

The Humanities and "The Well-Being of Mankind:"

The Humanities at The Rockefeller Foundation Since 1928

Joel Colton and Malcolm Richardson

ROCKEFELLER ARCHIVE CENTER

copy 1

"What shall be the attitude of the trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation toward the many and tempting fields in which its resources might unquestionably be used for increasing the health, happiness, and general welfare of the human race?"

-- Jerome D. Greene, 1913

"Although late in entering the field of the humanities, the trustees of the Foundation have felt increasingly that in a world where the values by which men have guided and still guide their lives are in constant danger of being submerged, no area of activity has greater significance.

-- Raymond B. Fosdick, 1952

I

Origins and Early Stages: The Humanities at the General Education Board and the Foundation, 1913-1929

...Some emphasis upon the arts and humanities might be a good balance for the other features of our program which so exclusively concerns science and health." -- Edwin R. Embree, 1924

The question of support for the humanities was present from the outset, but over a decade and a half elapsed before the Rockefeller Foundation, created in 1913, adopted a program in the humanities.* In the reorganization and consolidation of the various Rockefeller philanthropies which took place in 1928, the Foundation inherited the humanities program of the General Education Board (G.E.B.) and made it its own. In the earliest stages of the Foundation's existence, the Foundation's first executive director, Jerome D. Greene (whose formal title was Secretary since John D. Rockefeller, Jr., served as both president and chairman of the board of trustees) included the "fine arts" among suggested areas in which the Foundation and other Rockefeller agencies might work. However, Frederick T. Gates, the senior Rockefeller's principal adviser, insisted that the newly-created Foundation should confine its activities to health -- "which underlies all progress" -- and avoid "scat-teration" of its resources. Gates took the injunction in the Foundation's charter, "toward the well-being of mankind throughout the world," in an almost literal sense, the Foundation's mission to be interpreted in physical terms only.^{1/}

*Foundations have come to use the word "Program" to mean a set of professional activities or areas which a foundation has expressed an interest in funding.

Greene, on the other hand, emphasized in some of his earliest memoranda that the Foundation could not contribute to the advancement of human well-being in any part of the world without a thorough knowledge of its history and culture. Although he agreed with Gates that fragmentation of Foundation interests was to be avoided, he rejected the thesis that "bodily health" was "the only kind of good that it is worthwhile for these endowments to promote." It was the duty of the Rockefeller organizations, he believed, to study the "fundamental needs of human society, the true sources not only of its health, but...of its happiness." Among the "root causes" of happiness Greene included "religion, health, education, economic efficiency, family and social life" and the "cultivation of aesthetic sensibilities through literature, music, and the other fine arts." Under the influence of Greene, who also had a special interest in the Far East, the Foundation from the beginning considered such projects as an international institute to serve as "headquarters for the study of the Art, Literature, and History of East Asia," but these projects did not come to fruition.^{2/} With the exception of a single grant in 1913 (of \$100,000) to the American Academy in Rome, the Foundation did little in the humanities in the next several years. When Greene stepped aside in 1917 to make way for George E. Vincent, who headed the Foundation as president for the following twelve years, the concentration of the Foundation's program on medicine and public health was firmly established.

In the years from 1913 to 1928 four major Rockefeller funding agencies were active -- the Foundation, the General Education Board (established in 1903), the International Education Board, (I.E.B., created in 1923), and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (named for the wife of John D. Rockefeller, Sr., established in 1918). The GEB focused on promoting education at all levels, public and private, especially in the South, with a special

dedication to improving educational opportunities for American blacks, but it also had a substantial interest for many years in American medical education and later in research and teaching in the natural sciences.^{3/} Because its charter did not permit it to fund projects outside the United States, the International Education Board was created to carry out similar work overseas.^{4/}

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial was transformed in the 1920s under the leadership of Beardsley Ruml from a generalized fund into a more directed organization supporting research in the social sciences and with a few scattered interests in the humanities. Among its early grants in the humanities, it provided small research sums in 1925 for humanistic scholars in the United States, initiated a study of the humanities in Europe, and gave training and educational development grants to younger humanities scholars in Germany. In addition to these major funding agencies the Rockefeller philanthropies also included such important operating, but not funding organizations in medicine and public health as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (the earliest of all the philanthropies, established in 1901, and after 1965 known as Rockefeller University), the China Medical Board, and the International Health Board.

The Foundation, the GEB, the IEB, and the Memorial -- trustees often sat on more than one board and officers sometimes directed programs at more than one board -- often found themselves tripping over one another. At any one time, two or more Rockefeller agencies might be examining similar problems or even, on occasion, negotiating with the same research institute or scientist. Confusion was inevitable not only in the public mind but among the agencies themselves. Abraham Flexner, director of medical studies and medical education at the GEB (and educational affairs officer of the IEB), the author of a remarkable Carnegie-funded study in 1910 that revolutionized American medical education, returned from Europe at one point to recommend against one

venture only to discover that the Memorial had made a definite commitment to it. The unsatisfactory situation demanded attention. As Flexner informed his trustees at the GEB in 1927, "It is a mistake to have two foundations created by the same benefactor dealing in total ignorance of one another with the responsible head of a college or university."⁵/ Even before the reorganization of 1928, it was apparent that the need to avoid wasteful duplication of efforts called for some kind of consolidation.

Reorganization was needed not only for reasons of administrative efficiency alone. "About 1924 a change began to occur in the curve of Rockefeller activities," Edwin R. Embree, secretary and later vice president of the Foundation, recalled. "The old program began to go stale, and new proposals which might have taken their places failed to get established."⁶/ New personalities also played a part. The pressure to reorganize, Embree relates, took place "partly because Raymond Fosdick and Arthur Woods, who had recently come in as personal advisers to Mr. Rockefeller [Jr.] and as his representatives on all the Rockefeller boards, were terribly fed up with the existing formality and welcomed new activity."⁷/ Woods played a lesser role; it was Fosdick who was the principal catalyst of change. Fosdick, the "boy trustee" to some of the older hands, was elected to the Foundation's board of trustees in 1921 and to the other Rockefeller boards shortly thereafter. He enjoyed a strong personal friendship with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who as chairman of the Foundation's board, delegated the administrative responsibilities to Fosdick. Occupying a pivotal position thanks to his membership on every board, Fosdick came to occupy a strong position of leadership over his fellow trustees. At 38, he already had an impressive career in law and public service behind him; in 1919 he had seemed destined to be the United States representative to the League of Nations when the Senate scuttled

American entry into the League. Bringing to the board of trustees a greater vigor and energy than then prevailed, he soon had all of the boards reexamining their activities.

Some of the officers chafed at the limitations put upon them by Gates and the older generation. For these men the possibility of reorganization served as a convenient occasion to raise new questions. With Gates nearing retirement, and with the senior Rockefeller gradually relinquishing the day-to-day control of the family interests to his son, the time had come to reopen the question of what private philanthropy could and properly should do. Could the Rockefeller funds in general, and the Foundation in particular, contribute more broadly to "the well-being of mankind throughout the world"?

Embree, for one, thought so. After serving as Vincent's right-hand man, and just before being promoted to the vice presidency of the Foundation, he briefly headed a division with vaguely defined planning responsibilities designated the Division of Studies. He had earlier proposed that this division, which proved to be short-lived, house programs such as nursing education which did not fit into the existing administrative categories. Facetiously, Embree suggested that the new division might be called the "Division of Trial and Error" -- or if Vincent did not care for that -- the "Division of Lamé Ducks" or "of Half-Squeezed Lemons." However titled, Embree hoped to include some new fields in that division. "I am still inclined to think," he confided, more seriously, to Vincent in 1923, "that some emphasis upon the arts or the humanities might be a good balance for the other features of our program which so exclusively concerns science and health."⁸ Here was a refrain soon to be heard again.

Would all agree on the need to balance the Foundation's programs in international health and medical research with the arts and humanities? There is no record to indicate that Vincent, who received several memos in this vein

from Embree from 1922 to 1924, or any of the medical officers gave the matter much thought. So far as they were concerned, it was difficult enough to shape programs in medicine, public health, and the sciences. The burden of proof rested on the impatient to suggest workable new programs.

* * * * *

1c. The proponents of change at the Foundation and at the other Rockefeller organizations were given an opportunity to be heard in January 1924, at a small but important gathering held at Gedney Farms in New York. Fosdick, on behalf of the trustees, invited officers from each of the four Rockefeller Funding agencies to review their existing programs and to discuss "informally" "possible extension of present policies" and "possible new fields of work." He asked that each of the twelve men who were to meet at Gedney Farms "put this question to himself: "If I had the funds of a Board to do with as I pleased, what are the things I should set about doing?"9/ Fosdick encouraged written memoranda from the participants and several, including Embree at the Foundation and Flexner at the GEB, accepted the invitation readily. At the meeting Fosdick urged that all ideas be presented "without reserve" and promised that they would be "fully discussed."

