

Pkg. #8

911
P10-256
183
F18

APR 1 1963

HUMANITIES PROGRAM AND RELATED FOUNDATION

INTERESTS IN HISTORY 1950-1960

911
Pro-256

The Rockefeller Foundation

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

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

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

November 22, 1960

TO THE TRUSTEES

The recent Trustee Review Committee raised certain points about the Foundation's approach to History. The attached paper looks back over the Foundation's interest in History during the past decade and contains some suggestions about this field which could be usefully discussed at our Williamsburg Meeting.

I have asked Mr. Charles W. Cole to give some special thought to the matter and to introduce it for our consideration. It will be helpful if the Trustees could find an opportunity to study the attached paper before the Meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk

Enclosure

911
Pro-256
November 16, 1960
prepared by Charles B. Fahs

HUMANITIES PROGRAM AND RELATED FOUNDATION

INTERESTS IN HISTORY 1950-1960

History has had a more important share in the recent expenditures of The Rockefeller Foundation than the classification of grants used in the dockets for meetings of the Trustees or in the Annual Report might indicate. History is not a major Humanities classification and yet a substantial part of the funds appropriated or allocated under "intercultural studies" or "humanistic research" supports work in the field of history. While the share of history in each such case cannot be accurately determined (many grants have more than one purpose and the recipient is allowed a good deal of discretion in actual allocation of expenditures) we have made an attempt to estimate the approximate share of history in the grants, grants in aid and fellowships of the decade from 1950 through 1959. During these ten years total grants in Humanities came to \$37,643,552. Of this total we estimate that approximately seven million dollars was for work in history. This is roughly nineteen per cent. Included in the thirty-seven million total, however, are the extraordinary appropriations out of capital of ten million five hundred thousand dollars for the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. If this item is omitted the share of history in the remainder of the Humanities program rises to twenty-five per cent.

While Humanities is considered to have primary responsibility within The Rockefeller Foundation for the field of history, this jurisdiction is not exclusive and the other programs are free to recommend support for historical projects directly related to their needs. At an earlier period such support was given to work on the history of medicine at Johns Hopkins, but in recent years neither Agriculture nor Biological and Medical Research have recommended

grants in this field. Social Sciences, however, during this ten-year period has provided at least \$1,500,000 for economic history and \$350,000 for diplomatic history. It is clear that history has not been neglected by The Rockefeller Foundation. A more careful look at the problem of selection and at the various aspects of history with which we have been or might be concerned will help to assess our performance in this field. While we have tried to include Social Sciences interests in history, this paper represents primarily work in Humanities.

The Problem of Selection

History in its most general sense is the entire past of mankind; more specifically it is the recording, preservation, study, interpretation and transmission of evidence or records of mankind's past. Of course history is important. But this inclusiveness of history overwhelms even the historian who sticks to a narrow area or period. Moreover, as time moves forward the past of mankind grows at a pace which no conceivable program of study, recording and archival storage could match. One cannot say that any given piece of historical research is useless, and yet one cannot consider the question of history intelligently without facing the two questions: what is the optimum share of human effort to be allocated to the past? and what are the best criteria available to us for choosing the subjects and questions to which this effort should be devoted? This problem of selection is doubly pressing for Foundation officers and Trustees who have limited funds to administer "for the well-being of mankind."

Underdeveloped Areas

Selection is simplified in a few regions in which The Rockefeller Foundation is active by a nearly total lack of historical research. Southeast

Asia is a good example. There can be little doubt that the struggling new democracies in this area need some understanding of their pasts. Their people will have historical concepts willy-nilly. If they do not have facts they will the more readily succumb to ideologies. Sudjotmoko, one of Indonesia's most brilliant young intellectuals, in a lecture given in 1957 said:

When a people finds itself at a turning point in its history, it is only natural that it should ask itself questions about itself. There is the expectation that these questions and this act of self-examination will result in a clearer definition of who they really are, a definition which may be more suited to the needs of the new historical phase into which they are entering, and which may also be able to generate within them the strength and the faith needed to face the problems which arise from the new situation. We should therefore not be surprised at the fact that questions about our identity as a people, its roots and its historical development, invariably arise whenever we face the problems which are bound up with our independence and with our present period of critical change.

Who are we then, who are we as people and as a nation, who have only so recently felt ourselves a single people and now appear to be divided and no longer able to recognize ourselves in each other? What compass have we to use if we are to face this whole gamut of new realities and problems and not lose our personality and identity as a people? What is it that binds us together into a single people, and in what light are we to understand and place in perspective the differences and conflicts which divide us? How did we come to this condition of division and crisis which now appears to dominate our life? What are its origins, what are the remedies for it? Are we being swept along by an inexorable tide of history? If so, where are we now and whither are we being carried? If not, are we capable of controlling the course of this stream of development and in which direction are we to divert it?¹

The officers know few adequately trained Indonesian historians - this was not a field of study the Dutch encouraged. Trained staff is also lacking for maintenance of Indonesia's archaeological services and archives. There are, of course, a fair number of Western books on Indonesia but few are available in the Indonesian language, and most are suspect as representing a Western

1 Sudjotmoko: An Approach to Indonesian History: Towards an Open Future. Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program, Translation Series, 1960.

point of view even if they are not by Dutch scholars. Under such circumstances almost anything The Rockefeller Foundation can do to encourage sound historical writing, the training of historians, or the improvement of research facilities in history in Indonesia will be justifiable. The problem is to find any place where one can begin rather than to choose between many possibilities. There is no danger for years to come that history will be overemphasized or that it will take too large a share of Indonesian resources. The problem is to get any at all.

