

Table of Contents

	Page
B Ruml memo (undated)	1
* LB Dunham letter (12/28/26)	4
* RC Bertheau memo (12/31/26)	13
* JRM Butler memo (12/31/26)	14
* LK Frank memo (1/11/27)	31
* GS Ford letter (1/25/27)	37
* FB Stubbs memo (2/17/27)	50
* SH Walker letter (2/23/27)	55

NOTES ON MEMORIAL ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

by

Beardsley Ruml

From the standpoint of field and program:

- A. Social science. A very fruitful field. Must be extended to include anthropology and ethnology more completely in view of Rockefeller Foundation change. Methods to date satisfactory for preliminary steps, but entirely inadequate for future. Large endowments must be provided at strategic centers. Fellowship area must be extended. More attention to undergraduate instruction and more attention to secondary curriculum, unless General Education Board assumes this. General policies proving effective. Surprising lack of public attack or public interest.
- B. Social technology. Schools of social work good strategy but limited. Must cover public administration, especially state and municipal. Professional training and demonstrations. Must proceed with extreme caution. Safest point of contact probably public care of dependency. Relates closely to criminology. Also to race relations.
- Schools of business. Be prepared to strike hard at first real opportunity. An extremely strategic point. Schools of law should be studied. In these fields, both research and professional instruction worth attention in view of social consequences. Some day journalism.
- C. Child study and parent education. A fundamental and very pervasive attack on child welfare. Research should be liberally developed at a few centers. Training of leadership, personnel. Variety of experiments in administration of parent education. Large public interest increases Memorial opportunity and responsibility.

-2-

- D. Race relations. Emphasis on American negro. Memorial's concern primarily threefold. (1) Research on social aspects, (2) Professional education in social work, business and law, (3) Outstanding ameliorative activities. Future program should emphasize (1) and (2). Fisk action very important. Continue present emphasis on American negro.
- E. Criminology. A branch of social science and social technology. Present emphasis due to public importance. Should not be conceived permanently apart. Valuable emphasis for realistic integration of science, technology and common practices.
- F. Contributions to miscellaneous organizations for welfare work should be discontinued in line with present policy. Policy should not preclude occasional miscellaneous contribution, e.g. university presses, American-Scandinavian Foundation.

Organization:

Staff. No rigid division of field. No subsidiary sections. Titles only for administrative relations with outside. Highly centralized responsibility and control in Director. Results in extreme mobility; perhaps excessive responsibility in Director. Seems to work for time being. High grade secretarial assistance. Policy of other Boards a handicap on salaries.

Board. Small number advantageous. Weak in scientific background. Executive Committee extremely mobile and effective. Considering intimacy and interest Executive Committee holds to its proper function admirably. Finance Committee organization weak. Missing biggest uncultivated field. Doubtful Director a member would help, but change in policy and method sadly needed.

Trustee Committees of Review. Temporary. Every three years.

-3-

Fiscal Policy. Short distance from major issue on restriction of field or liquidation through appropriations of principal. Advisable for reorganization committee to work through this issue. Favor liquidation personally. Cannot be very rapid at best.

THE LAURA SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL

December 28, 1926

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York City

Dear Mr. Fosdick:

In compliance with your letter of December 14th I am herewith submitting some suggestions that might be considered in connection with making plans for the Memorial's operation and future. Kindly consider them as described, namely, suggestions for consideration. Had I been aware of specific recommendations that should be made I would of course have submitted them from time to time to Dr. Ruml.

The first paragraph of your letter refers to administrative machinery. It seems to me that in considering this item it should be noted that the Memorial has given much thought to this phase of the situation during the past year. The problem to be met was an exceedingly difficult one and consisted of endeavoring to devise a system that would keep tabs on the development of research work and of the results obtained from donations made by the Memorial. The very nature of research work makes such an undertaking a very difficult one. In endeavoring to meet the situation Dr. Ruml appointed a committee of which I was chairman, and we were not successful in developing an effective plan which was acceptable to all of the members of the staff. Thereafter another committee was appointed by Dr. Ruml of which Mr. Outhwaite was the chairman, and their report with recommendations was adopted and is now being put in operation. Admitting that proof of any pudding lies in the eating, nevertheless, I believe that the Outhwaite plan is a very promising one and if properly carried out will unquestionably prove very beneficial.

I think a letter of inquiry of this nature is an excellent thing and leads to a sharper and more critical examination of our work which is good for all of us. It also indicates the mutual advantages that would follow from more frequent contact between the staff members and the officers and trustees. The docket items should not form the only connecting link. These items represent conclusions, but lots of times when we have ideas in process of development, and no doubt the same is true of the officers and trustees, it would be helpful occasionally to discuss them.

With regard to the inter-relations between the various Rockefeller foundations, I would suggest that it would be helpful to have a loose-leaf booklet compiled which would state briefly the names of the members of the various organizations and the particular field of endeavor.

As a result of a little over a year's participation in the Memorial's work, I find myself faced with two outstanding conclusions: First, that to obtain the results that should be obtained from the use of these unprecedented foundations, or in other words, to make them accomplish the intentions of their donors is a task of extraordinary difficulty. Second, that while the functions of the trustees and officers are of vital importance, it is probable that in the long run the success or failure of the undertaking will depend primarily on the initiative, character and all-round ability of the operating staffs. It is inevitable that in at least nine times out of ten the trustees will see the problem through the eyes of the staff. The Trustees have the power to donate either the interest or the principal sum of the endowments. Unless they are prepared to take such steps as may be necessary to maintain the staff's ability at as high or higher point than can be found elsewhere, it would seem that the trustees should give serious consideration to the distribution of the principal. At all events, consideration must be given to the maintenance of the personnel of the various staffs on a very high plane.

The nature of the work to be done, and the pleasant surroundings tend to make it easier to secure such a staff. However, unless a proper compensation is paid, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain standards. It is not suggested that the rate of compensation should equal that in many commercial lines, but if the problem is not solved on that basis it should be solved on the basis of consideration of what are the reasonable requirements of members of the staff living in New York City. Let us presume, for the sake of argument, that the trustees believe that a member of the staff should receive sufficient pay to enable him to marry, live modestly in a decent neighborhood, maintain a family and educate the children, and have enough left over for some reasonable recreation and travel and meet extraordinary doctors' bills in case of unusual illness and to provide a competency for old age. I am trying to picture an existence with some leeway for a cultural background. It may be that that is now being done. As far as I know, there has never been any thorough investigation and consideration of the controlling factors from which to draw a conclusion. I have heard it stated that in a general way the salaries are believed to correspond with those of professors in a university. I personally doubt if that is a proper yard stick to measure by because the proper fulfillment of a staff position requires not only study and training but a larger measure of administrative ability than is required of a professor. And in addition, a wider social life and the maintenance of more contacts with people of large affairs is necessary than for a professor. However, considering the problem for the moment as being on a parity with that of the case of a professor, we find heads of departments receiving an equal or greater salary than staff members and living in small university towns where not only the general living scale is very substantially less than in New York, but the social demands are regulated by the university faculties in the same manner that occurs in an army post.

In the case of the secretariat, equally careful consideration seems to me to be demanded but from a somewhat different approach. At the present time the secretariat does not receive salaries equal to those paid in commercial houses, law offices and banking institutions in this neighborhood. As in the case of the staff, there are some compensating factors. As I see the situation, the most important one is the possibility of advancement beyond a fixed level. I doubt if we have this thought sufficiently in mind. The training received at least in the Memorial is broad in scope and rather unique in character. It should be an important factor in fitting the members of the secretariat for positions of responsibility in state and private institutions carrying on social welfare work and in the universities, and of course from time to time to advancement within our own organization. I think the trustees and officers and members of the staff could be more largely helpful in this regard.

In considering the scope and specific plans for the Memorial's work, it is interesting to note in passing that while our governing body is termed Board of Trustees, they are actually directors of a corporation and function as such rather than as trustees acting under a definite deed of trust. I realize that the terms "directors" and "trustees" are interchangeable, but they have acquired a different meaning in general speech. Now the result of this is that the Memorial is left singularly free to develop as may seem best from time to time. This fact is indicated by noting that while we are incorporated as a charitable organization, our work at the present time is largely in the field of education. On the other hand, we have not the clearly outlined policy and general direction that would have resulted from a definite deed of trust, and it follows that the burden of supplying such direction is placed on the trustees.

The preponderance of the work of the Memorial is in the field of the social sciences and considerable care has evidently been taken to indicate in a general way the course that should be pursued. The original memorandum on this subject prepared by Messrs. Buttrick, Vincent, Rose and Abraham Flexner has been somewhat revised and presumably will be subject to further investigation in the future as knowledge is acquired by experience. The revised memorandum sets forth some twelve points. Paragraph 5 is of major importance, and in my judgment should receive critical consideration. It reads as follows:

"Not to attempt to influence the findings or conclusions of research and investigations through the designation of either personnel, specific problems to be attacked, or methods of inquiry to be adopted; or through indirect influence in giving inadequate assurances of continuity of support."