The humanities surfaced quickly at the meeting. The case was again made that "the well-being of mankind" required more than attention to health and material needs and that an exclusive concern with science and medical research did not live up to the full obligations of the charter's mandate. Embree made the most vigorous presentation. "Of what good is it," he demanded to know -- in his "dramatic speech" (as Fosdick later described it) -- "to keep people alive and healthy if their lives are not to be touched increasingly with something of beauty?"10/ There was danger, he warned, that the promotion

of science alone would throw the "whole range of human affairs" out of equilibrium. The ready availability of funding for medicine and science was creating an imbalance within universities because of pressure on these institutions to match foundation grants for medical education and the sciences. There were "rumors" that university administrators were not taking the legitimate interests of the non-scientific departments and disciplines into consideration in their budgets and that "in certain instances university presidents are deflecting to medicine and hygiene outside funds which might otherwise go to other departments."

Foundation and IEB money abroad was having an even more disruptive influence on universities, he went on to complain. "In Central Europe, for instance, where even a small amount of American money means so much in the local currency, one finds the non-medical departments of universities looking wistfully, to say the least, at the sums given by the Rockefeller Foundation to provide apparatus and supplies, foreign journals, and local and travelling fellowships in the medical sciences." In the scramble for funds and grants, Embree feared, there was an unwholesome tendency to match grants with money that might otherwise have been allotted to the humanities. He noted also that the Rockefeller agencies and other major foundations were all "working chiefly in the same fields" -- education, medicine, and public health. Yet these were not the only fields in which foundations could do "notable work." Although accepting the need for continuing to be active in these areas, he nevertheless called upon the Rockefeller agencies "as leaders and pioneers" to reconsider their activities and discover "new departures upon which we might venture with benefit to mankind." Among them, he suggested, as "rich in possibilities," were population studies ("population, heredity, and eugenics"), the physical environment, and "the realm of the humanities, the arts, and recreation."¹¹/

The humanities and the fine arts, he emphasized, were in special need of support because they were "in danger of neglect today in the world generally and in America in particular." In no other area was "so little concerted effort or wise giving represented" or "opportunities for stimulus and help so great.^{12/} The long list of projects he recommended -- fellowships for study and research abroad, support for music, drama, painting, drama companies, educational films, a school of art, archaeology, encouragement for the teaching of English abroad and of foreign languages in America -- were less important than his resounding plea stressing the need for the humanities in "any well balanced society."

Somewhat unexpectedly, he ended his speech invoking the authority of Gates, whom he quoted as saying in the Foundation offices "a few years ago": "The field which so far has been neglected by these boards is that of the arts." "With Mr. Gates," he concluded, "I believe that the next great contribution of the agencies set up by Mr. Rockefeller is in the realm of the humanities and the fine arts."^{13/}

** ** **

Despite Embree's hopes and ambitions for the Foundation, the man who played the key role in creating a new program in the humanities for the Rockefeller agencies was not Embree but Abraham Flexner at the General Education Board. The reform of the American medical schools and other contributions to educational reform behind him, he had now with characteristic energy turned his attention to the humanities. The memo Flexner prepared for the Gedney Farms meeting reinforced Embree's. Feisty and dynamic, Flexner first peppered his remarks with some scathing observations about the shortcomings of his colleagues in the various Rockefeller agencies and in the foundation world in general:

There are in the city of New York today eight or ten so-called foundations. As I run over their personnel... it strikes me that they contain very few men of really pregnant intelligence, very few scholars and students, in the genuine, not the academic meaning of these terms. The situation is to some extent mitigated by the fact that there are in the foundations men of quick comprehension and ready sympathy, who take up with ideas which they have not themselves produced....Viewing all the foundations together, I should say that their financial resources exceed their stock of ideas, the capacity of their personnel, and the possibility of obtaining corresponding outside support.^{14/}

As Alan Gregg, who in 1930 became director for medical sciences at the Foundation, later recalled, "In Abraham Flexner we had free insurance against complacency."^{15/}

Flexner described the initiative already taken at the GEB to add the humanities and fine arts to its activities. Reading at the Gedney Farms meeting from a docket of a meeting less than a year previously, and paying tribute to the contributions in education, science and health of such agencies as the Carnegie organizations and the various Rockefeller agencies, including his own Board, he had noted:

There has been in recent years a large increase in the amount of free funds capable of being devoted to the encouragement of scientific research....General college and university endowments have grown and this growth has been equally beneficial to both scientific and humanistic studies, but special encouragement and support for humanistic studies, comparable to the support available for special scientific studies is not forthcoming. Meanwhile, inasmuch as a well-developed civilization requires humanistic as well as scientific culture, the officers raise the question as to whether the Board would not do well to consider projects in the field of humanism. [sic]^{16/}

Not recommending specific projects, he had urged instead staff appointments or consultancies for the humanities and for music and the fine arts. He had made clear that work in these areas, when relating to colleges and universities, should be the primary responsibility of the GEB and that the other Rockefeller boards should be expected to work closely with it.

Embree followed up his own "thought-provoking" presentation (as Fosdick also described it, at the time) at the meeting with a letter to President Vincent, recounting opportunities for the Foundation itself, and with pointed reference to the projected expansion in activities of the GEB:

The humanities and arts increasingly appeal to me. I have no doubt that some foundation will be so engaged on a major program within a few years. I am loath to see leadership here -- as in elementary education, agriculture and general science -- go to another board.... I believe it would bring new life and enthusiasm into the whole Foundation if we could get going on such a new field of such rich opportunity.^{17/}

The Gedney Farms meeting adjourned after endorsing a resolution of Flexner's that a committee representing the Foundation, the GEB, the IEB, and the Memorial (the Institute was also included) be set up to study ways and means to promote the scholarly growth of the officers and to coordinate the efforts of the various agencies in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

In his own organization Flexner was able to enlist the support of the new president. In 1923 Wycliffe Rose had left his post as head of the International Health Division of the Foundation to become president of the General Education Board. There he made a number of changes. He curtailed the ongoing practice of gifts to endowment funds and inaugurated a new program to foster training and research opportunities in selected institutions. Although Rose saw the sciences as the focus of the new program, Flexner had argued persuasively in favor of a role for the humanities as well. "I suggested that if the Board was going to promote 'science,' it should also promote the humanities,"^{18/} he later recalled, adding: "Science is not, in my judgment, a proper division. You cannot undertake to develop science in a college or university as a thing by itself, apart from other college and university activities." An artificial separation of the sciences and humanities "tends to disrupt things that should be viewed together."^{19/} In October 1924, ten months after Gedney

Farms, the General Education Board adopted a resolution endorsing support for the humanities. The justification, in the words of the Board, was "to preserve the proper balance of our educational activities."^{20/} As its own history admits, however, "the humanistic studies constituted something of an afterthought."^{21/}

Despite the resolution, Rose continued to believe in the primacy of the sciences, and for the next few years directed most of the major grants into that area. This was true of the newly created International Education Board, which Rose also headed, and which supported research abroad in the physical and biological sciences. Although sympathetic to humanistic studies, Rose could not embrace them with the same enthusiasm as he did the physical sciences -- at best, his attitude was one of "acquiescence." He went along, however, even if unenthusiastically, with the humanities program. Flexner, meanwhile, who regarded Rose's preoccupation with the physical sciences "with considerable skepticism," threw himself with zeal into support for the humanities.^{22/} The new program was announced with the statement that the humanistic scholar had been "doing his thinking and teaching with less recognition and encouragement than are at the moment enjoyed by his scientific brother" and that the Board would therefore "assist in righting the balance in the interest of a symmetrical development."^{23/}

Flexner's definition of the humanities was a very traditional one, restricting them largely to the classics, art history, and archaeology. The earliest grants of the GEB in the field of the humanities were a seven-year appropriation in 1927 totaling \$780,000 to the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago to train archaeologists and a grant of half a million dollars to Harvard for the Fogg Art Museum to train curators and art historians. The largest share of the other new grants also went to support archaeological

training and research. On support for archaeology there was agreement between Rose and Flexner. Archaeology appealed to Rose's passion for science. Indeed archaeology was defined by the GEB as "a legitimate field of pure scientific inquiry essential to the understanding of human development."²⁴/ Abroad, the IEB contributed \$1 million to the American Academy in Rome and \$500,000 to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, here too for archaeological training and excavation. It was James Harvey Breasted, professor of Oriental Studies at the University of Chicago and head of the division of Egyptology, who was active and persuasive in winning support for archaeology from Rose and Flexner, from John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and later, from the Foundation. (The Board's grants to the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute eventually exceeded \$3.5 million and the combined contributions of Rockefeller, Jr., the Foundation, the GEB, and the IEB came to over \$11 million.)²⁵/

Flexner's next step was even more significant. In December 1926 the energetic administrator convened a national conference in Washington, D.C., to which he invited seventeen leading scholars representing the principal humanities departments of the country -- all at the time east of the Mississippi -- to discuss the needs of the humanities as these scholars saw them. The disciplines represented included art, archaeology, language and literature, comparative religion, history, and philosophy. At the meeting, at Flexner's suggestion, Edward C. Capps, professor of classics at Princeton and later consultant for the humanities at the GEB and the Foundation, presided.

