

NSB: In simplest form, the question might be - should we try to devote more resources within the regions we now operate in western Europe - or with our resources should we give up western Europe and concentrate on some other area, - Latin America, for example? Putting it differently: Do we have a special obligation to backward areas? If so, should we devote resources to these areas just because they are backward? Carried still further, does the whole problem of backward areas development offer an opportunity in the field of SS in which to make an even greater contribution? Concerning the 1st question - what is the obligation to areas in which we are now operating? 2dly - do we have some special obligation to the backward regions in selecting other areas? 3dly - is the problem of development of backward areas as a scientific problem in SS one where the RF can make an effective contribution?

MAY -4 1959

PEM: We need to recognize that the difference in degree of acceleration in backward areas makes it more and more ^{unlikely} likely that they will remain completely like the advanced countries partly as a matter of aspirations. Their needs will not be met by giving them opportunities for industrialization with ^{nothing} beyond that on the other side. To help effectively, there is a great need for a real understanding of the peoples and what goes on among them, and to balance the interflow of ideas with the international (?) factor. For example, western ideas come to backward areas in 2 main forms: 1) the Soviet approach - very attractive - bound to win out, and 2) western Europe and American - a more flexible approach. The situation however is not hopeless.

CIH: We ought not to make any decision that would bind us in future until we have some particular objective somewhere else to change to other areas, where SS might make a somewhat unique contribution.

NSB: This whole question of working in backward areas doesn't necessarily mean our presence in a physical sense in the backward areas, but could be achieved by strengthening such an agency for example, as the Office of Pop. Research, etc.

PEM: In some backward area developments, there are often opportunities already present where you have a prospect of interest on the part of the people who can be shown how to do certain things. For example, in a public health problem in the Balkans, people were shown how to achieve the objective in terms of their own materials and methods. Another kind of proposal would involve strengthening work in village research, for example - U of Beirut - teaching and area research would be possible if RF supplied a station wagon. Here you have a point at which to dig in. Teaching social facts and understanding of social forces in their own areas are desirable objectives. The SSRC Area Committee may have some ideas.

NSB: Regardless of conclusions we reach here, we are likely to be pushed into this. Phil has suggested ways in which interest may be in order or may be called on.

PEM: Small programs might be put up to this division at any time. A real problem is that American social scientists do not look abroad. The need is to get a few American social scientists to live abroad, - in Korea for example, - to become well informed on the area.

RFE: ^{ee} SOME OF my concern is due to the reference in the Crete memo (JHW's) to "operational" and "500 to be trained." We're under pressure to do something in Point 4. This country has been pushed into the forefront of breaking down the barriers. Under the circumstances, more dollars and pronouncements on Point 4, etc. are inadequate measures for dealing with the problems. We lack a cadre of people able and willing to see from the viewpoint of the masses involved. Question is "how." E.g. "population" will have to be carried back to the land.

LCD: I wouldn't quarrel with the desirability, usefulness and importance of developing large cadre for backward areas, but feel that that aspect plus the efforts to help guide and stimulate a mass of backward areas into more rapid approach to western culture may have a tidal force behind it. How far is the optimum opportunity for RF to make its contribution? Government has to train people. Carnegie Corporation has recognized this as a major part of its program. We might be between government and business and see if a need can be covered there for best use of our resources.

Another concern is the problem of how to operate in backward areas. How much of our time energy and resources are going to be spread over how wide a variety of backward areas? How useful are these opportunities? We don't want to close the doors but we need to conserve our resources for the time being and not to worry about program there. If we have some scientific groups available, turn them loose, but otherwise turn the proposals down as out of program. I have a feeling that working in backward areas most of them are large with possible needs so numerous that the general level of operation is likely to be in so many places at so low a level and of great variety that net increment to knowledge is likely to be useful and important when judged by the local situation but not so much over a span of 50 years and total effect on scientific knowledge. Let us try to concentrate in the areas and focus on what we are trying to do and get one reasonably good program to provide reasonably adequate training for it. Focus fellowship programs for people in this fairly adequate center. That would become the source of people who are trained in the center. This would be a far more productive use of our facilities.