This is the situation in all of the countries of Southeast Asia, in all of the new countries of Africa, and in some of the countries of Latin America. Our grant in aid for a Peruvian history by Dr. Jorge Basadre (\$5,760 in 1950 and 1952) and the more recent grant of \$69,900 to the University College in Ibadan, Nigeria, for teaching and research in Arabic language and Islamic thought, culture and history are examples of efforts to initiate sound work in history in areas where very little is now done.

Intermediate Areas

Mexico and India may serve as examples of countries where historical research is further advanced yet where some gaps in historical research are so glaring and the possible relevance of research to contemporary intellectual needs so great that the decision to provide Foundation assistance for a few specific projects is relatively simple. Mexico has a modest number of able historians, although the failure of most of its universities to provide full-time professorships and the poor organization of its archives and libraries limit the quantity and quality of the research results. Until recently, however, the attention of Mexican scholars was focused almost exclusively on the pre-colonial or colonial periods. What little work was done on Mexico as an independent nation was almost entirely confined to the period before 1850.

As a result the lively political debates on the merits or demerits of the Diaz regime and of the Mexican Revolution are frequently based more on mythology than on fact. Under these circumstances it appeared clear that a thorough examination of more recent history could make an important contribution to Mexican thought and to the stabilization of Mexican political life. Accordingly when we learned that a distinguished scholar and an outstanding institution were interested in moving in this direction the officers welcomed the opportunity to recommend support to the Colegio de México for Daniel Cosío Villegas' Historia Moderna de México (\$61,572 from 1948 to 1957). This is now nearing completion and is being followed by his Historia Contemporánea de México (\$123,692 since 1958) which will bring the account up to 1952.

India, like Mexico, is neither very rich nor excessively poor in historians. The Humanities officers began exploration in India shortly after that country's achievement of independence. At that time Indian nationalists showed an understandable desire to emphasize the glories of the ancient Indian past. But Indian support for this approach seemed assured and there was some doubt as to how objective such history would be. More justifiable from the Foundation point of view seemed to be the encouragement of a re-examination of the history of the last several hundred years and of the processes which led up to and followed independence: more justifiable both because this type of research offered promise of stimulating Indian consideration of their own present and future problems and because it seemed unlikely to be undertaken without outside financial assistance. Accordingly as able and committed scholars have been found, help has been recommended for histories of the transfer of power from Britain to India and of the integration of the Indian States, both by V. P. Menon; for a cultural history of recent

India by Dr. S. Abid Husain; for research in modern Indian history by Professor Bisheshwar Prasad; for a social and cultural history of 20th century Bengal by Sibnarayan Ray; for collection by the Indian Council of World Affairs of materials on the political leader M. N. Roy; and to Aligarh University for a history of the Sikhs by Khushwant Singh. Social Sciences have assisted the University of Calcutta's work on Indian economic history. This series of projects is, we think, contributing to Indian thought. It should be continued as opportunities occur. In the meantime, however, it seems desirable to add greater depth to the historical perspective by study of the pre-British Indian society and culture. The officers are, accordingly, now investigating opportunities for encouragement of Moghul history.

Japan is an even more complicated case since Japan has over two hundred universities, thousands of historians, and immense library and archival resources. Even though the archives have been less fully used and the history of the country has been less adequately written than is the case with the United States or Europe, Japan offers fewer examples, than do Indonesia and Mexico, of research which is both urgently needed and not likely to be supplied within the next few years by the ongoing unaided activities of the historical profession. As far as Japanese history written by Japanese is concerned the officers have thus far selected for attention only two problems.¹ The first need is created by the Marxist interpretation of history which became influential in Japan in the prewar years and became dominant during the American occupation when its nationalist competition was eliminated. The key historical period here is the last half of the nineteenth

¹ We have also supported Japanese work in history of the United States, Russia, China, and Indonesia and, through fellowships, of India and Turkey. See the discussion of non-Western history below.

century, the period in which Japan laid the foundations for its modern development. The dogmatic Marxist interpretation of this period provides the foundation for the Communist doctrine with regard to where Japan is today and what she should do tomorrow. The officers have felt that it was important to support the few Japanese historians who are able and courageous enough to resist this prevailing dogmatism through new and more thorough studies of Japan's modern history. This has been an important reason for the support recommended for Professor Yoshio Sakata of Kyoto University (\$7,860 in 1956).