One of the participants gave voice to the general sense of discouragement prevalent among the humanistic scholars:

The humanists have been discouraged and unaggressive. Corporations and presidents have been pursued by the scientists and doctors with the result that no aggressive policy has been followed in getting funds, in training men, or in attracting men to the humanities.*

*Throughout these early memoranda the assumption seems to have been that scholars were male only.

This is the general American tendency to ignore the humanities and it has been allowed by the universities to have its way.^{26/}

The major needs of the humanities scholars, the participants made clear, were financial. Scholars needed funding for travel to foreign repositories of books and manuscripts or to excavation sites ("the spade is as good as the microscope," said one of the scholars present, "and has as much to reveal").^{27/} They needed funding also to secure publishing outlets for manuscripts, research and secretarial assistance, relief from heavy teaching assignments, fellowships for younger scholars and graduate students, and subsidies for scholarly journals. A shortage of trained scholars in the humanities was developing, they lamented, and competent trained scholars could not be found to replace the generation dying out.

Flexner agreed with what he had heard: that university authorities had been apathetic and the humanistic scholars themselves unaggressive, and that the main tide of America was in other directions. But he believed that something could be done to "withstand the narrow scientific and materialistic trend in America." Some participants had told him privately -- he termed it "pathetic" -- that "this was the first time in their lives that anybody had turned a sympathetic ear to them and had invited them to talk out....For the first time...somebody asked them what they needed and opened their eyes to the possibility that they might get something if they made an effort."^{28/} Flexner excitedly saw an opportunity for the GEB to work with the universities in developing programs of research and training in the humanities as it had so successfully done in medicine and science.

"The Washington conference," he wrote ten days later in a letter to Cyrus Adler, "was a great success." He was pleased that it had brought out a full and informal discussion of the status and needs of the various humanistic

studies. "I was struck by the unaggressiveness of the group; that is, these scholars have been -- as a rule -- quietly at work on their own studies, letting their scientific and medical brethren hustle for the resources which all alike have needed."^{29/} The GEB meeting in 1926 was a turning point for the humanities. A Foundation report several years later noted: "The conference of 1926 represented a declared interest in the humanities that the Rockefeller boards have maintained ever since."^{30/}

Some time after the meeting Flexner prepared a memo for the GEB trustees in 1927 and moved forward with his proposed plans to aid the humanistic disciplines in the universities:

For centuries the humanities had the whole field; latterly science and the professions have come into their own. The truth is not, however, that too much has been done for science; in fact enough has not been done for either; but meanwhile, during this period, the humanities have been to a certain extent overlooked. The country has been scientifically, not humanistically minded; and the universities have simply reflected the dominant forces of the time.^{31/}

A few months later he prepared a memorandum for the Board on the shortage of professors in the humanistic fields. When he asked Capps for examples, the latter informed him that competent trained scholars could not be found to teach archaeology, ancient history, Sanskrit, Byzantine studies. When a chair was vacated, it often remained empty. The need to reinforce the humanistic disciplines in the universities was pressing.

Support for the humanities at the GEB, as it developed, had three broad components. The first developed into specific grants, as already noted, to outstanding research institutions and organizations such as the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard, the American Academy in Rome, the American School for Classical Studies in Athens, and the American Classical League. The second component, a direct outgrowth

of the 1926 meeting, was a program of support for humanistic research and teaching on an experimental basis in which the Board appropriated to selected major universities large grants to extend over periods of generally five years and which the universities were asked to match with their own funds as well. The grants were called "general" or "fluid" research funds because each university was free to channel the funds into support for the humanities as its administrative officers saw fit. Princeton was the first beneficiary in 1927; other institutions selected shortly thereafter for the five-year grants were Harvard, Chicago, Michigan, and Yale; others would follow. The third component was support for the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), established in 1919 as a federation of all professional societies concerned with research and teaching in the humanities. The ACLS was able to serve as a coordinating and planning agency for the humanities in this country (as it has continued to do to the present) and by membership in the International Academic Union serve as spokesman for the humanities on the international scene. It helped also to inaugurate large-scale collaborative research projects that no single university or agency could undertake. Under the GEB program it now received funds for administrative expenses and general research funds with which it could award fellowships and grants-in-aid to scholars in the humanities. Rockefeller funding, through the GEB and later the Foundation, was the principal source of ACLS support for many years.

The grants in the humanities were Flexner's chief interest in his last two years with the Board. He resigned in June 1928 at the time of the reorganization of the Rockefeller agencies -- with parts of which he was not in agreement³²/ -- and departed to meet a new challenge -- to help shape the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, established with Bamberger funding. By the time he left the GEB he had launched a significant program in the

humanities. It was not his style to concern himself with specific projects or individuals, as later critics noted, but to make general grants to institutions. It was said that he was responsible for only two grants, one to Elias Avery Lowe for his study of Latin paleography and the second for the excavation of the Agora in Athens. His style was "trying to do massive things rather than building people."³³/ He had had no compunctions about telling medical educators what to do in his famous report, but in the case of the humanistic disciplines at the universities, or in the case of the ACLS, he believed it appropriate to grant them funds to use at their discretion. Although his style of funding would later be questioned and alternative ways sought for supporting the humanities, when Flexner departed from the Rockefeller philanthropies he left an immense legacy behind him.

Despite his enormous contribution another criticism would be offered. The program he developed was heavily oriented toward classical studies, the ancient world, and archaeological training and excavation. It embodied a conservative, traditional and -- even at the time -- somewhat outmoded and old-fashioned view of the humanities.

One critic at the GEB itself noted this. Anson Phelps Stokes, trustee of the GEB and later of the Foundation, was an Episcopal clergyman of wide learning who served as secretary of Yale University and later as Canon of the National Cathedral in Washington, was the author of a scholarly history of church-state relations in the United States, and was active in behalf of civil rights and international understanding. He wrote to Flexner in 1927 in response to a memorandum that Flexner had circulated: "The emphasis throughout [your] memorandum seems to me mainly on Ancient History, Ancient Languages and Archaeology. These are very important but the word Humanities

should be understood to include a very broad field, including Art, Music, Education, Literature, Sociology, etc." On the other hand, Stokes informed Flexner that he liked "your idea of giving to universities for advanced work in the Humanities and leaving it to them to determine the exact means."^{34/} A few years later that very procedure would be the target of other critics!

Meanwhile President Vincent of the Foundation, as a trustee of the GEB, expressed himself "in hearty sympathy" with Flexner's support for the humanities, which he interpreted, he said, as meaning "languages, literatures, cultural archaeology, and related interests." He agreed about the relative loss of ground by the humanities but made the point that "the social sciences and philosophy have been robbing the humanities of some of their early functions."^{35/} Where once the classicists had studied all of ancient civilization such disciplines as philosophy, history, political science, and the history of art were now making their contributions. Although supportive of the new program, he too saw it as concerned mainly with the ancient world.

Thus, well before the Foundation, the General Education Board had embarked on a program of generous support for the humanities. When the Foundation took over the program, the Foundation's Annual Report could describe it as "a program already in operation on a rather extensive scale, and touching practically every phase of humanistic work in the United States."^{36/} The Foundation itself during the years 1926 to 1929 had undertaken only one important venture. It initiated the negotiations that culminated later in its notable contribution toward the reconstruction of the new Bodleian Library at Oxford. It was Flexner's program for the humanities at GEB that the Foundation adopted in the reorganization of 1928, agreeing to continue it "on the same broad but experimental basis."^{37/}

The consolidation adopted in 1928 had as its base a decision that all programs relating to the funding of research, i.e., "the advance of human knowledge" be concentrated in the Foundation. The Foundation thus assumed the funding responsibilities of the GEB in medicine, natural sciences, and the humanities, and left it only with its program in education, and then principally in the American South. The Foundation took over the Memorial and its interests in the social sciences, and the Memorial disappeared although some monies were provided to carry on its work for a time as the New York Spelman Fund. The IEB, its funds committed, was soon liquidated and its activities taken over by the Foundation. It was in this way that the Foundation inherited the program in the humanities of the GEB, the IEB, and the Memorial. Except for the area of education, still in the province of the GEB, the Foundation took over the personnel policies, and programs of the other boards. The consolidation in 1928 and the administrative changes of 1929 inaugurated a new era for the Foundation -- and for the humanities.^{38/}

As part of the consolidation approved May 23, 1928, the trustees extended the scope of the Foundation's activities to include "the advancement of knowledge in the field of the humanities," and on January 3, 1929 it was stipulated that a director be appointed to supervise the program. Organizationally there were to be five programs at the Foundation, with a director for each: international health, natural sciences, social sciences, medical sciences, and the humanities.*

*Only International Health, the successor to the International Health Board, was designated a "division." A division was an administrative unit, generally with its own director and budget. It carried out a "program," or concentration of activities, often in cooperation with other divisions. The idea of the "division" was often played down in Foundation thinking, and in designating only one division the intent seems to have been to emphasize the collaboration and to avoid compartmentalization. Later other divisions were established, so that by the 1970s there were seven.