Part of this seems to me splendid and part of it doubtful. It seems to me tremendously to the credit of the Memorial that it has so carefully refrained from attempting to influence the findings or conclusions of research and investigations through the method in which support is given or otherwise. The rest of the paragraph should be considered in the light of the apparent line of development of the Memorial's work. Presumably when the field of the social sciences was first entered, considerable number of lines of activity was submitted in widely different fields. To a large extent they were apparently accepted or rejected on the basis of their individual value. As time went on it was inevitable, if the Memorial was to be effective, that it could not be spread out too thin. And while the Memorial was maintained in the situation that would permit of the taking on of new and valuable projects, it became increasingly identified with certain large endeavors and fields of activity. From this point, as we look ahead, it seems certain that we cannot rely on chance for the proper development of the fields. To an increasing degree it will

probably be necessary to specify problems to be attacked and to endeavor to ascertain and designate the most highly trained and generally competent personnel to carry on the work. There is no reason why this cannot be done in a scientific manner and without influencing conclusions or findings.

Organizations such as these are apt to become very timid. The suggestion of a project causes shudders and if the problem to be studied through the project is one which is of every day importance at the present time in regard to which there is sharp conflict of public opinion, it is only human to be tempted to pass it by and to make some undertaking in China, Egypt, or the heart of Africa, or some other place so far distant that the clashes of public opinion will not reach us here. The donors of these funds have been so careful not to unduly circumscribe the fields of activity that it is sometimes hard to know just what they had in mind. But presumably they intended to make the present world at the present time a better place to live in by endeavoring to take some of the sand out of the gear box. If we are going to do that we must do it with the knowledge that some of the undertakings will not come out the way we want them to and sometimes we will be subject to very considerable criticism. Along this same line, it might perhaps be beneficial if we could make a rough cash forecast and budget under the terms of which a certain percentage of the income would go to pure research and a certain percentage to the study of pressing problems of the day.

Of course, in our work in the social sciences we claim to be developing a considerable number of ideas that will have an important effect on the conduct of industry in this country. If these ideas, or a substantial part of them, may be good we ought to apply them ourselves as well as handing them on to someone else. We have enormous funds at our disposal and they have power both ways - that is, not only in the way in

which they are expended but through control of the source from which they come. If we do not make full use of them we are like a bird trying to fly with one wing. By way of specific example, the press advises that next spring we are threatened with an enormous strike in the bituminous coal fields. It is my understanding that the Memorial is a large stockholder in companies having interests in these fields. As far as I know, there is no member of the staff of the Memorial who is familiar with the facts in the coal fields, who has any idea as to whether there should or should not be a strike, and whether or not the conditions are as they should be. During the last few years people at large in this country, and the government itself, have been greatly interested in investigations of certain phases of the conduct of the oil business. Grave charges were made, but it was difficult to get at the facts because a number of the officers of some of the large oil companies in which doubtless the Memorial or some of the other foundations are large if not controlling factors absented themselves from the country. With a wide diffusion of the stock of the large corporations, comparatively small blocks may become, and frequently do become, controlling factors. If Justice Brandeis' statement that there is no such thing as an innocent stockholder is correct, these are matters that should receive earliest consideration since they affect not only the case in point but the nation's attitude toward these great trusts.

While it is of course right and proper that the funds should be liberally disbursed without regard to race, creed or color, it would seem proper to have in mind two qualifications, namely, (a) that if the scientists are right certain stocks are capable of far greater advancement than others. Would it not be wise to see that some funds are given with the idea that they reach certain stocks rather than given for problems?

(b) We should be careful to see that the institutions to which we contribute are actually using their funds without regard to race, creed or color when they purport to do so? I have in mind two large charitable organizations which admittedly are giving somewhere from 75 to 90% of their resources to the members of one creed and are giving practically nothing to another creed making up a very large percentage of the population of New York City and by official figures make up over 50% of the population of the great borough of the Bronx.

With regard to the selection and handling of our fellowship men, particularly from foreign countries, there seems to me substantial room for improvement, but as this is a matter that is being intensively studied at the present time it does not seem necessary to go into it.

With regard to problems in the social sciences relating to man's relation to man and man's relation to his government, there are four factors that seem to me of importance that are not receiving sufficient consideration. The first of these is character building in the universities. It is going to be a long time before the millenium arrives in this world, and people are much happier when they feel sure that their employers and their government are trying to give them the well-known square deal. That can only be done from having employers and governments made up of men who have been trained with this thought. To my mind it would have a larger effect than the actual number of hours of work, amount of wages or living conditions, important as all these problems are, because if the will is there these things will result from it.

Second, and this is a suggestion that I know cannot be acted on in this country, is the question of politeness. I think one of the most irritating things about living in New York is the too frequent absence of politeness on the part of the public. Anyone who feels that we have a good form of social adjustment here should take a ride in the subway, but its

application is a great deal wider than that.

Third, and this relates back to the first suggestion, the country is undoubtedly suffering as a result of growing breakdown of formerly accepted religious tenets. This is not rapidly enough being replaced by a new religion or even a new moral code. It would be interesting and perhaps fruitful to have some investigations made in this field, quietly and among the non-church going population. Materialism cannot be the answer to everything.

Lastly, how are we going to correct some of the bad effects of the apparently inevitable integration of industry? Is it not necessary to develop means that will perpetuate initiative, individuality and self confidence in the population when the time comes that we are practically all employees? Possibly this is a problem so important to the commercial life of the country that we may safely rely on the heads of the great industries to work it out themselves. I am sure I do not know, but would like to feel that the trustees had the matter under consideration.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Lawrence B. Dunham

December 31, 1926

Memorandum on personal observations relating to the effectiveness of our work.

During the period that I have been with the Memorial its activities and its staff have steadily expanded. Due to this expansion, together with the increasing insight that I was getting into the field and methods of foundation work, largely through the guidance and assistance of the Director and my other associates, questions necessarily arose in my own mind from time to time relating to all the various phases of the work, including the administrative machinery.

Many of these questions answered themselves as time went on but the most decided progress in clarifying my concept of the administration, of my work, and of my relations with my associates, probably because the time had become generally ripe for it, has been made during the past five months.

The staff meetings at Hanover last August conducted by the Director, the Report of Committee #2 and the subsequent observances of its findings, and finally the gathering at Colonel Woods' home to meet the Trustees and the Officers of the Memorial have altogether left little doubt as to what the individual functions of staff members should be.

Probably one of the most important phases of the work which seems to be extremely helpful to all staff members is that we keep as much as possible abreast with the Board's point of view regarding the major projects and tendencies as they change or develop from time to time. The actions taken by the Board reveal these viewpoints to a certain extent at the time they are taken. Past actions over longer periods, show trends, as do, of course, entirely new projects which are acted upon favorably, but it seems

essential that our conception of the Board's viewpoint always be as accurate and up to date as it can be.

Then there is, on my part, a decided desire for informal and very natural contact with those engaged in the same phases of foundation work as I am engaged in. In business, for instance, bankers like to mingle with bankers - it helps them - so I should like to meet with foundation people, informally, and more frequently than I do.

For instance, Mr. Lynd and Mr. Lytell of the Commonwealth Fund recently asked Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Frank and myself to lunch for an informal talk on the handling of the scholars. In that particular instance it seemed to me that we were probably able to give them a little more in the way of ideas for possible improvement in some directions than they gave us, but it was worthwhile all around, nevertheless. At another time this particular circumstance might be reversed, and one remark might count for a great deal.

Our contacts on the whole are necessarily quite reserved and I feel that it would be a distinct advantage for our general outlook to meet as many individuals as we can, with whom we may have an unrestricted general interchange of ideas and attitudes apart from specific subjects.

Whether more contacts with members of the staffs of foundations other than the Rockefeller foundations would be advisable, may involve considerations with which I am not familiar, but the members of the staffs of the Rockefeller foundations have the common ground of what might be called a family relationship, and therefore need have no restrictions among themselves. With the feeling of restraint removed at informal gatherings, I think certain benefits would undoubtedly result over a period of time from such contacts, and my thought is that possibly a convenient common meeting place for lunch might be designated on say two or three days a week and each staff member obligate himself to lunch there on at least one of these days each week.

-3-

If it would be of any assistance to the Committee that I answer specific questions on any points, I should, of course, be willing to do so frankly, as I have no confidence to withhold.

(Signed) Rudolf C. Bertheau

THE LAURA SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL

St. Louis, Mo.,
December 31, 1926

Memorandum for the Committee on Reorganization
by the Memorial's Representative for Great Britain
and Ireland.

My connection with the Memorial dates from April 1924, when its scheme for fellowships in the social sciences was explained to me in conversation by Mr. Frank Aydelotte. Apart from the generous and large minded spirit of helpfulness which inspired it, I was chiefly impressed by the Memorial's commendable desire to keep their scheme flexible and their methods informal. The admiration I then felt has been strengthened by what I have since seen of the work of the Memorial, and notably by the recent magnificent extension of the scheme to enable men and women from one European country to work in another. I propose to begin the rather disjointed remarks which follow by mentioning some of the points President Aydelotte emphasized to me and considering them in the light of two and a half years' experience.

