement and control. While both the social and the natural sciences have prided themselves on their "value-free" approach to problems, both now realize that there is something missing which the humanities can supply, that is, a confrontation with values and the moral and ethical illumination of problems. In short, the notion of a value-free science and technology is no longer tenable; there is a general dissatisfaction with merely quantitative approaches.

Although there will always be a desperate need for more knowledge and more technology, the time available for the world to solve its problems is shortening. As the world's population continues its astronomical expansion, more and more of the world's resources - both human and natural - are turned to "defense" and armaments on the one hand and to rapid industrialization in the under-developed countries or further high consumption economies in the developed countries on the other. Habits do not change as rapidly as techniques, and as skill increases, wisdom may fade. And the ancient notion of wisdom has always been the concern of the humanities. The last 200 years in Western civilization has seen a degradation of the value of wisdom. While more scientific knowledge and technologies are needed, a new humanism based on the objective techniques of the social sciences and the descriptions of the arts and humanities is even more desperately needed if life is to be qualitatively (as well as quantitatively) worthwhile. Without some moral ordering of priorities on research and technical developments, both at home and abroad, there is every evidence that confusion, alienation, apathy and conflict will increase and that life on this planet will degenerate, probably with a whimper, hopefully not a bang.

Ideally, I suppose, the answers to our questions might best be delivered by an oracular superman who combines the scholarly attributes of historian, economist, biologist, jurist, cultural anthropologist, artist, population expert, agricultural scientist, public health worker, educator, political scientist, theologian, and environmentalist with those activist attributes of the international financier, businessman, politician, and journalist. If, in addition, our superman could change the influence on his thought processes by the flick of a switch to "sex" (male or female), "color" (white, black, yellow, red), "religion" (Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Atheist, Animist), "ideology" (Democrat, Communist, Conservative, Monarchist, etc.), we might be able to encompass at least some of the major variables in our quest for how best to allocate the resources of The Rockefeller Foundation to "promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." Our man would of course be expected to be a visionary, subject neither to complacency nor apocalyptic moods, but seized with at least a modicum of millenarianism.

The process of our review over the past year has involved us with all the intellectual and practical (or "activist") disciplines mentioned above as we have attempted to answer the question of purpose: how best to allocate finite resources to infinite ends. The process is the strategy for clarifying our goals, setting priorities (with full knowledge of the cost and benefits of alternates), establishing operational objectives, and providing for the feedback of continuous evaluation, again while moving from the long-range to the immediate, from the general to the particular, and from the imprecise to

the measurable. Within the Foundation we have structured interdisciplinary committees of the staff, some of which have become standing committees while others have been disbanded with the completion of their work. The committees have been of three types - those concerned with the administrative and organizational means to our ends, those concerned with our existing programs (or "ends"), and those concerned with questions of new programs or interests of the Foundation.

Once established, the committees (as well as individual program officers) sought the advice of hundreds of outside advisers, both here and abroad, from public and private agencies, developed and less-developed countries, academic and free-standing institutions, singly and in groups, generalists and experts, scientists and humanists, men and women of affairs, and men with lean and hungry looks who sleep little o' nights. A level of coherence in our policies and programs, understandable to all interested in our efforts, is paramount - a coherence which would satisfy the most jaded skeptic that The Rockefeller Foundation, indeed all foundations, are worthy of support and are vital to human well-being. There is no excuse for not being able to do this well for we enjoy the privilege of being able to ask any one or any group at almost any time for help and advice with minimal bureaucratic or political constraints.

In addition to countless consultations with outside individuals and groups, we have reviewed written material from diverse sources - the reports of other foundations such as Ford, Commonwealth, Robert Wood Johnson, Sloan, Edna McConnell Clark, Mellon, Kresge, Lilly, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and those of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; detailed histories and archival material of The Rockefeller Foundation,

and the history of organized philanthropy and voluntarism in the United States; reviews of the operations of the World Bank and various other international development agencies, public and private; The Brookings Institution analyses of the federal budget ("Setting National Priorities: The 1973 and 1974 Budgets"), and the hearings on budget appropriations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Agency for International Development; various U.N. reports; the five and 10 year governmental development plans of various less-developed countries; the reports of a wide variety of grantees such as Resources for the Future, the Population Council, and universities in developing countries; the legislative hearings leading up to the Tax Reform Act of 1969, or to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

Knowing what questions to ask, whom to ask, what to read - and how to synthesize information and advice into understandable form; knowing when and how to time the display of information in terms of a coherent program which will generate understanding and support for the (potentially) unique functions and role of the Foundation - all this demands certain skills, knowledge, and experience gained over time which are difficult to acquire. In short, I believe that the best foundation officers have a unique set of qualifications which are generally associated with a profession. The Foundation officer is both expert (social or agricultural or medical scientist or humanist) and generalist, thinker and doer, intellectual entrepreneur, synthesizer and integrator of diverse information and knowledge. He is more than the politician or dilettante (in the laudatory sense of both words) for he retains a deep scholarly interest in some established university discipline while adding the functions of

integrating generalist, intellectual entrepreneur and man of action.

(No wonder foundations are prime hunting grounds for university presidents' search committees, government agencies, and various international bodies - both for possible candidates amongst their best program officers but also because they are - or should be - prime sources of information on the best people, ideas, and institutions.)

We have also attempted to review our failures and the reasons for them. This will be discussed further in the body of this report. We completed a detailed and extensive study of a recent "declination" (foundation euphemism for turning someone down). The grant application was submitted by one of our country's most distinguished scientists. His protest challenged us to review the entire process of our work.

Historic Strengths of the Foundation's Policy

"One page of history is worth a volume of logic." (Brandeis)

"He who knows no history is doomed to relive it."
(Paraphrase of Santayana)

"Nothing recedes like success." (McLuhan)

A summary of the Foundation's policies (or style, which is defined as the capacity to reach one's ends with the least expenditure of energy) can help to reinforce the framework within which we work. All human beings lapse into bad habits, take things for granted, pay lip service, or just plain forget certain institutional policies that have stood the test of time and facilitate the achievement of specific goals. I believe the following policies of The Rockefeller Foundation need reaffirmation and reinforcement:

1. The Foundation has focused on causes rather than effects; it has avoided fads and fashions. It has stressed the acquisition and transmission of knowledge through support of research and teaching-training programs to the exclusion of supporting services for the melioration of human misery, as important as those are. However, the Foundation has been heavily involved in the utilization of knowledge in the support of social research and of experimental "model" demonstrations and I believe this will, and should, increase. For example, while we will continue to support certain areas of technical and scientific research in agriculture, we will bend more attention to the problems of integrated rural development and the plight of the small farmer in the less-developed countries. Of the world's present population of 3.7 billion people, 1.1 billion live in the developed countries, while 2.6 billion live in the developing countries. Of the latter, the vast majority live in rural areas, subsisting on primitive agricultural techniques. The FAO estimates that one-third to one-half of the world's population suffers from hunger and nutritional deprivation, and of those children who survive in developing countries, as many as two-thirds are malnourished, and some 300 million children of low-income families around the world suffer from retarded physical growth. The pressing importance of extension services in agriculture combined with family planning services, nutritional and public health education, revision of primary and secondary education, and economic development based on labor-intensive technology cannot be denied. And, although I cannot understand the logic of the criticism of the Green Revolution and the Foundation's role in it, I do believe we can no longer avoid the "second generation" social and cultural

problems of more equitable income distribution through provision of technical assistance and necessary inputs to those with small landholdings; to storage, distribution, and marketing; to pricing systems; and to the testing of strategies by which progress can be spread to regions and populations still not benefiting from the Green Revolution.

2. From the outset, the Foundation followed its charter, "to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." Between 1913 and 1971, roughly 35 percent of its total expenditures of \$1.2 billion was spent in foreign countries. Recognition of the interdependence of the world's people and the universality of knowledge and its uses to improve the quality of life on our planet has been slow in coming, albeit accelerated in recent times due to the widespread use of the mass media, the view of our planet from the moon, and to tremendous cultural and scientific exchange amongst the populations of the world, facilitated by a variety of agencies and the ease of jet travel.

It is a particularly propitious moment for The Rockefeller Foundation to reaffirm its faith in a common destiny for all mankind and to seek ways to enhance international understanding through cultural and scientific exchange. Recent neo-isolationist and neo-populist sentiments in the United States as manifested by rigorous assaults on the Agency for International Development and reduction in support for the United Nations are warning signals that the handful of American foundations that conduct extensive overseas programs may not fare well at the next Tax Reform hearings. (There are only four major foundations in this category: Ford, Kellogg, Carnegie, and Rockefeller. The Lilly Endowment and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation are just now entering the field.)

There will be no two futures for an increasingly interdependent world - there will be one, or none at all. Furthermore, the positive argument can be logically made that it is no longer "all give and no get" when Americans and American money work in developing countries. Successful solutions to their problems can be transported to our country (and I have seen examples of health, nutritional, and family planning service models which could be used successfully in the United States). It is no longer "charity" (it never was in the Foundation's eyes); it is a true partnership of mutual cooperation and development.

Important policy questions are not concerned with should the RF continue its present programs in the developing countries, but how much of its efforts should be directed here and to which countries and which problems should they be directed? I believe that at the very least the same proportion of our resource distribution should be maintained. More importantly, we should seek new ways of cooperating with the major international banks and development agencies so as to compound our influence for the good. We can do this only if we maintain an energetic and sensitive staff of high quality, both in the field and in the New York offices.

As to the question: which countries?, it is clear that the gap between the developed and developing countries is widening, and it is also widening between the haves and the have-nots within countries. It cannot be gainsaid that we shouldn't devote all our international energies to the developing countries (in conjunction with agencies and individuals in the developed countries), and that the first requisite for our active involvement is an official invitation by the host government to work in their country, under contract with clearly defined goals and expectations. At the moment, we have

initiated new programs at the request of the governments of Indonesia, Brazil, and Zaire and are continuing established programs in Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Colombia, Mexico, Thailand, and St. Lucia. Minimal programs and much good will exist in India, Turkey, and the Philippines. We are reviewing other possibilities at the moment, including mutual interests in agriculture, public health, and population stabilization, as well as the arts and humanities as relates to Russia and China.

Finally, recognizing that actual as well as the potential for destructive conflict is rising within and amongst the nations of the world, the Trustees have authorized a new program entitled Conflict in International Relations (to be described under Program Committee Reviews in Section V).

3. The Rockefeller Foundation is both a granting as well as an operating Foundation and this fact has strengthened its work. If one looks superficially at the major contributions of the Foundation over its 60 years of existence, one would have to conclude that the work of the field staffs in public health (first 30 years) and agriculture (next 30 years) were responsible for the most important successes. (The awarding of the Nobel Prize to Max Theiler in 1951 for the development of the yellow fever vaccine and to Norman Borlaug in 1970 for his work in developing the new forms of highly productive wheat is the symbolic culmination of the successes in public health and agriculture.) The argument might then be made in the extreme that all the resources of the RF should be deployed to direct operations through a much expanded field staff. But this argument could be countered with the results of the "indirect" grant function as exemplified by the work of Alan Gregg and Warren Weaver, by the fellowship programs financed by the RF and administered

by the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council, by the establishment of new institutions (Brookings Institution, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Population Council) or the strengthening of existing ones (various American universities, the Urban League, land grant colleges). Further refinement of the question of the best balance between grants and direct operations recognizes the fact that a small field staff of high quality coupled with extensive grants to institutions and individuals (scholarships and fellowships) in the countries where we have worked seems to be the best method of operation. Our field staff has been characterized by its scientific and technical excellence, its sensitivity to people with diverse needs and cultures with whom it works, and its low visibility and minimal presence. This is as it should be. While we plan no dramatic change in the allocation of our resources between grants and direct operations, we do need to increase the size of our field staff in the areas of public health, population stabilization, and the social sciences, particularly if we are to approach successfully the problems of integrated rural development in developing countries. The policy of functioning both as a granting and an operating institution gives us unique strengths and flexibility in reaching our stated goals - and provides at least potentially for much better evaluation of the success or failure of our work.

I have often wondered why we have never been able or willing to try a similar combination of field staff and grants (except for the work in the South of the Sanitary Commission) in the United States. The obvious answers are that we don't need field staff in the U.S. because the distances are small, the New York officers (de facto) function interchangeably as domestic field

staff and granting agents, and there would be certain political sensitivities with which to contend. This is understandable but the question of a small domestic field staff and/or regional officers in the United States needs further study. It is interesting to me that The Rockefeller Foundation is more valued in India and Mexico than it is in our country. Perhaps this is good but the testimony leading to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 leads me to think that it is not. Minimal visibility in other countries has been matched by invisibility in the United States!

4. The strategic cycle of scientific and technical advice by professional program officers or field staff followed by grants and an extensive program of fellowship and scholarship support combined with or followed by institution-building or strengthening has been remarkably successful. It recognizes the ultimate, supreme value of educated and trained individuals to any society and it reaffirms the fact that such individuals simply must have institutions if anything of quality is to endure and be strengthened through time. The final phase is the assumption of ongoing responsibility by the host government (or founding domestic group) coupled with the establishment of multilateral support, thereby allowing the Foundation to withdraw and apply its funds to other issues. The most recent prime example of such an evolution is the group of international agricultural institutes.

Nearly 10,000 men and women have been supported through the scholarship and fellowship program of The Rockefeller Foundation since its beginnings in 1917. If I had to name the one major contribution of greatest enduring value of the Foundation over the past 60 years (and I'm glad I don't, for it is a futile exercise), I would have to point to the individuals encouraged and supported by the scholarship and fellowship program. I am of the carefully considered opinion that we should make much more use of this mechanism in the

United States, and with specific reference to our domestic programs in Equal Opportunity; The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values; Quality of the Environment; and Population and Health. I believe we can achieve the maximal return of enduring value for the minimal expenditure. (although, administrative costs will rise depending on the level of direct responsibility we assume). The experience both here (particularly between the 1920's and the 1950's) and abroad bears out this contention. We are presently developing a more effective program of fellowships and scholarships related to our domestic programs.

5. The Rockefeller Foundation has been careful to focus and concentrate its attempts over long periods of time on a few selected programs with well-defined goals. It has not been guilty of scatteration or faddism. It has not succumbed to whim or frenzy or bolted to the fashionable. It has maintained its integrity while successfully resisting political pressures and passing fancies. Whether in its contributions in public health and the medical sciences over its first thirty years, its wedding of the physical and natural sciences in its overlapping "middle period," its work in agriculture and the Green Revolution over the most recent 30 years, or the Arts program over the past 15 years, it has maintained sharply focused programs with endurance, which exemplify "what a foundation should be," as described in Father Hesburgh's letter to me quoted in the introduction. It has stuck to root causes and to the advance of knowledge. It has focused on individuals and institutions.

I believe we may be approaching the danger mark of scatteration. On the international scene we have extensive experience in agriculture, public health, population problems, and in university development. In addition, a new program in Conflict in International Relations is developing rapidly. What could

be more important than economic development and improved nutrition through agriculture; the prevention of disease through public health; the stabilization of population; the reduction of illiteracy, ignorance, poor management, and unemployment through education; and the reduction of destructive conflict - for the sake of us all in an interdependent world? (One should note that the world spends \$200 billion annually on arms and \$8 billion for aid to developing countries!)

On the domestic scene, what is more important than equal opportunity for all, the improvement of the quality of the environment, and the improvement of the quality of life through the arts and humanities? I expect a cacophonous chorus of answers here on the subject of domestic priorities, such as the need for improved economic theory, the better distribution of wealth and income, and a revised welfare system; or the need for more and better public policy-makers and administrators; or the refinancing of the key institutions in the private sector (such as private universities); or the special problems of women or youth or the elderly; or the problems of improving housing and transportation; or the need for a national health policy and improved delivery systems for health services; or the need to improve our system of government and its ability to plan; or the need for penal reform, the resolution of the drug problem, and so on. We have, in fact, reviewed each of these subjects and we have made an occasional grant in some of these areas of interest. But, for a variety of reasons, including sticking to root causes and struggling to avoid scatteration, or because of the presence of adequate support from the public sector, or other foundations' major interests, we have not elected to make any of these interests a major program of the Foundation. We are continuing our study of and interest

in the need for economic research, with specific reference to human services (and have made several grants in the past year in support of such research) and we are continuing an intensive study of the drastic need for improved quality and quantity of manpower in the field of public policy and public administration. It is possible that a limited domestic fellowship program might be initiated in this area.

I believe we must maintain and strengthen our domestic programs, and unresolved issues remain in all of them. At the same time we have to reach the bottom line and see where the money (and the staff) goes. Our money power has been eroded by both inflation and the absolute increase in the costs of social and biological experimentation. Our manpower has not, but we must seek additional ways of compounding our influence through the quality of our work (and therefore our staff); through seeking new ways of becoming more visible and attaching more symbolic significance to our grants; new ways of influencing public policy and public recognition of problems; new ways of attracting other sources of money; new ways of turning over more rapidly our successfully supported experiments to other sources of support, both public and private; and new ways of working cooperatively with the various international agencies. We are actively pursuing these issues through closer attention to our information sources and publications, and closer work with the representatives of other foundations, public and private agencies, and the mass media. We are considering the possibility of offering assistance to other foundations without substantial staffs, to trust and estate managers of banks, and to industries which make substantial philanthropic contributions. We are also pursuing closer liaison and cooperation with the federal Department

of Health, Education and Welfare, although this is not the most propitious moment to broach the subject of encouraging that Department to assume the responsibility for and spread the results of our successful program of internships for individuals of minority groups in school administration, to name but one example. Finally, we have increased our activity with the representatives of the international banks and development agencies in attempts to work cooperatively and to enhance fore-planning in a coordinate fashion.

What's in a Name?

"For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Corinthians Ch. 14, v. 8)

Before turning to the results of our Administrative and Program review, a brief discussion of the conceptual framework and the importance of simply conveyed ideas through the proper choice of words and phrases is in order. The ability to influence and generate action in large numbers of people (including the staff of The Rockefeller Foundation!) is predicated on three prime variables: 1) ideas are simply conceptualized, easily understood, and fit the needs of the times; 2) a valid claim to the truth is established; and 3) fusion of the simple idea and truth leads to sustained action. Churchill's phrase "Iron Curtain" is one example; Kennedy's "New Frontier" is another.

We began with our clarion call - "to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world" and came to the conclusion there was no better idea which encompasses our mandate over time. We considered other themes, the leading one being, "Toward the well-being of mankind in an interdependent world." One program officer suggested that an overall objective should be:

"To help create a domestic and international environment which fosters and facilitates positive cultural interactions by moving from dependency to interdependency relationships, from separate futures to a single future for all."

One has only to note the effects of selling wheat to Russia on the price of feed to the farmer and meat for the housewife; the competition for oil in the Middle East on the price of gasoline in the United States; the production of heroin in Southeast Asia on addiction and crime in New York City; the activities of the multinational corporations on employment opportunities in the United States; the results of the transmission of toxins by air and water across national boundaries; the profound effect of television (and INTELSAT) and jet travel on human understanding, human aspirations and expectations to realize that we live in an increasingly interdependent world and that problems in the United States cannot be resolved without reference to the whole world. We must identify our hopes and aspirations with those of all mankind.

Turning to our own microcosm and the Conquest of Hunger, the aim of the agricultural program is to "conquer" malnutrition, economic underdevelopment, unemployment - to improve the lot of those 60 to 80 percent of the developing world's people who live in rural areas barely surviving on subsistence agriculture. Should the name of our program be changed to "Conquest of Malnutrition," more clearly identifying the goal against which we measure our success, or to "Conquest of Economic Underdevelopment" thereby broadening our approach and our understanding of the ultimate question of "Food for What?" For a variety of reasons, mostly due to comfortable familiarity with the term

over many years - both within and outside the Foundation, we have elected to retain the original description, although we have made definite changes in our strategies and goals, as can be seen in the statement of the Program Committee in Section V of this report.

The name of the Population program has been changed - to Population and Health, recognizing the inextricable relationship between population size (and density) and health, and signalling the importance and desirability of new and expanded efforts in the field of health for The Rockefeller Foundation. Our history demands it, and there are some magnificent opportunities for the Foundation to renew and strengthen its activities in the field of public health in the developing countries with specific reference to tropical diseases, nutrition, family planning and rural integrated development programs. Simultaneously, the name of the disciplinary division has been changed from Biomedical Sciences to Health Sciences accenting the importance of both the social sciences and the biomedical sciences to the improvement of health.

The title "Cultural Development" will be changed to the much less ambiguous and more descriptive "The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values." A renewed and much increased emphasis will be placed on these subjects as described in the Program statement (Section V, p. 43), and as manifest by the marked increase in anticipated expenditures over the next five years (see below).

Finally, a spirited discussion dealt with the name of the new program. Conflict is both constructive and destructive. We all live in a state of dynamic imbalance, of tension over multiple choices and problems - in short, in chronic conflict which can be fruitful and productive - but the title, "The Reduction of Destructive Conflict and the Encouragement of Constructive Conflict in International Affairs," is too long, gratuitous, and boring.

Initially, we named the program "Conflict in International Affairs," but the initials CIA would re-light some of the misgivings about foundations in the United States, as well as abroad. (We are not an arm of the Federal Government.) We have settled on "Conflict in International Relations," for the time being ("Anticipation and Resolution of International Conflicts" has also been suggested.)

"University Development" has been changed to "Education for Development," stressing the ends of education and the implied answer to the question "Education for What?" It recognizes the hazards of institutions becoming ends in themselves. It encompasses new interests and explorations that the Foundation will undertake in the broader field of education and integrated rural development programs in the less-developed countries. This is discussed fully in the report of the "Education for Development" program in Section V.

We have discarded the term "Allied Interests," and plan to use the new category "Special Interests and Explorations," as described in the report concerned with Administrative issues in Section IV.

The Results of the Program Committee and Staff Review

Administrative and Organizational Review

The material in Section IV explains in detail our review of the administrative and organizational means to our ends. The review stresses the necessity for interdisciplinary work and describes why and how we hope to achieve it. The subject of evaluation deserves special comment, for rigorous evaluation of the grants and concentrated attempts we make to reach our stated goals is essential to improving the quality of our work. We are, however, in a particularly difficult position because of: 1) the widely differing paradigms

of evaluation which apply (even when available) to the diverse goals we establish (e.g., it is one thing to evaluate the goal of increased food production, and quite another to evaluate improvement in the quality of life through support of the arts); 2) the reluctance of many outside organizations and individuals to criticize us and flog us with our failures for fear of losing their welcome as future supplicants, recalling that for every 550 successful grant applicants there are over 7,000 turned down each year; and 3) the complexities of multiple interdependent variables which defy coherent analysis and require the services of philosopher kings as well as economists (e.g., irrigation is good when it enhances crop production, but bad should it bring schistosomiasis, consolidation of small holdings into large ones, mechanization with resulting unemployment, and should it contribute to rural-urban migration).

We need constant outside scrutiny and criticism, and we do get substantial help from those we ask (and have during our year's review), but we have to rely primarily on self-evaluation and criticism built into the ongoing work of the Foundation. The Standing Committee on Evaluation represents our initial attempt at institutionalizing the critical process, and as the report states, there is much to be done.

On October 4, 1973 the heads of a number of leading American foundations assembled in our New York offices to review the entire report of our work to date (i.e., the "Second Interim Report" to our Trustees dated September 19, 1973). I believe this was the first time that any foundation had totally exposed its entire workings to its colleagues. We did this for two reasons: 1) we wished to bring them up-to-date on our procedures, policies, and programs in order to facilitate better

cooperative planning and coordinated work in the future (furthermore, some of our experience should be helpful to them); and 2) we believed that they and their staffs were in the best positions to give us constructive criticism based on their own experience. They have the least to lose as friendly and constructive critics.

The group included the following: Dr. Nils Wessel (Sloan Foundation), Alan Pifer (Carnegie Corporation), Nathan Pusey (The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation), Landrum Bolling (Lilly Endowment), Quigg Newton (The Commonwealth Fund), Dana Creel (Rockefeller Brothers Fund), Boisseuillet Jones (Woodruff Foundation), and McGeorge Bundy (Ford Foundation). [Our entire review has also been distributed to Dr. Robert Glaser (The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation), Dr. David Rogers (The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation), Russell Mawby (W. K. Kellogg Foundation), James Henry (Edna McConnell Clark Foundation), and Robert Chollar (Charles F. Kettering Foundation); and we hope for their written reactions.]

These gentlemen did not disappoint us, and we gained much help from their review of our work. Our program officers were present and took copious notes. A brief summary of the major concerns follows (in the order of their discussion).

- 1) The question of administrative costs was fully aired. The difficulty in comparing these costs among the various foundations was cited, and the need for some uniformity of cost allocation was stressed. A number of foundations are pursuing this issue at the moment with a consulting accounting firm.

2) Many felt that the most important aspect of our exercise was the staff and Trustee discussions which led to our conclusions. The process of decision-making was crucial, and a new level of cohesiveness and understanding among Trustees and staff was apparent.

3) There was the general feeling that we might be getting too diffuse and that we shouldn't forget our traditional strength of focusing, over long periods of time, on a few leading problems with well-defined goals.

4) We were encouraged to maintain most of our efforts (and our allocations) on the population side of the Population and Health program. (It is clear that this is exactly what we plan to do.)

5) Most found the Equal Opportunity program statement somewhat diffuse and vague. The same critics said that their own programs suffered from similar problems. We were urged to continue to search for new organizations within the field of civil rights and to stress education and training through an expanded domestic program of scholarship and fellowships.

6) The question was asked whether or not we are in better touch with all the organizations and individuals, public and private, involved in the fields of agriculture, population, and public health than we are in our other program interests.

7) All applauded our decision to launch a major new program in the field of conflict and international relations.

8) The Quality of Environment program seemed too diffuse, but the regional Hudson Basin project was thought to be extremely promising.

9) They suggested that, if the entire review was to be disseminated widely, we rewrite it (for uniformity of style) and shorten it!

We have taken all the above criticisms and suggestions seriously, and are working now to answer them in our ongoing review. This was a tremendously important and constructive event for all of us.

It should be stated that, although the experts are central to the process of planning, the general public has every right and responsibility to criticize us, be heard, and have an effect. The Trustees serve this function, for their job is to set policy and represent the public interest in our work. But, there is a very wide and diverse mass of Americans who may have no view, or quite a different view of us than we have of ourselves. It is this group that we are trying to reach through our new publication, RF Illustrated - and it seems to be having some effect. In addition, through our new policy of opening our Archives to any and all scholars and journalists - indeed any interested groups or individuals with legitimate requests - we hope to enhance our exposure to constructive criticism and to achieve as high a level of accountability as possible. The report of the Standing Committee on Records and Archives explains our new policy. This is a most important, unique change in policy.

The role of the Trustees is a particularly important subject. They bear the ultimate responsibility for the quality of our work and the coherence of our means and ends. It was fashionable and popular during the 1960's to criticize the "faceless" establishment, whether it was the President and Trustees

of universities, hospitals, schools, foundations, or businesses. The criticism was justifiable in many instances and much good emerged from the turmoil. The Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation have been characterized over the years as men and women of accomplishment, imbued with a passionate commitment to improving the quality of human lives. During the past year, practically every Trustee has given untold hours, freely and willingly, to the work of the Foundation, whether it be as a member of the Program Committee, the Executive Committee, or the Finance Committee. Each Trustee has much to offer to the whole effort as well as to his own area of interest and expertise. Too often, Trustees and staff find themselves in adversary positions due to misunderstanding, the distortion due to distance or infrequent contacts, and the inevitable conflict amongst well-intentioned men and women who see their area of interest and responsibility as the most important subject. Such turmoil and conflict is healthy and constructive, but carried to an extreme can lead to demoralization and inefficiency.

Various Presidents of the Foundation have called for more active involvement of the Trustees. Both the Chairman of the Board, Douglas Dillon, and I feel this is highly desirable. My experience over the past year is that all you have to do is ask and "it shall be given." I have encouraged every program officer to make frequent contact with individual Trustees to gain their advice and help while issues and decisions are evolving, rather than after-the-fact. Our Trustees have had extensive experience in every field of Foundation interest - and they know the difference between policy considerations and operations. Their more active participation has already strengthened our work measurably. Used properly, the 21-man Board doubles the strength of the Foundation staff.

The work of what are now nine Standing Committees is described in Section IV (Administrative and Organizational Considerations). Each Committee's report is a summary statement based on extensive review of the Foundation's past reports and administrative arrangements, consultation with other foundations and outside consultants, and study of selected articles and books. All of us feel that there is much we can do to improve our performance. The identification of individual staff members with ongoing responsibility and authority on the various committees concerned with the means to our ends should facilitate the process of self-examination, renewal, and improvement. We have tried to develop an environment which will facilitate interdisciplinary work, the sharing of problems, intellectual rejuvenation, and direct, mature confrontation (constructive conflict, if you will) - each with the others - of our hopes, fears, prejudices, knowledge, skills and experience. The sum should be greater than the parts and we look for a new level of coherence and effectiveness in our means and ends. The description of the Program Committees, the organization of Education for Development Committee, and the notes on Special Interests and Explorations (the "Allied Interest" dilemma) (Section IV pages 60 to 63) gives specific information on these points.

Your attention is also called to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Women and to my reply to an inquiry of our field staff. (Section IV pages 64 to 68). Subsequent to the Ad Hoc Committee's report, we have developed a joint internship with the Council on Foundations and our first participant started the year's program in September 1973.