Another peculiarity of Japanese historical research is the relative scarcity of good biography, particularly political biography. (The Japanese seem to take more readily to literary and artistic biographies, usually done by creative writers rather than historians, though even these are not numerous.) It is not difficult to make a persuasive case that good political biography is essential to healthy democracy. Biographic emphasis on the role of individuals rather than abstract social forces is healthy. The officers have looked for opportunities to encourage biography in Japan and have made one grant in aid for the work on political biography of Professor Yoshitaka Oka of Tokyo University (\$2,500 in 1955). A project on leadership at the secondary level in the Meiji period which is under the direction of Professor Masaaki Kosaka at Kyoto University is related to our interests both in biography and in non-doctrinaire interpretations of modern Japanese history (\$14,164 in two grants in aid 1958-1960). The officers regret their lack of success in developing additional promising projects along these lines.

The United States and the West

When we turn to the United States (the situation in Great Britain, Canada, Australia and Europe differs in detail but is similar in broad outline)

the problem of selecting history projects for support becomes perplexing. The United States has some two thousand colleges and universities and generously supports libraries, archives, historical societies, and historical monuments and museums. There is a substantial sale for textbooks, biographies, historical works and even historical periodicals for the general public. Since history is a universally required subject in colleges and high schools, we have thousands of full-time academic historians in addition to many non-academic ones. Research, writing and publication are made compulsory by degree requirements and by the present practices of university appointment and advancement. It is true that historians, with much justification, feel that they do not have enough funds for the research expected of them, enough outlets for publication, or fellowship opportunities for their graduate students comparable to those available in medicine, technology, natural sciences and the social sciences. But to meet these general needs is beyond our budgetary possibilities. Such needs are an integral part of the broad problem of university financing in the United States to which we could make an important and equitable contribution only by distributing the entire endowment of The Rockefeller Foundation.

The selective approach to aid to history which in the West the Foundation cannot avoid demands a far closer look at needs and opportunities than is appropriate in countries where history is in short supply. With a reminder that what follows is not intended to be applied in Asia, Africa and Latin America without generous adjustments to local conditions, let us take a look at a number of aspects of historical work and the choices which have been made by The Rockefeller Foundation as illustrated primarily by grants, grants in aid and fellowships in the United States.

Sub-fields of History

Theory of History

The first place the officers looked for help in thinking about priorities in the field of history was to the historians themselves. There is a considerable literature on the history of historical writing, the methodology of historical research and interpretation, and philosophical critiques of the reliability or meaningfulness of writing about the past (in what sense, for instance, can we properly speak of understanding a past event or situation?). There is, however, disappointingly little critical analysis of the output of the historical profession, the areas or aspects of history which have been amply covered and those that have been neglected, or the process by which the selection has been determined. The officers have been prepared to recommend aid for such studies but have found almost no opportunities. The topic appears only very rarely in the agendas of the meetings of historical associations. Aid we have given for surveys of the Humanities in Canada and Australia and to the planning activities of the Canadian Humanities Research Council or the American Council of Learned Societies has resulted in no new thinking on research priorities in history. Indeed, the American Council of Learned Societies in its own allocation of fellowships and research grants has gone on record against any effort to choose between subjects, a position which the officers do not believe they can share and still perform their Foundation functions effectively. In our opinion, nothing would do more to raise the standing of history in Western civilization and to attract talent to the field than greater thoughtfulness on the part of historians with regard to the subjects and fields to which they direct their efforts. We should, therefore, continue to look for any opportunities to stimulate thinking along these lines.

Since most work in historiography is of a more traditional kind our actions have been few: one Humanities grant in aid in 1956 to enable Mr. B. H. G. Wormald of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, to survey historiography in Europe, one Social Sciences grant in aid in 1954 to Columbia University for a study of political historiography by Dr. Lee Benson, and a few cases related to our interests in Asia, Africa and Latin America - e.g., help to Latin American historiography through the Comisión de Historia and to the London School of Oriental and African Studies for a conference on Indian history.

World History

The officers in 1950 made their own tentative identification of three areas of historical work in which Foundation help seemed well justified: world history, the broad interpretation of the history of this century, and non-Western history.

Histories of individual countries are not enough to provide the broad vision and orientation which the present world situation - and that for the foreseeable future - demands. We also need a general framework of world history which can help the intelligent layman to see all nations as parts of an interrelated whole. The smaller and the newer nations particularly need the satisfaction of finding a meaningful place for themselves in a larger picture. This is one of the broad, philosophical needs which history should serve. World history has, however, too often been called "philosophy of history"; the term has gained a bad connotation through identification with oversimple attempts to assign a single meaning to human life whether by an eschatology which sees history as meaningless except as rounded out by a day of judgment, the naive belief in progress which was held by the nineteenth century positivists, or the more pessimistic cyclical theory of

Oswald Spengler. We believe that methods of writing world history can be found which are not subject to these objections. If we are correct that world history is needed, the proper answer to the shortcomings of previous efforts is more attempts by competent scholars. It was in this spirit that several grants for Arnold Toynbee's Study of History were recommended. We hoped to be able to support a variety of projects in this field so that various points of view might be represented and the faults of one corrected by the others. Professor Ralph Turner of Yale, in his Great Cultural Traditions, had written an outstanding work on world history in the ancient world and help was recommended and approved for him to attempt to apply a similar approach to the twentieth century. This work has not been completed. We have found no other major opportunities in world history - despite hope that some might develop in the Orient - and the few smaller projects which have been supported, while useful in themselves have not as yet had cumulative results, e.g., grant-in-aid assistance in 1950 for a conference sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies on uniformities in history.