1. Avoidance of undue publicity. This, I am sure, was wise. The fact that the fellowships are not advertised in the Press, and that applications are not invited from candidates, has certainly saved the Representative from the flood of unsuitable applications which the methods of the 'Commonwealth' scheme involve; and I think that all promising sources of candidates can be tapped by our method of communicating, in the first instance, only with heads of universities, colleges, departments, etc., and people in similar positions of knowledge and responsibility. I do not think we suffer in prestige from the absence of press advertise-

ment, though I believe no harm would be done were I allowed to send to the Times once a year a list of the Fellows appointed, as Sir Walter Fletcher does in the case of the medical fellowships.

2. Agent of selection. Whether the idea that the responsibility for selecting Fellows should rest with an individual, rather than a committee, has worked well, is not for me to say. The method adopted no doubt increases the element of gamble and possibly narrows the field; on the other hand, it minimizes delay, and makes it easy to deal with applications from time to time throughout the year - whereas the 'Commonwealth' selection committee make their decisions at one date in the spring. The possibility of consulting an informal committee is certainly helpful. In the first year I owed much to the advice of three gentlemen whom I consulted unofficially at a single meeting, after circulating to them copies of the relevant papers. (These advisers were Sir William Beveridge, Professor H. W. C. Davis, and Mr. W. T. Layton.) In 1925 I intended, with their kind consent, to repeat this procedure, but eventually I found it unnecessary, and I did not have recourse to it this year.

On every ground, except that of time, I am glad that the actual appointment of Fellows rests with the Memorial.

3. A Representative for Ireland. I know that one public man in the Irish Free State has expressed his opinion that, ultimately at any rate, there should be a separate Representative for the Free State.

Hitherto, 5 candidates from the Free State have received Fellowships (out of 30 awarded); 4 from Trinity College Dublin and 1 from the National University of Ireland (University College of Cork). When visiting Dublin on the business of the Memorial last year, I had conversations with officials of the Free State Government as well as with representatives of both Trinity College and the National University. If a separate Representa-

tive for the Free State is appointed, he will no doubt be a person acceptable to both elements. I presume that "Northern Ireland" will remain under the purview of the Representative for Great Britain.

4. Subjects included. The term 'Social Sciences' is not so familiar in England as in America, and consideration has been needed whether certain applications fell within the scope of the scheme or not.

In Economics, Political Science, International Law, Jurisprudence, no difficulty arises.

Sociology is a subject regarded with some suspicion in Great Britain, and not entirely without reason, since it has been very slightly developed and may be said - on the analogy of Economics - to be still in the pre-Marshallian epoch. It does not at present attract - at any rate under the name of Sociology - many of the best young students: it is necessary to beware of people with vague and washy ideas, without intellectual bite, who may present themselves in this subject. ✓

To some extent the same is true of Education.

A candidate in Philosophy may be expected to show some special reason why he should be financed to cross the Atlantic in the pursuit of abstract truth. I deal below with one such case.

Psychology is on the border of medicine. One application I referred to Sir Walter Fletcher, and at his request left to him to deal with.

Anthropology has so far provided one Fellow; the application of a craniometrist was judged by the Memorial, properly in my opinion, to fall outside its scope.

History must evidently be included, at any rate certain fields of history. Possibly an Englishman would be inclined to include more fields than an American; but in one case, the history of political theory, I found a Professor at Harvard just as positive as scholars in England that the study of mediaeval doctrine of Natural Law was an important topic

from the point of view of the social sciences. I, myself, refused an application concerned with mediaeval naval history, and the Memorial declined one concerned with mediaeval monastic life. My own view is that each case must be judged on its merits, but I would certainly not necessarily exclude mediaeval or even ancient history. Books like Zimmern's 'Greek Commonwealth', Maine's 'Ancient Law', Heitland's 'Agricola', which are studies in a past civilization, seem to me quite as valuable contributions to the social sciences as are researches into the habits of savage tribes. It may be more difficult, however, to show why the scholar should go abroad for his purpose.

Geography has as yet produced no candidate.

5. Fellowships open to men and women alike. This has caused no difficulty. Of the 30 successful candidates from the British Isles, 8 have been women.

6. Qualifications. When the scheme was first broached, I believe there was some idea that Fellows ought to be people who on social grounds would be likely to promote friendly relations between the two countries. I understand that now the test is regarded as wholly intellectual, and this I think a good thing, subject to the permissibility of rejecting candidates likely to promote positively bad feelings.

As to the intellectual qualification, President Aydelotte and I agreed that we would aim at what is understood by the phrase 'Fellowship standard' in the older English universities, as opposed to that of 'good research worker'. We wanted men with distinction and originality of mind, who would not merely work out ideas given them by others; or, to put it differently, men whom it would be of advantage, not merely to their own development, but to that of the social sciences, to help to research abroad. Some such criterion must, I think, be maintained if the scheme is to remain manageable. One might like to go further and aim at securing only those with

'genius'. But to pick out genius requires a kind of genius in the selector. If one per cent of an ordinary man's selections prove to possess the divine quality, he ought to be well content. I am very conscious of the shortcomings of my own work in the matter of selection: but it is work in which experience should teach a lot.

A further point which it was agreed ought to be taken into consideration was the likelihood of the candidate's attaining a position in which the assistance given to him by the award of a fellowship would result in benefit to the world at large. Successful academic teachers, journalists, and public men would evidently qualify in this way.

7. Candidates from non-academic fields. This last consideration raises a point which I consider of great importance. [According to the gospel I received from President Aydelotte, while Fellows should all possess high intellectual ability, they need not all necessarily represent the strictly academic point of view. They might be, or hope to become, politicians, journalists, preachers, administrators, civil servants. The tests were whether or not they would conduct their inquiries in the attitude of the true scholar, and whether it was for the public service, or for their private advantage, that they wanted a fellowship. This breadth of outlook on the Memorial's part delighted me from the first, and I still think it not the least valuable feature of the whole scheme. Work of the highest importance for the development of the social sciences can be done in the non-academic field; sometimes it can be done there only.] One of the weaknesses of economics and of politics, regarded as sciences, is that experiment is often difficult. The true laboratory of politics is public life. Only public bodies can conduct experiments on a large scale, and they are rarely willing to give a mere academic person the chance he desires. Then again, in both politics and economics, the experience of the practical man, as well as of the theorist, is vital. And, finally, there is the fact that

politics is a craft, at least as much as a science, and more than any other craft needs well-trained craftsmen.

I am glad therefore of the opportunity of saying how desirable I think it that our Fellowships should, in suitable cases, be used to make Government and Municipal servants more efficient in their work, whether of thought or action, and that in the interests of the social sciences themselves. In English social history it is hardly possible to exaggerate the value of the work done by, say, Edwin Chadwick and Charles Buller in the 1830's, and more recently by Sir Robert Morant and Sir Frederick Lugard, in the respective fields of domestic and colonial administration. Experiments which may be of far-reaching importance are now being made in these fields - in the prevention of destitution, in the treatment of crime, in the education of backward races; it is essential they should be studied by civil servants, because civil servants and their political chiefs have unique opportunities of putting the result of the experiments to practical use.

It is perfectly true that the authorities of the British and Irish public services ought to be alive to the importance of these opportunities, and to include the necessary appropriations in their estimates. But it is clear that, under the pressure of Treasury control, such expenditure is not at present forthcoming. It is in these circumstances that the Memorial's Fellowships may be of the greatest value. Indeed in two cases already the Memorial has shown its enlightened public spirit by accepting candidates who were, or were about to become, civil servants. I hope this policy will be continued, though I think it would be very reasonable for the Memorial to demand that a certain proportion of the necessary expenditure should be undertaken by the Government concerned.

8. Age Limit. It is difficult to tell, much before a man leaves college, or, it may be, considerably later, whether he has the qualifications we require. There is much to be said for not appointing anyone till he has

actually started on research and produced his first fruits. The first steps in research can usually be quite well taken at home, and to subsidize a man to go abroad for this purpose is wasteful.

On the other hand, the year or two just after his first degree may offer the only chance of going away a British student will ever get; later he will be claimed by his profession and the small staff of most departments make it hard for them to release teachers even for a sabbatical year.

Nevertheless, I think a Fellowship should rarely be awarded until, say, 2 years from the candidate's degree. It is worth considering whether we should come to an arrangement with the 'Commonwealth' selectors to pass applicants of status junior to this over to them. The alternative suggestion has been made that we might ask the 'Commonwealth' to refer all their social science applicants to us. On the whole, I prefer the former alternative, partly for the sake of maintaining the prestige of our Fellows at the institutions they visit; they should be regarded as quite distinct from ordinary graduate students.

9. Special Cases. It was part of the scheme that special provision might be made for senior men, such as Professors. These would presumably ask for assistance on the ground not of mere promise but of achievement, and they would be expected to have a definite purpose in view. The value of this provision seems to me beyond question, all the more because of the difficulty such people have in England of getting away in the ordinary course. One or two of our Fellows have suggested that a special class of Fellowships for senior men might be formed. I shall discuss this later. What I have said above about Professors applies equally to men of senior standing in other walks of life.