Reviews of Programs

Each one of the newly constituted interdisciplinary Committees reviewing our existing programs prepared extensive material for internal use in its deliberations and then prepared a short summary statement for review by the Program Committee of the Trustees (with extensive background material available to the Trustees should they want it). After the Program Committee's review, the Committees went back to work, rewriting the statements where necessary in answer to specific questions and criticism, and interviewing further individuals and groups of consultants suggested by the Trustees (See Section V). We expect more work after the Trustees' Special Meeting on September 19, 1973! In due course, we hope to prepare a report of summaries and selections for wide distribution both in the United States and abroad which would highlight what we have presented to our Trustees plus selected background material which we have found particularly valuable (internal reviews and position papers, Bellagio Conference material, selected articles written by consultants and others which may have been published elsewhere, etc.) - all in the effort to be fully accountable and to explain the process of our work and the basis for our decisions. At the very least we will distribute widely the final report which will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at their meeting on December 3-4, 1973, having incorporated the suggestions made at the Special Meeting of the Board on September 19, 1973 - plus the substantial help we have obtained from the other foundations, which has been summarized above.

The description of the new program authorized by the Trustees in April 1973 (Section V, pages 66 to 96) is necessarily somewhat longer than

the others - and for the immediate future will require intensive effort to implement. I have included two memos representing our initial attempts to implement the new program.

Program Objectives

Although the objectives of our programs are stated in the summaries in Section V, and should be read in their entirety, I believe they deserve brief summarization here. If the process of evaluation is to be effective and if there is to be coherence to our efforts, it is necessary to be clear on objectives within programs.

Conquest of Hunger:

The primary objective of The Rockefeller Foundation's Conquest of Hunger program is to accelerate rates of increase in food production in those countries where: 1) yields per unit area are low and relatively static, 2) decreasing amounts of arable land per person is a cause for concern, 3) low income of rural people is a major barrier to improvement of standards of living and of national economic and social advance, and 4) important national institutions need to be strengthened.

A related objective is to couple agricultural production on small farms with effective health care delivery and family planning programs, at costs the poorer nations can afford.

A third objective is to identify new ways - such as aquaculture or production of single cell protein - by which growing world food needs might be met.

Recognizing the complexity and magnitude of the task ahead, the Foundation will seek to cooperate with other national, international and

private organizations with similar concerns in devising new arrangements for more effective collaboration.

All of the above objectives have another most important goal: to buy time during which efforts toward stabilization of population growth might take effect.

Population and Health:

The objective of the program in Population and Health is to provide a basis on which the goals of population control and improved health can be approached. The primary emphasis will continue to be the acquisition of knowledge, its rapid transmission, and the institutionalization of research and teaching programs. Within the program, priority will be given to population problems both in the United States and abroad. In the field of health, we will increase our efforts in public health abroad, while emphasizing basic research in such tropical diseases as schistosomiasis and trypanosomiasis. Domestically, we are exploring the use of television in the regionalization of health sciences, and we are searching for opportunities to strengthen schools of tropical medicine and public health. Most importantly, we have taken steps to bring a more active medical component to our other existing programs - with specific reference to nutrition within Conquest of Hunger, health within the Quality of the Environment, the teaching of community medicine within Education for Development, and medical ethics within Contemporary Values.

Education for Development:

Our traditional University Development program will be continued in the less-developed countries, emphasizing the strengthening of institutions

which have the potential for serving as national or regional models. Particular attention has been placed on the development of departments of agriculture, public health, medicine, and social sciences. This involves the provision of temporary leadership to the less-developed countries by the developed countries and an extensive fellowship program for promising, indigenous students. (Our new programs of university development in Zaire and in Jogjakarta, Indonesia are examples.)

In addition, we will explore the interests of departments of education within universities. The problems of primary and secondary education in the less-developed countries become progressively more serious as their populations expand. Inordinately high attrition rates and inadequate curricula limit the number of qualified candidates for higher education. The universities are thus paralyzed by an inadequate learning foundation for their students. National needs cannot be met adequately unless the entire educational program becomes the subject of intense study and upgrading.

Finally, another objective is the encouragement of university-based applied programs and extension activities on an experimental basis. When the university is developed to the extent that its departments are administered and staffed by its own people, such programs, which should be interdisciplinary in nature, would provide more rapid transmission of knowledge and skills to the real needs of the people. It would demonstrate that "ivory tower" excellence is not the sole objective of academic growth and development. Community needs and national problems can be addressed experimentally on an applied level by

institutions of higher learning. The university's findings can be useful to other agencies responsible for developmental activities on a regional or national scale.

Equal Opportunity:

The Foundation's primary objective in its Equal Opportunity program is to assist in the transformation of American institutions and practices to assure the disadvantaged, with specific reference to minority groups, equality of opportunity. Educational opportunities are absolutely central to this objective, and, either directly or through other organizations, we are presently supporting:

- 1) The training of minority-group individuals, through internships and other specially designed programs, for positions of responsibility and leadership.
- 2) Community education/community development programs aimed specifically at involving a broad spectrum of the communities' leaders in developing indigenous expertise. Opportunities are provided for individuals to be more effective in managing a wide range of problems through educational and training programs.
- 3) Policy-oriented research efforts which should provide guidance for alleviating specific problems which confront the disadvantaged.
- 4) Continuing explorations of unique opportunities in the equal opportunity field. The Foundation is giving specific attention to the plight of the disadvantaged in rural areas, and it is searching for new and effective means for dealing with problems of institutionalized racism. Attention

is being given to special advocacy and litigation interests which are especially active in areas most directly concerned with providing equal opportunities for all Americans.

Despite the progress of the past decade, it is clear that major challenges still lie ahead in the civil rights-equal opportunity field. It is absolutely essential that The Rockefeller Foundation, with its long history of support in this field, continue a vigorous and innovative program at a time when some other organizations have grown weary or have reduced their support for such efforts.

The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values:

The objectives of the arts and humanities programs can be summarized as follows:

Arts:

- 1) To stimulate significant work by important creative artists.
- 2) To broaden opportunities for exposure and training of creative artists.
- 3) To engender in American society more positive attitudes toward the creative artist; making the arts more central to general education is of primary importance.
- 4) To promote increased international understanding through the arts.

Humanities:

- 1) To increase both the number and quality of, and the opportunities for, persons working on problems of the human spirit: on values, laws, symbols, purposes. Support for the creative individual is of prime importance to the program.

2) To internationalize the humanities and enhance transnational and cross-cultural understanding.

3) To enable a) humanistic scholars to extend their reach to new experiences and new dilemmas, and b) professionals in other fields to render explicit and critical the humanistic dimension of their own work.

4) To deepen our understanding of the many heritages of mankind.

5) To make development in humanistic skills accessible to all social classes.

Quality of the Environment:

The objectives of the program are, 1) to speed the identification of, and the implementation of solutions to, the more important and difficult national and international environmental problems; 2) to create institutional capabilities to deal with such problems effectively; and 3) to establish valid grounds for increased public confidence that environmental abuses will be minimized. In accomplishing these objectives, a strategy has been developed which concentrates support in five areas:

1) Testing the validity of a comprehensive, integrated, regional approach to environmental management within a defined geographic region.

2) Developing environmentally significant alternatives in the management of major pollutants, particularly the nutrients nitrogen and phosphorus, pesticides, and heavy metals. This would include an improved understanding of their relationship to principal food chains.

3) Assisting universities in their search for solutions to specific environmental problems which have major biological and/or social components, through the development of cooperative working relationships with state and federal agencies or other organizations.

4) Assisting in the establishment of linkages among the world's institutions concerned with internationally important environmental problems such as quality of international waterways, transnational air quality, and environmental contamination by toxic substances.

5) Developing an improved understanding of the nature and sources of public perceptions of environmental problems.

Conflict in International Relations:

This new Foundation program will be directed toward a) the support of measures for the anticipation, avoidance, and resolution of conflicts that are likely to disrupt the international community, and b) the development of international institutions and an international order with greater capacity for dealing effectively with emerging issues of global interdependency. The new program underscores the reality that we live in an increasingly interdependent world and that the realization of other Foundation program objectives will depend to a large degree on the avoidance of conflict and on the development of a more stable world order. The Conflict in International Relations program will seek to support:

1) Institutions and organizations which have the capacity to carry out effective programs in the international relations-conflict resolution field. Particular attention will be given to projects analyzing issues which have a high potential for generating destructive international conflict.

2) Selected individuals whose previous background and experience, suggest that they would make a significant contribution and clearly benefit from a period of ongoing research or profit from an operational program as a Rockefeller Foundation Fellow.

3) Measures, including task forces and study groups which have as their major purpose the identification of issues and programs in conflict avoidance.

4) Efforts which are clearly aimed at encouraging the involvement in global affairs of a broad spectrum of civic, educational, and special groups within the United States and perhaps in some other nations as well. There is a pressing need for new educational efforts which will allow the individual to understand the complexities of an increasingly interdependent world, and encourage him to participate in the resolution of international conflict.

Projected Budgets

"When a fellow says it hain't the money but the principle o' the thing, it's th' money." (Abe Martin: Hoss Sense and Nonsense, 1926)

Section VI contains the expenditures by program and a summary of the New York Office Consolidated Budget (by division and including general administrative costs) over the five-year period 1968-1972. (We have revised our system of budgeting and, in the budget on page 36 (Section III), "New York Program Costs" which were originally included under the heading "New York Consolidated Budget," are now included under the heading "Programs.") Careful study of these tables (Section VI) tells more in the gross about the Foundation's activities than a thousand words. Although we believe in healthy competition among and within the various programs and divisions, we should be able to point to the "bottom line" over the next five years and show that we have put our money where our mouth was in the 1972-1973 review, when the Trustees authorized new efforts and new directions to our activities. We must balance the need for accountability and control (by describing in detail our objectives and sticking to

a planned budget of expenditures over the next five or more years) with the need for healthy competition for funds among the program officers. It is important to note that the allocation of our funds depends heavily on the opportunities presented to us. We must retain the flexibility necessary to rise to the unanticipated opportunity, even though it throws our budgeting askew.

With this in mind I have attempted to summarize in the following Table what the next five years' expenditures might be, with the results of 1968-1972 expenditures in the right hand column for comparison. Expenditures of 220-270 million dollars over the next five years are assumed, based on a 4 percent annual increase in income. This estimate may be erroneous because of the variable effects of unknown rates of inflation on costs and assets, and because of unforeseen changes in payout provisions and excise tax required by law.

Estimated Expenditures 1974-1978 (in millions)

<u>Programs</u>	<u>1974-1978</u>	<u>Total 1968-1972</u>
Conquest of Hunger	\$ 35-44	\$ 48
Population and Health	36-44	25.5
Education for Development	40-49	43.4
Equal Opportunity	34-41	34
The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values	24-29	19.2
Quality of the Environment	12-16	7.3 (1970-72)
Conflict in International Relations	12-16	-
"Allied Interests" (i.e., Special Interests and Explorations)	<u>8-12</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Total Program Expenditure</u>	\$201-251	\$200.4
General Administration	<u>19</u>	<u>14.8</u>
<u>Total Expenditures</u>	<u>\$220-270</u>	<u>\$215.2</u>

The estimate of \$19 million for General Administration during the next five years allows for a 4.75% increase in expenditure each year.

The following notes will amplify the material in the Table.

1) It is estimated that the costs of General Administration (salaries, rents, supplies, etc.) will increase by 4.75% each year. This will be due largely to: 1) a new rental contract for our New York offices; 2) increased salaries, related primarily to inflationary costs; and 3) the increase in salaries required to replace people who retire.

2) Although it is anticipated that fewer funds will be utilized for the Conquest of Hunger program, Foundation activity in this area will, in fact, increase for three reasons:

First, it is not likely that Foundation funds will be required for construction costs of additional international agricultural research institutes. (Foundation support for facilities of CIMMYT and CIAT amounted to \$858,000 in 1972; \$1,554,000 in 1971; \$3,095,000 in 1970; \$632,000 in 1969, and \$212,000 in 1968.)

Second, the Foundation's rising involvement in exploratory, experimental, demonstrational, and organizational activities can increasingly be supported in part or conducted in cooperation with other funding agencies such as the International Development Research Centre of Canada, USAID, the Ford Foundation, UNDP, or the international banks. This suggests that a greater proportion of Foundation resources for Conquest of Hunger should be invested in professional staff time to allow the Foundation to increase the pace of its organizational and exploratory work.

Third, less direct support by the Foundation is projected for the expensive capital and operational requirements of national institutions -

particularly colleges of agriculture or veterinary medicine - except as part of the Education for Development program. Most institutions should be able to attract major financial support from banks or bilateral agencies for long-term development programs. The Foundation is assisting several major agencies to develop loan or grant programs for such purposes, while assisting national institutions by supplying interim leaders and by training young nationals for such roles.

3) Population and Health will need an increase in funds (roughly estimated at \$3 million over the next five years) - part of which is a shift of expenditures in schistosomiasis from "Allied Interests" - and the rest of which is related to an increase in public health and population interests both domestically and abroad. The current level of expenditures of roughly \$6 million annually in Population has been reached in only the past two years and it is anticipated that this will be maintained and probably increased (i.e., at least \$30 million will be allocated to population problems over the next five years - of an estimated total in Population and Health of \$36 to \$44 million).

4) Education for Development may need additional funds with which to pursue experimental interests in primary and secondary education through universities and in extension of university-based disciplines to defined population groups for the purposes of integrated rural development experiments.

5) Our efforts in the Equal Opportunity program will increase, and the emphasis on support for those institutions within the civil rights field and those concerned with educational opportunities and advancement will be strengthened. An improved and expanded domestic program with more stress on education and training through fellowships and scholarships will be presented to the Trustees at a later date.

6) The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values program (formerly Cultural Development) will increase markedly to reflect the belief such a program can do much to enhance the quality of life, to reduce destructive conflict, to quicken the ethical sense, and to give new meaning to troubled lives. Greater focus is needed as defined in the Program Statements. A renewed emphasis on an expanded scholarship and fellowship program is being developed. Within the program, the humanities will receive more attention and markedly increased funds - both within its own interests, as well as through active participation in the interdisciplinary work of the committees on Population and Health, Equal Opportunity, Education for Development, and the Social Science division. It is not necessary to repeat that the most neglected and underfinanced parts of the modern American university are the departments within the Humanities division - this at a time when the meaning and quality of life and the values upon which our civilization stands have become a central concern for all age groups.

7) Quality of the Environment will not receive an increase in support. Future expansion or contraction (or even phasing out) of the program may well depend on the degree of success of the "Hudson Basin" project. The field is a very large and extremely complex one. The question remains open as to whether the Foundation can make a significant contribution, what with the other demands on our resources and the real need to maintain a small number of focussed programs. Furthermore, many of our present concerns in environmental matters overlap with the leading agricultural and aquacultural problems, and with our new program in conflict and international affairs.

8) Conflict in International Relations will work up to approximately \$3.0 million a year over the next several years depending on the degree of "success" we can achieve in carrying out the Trustees' mandate. Part of the estimated amount represents transfers from "Allied Interests" (e.g., during 1971, roughly \$300,000 was allocated to organizations which could qualify for support in the new program; i.e., the Overseas Development Council; Institute for International Order; University of Sussex Institution for the Study of International Organizations) and our 1973 allocation of \$275,000 for a program of scholarships and fellowships in International Relations.

9) There is a marked decrease in the "Allied Interests" expenditures. Part of this is due to transfers of programs to Population and Health and to Conflict in International Relations. Part will be due to transfers to appropriate programs of grants in aid which should result in greater coherence. Quite aside from these transfers (or "book transactions") is the need for more stringent scrutiny of the best use of a sizable portion of our allocations and the real need to resist "scatteration." Grants in aid and ad hoc grants should receive the same rigorous review that major grants do. (It may be much more difficult to make a good \$10,000 grant in aid than a \$500,000 grant.) The Standing Committee on Grants in Aid will help to achieve this. At the same time we all recognize the critical importance of flexible funds with which to pursue ideas peripheral to our established program interests. The present projected budget will allow roughly \$2 million per year for such interests and explorations. At the moment we are pursuing new opportunities for cultural and scientific exchange with China and are researching the fields of economic studies and of

public policy and administration. The term "Allied Interests" will be discarded and replaced by "Special Interests and Explorations" as described fully in Section IV, pages 60 to 63.

Conclusion

It has become obvious to all of us over the past year of intensive review that all our interests and programs are interrelated and interdependent - increasing food production and improving its distribution will improve nutrition and health and enhance economic development which, in turn, will provide new resources with which to improve education in all its forms - all of which in turn will limit population growth - and allow further resources to be devoted to improving the quality of life by developing those institutions of health, education, welfare and social justice whose primary concern is the quality of living. A new concern for humanity spawned by the knowledge of the interdependence of all people and nations may bring new sanity to a troubled world, which, while it roams the brink of hell, may yet find the causeway to peace.

While the world will always need and value the expert and the professional, it demands new interdisciplinary approaches to problem solving which recognize the interrelatedness and interdependence of all knowledge and human welfare. In the microcosm of The Rockefeller Foundation, we are searching for new ways to bring our various experts into more fruitful tension with each other. We seem never to have enough time or money to do all the things we would like to do and we live in a state of chronic frustration. The process of review and evaluation is a continuous one as we search for the

best ways to use our limited resources to reach our goals. Our sixty-year history tells us that we have contributed something unique and of value - and it drives us on.

What's past is prologue. Two favorite sayings express our mood at the moment: "It's later than you think!" and "The best is yet to come."

John H. Knowles, M.D.

November 1973

SECTION IV

ADMINISTRATIVE and ORGANIZATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary Statements of Standing Committees	1
Grants in Aid	3
Scholarships and Fellowships	10
Bellagio Study and Conference Center	17
Records and Archives	21
Intellectual Rejuvenation	29
Information Service	32
Corporate Responsibility	40
Evaluation	43
Administrative Policy	51
Program Committees	53
Organization of Education for Development Program	57
Special Interests and Explorations	60
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Women	64
Reply to Field Staff Inquiry	69

Over the past year, as part of an extensive review of the programs and policies of The Rockefeller Foundation, the Staff has concerned itself with various administrative and organizational matters with an eye to improving the quality of our work and the efficiency with which we set and achieve stated goals. For these purposes we have pursued several lines of inquiry, which are summarized in the enclosed material, namely:

1) the establishment of Standing Committees to deal with certain ongoing administrative issues of prime importance to the achievement of the Foundation's goals;

2) the strengthening of the interdisciplinary work of the Program Committees through a variety of organizational changes;

3) a review of our relationship with Field Staff and of areas of special concern, such as the position of Women, and the Allied Interest dilemma.

Organizational and administrative arrangements should never become frozen, but should change with changing conditions and concerns both inside and outside the Foundation. Therefore, the enclosed material represents our interim report and will be reviewed annually on "RF Day" (May 14th).

At the moment we have established nine Standing Committees, seven Program Committees (one of which is a new Program on Conflict in International Relations), and two Special Interests (Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China; Public Policy and Administration) described in the enclosed reports. In addition, I have included my response to the Field Staff's reply to my letter which asked for their suggestions as to how we might improve

our relationships. Finally, the report of the ad hoc Committee on Women, and notes on Special Interests and Explorations (the Allied Interest dilemma) are enclosed.

We should discuss the enclosed material at our Wednesday morning meeting and then present it to the Trustee Program Committee.

May, 1973

John H. Knowles, M.D.

Grants in Aid

Committee Members

John A. Pino, Chairman
Joseph E. Black
Howard Klein
John Maier
Ralph W. Richardson, Jr.
Esther S. Stamm
Kenneth Wernimont

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

May - Afternoon of May 2
September - Afternoon of September 19
October - Meeting to prepare report to principal officers
(no date set)
November - Meeting to prepare report for December Board of
Trustees meeting (no date set)

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

In reviewing the historical background relative to the establishment and use of the grant in aid, the Committee felt that the rationale which was set forth by the officers and Trustees in 1929 and subsequently modified and strengthened remains valid today. In these times of rapid change, perhaps the grant in aid is even more important as a vehicle for responding quickly to opportunities for meeting the Foundation's program objectives.

The committee felt that on the basis of past records and performance, grants in aid have been used with good judgment by the officers and in general have achieved the purposes for which they were awarded. The Committee strongly recommended their continuance while, at the same time, suggesting certain changes in policy and administration that would improve

the quality of the awards as well as allow for continued initiative by the officers in identifying meritorious opportunities.

The Committee has made certain recommendations to the President, among which are included:

- 1) A strengthening of the procedures for award selection is indicated, in the opinion of the Committee, and an improvement in follow-up and evaluation methods is necessary.
- 2) The objectives and purposes of a grant should be clearly stated, as well as the criteria suggested for evaluating it.
- 3) The Committee suggests that grants which would formerly have been labeled "Allied Interests" now be termed either "Special Interests" - these being interests approved by the President as new and developmental activities, or, in cases when such grants are clearly associated with Program objectives, as "Program grants in aid" (and allocations listed in the Annual Report under the appropriate Program).
- 4) The Committee recommends that one of its continuing functions be the annual review of the uses and accomplishments of grants in aid during the previous year, including the presentation to the principal officers of an annual report. A report should also be made annually to the Trustees by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Grants in Aid.
- 5) It is the consensus of the Committee members that Trustee approval should be sought for an increase to \$35,000 in the upper limit of support permissible through a grant in aid to be signed by the President, and a

corresponding increase to \$25,000 in the upper limit of grants in aid to be signed by a Vice-President. Special Interest grants would all be signed by the President. The resolution of the Executive Committee of the Trustees taken at their meeting in response to the above recommendation is appended.

6) When used judiciously, the travel grant is a useful component of Foundation programs. A moratorium of this kind of award was imposed by the RF President early in January 1970, and it is the Committee's recommendation that the moratorium be lifted with the clear understanding that such awards be made in strict conformance with the Tax Reform Act. The Standing Committee on Grants in Aid, with the assistance of the Secretary's Office, has prepared an RF policy statement on such "study-travel" grant awards, which is appended to this report.

July 2, 1973

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE STAFF

SUBJECT: Change in Grant-in-Aid Regulations

At the meeting of the Executive Committee on June 29, 1973, the following action was taken:

RESOLVED that regulations governing the allocation of grant-in-aid funds appropriated by the Trustees be, and they hereby are, amended to provide that each allocation shall be limited to \$35,000, that the rate of support for a single project shall not exceed \$35,000 for any twelve-month period, and that total support of a project through grant-in-aid funds shall be limited to a three-year period and shall not exceed \$105,000; provided, however, that if an allocation exceeds \$25,000 or, taken together with previous allocations for the same project during a twelve-month period, provides more than \$25,000 for the project during the period, or falls within what is now known as the Allied Interests category, it shall require approval by the President.

The Secretary's Office will be glad to answer any questions you may have on the changes in regulations. The substantive changes are three: (1) an increase to \$35,000 in the upper limit of grant-in-aid support for a single project in a single year; (2) an increase to \$25,000 in the amount of grant-in-aid support for a single project in a single year that can be given final approval by a Vice-President; and (3) a requirement that all Allied Interests grants in aid be signed by the President.

J. K. S.

POLICY STATEMENT ON GRANTS TO INDIVIDUALS THAT INVOLVE SUBSTANTIAL TRAVEL

Traditionally the Foundation has been prepared to consider requests for grants for study, research, or observation, the major cost-component of which is travel. Such grants, known informally as travel grants, underwent a moratorium after the passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, primarily because of officer concern that they might not meet the requirements of the Act with respect to grants to individuals.

Today, with the pertinent final regulations issued and with three-and-a-half years of coexistence with the Act behind us, we believe that the moratorium of early 1970 should be lifted. In fact, a few individual grants have been made during the past two years - experimentally and on advice of counsel - that involved substantial travel. In each case the Foundation's commitment was made only after exhaustive examination of the plans of the individual in question and after development of a file that made clear the specificity of the objective to be attained and/or the pertinence and importance of the project to the enhancement of the individual's particular skills.

The officers recommend that formal authority be given for consideration of such grants, subject to all the requirements of the law and in conformity with the statement of the Foundation's individual grant procedures that has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service (which includes a stipulation of detailed substantive reporting by grantees).

Grants to individuals for study, research, creative work, or observation may involve no travel, some travel, or much travel. (The 1970 moratorium affected only those that involved substantial travel.) This point is important because it demonstrates that what is at issue is not the legitimacy or propriety of a particular type of grant but the amount of travel that may be included in a grant to an individual without raising questions of legitimacy

or propriety. The law requires that a grant to an individual be for the purpose of enabling him to achieve a specific objective (produce a book, a report, a work of art, or such other intellectual product as the nature of his talent and experience may make appropriate), or of improving or enhancing his skills or talents in the literary, artistic, musical, scientific, teaching, or other similar field. There is no prohibition of travel if it contributes directly to the achievement of the specific objective, or the enhancement of the particular skill or talent, which is the purpose of the grant. But substantial and expensive travel for the sake of a brief exposure to a new experience is clearly not justified, because of disproportion between the travel component of the project and the time devoted to, or the relative importance of, the objective of the project. Travel cannot be a purpose of a grant to an individual, but it may be an instrument for achieving the purpose if a case for its instrumentality is made with sufficient clarity and in sufficient detail.

Grants to individuals that involve substantial travel would be awarded, consistent with the foregoing, pursuant to the following guidelines:

The file should contain adequate background documentation, which clearly indicates the purpose of the award, the procedure by which the individual was identified, and the provision made for the preparation of a report by the recipient and an evaluative judgment by the initiating officer. It will be the responsibility of the initiating officer to make certain that at the termination of the grant the awardee report is filed and the evaluative statement is on record.

Financial provisions, which may include travel, incidentals, and a per diem for living expenses, would be clearly stated in the grant action; and honorarium would not be provided.

Once it has been determined that the purpose of an individual grant fulfills the requirements stated above, the administration of the grant would follow one of the following two forms:

(1) If the request has been initiated by a university or other publicly supported institution which identifies the individual without the prior intercession of the RF, and if the individual, in the judgment of the RF officers, qualifies on the basis of professional and/or other criteria, the award may be made directly to the institution, identifying (or not) the individual on whose behalf the grant has been requested. Such a grant is not an individual grant within the meaning of that term as used in the Tax Reform Act.

(2) If the prospective individual grantee has been identified by Foundation officers or field staff members rather than by his own institution, a grant may be made either to his institution or to him directly (once his professional qualifications have been fully documented and other questions answered in conformity with the foregoing paragraphs). Such a grant must be made on the basis of a special letter of notification which commits the individual and/or his institution to various reporting requirements. (The form of the letter is obtainable from the Secretary's office; the several program administrative assistants also have copies.)

The Standing Committee on Grants in Aid will periodically review all individual grants to ascertain their conformity with established policy and to assure their inclusion in the Committee's annual report to the Principal Officers and the Board of Trustees.

5/17/73

Scholarships and Fellowships

Committee Members

Kenneth Wernimont, Chairman; Administrative Vice-President
Allan C. Barnes or designate from BMS
Joseph E. Black
Ralph K. Davidson as Vice-Chairman of EFD Committee
Robert L. Fischelis and Joseph R. Bookmyer
Herbert Heaton or Leo Kirschner or Alex Daunys
Howard Klein
John A. Pino
Ralph W. Richardson, Jr.
Esther S. Stamm

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

It is expected that the Committee may need to meet at least once a month for an initial period of four or five months. Quarterly meetings should be scheduled after that with occasional special meetings called by the Chairman to deal with urgent matters.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

Dr. Knowles appointed an ad hoc Committee on Fellowships and Scholarships in July 1972 under the chairmanship of Robert L. Fischelis. This Committee had a substantial number of meetings during which the Foundation's entire fellowship and scholarship program was reviewed. A series of recommendations has been agreed upon by the members of the ad hoc Committee and reported to Dr. Knowles under the date of February 20. These recommendations (See Addendum to this Report) and the accompanying analytical statement will be important to the standing Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships as it proceeds with its work during the coming months.

The Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships is a reactivation of a committee which has traditionally guided the Foundation's fellowship and scholarship activity.

Functions

The Policy Committee will have the following responsibilities:

A. Program Planning and Review

(1) International Projects. A major part of the scholarship and fellowship activity of the Foundation is currently related to UDP (EFD) and COH program objectives in the less-developed countries. The Committee will be responsible for review of these activities and of the guidelines for subject matter and geographical distribution of such awards.

(2) Domestic Projects. The Committee will have responsibility for review of objectives and procedures for existing domestic scholarships and fellowships, including any project through which authorization to use the RF name is given.

The Committee should also review proposals for new domestic scholarship or fellowship projects, giving special consideration to the urgency of the proposal in relation to national priorities and availability of other non-RF sources of support, as well as coordination of projects with major Foundation programs dealing with domestic problems. (Domestic projects are defined as being available for residents of the United States, but should not preclude selection of foreign study posts.)

B. Administrative Matters

The Committee will have responsibility for a continuing review of standards and procedures for nomination, selection, and administration of all awards designated as RF scholarships or fellowships, whether international or domestic in origin. It will be responsible for recommending stipend rates and other conditions of awards for the approval of the President.

The Committee will concern itself with a periodic review of budgeting procedures. For example, attention might be given to a reorientation of the budget covering scholarship and fellowship activities for the calendar year 1974, with the possibility of recommending that Trustee authorization be allocated to (a) UDP (EFD), (b) COH, (c) Population and Health, (d) EO, and (e) Special Interests and Explorations.

C. Evaluation

The Committee will be expected to establish criteria for periodic evaluation of RF scholarship and fellowship activities.