In the humanities no director was appointed, as stipulated, but in January 1929 Edward Capps, the distinguished classicist and professor of Greek at Princeton, who had been serving as consultant for the General Education Board and had chaired Flexner's 1926 meeting, took leave from Princeton and began to serve as consultant for the humanities at the Foundation and to supervise the new program.* Capps had broad experience as an educational administrator. An authority on the Greek theater, he was a Yale Ph.D., taught at Chicago for several years and at Princeton from 1907 until his retirement in 1936. Through his friendship with Woodrow Wilson he had served in the early postwar years as American Red Cross Commissioner to Greece and subsequently as envoy extraordinary and ambassador to that country. A founder of the American Association of University Professors, he was its first president in 1920. For twenty years, from 1919 to 1939, he served as chairman of the managing committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens and was chiefly responsible for initiating in 1928 with the Greek government's permission the excavation of the Agora, for which he had been able to secure funding for the project from Flexner and Rose.

Under Capps' brief tenure -- he resigned from his consultancy after a year and a half, on June 30, 1930, to resume his professorship and other interests -- the humanities program at the Foundation was launched as a separate program. It continued in the same form shaped by Capps after his withdrawal and before a director was appointed. Not only by virtue of his own orientation

*Despite the fact that the minutes of the trustees' meetings and other official documents describe Capps only as a consultant, he somehow became listed in the annual report for 1929-30 as "director." We have restored his original title, since it helps to clarify the inconclusive discussions of 1930.

-- as John Marshall, a humanities program office later wrote of Capps, "for him the humanities meant the ancient world"³⁹/ -- but because of the guidelines carried over from the GEB, Capps' grants reflected the nature of the program as inherited from Flexner, which they continued to do for the next several years.

In projecting the outlines of the program "for the next five or ten years of any future Director," he believed there would need to be "an emphasis upon America rather than Europe."⁴⁰/ By that, like Flexner, he meant building humanities institutions and disciplines in the United States, supporting humanities teaching and research through grants to universities and to the ACLS, and filling vacancies in existing humanities departments. As the program developed, there were some exceptions; small grants were continued, for example, for the support of German scholars in the humanities through the Abraham Lincoln Stiftung, and large grants were made for libraries abroad.

Capps understandably championed continued support for archaeology -- "the opportunities for highly significant discoveries in the history of civilization through excavation," the results, he promised, would "affect practically all the humanities studies." The American School of Classical Studies in Athens quickly received support for fellowships to help train young archaeologists, which was described as a "great need." The same institution received funds to build a museum for the "preservation and display of antiquities" on the island of Lesbos. As an additional emphasis he called for cooperative efforts to preserve documentary materials and records -- including those "in stone and clay" -- and for aid to the "great libraries" and in some cases museums, and arranged support also for scholarly research tools such as "catalogues and bibliographies."⁴¹/

The annual report for 1930 summarized the new program's funding activities "in the historical arts and sciences, including archaeology," and in "bibliography." The following year the annual report, defining the humanities, said that they "may be broadly construed as including the liberal and historical arts, literature, philology (ancient and modern languages), and archaeology." It added that with the general interest of the Foundation in the "advance of knowledge," one of the obvious ways to increase knowledge in the humanities was to "safeguard and render permanently accessible to present and future generations the magnificent collections of books, manuscripts, and other documents which have accumulated for many centuries at important centers of learning." A special rubric henceforth appeared in the annual report for "Libraries, Museums and Bibliographical Work."^{42/}

In these early years of the program assistance was given to the two American Schools of Oriental Research, one in Jerusalem and one in Baghdad, for the construction and development of their libraries, and aid given to the Cambridge University Library for construction purposes. The Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris received funding to help fill gaps its periodical collections and the British Museum received help to complete its catalogue of printed books. In the United States the American Library Association was enabled to complete lists of foreign government serial publications. The largest and most impressive grant of all of these categories was the grant of \$2.3 million to Oxford University for the expansion of the Bodleian Library, a grant made after several years of planning assistance as well. For that reason, in 1931 the total expenditure in the humanities could be reported as \$2,978,100. Apart from the Bodleian, that year and into the early 1930s, the annual expenditure ran about \$700,000.^{43/}

At the same time the five year fluid research grants to the universities initiated under the GEB were administered, and in 1929 Virginia was added to the original list; Johns Hopkins was added in 1930 and Columbia in 1931. Chicago received a two-year renewal as well as additional funds for work in comparative philology. Much of the funds to the universities under these grants were also used for archaeological training and exploration.

Traditionalist and a product himself of Ivy League schools, Capps nonetheless expressed the hope that the Foundation's future policy would be "not to confine itself to great university centers but to extend assistance to smaller groups or even to individuals or institutions of secondary rank if first-rate research is being done by them."⁴⁴/ To fund first-rate individual scholars regardless of their institutions the ACLS received an extensive three-year grant in 1929 (of \$370,000) so that it could award individual postdoctoral fellowships and grants-in-aid for research in the humanities.

** ** **

Although the newly defined objective of the reorganized Foundation was the "advance of knowledge" and the chief tool research -- with an implicit shift from strengthening institutions alone -- President Max Mason, who succeeded Vincent in 1929, and the trustees agreed that "research" was not to be applied in a narrow sense of the word and that the advancement of knowledge demanded "an interest in educational processes" and the "application" of knowledge. To avoid a fragmentation of effort they recommended a concentration on specific objectives with the thought also that the Foundation's work might develop a "structural unity."⁴⁵/ How the humanities might fit into this design was not clear.

Debate over the role of the humanities at the Foundation continued even after the formal inauguration of the program in 1929. When Capps retired as consultant at the end of June 1930, the program continued along the same lines, but President Mason did not hurry to secure a director or give serious consideration to the further development of the program. That there was resistance to its very existence is made clear by a document prepared on the eve of an important trustee meeting in October 1930.

Alan Gregg, director for medical sciences who for many years would render distinguished service in medicine, and a man of broad interests and cultivation, put the case against the new program forthrightly. In an internal memo dated October 27, 1930, Gregg, although sympathetic to the humanities as disciplines, sought to put on record "arguments against the continuance of a division of the Humanities within the RF." To Gregg, the creation of another program meant that the Foundation was diluting its influence and misreading its future. He argued that the world needed scientific knowledge and assistance much more than it needed support for cultural activities. "Is it not true," he asked, "that throughout the world there still are more people and more nations possessing a culture to which our money could add but little and yet lacking scientific knowledge which we are qualified and invited to give, than people well advanced in scientific knowledge who would consider us competent judges of their cultural needs?" The most urgent needs all over the globe, Gregg argued, were not for aesthetic education or cultural advancement but for the application of science and scientific findings to sanitation, nutrition, and general health care. Cultural exchange programs, in Gregg's view of the world in 1930, could not be high priorities when beyond the United States' borders there were hundreds of thousands of people "ignorant of their bodies, minds and physical environments."⁴⁶ These physical or material conditions

were remediable, and progress could be measured, whereas in the humanities the results were not calculable. Support for the humanities, in his view, served only to divert resources that could be used otherwise to good and tangible effect.

In the natural, biological, and medical sciences, moreover, there were recognized scientific criteria for evaluating research proposals and research findings. Could the same be said for the humanities? "All the subjects in the field of the humanities involve taste and subjective feelings," Gregg observed, and "therein lies the danger to the RF of assuming the role of appraiser or judge of what should be aided within the humanities."⁴⁷ Taking the words "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" as literally as Gates and the early medical officers, Gregg insisted that the humanities did not fulfill the Foundation's mission. Lest he be misunderstood, he added that he did not deny the importance of the humanities or even the appropriateness of strengthening the humanities in the United States; the Foundation's first duty, however, was to seek out the most urgent needs of a majority of the human race and not of the privileged minority that lived in North America. As to international activities, he did not think the humanities could work abroad successfully without a naive "ethnocentrism." Finally, stressing the unity and concerted effort the Foundation should aspire to in its overall program, he could not see "what mutual programs" a division of humanities could share with the other divisions of the Foundation. He concluded unambiguously: "...in the present world, with the exception of parts of the United States, I would not consider the greater needs of mankind to be aesthetic and cultural."⁴⁸ In brief, the humanities did not fit the mission, goal, and purposes of the Foundation as the sciences did and it was wrong to divert the Foundation's resources from more pressing activities and from the need to focus on the more solvable problems of mankind.

A few days later, a two-day trustee meeting in Princeton on October 29-30, at which the various programs of the reorganized Foundation were being discussed, also dramatically brought into the open the precariousness of the humanities program.