10. Nature of work. The object of the Fellowships I take to be to add to the sum of our knowledge or understanding, or to our power of

controlling our environment, in the field of the social sciences. The method I take to be 'research', or the grappling at first hand with facts. The nature of the facts will differ; they may be manuscripts, or printed matter, or skulls, or customs, or institutions, or the thoughts and actions of men, or abstract relationships. It is desirable, as I have said above, that a Fellow should have already started on research, or at best shown his capacity to do it, and that he should have a pretty definite idea of what he wants to do. But I do not think it follows that he ought to devote the whole period of his Fellowship - it is even conceivable that he ought to devote none of it - to this work. I think experience has shown that some men may profit most by putting their research temporarily on the shelf and applying themselves to mastering the technique of their trade. In particular at Oxford or Cambridge it may happen that a man has actually produced first-class original work without having received a scientific training in research or mastered the general aspects of his subject. Whereas an American student, I gather, of the same, or even lower attainment, would certainly have done so. For instance, one of this year's Fellows, after winning a college Fellowship at Cambridge with great éclat by an elaborate dissertation on a legal subject and then studying for a year at Munich, is now deriving great benefit from working at jurisprudence at Harvard under Dean Pound. Another Fellow, an official in the British Ministry of Labor, came out with a definite plan of industrial research, but satisfied herself that she could derive greater profit from a more general survey of American industrial conditions. The Memorial, wisely as I think, made no objection. In fact, I think that the requirement for the submission of a definite piece of research should be looked upon rather as a test of fitness than as laying down a task to be scrupulously performed. The important thing is to choose really able men and women; once chosen, I am for giving them great freedom.

Research Degrees. It was first intended that Fellows should normally work for a Ph.D. or other research degree. This requirement has now been

abandoned - it was never enforced, - and I think Fellows should be positively discouraged from working for a degree, certainly if it means adhering to a rigidly defined course. Universities seem to make no objection to men registering in a graduate school and taking as few courses as they like.

Senior Men. Fellows of senior standing (Para. 9) should, I think, be left as free as possible and not even required to register at an institution. If they are fit to be Fellows, they will be fit to decide what is best for them, even if leisure should seem a large part of their object. It is clearly not the Memorial's purpose simply to give a man a sabbatical year; on the other hand, in the man's own mind, the research motive and the sabbatical year motive may be indistinguishable. This was actually the case of one of the 1925 Fellows. He had the ideas for a book on philosophy in his head, but no opportunity of putting them into shape; at the same time a man of his ability was bound to be affected by the American atmosphere, if rather impalpably. (The committee will remember that in 1925 Fellowships were tenable in America only.) The following are extracts from a very appreciative letter to me:

"I believe that apart from the great advantage that one gets from being in a new country for a year - especially what I may call a sort of 'feel' for the American point of view - the different and in a way freer atmosphere of America may have helped me to write more easily and less academically than if I had stayed in England.....

"It seemed to me unnecessary to keep up the fiction that I was working at a University and to insist on my being there during the University term. I cannot regret that I spent some time in Berkeley - I made too many good friends to do so - but when one has lived in a University atmosphere for 20 years one derives more stimulus elsewhere. The two and a half months I spent in Santa Barbara were by far the most profitable from the point of view of work, and it would have been better for me to go there at least a month or two earlier

"I have got so much out of my time in America that I am anxious to suggest anything that would encourage senior people to follow in my footsteps.... Here there are many men growing stale with teaching to whom a year of complete freedom would mean almost a new lease of life,

-10-

"and I believe that if this were made more easy to secure the result in the output of useful works would be very great "

Both this Fellow and another have suggested, as I said before, that there might be a special category, with a higher stipend and complete absence of supervision, of senior Fellows. I doubt if this is desirable - incidently it might lower the status of the other Fellows - but I think that Fellows of senior standing, if accepted, should be given the fullest possible freedom.

11. Temure of Fellowships. It is no doubt a sound plan to encourage Fellows to plan to come for two years, but to make the grant for the second year subject to review towards the end of the first. I have usually found men wish to come for two years rather than one, but circumstances have often made it impossible. Three of the 1924 Fellows have had their grants extended for a third year.

12. Place of study. It must clearly depend on circumstances whether a Fellow should spend his time in one place or more. One of the 1924 Fellows was allowed to spend his second year in France, and, under the extension of the scheme to European countries, that immigration may, I suppose, be frequent. This extension of the scheme will enable the Representative to demand an even stronger case than hitherto to be made out by candidates for going to America rather than elsewhere.

One Fellow, who had already done a year of research in the United States, was this year given a Fellowship to work in the Philippines.

13. Results. One of the most admirable features of the Memorial's scheme is, in my opinion, the fact that it demands no specific concrete result in the shape of a book or voluminous report. Research in the Social Sciences is not like research in the Natural Sciences; its results, like its subject matter, are likely to be far less definite and precise. It suggests tendencies

-11-

and probabilities, instead of propounding laws. Moreover it is far less capable of solving specific "problems" as the outcome of comparatively short investigations. I am sure the sound plan - which I take to be that of the Memorial - is to do everything possible first to choose and then to help the best men, and then to trust the intellectual conscience to produce its best in its own best way and time.

14. Finance. I propose to touch on this subject only lightly, as it is mainly a matter of details. Moreover, it is difficult to generalize as the circumstances of Fellows differ widely. Speaking generally, however, I think that \$1800.00 plus authorized travel allowances and tuition fees is sufficient, but it means that the Fellow has to watch his expenses pretty narrowly, at any rate in the Eastern cities. It would be certainly difficult to propose a rise in the stipend of British Fellows only, and I gather that those from the continent of Europe are more than satisfied. On the other hand our present stipend seems roughly equivalent to the inclusive \$3000.00 given to the Commonwealth Fellows. Should the Memorial accept the suggestion that our Fellows should normally be men of standing senior to these, it might consider whether the same - or rather equivalent - stipend is suitable.

Assuming that the basic stipend remains at \$1800.00 several Fellows have suggested that an extra grant for books would help them greatly. They are discouraged by the "Bulletin of Information" from bringing books from Great Britain, and there are books which a man wants to have continually at hand and mark; if he cannot buy the book, he may have to waste time on copying out passages from the library copy. The strongest case is perhaps that of men for whom no tuition is paid. Could they have a grant for books instead?

Several Fellows have spoken of the terrible cost of clothes in

America. In view of the difference in climate between different parts of America, and of the fact that Fellows sometimes do not know before they arrive in New York what part of the country they are going to, it may be difficult to obtain a complete outfit at home. However, I do not see how a special grant for clothes can well be made except possibly to Fellows staying a second year, particularly if they move to a climatically different part of the country.

With regard to travel, I understand that requests for special travel allowances have sometimes been declined on the ground that to grant them would be "setting a precedent". While I have no reason to believe that the several requests were not rightly declined on their merits, I am inclined to think that too much weight may be attached to the "precedent" argument. Our Fellows are all presumably picked men and women; in some at least of the Social Sciences personal contact is everything - for instance every student of political institutions ought to have a chance of seeing the National and some of the State Legislatures and Courts at work; and some of the Fellows may never come to America again. Therefore, I would urge a very generous attitude towards applications for travel allowance; I would almost go so far as to suggest that the applicant should always have the benefit of the doubt.

15. General assistance. All the Fellows without exception have spoken with warm appreciation of the kindness and help they have received from the officers of the Memorial, as also from the members of the Faculties and others with whom they have come in contact. English people are somewhat shy of approaching strangers without introductions, and it might perhaps be helpful to make special concession to this weakness in the early month of a Fellow's visit - particularly in the case of a woman. And I believe that social, as well as academic, introductions are greatly appreciated. It is the social life of an English University that a Fellow chiefly misses. But

the last thing I wish to suggest is that there has been any remissness in the providing of introductions.

The dinner given on December 16th at Columbia to all the Fellows then in New York gave great pleasure and was most valuable to the British Fellows.

Should any considerable expansion take place in the staff of the Memorial, it might possibly be a good plan to despatch an officer to go with some of the Fellows to the annual meeting of the various Associations of Teachers; this might provide some valuable contacts. Possibly, also, an officer who had experience of English University life might find it easier to understand the peculiarities of English Fellows; but I see the difficulty of doing in the case of one nation what you cannot do in the case of all. As it is, the staff of the Memorial have shown the Fellows from the British Isles wonderful sympathy and kindness.

16. Continental Fellows. It is too soon to speak of the recent extension of the scheme to cover Fellows from the continent working in England. With regard to those who spend a few weeks at the London School of Economics preparatory to visiting America, I think it would be worth while for an officer of the Memorial to discuss the situation with the Secretary of the School in London. Some details of the present arrangement seem not wholly satisfactory.

17. Keeping touch with former Fellows. It is of course the Representative's duty to keep in touch with the Fellows from his own country, and now that several Fellows have returned to the British Isles, it may be possible to arrange for an annual meeting.

The A. K. Foundation, I believe, maintains premises in Paris to which all its former Fellows are welcomed. I do not see what purpose anything of this sort would serve in our case. It might, however, be worth considering whether periodical meetings of all the Memorial's Representatives should be arranged for.