D. Compliance with Tax Reform Act of 1969 Regulations
Pertaining to Individual Grants

The Committee should give continuing attention to the requirements for definition of purpose, objectivity of selection and reporting in accordance with the Act, and the statement of procedures filed with the IRS by Counsel on December 12, 1972.

Addendum: Recommendations of Ad Hoc Committee on Fellowships

1. It is recommended that the Foundation continue to use a number of mechanisms for supporting training activities, including grants and appropriations to other institutions as well as individual RF awards, as highly effective methods of achieving program goals, both domestic and international.
2. It is recommended that support for study and training should be given for the following purposes in the context of RF program objectives:
 - a. institution building
 - b. advancement of a field of knowledge
 - c. enhancement of an individual's particular skill or talent
3. It is recommended that the categories of individual RF awards should be as follows:
 - a. The designation "RF scholar" should be reserved for academic degree candidates, whether from the U.S. or abroad, who do not already have a Ph.D. or M.D. degree or their equivalent, and who are studying at universities or other institutions.
 - b. The designation "RF fellow" should be reserved for those, whether from the U.S. or abroad, who already have a Ph.D. or M.D. degree or their equivalent, or who have an equivalent level of scholarly or professional achievement - whether or not they are working for an academic degree.
 - c. The designation "RF special fellow" should be reserved for those, whether from the U.S. or abroad, who are receiving advanced training differing from normal postdoctoral academic work at a university, and who have a particularly high level of experience, accomplishment, and qualifications.

(The Committee believes that the designation "special fellow," involving payment of varying stipends, requires further study; and that since administrative questions are involved, final decision on this matter should be left to the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships.)

- d. A new category of traineeships should be established. The designation "RF trainee" should be reserved for those, whether from the U.S. or abroad, who require non-degree or non-university training in order to acquire a particular skill.
4. It is recommended that training and study awards to which the RF name is applied must meet all the following criteria:
 - a. The Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships approves in advance use of the designation "RF awardee" under proposed training grants and similar actions.
 - b. The selection process is determined by the RF, with RF officers making final review and decision.
 - c. RF officers are responsible for the overall planning and supervision of the program to be followed during the course of the award.
 - d. Administration of the awards is handled directly by RF staff.
 5. It is recommended that at least once a year the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships meet specifically to review RF training activities and to establish future objectives for them. This Committee shall also establish policy toward each institution or country where more than one RF division is functioning and where fellowship, scholarship, and training awards are contemplated.

6. It is recommended that the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships have responsibility for advance review of all programs providing for appointments to which the designation "RF awardee" is to be applied. This responsibility should include approval of the conditions of the awards, levels of support, type of study to be undertaken, and standards and procedures of nomination and selection. The Committee recommends that central importance be given to the establishment of, and adherence to, standards of nomination and selection designed to insure the highest quality of awardees according to the purpose of the particular program. The Committee recommends that the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships give special attention in its review to the importance of establishing adequate details of selection procedures before any program of fellowships, scholarships or traineeships is initiated. Among the essential criteria for selection of RF awardees should be evidence of the direct relationship of a possible award to the program objectives, adequate evidence of candidates' qualifications, and objectivity.
7. It is recommended that support for those RF fellows, special fellows, scholars, and trainees to whom payment of funds is to be made directly by the RF should continue to be provided for by annual appropriations. Recommendations to the Trustees for these appropriations should be based upon needs of current programs, both domestic and international. Funds for other RF awards and for other types of training would be provided from time to time through appropriations for particular projects.

8. In view of the fact that the present system for evaluation is inadequate to determine the effectiveness of scholarship and fellowship awards, it is recommended that the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships undertake a comprehensive review of existing procedures in order to recommend changes.
9. It is recommended that current procedures of selection, post-award evaluation, and central administration of RF awards be continued and placed under supervision of the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships. Further, any programs at variance with such current procedures should be monitored by the same Committee.
10. It is recommended that the Fellowship Officer and Fellowship Associate be regular members of the Policy Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships. Officers responsible for special training projects administered within a division should be invited to participate in the Committee's deliberations when those particular projects are under discussion.

Bellagio Study and Conference Center

Committee Members

Ralph W. Richardson, Jr., Chairman
Jane Allen, Coordinator
Howard Klein
John Maier
Michael Novak
Charles H. Smith
Kenneth Thompson
Michael P. Todaro
Kenneth Wernimont, ex officio

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

The Committee has no definite schedule of meetings.

However, it does meet on an ad hoc basis approximately every 6 to 8 weeks. In June of this year, there will be an all-day meeting in New York which will bring together the Center's Director, Dr. Olson, the members of the Committee, and other Foundation officers to discuss general policy questions as well as specific details concerning the operation of the Center.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

The Program Committee of the Bellagio Study and Conference Center, appointed by its President, was first established in 1960, soon after the Foundation came into possession of the Villa Serbelloni under the will of the Princess della Torre e Tasso. The membership of the Program Committee has changed several times since then, rotating various interested staff to the Committee and to some extent, reflecting modified

program emphasis, but it is usually composed of eight or nine officers from the several program divisions as well as representatives of Central Administration.

The Program Committee has several responsibilities: it studies the various ways in which the Center might be utilized, considers requests from individuals and conference groups, establishes priorities among proposals, and makes recommendations for the overall program of the Center. The Program Committee has always obtained the counsel of outside scholars as a direct aid to its decision processes regarding conferences and resident scholars. Invitations and declinations are signed by the Chairman of the Committee and approved by a Vice-President and the President before mailing. Over the past 18 months, the work of the Committee has increased sharply, largely because the number of applications, particularly for residencies, has more than doubled.

In December 1971, a five-year report of the program at the Bellagio Center was prepared for the Foundation's Trustees. A copy of this report is attached. At that time, the Trustees gave their formal approval to the report and authorized the continuation of the Center's program for another five years. The report listed the principal reasons for recommending that the Foundation continue to operate the Center for an additional five-year period as follows:

- 1) The Center has now been effectively integrated into the substantive program of the Foundation and has become a uniquely valuable instrument of that program.

2) Those elements of the Center's activities which are not directly related to the Foundation's stated program interests do advance those interests indirectly and are contributing importantly to the well-being of mankind.

The Center's program now consists of two types of activities:

1) a wide assortment of international conferences of a scholarly or scientific nature, each consisting of ten to twenty participants; 2) a sizable scholars-in-residence program through which scholars, composers, and writers are invited to the Center for four or five weeks to complete a significant writing project or other creative undertaking that has already reached a stage where the research has been completed and where further progress can best be accomplished in an atmosphere of quiet privacy such as the one offered by the Villa.

During 1972, certain changes were made in the physical plant of the Villa complex. The rather ancient heating system in the main building was converted to oil heat, and a new oil-fueled heating plant was installed in the Sfondrata building on the lake shore. These modifications have not only increased the comfort and efficiency of the Center, but have also extended the period during the year when conference participants can be housed in these buildings.

Over the past two years, Foundation officers themselves have made greater use of the Center's conference facilities and have organized Foundation-related meetings. In 1972, for example, approximately one-third of the conferences were initiated by Foundation officers and hence are closely related to major Foundation programs. It is anticipated that over the next few years this trend will continue.

Foundation officers have also been encouraged to consider new ways of expanding the scholars-in-residence concept so as to provide simultaneous residencies for two or more individuals for the purpose of working on some team project -- either a single research project with several collaborators, or a series of studies centering around a central theme. One such experimental, joint residency was held in 1972 and consisted of four scholars working on four related topics. Because of the successful outcome of this experiment, the Program Committee will, in the future, plan to seek out additional opportunities of this type.

It should also be mentioned that the conferences at the Center are drawing more and more participants from countries in Eastern Europe, thus greatly strengthening the exchange of information, ideas, and points of view, and hopefully making a contribution to the relaxation of international tensions.

Records and Archives

Committee Members

J. William Hess, Chairman
Jane Allen
Henry Romney
J. Kellum Smith, Jr.
Kenneth Wernimont
Frank Wolling
Peter H. Wood

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

It is expected that the Committee will meet at least four times a year. The Chairman will call a special meeting when there is urgent business to be transacted.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

The Committee on Records and Archives was created by President Knowles' Memorandum to All Staff (attached to this report), December 8, 1972, shortly after the Trustees' approval of the report of their Committee on the Archives under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert F. Goheen. The Committee on Records and Archives succeeds the temporary Committee on Villa and Archives which was created by President Knowles in July, 1972, and which after wide-ranging deliberations submitted a final report in late October, 1972.

The Committee on Records and Archives met on December 19, 1972, at which time it reviewed the policy adopted by the Trustees and

the list of collections which are now regarded as open for research, adopted procedures for opening additional materials for research, approved a statement of policies and procedures which was presented by the Archivist, revised and approved a registration form for users of the Archives, and discussed recommendations for members of the Advisory Committee of three distinguished librarians and archivists which the Trustees had proposed. In a letter dated January 4, 1973, President Knowles asked Dr. William Dix of Princeton to serve as chairman of the Advisory Committee and to select two additional members. Late in January, Dr. Dix agreed to serve and suggested Dr. Ernst Posner of American University and Mr. Herman Kahn of Yale University as additional members. Dr. Posner has declined because of other commitments. Mr. Kahn and Mrs. Elizabeth Hamer Kegan, who is Assistant Librarian of Congress, have accepted membership on the Committee.

Further, in accordance with Trustee suggestions, Mr. Robert Pennoyer of Patterson, Belknap and Webb was consulted concerning policies and procedures and possible legal problems. Mr. Pennoyer recommended additional sentences for the searchers' registration form, which have been adopted verbatim. Mr. Pennoyer also submitted an 18-page "Memorandum of Law" and a letter summarizing the important points concerning copyright, libel, slander, invasion of privacy, and defamation. It was concluded that risk would be minimal or in most cases negligible, considering the types of material which will be shown

to visiting scholars. For maximum security, Mr. Pennoyer recommended that a form similar to the one used by Harvard University manuscript libraries be used when making reproductions. Such a form, declaring that the person for whom copies are made assumes responsibility for proper use of the document and warning against libel and invasion of privacy and violation of copyright has been adopted, using the Harvard form as a model.

The following persons have used the Archives since the December meeting of the Trustees:

1. James R. Gardner, a doctoral candidate in history at Indiana University, January 15 and 16. Topic: the social hygiene movement in New York, ca. 1910-1917. Materials used: Bureau of Social Hygiene Collection and files from the RF Archives relating to the Bureau and the American Social Hygiene Association.

2. Charles Scott Lachman, a senior honors candidate in history at Amherst College, January 17 and 18. Topic: German refugee scholars of the 1930's who were assisted by the RF. Materials used: folders from the General Correspondence and Projects files of the RF dated in the 1930's.

3. Steven D. Korenblat, a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Chicago, February 1 and 2, 1973. Topic: Deutsche hochschule für politik, 1920's and 1930's. Materials used: two folders from The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Collection and seven folders from the RF projects files.

Two more users are expected in the very near future.

Dr. Alexander A. Foursenko, Professor at the Institute of History, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, plans to visit the Archives on February 26, 1973. Dr. Foursenko previously made extensive use of the Rockefeller Family Archives while preparing a book on The Rockefeller Dynasty. While preparing a revision of this book, he is again working at the family archives and wants to use The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Collection and perhaps other open materials. In addition, a professor from Canada called recently to inquire about access to the General Education Board Collection. His interest is in the farm demonstration movement of the first two decades of this century. He was informed that the GEB papers can be used for those years.

During January and February, the Archivist has concentrated as much as possible on the preparation of a Guide or publishable description of the materials which are open for research; this Guide will be circulated to libraries, heads of history departments which have graduate programs, and other interested persons. In addition, the Archivist has continued to develop plans for processing general correspondence and projects files of the RF. The Archivist and Staff (two other persons full time) have answered requests for papers or information from the RF staff, provided information for RF Illustrated, proceeded with the processing of the General Education Board Papers and the Lewis Hackett Collection, and worked toward establishing control of photographs

and printed materials which were previously unorganized. Improvement in the appearance and arrangement of physical facilities has been accomplished in preparation for increased public exposure. The current budget allows the addition of one clerk for the purpose of typing labels and inventories as RF general correspondence and projects files are processed. It is believed that the staff will then be complete for the indefinite future.

December 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO ALL STAFF

Subject: Use of Archives and Other Past Foundation Records

The Trustees at their meeting in Williamsburg reviewed the report and the recommendations of the Archives Committee, and approved the following statement of policy. I would like to stress the fact that we are all most anxious to make much fuller use of our "proud record," so that we can develop a richer historical perspective on our own activities internally and externally, and promote the use of our archival materials by historians and others in this country and abroad.

A standing Committee on Records and Archives is now established and will be composed of J. William Hess, Chairman, Kenneth Wernimont, Chadbourne Gilpatric, Kellum Smith, Peter Wood, Frank Wolling, Jane Allen, and Henry Romney. As suggested by the Committee Report on Archives, this standing committee will be responsible for the implementation of archival policy in general and for recommendations on opening additional portions of the Archives. The report emphasizes the importance of a positive response to increased interest by scholars in past activities of the Foundation. The President will have the authority to declare additional archival materials open for research. Limits which are imposed will not be for the purpose of guarding RF policy from public scrutiny, but for the purpose of protecting the legitimate privacy of individuals and institutions and maintaining the confidential character of material so regarded. After three years, or earlier, the standing committee will review the result of the new archive policy and make recommendations for the future. An Advisory Committee of three distinguished Archivists will be appointed to help with periodic review and advice. Mr. Pennoyer will be asked to review questions of legal liability arising from use of our Archives.

After discussions with members of this committee, I have asked Chad Gilpatric to assume special responsibilities on behalf of all the Program Officers with respect to future use of the Archives and other records. Because I believe strongly in the value of these materials, the primary responsibility of Chad Gilpatric will be to search and research their contents on significant topics and themes for internal use and occasional publication. Bearing in mind recommendations of the Ad Hoc Archives Committee, Mr. Gilpatric will work with Mr. Hess and Henry Romney in drawing up a guide to our Archives - their nature and availability - for potential outside users. This "Guide" to the Archives will be widely distributed, inviting applications for research. I hope you will also view our new and expanded use of the Archives as a vital ongoing part of our Cultural Development program.

We all understand the Archives are only part of the cumulative records of the Foundation. Most of the Foundation's documentary materials from 1913 through 1949 are now in the Archives on 52nd Street. The total quantity of these materials covering 36 years is considerably exceeded by the volume of records from 1950, which, with certain categories of important previous materials, remain with the Reference Service in this building. It will be obvious that researching the Foundation's past to illuminate and strengthen RF continuity and commitment over time will require use of both the Reference Service and the Archives. At the outset, Mr. Gilpatric will be reviewing the story of this Foundation's historic relations with China, for our internal benefit and, where appropriate, for publication. He will also work with Henry Romney on some profiles of former Fellows for possible publication in the RF Illustrated. Beyond that he will help provide background information useful to the ongoing work of our programs and committees, as you and he think would be worthwhile, so as to strengthen the continuities between past and present.

Within the next two months (i.e., February or March) we should report to our Executive Committee on progress in implementing the Trustees' policy.

John H. Knowles, M.D.

Report of the 1972 Special Trustees' Committee on the Archives

1. The Trustees' Special Committee on the Archives recommends that The Rockefeller Foundation archives be maintained at their current site under present circumstances and that they be developed for use by interested parties under the policies and procedures outlined below.

2. The Special Committee also endorses the budget of \$133,500 proposed by the staff for the maintenance and development of the archives in 1973.

3. General Policy: It is the policy of The Rockefeller Foundation that its records shall as soon as possible be made as freely accessible for research and study as the nature of the records will permit.

4. Further recommendations: In implementation of this general policy:

(a) The archival material of the Foundation from its origin up until World War II will be made available to the public as rapidly as they can be processed. The same policy will apply for the several other collections of documents from the same era in the control of the Foundation - e.g., the records of The China Medical Board, those of Frederick Gates, etc.

(b) Similarly, the records of the General Education Board (a valuable repository of material relating to American higher education generally and black education in the South particularly) will be prepared for availability by 1974.

(c) Under the general supervision of the Executive Committee, the officers of the Foundation will develop policies and procedures to enable useful and nonconfidential records in the Foundation's files from more recent times to be opened to the public when this is feasible and does not unduly endanger the legitimate privacy of individuals.

(d) There will be a continuing Archives Committee, composed of the Archivist, the Secretary, at least one Vice-President, and at least one program officer, to be responsible for the implementation of archival policy in general and for the opening up of more recent materials. The Archives Committee will report to the Executive Committee from time to time and as substantial problems or new policy questions arise.

Robert F. Goheen
(for the Committee)

December 4, 1972

Intellectual Rejuvenation

Committee Members

Michael P. Todaro, Chairman
Clarence C. Gray, III
John Maier
Michael Novak
Lewis M. Roberts
Peter H. Wood

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

The Committee has agreed to meet regularly on a monthly basis. These meetings will be held on the first Thursday of every month at 11:30 a.m. in the Corner Conference Room. In addition to conducting the seminar series, we propose, over the coming year, to develop specific guidelines for study/research assignment applications and to continue our discussions of ways in which the objective of enhanced intellectual vitality can best be achieved.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

Leadership by The Rockefeller Foundation in ideas and judgment continues to depend in large part on the knowledgeability and acumen of its officers. To sustain and improve these capabilities is the purpose of this report and its several proposals.

The report is based on the premise that intellectual vitality requires not only a lively atmosphere for creative thought but also an efficient organizational framework within which such thought can flourish. Each is of limited value without the other.

Summary of Principal Recommendations

VITALIZING STAFF TALENT

1. Seminars

A regular bimonthly series of internal seminars should be established to provide a forum for discussion of issues of major Foundation concern. Seminars should be conducted by Foundation officers, making frequent use of RF Trustees and field staff, grant recipients and outside speakers. The seminars will be taped and edited for possible publication in RF Illustrated or other publications of the Foundation.

2. Study/Research Assignments

The principle of periodic officer assignments away from usual duties should be recognized and procedures established to implement such assignments. These may include (1) an extended period, not to exceed 6 months every 4 years, of uninterrupted study, research or work at appropriate locations to pursue a major activity of significance to both the Foundation and the officer; and (2) short-term assignments of 1 to 4 weeks to complete a piece of work closely related to Foundation programs.

3. Writing, Publishing, and Lecturing

Full encouragement and necessary assistance should be given for officer writing and lecturing for audiences outside the Foundation, including publication, reprints, recording and other measures to insure convenient and adequate dissemination. Writing maketh the exact man!

4. Conferences and Commissions

Short of commissions on important issues, Foundation officers should make greater use of commissioning outside advice and assistance (including consultants), and of organizing problem-centered working conferences. Only when these flexible and easily-managed options have been exhausted would there be adequate justification to create and support a commission. If and when a commission is established, it should not be independent but rather include the working association of designated officers.

REORGANIZING FOUNDATION STRUCTURE

The Committee examined the organizational structure of the Foundation because of its obvious central importance to the quality of the Foundation's work. Dr. Knowles has summarized the consensus of the officers in his description of the Program Committees beginning on page 53.

Information Service

Committee Members

Henry Romney, Chairman
Howard Klein
Ralph W. Richardson, Jr.
Charles H. Smith
J. Kellum Smith, Jr.
Sterling Wortman

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

The Committee intends to meet every second month to review work accomplished and to discuss future projects.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date: Compounding the RF's Influence

How Important is Reporting?

A common denominator of the literature on foundations is the plea for more and better reporting.

The Foundation Center has shown that between 1956 and 1966 only 1.9 percent of almost 7,000 foundations sampled -- small, medium, and large -- were found to issue even an annual or biennial report. Nielsen finds "an even greater qualitative deficiency" which he ascribes to the "enclave mentality" of donors, trustees, and officers.

In the opinion of the Peterson Commission, a group as well disposed to foundations as one could reasonably ask for, foundation survival hinges directly on foundation reporting. "To broaden the public understanding of (the foundation) effort" is, as a matter of fact, one of the "three great ends" towards which the Commission's entire report is devoted.

In a memorandum to the membership, the Chairman of the Council on Foundations warned that "In today's atmosphere of scrutiny, when all established institutions must publicly demonstrate their value, to fail to communicate adequately is tantamount to avoidance of responsibility."

The Chairman cites, among other examples, the Gardner Committee's advocacy of "policies to improve understanding of foundations by the American public generally, and specialized publics." He reminds us that Senator Ribicoff counseled foundations to regularly inform Congressional members of their work, and quotes Senator Cranston's judgment that "the foundations have done a bad job in letting (the press, the Congress, and the public) know what they are doing and how well they are doing it."

Max Ways, on retiring as Managing Editor of FORTUNE, made an appeal to the entire private sector to change the public's "silent absence of assent" into "cooperation freely and intelligently given," but warned that "highly selective self-praise is not the same as public information."

RF Reporting: The Past

The RF has been committed to full and public disclosure since its earliest days. Each grant, each payment, each security transaction was reported and readily made available. Quarterly reports, as well as the annual report, have sought to rationalize its undertakings. At various times in its history the RF was fortunate in having men of

intellect and eloquence, men with a high regard for public opinion, who lent a singular persuasiveness to its reporting. Raymond Fosdick, Alan Gregg, Warren Weaver are among those still remembered in the world at large.

But one must ask oneself whether, in the past, the RF did not by and large preach to the converted. Did it seek more than the good opinion of its peers? In retrospect, it would seem that politicians, the popular press, and the great majority of the electorate were not ranked among the elect because they were judged to lack the capacity of comprehension or the commitment to objectivity.

We are all agreed that today we must have some anxieties on this subject. Even if foundations have no legal obligation to report directly to the public, the desirability to do so as a matter of enlightened self-interest would seem to be obvious. Yet few foundations do, and most who do, do it badly.

RF Reporting: Today

We doubt that a public information program, no matter how intelligently conceived or skillfully executed, can make converts out of people hostile to foundations. We do believe that such a program can move a good many people from apathy, or passive acceptance of foundations, to a much firmer belief that the country as a whole benefits from the preservation of the tax-exempt privilege as it is personified by foundations.

We also believe that for such a program to be effective, it must meet public perceptions both in form and content. As to form, the information explosion, especially the newer media, has created a public whose information intake is increasingly geared to condensed, vivid, and open styles of communication. As to content, it seems to us very important that a real effort be made to show the RF as accessible to public influence (including criticism), ready to admit failures as well as to claim successes, flexible and self-questioning, but unswerving in its devotion to fundamental improvements in the human condition.

Publications

The Committee has participated actively in the planning of the new publication RF ILLUSTRATED which takes the place of the Quarterly, Staff and Program News, and the illustrative portions of the annual report. In format and content, we believe this publication to have the potential of signaling, dramatically and effectively, the RF's awareness of concern for public opinion. By being interesting and vivid, RF ILLUSTRATED hopes to inform and educate. By taking a more informal and open stance, it hopes to remove some of the suspicion concerning the RF's intentions and some of the doubts as to the value of its work.

With its second issue RF ILLUSTRATED will publish letters from its readers -- friends and critics alike -- and each issue will seek to attitudinize in a variety of ways that the RF's work -- not only the what but also the why -- is open to discussion.

The response to the first issue has been very impressive. Thirteen percent of the postcards mailed out with Vol. 1, No. 1 were returned by people wishing to receive RF ILLUSTRATED regularly -- as far as we can ascertain, an unprecedented response. Hundreds of letters were received (and answered), the vast majority confirming that the publication's objectives of creating bridges between the Foundation and the public were being achieved. A "demand" audience of 110,000 people is now contemplated, based in part on the response from carefully selected and highly focused lists. Special inserts, aimed at school children for example, are planned. Because its newspaper format is relatively inexpensive to produce, RF ILLUSTRATED will reach 200 times the number of people reached by the 1971 annual report at about the same cost.

We wish to stress however that, although RF ILLUSTRATED is a highly visible effort, it will by no means elbow out other, and equally important, information activities. In the field of publications, the RF will continue to publish a comprehensive but inexpensively produced annual report. We will continue scholarly publications for scholarly audiences and seek to broaden the scope of the Foundation's well-known Special Reports. The RF will continue to foster relationships between its staff and commercial publishers or university presses to produce books for the general or specialized publics at little or no cost to the Foundation. In all of this the RF will be mindful to avoid "highly selective self-praise," and to relate potential benefits to actual costs.

The Press

Each year the RF receives more attention in local newspapers throughout the country than all other major foundations combined. We can make that flat statement because, for purposes of comparison, we have subscribed for three-month periods over several years to a service which sends us every mention of every foundation. However, in newspapers of national standing, particularly The New York Times, the Foundation receives very little coverage.

In the opinion of the national press, the RF is not a news-maker. Unlike Carnegie, it does not issue reports on national concerns prepared by independent bodies. Unlike Ford, the dollar amounts of particular grants are not startling. The RF does not with any frequency adopt new programs, does not make "bold new" departures within existing programs, and, importantly, makes no objective public evaluations of projects assisted.

In the past, we have therefore concentrated on feature stories (or "soft" news). An "RF Feature Service" has been highly successful in placing first-hand reports of work-in-progress in U.S. newspapers; the Foundation's reputation ensures that announcements by grantees get good local coverage, and major Foundation undertakings, such as the agricultural projects, have been described in most national magazines (three articles in the Reader's Digest, for example).

But for the future we believe that, in addition to features and articles placement, a judicious effort should be considered to make news.

This means authorization of substantive reports, containing analyses of problems, evaluations of work performed, and recommendations for future efforts, relating to the RF's areas of interests. There is middle ground between indiscriminate and indiscrete publicity seeking, and cautious silence induced by fear of being judged. But to cultivate this middle ground it is necessary to have in hand documents that highlight facts and figures.

Finally, the development of RF specialists as "sources" for reporters is a highly desirable development. A start has been made on this. An extension of this effort is to occasionally prepare and make presentations to major newspapers and other organizations to familiarize their principals with the RF's interests and work-in-progress.

Television and Radio

The networks have devoted major documentaries to Foundation interests (food production; population), programs in which RF staff has taken part. More importantly, Information Service took the initiative some years ago to coordinate appearances on good local television and radio shows with the President's travel schedule.

Television and radio is of course ideally suited to promoting the RF by means of the kind of factual document described under "Press," including network or nationally syndicated programs if the document has national news significance.

Finally, the Committee has begun to explore the potentials and the cost/benefits ratios of RF-produced educational programs for cable television. The opportunity is an attractive one: unlike

commercial or public television, such programming is welcome; relatively large audiences can be put together through syndication, and the residual uses, as in schools, are important. But the costs are relatively high and the business a complex one. Careful further investigation seems warranted, however.

Cooperative Work

The Committee notes with pleasure the greatly increased information activities of the Council on Foundations. Whatever role RF staff can play in this would be welcomed. A cooperative information project with the Ford Foundation concerning the international agricultural institutes is under discussion.

Summary

The RF has always been desirous of meeting the public's legitimate curiosity as to what it does and why. Because today, more than ever, the fulfillment of such expectations is directly linked to survival, a careful mix of intelligently conceived and skillfully executed information programs that, in an open and revealing manner, address themselves to both the general and specific audiences are important and merit advice and support from Trustees and staff.

Corporate Responsibility

Committee Members

Theodore R. Frye, Chairman
Ralph W. Cummings, Jr.
Ralph K. Davidson
John Maier
Ellsworth T. Neumann
Michael Novak
Henry Romney
J. Kellum Smith, Jr.
Gary H. Toenniessen
Webb Trammell
Kenneth Wernimont
Bruce E. Williams

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

Committee meetings will be held on the fourth Thursday of each quarter. In addition, they will meet on an ad hoc basis to review grant requests. On April 18 and May 2, the Committee will gather to review proxy resolutions for the Finance Committee.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

The Committee on Corporate Responsibility has met six times since its formation on August 3rd of last year. At those meetings the Committee members have discussed the Foundation's role and responsibilities as a shareholder in major U.S. corporations, and have reviewed requests for grants for research and other activities in the general field of Corporate Responsibility.

Efforts by the present Committee and those concerned with the problem earlier have demonstrated the difficulty of arriving at an internally consistent rationale to define the Foundation's investment policies; however, the Committee members have agreed on the following points:

1. The way in which the Foundation permits its invested assets to be used by corporate management goes to the heart of the Foundation's existence. It should not allow its assets to be used in ways which detract from, or negate, its program achievements.

2. The Foundation's ability to carry out its basic objectives depends upon the production of income. If the Foundation should decide upon a course of expressing its social concerns to corporations, it should seek to do so in the first instance in ways which would not result in a reduction of income.

3. The Foundation's promotion of the well-being of mankind has traditionally been pursued through the making of grants, and no major change in this modus operandi is foreseen.

4. The Foundation is not equipped to advise management regarding the economic aspects of its business, but the social aspects, where value judgments predominate, is another matter; one where management does not necessarily have a monopoly on objectivity or expertise.

5. The Foundation could very effectively compound its influence through its contacts with the managements of companies in its portfolio.

The Committee members have not been able to agree on the relationship which it would recommend the Foundation assume with the managements of those companies in its portfolio; they are not agreed on whether the Foundation should limit its concern to those social issues which fall within its own program areas, or whether it should adopt a more comprehensive view.

In its efforts to assist in developing a body of expertise, the Committee has recommended grants to the following organizations:

- . \$10,000 to the National Affiliation of Concerned Business Students
- . \$14,000 to Harvard Business School for a study on current social and political considerations in the corporate decision-making process.
- . \$15,000 to the White House Conference on the Industrial World Ahead
- . \$22,000 to the African-American Institute
- . \$25,000 to the Smithsonian Research Foundation, Washington, D.C., toward the costs of professional staff for the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
- . \$25,000 to Columbia University (since rescinded because faculty decided it was unable to meet original schedule)

On March 8, 1972, the Finance Committee approved an investment in the Dreyfus Third Century Fund, a new mutual fund designed to invest in companies which show leadership in dealing with corporate social concerns. On June 20, 1972, the Foundation signed a Letter of Intent to purchase up to \$1,000,000, and made an initial purchase amounting to \$394,450.