Vice President Thomas B. Appleget, who had been administering the humanities program in the absence of a director, made clear in his written memorandum and in his oral presentation the uneasiness with which Mason and he viewed the Foundation's activities in the humanities. The program, inherited in the reorganization of 1928 from the other Rockefeller philanthropies, he noted, had originated because the humanities in the last 50 or 75 years had been "crowded out" by the natural and social sciences and were in a "depressed condition." The program's focus was on strengthening teaching and research in the humanities departments in the universities and, as an "experimental step," fluid research funds had been awarded to six universities for advanced work in the humanities. Grants to the ACLS were also intended to make such research possible. Another emphasis had been on archaeology ("in accordance, consciously or unconsciously with the interest which Mr. Rockefeller [John D. Rockefeller, Jr.] personally has had in archaeology").^{49/} With Capps as consultant, the Foundation had continued along these same lines, with some additional support for bibliography and library cataloguing. It had added the University of Virginia to the original list of universities as recipients of fluid research funds. The Foundation, he noted, had inherited a considerable background of experience with the traditional humanities -- "the field of polite learning," as he described it. Approximately \$15 million had been spent by the various boards, and the Foundation itself was currently spending about \$600,000 annually on appropriations voted earlier. It continued to provide funds to the ACLS for its activities, including grant funds for individual research. Despite these activities, a change was called for.

President Mason and he were recommending to the trustees "not a discontinuance of Foundation interest in the humanities, but a temporary halting of new activities."50/ This arrangement would provide an opportunity for "careful study" of what has been accomplished and for ascertaining "the real results" of these efforts to encourage the humanities. The reorganized Foundation, he added, had taken on new personnel and had entered a number of new fields and it was "a part of prudence" not to move too rapidly in still another area. The implication was also clear that there would be no haste to appoint a director for the program. One exception, as a new activity, was recommended. A case could be made for "the preservation of records, both human, as in the case of vanishing tribes...or materials...useful to later generations which without Foundation intervention would doubtless perish." He added, pointedly: "the Foundation would not include interpretation as part of this program unless interpretation were a necessary part of preservation."51/ To some trustees Appleget's remarks came like a thunder-bolt.

When he finished his presentation, Stokes, who as a trustee of the GEB had staunchly supported that organization's work in the humanities and was now a trustee of the Foundation, spoke up sharply. He had no objection to the recommendation that the program be expanded to include proposals for the preservation of human records but it was a disappointment when so much was being done for the sciences in the colleges and universities that nothing more was being proposed for the humanities.

I have no fear whatever, such as was expressed here the other night, about the results of science being used in dangerous ways rather than in constructive ways, if alongside the teaching of science goes an adequate teaching of the humanities. I do think, however, that the Foundation, devoted to the welfare of mankind, which gives the overwhelming proportion of its money on the purely scientific side is likely to discourage the study of the humanities in our universities. 52/

He objected to the proposed "temporary halting of activities":

"I am frankly disappointed that the officers cannot recommend at this time much more than marking time in the humanities." Dismissing the thought of curtailing the humanities, he suggested that in addition to the preservation of records the Foundation develop fields where great opportunities existed -- comparative philology ("especially as it is being worked out by some of the great linguists of today"), the history of science ("which brings together science and the humanities in a most profitable way") and Oriental cultures, already the subject of a memorandum prepared for the same meeting by Mr. Greene, his fellow trustee. He strenuously objected to the decision not to move forward with the appointment of a director. Contrary to what had been said, a director was much needed, precisely to evaluate the results of what had already been accomplished. Acknowledging the difficulty of absorbing many new officers and activities after the consolidation, he argued that it was wrong to postpone appointing a director in the humanities who would not have trained along with the other directors; he would seem "a bit like an outsider." He hoped that President Mason would be on the outlook for a man of breadth, culture, and imagination comparable to that of the other directors and that the Rockefeller Foundation would not be looked upon by the outside world as almost exclusively scientific."53/

Stokes' intervention was supported by Trevor Arnett, successor to Wycliffe Rose as head of the General Education Board. Arnett recapitulated the work undertaken in the humanities by the General Education Board in order to balance its work in the sciences and to remedy the "relative backwardness" and "depression" that existed in the colleges and universities because of the "secondary and subordinate position" in which the humanities had been placed. He hoped that there was "no intention of putting the humanities at a still

greater disadvantage" by not carrying on as rapidly and as expeditiously as possible, "otherwise a division which is already behind would get still further behind." He thought that delay was occasioned by the complexity of the problem rather than by "any inherent opposition to the humanities."⁵⁴/

Greene, a veteran champion of the humanities at the Foundation, and since 1928 a trustee, spoke up sharply in favor of the "continuation of our work in this very large field of human knowledge...a field of tremendous importance." He spoke with the authority of a man who had been present at the creation and knew the meaning behind the Foundation's charter and mission. The charter, he insisted, spoke not of human "welfare" but of human "well-being," which meant more than physical health:

In our charter, which has been referred to, we speak of a sense of well-being. When we try to think, in our life, of the elements which constitute well-being and habits, we almost invariably turn to those aspects of life which have to do with the humanities. We are grateful to science for invention. We are grateful to medicine for health. But, when we think of the aspects of life which make the community in which we live attractive, we find ourselves almost invariably thinking of the humanities. When we speak of beautiful architecture, when we speak about parks, when we speak about paintings, when we speak about the drama, when we speak about music -- those are the things which distinguish a happy community.⁵⁵/

He was confident that the Foundation would not "diminish the importance" of the program. "It has," he added, "the utmost importance to the well-being of mankind." He pressed also his concern for supporting opportunities in the "major field" of East Asian culture which was in serious need of assistance: "There isn't in the United States at this moment one scholar of American birth who can deal with the materials of history, literature, philosophy, religion, and fine arts in the great civilizations of Japan and China." The West had succeeded in collecting Oriental art but lacked the "scholarship and the linguistic equipment to study the culture that had

produced it."^{56/} The important connection between art, religion, and philosophy, and the linguistic tools necessary for the interpretation of many works of art," he added, "are hardly understood by more than two or three American scholars at the outside." He saw a remarkable opportunity to initiate Western scholars to "the wonderful sources of Oriental civilization." The memorandum he had distributed spelled out his suggestions in even greater detail. A number of other trustees at the meeting, including William Allen White, spoke up to support the idea of broadening the Foundation's definition of the humanities to include non-Western culture.^{57/}

Mason, although making no concessions on the status of the humanities program, responded -- to the general satisfaction of both Greene and Stokes -- with warmth to Greene's suggestion. "I think the history of the development of ideas is one of the most important things that any group of scholars can study. It is fundamentally important, the study of cultures. More than once the suggestion has come... that the Foundation might well engage in efforts that are more directly aimed at the cultural side of the fine arts."^{58/}

But as to moving forward with the development of the program and the appointment of a new director, Mason remained non-committal. He and his staff had been making an exhaustive search for possible directors, but no conclusion had been reached. On an interim basis, and not for very long, he recommended the need for further study of the program. "I think that some months of marking time and the resumption of the study will enable us to make a much saner selection." Fosdick, chairing the meeting, pressed Mason for a pledge that he was not suspending his search for a director and that if he found someone he would bring forth a recommendation for appointment. Stokes went further and asked whether when he found a director Mason expected to "put his position and his work on a plane of equal importance and significance with these others." Mason, still hedging, insisted on the need for further study.

"I don't know what we expect. We do not recommend giving up our interest in the humanities...It has been very difficult, very confusing, and a very hard problem to work with."59/

The trustee interventions on behalf of the humanities were not, however, without result. Fosdick closed the session by inserting into the record his understanding that the search for a director would be prosecuted vigorously and that proper attention would be given to the development of the humanities program:

I think I voice the sentiment of the Board...We take it that the President in his recommendation is not recommending unnecessary postponement, and that this field has his entire support, and that it will be developed as rapidly as possible, and as rapidly as proper personnel can be found for it.60/

The procrastination, nevertheless, continued and Stokes continued to make himself a thorn in Mason's flesh, pressing the case for the humanities. When Mason had not yet appointed a director a full year later, Stokes took up the cudgels again. Writing in October, 1931, he called Mason's attention to an item in the day's paper:

I have been interested in the statement in this morning's Times showing the report of the 20th Century Fund's regarding Foundation giving in the United States during the last calendar year. I notice that of a total of \$52,000,000 granted to various causes by the foundations, less than \$1,000,000 was in the field of the humanities. I have not seen the full report so I do not know how the humanities are defined....At any rate the figures seem to me to indicate what I have always contended, that the relative amount of money being given by our Foundations to advance the cause of the humanities is inadequate.61/

In appeals to his fellow trustees and in letters to Mason and others, Stokes argued for what he considered to be the Foundation's responsibility in this area. Without leadership from the Foundation, funding for the arts and humanities would remain inadequate. The imbalance in prestige and resources in favor

of the sciences would undermine the framework of liberal education. The weakness of the humanities would have serious social consequences, he warned. "I am convinced that if the Humanities are put into the background in American education, the nation will ultimately suffer in its idealism and its culture."⁶²/ At least in part to protest the unconscionable delay in naming a new director and in developing the humanities program, Stokes announced his intention to resign from the board of trustees effective April 1932. A few months before his resignation took effect, a new director had been named.⁶³/

** ** ** **

In January 1932, three years after the program had been inaugurated, a full-time director for humanities, David H. Stevens, who filled the post for the next eighteen years until his retirement in 1949, was appointed. He was 48 at the time. Two years earlier, in 1930, he had left the University of Chicago, where he had taught English since 1912, to accept appointment in New York as vice president of the General Education Board. Born in Wisconsin, he had been educated at Lawrence College, and took a master's at Harvard and a doctorate at Chicago. A scholar of distinction, Stevens had published books on English eighteenth-century party politics and journalism, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English drama, Milton, and English composition and rhetoric. At Chicago he had worked closely with Max Mason when Mason had been president of the University, serving as dean and as assistant to the president. He was serving in this latter capacity when Mason left in 1928 to join the Foundation, first as director of the new program in natural sciences, and shortly thereafter as president. At Chicago Stevens also came to know Trevor Arnett, who had been comptroller

at the University until he joined the General Education Board as secretary, and later in 1928, became its president. Seeking an educator to supplement his own background, which was mostly in financial matters, Arnett had asked Stevens to join him as vice president and work with him on the Board's now more limited agenda in the area of education, mostly in the South. Stevens, unhappy with the advent of the Robert Maynard Hutchins era at Chicago, had accepted.^{64/}

For about two years he worked closely with Arnett at the General Education Board. Reflecting the Rockefeller dedication to the education of American blacks, the Board continued, as it had since its inception, to strengthen black higher education and simultaneously raise educational standards for black and white schools and private colleges throughout the southern states.