I think it might be part of the understanding come to with all Fellows when appointed, that they should send copies, or at least notices, of their published professional work to the Memorial.

18. Future Developments. I do not know how far it is desired that I should express any view as to the possible extensions of the work of the Memorial. Any points which have occurred to me are no doubt obvious and have occurred to the Memorial. For instance, I know the question of making limited grants to individuals for specific research, or to free them from routine work at creative periods, has been considered. I have mentioned to Dr. Ruml one actual case in which I think this might be done with great advantage; if the Memorial adopted a general policy, I do not think the machinery for carrying it out would present many difficulties.

The establishment of Chairs when the time for such is ripe, and the subsidising of efficient research institutes, and the guaranteeing of scientific periodicals are all obvious means of assistance; it is equally obvious that each case must be judged on its merits.

19. Prevention of War. There is one practical matter of such vital and urgent importance that the achievement of even small results would justify large expenditure - the prevention of war. Here, more than in the equally important field of industrial relations, it would seem that money could help. For in this field there are plenty of ideas about; what is lacking is a sufficient force of public opinion to insist on their being tried in practice and to resist the pressure of excessive nationalism in emergencies. The weakness or apathy of public opinion is largely due to lack of knowledge or appreciation of the international aspect of things; and this lack is in its turn largely due to insufficiency of personal contact. Such contact can be supplied either by bringing men from Country A to explain their point of view in Country B, or by sending men from Country B to study Country A on the

spot. I imagine the Memorial might help in both ways, it being assumed that the men and women concerned would be carefully selected, both for their personal qualities and for their opportunities to influence others. From the latter point of view journalists and school teachers would seem the most important people to get at; I place these before University teachers only because of the larger public with which they come in touch, and of the fact that University teachers probably have more international contacts already. The obvious means of working to these ends appear to be:

1. Foundation of Chairs such as that of International Relations at Aberystwyth, of International History in London, of American History at Oxford.
2. Foundation or Subsidising in different countries of such centres of information and discussion as the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. (Clearly immense tact would be needed in such cases.)
3. Encouraging conferences on international relations like those of Williamstown and Honolulu, and such as has been arranged for next February by the Louisiana State University. Special provision might be made for journalists and school teachers to attend.
4. Subsidising in different countries periodicals concerned with international topics like the American "Foreign Affairs"; assuming that a suitable editor could be found, and that he would be given an entirely free hand.

(Signed) J. R. M. Butler

St. Louis, Mo.

THE LAURA SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL

New York, January 11, 1927

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York City

My dear Mr. Fosdick:

I hope you will forgive my tardiness in replying to your letter of December 14. The pressure of work in the office has crowded me so that I have not had either the time nor the energy to prepare the kind of memorandum I should like to give you. Moreover, I have been out of the office for the past two weeks and more and as you know traveling is not conducive to consecutive thought.

I am sending the attached memorandum with considerable hesitation, because I am not at all sure that it will in any way contribute anything to the task of your Committee.

With renewed apologies for the delay, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Lawrence K. Frank

-1-

The organization and administration of the Memorial must inevitably reflect the conceptions of its aims and purposes which animate the Trustees and the Staff. The following remarks are offered, not as a program, but merely as an attempt to express the writer's personal views and interests on the subject. Naturally they will betray his temperament and prior experiences, just as they serve to color his views of the situation and incline him to emphasize certain aspects of the work to the neglect of others. To save time and space, these remarks are made rather dogmatically, but with the hope that the reader will not impute any such intention or spirit to the writer.

The rapidity and extent of the changes taking place in almost all departments of human life have made it more imperative than ever before that new ideas, conceptions, plans and programs be given opportunity for development and application. Uniquely among existing institutions and agencies, the endowed foundation is in a position to promote social welfare by cultivating these experimental and pioneering efforts which may otherwise languish or be killed off. Since the other organizations with which the Memorial is affiliated have so largely become committed to long-term programs of development of established institutions and programs, the opportunity and the obligation facing the Memorial to be experimental and sensitive to these newly arising needs are paramount.

It follows from the above that the Staff of the Memorial should be alert and informed not only in the particular fields which may be at any one time under consideration, but also in contiguous and affiliated fields or scenes of activity. This means that every effort should be made by the Staff to keep abreast of scientific and social developments, and that the administration of the Memorial should be largely concentrated upon that aim.

When viewed from this angle, it might be said that the appropriation of funds is largely incidental and subordinate to the real work of the Memorial as thus interpreted. Which is another way of saying, "The gift without the

giver is bare", perhaps more so in the case of foundation grants than in any other case, because, whether so intended or not, a foundation grant has wide-spread implications: It is taken as a sign and seal of approval by experts and so serves to spur on those who share the ideas and views of the persons receiving the grant; moreover, it is interpreted as a forecast of the trend of research or development and so acts powerfully to encourage or discourage the younger workers. It is, then, impossible for a foundation, no matter how cautiously it proceeds or attempts to evade direct responsibility, to escape the onus for what is happening in the several fields it cultivates. It would seem wiser and fairer then to recognize this situation more explicitly and to deal with it more frankly, especially within the organization.

Specifically, this means that every Staff member in considering appeals and plans is acting upon some general conception of the foundation's purpose and is guided by fairly definite, if not explicit, views of what is, and what is not, important and significant of the future. Some method of keeping these conceptions and views open to discussion and criticism and open to further growth, would seem imperative if the Staff is to fulfill its functions and its larger obligations.

In this situation, the Trustees could be of greater service, if time and energy permitted, by more closely scrutinizing these mental backgrounds and general conceptions of the Staff. Speaking personally, the writer is continually wondering how nearly he is realizing the purpose of the Founder and the intentions of the Board in his daily activities and judgments. This concern is aggravated by the fact that for good or evil every proposal reaching the Board for decision has been largely influenced in intent and form by the Staff member who dealt with it. Theoretically, the Staff receives appeals or proposals which it scrutinizes and then passes along to the Board for decision upon the basis of the Staff member's study. Practically and

inevitably, the Staff's participation in the proposal is usually much greater. It follows, then, that from such continued supervision and direction of projects, the Staff member is beset by the temptation to overvalue his own judgment; moreover, knowing about what the Board may expect and will probably approve, he is inclined to stereotype his judgments and his proposals. Then he begins to crystallize his thinking and to become insensitive to the changing needs and newer developments in his field of work and thereby converts his activities into a rather humdrum repetition of what has gone before.

This, I take it, is the prognosis of the occupational disease of foundation staffs and I venture to speak feelingly of it, because I have observed, in my own brief career with the Memorial, the insidious manner of its operation upon my personal activities. By trying to develop a group spirit and aim, we are attempting to reduce some of these dangers. But I am not at all sure this is sufficient. If the Trustees, or any single one, interested in some one field of work, could undertake to perform this office of friendly critic and counsellor to the Staff member in charge, such a service might be of considerable value as a prophylactic. In so far as the Trustees' activities are limited largely to decisions upon specific appropriations, even though they devote their attention primarily to questions of policy, the Staff fails to receive the kind of explicit criticism and discussion essential to the maintenance of its vitality and intellectual growth.

Let me here disclaim any intention of suggesting that my own ideas and convictions are of such importance that I want to take up the time of busy Trustees with their discussion. Rather I am trying to emphasize the fact that the Trustees are, at present, probably unaware of the underlying ideas, notions and beliefs of the Staff members which are shaping the proposals they are called upon to judge. In the nature of things, failure to achieve Trustee approval for a proposal will more often than not be taken as a sign of clumsy or ineffective presentation rather than as criticism of the proponent's

thinking on the subject.

In other words, I am pleading for the consideration of the dangers confronting the Staff member by reason of the position he occupies toward the outside world and toward the Board. The deference and acquiescence he receives from the outside world, eager to agree and to flatter in the hope of favors to come, and the temptation to speak as one with authority because others must listen, create as devastating a situation as the wit of man could devise. Those of us who are keenly aware of the extraordinary privileges and opportunities given us by the Memorial, and who would like to escape the fate which seems to threaten us, are plainly in a difficult situation. I venture to dwell upon it in some detail because in its larger and more general aspects it seems to be the crux of the problem of administration upon which your Committee is at work. The Board should and must rely upon the Staff to do the work of the organization. We of the Staff need help in discharging that obligation and fulfilling that trust and we can find such help only in a continually renewed conception of our tasks and the helpful scrutiny by our Trustees of the ideas and thinking we bring to our work.

If it were possible to develop some plan for more frequent and friendly discussion of plans and programs and underlying conceptions with our colleagues in the other Boards, it would help to create a more favorable milieu to creative thinking and to mitigate the perils of which I have spoken above. I must confess that I have not found the auspices on the whole favorable to this activity. It is easily seen that, in the eyes of our older and more experienced colleagues, the Memorial Staff is young and inexperienced; moreover, the Memorial's interests and activities not infrequently run athwart the matured policies and programs of the other Boards. It would indeed be a thick-skinned person who was not continually made aware of this readily understood attitude. While comprehensible, it is nevertheless to be deprecated, for it does not contribute to our working effectiveness. It

-5-

does, in addition, tempt one to develop a compensatory dogmatism, as a means of maintaining some semblance of self-confidence necessary to the daily work. Perhaps I am unduly lacking in self-confidence and assurance and too ready to acknowledge the tentative and experimental character of my thinking, to cope with this atmosphere successfully.