The Foundation is a founding member of the Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC). The first IRRC newsletter and a special report by Phillip Blumberg on disclosure procedures have just recently arrived and will be distributed to the Finance Committee. The Committee expects to devote a good portion of its time in the next 2-3 months to those controversial proxy issues involving companies in the Foundation's portfolio. The Committee also plans to continue trying to define the Foundation's policy vis-à-vis its investments; the scope of its responsibilities as shareholder; and the best means to discharge those responsibilities intelligently and effectively.

Evaluation

Committee Members

J. Kellum Smith, Jr., Chairman
Allan C. Barnes, Vice-Chairman
Elizabeth B. Connell
Ralph K. Davidson
Herbert Heaton
Kenneth W. Thompson
Michael P. Todaro
Kenneth Wernimont
Sterling Wortman

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

The Committee plans to meet monthly during the coming year.

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

Soon after Dr. Knowles took up his duties at the Foundation, he appointed a Committee on Evaluation to consider the adequacy of the Foundation's methods of self-evaluation and to recommend such changes as might appear desirable. The Committee has interviewed a number of outsiders with experience in one form or another of institutional evaluation, has read a good deal of the (relatively sparse) literature on the subject, and has produced an extended report. Several of the Committee's recommendations (which are summarized below) have already been adopted by the Foundation. Others, being future in their nature, remain to be implemented when the time comes. Still others are tentative and require either further considerations or further experience before they can be made definite.

In its deliberations the Committee has emphasized program evaluation, as distinct from overall evaluation of the Foundation's

activities, including general administration, personnel policies, investment, and financial control. The Committee recognizes that the absolute need for evaluation is entire - that it covers the whole range of an institution's actions - but it believes that because the bulk of the Foundation's energies and funds are devoted to program, and because it is primarily by its program that the Foundation will be judged, program evaluation must be paramount. The Committee also believes that several of the other categories of activity mentioned above - investment and financial control, for example - are now subject to such evaluative processes as to make it unlikely that more need be done.

So far as concerns program evaluation, the Committee has found it necessary to emphasize that, although learning what happens as a result of a particular grant is essential to evaluation, it is only a small step. Indeed, it is not even the first step (although the first step the Foundation has taken as a result of the Committee's recommendations is to establish procedures to assure that the results of each grant will be systematically observed and recorded). Institutions may be judged on the basis of what they decide to do and not to do as well as on the basis of how well they do what they have decided to do. It is possible to be sharply critical of an institution for its stated goals, without even looking at the results of its pursuit of those goals. Foundations are in a particularly sensitive position with respect to their decisions about goals, because they operate on a largely tax-exempt basis and have virtually complete freedom (absent some limiting language in their charters) to select

their goals from the entire range of activities recognized in law as charitable. Therefore, although the relative ease of post-facto evaluation (evaluation of results in comparison with stated expectations) tempts an institution to rely exclusively upon it and to believe that it is evaluation, a more critical view of the matter indicates that it is essential to review and, if possible, to improve the methods by which general and specific goals are arrived at and program decisions made.

It is interesting that the two formal Trustee evaluations of the Foundation's programs (one in 1934 and one in 1958) put relatively equal emphasis on (a) examination of the Foundation's results, and (b) critical analysis of the Foundation's stated goals - from the point of view of their relative importance, possibility of accomplishment, and other criteria. The history of the Foundation's engagement in officer evaluation and informal external evaluation, on the other hand, evidences concentration on assessment of results. (The full report of the Committee on Evaluation embodies an extended review of the history of the Foundation's efforts at review and assessment.)

The relationship between post-facto and ante-facto evaluation is intimate. Although post-facto evaluation is commonly seen as a means of supplying a report card, its fundamental use is to improve the decision-making process. There must be a feedback arrangement, by which an institution not only learns the results of its actions but is able to modify subsequent decisions by reference to what it has learned. The

formalization or systematization of this process is, the Committee believes, the primary problem in evaluation, and a crucial element in it is systematization of the making of the basic program decisions. A Trustee Committee on Program is now reviewing all the Foundation's programs, on the basis of material supplied to it by the officers. Partly because that Committee has not completed its work, and partly because of the complexity of the problem, the Committee on Evaluation makes no present recommendation with respect to improvement of the Foundation's program decision-making, beyond observing that it deserves the strictest intellectual rigor and that every effort must be made to avoid ad hoc responses, either of assent or of rejection, to the thousands of program opportunities that come before the Foundation every year.

The Committee on Evaluation believes that the bulk of its job remains to be done. Questions abound that can only be answered through continued observation and experience. To what extent is it possible to feed observed results methodically into subsequent decisions? Can superior procedures for doing so be developed? Is effective internal evaluation possible? Does objectivity demand external evaluation? Are particular types of people peculiarly adept at evaluation? Social scientists? Journalists? Will sharper definition of program goals turn out to hinder program? Will specificity be limiting? How much evaluation is good for an organization? Is it possible that energies devoted to evaluation could be better expended on getting on with the job? Is there an ideal ratio between evaluation effort and

getting-on-with-the-job effort? Is it possible so to improve procedures that effective evaluation can be carried out at small expense in institutional energy?

The Committee recommends that it continue in existence as a standing committee in order to give sustained consideration to these and other questions.

There follows a brief summary of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations:

1. Regular, systematic evaluation should be recognized as an obligation of the Foundation. Section 60 of the By-Laws imposes on the Trustees an obligation of periodic appraisal. The Committee's recommendation goes beyond the By-Law requirement that we pause once every few years to consider how we are doing. The obligation the Committee sees is that of arriving at a feedback system that will more or less continuously inform the Foundation's decisions. The evaluative material produced by such a system would be extremely useful (if not indeed essential) for the periodic reviews as well; but there is a substantial difference between the principle of periodic appraisal and the principle of continuous monitoring.

The Committee also believes that it should provide a report to the Trustees annually on the progress of its work and on such further recommendations as appear desirable in improving the Foundation's system of self-knowledge and self-criticism.

2. Notwithstanding periodic appraisals by the Trustees, and possible periodic recourse to outside evaluators, regular, systematic

appraisal is primarily the responsibility of the officers. Essential to this conclusion is the concept of evaluation as a continuous process the chief role of which is not to provide a report card but to provide feedback for the decision-making process on a regular basis. If evaluation is to be woven as intimately as possible into the daily operations of the Foundation, it should and must be as much a staff responsibility as any other activity regularly carried on by the Foundation.

3. The Foundation's objectives should be defined with a degree of specificity that will make evaluation possible. Although extremely sharp definition of objectives may be counter-productive from the program point of view, reducing flexibility and making it less possible (for example) to make grants in virtue of the sheer excellence of people and institutions with only secondary regard to their specific intentions, the Committee believes that sharper definition of objectives than now prevails in the Foundation is essential to fulfillment of the obligation to evaluate.

4. Every grant should include a statement, as precise as circumstances permit, of the result it is expected to yield and the criteria on the basis of which it will be evaluated. The Committee believes that scrutiny of particular grants is only the beginning of evaluation but that larger units of program cannot be effectively evaluated unless each grant is so framed as to be susceptible of systematic scrutiny. (This recommendation has already been put into effect.)

5. The base record policy should be reinstated, in an administratively manageable form. (The base record policy, adopted by the Foundation

in 1937 and abandoned in 1941, was a rule that required a summary statement and assessment of the results of each grant to be written by an officer and included in the grant file before the file could be closed.) Such a policy is the only means of making sure that each grant will be evaluated, as promptly as possible, on the basis of the criteria stated when it was made. (This recommendation has already been put into effect.)

6. The Foundation should re-examine the procedures by which it determines program directions, decides upon particular programs, and makes grants. This recommendation is made partly because it is essential that the results of post-facto evaluation be fed back into the process by which program is formulated, partly because precise and deliberate formulation of program has an automatic evaluative effect (by increasing the visibility of non-correspondence of results with expectations), and partly because evaluation can occur before as well as after the fact (evaluation of goals rather than of results).

7. Continuing thought should be given to the broader types of evaluation - periodic evaluation of areas of program, perhaps with reference to outside evaluators, periodic assessment of the efficacy of particular program instrumentalities, such as grants in aid and fellowships, and periodic appraisal of the Foundation's overall program as well as of its administration. The Committee is not prepared at present to make firm recommendations on these questions. It believes that periodic evaluation of areas of program, of program instrumentalities, and of overall program is essential, but it is not yet certain what the appropriate intervals might

be for such evaluation or what shape such evaluation ought to take. It believes that the answers to such questions are likely to emerge from the Foundation's experience with the specific recommendations made herein. It should be observed that during the past year most of the Foundation's programs have undergone general review with the assistance of outside evaluators, and that the grant-in-aid program and the fellowship and scholarship program have been subjected to review by officer committees parallel with the Committee on Evaluation.

8. Written descriptions of the results of Foundation grants and programs sufficiently rigorous and critical to constitute evaluation should be provided systematically to the Trustees, and then to the public. The primary justification for spending time and energy on evaluation is the need for it in the Foundation's decision-making process. The Trustees are as much a part of that process as are the officers. In addition, the argument can be made that the Foundation has an obligation, as a tax-exempt organization, to make evaluative material available to the public in some form at regular intervals - for example, in the Annual Report.

Administrative Policy

Committee Members

Kenneth Wernimont, Chairman
Joseph E. Black
Elizabeth B. Connell
Theodore R. Frye
Patricia Harris
Herbert Heaton
Richard T. Kimball
Edith King
Howard Klein
John Maier
Michael Novak
John A. Pino
Ralph W. Ricardson, Jr.
Portia Slappèy
J. Kellum Smith, Jr.
Esther S. Stamm

Schedule of Meetings for 1973

September - first week (no date set)
November - first week (no date set)

Summary of Committee's Work to Date

The Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Policy has completed an extensive review of the Foundation's employee benefit plans and made recommendations to the Trustees which were approved at the Executive Committee meeting on October 13, 1972.

Functions

The Committee on Administrative Policy will be expected to make periodic reviews of personnel policies, employee benefit programs, administrative procedures applicable to field staff, and other matters which may be brought to its attention from time to time. It is anticipated that the Committee, operating as a whole or through ad hoc subcommittees, will make substantial analyses of administrative questions which may be brought

to its attention or which it may initiate and that recommendations will be made from time to time for appropriate consideration and approval by the President or the Board of Trustees.

Membership of the ad hoc subcommittees may include staff members who are not regular members of the Standing Committee. As an example, when the field staff manual is next reviewed, the Program Associates dealing with field staff members should be included on the subcommittee as well as one or two representatives from among the field staff. Subcommittees dealing with various aspects of personnel policy may include members of the support staff.

PROGRAM COMMITTEES

I believe we all agree that individuals, rigorously disciplined, both intellectually and through experience, are the backbone of the Foundation's work. We also agree that we can strengthen the quality and coherence of our work by subjecting ourselves to the questions of scholars from other disciplines and by collectively working together in a definite frame of policy. Therefore, we have decided to maintain and strengthen the six disciplines of the Foundation, while we simultaneously develop more effective interdisciplinary Program Committees. The individual generates and pursues the idea, which is then subjected to the scrutiny of the appropriate Program Committee, and with its approval, comes to the Docket Conference for final review prior to submission to the Trustees (grants in aid will be reviewed annually by the Standing Committee for report to the December meeting of the Trustees). Each Program Committee is developing its own mechanisms for review and this is desirable for we want to retain our flexibility and avoid the rigidities of over-bureaucratization. A variety of approaches can show us all how to fulfill our functions most efficiently. Standing Committees help to institutionalize interdisciplinary work but they cannot substitute for the individual's creativity, energy, or intellectual capacity, although they can facilitate and embellish these qualities. Finally, direct communication among individuals is the glue that holds organizations together. Standing Committees facilitate communication, but don't guarantee it!

The list of Program Committees and their membership is appended. On May 14 (RF Day!) each year we should review the membership and the work

of the Committees. Change in membership and chairmanship should be infrequent in order to provide for sustained work and continuity, but we should recognize that an occasional change in membership can also keep us alive intellectually!

Please note the change in name of two programs which reflects some of our deliberations over the past months as to new directions and concepts. Thus, University Development is changed to Education for Development, reflecting our heightened concern with 1) the ends of education and university development as contrasted with institutional means; 2) increased emphasis on extension of university interests to balanced or integrated rural-urban development (where the university is sufficiently developed and stable to allow such extensions); and 3) issues surrounding primary and secondary education in the LDC's. This in no way means that we are leaving the field of university development where that is the prime need (e.g., Zaire). New developments such as the program at Bahia may encompass concerns with university development, primary and secondary education, and integrated (or balanced) rural development simultaneously. It also means that instead of withdrawing completely in all instances from the LDC's when university development is established, there will be selected situations (e.g., Ibadan, Nigeria) where we would emphasize rural development which includes economic and agricultural development, primary and secondary education, and public health.

The Population program is changed to Population and Health, recognizing the obligatory interrelationship of the two subjects while also designating our historic interest in health as a definite program

within the Foundation. Our interest in schistosomiasis, the phasing-out of the virus research program, public health in the LDC's as part of university and integrated rural development, and in health policy and administration, will come under the new designation along with our interests in various aspects of the population problem. Projects relating to the health problems of youth and minority groups, fetal physiology and perinatology, medical ethics, health education and consultation through mass media, as well as other possibilities, are being reviewed at the present time.

A new program on Conflict in International Relations was approved by the Trustees at their annual meeting in April 1973.

The term "Allied Interests" is being scrapped and will be replaced by the designation "Special Interests and Explorations." Ultimately, a "rapid research" group might be placed here under a Director of "Special Interests and Explorations." Notes on Special Interests and Explorations (the Allied Interest Dilemma) are included later in the body of the report on RF Administrative and Organizational Matters.

It would be desirable if all the Program Chairmen would establish regular meetings for the coming year so that we could all attend these meetings when possible by setting our calendars in advance. Such meetings should not be so frequent as to interfere with the individual program officer's work, but should be held often enough to set and implement a coherent policy.

The above considerations are not set in concrete, nor are our existing and new programs. Any ideas or changes suggested will be gratefully received by all of us.

J. H. K.

P.S. Please note separate memo covering (UDP) - Education for Development Program Committee.

JHK
February 1, 1973

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING PROGRAM COMMITTEES (NOVEMBER 1, 1973)

**** Chairman**

*** Vice-Chairman**

Cultural Development

**** HKlein**
*** MNovak**
JAllen
CHSmith
JKSmith
MPTodaro
BEWilliams
PHWood
SWortman

Conquest of Hunger

**** SWortman**
*** JAPino**
ACBarnes
JEBlack
RWCummings
RKDavidson
CCGray
GSHayes
JZMaier
JJMcKelvey
LMRoberts
MPTodaro

Equal Opportunity

**** CHSmith**
*** CCGray**
JEBlack
EBConnell
RWCummings
GSHayes
HKlein
EWMuhlfeld
MNovak
RWRichardson
ESStamm
BEWilliams

Population and Health

**** ACBarnes**
*** MPTodaro**
EBConnell
RKDavidson
JZMaier
JJMcKelvey
MNovak
ESStamm
PHWood
SWortman

Quality of Environment

**** SWortman**
*** RWRichardson**
JEBlack
GSHayes
HKlein
JJMcKelvey
MEStephenson
MPTodaro
GHToenniessen

Education
for Development

**** ACBarnes**
*** RKDavidson**
JEBlack
EBConnell
CCGray
PHarris
EEKing
JJMcKelvey
JAPino
RWRichardson
VCScott
MPTodaro
SWortman

Conflict in International Relations

**** JEBlack, * EJackson, ACBarnes, RLFischelis, PHarris,**
MNovak, RWRichardson, SWortman

Special Explorations

**** SWortman, ACBarnes, JEBlack, JHKnowles, ETNeumann,**
RWRichardson, MPTodaro

Special Interests

Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China

**** JHKnowles, JEBlack, EBConnell, JWHess,**
EJackson, SWortman

Public Policy and Administration

**** JHKnowles, ACBarnes, JEBlack, EJackson, RWRichardson,**
MPTodaro, SWortman

ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

We have agreed to reorganize the University Development Program to enlarge its responsibilities and facilitate its work. The reasons for changing the name of the program and enlarging its potential interests have been described in the memo on Program Committees dated 2/1/73. The newly-formed EFD Committee will consist of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Vice-Presidents, Directors, Chairmen of the three subcommittees, and the Chairman of the (ad hoc) Education Committee.

Previously, there was one subcommittee for each University Development Center. These will be combined on a geographic basis into one subcommittee for Africa (combining the interests of those for Zaire, Nigeria, and East Africa); one for Asia (combining Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines); and one for Latin America (combining those for Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, and Central America).

The EFD Program Committee will be responsible for policy and review of all recommended appropriations before presentation at the Docket Conference. Periodic review and evaluation of each development center will be the responsibility of the Committee. The scheduling and composition of Review Committees will also be the responsibility of the Committee and will ordinarily include the Chairman of the "geographically-relevant" subcommittee and a Vice-President.

The subcommittees have the responsibility and authority for implementing policy developed by the Program Committee, of which the three Chairmen are members. The Chairmen of the three subcommittees will work directly with the Foundation's local representatives at the

local centers to speed decision-making and reduce bureaucratic log-jams. The Chairmen and the members of the subcommittees are in operations with direct on-going responsibility and authority in the field. Clearly they will work closely with Division heads and Vice-Presidents where appropriate (e.g., recruitment of specialists, etc.) and will form policy with the whole Committee.

I am appending the membership of the Committee and the subcommittees; also the schedule of meetings and Team Reviews for the coming year.

J. H. K.

P.S. Wednesday morning monthly meetings of the Committee will leave two other Wednesday mornings each month for "Intellectual Rejuvenation" activities -- and one morning for internal matters.

EFD PROGRAM COMMITTEE

** Allan C. Barnes
* Ralph K. Davidson
Joseph E. Black
Elizabeth B. Connell
Clarence C. Gray III (Chairman - Asia Subcommittee)
Patricia Harris
Edith E. King
John J. McKelvey, Jr. (Chairman - Africa Subcommittee)
John A. Pino
Ralph W. Richardson, Jr.
Virgil C. Scott (Chairman - Latin American Subcommittee)
Michael P. Todaro
Sterling Wortman

Subcommittee for Asia ** CCG, ACB, RWC, EBC
" for Latin America ** VCS, GSH, JAP, MPT, PHW
" for Africa ** JJM, JEB, RKD, GSH

Schedule of Meetings for Committee:

Wednesday 9:30 a.m. Feb. 7 and 21; April 18; June 13;
Sept. 26; Oct. 24; Nov. 7

EFD Team Review

University of Bahia - sometime in June, 1973
East Africa (final evaluation review) - 2 weeks beginning
Feb. 11, 1974

** Chairman
* Vice-Chairman

NOTES ON SPECIAL INTERESTS AND EXPLORATIONS - THE
"ALLIED INTEREST" DILEMMA

In the overview which I was asked to provide for the deliberations of the Trustee Program Committee, I wrote:

"While the Foundation cannot cover the waterfront (and the rising tide!) of scientific and social problems, it must seek to be knowledgeable about the particulars of social movements and change and to understand their significance. This will require a small group of individuals who constantly monitor major social and cultural movements (e.g., Women; Youth; Employment-Welfare-Tax Reform; the First Amendment; Crime and Penal Reform; Housing; religious movements, etc.) have up-to-date knowledge of State and Federal programs, and have detailed knowledge of economic research as it relates specifically to human services (welfare, health, education, housing, transportation, employment, legal). This same group might be responsible for the development of a small number of new (i.e., exploratory) programs which could in due course develop into major interests of the Foundation - e.g., Public Policy and Administration, Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China " The Trustees have asked us to pursue these ideas.

While a new program, named for the time being "Conflict and International Affairs" has been authorized by the Trustees, we have been asked to continue our explorations in Public Policy and Administration. The need for more effective development of leaders in public policy and management (at both the national and international level) - who understand and can relate the complexities of social melioration and human behavior to the political process - is obvious.

A renewed interest in Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China is being pursued by the Foundation and in due course we should be able to present persuasive reasons for establishing an organized effort and a definite Program for our Trustees' approval.

With the institution of a "new" Program in Population and Health, our long-term interest in Schistosomiasis, Arbovirus Research and other efforts in the field of health will be removed from the "Allied Interest" category and placed where they belong.

Thus, the "Allied Interest" category both shrinks and expands while the term itself remains cold, uninspired, and a handy grab-bag of "winter-sausage" like miscellany (all to the tune of nearly 5 million dollars or roughly 13 percent of our total releases during 1972). Clearly we can exert greater control on the quality of our work and greater influence externally by a clearer definition and organization of the work done under the heading "Allied Interests" while preserving and fostering the idea of pluralistic responses and a fund for rapid exploration and support of new ideas.

I would like to suggest that instead of "Allied Interests" we use the term "Special Interests and Explorations" and under this heading include the following:

Special Interests

1) Grants not clearly associated with any existing program or major interest of a single division but of special interest to the Foundation as a whole. Such activities would be designed to study and pursue new possibilities (e.g., Public Policy and Administration, Cultural and Scientific Exchange with China).

2) Grants related to the special interests of the Foundation as an institution (e.g., Council on Foundations, Overseas Development Council, etc.). Under this category also can be placed the interests of the Committee on Corporate Responsibility and activities related to program administration (e.g., contingency item in the International Programs Budget).

3) Grants which are of special interest to a division but not to any existing program (e.g., National Bureau of Economic Research, NAS Agricultural Board, etc.).

Special Explorations

There is a need to improve the Foundation's mechanism for moving from the identification of important new issues to their institutionalization as new programs. There is also a deficiency in our ability to keep closely informed about the complexities of major emerging issues. Accordingly, I would suggest that we include under our "Special Explorations" category:

1) The funding of "rapid research" efforts related to keeping abreast of major social, scientific and cultural issues primarily in the United States - perhaps with the aim of "occasional papers" from short-term "commissions," seminars, etc., with outside consultants. This work dovetails in certain respects with the work of both the Committee on Evaluation and the Committee on Intellectual Rejuvenation. Inevitably there may be occasional instances of overlap with the interests and expertise of the various divisions and programs of the Foundation.

2) In certain instances, the funding of "deeper explorations" of particular problems identified by our rapid research efforts will prove especially promising. Such explorations might be utilized to evaluate

whether a particular problem area is of sufficient interest to Trustees and officers to emerge as a "special interest" and perhaps eventually as a new program.

Heretofore, grants allied to the interest of an ongoing program but specifically designed to explore new directions were placed under "Allied Interests." I believe these grants should be listed under the Program with or without a special designation. I believe we should also be careful to review regularly (at least annually and probably at Docket Conferences) the large appropriation for allocation by the officers usually over three-year periods (e.g., Unemployment and Human Resource Utilization in LDC's, Insect Growth Regulators, Research on Insect Pheromones, etc.).

I believe we might designate a "division head" to oversee these rather amorphous and emerging (or disappearing!) activities and provide him with a Committee of the Vice-Presidents and other interested officers within the Foundation. I would prefer to find the head from within the Foundation although we may have to go outside to find such a broad individual - and one who can tolerate ambiguity and a veritable welter of diverse interests and skills.

I would appreciate your reaction to the above thoughts so we can prepare a final statement on the issues for the Program Committee of the Trustees.

J. H. K.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON WOMEN

The Ad Hoc Committee on Women has submitted a thoughtful report, much of which can be implemented. The Committee can be disbanded while our ongoing concern for the position of women both within the Foundation and in our program activities will be assumed by the appropriate administrative, standing (e.g., Intellectual Rejuvenation) and program committees (with particular reference to Population, Health, Cultural Heritage, and Equal Opportunity).

The Foundation's concern with the status of women in recent years, both within and outside the organization, has been evidenced in a number of different ways.

1. A highly qualified and active woman Trustee was elected to the Board in April 1971. Another was elected in April 1973. Other women in leadership positions on the national scene will be considered to fill Board vacancies when they arise.

2. As officer additions or replacements for staff are needed, particular attention is being given to the search for qualified women. Two offers have been made in recent months to women. Both candidates are already deeply involved in their respective institutions and may not be movable at present. An Associate Director for Health Sciences (formerly Biomedical Sciences) has been appointed. Her special interest is in the field of Population. Over the coming year, new Program Officers may be recruited for the Equal Opportunity Program, Social Sciences division (e.g., cultural anthropologist), Population and Health, Health Sciences division, Natural and Environmental Sciences, the Arts, and Special Interests

and Explorations. In each instance we should (indeed must by law) be sure that women have been given equal consideration and opportunity for employment here.

3. Changes in the group benefit plans for Foundation employees have been made so that women have the same status as men. The principal changes include the following:

a. The qualified retirement plan, which was put into effect in 1966, eliminated mandatory retirement for women at age 60 and provided that the mandatory retirement age for all employees would be 65. More recently a change was made so that benefits formerly reserved for widows now apply to the spouse of either sex.

b. The Foundation's medical care plan has been modified to provide full coverage for medical care in connection with termination of pregnancy.

4. Personnel policies have been under continuous review in recent years in order to deal with the general problems of level of compensation, job description, and organizational structure. Opportunities for upward mobility, particularly in support positions, are limited in a relatively small organization. Most program positions require rather specialized training usually at the M.D., Ph.D., or equivalent levels. Movement from the support staff to these program area positions is possible only when academic requirements and capacities have been met in addition to years of practical experience such as only a few of our long-term staff members have gained. Occasional opportunities have arisen in the officer

cadre, especially in administrative areas including the Secretary's Office, the Conference Office, and the Treasurer's and Comptroller's areas. Both men and women having long experience with the Foundation have been promoted to these positions. As future openings occur, qualified women employees will continue to be considered on the same basis as qualified men.

Some middle-ground positions have been developed over the years, including the more recent concept of Program Associates. Four of these positions have been filled with highly qualified women who have developed skills and understandings which make them invaluable in dealing with a number of aspects of program administration.

Quite recently additional positions have been created for which employees having secretarial skills can be considered from time to time. An Executive Assistant position has been created in the President's Office, Executive Secretary designations have been established for positions in the Offices of the Vice-Presidents, and secretaries whose duties within the various program divisions requiring a high degree of responsibility and initiative have been reclassified with the title of Program Secretary. (There are now twenty Program Secretaries.) At a somewhat similar level, but with duties slightly different, are the Administrative Secretaries and the Fellowship Secretaries.

In the service departments there are a number of opportunities for upward mobility with several of the most responsible positions being

currently filled by women in the Comptroller's Office, the Office Service Department, the Reference Service, and the Information Service.

There is nothing in the organization chart at the moment which responds directly to the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Position of Women that internships be created. As indicated above, there are, in effect, several layers of responsibility which can be more precisely defined and re-evaluated from time to time to accomplish some of the objectives the Committee appears to have had in mind in proposing internships. The concept of interns implies a prerequisite of substantial academic or professional training which can be further advanced by a relatively short term (one or two years) of practical experience in a professional capacity before going on to other career opportunities. We shall continue our interest in the possibility of selected internships. The Council on Foundations is also considering the possibilities and we may be able to develop a joint program.

5. The women officers and Program Associates have each made substantial contributions to the work of various ad hoc committees. As the standing committees are organized to deal with the various aspects of Foundation program, women have been assigned to the committees and will participate fully in their deliberations.

6. As an indication of the Foundation's concern about the place of women in our society outside the organization, it should be noted that a two-day meeting of scholars interested in the place of women in American history was organized a few months ago, and a summary of the

discussions has been prepared and can be made available to all who are interested. The first follow-up of that meeting is an item which was presented for the consideration of the Executive Committee in February to establish a women's studies program at Sarah Lawrence College. This grant was approved by the Executive Committee. At the May 1973 meeting of the Trustees, grants were approved to develop Research Resources in Women's History at Radcliffe and Smith. It is hoped that the Foundation can have at least a modest impact through support of projects which are designed to improve the position of women in our society.

Each Program Officer is responsible for the morale of his secretary, and for making sure that her skills and interests are known and used effectively. In this way, individuals will emerge, if encouraged, who can assume other responsibilities within the Foundation.

- 69 -

REPLY TO FIELD STAFF INQUIRY

The Rockefeller Foundation

111 WEST 50th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10020

JOHN H. KNOWLES, M. D.
PRESIDENT

CABLE: ROCKFOUND, NEW YORK
TELEPHONE: COLUMBUS 5-8100

February 26, 1973

Dear Norm:

Out of a total of 78 letters sent to field staff members last summer (1972) there were 39 replies by the deadline of October 31 which we had set as the cut-off date. Many useful suggestions were made in those replies, and I asked a small interdisciplinary committee to review them and make recommendations to me for a response to the field.

I am happy to report that the preponderance of responses indicated a general satisfaction with the interrelationships between the field staff and the New York staff. At the same time, there were several letters offering suggestions for improvements, most of which could be accomplished with relatively simple changes in patterns of organization and communication. As you all know from information which has been forwarded in recent months, we have had a number of ad hoc committees examining all aspects of the Foundation's operation, including a review of programs to which we are already committed and a hard look at major problems to which the Foundation should perhaps give attention in the future. Ad hoc committees have also examined our various administrative patterns including grants in aid, fellowships, personnel organization, benefits, and other related matters.

