

China Program

copy filed: 601
Ptp

0.601
Rural reconstruction

After consideration of the report of the Appraisal Committee on the proposed program in China, the Trustees approved in principle the program presented for China in Mr. Gunn's report, with the understanding that this may involve the expenditure of up to \$1,000,000 in the course of three years and further that items will be presented to the Trustees or to the Executive Committee for approval in detail.

ADJOURNED 1:30 P.M.

NORMA S. THOMPSON

Secretary

From report of

105

Committee on Appraisal and Plan (DR 486)

Approved at Trustees' Meeting

Dec 21, 1934

SECTION VII.

copy filed

601

P+P

MR. GUNN'S PROGRAM FOR CHINA

At the last meeting of the Foundation, Mr. Gunn, vice-president in the Far East, presented an interesting report on the modification and extension of our program in China. The report was tentatively adopted, but was referred for further consideration to the Committee on Appraisal and Plan. Mr. Gunn pointed out that the existing program in China is no longer in touch with the times or with the best that we could find to do. He urged the close correlation of our medical work with public health and the integration of these two activities with national reconstruction. He recommended a greater emphasis on national universities rather than on mission colleges. He particularly urged a program of rural reconstruction, and suggested, finally, the correlation of these activities in the Shanghai office.

That Mr. Gunn's program represents a realistic approach to present difficulties in China there can be little question. There can be little question, too, not only of the great need in China today but of the wide open opportunity for the constructive type of work which Mr. Gunn recommends. In her evolution into a modern state, China is bound by few hampering traditions, and the plastic condition of her life and institutions at the present moment is an inviting challenge to a positive kind of service. Indeed there is a sense in which China might become a vast laboratory in the social sciences, with implications that would be international in scope. Finally it may be said that this suggested program of Mr. Gunn's helps to conserve and revivify the work that has already

been done through the Peking Union Medical College. It ties it more intimately to the life of China.

All this is on the positive side. There are other considerations, however, which, we believe, should be taken into account. Mr. Gunn estimates an annual budget of \$300,000, a modest sum compared to the possible scope of his proposed program. A plan aimed at raising the educational, social, and economic standards of rural China would, if it were undertaken at all, have to be adequately financed, and the Trustees of the Foundation must be prepared for an undertaking of no small proportions. This relates not only to the element of money, but to the element of time. Mr. Gunn's program is one to which no time limitations can easily be set. If we embark, we embark for the voyage, and we must contemplate a trip of considerable duration if any significant contribution is really to be made. Your committee does not by any means say that this is a conclusive argument against the project. It is a factor, however, that should be weighed.

Another question deserving consideration is whether we are to have two programs in China - one headed up in Peking and the other in Shanghai. What relationship, if any, is there to be between these two programs? It would seem to your committee that some kind of integration, or at least a carefully matured understanding, would be desirable and necessary if some degree of uncertainty and perhaps confusion is to be avoided.

Another query that presents itself is the relationship of the International Health Division to Mr. Gunn's program. Insofar as it involves public health, the program would seem to contemplate an approach and a technique differing from those customarily employed by the International Health Division.

Are we to have two techniques in public health - one for the rest of the world and one for China? There may be excellent reason for two techniques, but the matter is not clear in the minds of your committee.

A final consideration in relation to this proposal relates to the broad question of the size of our support to China. Since 1913 the Foundation has spent over \$37,000,000 in China. It is by far the largest sum that has been spent in any country outside the United States. The fifteen countries which have absorbed the greater part of the Foundation's contribution are, in order of magnitude of expenditures, as follows:

United States	\$117,208,233
China	37,481,104
Great Britain	14,346,068
Canada	7,375,807
Belgium	5,724,828
Brazil	5,499,634
France	5,128,162
Germany	2,701,600
Italy	1,510,336
Syria	1,367,872
Czechoslovakia	1,330,798
Poland	1,306,266
Turkey	1,143,192
Japan	1,109,197
Denmark	996,328

The question that confronts us, therefore, is whether China's needs and opportunities are so great as to justify us in expending in that country still further amounts. Or to put the matter in another way, is the welfare of mankind best served by enlarging our investment in China? Is China the outstanding strategic point in which we ought to push our attack? Is there no other sector of the world where we can hope to obtain as large a return in human happiness and welfare as we can in China.

Your committee is making no recommendation on this point. This is properly a matter for discussion and decision by the entire Board of Trustees.

We would point, however, to the possibilities that lie in a country like Mexico, for example, where the Foundation has made relatively little expenditure. The South American countries likewise present an inviting field. India is another conceivable opportunity. We are not arguing for India or South America or Mexico as against China. These areas are merely mentioned by way of balance and contrast so that the Trustees may have the opportunity of weighing Mr. Gunn's proposal in terms of present need and past expenditure.