Stevens, eager to return to his original interest in the humanities, accepted Mason's invitation to join the Foundation, with the understanding that he would keep some of his duties at the GEB as well.* Stevens brought to his new position a broad background of experience as scholar, administrator, and educator; his diversified experience and interests also guaranteed that changes in the humanities program would occur. Although respectful of academic scholarship, he had long objected to the pedantry and specialized nature of graduate instruction and research, inherited from European, particularly German universities. He objected to the excessive specialization and the zeal for the accumulation of evidence along the lines of the physical sciences. At the same time he believed that the classical tradition

*Following the re-organization, officers increasingly tended to hold joint appointments with both the GEB and the Foundation. Although the GEB continues to exist as a legal entity, its trustees voted in 1960 to spend its remaining endowment.

often led to antiquarianism and a strangle-hold on teaching and research by classical disciplines and departments. Although aware that the "progressive movement" in education could lead to permissiveness and a dilution of standards, he nonetheless saw it also as a liberating movement to encourage creative humanistic expression. A product of the Midwest, he was less deferential to European culture than many Easterners and took pride in American culture, regional and national. At the same time he saw language as a key to international understanding.

Stevens began almost at once to move the Foundation's program in the humanities away from its classical and traditional focus. He began to support work in "international cultural relations," which included support for the teaching of Asian languages, and projects for the "preservation and interpretation of American cultural traditions," including support to the Library of Congress for the accumulation of source materials in American history and to other organizations for such projects as the indexing of American newspaper files; a program in regional drama was initiated with a small grant to the University of North Carolina.

Nonetheless, for the first few years the program continued along the lines inherited from the GEB and Flexner, and shaped by Capps. The commitment to archaeology remained firm. New appropriations were made in 1933 to the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago -- Breasted continued to receive help for the Institute's expeditions in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and Persia -- to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens and to the American Academy in Rome. The University of Pennsylvania received support for archaeological expeditions. Before long, however, these grants for archaeology came to be listed in the annual reports under the rubric "Former Programs."⁶⁵/

The awards to the university of fluid research funds continued, but were already coming under the criticism that the Foundation had little or no control over the types and kinds of research that each university saw fit to support. Support continued to the ACLS, which received annual grants for its administrative costs and funds for the award of fellowships and grants in aid to humanistic scholars as well as project assistance for the funding of larger collective enterprises in the humanities that it helped initiate, as for example the Dictionary of American Biography.

With no source of funding except contributions from its constituent societies, the ACLS was heavily dependent on philanthropic support. Although it received some Carnegie assistance, the major source remained Rockefeller funds, which remained the case until the 1950s when a new philanthropy, the Ford Foundation, came to its assistance. Stevens later noted that about ten percent of the Foundation's humanities budget each year went to the ACLS for its general support. Stevens later jocularly, and with pride, recalled that for many years the ACLS was "a kept society of the Rockefeller Foundation."⁶⁶ The contributions of the ACLS to the health of the traditional humanistic disciplines were invaluable. In some cases, as in Far Eastern language studies, its objectives coincided closely with those of the Foundation. The criticism would soon be voiced, however, that there was little "purposeful planning" on the part of the Foundation with respect to the kinds of research that its grants either to the universities or to the ACLS were supporting.

** ** ** **

Taking stock of the Rockefeller philanthropies over the years 1913 to 1934, a Foundation report calculated a grand total of expenditures by the

various boards (including the GEB), as \$509 million. Of that total, expenditures on medical education and public health represented 43.6 percent, the social sciences 8.8 percent, the natural sciences 7.5 percent, and the humanities 0.7 percent (almost all of that after 1925). For the four Rockefeller boards a total of \$16,620,034 was spent on the humanities for the eight-year period 1925 to 1933 of which \$11.8 million was spent in the United States and \$4.8 million abroad. Another report showed the share allotted to the humanities in 1933 as against other programs: "Roughly speaking, out of every dollar spent by the Foundation in 1933, 19 cents went to the International Health Board, 26 1/2 cents to the social sciences, 12 cents to the medical sciences, 10 1/2 cents to the natural sciences, 7 cents to the humanities, 5 1/2 cents to administration, 11 cents for general purposes not easily classified with any of the other divisions." In 1934, of a total of \$12,679,775 appropriated, the humanities share was \$1,160,578, or 9 percent of the total.⁶⁷

At the time, in 1933-34, and in later years, Stevens attempted to evaluate the accomplishments and shortcomings of the older program of support for the humanities by the GEB and the Foundation over the years 1927 to 1932. The universities selected to receive general or fluid research funds were Princeton (\$300,000 over 6 years), Harvard (\$250,000 over 5 years), Chicago (\$250,000 over 5 years), Yale \$195,000 over 5 years), Michigan (\$250,000 over 5 years), Johns Hopkins (\$100,000 over 5 years), and Columbia (\$112,500 over 3 years); the University of Virginia (\$120,000 over 5 years) had become the eighth. The fluid research funds, granted on a matching basis so that each university pledged to contribute an equal sum, were for "a laudable purpose," he noted -- the "promotion of productive scholarship in humanistic subjects and the strengthening of those

university disciplines that transmit and extend our knowledge of man's cultural attainments." On the positive side also, the grants were "simple in formula and gave well deserved assistance to many productive scholars."^{68/} For a period of five years (with some shorter-term renewals) the universities had sums of \$25 or \$30,000 annually to use as their local administrative and faculty committees recommended in order to promote humanistic research. The graduate schools of these universities grew in strength and prestige. Other institutions, large and small, benefited also by the program of aid to individual scholars who received fellowships and grants under the funding supplied to the ACLS. The first grant in 1925 to the ACLS had been from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. Over a ten year period beginning with the grants of the Memorial and the GEB, a total of \$1,045,000 had gone to the Council.

Under the early humanities program as inherited by the Foundation and then continued under its aegis, over 200 humanistic scholars had received direct assistance. Fosdick, incorporating Stevens' evaluation into his history, wrote that it was "a fortunate time for historians, linguists, editors of texts and manuscripts."^{69/} Many older scholars, unable earlier to work abroad, now completed their lifelong studies and inspired students to productive activity. The program was predicated on faith in institutions that would "increase knowledge and promote authoritative interpretation of human learning." Raising the question of its "social effectiveness," Stevens had responded realistically:

The social effectiveness of such spending must come slowly through the research and teaching of a few highly trained scholars and from the work of followers having the ability to disseminate ideas in popular form. It cannot be evaluated statistically. It cannot be traced in many immediate results other than print or continuing research.

The necessity of such financing of humanistic scholarship is evident. Protection of highly trained men by three institutions is essential to the preservation of historical perspective, for their interpretation of the past help toward clear views of today and tomorrow. Therefore this investment...was proof of a belief in free institutions that will put the record of the past into use for democratic society. Some of the results may be as remote from daily use as the manuscripts and annotations of medieval monasticism. In total effect, however, the results are of the right kind.

The grants, he said, represented "an affirmation of belief in intellectual freedom and in the orderly progress of learning." The expenditures, it must be recalled, were made in the 1930s, when the lights of learning were extinguished in many parts of the world. Proud of the Foundation's contribution, he also paid tribute to the reaffirmation of private philanthropy in a pluralistic society: "We encouraged humanistic scholars immeasurably by this declaration of confidence, and we made possible such major projects as other countries develop only under state support."70/

** ** ** **

Nonetheless the program had major defects, and there was increasing restlessness with it. Stevens saw this clearly. The unrestricted grants "derived from no centralized planning based upon a comprehensive study of needs and opportunities."71/ The Foundation had little to do with the kind of research supported. Stevens' study of the grants showed remarkable similarities. At Harvard the grants had been used for ancient and modern languages, philosophy, and art and for the publication of annual volumes in classical philology, and comparative literature; in linguistic and textual studies the largest part of the work was in the classical and medieval fields. Yale, which received special praise for its attention to "training the next generation of humanistic scholars," had concentrated on general linguistics and on archaeological research in the Near East. (Yale

received an additional grant of \$250,000 in 1933 for a total of \$505,000 over the ten-year period 1928-38.) Columbia had focused on classical archaeology and Anglo-Saxon literature, Princeton on Greek and Latin classical studies, medieval French, Romance literature, and art. At Johns Hopkins, especially hard hit by the depression, there had been no research funds for four years; work supported by the Foundation had centered on Anglo-Saxon poetry, Spenser, French drama, Roman economic history, and philosophy. The University of Virginia's grant went for library materials and new appointments. Chicago and Michigan both focused on major projects: Chicago on the Dictionary of American English, with some attention to Chaucer studies; Michigan encouraged archaeological projects and embarked on two large dictionaries to supplement the Oxford English Dictionary, a dictionary of Middle English and of the Early Modern (Tudor-Stuart) period, neither of which after many years came to fruition. The Dictionaries project "fared badly, absorbed large sums and produced little."⁷²/ In this instance the funds did little for persons outside these major projects. On balance, Stevens wrote that none of the universities "could maintain the flow of work started up by board funds, but all increased their annual allocations of research money for humanistic studies."⁷³/ The contributions had been significant both as grants and as catalyst.