Enclosed with this letter are two memoranda reporting some of the initial decisions with respect to the development of standing committees to deal with program matters - Program Committees (2/1/73) and Organization of Education for Development Program (2/1/73). As we gain experience and decide on other organizational changes, we will keep you informed through similar memoranda. We welcome your comments and suggestions at any time.

On the administrative side we have already taken a number of steps to improve our procedures, and we have a number of additional steps in mind. These may be summarized somewhat as follows:

February 26, 1973

(1) Placing salary review on a systematic annual schedule. The first review under this new schedule was completed, as you know, on January 1, 1973, and it is anticipated that complete reviews will be made annually hereafter.

(2) Better orientation at the beginning of the field assignment. We believe that field staff members should undergo a period of orientation in the New York office prior to taking up their duties in the field. Depending upon the circumstances, periods of up to four weeks would appear to be indicated. New staff members would work closely with program officers in day-to-day routines in the New York office, assist in the preparation of grant proposals, attend staff meetings, etc. Such a period of orientation would acquaint new field staff members with the functions of the New York office and, in so doing, contribute to their effectiveness in the field.

(3) Better planning of field staff visits to New York. To the extent that it is possible within the requirements of field program needs and budgetary restrictions, we think it would be desirable for field staff members to spend a week or two in the New York office in connection with vacation or business trips each year or at least every other year. These visits need to be carefully planned and structured well in advance through the individual's New York Director to permit as much participation in staff meetings, seminars, and other discussions as can be arranged. We will undertake to provide field offices with a schedule of forthcoming staff meetings and seminars which might be of interest. At the very least, nearly every Wednesday morning is devoted to a meeting of all program officers to discuss matters of general interest and to hear reports by program officers, field staff, or outside speakers. I would hope you would always plan to attend this meeting when in New York.

I hope that it will be possible for me to exchange ideas and information with each field staff member when he is in New York and, therefore, would stress the importance of our having as much advance notice as possible of projected visits - our calendars tend to become crowded for several weeks ahead.

New York visits also provide an opportunity for field staff members to become better acquainted with (or to refresh their memories about) Foundation procedures and facilities. While information on these subjects is contained in the Manual for Overseas Staff, a chance to talk with individuals in the various offices (Treasurer, Comptroller, Travel, Purchasing and Shipping, Information Service, Archives, Library, and Reference Service) is usually mutually profitable.

February 26, 1973

(4) Program reviews in the field. It is our intention to arrange visits of small teams of New York officers to participate in occasional program reviews in the field. Such visits will be scheduled far enough in advance so that the entire field staff at a given post may participate in the discussions. Subject to the many demands placed upon them here in New York, other New York officers will endeavor to make field visits from time to time. Again, every effort will be made to schedule such visits well in advance and to notify field representatives of schedule changes that may be required.

Field staff members must play an important role in connection with these reviews, as well as the planning, development, and implementation of programs. It, therefore, seems vital to us that the local directors - who serve as the principal conduit for communication between the field and New York - should meet regularly and frequently with their staffs for the mutual exchange of ideas and information regarding the planning and execution of Foundation programs.

(5) Program reviews by the standing program committees in the New York office. The standing program committees in the New York office, about which more will be said from time to time in separate memoranda, will endeavor to schedule periodic in-depth program reviews. These reviews will be somewhat in the pattern of the UDP meetings which were held last November with the participation of all field representatives from UDP centers. Because of the time and travel requirements, not every program will be able to schedule a review of meeting on an annual basis.

(6) Trustee visits to the field. As in the past, the Trustees are encouraged to visit field programs whenever possible, and there is discussion of a Board meeting to be held outside the United States - possibly in Mexico next December.

(7) Information circulated to the field. In addition to RF Illustrated, which we expect to issue four times a year, there will be periodic memoranda from the President's Office regarding program and organizational developments.

(8) Exchange of diaries between New York office and field. Field staff are requested to prepare diaries from time to time for use by the New York officers. New York officers in the future will undertake to send selected diaries and reports to field staff on matters of particular concern and interest to those working in the field.

February 26, 1973

(9) Revision of field staff manual. Several field staff members expressed interest in participating in the periodic revisions of the Manual for Overseas Staff. There has perhaps been more field participation in past Manual revisions than was realized. The last two or three revisions were prepared by a committee of New York officers and staff who took the opportunity of consulting field representatives and field staff members during chance visits to the New York office. An effort will be made in the future, however, to make this type of consultation a bit more formal.

We have all appreciated and profited from the letters which came in from field staff, and we very much hope that all of you will feel free to send comments and suggestions to New York at any time. Ordinarily these suggestions should be channeled through the field representative. Just as we have reorganized ourselves here to provide for better sharing of ideas and more vigorous interdisciplinary work, I would hope that the field representative would meet periodically with local staff to realize the strength of collective thought as it relates to improving the programs of the Foundation.

Sincerely yours,


John H. Knowles, M.D.

Dr. Norman E. Borlaug
Director International Wheat
Improvement Program
CIMMYT
Londres 40
Mexico 6, D.F.
MEXICO

Section V

SUMMARIES OF STATEMENTS OF PROGRAMS

	<u>Page</u>
Conquest of Hunger	1
Population and Health	7
Education for Development	23
Equal Opportunity for All	30
The Arts, The Humanities, and Contemporary Values	43
Quality of the Environment	61
Conflict in International Relations	69

CONQUEST OF HUNGER

Two-thirds of the world's population live in the developing countries, and 50 to 80 percent of these people are found in rural areas. Most depend on small farms, struggling for existence through traditional agriculture. Per capita incomes of such rural people commonly are abysmally low - well under the national averages of \$50 to \$200 per year, a small fraction of the \$3,900 of the United States. These rural dwellers for the most part have little hope for even minimal education, health care, diets, housing, or even the barest amenities. It is the improvement of the lot of these poorest of the world's people toward which the Foundation's future efforts under Conquest of Hunger will be mainly directed.

In spite of the very considerable gains in farm productivity and income brought about by the new agricultural technology in developing nations, food production in most countries is still barely keeping pace with population growth. Given present rates of population increase, world production of basic food crops must be increased by four percent per year in the decades ahead if only modest improvements in diets for the poor are to be achieved. This will require the doubling of world food output in the next 18 years and a quadrupling in 36 years - a most difficult task, considering that it entails efforts by over 100 developing nations to effect changes on tens of millions of farms. A major concern of the agrarian nations and major assistance agencies is the development of the network of institutions for research and the training of people required for such a massive effort. Furthermore, a series of institutional changes must be carried out by the local governments to insure that the benefits of the new technologies are distributed more equitably.

Through its support of national programs and international institutes, the Foundation has assisted substantially with the development of the technology by which rapid increases in productivity of a few of the basic food crops could be achieved. Substantial numbers of scientists and technicians have been trained and nations have been encouraged, with some success, to strengthen their relevant institutions and to utilize more fully the talents of those nationals trained over the years by the Foundation or others. Acres devoted to the high-yielding cereals have expanded at an accelerated rate in areas in which the international institutes, the foundations, and major assistance agencies have supported intensive research and production programs. Where there has been no such cooperation, food production generally has remained stagnant.

International institutes have been established to provide competent help to developing countries with rice, wheat, maize, and a few other commodities.¹ There remain, however, a greater number of important yet still neglected food crops and animal species for which no similar assistance is available.

Given the continuing urgency of the world food problem and the Foundation's concern for man's quality of life including improved health and nutrition, it is recommended that efforts be concentrated in the following problem areas, with consideration both to needs for increased agricultural productivity and to concerns for preservation of the environment:

¹ The main institutes are: The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), Philippines; International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), Mexico; International Center of Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Colombia; International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Nigeria; International Potato Center (CIP), Peru; International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), India; and International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD), Kenya.

1. The Rockefeller Foundation as a pioneer in the development of strategies, institutions, and model programs required for acceleration of agricultural progress, expects to move toward broader definitions of the roles of the international agricultural research and training centers, working in close cooperation with members of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research.² The institute system will remain central to the Conquest of Hunger program. Sustained Foundation support for the institutes is projected, hopefully on a diminishing scale to permit greater amounts of Foundation resources to be used for innovation and to link expertise in technically advanced nations with work at the centers, and that of the centers with efforts of the poor countries. The Foundation now has 31 scientists assigned to the international agricultural institutes and many may continue to be assigned there.

2. Research and training priorities:

a. Continuing attention will be devoted to means of improving yields and nutritional quality, and of intensifying disease and insect resistance of the basic food grains. These problems have not yet been solved as evidenced by the current production figures throughout Asia. Emphasis will be on strengthening the science base on which success of intensified agricultural production efforts will depend.

b. The long-neglected food legumes and certain oilseed crops will receive attention through support of research to increase yields while maintaining or improving nutritional quality. This will supplement continuing

² The Consultative Group consists of the World Bank, UNDP, FAO, governments, foundations, and other funding agencies. In support of the international institutes and centers, this Group provided a total of \$15 million in 1972 and \$24 million for 1973.

efforts to improve protein quantity and quality of the major cereal grain crops - the present sources of approximately 50 percent of proteins for human consumption. For both food legumes and cereal grains, studies will be supported to identify those changes in grain quality which would be important for plant breeders to incorporate in new varieties.

c. There will be an intensification of efforts to improve animal health and production, particularly in Africa, where animal production is important for both human nutrition and economic development; research on hemoparasitic diseases will be emphasized.³ Possibilities of improving poultry and swine production in Asia will be explored.

d. World efforts to control plant pests and pathogens should be initiated. This will require new international, cooperative research and control programs aimed at protecting the basic food crops.

Progress on some aspects of the above research areas can be accelerated by joint efforts of international institutes and other centers of specialization, particularly universities in the United States; such cooperation will be encouraged whenever appropriate. Intensification of pioneering, independent work at universities or other research centers will be desirable, as will arrangements for occasional conferences among leading world authorities in specific lines of research.

3. The Foundation will continue to search for and support efforts to obtain scientific breakthroughs in critical new areas. Among those of present interest are (a) extension of nitrogen fixation to the grasses; (b) effecting

³ Primarily East Coast Fever (a red blood cell parasite of cattle) and trypanosomiasis.

broad crosses through use of cell and tissue culture as a means of genetic improvement of basic food crops; (c) exploration of new techniques and approaches in aquaculture; (d) production of single cell protein, especially from cellulosic crop residues; and (e) identification of the nature of plant resistance to diseases.

4. Assistance to nations, or to groups of small nations as in Central America, which give high priority to better organization for orderly and accelerated rural development is an urgent need. Three mechanisms are envisaged for such assistance. One is to provide a group of highly experienced consultants for a limited period as was done in the three-man team the Foundation loaned to the Ethiopian government to reorganize the national agricultural effort. A second is to provide especially qualified individual leaders for important institutions in developing countries, on or outside the Foundation staff, for more sustained periods, as the Foundation has done in numerous instances. The third is to improve the level of understanding of the development process; one way to achieve this would be through workshops where potential leaders for development might learn from those with substantial experience and accomplishment, and thus increase the number of exceptionally capable persons available for rural development programs.

5. Formulation of strategies and low-cost techniques which can be employed effectively by poorer nations to improve the quality of life of rural dwellers will be given priority. Recognizing the very large extent and variety of rural conditions, the Foundation would concentrate on one or a few experimental and demonstrative rural integrated development projects for selected populations and regions, with simultaneous attention to problems of small farmers' income generation, health and family planning, education, housing,

nutrition, and cultural values. This will require interdisciplinary cooperation of Foundation staff in the agricultural, medical, and social sciences.

At the same time the Foundation will work with leading authorities on development to synthesize workable strategies for maximum speed in comprehensive rural development, adopting levels of expenditure and input which could be maintained or replicated by the national economies of less-developed countries.

6. Increasing emphasis will be given to the analysis of the socio-economic aspects of food production and distribution in the LDC's, particularly as these relate to small farmers and laborers. Issues to be investigated include sources of income generation, rural employment and unemployment, marketing, credit, land tenure arrangements, the impact of farm mechanization, adoption of new seed varieties and other elements of new production technology, availability of inputs, and policies affecting trade, distribution, and storage of basic food products.

To advance most of the objectives stated in the foregoing, the Foundation will continue its role in agricultural diplomacy to assist in the organization of international efforts to achieve concerted action among less-developed countries and contributing agencies for faster agricultural and rural improvement.

POPULATION AND HEALTH

The present Biomedical Sciences division is successor to a number of former Foundation programs concerned with public health, medical education, and the biological and medical sciences. Beginning in 1913 with the original International Health Board (later the International Health Division), the Foundation in 1919 added a Division of Medical Education. In 1929 the latter became the Medical Sciences division and a parallel Natural Sciences division was established. In 1951 the Medical Sciences and the International Health Division were terminated; some of their functions were continued by a new organization, the Division of Medicine and Public Health. In 1955 Medicine and Public Health (the word Division had been dropped from the title in the interim) was divided into Medical Education and Public Health, and Biological and Medical Research; in 1959 the two were recombined into Medical and Natural Sciences. This represented the first time in Foundation history that the word Health did not appear in the title of any of its divisions. Finally, in June 1970, Medical and Natural Sciences was renamed Biomedical Sciences.

These changes were not merely semantic or terminological; on the contrary, they reflected changes - often major and far-reaching - in program content and emphasis, as well as in organizational structure. They resulted from program reviews of varying degrees of depth and intensity by both Trustees and officers, as part of the more or less continuous process of evaluation of the scope and impact of the Foundation's activities in relation to changing world needs.

For example, the International Health Board and Division had carried out extensive operating programs in research on and control of specific major

diseases, in technical assistance for the development of official health agencies, and in professional training and education. After World War II the World Health Organization was established as an arm of the United Nations; it rapidly expanded with major support from governments, and began to work in the fields developed by the IHD, often using the same methods and techniques to which it was able to bring much larger resources. The pioneering phase in the development of public health was over; a new international organization had been created to assist governments to meet their responsibilities for the health of their peoples, and accordingly the IHD and its programs were terminated.

Similarly, the Medical Sciences division under Alan Gregg and the Natural Sciences division under Warren Weaver were responsible during the 1930's and 1940's for a significant development of the strength of basic science through the strategic use of grants for research support. Weaver has observed that during that period in the United States a very large proportion - perhaps as much as 90 percent - of the research monies available to biological and medical scientists outside regular university budgets came from the Foundation, then the only major alternative source in existence. This represented an investment by the Foundation of the order of \$3 million to \$5 million per year.

Clearly, this sum did not meet all the biological and medical research needs of the time; in order to make these limited funds maximally effective, it was necessary to focus on fields of research selected for special significance and potential. Medical Sciences concentrated on the basic sciences underlying neurology, as part of its major interest in the development of psychiatry as an academic discipline; Natural Sciences, on genetics, biochemistry of proteins and nucleic acids, the chemistry of naturally occurring products, biophysics, and molecular structure. It was also necessary to emphasize scientific quality.

Here it is pertinent to note that of the 48 Nobel Laureates in Medicine and Physiology during the period 1950-1970, 13 had received part of their training under Foundation fellowships, and 26 had Foundation research support, prior to the Nobel award (another, the late Max Theiler, was a Foundation staff member). Again after the war - with the emergence of the U.S. National Institutes of Health as a major force engaged in constructing an enormous national biomedical research enterprise, and with the postwar recovery of Western Europe - the Foundation in the early 1950's began progressively to reduce its own commitments, and by the end of the decade former programs in the support of biomedical research in both areas were essentially at an end. As a result of the new program guidelines approved by the Trustees in 1963, Foundation support to biomedical research since then has been primarily in the area of reproductive biology, under the Population program, and to a lesser extent in schistosomiasis and in connection with University Development Program.

* * * * *

It is recommended that the present Population program be renamed Population and Health. Again, not a minor semantic shift: it underlines the broad interrelationships between population questions, fertility reduction, and health (as, for example, between fertility and infant and child mortality); it opens avenues for wider future activity; and it recognizes the long tradition of the Foundation in the health field.

It is also recommended that the title of the Biomedical Sciences division be changed to Health Sciences. This would link the name of the division to that of the program in Population and Health, and would signal the relationship of health to the social sciences as well as the biomedical. The re-identification with health would permit the realignment of existing programs and the exploration of additional opportunities.

* * * * *

Population: devastation, laying waste
Populate: to lay waste, ravage, devastate, destroy
..... Oxford English Dictionary

These definitions are noted by the Dictionary as "obsolete, rare." Indeed, throughout most of recorded history any official or professional concern with questions of population was in the direction of stimulating growth and increase. Beginning in approximately the mid to late 1940's, the world was faced with a new and unprecedented situation - a very rapid and sustained growth of population, occurring worldwide, but particularly marked in the poor countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and resulting primarily from steep declines in mortality in the face of continuing high fertility. The multiplier of unusually high national population growth rates was applied to a very large world population base; the resulting increase in absolute numbers began to be seen as a threat to the expectations of those countries for economic and social development and to the efforts of national and international agencies to assist them in attaining that objective. In the industrialized countries, population pressure together with increasing consumption of natural resources began to be recognized as imperiling the continued availability of such resources and the quality of the global environment. These radical changes, without parallel in human experience and occurring over a brief time span, raised the possibility that the "obsolete, rare" definitions above might once again become current.

In 1962-1963, in the course of a review of existing and past Foundation programs, the Trustees identified a series of major problems, of which Population was one, which were expected to be critical for human well-being during the coming decades, and to the solution or mitigation of which the

Foundation should bring its resources to bear. In a Statement published September 20, 1963, they noted:

"Within forty years there may be twice as many human beings living on the earth as there are today. Part of the reason is that the combined efforts of physicians, scientists, educators, and governments have helped to conquer disease, prevent excessive infant and juvenile mortality, and prolong life expectancy. Comparable progress in bringing about stability among populations, so that the number of people will not outstrip the capacity of their material and cultural resources to sustain them, has not been achieved.

"The grim, steady swelling in the size of the world's population is a fact of tremendous significance for all mankind, and the problem is aggravated by the tendency of people to concentrate massively in urban centers. The explosive increase in numbers and the parallel growth of cities have together created new kinds of problems in health, housing, transportation, education, employment, and social organization. These problems will become more complicated and more difficult as the years go by and the numbers continue to grow.

"In the belief that an urgent need exists to stabilize world population and thus prevent the eventual condemnation of millions of future citizens to lives of underprivilege, misery, and hopelessness, the Foundation expects to expand its support of critical research and of action programs in population dynamics and population stabilization."

The goal of the Foundation's Population program as interpreted under this mandate is the eventual attainment of population stabilization, resulting from low mortality balanced by low fertility achieved by voluntary means through individual decision. The logical position is that zero population growth must eventually be reached, since any degree of growth - no matter how slow - if continued over a long enough time must lead to an impossible situation. The questions at issue are - zero growth at what level of mortality? At what level of world population? And at what level of quality of life?

In principle, a general strategy for attaining population stabilization is:

- 1) Make information about contraception readily available, and provide to all who need them services which are adequate qualitatively and quantitatively. This measure will reach at once all those already motivated to limit family size.

This will require operational research into the management and administration of family planning programs, and in most of the developing world the training of large numbers of non-medical family planning workers. It would be materially aided if better contraceptive methods were available; this requires not only applied research in contraceptive technology but also basic research in those aspects of reproductive biology likely to lead to improved technology.

- 2) Motivate the rest (and motivate all toward smaller family size) by the introduction of social and economic policies to modify individual behavior in the direction of population stabilization.

Improvements in incomes, job opportunities, education, and health will certainly be needed, but these imply development. In the meantime the body of knowledge needed to formulate sound policies is deficient; much research in the relevant social sciences is needed to establish this basic knowledge.

The tactics followed by the Foundation's program, in accordance with the Trustees' mandate of 1963, have been patterned on the strategy outlined above, and have been constantly monitored in order to adapt them to changing circumstances, needs, and opportunities.

The situation has indeed changed profoundly. The last decade since the inauguration of the Foundation's specific interest in population has seen a remarkable and unprecedented upsurge in public awareness of the problems caused by population growth and the tendency of that growth to increase in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Recognition of the problem was accompanied by a greatly increased effort on the part of governments and private organizations to find solutions. Progress in this respect is perhaps without parallel in the history of problems of such complexity, although the desired goal of major decreases in fertility in the developing countries is not yet in sight. An indication of the progress made - one which has implications for the Foundation's

program - is the rapid and substantial increase in the external financial resources available for the support of family planning programs, both in the United States and in the developing countries, and for research in reproductive biology and in the social sciences related to population. In 1962 the amount committed by outside sources (other than governmental contributions to their own domestic programs) for these purposes totaled \$4.3 million, coming from the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Ford Foundation, and the Population Council. In 1972 the estimated total from all outside sources was about \$225 million. However, the largest part of this sum represented the contributions of national foreign aid agencies to the family planning programs of developing countries, through technical assistance or direct support, and to international organizations (mostly the IPPF and United Nations agencies) for the same purposes. Such service programs, and operational research on their management and evaluation, are clearly the responsibility of governments and intergovernmental agencies; since very large sums are available there seems little reason for the Foundation to add any of its own resources to activities which may already be suffering from financial indigestion.

On the other hand, there is general agreement that population research in both the biological and social science fields is seriously underfinanced. Among the major U.S. foundations (including 40 with assets of over \$100 million), only the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations have specific programs, and a consistent major interest, in population. They, with the U.S. National Institutes of Health, are the principal sources of support for population research. The population problem is a long-range one, the

solutions to which can come only through intensive research in order to establish the solid foundation of basic knowledge on which future advances must depend. It is in the support of such research that the most important opportunities exist for the Foundation.

It is recommended that the recent policy of increased emphasis on the support of research in a range of social sciences relevant to population issues be continued, with special reference to those fields of economics, population distribution, employment, migration, and rural development which have implications for and can assist the formulation of rational population policies. An example is the program supported jointly by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations over the last three years in social science and legal research in a broad range of such subjects. Another important field in which support should be continued is research on the economic, cultural, and social factors which act as determinants of family size.

In reproductive biology, the complex chain of events leading from gamete formation through fertilization to establishment of pregnancy is only imperfectly understood, and many of the steps in this process are completely unknown. The links in this chain must be fully elucidated in order to be able to identify the weak links which represent possible points of attack through which blocking or inhibition of the process can occur. Basic research in this general area needs strengthening; support to it should be continued, primarily through assistance to university-based teams of investigators, with careful coordination of the Foundation's program with those of other organizations in order to avoid duplication and to insure the most effective use of the resources available. Applied research in reproductive biology, directed specifically at contraceptive development, is to be encouraged.

Both basic and applied research can be aided by increasing the possibility of collaboration and interaction between basic scientists and clinical departments of obstetrics and gynecology. To this end, assistance should be continued to the establishment of research positions at the assistant or associate professor level for biological scientists in such departments.

Further advances must depend upon increasing both the numbers and the quality of investigators working in the field, which requires increased opportunities for advanced training. A program of special postdoctoral research fellowships for scientists of high quality is in progress.

Particularly in the developing countries, little attention is paid to the teaching of population-related matters in universities, both at the undergraduate level and in medical faculties. Efforts are under way to stimulate the introduction of such instruction in selected institutions, and it is planned to continue them as demonstration projects. Programs of training for auxiliary personnel as providers of family planning services will continue to receive consideration, chiefly when they have an important teaching component and the potential for serving as models for expanding the use of such personnel. Attention is also being given to the development of population teaching in grade schools, again on a demonstration basis, in the hope that programs of this kind may become widely available if their feasibility and effectiveness can be established.

* * * * *

In considering the Health side (although Population would remain the primary emphasis and commitment), we recommend the strategy of developing health programs as an integral part of and as an input to other major Foundation programs where appropriate. Such a strategy would give a cohesiveness to Foundation

activities, so that they would be mutually reinforcing; it would also represent a significant unifying force, drawing programs together. It would have the advantage of keeping health programs in new and innovative fields, and would diminish the risk of becoming involved in the traditional and the well-explored, and of diffusion of effort and resources. There follow some examples of possible ways in which Health could be built into other Foundation programs.

University Development. The most important contribution to improvement of the health of peoples in the less-developed countries would be the introduction of simplified methods of delivery of health services aimed at wide coverage of the population, especially in rural areas, but consistent with the country's resources of personnel and money. This is a long-range goal which requires that health services concentrate on those relatively simple factors that are the chief causes of morbidity and mortality, rather than on advanced scientific and technological fixes. (Among such factors is the pneumonia-diarrhea complex in infants and young children, where attention to rudimentary sanitation and basic nutrition, allied to simplified maternal and child health programs with an important family planning component, can produce significant results.) The goal requires the training and extensive use of health auxiliaries at a number of subprofessional levels. How best to train and deploy such auxiliaries is far from an easy problem, and one which needs the type of experimentation and demonstration which the Foundation can best assist through the use of its own field staff. The Foundation has supported the development of community medicine programs designed to provide the locus for such teaching, experiment, and pilot demonstrations at several University Development centers - the projects at Candelaria (Universidad del Valle),

Bay (University of the Philippines), Bang Pa-In (Bangkok), and Igbo-Ora (University of Ibadan). Candelaria, as the oldest of these, has thus far produced the most notable results. It was here that studies on the treatment of acute severe malnutrition in infants, coupled with the observation of an unexpectedly high relapse rate, led to the discovery of what might be called a form of disguised or unconscious infanticide - the resources of the family in money and time were simply not enough to take care of all the children, so that the youngest and most vulnerable were neglected. This evidence persuaded the country's medical leadership and the government to formulate a national population policy and to begin a family planning program. More recently, the research group at Candelaria has found that the installation of a simplified water supply-sanitation system reduced the incidence of diarrheal diseases in children from 50 episodes/100 children/month to 7. A decrease in clinical cases of malnutrition was also noted, but this could not be ascribed solely to the improvements in sanitation, since at the same time the use of health promoters - trained local girls who make systematic home visits to instruct mothers in the care of children - had begun.

The program in Population and Health would expect to continue the modest support needed for such community medicine programs in connection with existing and new University Development centers, and possibly in a few additional areas where unusual opportunities exist.

Quality of the Environment. Many of the problems dealt with by the Quality of the Environment program are concerned with toxic pollutants or other factors which constitute serious human health hazards. Population and Health would expect to contribute to such programs where appropriate, and to explore the possibility of training programs for physicians in environmental medicine.

Cultural Development. Population and Health has at least two interfaces with the Cultural Development program. The whole range of ethical, moral, and value issues as related to scientific advance and the use of medical technology is becoming of increasing interest and concern, and needs intensive study. The use of the patient as an investigative subject and the risk-benefit ratio of diagnostic or therapeutic procedures are among other problem areas which require impartial consideration and evaluation.

Two other sorts of human questions need to be raised. Human culture adds to human biology the dimension of diversity - of diverse ways of perceiving, diverse ways of evaluating, diverse ways of acting. From a humanistic point of view, it is important to avoid "cultural imperialism," i.e., the imposition of the ways of one culture upon those of another. Methods need to be discovered for peaceful, self-critical, and mutual negotiation of conflicts between cultures, not least on matters so basic as procedures regarding Population and Health.

Secondly, persons trained in disciplines of moral-cultural inquiry need to be encouraged to develop the basic concepts and procedures of their field, so as to shed useful light on the dilemmas which result from modern science, modern forms of organization, and modern dependence on social planning. The ancient and traditional concepts and procedures have direct bearing on a quite different social order. Creativity and originality of mind in fields of cultural and social morality are at least as necessary as in fields of science and technology.

The uses of television in medicine remain relatively unexplored. There are at least four areas for the utilization of this powerful medium - undergraduate medical education, graduate education and refresher courses, direct

consultation by closed circuit between medical centers and outlying areas, and health education of the public. Population and Health plans to study the feasibility of these uses of television and, if suitable opportunities can be developed, to assist research on the cost-effectiveness and usefulness of the method.

Conquest of Hunger. If it is decided to develop one or more demonstration projects in rural integrated development under the Conquest of Hunger program, in either the U.S. or the less-developed countries, Population and Health would expect to take part in the health/nutrition/family planning component, using the Candelaria community medicine model with such variations as may be necessary to adapt this simplified health care system to the local scene.

Schistosomiasis. Although the Foundation has had an interest in schistosomiasis since the late 1920's, recent concern dates to 1958 when several officers serving as members of a National Academy of Sciences group of advisers returned from a tour of Africa impressed with the enormity of the problem. Schistosomiasis is probably the only major communicable disease which is spreading in spite of all efforts at control. Transmission of the parasite becomes increasingly efficient under conditions of exploding population densities of both humans and snail vectors, the latter resulting largely from water management schemes constructed for industrial and agricultural use. The disease has already reached epidemic proportions around Lake Volta in Ghana and in large-scale irrigation projects in the Sudan, Rhodesia, the United Arab Republic, and elsewhere.

Trustee approval for an operating program to study control of schistosomiasis was given in 1965 when the St. Lucia project was endorsed; the program formally got under way in early 1967. The objective is to carry out research on transmission and control of S. mansoni, the form of the helminth indigenous to

the Western Hemisphere. St. Lucia, a mountainous island, is divided into a series of valleys which make it ideal for epidemiologic and control studies. Most of the work to date has been concentrated in three of the major valleys - one for the application of snail control measures, a second for the installation of sanitary facilities to decrease human contact with infected natural waters, and a third where mass treatment of the infected human population will be undertaken. Early results in the first two valleys are encouraging, but several years more will be required for evaluation. It is quite possible that no single method will prove completely successful, and that some combination of methods will be required for control.

In addition to the operating program on St. Lucia, the Foundation is supporting through grants and appropriations a number of basic studies on the snail vectors, new antischistosomal drugs, and particularly immunology with the ultimate aim of developing a protective vaccine.