In regard to the Fellowships, my notion is akin to that expressed above. If we can find out the young men and women who are trying to pioneer ahead in the field of the social sciences and can give them opportunities to follow their insights and work out their problems, we may make a substantial contribution to human progress. In the nature of the case, the person who is thinking ahead of his times is isolated and too often subject to overwhelming odds. It should be our task to cultivate such persons, to give them the reassurance and the support necessary to the achievement of their aims. This calls for sympathetic interest in the person and in his problem and a willingness to offer help and encouragement and individual attention. This is what I have been endeavoring to do, within the limits of my time and capacities. The task is not uncongenial to me because I can personally sympathize with the position and needs of such persons. It is the hardest task in the world to escape from the traditional and conventional ideas and conceptions of one's day and yet it is becoming ever clearer that the developments of science and the achievement of social welfare are dependent upon the ability to do so. The fellowships, therefore, should be considered as a means of seeking out and furthering the rare individuals who may become the intellectual leaders of tomorrow. This calls for patience and wide sympathies and willingness to consider the aims and purposes of others, no matter how divergent from one's own beliefs. In this respect, the fellowship work is susceptible to the same comments I have ventured to offer above on the general work of the Memorial.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Minneapolis, January 25, 1927

Mr. Raymond Fosdick
Curtis, Fosdick & Belknap
61 Broadway
New York City

Dear Mr. Fosdick:

In answering your letter about the possible reorganization of the Memorial, the first question is really as to what new functions the Memorial proposes to assume or new tasks that it proposes to undertake. Organization or reorganization should and would be largely determined by functions or by fields of effort.

I suppose that it is advisable for me to take it for granted that the Memorial will act along the lines and by the methods it has been following.

Its present basic organization and method of doing business is exceptional if not unique among educational and philanthropic foundations, certainly among those including endowed Universities with anything like the capital and income at its disposal. The fact that you have a Director who gives the program and activities of the Memorial constant attention is usual. The fact that the Memorial has an executive committee at hand which gives exceptional, if not equal, attention to the Memorial's work is the unique feature. What marks off the Memorial's organization at present is the intimate interest and consideration that you and Mr. Woods and Mr. Richardson, and even Mr. Rockefeller himself, can and do give constantly or at any important moment to its affairs. With the Board as a whole as small as it is, the support of the Executive Committee when given can and does fortify the recommendations of the Director before the Board however much

they may have influenced them before hand. It is this phase of the organization which gives to the Memorial at present much of that flexibility and promptness in decisions that is valuable in the beginning or experimental stage.

I have spoken of this situation as "organization". I am not so sure but that it has to do with personalities more than it does with administration. Now I am all for persons and certainly not strong for machinery. The system I have mentioned above will work just so long as there exists the present intimate, effective and cordial cooperation of this group who have the time and intelligence necessary for the responsibilities they now share in a sense with the director. When the circumstances arise, and time will surely bring them, when you do not have in this group men with the same devotion and equal intelligence and social-mindedness, the system won't work. It might even be as bad as local trustees who think proximity confers power and use it to harry a president or a director. At the present this arrangement gives not only flexibility, but the more careful immediate consideration of several capable men to any project or program. The advantages of the one man directorship are combined with the consideration of four or five men almost equally concerned and competent, having essentially a like point of view and indoctrinated with the Memorial's present program.

What I have said so far is meant as description of things as I saw them. It is written to bring out certain essentials that may in the future have to be secured by modifying the organization either at the top or in the technical or office staff. Those essentials are vigor and leadership in the director who recommends and executes the program after its consideration by a group large enough at present because it is exceptionally interested, qualified and free to give the necessary time. And you men who

selected and are supporting Mr. Ruml in the executive committee must not measure your deliberation about any matter he brings up by the time it takes you to come to a decision. That is brief because each of you in his own way has been grappling with problems of human conduct and social action, each in his own rather large way, long before the Memorial was founded.

Now all this more or less personal situation has been of great importance in view of the field the Memorial has entered. True, its report shows that it is making an amazingly long and diverse list of grants. But I am speaking of the fundamental lines Mr. Ruml has outlined in various memoranda usually incorporated in other directors published annual reports. It is the field for which I used above the phrase 'the problems of human conduct and social action', covered in part when we say social sciences. It was, so far as I know, the first large foundation to select such a general basic field in which to encourage research and experimentation. The Foundation's work in medical education deals largely with sciences only as they are synthesized and applied by a certain professional group, much as the Memorial might have done if it had concentrated on law schools or schools of business administration, or education. That considerable part of the General Education Board's activities that dealt with endowment for colleges was equally unlike the policy inaugurated by the Memorial. Likewise the Carnegie support of libraries had in the long run to be shifted to basic studies or broader conceptions of adult activities and seems in the Corporation's report to be marking out for itself a field in the fine arts. What the Memorial did first, the other large foundations will, I think, come to do in such fields as the biological and physical sciences, and I hope the humanities in the largest, finest and most cultural sense.

The Memorial chose first, and its choice was the most difficult, and in some ways most dangerous field. Medical education and public health

only expose you to the desultory sniping of the medical profession, the biological and physical sciences when you advance them bring the plaudits or amazement of great numbers who accept and apply the results all too readily. Protests by rear guard theologians would affect much. Art education and the humanities can be invigorated and the discerning will know it and they will welcome it. But when you support a social scientist in studies that may run counter to any age-old taboo, or help him to look critically or objectively or historically at some outworn political or social institution, you want to be sure your dug-out is really bomb-proof.

All this is said in order to indicate the wisdom in bottoming policy and action on as wide an administrative and advisory basis as is consistent with getting results in action.

That means ultimately a somewhat larger board of directors made up not of professional men per se but of men who are social statesmen and come from any profession or any section. If one turns to the working staff, it is in my opinion too small or at least has too few people of first rate ability and wide experience. You have in Mr. Ruml and Mr. Frank two men of exceptional ability and Mr. Outhwaite is a rare sort of fellow in his own way. They all have the advantages of native ability well-trained, and they are young. They have had a sketchy connection with the kind of men and academic institutions where a goodly part of the research goes on. This is an advantage and a disadvantage. They are congenial and supplement each other within the offices, but they do not supplement each other in the official contacts with the individuals and groups that come into the office for conference. They, especially Mr. Ruml and Mr. Frank, handle people too much alike and likewise in a degree proposals. They are both keen enough to go through a proposal and come out at the other end before the proposer has had time to uncoil it. Even Miss Walker when out in the field has given something of the impression of

knowing too much about things she has not done. This may not be the gentle art of making enemies, but it leaves some conferees with the impression that they have been done out of a perfectly good idea by cleverness rather than by maturity or riper experience. You have to stand a lot of bores in order to have worth-while people think you are hospitable to new ideas and new proposals, and foreign scholars need their own special treatment as they come and go. However this is only a suggestion that has its pertinency, if any, in considering the personnel of an enlarged staff. About the need of this, I should think there was no doubt.

The staff needs at least two first class men of scholarship, standing and experience with contacts already established on a national if not an international basis. You were on the right level when you sought the services of such men as Coss and Lingelbach. Personally, I could not think of a better combination, but I suppose it is impossible. Even any just as good involves men that I fear are not any easier to move. Taking into consideration the present staff, I should want a man from sociology and from history. This is not with any view to departmentalizing the work, but to furnish variety in experience, training and point of view. Nevertheless, until you have an European office or representative, someone should combine perhaps the fellowships and readiness and ability to look after foreign matters. In this the European end looms largest at first, but Spanish-American countries must be taken into account soon, then the Far East.

Now the policy of working indirectly through others who execute plans once an appropriation has been made is nowhere more justifiable than in the case of the Memorial in cultivating the field it has chosen. It is free to operate through any responsible agency to whom it gives funds. It needs to keep in contact with, encourage and study all the ways and groups in which scholars are associated for research.

What I may say will sound, perhaps, like a discussion of policy when you have asked only for suggestions on reorganization. But the thing I am concerned with is to assure in some way through trustees or staff or both, and in other ways, that the Memorial and its plans are given just as broad a base as possible, that just as many avenues as possible are open through which may come either new ideas or wise judgments.

Now in my opinion the best staff in an office behind glass topped desks will sooner or later lose its value, for Anteus like, it finds it difficult to keep its feet in the soil where the workers are and the work is really done. The real people you have to serve and support are the scholars. How to do that is the one big job of any organization or reorganization acting for any foundation and in any field.

Where are they and how do you get at them? Isn't the picture in rough something as follows:

Scholars can be found and sustained in

- A) Teaching foundations, i.e., Universities.
- B) Research foundations or groups in some form of social work. i.e., Bureau of Economics.
- C) Their own national organizations for economics, history, sociology, etc.
- D) Cooperative organizations based on this organization by disciplines as the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, etc.
- E) Individual scholars of proved ability or considerable promise who may be in any or all of the above, and not part of any program they conceive as a group but are doing or can do something single-handed that is well worth while.