The letter written by President James R. Angell of Yale to Mason in January 1933 is typical of the appreciation of the universities:

The results, judged merely by the usual standards of publication, and the like, have been striking enough, but they quite fail to show what is really much more significant, i.e., the wide and deep stimulation of renewed scholarly activity on the part of a large group of able men, who had been laboring under a sense of discouragement and

depression, by reason of their inability to see how they could finance the necessary expenses connected with studies they were keen to undertake.

I think it not amiss to say that, so far as concerns Yale, this appropriation has been more fruitful in the provoking of intellectual activity than any single gift of comparable magnitude which the university has ever received.⁷⁴/

But there was another side to the coin, as Stevens and others saw it. The Foundation was not helping to broaden the scope and appeal of the humanities, or encourage the scholars to share the broad implications of their specialized research. The story was everywhere much the same. The research was along traditional and specialized lines, reflecting the older classical orientation of the humanities. Often the research funds went to older, established scholars working in well-ploughed areas of research. The evaluation of the grant to Princeton was typical: "The bulk of the funds supported longer-term projects of older men in the established disciplines by providing for travel, research assistance, and publication." Stevens spoke disparagingly of "this aristocratic tradition of humanistic scholarship." "It [the program] tended to entrench scholasticism and antiquarianism in our universities more deeply....While advancing human knowledge we were strengthening the aristocracy of scholasticism."⁷⁵/

Support for research on highly specialized topics also undermined one of the principal rationales for supporting the humanities. Canon Stokes' dictum that "the sciences are not dangerous as long as the humanities are cultivated" obviously lost some of its meaning when the humanistic research supported turned out to be largely antiquarian. Critics of the humanities could ask in what way such a program could help balance the narrow specialization of science and technology when the humanists themselves took refuge in narrow specialization. The Foundation would soon be called upon

to redirect its support toward activities "of more immediate value" to society.

Relatively small though the expenditures on the humanities were, the Foundation could be proud of its contributions. The appropriations had helped the humanistic disciplines and humanistic scholars in their research, archaeologists and archaeological institutes in their training and explorations, and key libraries in the United States and Europe. It enriched and preserved our cultural heritage. But much of the humanistic activities supported belonged to what Fosdick also called the "aristocratic tradition." The Foundation's funds had encouraged specialized research, with little attention to large scale interpretation, reaching out to broader audiences, or relating scholars and scholarship to the contemporary age. Fosdick summed up this early period of support, citing a 1937 report by Stevens: "How was this program a credit to us? In having a sense of magnitude. In what way a discredit? By buttressing scholasticism and antiquarianism in our universities."76/

The shift from traditional humanistic research toward broadening the interpretive role of the humanities was a gradual one. The first formal opportunity to consider developing the humanities program along new lines arose in 1934.

Notes, Chapter I.

1. This portrait of Gates comes largely from Raymond B. Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation 1913-1950 (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 1-3, 23-25, 29, and passim. Written by an insider who knew all the principals, Fosdick's account remains invaluable. In addition to Fosdick's portrait, Alan Gregg left a memorable sketch of Gates which is reprinted in Wilder Penfield, The Difficult Art of Giving: The Epic of Alan Gregg, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967) pp. 198-207; and finally there is Gates' own autobiography, Chapters in My Life, (New York: Free Press, 1977).

2. Greene's early memoranda can be found at the Rockefeller Archive Center in two series of documents of interest to this study of the humanities. In the files on "Organization," (series 900) are: "Principles and Policies of Giving," October 22, 1913, (Box 21, folder 163); and "Memorandum on the Policy of the Rockefeller Foundation with Reference to the Concentration or Extension of Its Field of Giving," May 23, 1916, (covering letter dated January 13, 1917) in the same file; and, also in folder 163, "Educational and Other Needs in the Far East," October 22, 1913. In 900.21.164 is Greene's suggestion for "Surveys of Foreign Countries," a memorandum dated May 24, 1916. Many of these documents are also duplicated in the program and policy files on the humanities, series 911 at the Rockefeller Archives. Citations will hereafter include the series number -- usually 900 or 911 -- followed by the box number and the folder number.

3. Raymond B. Fosdick, with Henry and Katherine Pringle, Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board, (New York: Harper, 1962).

4. George W. Gray, Education on an International Scale: A History of the International Education Board, 1923-1938. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1941).

5. Abraham Flexner, "Memorandum Regarding General Education Board," January 4, 1927. (RAC: 900.19.137).

6. Embree Papers and Correspondence, Rockefeller Archive Center. Embree's papers include an unfinished manuscript history of the Rockefeller Foundation from which this quotation is taken.

7. Ibid.

8. Embree to Vincent, May 4, 1923. (RAC: 913.1.1.)

9. RAC: 900.22.136.

10. Embree's speech can be found in the file, "Gedney Farm Conference," January 18-19, 1924. (RAC: 900.22.165.) See also Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, p. 238.

11. Embree, "Expansion of Programs of Rockefeller Boards." (RAC: 900.22.165).

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Abraham Flexner, "Foundations -- Ours and Others." (RAC: 900.22.165.)

15. Quoted in Wilder Penfield, The Difficult Art of Giving, p. 202.

16. "Foundations -- Ours and Others." (RAC: 900.22.165.)

17. Embree to Vincent, February 4, 1924. (RAC: 913.1.1.)

18. Abraham Flexner, "Memorandum Regarding General Education Board," January 4, 1927. (RAC: 900.19.137.) These retrospective comments were part of a memo submitted by Flexner to the trustees' committee on reorganization.

19. Ibid.
20. Annual Report of the General Education Board 1925-1926. (New York: GEB, 1927), pp. 9-10.
21. Fosdick, Adventure in Giving, p. 229.
22. Ibid., pp. 228-29; 233-34 for the quotations and a summary of the different approaches. For a fuller discussion of the implications of these administrative wrangles, see the article by Robert E. Kohler, "A Policy for the Advancement of Science: the Rockefeller Foundation, 1924-1929," Minerva, XVI: 4, (Winter, 1978), pp. 480-515.
23. GEB, Annual Report, 1925-26, pp. 9-10.
24. Quoted in Fosdick, Adventure in Giving, p. 236.
25. Ibid., p. 237.
26. The minutes of Flexner's conference can be found in the GEB files, also at the Rockefeller Archive Center, series 717. Box 314. f. 3281.
27. Ibid.
28. Abraham Flexner, "General Reflections," appended to conference minutes.
29. Abraham Flexner to Cyrus Adler, December 21, 1926. RAC: 717.314.3281.
30. In the agenda for the trustees' meeting, April 11, 1933.
(RAC: 911.2.9.)
31. Flexner's memorandum, "The Humanities," (March 29, 1927) is found in 717 (GEB files): 314.3280. See also, Fosdick, Adventure in Giving, p. 234.
32. For Flexner's disagreement, see Kohler, "A Policy for the Advancement of Science," pp. 503-504; Flexner's own comments in his Funds and Foundations, (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 77-100; and the treatment in Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, pp. 135-144. The relevant files at the archives are 900.19.136 through 900.19.138.

33. David Stevens, A Time of Humanities: An Oral History. Recollections of David H. Stevens, edited by Robert Yahnke. (Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin House, 1976), p. 27.

34. Stokes to Flexner, April 9, 1927. (RAC: 717.314.3281). In a partial defense of his limited definition, Flexner pointed out that he had considered some of these areas, but that "... for our purposes I should regard humanities as everything in the broad field ... except such activities as are otherwise cared for. For example, art is being looked after by the Carnegie Corporation, music by the Julliard Foundation, sociology by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, English literature and art history in the sense in which it is being cultivated in Princeton would, I think, on this basis fall to us." Flexner to Stokes, April 13, 1927. (RAC: 717.314.3278).

35. Vincent to Flexner, April 22, 1927. (RAC: 717.314.3281).

36. Annual Report and President's Review, 1931, p. 277.

37. Ibid.

38. Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, pp. 135-144 and especially 140-142.