There are other so-called tropical diseases (defined for present purposes as those due to protozoal or helminthic parasites or to viruses, usually insect-transmitted) of major importance to vast areas of the world. Among these the most serious are malaria, trypanosomiasis, and onchocerciasis. Research on malaria in the U.S. usually occurs as the result of crash programs due to an immediate need, such as urgent military requirements; despite some recent advances, malaria remains a major problem because of vector insecticide resistance (or avoidance) and drug-resistant strains of parasites. The other diseases are largely ignored by U.S. investigators, in part because of disinterest and in part due to lack of research support. In research, the Foundation has a "foot in the door" in schistosomiasis. This may be expanded into support for research in other tropical diseases if suitable opportunities arise. The field of immunology in particular deserves emphasis.

The teaching of tropical medicine has declined seriously in the United States since World War II. So too has the clinical ability of U.S. physicians to recognize and treat tropical diseases. This decline has occurred at precisely the wrong time. Jet air travel has greatly increased the number of Americans visiting tropical countries and returning home with diseases unfamiliar to their physicians, frequently with disastrous results. The officers are considering the establishment of a center in a U.S. medical school (perhaps two) which could undertake research and postgraduate training in diseases peculiar to the tropics. For both research and training the proposed center would benefit from linkages to medical and community health projects at University Development centers, as well as to the St. Lucia project. A case in point is the new program at the Federal University of Bahia, located at a focal point in the Northeast of Brazil. Among the major health problems of this region are schistosomiasis, which is particularly serious here, Chagas' disease and kala azar (both of which are forms of trypanosomiasis), and filariasis. Indeed, as the Bahia program develops, it is quite possible that control measures developed on St. Lucia would have immediate applicability here.

* * * * *

The above list is not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive, but to indicate the range of possibilities which the Foundation might investigate within the framework of a Health program. The Foundation can play an important part in such work in public health, and particularly in the less-developed countries - quite apart from the long tradition of the Foundation and from its past contributions in this field. The program developments suggested would be strengthened by this tradition, but at the same time would represent new departures and innovative approaches rather than continuing along well-worn paths. The Foundation's

EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

During the past ten years researchers, planners, educators, and students have articulated the existence of a crisis in formal education around the world. Many of the facets of this were highlighted at a Rockefeller Foundation-sponsored Bellagio conference in May of 1972.

This crisis has arisen not solely because of rapidly expanding enrollments, too few teachers, inadequate finance, antiquated facilities, although these have been important contributors. Rather the fundamental cause of the crisis is the serious maladjustment which has arisen between the educational system and the needs and aspirations of the societies which it is supposed to serve. Nowhere is this maladjustment more evident than in the contemporary less-developed countries. The recent report of the UNESCO Faure Commission, for example, asserts that "serious anomalies appear where the educational system has been set up only recently and has copied from foreign models - usually the case in developing countries....They have now become aware that these models (often obsolete, even by and for whom they were devised) are adapted neither to their own needs nor to their problems." The Foundation's University Development Program has addressed itself to this problem by the systematic upgrading of certain LDC universities per se and through them hopes to contribute to the improvement of national life.

Two premises have guided this program: First, the need for social and economic development for millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is self-evident; indeed this premise is inherent in the phrase "less developed country." Secondly, the university is a powerful weapon

for social improvement. This is true both in the broad general sense (e.g., an increase in the percentage of educated people helps a society), and in the specific sense (e.g., the university can address itself directly to imperative national needs).

Background

The University Development Program was one of five major programs included in the Trustees' statement "Plans for the Future" of September 1963. It was proposed that the Foundation assist a small number of universities, possibly six to nine, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to develop and strengthen their capacity to meet national and regional development needs as defined by indigenous leadership. The goal of the program was to help develop strong, stable, and progressive institutions capable of training men and women to carry out the functions of government, staff the professions, manage commerce and industry, teach and carry out research.

Five centers have received long-term support: the University of Ibadan, Nigeria; the former University of East Africa (Makerere, Nairobi, and Dar es Salaam Universities); the Universidad del Valle, Cali, Colombia; an institutional complex in Bangkok, Thailand (Mahidol, Kasetsart, and Thammasat Universities); and the University of the Philippines. The timetable is different for each of these institutions but the yardstick is the same - the creation of a strong indigenous university with a critical mass of highly qualified scholars able to carry forward their own programs to meet local, national, and regional needs. By its very nature the program is a dynamic one: at any given moment some institutions

are being phased out, some are experiencing their peak participation, and others are in an early exploratory phase. Contracts are arranged with the local government to facilitate the implementation of the program, and during the phasing-out period the program is monitored carefully to insure an orderly transfer of function to the local academic authorities.

Evaluation

Much has been accomplished in the ten years since the establishment of the University Development Program. As would be inevitably true of broad interdisciplinary programs involving so many institutions, both high points and low points can be identified. In general, however, considered review by both officers and visiting Trustees has indicated that the institutions involved have by and large been strengthened and in some instances incredibly improved. Many of the programs which have been initiated have become regional assets extending an influence beyond the immediate country involved. The deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Education, the special review of the University Development Program in which all participating field staff were recalled to New York for an intensive two days of comment and criticism, and the innumerable discussions among the officers all point to the conclusion that this program clearly should not be abandoned as we set our guidelines for the coming years.

Proposal

Rather than suggesting abandonment the officers are presenting proposals intended to strengthen and slightly extend the program. This

would represent the appropriate evolution of the process we have been involved in and would be a logical forward step.

The traditional University Development as it has been practiced (and as we have learned from it) in the past decade will continue. Institutions which are weak, yet which have the potential for serving as national or regional models, will be identified for institution building per se. Departments which are understaffed (in the social sciences, medicine, and agriculture) will have temporary leadership provided while, through the fellowship mechanism, local students with potential are identified and trained to the professional competence necessary to assume departmental leadership. At the end of an appropriate period (usually six to ten years) the Foundation will have hopefully made itself unnecessary and the institution will be in strong indigenous hands. The new effort in Zaire is an example.

This traditional approach which has customarily been carried out through agriculture, social sciences, and medicine will be expanded to include explorations in the department of education. The traditional University Development Program has always worked closely with the Ministries of Education, but has seldom participated in strengthening departments of education, or through them being concerned with the national needs in primary and secondary education. It is not proposed that the Foundation, nor indeed the universities themselves, actively attempt on a service basis to engage in or to strengthen existing primary and secondary educational programs, but research can be carried out and model programs can be tested through the education departments of the universities. It

should be no more difficult to visualize university-sponsored "Educational Extension Programs" than it is to establish agricultural extension programs; in both instances national needs are served and the university is strengthened per se. The University of Ibadan is an example where this approach might be tried.

There should be no necessity in this connection to point out the great needs in this area. The 1972 Bellagio Conference on Education in the LDC's pinpointed the need for study and experimentation in both primary and secondary education. The universities are themselves penalized by an inadequate learning foundation for their students, dropout rates are high and national needs are not adequately met unless the entire educational program becomes the subject of intensive study and upgrading.

Finally, explorations will be carried out to encourage university-based applied programs and extension activities on an experimental and demonstration basis. After the university has itself been upgraded, and after confidence in The Rockefeller Foundation has been established, certain selected, limited outreach programs can be undertaken through the university mechanism. This form of activity, which should be interdisciplinary in nature, would have the advantage of providing for the university itself an example of the fact that "ivory tower" excellence is not the sole objective in academic growth and development; community needs and national problems can effectively be addressed experimentally on an applied level by institutions of higher learning. And, it can be expected that the university's findings will be useful to other agencies having responsibility for developmental activities on a regional or national basis. An outreach program of this

type, which could serve as a model for other institutions in the region, is currently being considered at Ibadan - actually under the impetus of the University itself.

Comment

Three points perhaps need to be made with respect to this proposal for program redirection.

First, not all universities will participate in all three thrusts as outlined above. The decision with reference to any given institution will be an ad hoc decision, based on officer review of the existing strengths and weaknesses in the particular university being considered.

Secondly, the officers do not anticipate that these expanded efforts will be significantly expensive. Modest sums over relatively short periods can help the university achieve applied outreach programs; often the Foundation's role will be providing expertise and personnel rather than large sums of money. To extend our participation into departments of education would represent a minimal increment in budget, possibly in many instances balanced by shifts of funds from other areas.

Thirdly, as would be inevitable in any multi-track program, permutations and combinations of the above approaches will occur. In general one would anticipate situations evolving from first University Development to Educational Reform to Outreach applied programs. However, it is inevitable that certain circumstances will be encountered in which, for unique local reasons, all three may be initially applicable. The current incipient program in Bahia, Brazil, may well represent such a case.

The evolution of any Foundation program is an ongoing process which builds on its achievements and learns from its mistakes. There is much to be proud of in the University Development experience; there is much more to look forward to. Certainly the expanded dimension which "Education for Development" adds to the University Development concept provides greater flexibility for meeting both institutional and national or regional needs.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

Significant and far-reaching gains have been made by American minorities over the past decade: the increase in the number of minority-group students enrolled in institutions of higher education, the movement of minority-group members into positions of responsibility in a wide range of institutions in both public and private sectors, and the rapid increase in the number of black elected officials, all attest to this fact. The progress of the past decade, however, has more openly revealed the extent of the problems confronting minorities and made it clear that major tasks in the equal opportunity field still lie ahead. We must be certain to avoid a Second Reconstruction similar to the era of the 1870's and 1880's. During this era of rapid change, of great social unrest, of striving for increased opportunities on the part of long-suppressed minorities, of a new awareness of the deficiencies of educational and other institutions, and of an apparent lateral drift and demoralization in central government, there continue to be opportunities open to the Foundation to play an important role in helping to realize the ideal of "equal opportunity for all." Perhaps the best way to gain a perspective on the challenges that lie ahead and the program thrusts recommended, is to review briefly the response of this organization over the years to challenges in the field of minority rights.

In the early years of this century - years of poverty, oppression, and segregation of blacks in the South - the greatest need, as seen by many black people and those aware of their plight, was improvement of educational opportunities. The General Education Board, founded in 1902 to aid education

in this country "without distinction of race, sex, or creed," contributed about \$62.5 million (out of a total of \$325 million) to Negro education in the South in the 58 years of its existence. A significant portion of that support (about \$32 million) went to institutions of higher and secondary education. (During the same period, the medical program of The Rockefeller Foundation made a significant contribution to the elimination of hookworm disease . . . which was especially burdensome for the low-income people in southern United States.)

By the mid-fifties, the General Education Board had virtually spent itself out of operation. While The Rockefeller Foundation did not attempt to sustain the Board's wide range of southern education support programs, assistance was continued to some of the black institutions of higher education.

Equal Opportunity Program Initiated (1963)

The Equal Opportunity for All program, approved by the Trustees in 1963, provided the framework for the major steps the Foundation would take in this field over the next decade. When the program was initiated, the equal rights movement had considerable strength, but was basically non-violent and middle-class. The Foundation's initial decision was to focus its efforts on opening higher educational opportunities to minority-group students and inducing the institutional changes that would make higher educational opportunity permanent in our society. A key part of this objective was to spur the appearance in positions of distinction and leadership in all phases of our national life of increasing numbers of highly talented and excellently trained members of traditionally excluded minorities. Grants

were made to four of the strongest universities in the South - Duke, Vanderbilt, Emory, and Tulane - to enable them to recruit and finance minority-group students. Awards were also made to a significant number of private liberal arts colleges throughout the nation and other institutions to encourage them to rapidly increase their enrollments of minority students. And perhaps just as important was the effort through the ABC (A Better Chance) and other programs to increase rapidly the number of minority-group students who would be well qualified to enter the most competitive institutions of higher education. For the most part, these programs were outstandingly successful and helped to encourage the subsequent allocation of government funds for a variety of programs to assist minority students in the educational field.

During the 1960's a series of federal judicial decisions and legislative acts helped pave the way for a much more open society. The year 1965 was a high-water mark for social legislation by the Federal Government: Congress passed the Landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act and appropriated \$1 billion for Title I focusing on over eight million disadvantaged youngsters. President Johnson formed the President's Council on Youth Opportunity with the mandate to provide job-training opportunities for disadvantaged young people through the Job Corps, various vocational training programs in the Manpower Division of the Labor Department, and the allocation of millions of dollars for summer jobs. The Office of Economic Opportunity was created as an advocacy mechanism for minority groups determined to have improved health care, social justice, early-childhood education, and effective community organizations.

Indeed, the early and mid 1960's were marked by unprecedented federal activity in civil rights, elementary and secondary education, and economic opportunity for disadvantaged groups in the society. Major court decisions

were handed down, major legislation passed, and billions of dollars appropriated and spent. The officers of the Foundation observed with satisfaction that the Higher Education Act included certain scholarship provisions already tested in Foundation-assisted projects.

Trustee Review and New Program Thrusts (1967-1968)

Meeting in December 1967, following the major racial disturbances in Newark, Detroit, and other communities, the Trustees agreed that massive and sustained programs were called for by the nation. It was agreed that the Foundation's equal opportunity efforts should be reviewed and redirected to meet new challenges and opportunities. A special Trustee-Officer Committee, chaired by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., after a series of meetings with outside consultants, recommended that the Foundation effort should be based squarely on two principles: (a) the validity of integration - and the absolute necessity of assuring the oppressed "equal participation and choice in the American social, political, and economic system," and (b) the necessity of developing minority leadership to "evaluate community problems and deal constructively with them."

Three program thrusts were recommended by this Committee - and accepted by the Trustees:

- 1) Leadership development - "the training and preparation for leadership in existing ghettos and in rural areas . . . is essential."
- 2) Community schools - "the Foundation can make immediate and timely contributions to selected ghetto areas by assisting a few experimental school systems which might

serve as community centers in a variety of efforts to improve and upgrade the life of ghetto residents . . . using the school as a center for action, it might be possible to affect the multi-faceted problems of the ghetto through a broad spectrum of social and educational projects directed to the needs of students, faculty, and parents."

- 3) Research on inner-city problems - systematically studying the causes, the problems, and the ways to achieve constructive change of America's ghettos.

These three thrusts (with primary emphasis on the first two), have been at the core of the Foundation's Equal Opportunity program over the past five years (1968-1973). These programs are interrelated, and a number of projects approved by the Trustees have included provisions for identifying and training individuals for leadership roles as a part of a broader effort to organize citizens' groups to deal effectively with educational issues and a wide range of community problems.

Leadership Development

There is clearly not a "science of leadership development" - and any successful effort in this field must involve the careful selection of individuals who, with training and special opportunities, can be especially useful and effective. Grants have been made to a number of major organizations for "leadership development and training" activities. These include the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, Opportunities Industrialization Center, and the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity. Support was also provided for a wide variety of

leadership training efforts: to Industrial Areas Foundation (Saul Alinsky's Institute); to Massachusetts Institute of Technology for its Community Fellows program; the inner-city staff of Chicago's Metropolitan Y.M.C.A.; and to the Urban Affairs Institute for student internship programs in government offices.

More recently, internship programs for minority-group administrators have given gifted men and women the opportunity to work for a year with experienced senior people in a range of positions - school superintendents, elementary and high school principals, officials in government agencies, and presidents or deans of colleges or universities. In each case, the intern who has already had middle-level administrative experience returns to his home institution or school system (or takes a position elsewhere) - almost without exception, at a higher level of responsibility. Thirty former interns are now public school principals in Baltimore; ten new principals have completed their training in Washington, D.C. and thirty more are interning; ten "managers" (the equivalent of principal) are completing their programs in Los Angeles. Twenty-nine men and women have completed their internships with school superintendents. Three members of the first group of interns are presently superintendents, several are deputy superintendents, some are assistant superintendents; all hold high-level positions.

Community Education

The Foundation has supported programs that have opened public schools to their communities and have fostered cooperation between them. Grants to California State College in Los Angeles supported cooperative programs with Alain LeRoy Locke High School, a predominantly black inner-city school, to clearly upgrade the quality of education and, at the same time, develop

cooperative and fruitful relations between the school and the community.

Grants to school systems in Minneapolis, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and St. Louis enable the schools to develop effective educational and community activities.

Several programs have developed successful methods for including parents, students, and other neighborhood people, as well as school staff, in the decision-making process. For example, in Gary, Indiana, a 1970 grant to a community-based education program has resulted in either beginning jobs or upgraded jobs for 150 people; a number of these community men and women now serve on various city commissions, school boards, and other policy-making bodies.

In Oakland, California, Foundation support has allowed community people to form a number of task forces on the major questions affecting the schools. To name just two - the task force on curriculum and instruction is dealing with such sophisticated questions as the best kind of in-service training for teachers, and ways to improve communication among parents, teachers, and students; and the group on school buildings is studying, among other things, the problem of earthquake safety, which is of immediate importance in California. The Oakland Master Plan involves about 20 people in each of the 66 schools in the district. Advisers to the superintendent now include all elements of the community.

In Chicago, the Kenwood-Oakland Community Organization (KOCO) has trained, to date, about 50 general community organizers; in the next two years about 63 community specialists will be trained in such areas as housing, health, education, welfare and social justice. These men and women, working through

neighborhood councils, are expected to affect the lives of about 10,000 people living in the inner-city.

The most recent grant for community development has been to the New Orleans Public Schools. A conference on community participation was held in New Orleans in April; parents from Gary, Oakland, and Los Angeles, community workers from KOCO, and interested observers from Atlanta (probably the next city on the list) all compared notes - sharing their various experiences and methods with their counterparts in New Orleans.

To summarize: leadership development and community development are inseparably linked. Community people are now being trained to be leaders - and they are being trained to a greater awareness of ways in which institutions and agencies should serve them. With this increased knowledge and sophistication they are able to evoke more satisfactory responses from service agencies, and to foster greater awareness of the real issues and problems of the community. Frequently such men and women acquire the competence and motivation to seek membership on the boards and commissions which govern and regulate their communities and their lives.

Research on Inner-City Problems

In response to Foundation initiative and support, a group of social scientists, scholars, and experienced practitioners assembled by the Metropolitan Applied Research Center in New York City are engaged in a comprehensive study of two different urban centers with special reference to problems of ghetto formation and transformation. A grant to the University of Chicago enabled a team of scholars in cooperation with city government and private agencies to undertake a broad research program centered on the

characteristics and problems of the people who are living in poverty in Chicago and the operations and results of the many programs that are seeking remedies to major problems of the inner-city. Researchers at Harvard University, under the direction of Thomas C. Pettigrew, have been especially successful in researching political attitudes in several cities with special reference to problems of racism and the willingness of white voters to support black candidates for mayor or other top executive positions. A group of researchers at the City University of New York was supported to make an in-depth study of inner-city youth and the service performed by the plethora of agencies established to deal with the problems of children and young people.

It should also be noted that modest provisions for research and evaluation are included in many of the equal opportunity grants.

Other Program Activities

While concentrating its efforts on specified program priority areas, the Foundation has remained responsive to extraordinary opportunities in areas related to its primary targets. Grants for career development for minority-group individuals in the various health professions, agriculture, and other fields are one example. Support for the Southern Regional Council's varied and effective programs to reduce racial conflict and discrimination in the southern states is another. Support to enable Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College and Mississippi State University to work creatively in bringing about social and economic development in rural areas is a third. A careful review of the grants made over the decade of the program's operation underlines clearly the Foundation's attempt to help provide "an equal opportunity for all."

Program Review and Recommendations

As new challenges and concerns receive primary attention, many groups and individuals seem to tire of the long-term problems associated with securing equal rights for all citizens. The country's efforts so clearly mapped out in the 1960's to remedy its historic racial discrimination and the resulting inequality of opportunity must be pursued on a massive scale and on a great many fronts. The objective clearly is the transformation of American institutions and practices to assure the disadvantaged, and especially minority-group citizens, equality of opportunity and treatment in all walks and areas of our life.

As always, the Foundation must select carefully only a few strategic targets within this tremendous area in order to have any hope of making a significant and enduring contribution. The problems of program focus, persistence, and follow-through over a considerable period of time must constantly be kept in mind.

Major Considerations

- 1) An integrated society with basic rights protected for individuals from all ethnic and racial groups remains an essential goal for the Foundation and the nation.
- 2) The historical suppression of certain minority groups in the American society warrants the provision of special opportunities for talented individuals in those groups. Identifying and training such individuals, both at the highest level of accomplishment and within their communities, demands a high priority.

- 3) The wide range of disadvantaged minority groups should continue to be included within the Equal Opportunity program even though primary attention is given to American blacks - by far the largest of the racial minorities.
- 4) Attention must be directed to the especially burdensome plight of the disadvantaged living in rural areas, even though primary consideration will continue to be given to the serious problems which confront minorities in urban areas. The close relationship between inner-city and rural problems cannot be ignored.

Program Recommendations

Following an intensive review of the Foundation's Equal Opportunity program, it is recommended:

- 1) That the program in community education-community development be continued.

In spite of the fact that the expenditure of many millions of dollars on remedial education has done relatively little to improve test scores, and notwithstanding recent research findings that tend to dissociate school-quality and school performance from economic well-being in adult life, the conclusion remains virtually inescapable that a strong national education program, supported enthusiastically by the communities it serves, is the best means of moving the disadvantaged into the mainstream of American life.

- 2) That the leadership development component of the program be continued and strengthened.

Through the use of special internship programs and by working with established organizations in the minorities field and educational and other institutions, it is possible to identify, effectively train, and then assist minority-group individuals of high potential to become increasingly effective in a wide variety of responsible positions.

- 3) That a modest, but high-quality, policy-oriented research effort be continued.

Many questions concerning the problems of the disadvantaged minorities remain unanswered, and private and governmental efforts to deal with those problems suffer from a lack of information about the causes and effects of the conditions to be remedied. In seeking opportunities to support research on such problems, the officers have in mind both the absolute need for high-quality research results and the desirability of identifying and encouraging able minority-group scholars and scientists.

- 4) That a new component of the program be initiated centering squarely on the plight of the disadvantaged in selected rural regions.

Building on past Foundation efforts, both in the U.S. and overseas, highly effective, integrated programs dealing with the wide range of economic, health, educational, demographic, and other problems of rural development can be initiated. Special attention should be given to human resource development as well as to strengthening institutional capability (including that of some of the most effective, traditional black colleges) to deal with a wide variety of rural-urban problems. Initially, attention would be focused on the Southeast but demonstration programs in other parts of the country may be considered.

- 5) That the officers continue to search for exceptional and unique new opportunities in the equal opportunity field.

Challenges and new opportunities arise constantly as changes take place within the society. Officers are currently exploring possibilities for exceptional opportunities in a number of fields:

- a) the opportunity to assist the increasing number of minority elected officials - this is a special challenge as the number of such officials has increased dramatically during the past three years;
- b) continued examination of the special advocacy and litigation fields and the work of established and new institutions in this area; and

- c) consideration of effective means for dealing with problems of institutionalized racism - a number of publications, organizations, and leadership development efforts are directly targeted on continuing problems arising from the exclusion of minority-group individuals from employment and career opportunities. Exploratory grants have been made, e.g., training opportunities for investigative reporters have been provided. (Many institutions, corporations, labor unions, governmental organizations, etc., persist in excluding minorities or acquiesce in token integration only. Programs and strategies for changing patterns and practices of institutionalized racism must remain on the agenda.)

- 6) That, in implementing program activities in leadership development, community education, rural development, and other efforts, special attention be given to the program plans and objectives of the most appropriate and effective existing organizations and institutions with interests in the equal opportunity field.

In this connection:

- a) the continuing major contribution of the historic black private colleges in providing educational opportunities for disadvantaged minority students should continue to receive Foundation attention;
- b) the crucial role of stable and effective organizations, such as the NAACP, the National Urban League and the Southern Regional Council, in dealing with major problems confronting the country should be kept in mind. It is essential that such organizations be supported as they focus on the wide range of fundamental problems with which they must contend.

THE ARTS, THE HUMANITIES, AND CONTEMPORARY VALUES

The Arts

One of the historical roles of the creative artist has been to tap the deep currents of thought and attitude in a society and to give expression to the values, ideals, and aspirations of that society.

Working in abstractions of light, sound, movement, language or objects, the artist renders a faithful portrait of his time. The artist, by nature, freezes current concepts and moods into blocks of concrete reality of realized forms or realizable schemata. His work partakes both of intellect and intuition, for often the artist expresses the currents moving within a society which will bring about great change but which, before they do so, are merely, "in the air." His expressions can baffle contemporaries while a subsequent generation can read back into the same works the hallmarks of the period.

The value of the creative artist to the society, while thus clear in hindsight, needs to be clarified for the future. Could Americans have read in the esthetic expressions by the flower-children of San Francisco's Hippies of the early 1960's, the profound social changes that were hinted at in the music, dance, art, and style of dress created first by anonymous artists then hungrily embraced by known artists until Madison Avenue and Seventh Avenue legitimized the movement several years later, society might have been spared some of the violence it went through. Confucius said that in order to understand a culture, one only had to witness the dances of its people, a dictum that holds true for the keen contemporary observer.

Times of social upheaval often promote vigorous activity in the arts, for in them the artist's ability to sense the winds of change are

encouraged, uncovered. The violent upheaval of the 1960's was a time of artistic flowering in America. The wave of experimental artists in music, theater, dance, painting, sculpture, the amalgamators of mixed media, and the explosion of the pop culture, led America to a central position in the arts in the world culture. As individuals blazed new paths, established institutions too expanded and increased their spheres of activity. It was a time for big thinking on the part of artists and institutions, big planning, and, in some cases, equally big realizations of goals.

With the ushering in of a period of political quietude in the beginning of the 1970's the society returned to a feeling of normalcy characterized, however, by some keen anxieties; and the situation for the arts seemed also to change. Without the impetus of rampant social change in the air, the work of artists and institutions seemed to be that of consolidating gains and insights developed in the previous period. Experimentalism was giving way to working in the new disciplines which had emerged from the period of freely flowing expression.

One was tempted to say that the arts in America had at last come into their own, that the populace had developed a taste and thirst for the arts which Americans had lacked in previous years. Three things had happened: 1) artists and institutions had quit their former quasi-isolation and in the consciousness of the society entered a broad new area of public activity; 2) institutions long content to play admittedly elitist roles, began to respond to the new public demands for access to the arts and a democratizing effect was observed; and 3) financial support for the artist and institutions increased dramatically as foundation, federal, state, private, and corporate giving to the arts mounted.

As our culture continues to grapple with the problems of support - a struggle which has only just begun - it seems sure that a marriage has taken place. The unprecedented growth in the arts during the phase of the cycle begun in the 1960's has seen the development of arts institutions in every aspect of American life, on campuses, cities, in ghettos, rural communities. No longer are the arts seen merely as finishing school graces, peripheral to the concerns of a pragmatic society. Now they were being perceived as essential grammar of the vocabulary of man and as urgently needed forms of communication which convey the insights and perceptions of creative artists who reflect the goals and identity of the society to that society.

During the second phase of arts development, that seen as a consolidation of the work of the creative artists of the 1960's, one may expect somewhat less experimentation and more refinement of the work born in that period. But in order for the creative artists in our society to develop their work and thereby ensure the growth of the arts in America, it is necessary that society reevaluate the position of the artist, his importance as a member of society, his function within that society and the social and economic levels to which the artist may aspire with impunity. Otherwise he may sink again into the neglect which has typified American attitudes toward the artist for too long.

In determining key points of Foundation program for the Arts in the coming period, the following factors have been taken into account:

- 1) the central importance of the creative artist to the development of a fully mature, sensitive, receptive, and responsive society;
- 2) the reality of professional life in the arts in America, a life which offers most artists odd jobs and unemployment for sustenance;

3) the continued lack of social position for the artist in the society;

4) the need for greater awareness on the part of corporate and legislative leaders to support the arts, and the relationship of their reluctance in supporting the arts to pre-collegiate school experiences;

5) the overwhelming impact of television on our culture and the need for that medium to carry information of a stimulating esthetic nature; and

6) the movement within the arts to blur lines of discipline which formerly separated the performing artist from visual artists, writers, and poets.

It has been said that nothing could be more important to the solution of contemporary problems than the developing of a global realization of the interdependency of cultures. The arts and humanities can and should play an increasingly important role in engendering this sense of understanding and interdependency and, therefore, while recognizing the importance of developing arts programs within the United States, officers would nevertheless seek selected opportunities for effective international projects in the arts which relate to the central goals and objectives as stated above and under the following specific areas of interest:

1) MAKING THE ARTS MORE CENTRAL TO GENERAL EDUCATION: A new program objective, officers would attempt through carefully developed projects of national importance to demonstrate further the importance of the arts to the development of a human being and to promote an increased commitment to skill-training in the arts on the part of educators and administrators involved with public schools.

A long-held concept in arts tended to apprehend other skills more readily - reading, mathematics. A recent as yet unreleased study of this premise by the Guggenheim Foundation is said to prove that reading scores had in fact been advanced through programs in the arts in a controlled situation. The Foundation is already supporting another important study which will determine for the first time what in fact is being taught in the schools in the name of art. As part of the study, exemplar models will be projected and the actual curricula and its realization compared with the models.

The educational cycle presents a three-part configuration of the student in school, the teacher in school, and the teacher in the preschool training situation. Many programs such as those funded in the past by Title I, the CEMREL Project in University City, Illinois, and programs such as those supported by the JDR 3rd Fund have emphasized the problems of arts training involving the student and teacher in the classroom. Little attention has been given, however, to the preschool training aspect for the teacher. This involves what teachers are required to study for matriculation and accreditation and what standards are set for them by state boards of education. It would be almost useless to supplement the schools' curriculum so long as the arts are not given greater importance by boards of regents and other agencies which determine curriculum and what course work teachers need to qualify. It would seem appropriate for the Foundation to seek ways of working with teachers and teacher-training institutions in an effort to improve the understanding of the importance of the arts on the part of the requirement-setting groups. A corollary to this program interest would be teacher re-training, since, with the recent drop in the population growth and the leveling off of enrollment, fewer new teachers may be needed in the years ahead.