It is important to continue to watch for opportunities in world history but, during the next five years, projects in this field are not likely to constitute financially a substantial part of our Humanities program.

Interpretation of the Twentieth Century

The greater the rate of change in human affairs the more our thinking about the future is influenced by our understanding of the very recent past. Even before the achievement of nuclear fission in World War II it was clear that we are now living in the century of most rapid change in the history of mankind. Of course many of the changes with which we have to learn to live had their origins in the nineteenth century or before. But it is in the twentieth century that they have begun to have a major impact

on human life, and if it is important to know the origins it is even more important to understand the effects. World population has multiplied, power available has been augmented first by electricity and the internal combustion engine and now by nuclear fission. The automobile, the airplane, radio and television have shrunk distances. Undreamed-of new industries have appeared. The Rockefeller Foundation has in its short life itself been closely associated with two of these revolutionary developments - our ability in medicine and public health to have, for the first time in history, a major impact on the incidence of disease and our ability in agriculture to plan an active role in the development of important new plant varieties. Universal education and mass communications, the high-speed press, rapid transportation, telephone, radio and television have brought major changes in culture, politics and administration. Unfortunately our historians, while giving some attention to recent political events and military action, have done less well by most of the topics mentioned above. The dogma that an historian should not attempt to deal with recent events was prevalent a few years ago and is still influential while prejudice against broad interpretive writing is even stronger. While, therefore, many articles and books are published dealing with history in this century, their scope is usually narrow. Attempts in the Free World to provide a more general interpretation of this vastly confusing epoch in which we live are very few. Yet much of our individual malaise and at least part of our collective political uncertainty is due to the lack of adequate interpretative effort in just this field. The appeal throughout the world of the Marxist interpretation of history is due to this need which non-Marxists have not met. What is desirable, of course, is not a competing dogma but enough interpretative efforts by careful historians of varying viewpoints to help the layman find some orientation in this confused period of unprecedented

change and at the same time to keep his mind open to more than one line of potential development. The officers would gladly recommend more appropriations for general historical interpretation of the twentieth century but expect the opportunities to do so to be relatively limited.

One of the most important aspects of the twentieth century is, of course, the rapid development of science. Unfortunately most research and writing on the history of science has been confined to earlier - and simpler - periods and the lack of good specialized studies is one of the factors discouraging the nonspecialist historian from any attempt to include science in writing on the twentieth century. However, there now appears to be growing interest in the study of the history of science during recent decades. One grant (to the University of Indiana) was approved in 1960 and the Humanities officers expect to recommend others in 1961 and the years ahead. The Humanities officers are interested in the development of work in the history of science not only as an aspect of twentieth century history but also because of the key role which this subject can play in relating the humanities and the natural sciences in general education.

Non-Western History

Historians in the West, and the universities which employ them, have been slow to recognize that there is anything important in human history outside the Western tradition. In the 1930's The Rockefeller Foundation undertook to encourage study of the areas of the world neglected in our university curricula, e.g., Russia, China, Japan, India, and Latin America. When, in 1950, the officers in the Humanities listed non-Western history as one of three fields for encouragement, they were only continuing a program in which the Foundation had pioneered, in which we had a reputation, contacts and staff competence, and one the urgency of which had been continually

re-emphasized by the course of world affairs. We estimate that roughly three million dollars, or forty per cent of the help we have given under Humanities to historical work during the last decade has been in this field. In addition there has been substantial help under Social Sciences programs, notably to Russian studies (e.g., the study of Soviet economic growth of the National Bureau of Economic Research) and more recently a variety of projects on the history of economic growth. The rationale of this part of our program was described to the Trustees in my memo on "Widening our Cultural Horizons" in November, 1954, and so the discussion here will be far shorter than the importance of the topic warrants. This has been the most important aspect of our program in history.

A substantial proportion of this aid has been in the form of major grants for area studies programs - Middle Eastern studies at Harvard and Princeton, Islamic studies at McGill University, Southeast Asian studies at Cornell, Northeast Asian studies at the University of Washington, Indian studies at the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin, Asian studies at the Sixième Section in Paris and the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, and East European studies at St. Antony's College, Oxford. Such grants have typically left the receiving institution a large measure of freedom for use of the funds in both the Humanities and the Social Sciences. Although we can only guess at the proportion which has been used for history, there is no one of these programs in which history does not play a substantial part.

Because of this contribution to the West's understanding of Asia, we felt, as we expanded our work overseas, that we were quite justified in encouraging Asian study of America and have done so through grants in Turkey, Ceylon, Free China, and Japan. This experience and the same principle of

filling major gaps in historical attention led the Humanities also to encourage American studies in Europe, e.g., at Munich, Berlin, Salzburg, Cagliari, London, Birmingham, Oxford, Manchester, North Bangor, Aberystwyth and through American studies associations in Great Britain, Germany and Europe as a whole. Finally we have aided for similar reasons Russian studies in Japan, and Japanese studies in the Philippines, Indonesia, and Burma.