In supporting research so far, as distinguished from its giving to a somewhat miscellaneous list of worthy public enterprises, the Memorial has used "A" and "B" to a degree, (for there are not many) "C" not at all, "D" in part and largely through the Social Research Council and "E" up to the present has received less support due to certain difficulties in finding individuals and

discriminating at long range between worth and mediocrity.

The support given through "A", i.e., Universities, has been nation wide only in the field of child study, and parent education. The grants to Chicago and North Carolina and Vanderbilt are, so far as I recall, the only considerable subvention outside the group represented by Harvard, Yale, Columbia. It has an international aspect if you count the London School of Economics in this group as it should be rather than in "B".

"B" is a small group in any case.

"C" has not been cultivated at all and in declining the request of the American Historical Association to aid it in its endowment campaign and in putting the declination on the ground that it would be a precedent for similar requests and action in the case of other national associations such as economics, political science and sociology there was a definite turning away from these agencies. This action of the Memorial is in my opinion a very serious one. These organizations are the scholars own effort through which at considerable sacrifice of effort, time and their limited personal incomes they have sought in a cooperative way to forward scholarship in an effective way and in a way not matched in any other country. Through them and their membership one can give encouragement and incidental support on a nation-wide basis to the things that scholars themselves think worth while. I should give them more consideration than a single university represented by a president skilled in selling his proposition. Without such national organizations there would be little possibility of cooperative research councils of any kind. In connection with any future extension of the effort to reach individual scholars, they will be a valuable agency. In fact, I should be inclined to turn end for end the Memorial's action in regard to the one association, the oldest and largest, and make a grant because among other things it would encourage the other national associations to attempt to expand their scholarship

work by raising the necessary funds.

"D" The Social Research Council is an admirable agency under its present leadership and with the care the national associations have taken in making up its membership through their chosen representatives. The fact that it is so cooperative should not obscure or absorb the functions and activities of its parent organizations or constituent members. The American Council of Learned Societies has a longer reach into other interests not as yet in the purview of any foundation. I am glad that its future is in part assured by the grant it has for its maintenance but not its enterprises outside the Dictionary of American Biography.

The Memorial's grant of \$5000. to the American Council of Learned Societies for aid to individual scholars is working well. I note that at its recent meeting the Social Science Research Council adopted this plan and will seek \$15,000. for individual grants in its fields alone, an admirable plan, but the duplication of effort and cost in distribution ought to be easily avoidable. I am not as seriously concerned about this and similar matters as between the two councils as is Mr. Ruml and, of course, Professor Merriam.

"E" I know how seriously concerned you all are to reach individual scholars and have felt the difficulties of this method of action from the standpoint of 61 Broadway. But the Memorial has done some things here. There is first and foremost the system of fellowships for foreigners that has been set up in Europe as the result of the trips of Messrs. Coss, Lingelbach and myself. There are the fellowships in this country administered by the Social Science Research Council in their fields. There is the selection and aid given foreign scholars who want to visit this country and are not exactly fellows, as Pasquet, Rein, Koppke, et al. There is nothing quite corresponding to this in aid to American scholars who need to go abroad outside a fellowship arrangement and yet have a plan and purpose equally commendable. The

International Education Board is doing something. I am thinking in their case, aside from agricultural sciences, of their probable support to Professor Black here in agricultural economics. In his case, a fellowship system takes care of his pupils either through the Social Science Research Council or the Guggenheim Board, although it does not of him, although he is just beginning his period of greatest usefulness. There is the small grant of \$5000. I have spoken of above, distributed in sums from \$50. to \$300. by a committee of the American Council of Learned Societies.

There is great difficulty in any group in a New York Office making selections or discriminations. It is here again that the organization of scholars if they had funds could do a useful and vital service, for they know better than any office staff who and what is worthwhile. It seems certain that in the long run, universities themselves will have to be given sums that they can use for their staff rather freely without regard to definite programs, and projects that they now submit, and for which they win approval. That means the selection and support of the social sciences in strategic and promising universities. The Carnegie Corporation will have to do it when it swings into the field of fine arts. It will have to be done on a graduate school or research basis by any foundation that enters the field of biological or physical sciences. It seems to me that in its field the Memorial has, since my day, taken a step in this direction in Nashville. Something like it will have to be done in Universities elsewhere or we will have an intensification within the Universities as centers of scholarship for support to all sciences and interests except the most vital ones that are represented by the social sciences and the humanities in a wide sense. We are learning now almost too much about the world about us, and too little about the world within us, and too little about the appreciation and development of those things which will make any world worth living in.

-10-

There is perhaps another form of keeping in touch with the field work of individuals and groups. The Memorial made a start in this in the first Dartmouth Conference where the attendants were chiefly psychologists. The one last summer and one this coming summer directed to the work and problems of the Social Science Research Council and its Committee on Problems and Policy are well worth while, but should not be made to serve as a substitute for conferences that the officers of the Memorial should feel free to call of any group, on any occasion and in any section. In matters of such import as your work, it is almost too easy to seek and find excellent advice right in New York City. Almost unconsciously the same type of questions will be discussed informally with the same unofficial advisers. The result in the long run will reflect itself in the views of the Executive Committee or in the recommendations of the staff. I see just enough future danger in this to justify any reasonable effort to get light and suggestion from other sources not so easily reached at the end of the telephone or in a casual luncheon by you or Colonel Woods or Mr. Ruml. In the closing paragraphs of Mr. Keppel's last report, you will see an interesting application of this conference idea to the purpose of educating prospective donors. It seems to me that the Memorial, already a going concern, can (as it has) make good use of the plan for keeping it abreast of the plans and ideas of the field workers. Another way is to have some one or all of the staff in turn move about over the country from center to center. The Memorial staff is too small now to permit this to the extent that it is already done by other foundations.

Now another problem that is indirectly related to the inquiry you made arises out of the relations of the group of Rockefeller benefactions. It is quite conceivable that the plans or programs of different foundations may overlap. I think even at present the Memorial could easily follow psychology into certain aspects of biology or even of medicine and public health.

Another group could just as easily reverse the overlapping process and edge into psychology. Work here or abroad in the field of agriculture cannot deal with the farmer's production and marketing problems without dealing with the farmer and his social and economic status; agriculture in any large sense today is becoming or actually is a problem of the social sciences quite as much as it is of dairy or animal husbandry or soil physics.

The Monday interboard luncheons are as good meals as I ever ate in congenial company, but they don't go very far as a clearing house about fundamental things. I don't think they ever could or were meant to. I don't think for a moment there should be any plan to diminish the autonomy of any group seriously or curb initiative in any director or board, but if I and my associates here did not confer with and confide in one another informally and constantly, the University would be a group of rival educational units all the more discordant and indefensible because they were on the same campus. Of course the suggested comparison cannot be pressed very far but there ought to be some regular informal provision for conferences. As programs shift within the group, it is even more essential. As a small contribution Mr. Ruml ought to publish an annual report that would let anybody know what in general or in any particular year the Memorial was doing and thinking. And the thinking out loud ought not be confined to specific things done but give any reader some of the advantages that come to one in such a strategic position to study or discuss the drift of education, research and activity in the the whole field that interests him.

I meant to do somewhere a little analysis of the Memorial's last report as a partial basis for the suggestions I made about the staff. And at another place where I was discussing the finding of scholars to aid, it would have been possible to discuss a little more definitely the means by which scholars individually and in groups can be helped. Most of those means the

-12-

Memorial and other foundations are using. One only have they all left out, and that is some way of making it easier for the investigator to publish his results. All possible means are given in some way by some or all the foundations (books, instruments, clerical aid, travel, etc.) to enable him to do a piece of scholarly work. But the particular thing that would make his researches available is almost universally unprovided. It is a very difficult problem, but is not therefore to be ignored, and sooner or later if you listen to the scholars in any field, you will find that the question of publication is one thing in which they are all interested and which they consider of first importance. The possibilities and impossibilities in this form of aid to research will have to be explored anew by each foundation that is aiding investigators.

I should like in conclusion to revert again to the problem of personnel and staff. I wish I could end with a whole list of men able and obtainable but so often as I think of various men, I fear the results of approaching them would be no more successful than in the case of Coss or Lingelbach. That would be true of Hayes at Columbia or Schlessinger at Harvard, for example. One of the best young men I know is Henry M. Wriston who went from the history department of Wesleyan last year to the Presidency of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin. Herman James (Political Science) son of Edmund J. James, former president of the University of Illinois, transferred last year from a Texas professorship to a deanship at the University of Nebraska. He is a real man but now the retirement of Chancellor Avery may be opening up for him a presidency there. He knows South America and Europe well. Both he and Wriston are scholars, executives, and forceful personalities. If I wanted a sociologist or a man with that training, I should try for Arthur Todd at Northwestern, but I know Mr. Ruml, although he does not know him would demur. Todd is one of the rarest combinations I know

and to his theoretical grasp of his field he added this last year a valuable experience in India and the Orient. He has culture, charm, vigor and scholarship. His years as labor adjuster with Kuppenheimer are proof of his ability to handle men of diverse kinds. Mr. Vincent knows him.