2) ASSISTING THE CREATIVE ARTIST: A continuation of past policy of identification of talented artists and, through carefully designed programs which address the needs of various disciplines, providing modest support for their creative work. For example, the current Playwright's Residency Program might be continued and similar programs designed for support of composers, choreographers or other artists. Officers would also hope to examine the question of support to artists beyond the performing arts. In addition to individual assistance programs, officers will continue to work through existing institutions to develop programs which benefit the creative person, and in selective instances, cooperate with outside agencies to bring new institutions into being which can benefit the creative artist.

3) INSTITUTION BUILDING: A continuation of programs aimed at:
a) assisting existing institutions to take on new roles as needed to function more creatively or to respond to new demands of society, and b) to assist in the establishment of new institutions when it is deemed important for the work of major creative talents, for a field of endeavor in the arts, or for a region of the country not adequately served by arts organizations.

Summary

In seeking ways to address problems in the arts, officers will continue to emphasize the creative person's contribution to society and attempt to keep the creative artist central to all program endeavors. Identifying important talents and giving assistance at key periods in their development has been and will continue to be the most advantageous path to follow. Officers look forward to that day when the artist can claim a full measure of dignity and respect in American society, one indication of that recognition being a professional life which renders value for value received. As of this writing, that day is yet distant.

The Humanities

The impulse to express perceptions is common to the arts and the humanities. In the arts this impulse leads to the creation of experiential forms for ear and eye. In the humanities it leads to image, concept, and word. Competence in one or the other field often overlaps in individuals; the artist may be regarded as a humanist and vice versa.

In the past several years the arts have found a new acceptance in American society. The humanities are now growing in demand, both in the professions and in the public at large. The arts enrich life through conveying new perspectives, new ways of seeing or hearing, and a heightened sensory and emotional awareness. The humanities may lend clarity to intellectual vision and imaginative form. In a society rapidly "modernized" and bureaucratized, many now look to humanists for keys to lost human values. Scientists no less than other technological specialists see the need to consider the impact of their work in human rather than solely technical contexts.

Although more widely known for its scientific work, The Rockefeller Foundation has a distinguished record of grants in the humanities. These grants total well over sixty million dollars and cover almost every aspect of the humanities, from the scholarly to the popular, from the American to the international, from the archeological to the future-oriented. So deep and varied are these traditions of the humanities in The Rockefeller Foundation, that it would be difficult to invent projects that do not have some precedent or parallel in the Foundation's past. From 1928 until 1962, the Foundation had a separate and important program in the humanities - one of whose pioneering contributions was the introduction of studies in Oriental culture and languages into American universities in the 1930's.

For almost twelve years, centering on the decade of the sixties, the Foundation de-emphasized its efforts in the humanities. The cultural situation seemed to demand a concentration of resources in other areas. The launching of Sputnik in 1956, for example, gave unparalleled impetus to scientific studies; rising domestic turbulence encouraged programs in social scientific study and in practical social intervention; and problems of world hunger and growing population demanded immediate attention.

Yet events in the sixties also uncovered an urgent social need for expanded activities in the humanities. The reemergence of perennial themes like the meaning of justice, progress, liberty, the common good, and conscience has been pronounced. From many different directions, humanists have been challenged to enlarge and to deepen traditional ways of thinking:

-- An unresolved debate arose concerning the gulf between humanistic culture and scientific culture. Attention was drawn to widening internal conflicts between central ideas of modern civilization - between values and techniques, between freedom and the order required by technology, between experts and citizens, between faith in progress and fear of impending environmental and social breakdown.

-- Rapid strides in genetics and in medical science disturbed an ancient consensus about the meaning of fundamentals like life and death. They also raised questions about unbridled scientific experimentation, about the rights of individuals, and about choices among competing values.

-- Widespread interest in other cultures beyond Western culture - in China, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa, for

example - has obliged Western humanists to expand the range of their interests and their store of methods. In an interdependent world, education in "the humanities" includes all humanity. Much fresh intellectual work must be done if the image "spaceship Earth" is to be realized in the humanities.

-- Virtually all major professions (in the contemporary, wider meaning of the term) from law, medicine, public administration, science, and journalism to engineering and business, have had to face moral problems both within and beyond their specialization. They have had to recognize that the decisions they daily make depend not merely upon technical expertise but also upon competing moral values. Granted we have the technical capacity to do X, the question arises: By what criteria do we decide whether we should do X? Institutions like multinational corporations - some of them more powerful than nation states - have introduced new types of moral and legal problems.

-- There is growing awareness that merely technical and administrative approaches to human problems are insufficient; and that the solution of large-scale problems also requires an understanding of the diversity of cultures. The humanities are called upon to shed light on cultural differences both within the United States and abroad. This demand is experienced in virtually all the programs of the Foundation, in universities, and in other centers of inquiry.

-- Many working people feel excluded from the intellectual horizons of the college-educated (sometimes including their own

children), do not understand many terms of public discourse, and find their traditional cultural guideposts undermined. Two out of every three youths of college age are not, and perhaps never will be, in college. Humanities education for working men and women may therefore become a necessary and fruitful undertaking in future societies, particularly as leisure time grows. Such education might enlarge the humanities by engaging them in everyday perplexities. It would raise new and profound questions for historical perspective, for curriculum development, and for the examination of cultural values.

-- Because of profound changes in modern economies, less time is spent by most individuals in the production of goods; more time is spent in consumption and in private life. In resistance to tawdriness in the uses of leisure time, many from all social classes cry out for beauty, for direct contact with nature, and for growth in humanistic skills.

In a word, humanists, as often before in their history, are called upon to absorb new ranges of human experience, and to give them the most profound, intelligent, and communicable shape possible. From many quarters there are signs, in the midst of the current confusion over values, of a new creative period in the humanities.

The Rockefeller Foundation would like to contribute to this era by extending disciplines that are at once new and ancient into the following three areas:

I. ANCHORS OF CULTURES: Values, Ideas, Symbols, Laws

The major need in the humanities is at the deepest possible conceptual and imaginative level. We need to identify talents of the highest order available in order to "anchor" the fundamental values and goals of human cultures. Basic concepts like human nature, equality, freedom, dignity, honesty, person, family, community, civility need constant reinterpretation in every generation. This is all the more true in a planetary age profoundly altered by technological developments and intercultural communications.

By the force of the word itself, the "humanities" involve all humanity. In the humanities, scholarship in LDC's is frequently exemplary and has much to teach Americans. For this reason, we wish to favor studies in all the world's cultures, and particularly in the communication of experience, percepts, and insights from culture to culture. It is one of our goals that "the humanities" should no longer refer to "western civilization" merely, but to all cultures.

In matters of the mind there is no substitute for the identification of persons of rare spiritual depth, breadth, and an ability to cast illumination for others. Thus the humanities program will offer fellowships and grants in aid to two types of creative persons: a) senior fellows of great distinction, who require leisure and resources for their mature reflections; b) junior fellows, proven in their early careers, for whom a period of creative liberty might promise significant intellectual advance.

On the other hand, faced with the complexities of the modern professions, one individual alone is not enough; sustained collaboration

is required. On questions at the boundary line between medicine and ethics, law and values, journalism and reality, politics and justice, religion and spirit, business and the quality of life, support may best be given to an institute, center, or interdisciplinary program, focused on central issues, promising practical outcomes.

Over the next ten years, the Foundation will seek to support renewed examination of values in pivotal professions of modern life - in journalism, public administration, medicine, and law, for example.

II. AMERICAN IDENTITY: America's Cultural Heritage

America, in the phrase of Walt Whitman, is a "nation of nations." Many of its peoples and regions are inadequately represented in national consciousness. Some fields of scholarship have been virtually neglected. When representatives of the humanities make all their fellow citizens feel included in their symbols, images, and ways of articulating values, they gain credibility as guides of the human spirit and as spokesmen of humanity. With encouragement to be more just and universal in their sympathies, scholars in the humanities can enrich our national self-consciousness, draw upon overlooked cultural resources, and enhance the nation's pride in its diversity and amazing unity.

Specifically, fellowships and institutional grants will be directed to scholars in fresh areas and among neglected groups in the American population. The opportunity for a rejuvenated humanities depends, as it always has, on the appropriation of fresh bodies of experience. In an anti-historical time, such freshness is often to be found, ironically, in historical studies. It is also to be found, as Oscar Lewis and Robert Coles have shown, in the ordinary lives of

the living. The humanities program will seek out artists, writers, and scholars in groups and in locations that heretofore have received little encouragement that what is theirs is valuable to the whole Republic.

III. THE PUBLIC HUMANITIES: Values Lived and Choices Exercised

Too often the word "humanities" is used only in colleges and universities. Yet human values do not exist solely in books or discussions or works of art; they exist also in the thoughts and actions of people, from whose midst our scholars and artists come. Often the real experience of ordinary people is neither recorded nor studied; the gap between the educated and the uneducated is allowed to widen. Such a development is contrary to the Jeffersonian ideal of "a Republic of learning." It could result in the growth of two cultures, separate and possibly hostile.

We have learned in recent years that if the ordinary family does not provide children with a strong education in values, other agencies in society can scarcely make up the difference. The moral and humanistic resources of ordinary families, neighborhoods, traditions, and regions need to be studied in their diversity - and perhaps, also, to be strengthened institutionally. A society is no stronger than its local and regional networks.

The Foundation alone cannot meet the enormity of such tasks. But it can signal the importance and fruitfulness of this area of inquiry by even a small number of grants to individuals willing to develop appropriate devices. (Social scientists as well as humanists have indicated to officers of the Foundation the "underdeveloped" state of their arts in this respect.)

In this context, three limited initiatives will be undertaken. Less than half of young Americans now go to college, but all go to high school. In most high school systems, as in society at large, the humanities are not integrated either with the sciences or with daily living. Reasoning about value questions is not taught; religious studies are not taught; the traditional philosophical values underlying our legal system are not subjected to analysis; connection is seldom made with the values and traditions acquired in the home. In place of these, a kind of homogeneous "American way of life" is presented in a non-controversial, non-critical way. The moral precocity of contemporary adolescents is not sufficiently challenged.

Specifically, the Foundation will encourage concerned educators who are trying to enrich the moral and philosophical content of high school programs. The use of case studies based on contemporary moral problems seems especially promising.

A second area of specialization follows from Jefferson's vision of the United States as a Republic in which learning is continuous throughout the lifetime of all citizens. In recent years, the attention of educators - witness Empire State College - has been drawn to the millions of working men and women who had no opportunity to go to college, but whose appetite to understand the world around them is keen. Humanities education among working people may help to dissipate social fear, to convey a sense of dignity, and to liberate energies of creativity and inquiry. Yet surprisingly little is known about adult education in the humanities, especially for working-class men and women.

The Foundation, in a modest and limited way, will encourage explorations and experiments in this field, perhaps by concentrating on limited projects in one or two major working-class areas, as for example in a large industrial city, or in smaller industrial cities in proximity to one another.

In a word, the Foundation hopes to make a contribution to the new flowering of the humanities now on the horizon. It will do so by encouraging the renewal and re-definition of the humanities - in university settings, in creative institutions and centers, among all groups of Americans. Support for the humanities and encouragement of humanists in all countries will be emphasized. For values and choices - and hence the humanities - suffuse the whole of national and international life.

Arts, Humanities, and Television

Television has been recognized as a most prodigious influence in contemporary life. Its all-permeating quality is held accountable for any number of sins and its potentials are viewed with almost Utopian enthusiasms. Television has been called the third parent in the home - perhaps as influential as the natal pair.

A major contribution has been made through the CD Program in the experimental uses of video by artists, humanists, and other non-television professionals. New concepts developed by artists have led to the evolution of new techniques at San Francisco's National Center for Experiments in Television (a Foundation offspring), Boston's WGBH-TV, and WNET-TV's Experimental Laboratory in New York (another RF-initiated project). Artists such as Nam June Paik and Stephen Beck have spurred the development of major technical innovations in video synthesizers - equivalent to the synthesizers of electronic music pioneered in the 1950's which subsequently revolutionized the composition of music throughout the world.

Program involvement to date has been rewarding, but the Foundation has not yet found the most advantageous usage of television in relation to its total worldwide interests. For example, a project by the Global Village, an experimental video center in New York, formerly supported through the CD Program for its artistic work, has now begun working at the request of the government of Bangladesh in the fields of health and family planning in Bangladesh. A CD grant in aid is assisting the Global Village to begin a training program for LDC nationals interested in learning how to use profitable video equipment for work in their developing countries. This approach to the medium is well within the Foundation's abilities, since the massive expenses

of transmitters, satellites, studio equipment, and crews are obviated. All Foundation programs can explore the uses of the medium to further their own goals, both here and abroad. A current grant to the Alternate Media Center of New York University is underwriting the costs of a study of the use of television in medical education and health services, another example of possible Foundation interest in this medium.

One highly promising area lies in the use of television in the Humanities. Individual humanists of great importance to the culture can be brought to meet a larger public through the relatively inexpensive production of conversational programs. Sensitive cameramen and skilled interviewers might film such persons at work, teaching in the classroom, at their summer retreats. Creative individuals might also work with television producers on specific programs of a more dramatic type. For example, an examination of the year's top news stories by leading philosophers, historians, and other humanists might lead to a series of interpretive programs conceived and perhaps written by the humanists in cooperation with professionals of the media. Not all great writers or teachers present themselves well on television, but much more could be done to draw those who do into more fresh and immediate contact with public issues and with the larger public.

Basic questions relating to the use of image and sound as conduits of the humanistic tradition might also be explored. Some experts regard our current period as one of transition between print culture and one in which image and sound take on some prerogatives formerly held by the print media, the written word yielding some of its power to the moving image. Our concept of "reason" is thereby enlarged.

Questions about the nature of truth, reality, and authenticity in relationship to print and visual-aural mediums profoundly challenge humanists and artists. The need to understand the power and limitations of television as a social force, an educational tool, and a general disseminator of "facts" increases as the medium itself expands.

Television, like the air itself, is a medium which can carry whatever is projected upon it. The aim of the Arts, Humanities, and Television Program is to use this powerful medium, in accordance with Foundation programs, to foster discussions, portraits, and dramatic materials that commercial or public television might otherwise not produce. With even modest funds, new sources of beauty, diversity, and intelligence might thereby be brought before the nation.

QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Man's increasing capability through science and industry to mass-produce energy and goods at ever lower real prices and his growing numbers and consumption of resources have contributed to the magnitude and severity of modern environment problems. Among such problems are fear of rapid depletion of natural resources; lack of acceptable means of handling growing amounts of industrial, household, agricultural, and other wastes through disposal, recycling, or reduction or elimination at sources; crowding of individuals; loss through mobility of identity and structure of neighborhoods; and lack of access to natural environments.

With growing public awareness of environmental degradation and related demands for correction of abuses, especially in the industrial nations, conflicts have arisen between interests concerned with environmental protection and those favoring an expanded economy. Individual or corporate freedom is at variance with protection of those public assets of air and water formerly so abundant that they were treated as free. Concern for quick solutions to present-day problems, correctly or incorrectly pressed upon the American public as "crises," is weighed against issues of longer term importance, ranging from maintenance of options for the next generations to survival of civilization. Some feel that environmental difficulties, related to rapidly changing technology, can be resolved technologically. Others state that corrections can be made through policy changes based on presently available information. Such views are at odds with convictions of some authorities of public agencies that many massive investments in public works or regulatory programs now are being made on the basis of controversial if not flimsy information.

The goals of the Foundation's Quality of the Environment program are to speed the identification of, and solutions to, the more important and difficult environmental problems, the creation of institutional capabilities to deal with them effectively on a continuing basis, and the establishment of valid grounds for increased public confidence that environmental abuses will be minimized. To these ends, the program supports (1) the development of improved understanding of the causes and nature of environmental difficulties; (2) the identification of new and imaginative ways in which talent and funds can be marshaled and tailored as required for solution of major problems; (3) the generation of an improved understanding by research and action agencies of public concerns for the environment; and (4) the determination of ways to create credible and responsible sources of information.

Initially, Foundation efforts have concentrated on environmental issues in the United States rather than internationally for at least two reasons. First, this country has been consuming high and rapidly increasing amounts of energy and natural resources without controlling some deleterious side effects; this has led to threats of shortages of resources, to poor quality of many water bodies and portions of the air envelope, and to other problems associated with urban congestion or sprawl, inner-city decay, and increasing mobility of people. Second, an understanding of approaches to problems of the United States, which has many good institutions and competent specialists, should be helpful to the Foundation and others as opportunities arise to participate in significant international environmental activities. Communities and regions of the United States, then, comprise primary and convenient battlegrounds for dealing with environmental issues associated with industrialization and high rates of resource consumption. Alternatives

for development of communities or intra- or inter-state regions must be understood along with a knowledge of implications for the environment.

The increased importance so recently accorded environmental issues by America and other nations has caught major segments of the scientific community ill-organized and inexperienced in dealing with those complex problems requiring concerted efforts by specialists in such diverse fields as biology, economics, political science, geology, sociology, engineering, medicine, and law. Many universities, which should provide much of the research results and insights on which public planning and action can be based, have their expertise scattered over many departments, faculties, or even campuses, in the case of some state systems. While strong interdisciplinary efforts have been achieved in some instances through the development of campus-wide institutes and centers and in Agricultural Experiment Stations, there is as yet no tradition of close continuing collaboration among greatly diverse disciplines. There are consequent organizational difficulties in dealing on an interdisciplinary basis with environmental problems. To complicate matters, scientists generally have not learned to cope effectively with biological or social variability in complex systems, to masterplan as others have done with systems (such as exploration of space) primarily involving physical constants.

Research in the U.S. related to environmental matters not only is fragmented by discipline, but by component of the environment (air, water, land), or by topic (animal wastes, eutrophication of lakes, lead in paints, mercury accumulation in food chains, noise, effects of various legislative approaches to reduction of industrial waste discharges, energy policy, to suggest a few).

It is now increasingly realized that competencies of many types must quickly be marshaled in combinations dictated by the nature of complex problems.

There are inter-state efforts in many regions of the United States to deal comprehensively with specific environmental problems, such as Puget Sound, Chesapeake Bay, the Potomac River, the Delaware River, and, with Canada, the Great Lakes. Most are reported to be far less successful than they could be. Reasons vary and include political differences, mediocrity of scientific or other inputs, and conflicting interest of institutions. Foundation officers have repeatedly been told that one of the most helpful contributions it could make to improvement of the environment of this country would be to bring its capabilities, especially organizational ones, to bear on problems of a regional nature. By assisting individuals and institutions in both public and private sectors to cooperate in combining their many types of specialized knowledge into an ever-improving understanding of environmental problems and of environmental developmental trade-offs, there should emerge more useful and credible knowledge on which conflict resolution could be based.

Effects of pollutants on the quality of ground and surface waters, on the productivity of land, on human health, and on survival of wildlife are of widespread concern. That some toxic substances - such as heavy metals or components of insecticides - accumulate in food chains is clearly established; the extent and nature of risks in many cases is controversial. The understanding of living systems, including many important food chains, is still rudimentary, as is the effect on them of nutrients in unnatural amounts (nitrogen, phosphorus, for example), toxic substances, or man-made changes in the environment.

There is so much which could be learned about the vulnerabilities of the environment, so much that it would be desirable to know, some of which is urgently needed, that a major challenge to funding agencies and the scientific community is to establish research priorities, even if imperfect. There is need for new and more orderly development of knowledge, for reduction of redundant studies, and for focused efforts to fill important gaps in the research effort. This often can be accomplished at low cost by arranging for leading authorities to identify needs in informal debate. Findings of such groups can have substantial value to authorities of funding agencies. Results also can influence the orientation of research of scientists whose work already is supported or on the nature of proposals submitted by them to funding agencies.

International attention has been drawn to environmental problems by the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. Of particular concern are questions of global importance, even survival, such as quality of the atmosphere and the oceans, and depletion of resources. The magnitude and complexity of international issues require that, for the most part, they be handled by the United Nations' organizations and by governments. As in the case of agricultural, health, and other problems which cut across political boundaries, however, effectiveness of official efforts probably can be enhanced by imaginative, timely assistance from the private sector. The basis for official action often can be developed best through unofficial multilateral conferences or studies undertaken under nonpolitical auspices.

The poorer nations, beset as they are with burgeoning populations and extremely limited resources per person, place high priority on greater productivity in the agricultural and industrial sectors, increased real incomes for masses of people, and improvements in diets, health care, education,

housing, and other basic needs. To such nations these are "environmental" problems of greatest importance. The Foundation attempts to respond to these basic needs internationally through its work abroad in agriculture, health, population and family planning, and higher education.

It should be possible for developing nations, given an understanding of consequences and appropriate assistance, to avoid some types of mismanagement of environments (as in deforestation, or pollution of waterways) while striving to meet major development goals.

In view of the importance of issues and problems stated above, it is proposed that the Foundation's efforts in its Quality of the Environment program be concentrated on:

1. Support of a comprehensive study of the environmental problems of a defined geographical region, namely, the metropolitan area of New York-New Jersey and its hinterland to the north (for brevity called the Hudson Basin), in cooperation with interested scientists and other specialists of universities, and federal, state, and local agencies. The purpose of this study would be to marshal available information on major problems from all sources and to arrange for its adequacy for planning purposes and conflict resolution to be assessed by responsible persons from the region.

The outcome of the study should reveal the present status of knowledge of the region, indicate priorities for present and future research, and reveal the nature of the need for some arrangement for continuing cooperation among the institutions and individuals in the region which could enable them to anticipate and successfully resolve environmental issues.

An effort will be made simultaneously to develop knowledge of advances being made by organizations concerned with regional approaches

elsewhere, such as those dealing with Chesapeake Bay, the Potomac, Delaware and Connecticut rivers, Long Island Sound, and the Great Lakes.

This could become a major thrust of the Quality of the Environment program.

2. Support of cooperative efforts by universities, state and federal agencies, and other organizations in their search for solutions to specific environmental problems of regional or national importance. To qualify for Foundation support, there should be searches for new knowledge by major biological or social components, substantial funding from public or other sources, an expectation of usefulness of results both in the short and long run, and evidence that the work represents an unusually imaginative and novel, yet realistic, approach to an important problem. Probability of positive effects on institutional arrangements for interdisciplinary research on future problems, and on training of young people, will also be considered. Initially the focus will be the U.S. but unusual opportunities abroad, particularly in connection with the Education for Development program, will be considered.

3. Development of an understanding of environmentally significant alternatives in the management of major pollutants, particularly the nutrients nitrogen and phosphorus, and ways to minimize harmful effects of insecticides and animal wastes. This will include a search for improved understanding of major food chains. It is anticipated that a number of these specific interests will be developed in conjunction with the Conquest of Hunger program.

4. Development of linkages among the world's institutions concerned with internationally important environmental problems such as quality of international waterways, transnational air quality, and environmental contamination

by toxic substances. Specifically, the Foundation would expect to assist in arranging for informal consultation among leading authorities on these types of problems and to support studies critical to the success of official agencies and the resolution of serious environmental disputes.

These activities may well be developed in conjunction with new program initiatives in conflict resolution and international affairs.

5. Development of an understanding of the nature and sources of public perceptions of environmental problems through careful, sharply focused studies. The results should assist both the Foundation and important public action agencies to identify major gaps in public understanding and enable public agencies to pursue activities that will lead to a better informed citizenry.

The above program would be implemented by Natural and Environmental Sciences, in cooperation with colleagues in the agricultural, biomedical, and social sciences, and in the humanities.

CONFLICT IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

I. A World of Change - and Continuity

New scientific advancements, concern over the world's environment, and the rapid depletion of some of the world's resources dramatically highlight the growing interdependence of men and nations. With an increasing realization that Planet Earth is indeed a "spaceship" with finite support systems, alarms are being sounded that global priorities must be reordered and that systematic attention must be given to a host of environmental, demographic, cultural, economic, and social problems if catastrophe is to be avoided. It is becoming increasingly clear that the sum of prevailing national priorities, based upon traditional concepts and sets of interests, does not add up to a rational set of global priorities. Currently, for example, world military expenditures exceed two hundred billion dollars per year - an amount larger than the total income of the poorest half of mankind.

The world is therefore faced with seeming contradictions of increasing interdependencies (the rapid growth of multi-national corporations, new initiatives to build a more satisfactory and flexible monetary system, and a worldwide effort to mount environmental monitoring systems), while, with increasing military expenditures, war and other forms of organized violence continue to be a major threat to mankind. Indeed, one of the great dilemmas confronting mankind is the magnitude and scope of new challenges and opportunities which must be dealt with, at least for the present, within the context of conflicting interests and through procedures and institutional arrangements developed for earlier eras. Let us examine briefly some of the major developments that increasingly unite mankind and, at the same time, give rise to new competition and possibly conflict.

1. The phenomenal growth in the consumption of both energy resources and minerals by the developed countries, coupled with the depletion of their own natural reserves, makes them increasingly dependent upon the LDC's of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. (Japan imports 99% of her petroleum needs; Britain is dependent on overseas sources for 96% of her needs. The United States, which in the past has been only marginally dependent on foreign fuels, is now a major importer of petroleum; it is anticipated by 1985, even with Alaska's fields brought into production, the United States will be dependent on foreign sources for more than half of her petroleum needs.) Studies of the world's consumption of mineral ores also point to the increasing reliance of the developed countries on the reserves of the poorer ones. Increasingly the LDC's are taking a much stronger bargaining position with the advanced countries and corporations when agreements are negotiated. New organizational arrangements (for example, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) are also emerging and greatly increasing the capacity of the exporting countries to deal more effectively with the highly developed countries and the major multi-national corporations.

2. The unfolding environmental crisis has received worldwide attention as a result of the Stockholm Conference and the hundreds of preparatory national and regional conferences related to that effort. While there is clearly no widespread agreement on the details and the theories of the extent of particular threats to the eco-system, it is clear, as Heilbroner notes, that "life on this planet is a fragile affair, a kind of miraculous microbial activity that flourishes on the thin film of air and water and decomposed rock which separates the uninhabitable core of the earth from the void of space." The decision to establish an agency

for implementing the Stockholm program as a part of the United Nations system was reached with the realization that there is at present no realistic alternative to the United Nations for coordinating major worldwide efforts. (The decision of the General Assembly's Economic and Social Committee to locate the new United Nations Environmental program headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya, rather than in Geneva, not only illustrates the increasing voting power of the African, Asian, and Latin American nations, but also highlights growing differences between developed and developing nations over environmental issues.)

3. The rapid expansion of world trade and production is an indicator of the development of an international economic system. The internationalization of production and the growth of multi-national corporations are especially worthy of note: of the 100 largest entities, rated according to total annual production, 58 are nations and 42 are corporations - General Motors ranks as number twenty-three, ahead of Switzerland, Pakistan, and South Africa.* With new regional arrangements for international production of goods ("Complementation Agreements"), a world of sovereign states with clearly delimited boundaries is now being overlaid, as Lester Brown notes, "by a network of international economic institutions, creating a complex political-economic matrix." The international monetary system, which underpins the world's growing economic relationships, and the many regional economic organizations are also integral pieces in the world's economic organization.

4. The "technological revolution" of the past few years has had a resounding impact on virtually all social and political institutions. New advances in weapons and warfare, in communication and transportation, in methods of production, in computer technology, and in medicine and agriculture

* See chart ranking countries and corporations according to size and annual product in Lester R. Brown, World Without Borders, Random House, 1972, pp. 214-15.

have altered traditional institutions, work patterns, and relationships. Indeed, it is the rapid changes in technology which have given birth to the many factors that are transforming the world into a "global village." But, of course, rapid technological change has its costs and fall-outs as well as its benefits - and they are spread unevenly throughout the world. For example, new technologies developed in the most advanced countries are usually capital-intensive, and when transferred to the poor countries (which are short of capital and have excess manpower) they can result in increasing unemployment and underemployment. In fact, the reality of massive world unemployment and underemployment is a problem still to be reckoned with and will certainly test the viability of some social and political institutions that have seemed fairly adequate for another age.

The political implications of the developments discussed above, along with the many others, are not well understood. New types of functional dependencies and interdependencies are emerging as a result of the establishment of new trading patterns and regional arrangements, and the spread of new technologies. The world is witnessing a whole range of systemic changes related directly to both rapid changes in communication and transportation and the vast network of nongovernmental, economic, professional, and voluntary institutions. These changes center on such developments as the multi-national corporations, new transport and energy production systems, and "apolitical" scientific communications networks. These developments seem to describe the movement toward a more united world, yet the potential for conflict is always present and, despite new integrative factors, nations will continue to pursue a wide range of interests and employ a multiplicity

of policies and strategies to advance them. While some of the more traditional causes of war, including the outright quest for new territory, are to some degree sublimated, new tensions seem to be rising as the limitations of the earth are better understood, as technology for global control and exploitation improves, and as demands for access to limited resources become insistent. Traditional rivalries and potential explosive situations persist and must be considered in light of new technologies, new weapons systems, and powerful economic, political, and population pressures. Indeed, such developments are occurring in a world of sovereign states where the spread of nuclear materials and related technologies is a matter of the utmost concern. The avoidance of conflicts that could ignite a nuclear war continues to be a major challenge as world leaders, diplomats, and international agencies deal with increasingly complex issues.