While much of this support has been institutional rather than individual, it is important to note that our major grants in area studies have not been project grants, i.e., they have not been for a narrowly defined program of research. While limited to a broad region of the world, they have allowed great freedom to the recipients in the choice of research topics and even disciplines. Nor have they required team research: obviously a large part of the support has indirectly aided the research projects of individual scholars.

We see no reason to believe that the present need for university and scholarly attention to the whole of the world will not be permanent. Since Rockefeller Foundation help will be temporary, our major objective has been to build the new studies into university situations where they can continue to grow. Capital grants have been recommended where appropriate. However, opportunities for sound institutional support have been limited and we have continued to give fellowships to able young scholars entering difficult and time-consuming fields, and smaller grants in aid in support of research or writing. Institutional grants have frequently included funds for library development and we have supported the compilation of a variety of reference books. In fact with very few exceptions all of our grants for library development or the preparation of reference works have been related to this interest in non-Western history. The 1958 grant to Cambridge

University for the Journal of African History, the only grant during this period for support of historical publication, also belongs here.

We welcome opportunities to encourage first-class general interpretative writing on the histories of non-Western countries but such opportunities are few and cannot be forced. A good example is Sir George Sansom, whom we aided in initiating his three-volume history of Japan.

We think this part of our program in history has been sufficiently concentrated to have had important and very useful results. The need is far from being met, however, and, with some modifications, the program should be continued. In view of Ford Foundation activity and the National Defense Education Act support for area studies, some curtailment in our support for the more obvious developments in the United States and a more careful search for the unfilled needs may be in order. We would propose to reduce aid in Europe to either American or Asian and African studies on the assumption that these needs now can and should be met increasingly from European sources of funds. Balancing decreases and increases in emphasis, this work should continue at about the present order of magnitude and should remain the backbone of our program. Only the development of historical writing in the underdeveloped areas themselves should have higher priority.

Other Subjects

The officers never intended that our program in history should end with world history, the twentieth century, and the history of neglected areas. We have from time to time attempted to define other limited objectives but the difficulties of doing so within the flourishing fields of European and American history have led to a ten-year record which may well seem vulnerable to charges of scatteration. Granted the complex field and limited funds,

however, the record is not as confused as it may appear at first sight, either in commission or omission.

American History - Urban

In American history there are two major patterns of recent Rockefeller Foundation action: urban studies and the editing of papers of great political leaders. Prior to this decade the Humanities had supported a number of programs in regional studies of the United States as a means of enriching American history and the new college programs in American studies. The last of this series of actions were taken in 1950 with a grant to the Huntington Library for southwest studies and a grant in aid to the Texas State Historical Society for a "Handbook of Texas." It was not long thereafter that one of the Trustees suggested help to local history. The officers readily agreed that our communities are the foundation of our democratic life and that good local histories might both stimulate citizen interest and add significantly to the understanding of community problems of contemporary importance. Initial examination of American work in local history showed, however, that with very rare exceptions such history emphasized the early, romantic, and picturesque to the neglect of more recent, practical, and problematic aspects. The officers were particularly concerned with urban history because this seemed most neglected (school and college curriculum requirements in many states provide an incentive for writing on state history) and because the metropolis seemed to us to be one of the most pressing problems of modern life for both culture and democracy. We found no history of New York City since 1900, in fact, no substantial history of any major American city covering the twentieth century. Urban history requires resources beyond the means of amateur scholars but has been neglected by the departments of history of our colleges and universities (partly because of curricular

emphasis on standard courses on national history). The officers concluded that if opportunities occurred, it would be worthwhile to encourage two or three pilot histories of major cities which would be carried into the mid-twentieth century and which would be oriented to some of the major problems facing our cities today. If at the same time we could engage the lasting interest of two or three universities in the history of the cities in which they are located, such a limited Foundation program might by the example of the work itself and by institutional commitment prepare the way for a healthier development of work in urban history in the United States.

Projects were recommended to the Trustees for work on New York City, Washington, D. C., and Kansas City. The plan of the College of the City of New York was not solely for history but rather for a graduate program on metropolitan New York including politics, economics, literature and art as well as history. While the officers did not recommend a second grant the New York studies program at the City College continues on a modest scale having enlisted both faculty interest and some other sources of support. Two grants (\$46,000 in 1954 and \$26,000 in 1958) were made to the American University for Mrs. Constance Green's major history of Washington, D. C. The cost of this undertaking was increased both by the discovery of more source materials and problems than anticipated and by the acceptance by Mrs. Green and the officers of the advice of a distinguished advisory committee of historians that she should start with the founding of Washington rather than with the post-Civil War period as she had originally planned. This work is now nearing completion and in the meantime the American University has found financing elsewhere for a broader and continuing study of the problems of metropolitan Washington. The history of Kansas City was begun at the University of Chicago by Dr. Richard Wohl, interrupted by his sudden death, and continued at the

University of Kansas City by Wohl's collaborator, Dr. A. T. Brown (\$64,500 to the University of Chicago and \$46,500 to the University of Kansas City). In the meantime the redevelopment of Kansas City has increased local interest and support and the University proposes to make the continuation of work on Kansas City history a part of its ongoing program.