NSB: Your point is - our job is to proceed step by step in social science, and people in the rest of the world will be affected by it ultimately?

LCD: I can't define it in that extreme form, but rather in a modified form. In SS, the produce we have ready for export is limited particularly in the areas of my concern for operational work or for final professional activities. In the attempt to study economic analyses (as contrasted with the humanities type of project), there is some level beyond which or below which the amount which is known and the kind of training being given is sufficiently ineffective - it doesn't make any difference whether it is done at this level or not. In social psychological analysis, you have to set some kind of minimum training and strength and say people who get trained up to this extent can train others. Below that level, you can't accomplish very much, - but something. In training in medicine, you can address this to improving the level of operation of practical nursing and in many backward areas an improvement will result. Alternately, you get to know enough about medical practice to attack epidemic disease by those well enough trained to operate at this level. Instead of trying to improve practical nursing operation over wide areas, try to get a center and train up to the level where it makes a difference. Launch a pilot program after training is given.

PEM: SS involves reorientation of society.

NSB: Cited illustration of ~~giving~~ Galbraith's giving of inflationary information to a Latin-American government group during the war. They had no economic understanding - no understanding between unbalanced budget and prices, etc.

AB: Raised the question as to where we would get a chance to work at this one center of LCD's. Isn't this a rather mechanistic approach? The cultural impact of one culture on another is important. Are we going to cash in on it?

FFS: Argues for experiments and demonstrations. There is no adequate provision for learning the lessons of the past.

RFE: One concern - In study of mankind's welfare, we will be leaving out the situation PEM mentions if we do it at the Olympian level of (in?) Western European countries. We must really become acquainted with these countries, - their viewpoints, value systems, etc. in order to know where and how to approach; what do they want and what do we have to offer; where can it be applied? If Olympian levels are adhered to, there's little hope of attaining our goal in time. It doesn't involve operational activity on a large scale. (See CIB memo. to WW) I do not think diverting large amounts to work at this level is necessary but if something isn't done for the Orient now, there will be very few trained people available in 10 years.

NSB: Issue joined. - On the one hand, there was the point of view expressed that our business is to produce more or less steady funds for something called the SS. If that interpretation is accepted, it may then be argued that the proper place to concentrate major attention is at those places where scientific progress is proceeding most effectively, - ie., geographically by countries and by the most advanced centers. In the US, this would mean that almost no grants in the SS would be made west of Minnesota, until the Pacific Coast area.

On the other hand, the view expressed implied that this was not the only way to proceed but from the mandate laid down by the Trustees there is an obligation to achieve some development of the social sciences in all parts of the world perhaps, but particularly now in those parts where a little SS might do a lot of good and that consideration be given to the ways and means by which that might be carried through, - in terms of advancing pure science as pure science as well as considering our obligation as being that of bringing the results of social science achievement in the more advanced countries to the less advanced and to take steps to push the results of social science to the backward areas.

LCD: I would have stated the issue in terms of advancing the well-being of mankind to be accomplished mostly by going where mankind is and doing something that will beneficially influence the economy (?). I would like to press for the point of view that we can do more, long run, with our resources by striving to advance knowledge in the SS building up those centers that offer some real hope of advancing knowledge programs not only in the best universities in the US. Where a center is set up, it should be sufficiently strong to be a productive center. From this, you would then assume that within the countries concerned, there would be diffusion from the center. mankind?

The other point of view is that of operating more or less directly at more or less local areas in the philanthropic (?) sense. Instead of focusing resources into a given area and building up a center of some excellence, divide those resources and make them go around.

RFE: All this confirms to me that the difficulty is not so much a difference in principle as in degree. I would largely accept LCD's point of view. In things like this it might be understood as the kind of thing that General Motors did in making available their know-how in its simplest form in

China. Concerning centers, these might be illustrated by type of thing built around the subject of population - as to next steps - comprehended in what LCD had in mind. As regards centers in wrong places, - it might be possible for conditions to settle down in Java, China, etc. but these would hardly be centers from which one could expect absolute additions to SS by western standards. To that extent, I would favor some more general standard than I gather from LCD's view would be acceptable. We have to work with what we have and start where we can. We could pick up persons for fellowships with qualifications for training appropriate to the circumstances and send them back, until we can get our men out there. If we take population as a focus of interest, we might consider sociology in West China via the man and wife team which is available. So far as conditions permit, the idea of an occasional center where several factors recommend it, would tend to multiply the effectiveness of the whole contribution. In the Far East, it would be desirable where possible for the interests of the RF to work together. The goal is the same.