Another man who is a possibility is Robert J. Kerner, professor of Modern European History of the University of Missouri, and also acting dean of the Graduate School. He is a Harvard Ph. D., his parents were Czechs. He was an expert with the American Peace Commissioners at Versailles. He is a younger man of pleasing personality, enthusiasm and energy. Having known him since he was a graduate student, my disadvantage in judging him arises out of an inability to say just how much he has matured in judgment.

Mr. Thorkelson when he was in my office recently spoke very cordially of Kerner as he knew him in visits at Columbia for the G.E.B.

In these few suggestions I am limiting myself to the men who have a training, point of view and experience that would supplement the present staff.

I hope this memo may be of some use to you. I am sending Mr. Ruml a carbon copy.

If there is any other way in which I can be helpful, please count on my cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Guy Stanton Ford

Dean

The Trustees are as familiar with the program and objectives of the Memorial as is the Administrative Staff, therefore this memorandum will be limited to the consideration of administrative machinery and will discuss the following points:

1. High rate of turnover in the Administrative Staff.
2. Hair shirt minority in Board of Trustees.
3. Social investment as a foundation activity.
4. Simple and flexible organization prepared to undertake any worthwhile project.

MEMORANDUM
TO
THE COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION
OF
THE LAURA SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL

1. In support of the theory that a high rate of turnover in the administrative staff is desirable, may I suggest that men like Professor Merriam, Professor Marshall, Professor Day and Dean Ford as temporary members of the staff are invaluable as advisors and as channels through which worthwhile projects may be brought to the attention of the Memorial, but that it would be a great waste of good research material permanently to remove them from university work and that from the Memorial's point of view they probably would make mediocre executives and would lose their value as advisors, if too far removed from active participation in research projects.

This raises the question as to whether it is desirable to develop a group of professional foundation administrators. I do not think that it is. Young members of the staff have contributions to make to foundation activities. Their enthusiasm, vigor and questioning attitude and the opportunity which they have for acquiring a broad social point of view are valuable assets, but work of this kind does not provide for unlimited growth as would participation in the solution of actual problems. After a few years the staff member's ideas are apt to become crystalized and his development arrested. He then becomes a liability instead of an asset. ✓

There is another factor which seems worthy of consideration - the necessity for holding on to the job in view of the difficulty of securing another without starting at the bottom. Isn't it expecting too much of a human being, who regards foundation work as his career and source of livelihood, to sponsor dubious projects when he has everything to lose and very little to gain by backing a project which may prove unpopular or at best must ✓

wait years to show results?

2. Of course there must be some provision for continuity and for the accumulation of experience as a basis for action. This can be accomplished through the Board of Trustees. It is essential that the control of such power be in the hands of broadminded, far-seeing and conservative individuals, but it is also necessary to the success of this undertaking that the Board create within itself a strong, active-minded minority.

Therefore a new classification of trustees is suggested. Of a board of nine, six to be self perpetuating and elected as at present, three to be elected for three year periods but not eligible to succeed themselves. These three should be so chosen that this group would stand in the same relation to the Board as did the hair shirt to the monk. Perhaps this too is expecting too much of human beings. As an example of the type I have in mind, the names of Sir William Beveridge, Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, Dr. Elton Mayo, Mr. Andrew Mellon and Mr. John M. Keynes are presented.

Since the Memorial's work is conceived on a world wide basis, would it not be worthwhile to have other countries represented on the Board?

3. Social investment seems to be virgin territory so far as these foundations are concerned and yet it might prove the most productive field in which they could work. It staggers one to think what could be accomplished through the investing power controlled by these foundations and by Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Rockefeller has taken a cautious step in this direction through his building program but even there the foundations have not followed.

Of course one could point to a number of opportunities but one will suffice. The movie industry is largely in the hands of self-seeking individuals whose ignorance of social effects is only exceeded by their lack of interest in them. If this preoccupation with the box office were only

-3-

intelligent, there might be some hope for the future.

Here is a great industry whose potential power is exceeded by no social institution, the Church and press not excepted, with self-seeking ignorance so firmly intrenched that social minded producers with limited capital have not the remotest chance of breaking through. And yet this is a gold mine waiting to be tapped by intelligence.

Social investment would require and command the best brains in the country. A man of the broad vision, wide experience and conservative point of view of Mr. Mellon would be desirable. Along with him there should be such a man as Mr. Keynes for inspiration.

4. Organizations like organisms tend to pass through a life cycle of youth, with its optimism, enthusiasm and mistakes, middle age, of conservatism and productivity, and old age, of querulous defense of obsolete ideas. Old organizations tend to spin cocoons of red tape and precedent and to become impervious to new ideas and procedures. This is especially true of social welfare organizations which are not subjected to the test of competition.

A large organization is not only unwieldy but it is usually built up through becoming an operating concern. I do not believe that operation is a function of foundations. When the operative machinery becomes an integral part of the foundation organization, it is more difficult to maintain an objective and critical attitude toward it. As an illustration from another Board: It seems to me that it would be better to maintain the International Health Board as a separate institution located at some strategic point such as Washington or Geneva and by allowing it to raise part of its budget from the outside, enable the Foundation gradually to withdraw and use its funds for other unproven projects. After an experimental stage, it would either stand or fall, depending on its intrinsic merit.

The problem of the Memorial's Reorganization Committee is simplified by the fact that the Memorial is staffed by young individuals who have not yet

-4-

become fixed in their attitudes and has simple administrative machinery which can be changed easily. Although I am a strong advocate of consolidation of administrative machinery, I nevertheless appreciate the value of having one organization where experiments in administration can be tried without too much difficulty and where essential factors are not too much obscured by the flood of detail.

Furthermore, there should be one arm of the service which could readily be brought to bear on any problem in any field.

Submitted by

Frank B. Stubbs

February 17, 1927.

THE LAURA SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL

New York, February 23, 1927

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York City

My dear Mr. Fosdick:

You have asked for suggestions from the staff as to the reorganization of the Memorial. The term "reorganization" has been a little baffling to me as I have thought of the Memorial as hardly organized as yet -- still in a somewhat amorphous state. However, we are moving in the direction of more definite form and the need of planning what that form shall be is apparent.

The development of the Memorial to date seems to have been furthered by freedom from set program and organization. Through the experimentation permitted, several satisfactory fields of activity have opened up. The question now raised is whether it is better to continue to evolve a program as we go or whether a program should be drawn upon the basis of the Memorial's present experience. Much would be lost if any hard and fast program were made, since flexibility in point of view is essential for work dealing with the social sciences and social relations. At the same time a degree of prescience as to possible next steps might yield a coherency and unity not yet achieved. We have discovered certain things which are worth doing and also certain ways of doing them. What further activities are likely to support and extend the activities already entered upon? Is dependence of new activities upon those already undertaken to be the decisive factor in extensions? Or do we recognize the possibility of taking on new functions of importance equal to those now handled and not of necessity related to them?

Consideration by the staff and by the trustees either separately or

jointly of possible future lines of development should yield some tangible benefits. Ground work could be done in advance of taking on new interests. Also, present activities might have a different aspect or a changed emphasis. For instance, if the Memorial planned at some future date to assist university departments of social science or social science research in South America and in Asia, some period of time could be profitably used for collection of general and then specific information before any definite work was undertaken. Existing connections with South America and Asia would be utilized with a view to probable future connections.

Some indication of priority of interests -- the probable dozen next steps -- might be further suggested. This with no idea of making a schedule to be adhered to in the face of unforeseen opportunities or obstacles, but to provide some kind of chart for guidance. Before such a chart is framed, consideration should be given to what men actively engaged in the social sciences and in the fields of our other interests propose as desirable developments. Probably this counsel should be obtained indirectly -- that is, there is advantage in learning what is thought of value to the field from the point of view of professional interest, rather than what is thought an expedient program to suggest in view of the Memorial's interests. Meetings such as those at Hanover, where the Memorial's staff sits on the side lines and the responsibility of advancing social science is the subject of the discussion by social scientists, furnish most valuable guidance. Attendance upon various conferences held by organized groups in whose work we are interested furnish insight as to objectives professionally accepted.

The necessity for reliance upon technical advice from without the Memorial's own staff is evident, if the staff and board of trustees continue to be constituted as at present. There are advantages and disadvantages in maintaining the existent order. Experts in the fields of our interests, who could speak with authority as to the advisability or inadvisability of propositions submitted,

might command respect but would perhaps commit the Memorial to advancement of one man's point of view. When members of the staff have not had extensive experience in the fields which they are promoting, there will always be criticism of their apparent power of decision upon technical questions. The second disadvantage appears to be of less serious account than the first, for it can be shown that few decisions are made upon technical points and in such cases are based upon the best advice obtainable from technicians. Close contact between staff members and technicians must, therefore, be a reality.

The staff will necessarily increase with a wider range of interests. In additions which may be made, not only should there be consideration of the character of the new activities, but also of the need of supplementing the present staff in its cooperative capacities. Maturity of judgment and foresight in policy-shaping should be sought.

These comments are, I recognize, of very general nature. I do not see an opportunity of being more specific.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Sydnor H. Walker