The officers never contemplated a large number of such projects. The history of Washington or Kansas City can throw some light on the contemporary problems of other major cities, but there is no escaping the need for each city to have its own history. All the Foundation can do is to provide a few models suggesting both how significant histories can be written and how such work can be made an integral and permanent part of the academic program of local institutions. This we shall have done if the Washington, D. C., and Kansas City histories turn out well. We should now like to leave the way open for only occasional local historical projects where these appear highly useful in connection with the work in urban design, which is becoming a more active part of Humanities program.

American History - Collection of Papers

The second principal category of aid to American history during this decade was for the editing of definitive editions of the papers of distinguished statesmen. Grants were made to Columbia University for the Hamilton papers (\$90,000), to the University of Chicago for the Madison papers (\$150,000), to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation for the Wilson papers (\$150,000)¹, and to Columbia University for the Jay papers (\$15,000)². In the 1940's we had similarly aided the editing of the Lincoln papers. It is fitting that national leaders should be so remembered. Where their

1 Jointly by Social Sciences and Humanities.

2 By Social Sciences.

contribution to American institutions and political thought has been substantial and an important segment of their writings is not otherwise readily available to scholars, publication may also make a valuable contribution to contemporary thought. In 1954 The National Historic Publications Commission, reporting to President Eisenhower, recommended the publication of the papers of 361 outstanding Americans. The first five on their list - Franklin, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton - have now been provided for, two with Rockefeller Foundation assistance. Future cases will have to be decided on their merits but with the most important projects already financed we anticipate that this will be a declining element in our program during the next few years.

Biography and European History

These two topics, otherwise unrelated, are discussed together here as examples of past lines of action which had a reasonable programmatic purpose and which resulted in useful studies but which we now think should not be pursued further.

We have already suggested that where, as in Japan, biography is neglected, it should be encouraged. But in the United States and generally in the West it is in good supply. It is a valuable form of history appealing to an unusually intelligent and important group of readers, but there is no shortage of writing for this market. (One of our Japanese visitors, concerned about Japan's shortage of biographies, commented that in the United States we appear to write biographies not only of all the important people but of many unimportant people as well.) Our aid to biographical writing during the last decade falls into two patterns. First there are a number of cases in which biographies were aided as means to further other agreed program interests: biographies of Premier Tojo, Lafcadio Hearn, and

Robert de Nobili (first Jesuit missionary to write extensively about South India) in relation to Asian history and biographies of J. M. Synge and Charles S. Peirce in relation to our interests in contemporary literature and philosophy. Such projects should also be entertained in the future but should be justified in relation to other major program headings rather than as biography per se. Second, and far more important financially during this period, was Foundation assistance for biographies of Mackenzie King, John Alexander Macdonald of Canada, Booker T. Washington, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Lafayette, where the relation to other program interests than encouragement of biography as a genre was not clear. Each of these projects had its justification but we suggest that aid for work of this sort in the West can now properly be curtailed.

During these ten years there have been only about a score of grants and grants in aid for work on European history. There is only one important grouping of actions - a series on the very recent history of Germany designed to keep the excesses of the Hitler period in focus in Germany and abroad. The most important of these have been the grants to the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich (\$38,000), but related are a grant to the New School in New York for the history of religion in Germany in the postwar period and grants in aid for work by Herzfeld on German militarism, by Koehl on the SS Corps and by Viereck on recent German cultural history. Our help to St. Antony's College at Oxford while primarily for East European studies has also by intent strengthened work on Europe as a whole since we found European history surprisingly neglected in Great Britain. Aid to the Italian Institute of Historical Studies in Naples was recommended as the best available means of stimulating non-Fascist non-Marxist historical research and training in the postwar period in Italy.

The situation has changed since this line of historical work in or on Europe was initiated in the immediate postwar years. European institutions are back on their feet, Europe is on the whole prosperous, and The Rockefeller Foundation is turning its interest increasingly to Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It now seems proper not to attempt any systematic development of aid to work in European history. Such work is well represented in American faculties and in Europe should find European sources of help. Two exceptions at least should be made, however. One is work on Eastern Europe and the USSR where the help and cooperation of Western European scholars may be urgently needed if in the Free World we are to understand adequately the problems facing us in our relations with the Communist bloc. The second necessary exception may be work on the development of Socialist and Communist thought and the rewriting of recent history to take the Labor and Socialist movements, of which Communism is only a part, into more adequate consideration. These two exceptions can, however, be handled under our more general interests in non-Western history and twentieth century history without recourse to a special heading for Europe.

Applied History

While much of the value of history lies in its contribution to general education many kinds of history have much more specific uses: we read them because we want to learn how to meet fairly specific present or expected problems. In this sense historical research may be relevant to other phases of our Humanities program in art, music, literature, and philosophy. In these fields our primary intent has been to promote vigorous and high quality current work, i.e., our principal concern has been for philosophy, not history of philosophy, and for music, not history of music. This does not mean that the history of these arts does not have a place.