LCD: I do not argue in favor of insisting, if we get a chance, to spend money on the research program at Harvard, Yale or Columbia, and if we go in it, we would have to do that - to use up all our money. If we get more money, we could move up to the 2d, 3d and 4th leading places in America, Europe, etc. On a single continuum (?) in competition with the same money, we would look all over the world to get the best places for SS research. A case might be made for doing that. That is not the position I take.

There is some underlying difference. I have a strong feeling that we might really accomplish more in building up strengths on other areas in which we want to work instead of trying to comb an entire country for a small group of people who looked somewhat promising ... and scatter what we have to spend in China or Europe and give fellowships. We might get more for our money in the long run if we would pick 1 or 2 or 3 places that look pretty strong compared to the others, and focus our money to build up some of these. For example, in Europe, we might try to pick up 1, 2 or 3 places to build some really strong research centers and help to draw students around Europe to these centers.

CIH: The "grass roots" proposal has merit for certain types of operation. LCD's point is where do you make the most headway for acquiring knowledge.

JHW: I would gamble more on smaller amounts over widely scattered area. Grade the amount to the particular circumstances. Carl Sauer would favor scattering as widely as there are individuals. The character of the problem influences; also the maturity and size of the group.

NSB: On LCD's point, if you use that technique in foreign countries, you must be prepared for several things: 1) dictate what to do, 2) in most instances, you must keep on supporting almost indefinitely. For example, Rappard and Rist's Institutes - both initiated by RF and Spelman. They are not built into the structure of the country, and there is no provision for ~~for~~ succession and they are withering.

LCD: TRY picking a place that is already in the structure.

NSB: That would restrict pretty much what you would want.

RFEB: In China there is no system of philanthropy to pick up and go on, and also, if ~~there~~ the center/established is made so attractive that the people are reluctant to return to their own villages (as happened at PUMC), we would to that extent be limiting our effectiveness of serving our mandate.

JHW: In regard to backward centers - directly - to what extent is American development needed? How do we apply knowledge already known in the service of the people. Considering the rudimentary state of social knowledge, the highest priority should be given always to whatever makes for the best development of SS. Nothing should be allowed to keep that objective from driving forward in whatever ways likely to be productive.

experiments? The essential contribution to Pasteur's learning came out of his experiments and contributed significantly to the development of the Germ Theory of ~~the~~ disease. I would agree that for us in our state of knowledge anything that may be done to improve the opportunity for backward countries should be done as a contribution to learning. The IHD was exposed to concrete problems, and the necessity for meeting them resulted in more fundamental work being done on them.

The question I would raise is not the various forms of contact, but whether, keeping the objective of contribution to learning high in the scale of objectives, anything that is done in the backward areas does not have some justification, and whether it may not be an important part of the building up of that social knowledge that would make for a broad, more ~~xx~~ catholic SS.

LCD: In operating in backward area programs, how can one foresee what is likely to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. The risks of technical shifts, the implications and expectations on the part of the people concerned, and the predominantly practical aspect which operational programs require, result in thinness so far as more objective research is concerned. The Foundations are in a position to try to keep the channel for basic research open. The government, business and a large number of public groups are very much interested in getting social science talent for consultants on practical problems.

CIH: With expanding interest in backward areas as an opportunity for basic work, what would be the crucial variables in the situation?

JHW: Will RFE put down in a half page his summation of what he thinks the policy ought to be on this issue. RFE and LCD to accommodate views on it.