Primary attention in the discussion above has been given to "change" and "interdependence." It must be stressed, however, that, even though the world is physically one, in many other respects, including ideologically, politically, and economically, there are many worlds. While relations among states are conditioned by the grid of overlapping interests and a host of new technological and economic developments, they are also characterized by competition and conflict in thousands of particular cases.

Perhaps as dramatic and far-reaching as many of the current technological changes are the shifts in the power position, policies, and regional arrangements of nations. The changes in Russia's policies and tactics as the Cold War era recedes, the reemergence of China as a major actor on the international stage, the phenomenal rise in the economic power

and potential influence of Japan, the increase in the power of a more united Europe, are indeed forces which must be considered by those who would understand emerging global interrelationships.

It is ironic but understandable that, coincidental with the growth of new global interdependencies and the necessity of dealing more effectively with a host of long- and short-range transnational problems, the United States (and the same is true of some other countries) is beset with domestic concerns, pressures, and reactions that shift attention and priorities away from broader global concerns.

It is too simple to call America's mood "neo-isolationist" and to speak glibly about "withdrawal from responsibility." Nevertheless, it seems the foreign policy consensus that has sustained international endeavors in past years has seriously eroded. Quite apart from present preoccupations with specific domestic pressures and the reaction against the Vietnam conflict, there is disillusionment among much of the American public with the apparent complexities of the modern world, with the criticisms of the U.S. and its policies, and particularly with the failure of past international assistance efforts to achieve quickly a wide variety of political and economic objectives. The public is weary of continuing international crises, and of political and social instability in developing countries. The "threat of Communism" as a major justification for U.S. foreign policies and programs has largely lost its appeal, and national political leaders have seemingly lost confidence in many international institutions. Increasingly, reliance has been placed by those in authority on shortcuts through ad hoc initiatives and quick technological fixes. All

of these factors taken together tend to limit international endeavors and to reinforce those groups demanding withdrawal from global involvements.

The Committee found it especially noteworthy that a significant number of younger scholars, college students, and others of the younger generation have explicitly rejected the validity of past conceptualizations of international affairs and - even more vehemently - the particular policies flowing therefrom. A "generation gap" philosophy is not satisfactory as a framework for understanding the mood of the young because the same factors which have been conditioning agents for them have also brought disillusionment to an older generation. Many of the best informed young Americans striving to understand the world today largely reject the long list of axioms that have been accepted as the rationale for U.S. policy in the post-war era - monolithic communism, the domino theory, and "peace is indivisible." Inevitably, the Vietnam experience is to young Americans what the two World Wars were to their elders; it has provided a framework for understanding military and foreign policy and for demonstrating the power (or lack thereof) of the U.S. in foreign involvements. Peace marches and demonstrations represented not only an understandable revulsion against a particular tragic conflict but also a reaction to problems and policies at home - some of them related to that conflict.

Indeed, this growing awareness that "national" and "international," "domestic" and "foreign" problems are not neatly separable constitutes a major realization of the past decade. As a case in point, one could trace the way in which awareness of "the drug problem" has grown from isolated local concerns to a perception of its global dimensions. The intensified concern of many young people for protecting life and the environment which

sustains it, taken together with their deep humanitarian concerns (given ample expression in the Nobel address of Solzhenitsyn), means there is a willingness to focus on "planetary concerns" if not on present international arrangements. Many are making it clear that wiser policies must be adopted and adequate institutions created; they stress that idealism, vigor, and dedication must be wedded to professionalism, patience, and the capacity to grapple with the realities of a transnational world.

It would appear that the nation's posture may be moving beyond militarism to one of recognition of the inevitability of international interdependence, which requires a greater degree of altruism, especially in relations with the so-called third world. Social justice is as central to international peace as to national order; without it, people turn in their frustration to violence. The Declaration of Human Rights reflects the fact that human rights are close to the center of growth and progress. Thus peace requires the building and strengthening of the international community, with continuing attention paid not only to dispute settlement but also to problems of the environment, scarce natural resources, social welfare, and development aid. A new vision of foreign affairs and a more hopeful view of where the world can go are required, and achievement of these objectives will depend in part on our recognition of the interdependencies that bind us together.

II. Framework for Recommendations

The Committee feels that it is especially important for The Rockefeller Foundation to make clear its continuing interest in the further development and maintenance of international order. The following points weighed especially heavy with the Committee's deliberations:

(a) the "Well-being of Mankind" mandate can scarcely ignore problems related to the survival of men and civilizations and the challenge of resolving conflicts and building more stable international institutions;

(b) the achievement of many of the Foundation's other program goals is dependent on peace, stability, and a high degree of transnational cooperation. (One Trustee commented on the fact that years of effort in Agriculture and other fields could be quickly erased because of civil or international conflict. His query: "Would it not be possible for the Foundation to renew its efforts in the conflict-resolution and community-building area?");

(c) previously, the Foundation had an impressive record of support for individual scholars and for institutions working directly in the international relations field;

(d) the Committee was impressed by the apparent lack of support for creative research, communication, and institution-building in this field and yet was persuaded there are new challenges where modest but effective support programs could be undertaken.

For these reasons the Committee felt that, during a period of major global changes and new challenges and with the partial withdrawal from international responsibility of many agencies, it is vitally important that the Foundation be an effective force for constructive review and reform in the conflict resolution/international relations field.

The Foundation could clarify its concerns by relating its major programs in the foreign and domestic fields in a more concrete manner to some of the global concerns noted above. Opportunities in the Education for Development, Conquest of Hunger, Quality of the Environment, Population, and other major ongoing program activities for helping to achieve some of the goals outlined should be kept constantly in mind. For example, special attention might be given through universities receiving assistance under the Education for Development program for the training of diplomats and for encouraging research directly related to problems of conflict anticipation and management. Similarly, as increased notice is paid to global environmental concerns, opportunities will arise for developing activities closely related to conflicts that arise over problems of scarceness of resources, allocating pollution-intensive industries, etc. Further, given both the number of Foundation staff with experience in international relations (and some with specific interests and training in international politics, international law and organization, and related fields) and the facilities in New York and at the Bellagio Study and Conference Center, it should be possible for the Foundation, at a relatively modest annual expenditure, to implement an effective program in international relations with specific reference to conflict resolution, international stability and order, and emerging global relationships.

Recognizing that the problems and issues discussed are awesome in their dimensions and that there are a number of options open for constructive efforts in the world-order field, the Committee felt that there were clear priority areas for consideration by the Foundation which might be especially productive:

1. Clearer analyses and interpretations of global and regional issues related directly to advances in knowledge and techniques and human demands and expectations need to be encouraged. To be useful, the few individuals encouraged to undertake this activity must be not only extraordinarily able and imaginative but also well-informed about subjects heretofore left to interested governmental officials, the business community, or technical experts. They must be backstopped with a positive strategy for the dissemination of new concepts to relevant communities, perhaps through special conferences as well as publications. As a corollary to conceptualizations involving dramatic new changes, encouragement should be given to careful re-formulations of some of the persistent factors conditioning national policies, regional arrangements, and international order building. "Balance of power," "national and regional interest," the influence of "national character" on behavior, and various other factors must be reconsidered and woven into new conceptualizations of national and international behavior. Historical perspective is a safeguard and a corrective for a modern age which all too frequently ignores the "uses of the past."

2. Man's capacity to resolve global, regional, and intrastate issues peacefully depends upon the growth of active mechanisms designed both to anticipate and help avoid potential disputes and to find more adequate means of resolving issues as they arise. The Committee's discussions brought out the inadequacies of existing institutional mechanisms capable of taking fuller account of global and mankind considerations and the absence of established and effective governmental machinery for conflict resolution and for setting major social goals through the development

and implementation of public policies. It should be possible to encourage greater attention to the kinds of information and analysis, early warning mechanisms, anticipatory studies, and forums that would be of particular help to global conflict resolution and goal-setting.

Attention was given by the Committee to the wisdom of focusing at the outset directly on a broad range of problems within the conflict anticipation, conflict management, and conflict resolution field. A number of consultants noted that increased attention should be given to early warning systems and to finding alternatives for dealing with conflict situations. This would include finding ways of assisting scientists, industrial leaders, and others in exchanging information and working more effectively together. Attention was also given to the positive role of conflict within society and that any major change or innovation produces tension. Indeed, if major development programs are successful, they will result in societal conflict and unrest. The Committee discussed a number of examples of tension produced through land reform programs, problems arising from increases in urban development, changes in transportation patterns, and new pressures which arise because of innovations in educational systems, and the access of new educated elites to positions of authority. Of course, this merely highlights the fact that increased attention must be given to conflict anticipation and conflict management as changes take place.

3. As an essential element of any program, there is a need to identify and encourage the continual involvement in global affairs of a broad spectrum of civic, educational, and special interest groups within the United States (if not in other countries as well), that may now be

inadequately represented and lack awareness of how transnational issues affect them or vice versa. In this connection, a number of outside experts who met with the Committee stressed the need for educational efforts more consistent with changing world realities and emphasizing the impact of new trends, modern technology, and emerging multi-national institutions on traditional values and perceptions.

4. Specialized training for talented individuals, particularly those from developing countries, in problems of transnational law, conflict management, diplomacy, human resource utilization, international economics, environmental management, etc., was given high priority by several consultants. Wilfred Jenks, Director General of ILO, and Jacques Freymond, Director of the Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies, particularly stressed the wisdom of identifying and training individuals who will have to deal with major issues as the impact of many of the global trends becomes more evident.

Recommendations

Bearing in mind the complexity and variety of problems discussed, the program activities recommended are governed by four main objectives:

1. To identify and assess emerging areas of international affairs likely to be of major importance in the decade ahead.
2. To facilitate the development of new conceptualizations of these problems by existing organizations which have special competence in the international relations field.

3. To promote an understanding of and involvement in international affairs of a broader segment of the world's citizenry, including educational, professional, civic, and other groups.
4. To help develop needed additional expertise in the policy and action areas discussed in this paper.

(Officers would also be alert to special or unique opportunities where assistance might be particularly useful to peace-making, peace-keeping, or other efforts directly related to building a more stable world order and which should be called to the attention of the Board.)

To realize these aims, it is recommended that the Foundation initiate a special program in Conflict in International Relations through the following initial program activities.*

1. Support the work of exceptionally talented and promising scholars and participants in world affairs through an experimental Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship Program in International Affairs centered on selected problems likely to be of major international importance in the decade ahead. It is recommended that special attention be given to younger scholars and participants, that they need not be U.S. citizens, and that, in exceptional cases, support be extended for two years. The program would be tailored to meet the needs of each Fellow, and it is clearly envisaged that some of the participants would be assigned to national, international, or private agencies or organizations and would gain experience in such areas as conflict avoidance or conflict management. It is further recommended

* This program was approved at the April 1973 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

that initially up to ten fellowships be awarded, providing support not to exceed \$25,000 to any one individual over a twelve-month period.

Rationale

a. Increasing attention should be given by highly competent individuals to some of the major, emerging international policy and conflict issues. This individual awards program would give visibility to selected key issues, and, at the same time, enable exceptionally talented individuals to explore these issues in depth.

b. The Foundation, given its experience in operating individual awards programs, is perhaps uniquely qualified to organize and administer the program envisaged here. It is felt by the Committee that there should be a remarkably high pay-off for the funds expended.

c. The program would enable and encourage appropriate Foundation officers and Foundation Fellows to maintain closer contacts and to work more effectively with organizations and scholars giving attention to the highest priority problems in the conflict resolution-international relations field.

d. The Fellows would be expected to use their study opportunities to prepare themselves for subsequent leadership roles in their respective fields. The Fellows could make an important contribution, by special invitation, to ongoing Foundation deliberations and discussions.

2. Support - and in some cases initiate - special efforts to counteract the current discernible sense of hopelessness among individuals and groups through the promotion of deeper public understanding of, and genuine interest in, international affairs. Such efforts would be directed to educational, civic, professional, business, and labor groups in a few selected communities. The work of such national organizations as the

Overseas Development Council can facilitate this approach, and the Foundation may wish to continue its support for such efforts which are clearly aimed at reaching a wide constituency.

Special attention may be given to educational programs that emphasize transnational values, techniques and problems of peace-making and peace-keeping, and the challenge of building a more stable and just world order. Given the pressures toward neo-isolationism and compulsions to act unilaterally as a nation, it is essential that attention be given to efforts by multi-national organizations and programs to make this an interdependent world.

3. Support - primarily through other organizations and institutions - task forces or working seminars which would give attention over a sustained period of time to topics directly related to emerging global interrelationships, to new international institutional arrangements and to such problems as conflict anticipation and resolution. Types of activities to be included:

a. International seminars dealing with specific problems and topics in the conflict resolution/international relations field.

b. National task forces or seminars organized to consider problems related directly to U.S. responses to emerging work interrelationships and to such specific problems as the present state and prospects for training and career development of persons attempting to work at the interface between knowledge and action in the international arena.

c. Regional conferences and special workshops within the U.S. involving educators, opinion leaders, and others designed to grapple with problems arising from new global interdependencies that are emerging, and

how communities interact on spaceship earth and the consequences of this for education, voluntary activities, etc.

4. Support for (1) a small number of institutions working directly on high-priority problems; and (2) through selected institutions to (a) train exceptional younger scholars by linking them with ongoing research efforts, (b) train young or mid-career diplomats from developing countries, and (c) enable especially creative individuals to work on problem areas identified in terms of our first objective.

Initial Focus

Keeping in mind the stated program objectives and the need for an initial point of focus, special attention would be given to the broad range of problems related to "conflict" - not only international but also that within regions or nations when seemingly local disputes related, for example, to the exploitation of scarce resources or problems of particular ethnic or tribal groups within states may have broad and ominous implications. Within this context, a number of problem areas have already been identified, including those centering on:

1. Anticipation and avoidance of conflict - for example, early warning systems and fact-finding procedures, and the development of effective techniques for delay or avoidance through extension of legal order and legal institutions.
2. Management of conflict - alternative means of dealing creatively with crisis situations and issues requiring negotiation or compromise and related skills among diplomats, decision-makers, scientists, and others.

3. Conflict resolution - the range of means for terminating or escalating conflict.

The approach herein proposed for the Foundation in constructive efforts in the world-order field can be summarized as operating in two parallel but mutually-supportive ways: to help overcome the lack of trained leaders, particularly in such parts of the world as the less-developed countries, and to make a larger proportion of the world's citizenry conscious of emergent global conflict problems. There are, for example, nine million people in formal higher education in the United States alone, many of whom go through the process without ever becoming aware of international conflict problems. To ameliorate this situation and contribute to mankind's survival, it may be necessary to help generalize peace and conflict studies in the elementary and secondary schools.

(This statement about the new fellowship program is used to explain, to those interested in applying, the focus of the program and the application procedure.)

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION FELLOWSHIPS

IN

CONFLICT IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

THE SETTING

The growing interdependence of men and nations is dramatically reflected in new scientific advancements, by concern over the global environment, by the rapid depletion of scarce and non-renewable natural resources, and by the impact of these and other central issues in a new range of trade and monetary problems. It is clear that life on this planet is a fragile affair. The escalating impact of technological advance, a rapidly increasing world population, and dramatic changes in the world's economy are altering traditional approaches to world affairs and giving rise to a vast network of new transnational relationships. The future political and institutional implications of these developments are by no means clear.

Even though the world is physically one, in many other respects - ideologically, politically, and economically - there are many worlds. Currently, global military expenditures exceed two hundred billion dollars per year - an amount larger than the total income of the poorest half of mankind. The world is therefore faced with seeming contradictions of increasing interdependence while, with increasing military expenditures, war and other forms of organized violence continue to be of major concern to mankind.

These developments have been accompanied by changes in the power position and regional arrangements of nations. The changes in Soviet policies and tactics as the Cold War era recedes, the reemergence of China as a political force in the international community, the rise in the economic power and potential influence of Japan, and the growing economic and political power of a more united Europe, are among the major factors which must be considered by those who would understand emerging global interrelationships.

It is against this background that The Rockefeller Foundation has decided to undertake a new program entitled "Conflict in International Relations." Guidelines for the general program are being developed.

OBJECTIVES AND FOCUS

The program will have three major objectives:

1. To identify and assess emerging areas of international affairs likely to be of major importance in the decade ahead.
2. To facilitate new conceptualizations of these problems and the development of alternative approaches to their solution for the benefit of policy makers and others concerned with progress in the development of international order.
3. To help develop needed additional expertise in these policy areas.

Keeping in mind these program objectives and the need for a point of focus, special attention will be given to the broad range of problems related to "conflict" - not only international conflicts but

also those within regions or nations. Within this context, a number of problem areas have already been identified, including those centering on:

1. Anticipation and avoidance of conflict - for example, early warning systems and fact-finding procedures, and the development of effective techniques for conflict avoidance through extension of legal order and legal institutions.
2. Management of conflict - alternative means of dealing creatively with crisis situations and issues requiring negotiation or compromise.
3. Conflict resolution - the range of means for terminating or de-escalating destructive conflict and for facilitating peaceful change.

THE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

As a first step under the new program, the Foundation is initiating a series of fellowships designed for those whose experience and field of interest are related to the issues outlined above. It is anticipated that some 15 awards will be made during the first year. Initial awards will be made from applications received by September 1. Additional awards will be made from applications received by January 1, 1974. In making awards, the Foundation will have the counsel of a small outside advisory committee.

The majority of the grants will be for a one-year period. The size of the grants will depend upon individual circumstances, but would be expected to cover maintenance, travel, and other approved costs. It is anticipated that, in some cases, fellows will be working on special projects while continuing

with present institutional relationships. In other cases, the project for the fellowship period may include participation in the work of another national or international institution in a position to provide special training and experience contributing substantially to the fellow's future ability to handle problems in his or her field of special interest. Fellows might, for instance, be attached for both study and active experience to an international institution such as the World Bank, or the UN Environment Program.

It is expected that grants will be administered by a non-profit institution with which the applicant is, or expects to be, associated.

ELIGIBILITY

While there are no specific eligibility criteria, previous experience or a demonstrated research ability in areas related to the focus of the Foundation's new program or in a closely related field, is likely to be minimally necessary if a proposal is to be competitive.

PROCEDURE FOR APPLICATIONS

Those wishing to be considered for a fellowship under this program should write to:

Fellowship Program
Conflict in International Relations
The Rockefeller Foundation
111 West 50th Street
New York, New York 10020

The letter should state clearly:

- 1) the purpose for which the grant is requested
- 2) the amount sought
- 3) the period of time proposed for the project
- 4) the non-profit institution which would administer the grant
- 5) the location at which the project would be undertaken.

Applicants should also (a) enclose a curriculum vitae, (b) provide the Foundation with copies of any articles and other materials bearing directly on qualifications for the work projected for the fellowship period and (c) arrange for three letters of reference to be sent to the Foundation.

October 1973

Section VI

	<u>Page</u>
Summaries of Expenditures, 1968 - 1972:	
By Programs	1
New York Consolidated Budget	9

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

1

EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

(In Thousands)

1968 - 1972

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>AREAS OF INTEREST</u>												
Conquest of Hunger	\$ 44,278	21	\$ 7,427	17	\$ 8,956	20	\$11,008	23	\$ 8,962	23	\$ 7,925	19
Cultural Development	18,245	8	4,150	9	3,980	9	3,103	7	2,950	8	4,062	10
Equal Opportunity	33,102	15	4,880	11	6,170	14	8,550	18	5,874	15	7,628	18
Population	23,742	11	6,620	15	5,980	14	6,150	13	2,813	7	2,179	6
Quality of the Environment	6,602	3	3,442	8	2,050	5	1,110	2	-		-	
University Development (Education for Development)	40,502	19	7,250	17	7,526	17	8,420	18	9,024	24	8,282	20
Allied Interests (Special Studies)	<u>22,257</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3,720</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3,550</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3,973</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6,514</u>	<u>16</u>
Total - Program Expenditures	<u>188,728</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>38,269</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>38,382</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>41,891</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>33,596</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>36,590</u>	<u>89</u>
New York Consolidated Budget												
N.Y. Program Costs	11,685	6	2,344	5	2,260	5	2,390	5	2,417	6	2,274	5
General Administration	<u>14,823</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3,414</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3,243</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2,834</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2,708</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2,624</u>	<u>6</u>
	<u>26,508</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>5,758</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>5,503</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5,224</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5,125</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4,898</u>	<u>11</u>
Total Expenditures	<u>\$215,236</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$44,027</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$43,885</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$47,115</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$38,721</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$41,488</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

CONQUEST OF HUNGER

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
Grant Funds												
International Agricultural												
Institutes	\$11,883	27	\$2,970	39	\$2,924	32	\$2,454	22	\$2,019	23	\$1,516	19
Capital grants	6,351	14	858	12	1,554	17	3,095	28	632	7	212	3
Other	12,130	27	1,815	24	2,126	24	2,655	24	2,671	30	2,863	36
	<u>30,364</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>5,643</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>6,604</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>8,204</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>5,322</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>4,591</u>	<u>58</u>
Grants in Aid	2,469	6	272	4	367	4	489	4	742	8	599	7
Scholarship Funds	4,239	10	582	8	774	9	937	9	1,010	11	936	12
International Programs Budget												
Field Staff	5,418	12	847	11	1,070	12	962	9	1,352	15	1,187	15
Operating Support	1,788	4	83	2	141	2	416	4	536	6	612	8
	<u>7,206</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>930</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1,211</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1,378</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1,888</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>1,799</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	<u>\$44,278</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$7,427</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$8,956</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$11,008</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$8,962</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$7,925</u>	<u>100</u>

1. Cost of field staff assigned to the four international agricultural institutes (IRRI, CIMMYT, CIAT and IITA) are included under "Grant Funds."
2. Non-recurring capital grants include \$3,984,000 for CIMMYT and \$2,367,000 for CIAT.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
Grant Funds	\$15,272	84	\$3,453	83	\$3,455	87	\$2,378	77	\$2,444	83	\$3,542	87
Grants in Aid	2,973	16	697	17	525	13	725	23	506	17	520	13
Scholarship Funds	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	<u>\$18,245</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$4,150</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,980</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,103</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$2,950</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$4,062</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
Grant Funds	\$31,434	95	\$4,543	93	\$5,956	97	\$8,235	96	\$5,564	95	\$7,136	94
Grants in Aid	1,663	5	337	7	214	3	315	4	310	5	487	6
Scholarship Funds	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—
Total	<u>\$33,102</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$4,880</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$6,170</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$8,550</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,874</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$7,628</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

POPULATION

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
Grant Funds	\$22,732	96	\$6,182	94	\$5,879	98	\$5,984	98	\$2,687	96	\$2,000	92
Grants in Aid	927	4	393	6	79	1	155	2	121	4	179	8
Scholarship Funds	<u>83</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>
Total	<u>\$23,742</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$6,620</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,980</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$6,150</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$2,813</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$2,179</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Expenditures 1970 - 1973

(In Thousands)

	Three-Year Total Amount	%	1972 Amount	%	1971 Amount	%	1970 Amount	%
Grant Funds	\$6,089	92	\$3,110	90	\$1,939	95	\$1,040	94
Grants in Aid	508	8	327	10	111	5	70	6
Scholarship Funds	<u>5</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>
Total	<u>\$6,602</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,442</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$2,050</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$1,110</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
Grant Funds	\$16,520	41	\$3,153	43	\$2,868	38	\$3,502	42	\$3,687	41	\$3,310	40
Grants in Aid	889	2	111	2	125	2	131	2	251	3	271	3
Scholarship Funds	8,140	20	1,478	20	1,667	22	1,779	21	1,665	18	1,551	19
International Programs Budget												
Field Staff & Visiting Faculty	12,058	30	1,998	28	2,381	32	2,388	28	2,707	30	2,584	31
Operating Support	2,895	7	510	7	485	6	620	7	714	8	566	7
	<u>14,953</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>2,508</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>2,866</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>3,008</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>3,421</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>3,150</u>	<u>38</u>
Total	\$40,502	100	\$7,250	100	\$7,526	100	\$8,420	100	\$9,024	100	\$8,282	100

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

ALLIED INTERESTS

Expenditures 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Five-Year Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
Grant Funds	\$12,218	55	\$2,401	54	\$2,120	57	\$1,546	44	\$1,885	48	\$4,266	66
Grants in Aid	1,621	7	513	11	256	7	290	8	287	7	275	4
Scholarship Funds												
Scholarship Awards	604	3	109	3	86	3	96	3	117	3	196	3
Institutional Grants	<u>2,797</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>462</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>506</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>597</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>647</u>	<u>10</u>
	<u>3,401</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>571</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>592</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>681</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>714</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>843</u>	<u>13</u>
International Programs												
Budget												
Field Staff	2,421	11	510	11	301	8	507	14	569	14	534	8
Operating Support	<u>2,596</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>451</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>526</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>518</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>596</u>	<u>9</u>
	<u>5,017</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>1,015</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>752</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>1,033</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>1,087</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>1,130</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	<u>\$22,257</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$4,500</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,720</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,550</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$3,973</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$6,514</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

SUMMARY OF NEW YORK CONSOLIDATED BUDGET EXPENDITURES 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

	Total		1972		1971		1970		1969		1968	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
1. <u>Program Costs</u>												
Agricultural Sciences	\$ 2,291	9	\$ 425	7	\$ 442	8	\$ 492	9	\$ 450	9	\$ 482	10
Arts & Humanities	792	3	207	4	152	3	134	3	150	3	149	3
Biomedical Sciences	2,088	8	384	7	382	7	445	8	473	9	404	8
Natural & Environmental Sciences	355	1	230	4	125	2	-		-		-	
Social Sciences	2,201	8	465	8	404	7	488	9	460	9	384	8
Interdisciplinary Activities	<u>3,958</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>633</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>755</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>831</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>884</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>855</u>	<u>17</u>
Total Program Costs	<u>11,685</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>2,344</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>2,260</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>2,390</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>2,417</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>2,274</u>	<u>46</u>
2. <u>General Administrative Costs</u>	<u>14,823</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>3,414</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>3,243</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>2,834</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>2,708</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>2,624</u>	<u>54</u>
Total New York Consolidated Budget	<u>\$26,508</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,758</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,503</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,224</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,125</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$4,898</u>	<u>100</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$ 891	\$169	\$156	\$208	\$169	\$189
Staff	306	64	58	61	60	63
	<u>1,197</u>	<u>233</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>269</u>	<u>229</u>	<u>252</u>
Employee Benefits	381	83	76	82	67	73
Travel	268	42	56	58	57	55
Consultants	157	16	33	24	41	43
Rent	246	49	50	50	48	49
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	<u>42</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	<u>\$2,291</u>	<u>\$425</u>	<u>\$442</u>	<u>\$492</u>	<u>\$450</u>	<u>\$482</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION
NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

ARTS & HUMANITIES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$370	\$ 90	\$ 67	\$ 60	\$ 74	\$ 79
Staff	<u>121</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>18</u>
	491	123	94	83	94	97
Employee Benefits	155	41	33	25	28	28
Travel	27	4	5	4	7	7
Consultants	43	18	1	10	9	5
Rent	65	20	15	10	10	10
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	<u>\$792</u>	<u>\$207</u>	<u>\$152</u>	<u>\$134</u>	<u>\$150</u>	<u>\$149</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$ 894	\$170	\$158	\$198	\$207	\$161
Staff	242	46	41	52	53	50
	<u>1,136</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>260</u>	<u>211</u>
Employee Benefits	356	74	70	76	76	60
Travel	237	41	45	53	53	45
Consultants	127	11	17	19	39	41
Rent	198	40	40	40	39	39
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	34	2	11	7	6	8
Total	<u>\$2,088</u>	<u>\$384</u>	<u>\$382</u>	<u>\$445</u>	<u>\$473</u>	<u>\$404</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION
NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972
(In Thousands)

NATURAL & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$ 63	\$ 43	\$ 20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Staff	<u>136</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	199	136	63	-	-	-
Employee Benefits	67	46	21	-	-	-
Travel	28	19	9	-	-	-
Consultants	26	13	13	-	-	-
Rent	30	15	15	-	-	-
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	<u>\$355</u>	<u>\$230</u>	<u>\$125</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION
NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972

(In Thousands)

SOCIAL SCIENCES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$ 800	\$163	\$146	\$183	\$172	\$136
Staff	<u>454</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>76</u>
	1,254	275	222	274	271	212
Employee Benefits	393	89	79	83	80	62
Travel	194	56	34	47	34	23
Consultants	62	9	18	12	7	16
Rent	252	35	40	61	58	58
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	<u>46</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	<u>\$2,201</u>	<u>\$465</u>	<u>\$404</u>	<u>\$488</u>	<u>\$460</u>	<u>\$384</u>

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION
NEW YORK PROGRAM COSTS 1968 - 1972
(In Thousands)

INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>
Salaries						
Officers	\$ 197	\$ 25	\$ 22	\$ 52	\$ 51	\$ 47
Staff	<u>1,351</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>265</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>287</u>	<u>254</u>
	1,548	287	287	335	338	301
Employee Benefits	450	98	100	101	64	87
Travel	65	14	13	16	9	13
Consultants	56	20	3	33	-	-
Rent	198	39	40	41	39	39
Furniture, Equipment, etc.	35	2	11	7	7	8
Shipping	<u>1,606</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>301</u>	<u>298</u>	<u>427</u>	<u>407</u>
Total	<u>\$3,958</u>	<u>\$633</u>	<u>\$755</u>	<u>\$831</u>	<u>\$884</u>	<u>\$855</u>