But we have assumed that such history was, on the whole, fairly well cared for - after all, many departments of philosophy offer little more than history of philosophy, and many departments of art nothing but art history. We have, therefore, tried to sort out only a few historical projects which seemed eminently timely as part of a major effort toward contemporary creative work. Thus in philosophy we have aided work on the papers of de Tocqueville, Bentham, Wittgenstein, Peirce, and Moore, and a biography of Peirce. In each case there was good reason to believe that aside from historical interest the work supported had something unusual to offer in the way of stimulus for contemporary philosophical thought. The other actions, mostly grants in aid, are more scattered yet are closely related to other Humanities interests in the arts: Una Johnson's history of prints in the twentieth century to our encouragement of printmaking in this country and in Asia, Lillian Moore's history of dance in the American theatre to our efforts to find a healthy base for dance performance and choreography, Paul Lang's social history of music to our concern with the role of music in contemporary society. This type of grant is properly judged for its value as an adjunct to the program to which it is related.

For many other types of applied history the purposes lie outside the Humanities; frequently the link is with the Social Sciences and here the interests of the two programs overlap. While the Humanities have aided selected work on the history of philosophy Social Sciences have had a series of grants and grants in aid for historical work relevant to political, legal, diplomatic and economic thought. A number of Humanities projects are relevant here also: several grants for work on the development of parliamentary institutions and the editing of the Madison papers, for example. Humanities and Social Sciences have come closest, however, in the field of diplomatic

history and foreign relations with the majority of grants being made under Social Sciences sponsorship: the Woodrow Wilson papers (joint Social Sciences and Humanities), research by George F. Kennan (Social Sciences), British-Soviet-American relations from 1940-1947 by Dr. Herbert Feis at Columbia (Social Sciences), research on American foreign policy at Notre Dame (Social Sciences), a study of Woodrow Wilson's neutrality policy (Humanities), and the development at the Truman Library of research facilities on foreign policy making (Humanities).

In fields such as this a closer working relationship between Social Sciences and Humanities, particularly a more thorough analysis both of the problems to be faced and the relevant areas of history, might lead to more significant results and justify expanded activity.

Auxiliary Sciences and Techniques

In Humanities we have not in general been active in improvement of techniques of historical research whether in such old-line subjects as paleography, sigillography, numismatics and epigraphy or in application of new technologies such as carbon-14 dating (under general program, however, \$42,500 was appropriated to Yale University for the development of a carbon-14 laboratory in 1950), glottochronology, mine-detector-like devices for locating underground sites, the determination of origins of artifacts by reference to terrestrial magnetism, or elaborate schemes for the classification of pottery (though we made a grant in aid for exploration of the latter before backing away from larger support). Our reluctance has been in part due to cost and to doubts as to whether Foundation help was really needed, but more basically to a feeling that such techniques contribute only remotely to the kinds of history which are now most urgently needed. Exceptions would be justified

where the contribution is more direct as in the case of techniques for the critical use of oral tradition in connection with fairly recent African history.

General Education

Five of Humanities grants - one to MIT, two to Robert College, one to the University of Veracruz and one to the University of Nuevo León - involve aid to general education programs in which history plays a substantial part. General education remains one of the most important humanities functions and under similar circumstances additional grants of this sort should be recommended, particularly in the underdeveloped areas. In the United States the circumstances would have to be very unusual, as they were in the case of MIT.

Archaeology, Monuments, Manuscripts

Three kinds of problems have troubled us during this period because they occur most frequently in our areas of special interest - Asia, Africa, and Latin America - and are related at least indirectly to our concerns with art, world history, and the history of the non-Western areas and because they are at the same time of an order of magnitude with which it has not seemed practicable to deal systematically within our normal budgets. The three problems are archaeological excavation, the restoration and preservation of monuments, and the collection, caretaking and duplicating of unique collections of manuscripts and documents.

The Rockefeller Foundation spent very substantial funds in archaeology in the 1920's, notably in connection with the work of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. This interest in archaeology was terminated as a result of the Trustee report on program in 1934 although for a variety of reasons some activity continued into the 1950's in

connection with the excavations of the Agora in Athens and the restoration of the Stoa of Attalos there. New activities during the last ten years have been only two grants in aid, one a travel grant for an Egyptian archaeologist which seemed expedient in connection with wider Foundation interests in Egypt and the other in 1956 toward preliminary work of the University of Pennsylvania in connection with the excavation and restoration of Tikal, Guatemala. Recently requests for general support for excavations in the Nubian Desert area of Egypt and the Sudan to be flooded by the Assuan high dam have been declined. It would not be difficult to spend a million dollars a year for archaeology - and if allocated carefully this amount might have important results (the officers for practical purposes would give high priority to Middle America) - but it is difficult to plan a small program or to justify one or two exceptions in the face of many needs.

Above the Assuan Dam, the Abu Simbel temple will soon be inundated unless a fifty million dollar coffer dam is built. The great Pagan temple complex in Burma, less well-known than Angkor Wat or Borobodur, requires study, restoration and care; the old Christian churches in Turkey need major cleaning and reconstruction if their architecture and their mosaics and sculpture are to be preserved and appreciated; millions could be spent with little trouble on worthy projects of this sort. There are others in many parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. During this decade we have stayed out of reconstruction except for two grants, one toward restoration of the Kahriyeh Djami chapel in Istanbul and one for research in connection with the restoration work at Sleepy Hollow, New York, and one fellowship to a young Brazilian who has set new standards for restoration work in his country.