NSB: What I have to say in this is negative for the time being. The staff we have and other things already with us, I think we ought to stay away from any operating program for the present. I am thinking of the Crete kind of thing and related undertakings. Our personnel has not had any particular experience with that kind of thing. Demonstration projects are enormously expensive. If there was a mission such as e.g. Rand, and some good economist or sociologist wanted to explore certain problems and asked to go along as an individual professional person and not on their payroll, I would favor it. Furthermore, I don't have much faith in sending people out to backward areas to work at grass roots in general. Persons with knowledge about China or North Africa or Russia in an unorganized kind of way wouldn't get very far. To be preferred is the kind of thing like the Russian Institute - area study group. However, if for example, you have some good person in population and a population problem in Korea is to be investigated, we ought to help. Beyond that, I wouldn't go very far. Send out only experts.

On the positive side, in a general policy of supporting research activities in various countries, we can very easily turn to our centers and concentrate

a little more in the direction related to the problems of backward areas,- e.g. supporting _____ Institute in France, for a study of industrialization of North Africa or some study of French-Indo China if that came along.

By the same token, in England, there is a lot of work going on in connection with African and colonial affairs programs. Centering our program a little more in that direction would yield a wide interest.

Without moving into new areas (SS activities) we will come across people who should be brought to centers in this country from western Europe to receive training. Beyond that, for the moment, I do not see any great merit in proceeding.

RFE: Commented on the kind of situation students from China encounter here when they go, for example, into departments of economics where the theory they study is very far removed from the conditions they face upon returning to their own country. There is a learning possibility that has to be adjusted to the situation into which the student will return.

JHW: Concerning the relationship of the study of backward areas to the serving of the well-being of mankind or the application of knowledge,- my thought concerns not merely the sponsoring of a particular thing like Crete, but the fact that in one of these areas, there has been a great deal of unrest. You have then an opportunity to study international relations in an indefinite kind of field, and the standards are apt not to be high. We can very easily get into the kind of thing that was typified by the Great Island Conference. The problem in international relations has been to try to get that interest and natural concern channelled off into some area for intellectual, scholarly study and discussion. (This is our justification for support of the Russian Institute and also of population).

The thing that has impressed me in the very little contact with the problem of Crete, etc. (in application terms and not in terms of learning) is the immaturity and naivete with which this country is reaching out toward all the backward nations of the world. You get this kind of thing equally in the State Department conferences. We are trying to make sure that the backward areas will be won away from Communism. That means a state of affairs which is the antithesis of good and effective research work. Much money will be spent very fast playing for their support and getting mixed up with the political motives and developing the "gimme" habit on the part of the people. The opposite thing would be to work slowly, learning first and then teaching, and not introducing ~~more~~ things more rapidly than the political and cultural systems can absorb them, and don't interfere with the political and cultural integrity of the people, leaving the responsibility with them and putting in a very little money in a long, slow program. I wonder what we can do to aid that?

The absence of personnel with modesty, interest in working slowly or interest in other countries or cultures is the first lack. If the area programs are not adequate in amount or character, that represents a potential field. There is also the possibility of facilitating the review of experience that we have had. There has been the pretty long experience with RF and the IHD as cases in point. Is there an opportunity in the quite specific thing of lessons from that experience? There could be some profit from a resume of the experience that has been had by various other agencies. The English experience in the development of Africa may be one of the functions all ready to be performed by having someone on the task to draw any general lessons.

I would assume that IHD is going to^{go} ahead on the Crete venture. I would like permission to bring that up for consideration at the Board meeting. I would be inclined to use IHD as a mechanism and superimpose on it the opportunity to attach a person for a time if he had a problem and wanted to work in that area. IHD might wish to have suggestions on economic, sociology and other problems.

We should keep our efforts calculated to emphasize personnel, economic phases of problems, population studies that are pertinent, utilization of the machinery that exists in UN; IHD as a contact for training and incidentally for studying.

I would be happy at the possibility of working out a situation where a man would be located in a little village in Crete with his Greek counterpart, and study with a particular problem in view.

So far as the Far East is concerned, the focus of activity for active intelligence ought to be kept going. We are not yet in a position to know what the need is there. A considered analysis by RFE will give us the basis for this discussion.

NSB: The use of geographers might be fruitful in the backward area study. (E.g. Liverpool; Stockholm). They are getting close to cultural anthropology.