There now exists, in a single reasonably complete copy preserved in the library of Seoul National University, the manuscript record of the Korean Court prepared daily during nearly five hundred years of the Li Dynasty. This set almost miraculously escaped the hazards of a leaky roof and use of the library as an American barracks during the early days of U.S. occupation of Korea, two Communist invasions and two UN counterattacks. Will it survive the next such occasion? Microfilming has been repeatedly proposed and might be accomplished for something in the order of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Near Taichung, Formosa, in rough warehouses which keep off the rain but are neither fireproof nor air conditioned, some four thousand packing cases containing the cream of China's art and rare books are stored. An air-conditioned tunnel nearby could house some seven hundred cases if the international situation should worsen. One or two bombs could destroy the rest as could an accidental fire. In the meantime even the devoted care of a skeleton staff which lacks means and facilities cannot prevent deterioration in the humid climate of Formosa. Again microfilming has been proposed and again the cost would be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Adequate housing would be even more costly. In a park in Kumamoto City in southern Japan is a wood and plaster warehouse built in feudal days. It houses, subject to the hazards of fire and insects, a hundred and ten thousand volumes of manuscript records of the Hosokawa clan covering the period roughly from 1650 to 1867. This is perhaps the most important untapped source on the political and economic history of Japanese feudalism. Approximately one hundred thousand dollars has been requested of The Rockefeller Foundation to enable Kumamoto University to acquire, organize, and study this Hosokawa archive. There are many other less spectacular cases of this sort. The officers have not hesitated to recommend

modest help for microfilming of manuscripts and documents where this has been related to other program interests as, for example, help to the University College of the West Indies for the microfilming of historical archives in the various West Indian islands. Modest aid has also been given for the training of Latin American archivists. We are still exploring the possibility of a cooperative microfilm laboratory in Formosa which might draw resources from the various Western institutions interested in Chinese studies for the gradual microfilming of important holdings in Taiwan while at the same time meeting part of Free China's needs for scholarly materials from the West.

We suggest that this modest approach in the document field be applied also to archaeology and monuments. We should limit activity in any of these three fields to Asia, Africa, and Latin America, avoid major commitments for archaeological excavation, restoration, or indiscriminate microfilming, but attempt through fellowships, grants in aid and modest grants to build up the capacity of these countries to handle their own problems in these fields. In some cases, particularly in Latin America and Africa, relatively small-scale support for archaeological work may be justified in connection with the development of national or comparative history. This modest approach to these three fields should be feasible within present Humanities budget limitations as a major approach to any one of them would not be.

Exceptions

Every Foundation program must leave some room for exceptions which I would define here as grants made because of extraordinary competence on the part of the recipient, or because of the extraordinary interest or importance of the subject but in a field in which the Foundation makes no effort to maintain a systematic interest. If exceptions are too numerous the program loses coherence and impact, but to make none would imply rigidity

of outlook and make difficult the opening of new and perhaps promising lines of work.

Among the distinguished historians we have aided on an exceptional basis during the last decade are Professor Lawrence H. Gipson of Lehigh University whose eleven-volume history of the British Empire in the few years preceding the American Revolution is now nearly completed; Professor Louis Gottschalk of the University of Chicago who is working on a multivolume biography of Lafayette; the distinguished Polish emigré, Stanislas Kot, who is writing a history of the Reformation in Eastern Europe; and Professor Elie Denissoff of Notre Dame for his studies of Maxime le Grec (a religious leader who brought the influence of the Italian Renaissance to Russia). Three younger scholars were aided for the originality of their approaches to history: Marshall W. Fishwick for his studies of American folk heroes; Professor Eric McKittrick, now of Columbia University; and Professor Stanley Elkins of Smith College for their efforts at social science and problem-oriented studies of the history of the United States in the nineteenth century.

Subject-matter exceptions include a study of arid zone life in antiquity by Professor Philip Mayerson of New York University which was accepted as relevant to other Foundation interests in agriculture and the Near East; a study of religion in Canadian history by Professor H. H. Walsh (Canada is hardly underdeveloped but its history is grossly neglected in the United States); and fascinating work by Professor Abraham Sachs of Brown University in the classification and dating - from astronomical notations - of cuneiform tablets in the British Museum.

Summary

During the last ten years history has received much attention in The Rockefeller Foundation and the officers have made persistent efforts to develop a rationale and consistent patterns of action for this very large and complicated field.

The Humanities officers do not recommend the allocation to history of a larger share of present Humanities budgets at the cost of our other activities in the arts, philosophy, urban design, and intercultural studies. We have suggested above expansion of interest in the recent history of science, in cooperative development with Social Sciences of historical studies closely related to present problems of government and international affairs, and in a wide range of historical work in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These increases can, however, be balanced by reductions in other fields such as biography, urban history, and the editing of the papers of American statesmen to leave the over-all allocation of funds for history little changed.

The emphasis chosen ten years ago on world history, twentieth century history, and the histories of areas heretofore unduly neglected in our university programs seems still valid. In line with the growing interest throughout the Foundation on Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we would like above all to increase the contribution of history to the national and democratic development of the nations of these areas.

Charles B. Fahs

November 16, 1960