39. John Marshall, untitled memorandum, March 16, 1959. (RAC: 911.1.8).

40. Minutes of staff conference, January 16, 1930. (RAC: 911.1.1).

41. Ibid.

42. Annual Report, 1930, p. 245; Annual Report, 1931, p. 278.

43. Annual Report, 1931, p. 281.

44. Minutes, January 16, 1930. (RAC: 911.1.1).

45. The minutes of the trustees' meeting for October, 1930, are a rare treasure among the Foundation's records. Not only do they record in detail the discussions, but there are two other accounts in addition to the official minutes: one roughly verbatim -- a practice which, unfortunately, did not

survive -- and a separate set of notes by Henry Van Wesep. See "Informal Meeting of Rockefeller Foundation Trustees, Officers, and Directors at Princeton, October 29 and 30, 1930," Notes by HvW; Verbatim notes, and the minutes. (RAC: 900.22.166). Also, Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, p. 142.

46. Alan Gregg, untitled memorandum, October 27, 1930. (RAC: 911.1.1).

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. "Verbatim Notes," officers and trustees' meeting, October 29-30, 1930, pp. 165-166. (RAC: 900.22.167).

50. Ibid., p. 168.

51. Ibid., p. 170.

52. Ibid., p. 170-171.

53. Ibid., pp. 171-172.

54. Ibid., p. 176.

55. Ibid., p. 177.

56. Ibid., p. 178.

57. Ibid., p. 182.

58. Ibid., pp. 181-82.

59. Ibid., pp. 174-75.

60. Ibid., p. 183.

61. Stokes to Mason, October 26, 1931. (RAC: 911.1.1).

62. Ibid.

63. Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, p. 240; Stevens, A Time of Humanities, p. 27-291.

64. Stevens, A Time of Humanities, pp. 16-17;22-29; on Hutchins, p. 16.

65. Annual Report, 1933, pp. 305-309;329.

66. A Time of Humanities, p. 29.
67. Report of the Committee on Appraisal and Plan, (1934) pp. 28, 29-30.
68. David Stevens, "The Humanities Program of the Rockefeller Foundation: A Review of the Period 1934-1939," an unpublished internal review of 99 pages dated October 25, 1939. (RAC: 911.2.11).
69. Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, p. 240.
70. Stevens, "Humanities Program, 1934-1939," p. 11, and p. 14.
71. From the agenda for the trustees meeting, April 11, 1933. (RAC: 911.2.9).
72. On the uses of the fluid research funds, see the appendix to Stevens' "Program in the Humanities," March, 1934, (RAC: 911.2.9) and the summary of this evaluation in the agenda cited above. For the evaluation of the dictionaries, see the file on the fluid research grants to Michigan (RAC: 200R. box 286, folder 3423).
73. Stevens, "Humanities Program, 1934-1939," p. 12.
74. Angell to Mason, January 19, 1931. (RAC: 200R. 298.3558).
75. "Humanities Program, 1934-1939," p. 14.
76. David Stevens, "The Humanities in Theory and Policy," March 31, 1937. (RAC: 911.2.10); Fosdick, Rockefeller Foundation, p. 239.

Chapter II

Changed Directions: "A Modern Humanities" Under Stevens, 1934-1949

"...a program in the humanities, based on a cloistered kind of research, is wide of the goal which the trustees of the Foundation should have in mind."

-1934 Report of the Committee on Appraisal and Plan

The year 1934 marked another turning point in the history of the Foundation and of the humanities program. In December 1933 the board of trustees appointed a special three-man trustee committee chaired by Fosdick -- the two other members were James R. Angell and Walter W. Stewart -- to review the Foundation's existing programs. The Report of the Committee on Appraisal and Plan (1934), presented a year later, came down hard on many of the assumptions and results of the Foundation's activities. Largely the product of Fosdick's pen, the Report constitutes one of the fundamental documents in the evolution of the Foundation.

When the Foundation had been reorganized in 1928, it will be recalled, the "advance of knowledge," or "research," was singled out as the most effective means of contributing to "the well-being of mankind." In 1934 the Report indicated that all had not gone well with this formula and that the well-being of mankind could not be served only through support for university seminars and medical and other research laboratories. Research, the committee on appraisal asserted, was but one -- and not necessarily the best -- way by which the Foundation's mandate might be fulfilled and it was harsh in criticizing some of the highly specialized forms of research the Foundation had helped support which had little to do with the Foundation's concerns in troubled times.

The committee's report has to be read as a product of its era. Seldom have the pressures for practicality been greater. The sense of

urgency, the demand for relevance, the tone of the entire document take the reader back to the climate of the depression. "Has the world so changed in the last five years," the Report asked pointedly, "that the policies and plans which we have been following no longer represent the wisest and most helpful use to which our funds can be put?"¹ The world had changed, and for the worse since 1929, the year of the American stock market crash. Not only did the crash devalue foundation assets, and hence income, but the widening circle of economic woes crossed the Atlantic and produced political consequences. In 1933 Hitler took power in Germany, and within months the director for natural sciences at the Foundation, Warren Weaver, was telling his colleagues that the climate for scientific work in Germany had dramatically worsened.² Foundation fellows in mathematics and the sciences were among the first victims of the Nazi purge.³ In the months that followed, Hitler announced a program of rearmament, dealing a death blow to Fosdick's hopes for disarmament and an effective League of Nations. At home the situation was also serious. By the time of Roosevelt's inaugural a third of the American labor force was unemployed, and the bread lines came menacingly near the Foundation's offices in the Wall Street district.

Some idea of the pressures at work can be gathered from a letter written by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., chairman of the board, to Fosdick complaining that too much of the Foundation's money was going into academic research and not enough to more immediate matters.⁴ It was unusual for the chairman to write so explicitly about the Foundation's affairs, but it was symptomatic of the strong feelings he and others had on the subject. In a similar vein Fosdick's correspondence with the trustees shows that this demand for action in the face of widespread misery was not limited to the donor's family.

Fosdick's ally on the board, Ernest M. Hopkins, President of Dartmouth College, tended to be an alarmist but his letters to Fosdick in 1933 and 1934 show clearly that the opinions expressed in the Report were not simply the work of a "hard-boiled Wall Street man" -- as Fosdick referred to himself -- but expressed the views of academic leaders as well.

"There isn't going to be any very great advantage to mankind in extending the frontiers of knowledge," Hopkins wrote to Fosdick in 1934, "if nothing is done, meanwhile, to leave any inhabitants within the province." And Hopkins added: "I am inclined to think that academic disciplines, research enthusiasms, and brain trust characteristics need to be offset to some extent in the Foundation by that form of native intelligence which up in this country we characterize as good horse sense."⁵

Hopkins also communicated his worries directly to President Mason. In a memorable letter, he conveyed the need for immediate and practical action in the bleakness of the present situation:

Somehow, as I go about the country and see the average age of the most reckless criminals going back not slowly but by leaps and bounds into the ranks of boys and girls under twenty, as I see the demoralization of hundreds of thousands of college graduates who have never been able to secure a job, as I see the bread lines and the desperate want in communities everywhere all over the country, and as I reflect on the blunderings and clumsiness of our present civilization, the affairs of a future civilization to which we may never attain and the problems of a future society which may never be existent seem to me necessarily of less consequence at the immediate moment than having all hands⁶ turn in to salvage the battered hulk of what we have got.

And to Angell he wrote: "The Rockefeller Foundation's work has become too largely an investment in remote futures with an attendant policy of ignoring the present to such an extent that civilization may never reach the future."⁷

These concerns were shared by Fosdick. As he informed Hopkins they were "precisely what I wanted to say in my Report....We shall need you," he added, "to stand with us Philistines against the attack of the classicists."⁸

The Report, beginning with a thoughtful review of the Foundation's activities since its inception, recalled that for a decade and a half, from 1913 to 1928, the Foundation had concerned itself predominantly with public health and medical education, with only minor forays into other areas. With the reorganization of the Rockefeller boards in 1928, the Foundation had taken over the interest of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in the social sciences, and from the GEB and the IEB a program of activities in the natural sciences and the humanities. Appropriately the Report recalled Jerome Greene's query in 1913, at one of the first meetings of the Foundation: "What shall be the attitude of the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation toward the many and tempting fields in which its resources might unquestionably be used for increasing the health, happiness, and general welfare of the human race?"⁹

Research, the Fosdick committee's Report made clear, could not be an end in itself for the Foundation. In contrast to the university or individual scholar, the Foundation had to regard itself as a utilitarian institution. The Report, cast in the mold of American pragmatism and John Dewey's instrumentalism, insisted that knowledge had a social function and served as a means by which the human race learned to control its environment. At the same time a note of anxiety over the ability of contemporary society to absorb modern science and technology, a theme found in Fosdick's other writings, was sounded: "Developments around the world in the last twenty years raise sharply the question whether the civilization which we are building can utilize the knowledge which

it has. "It is open to debate," the Report went on to say, "whether the welfare of mankind can more wisely be served by more knowledge or by the better dissemination and the more thorough application of existing knowledge." The accumulation of knowledge through specialized research alone did not seem to be the appropriate response to the world's woes in 1934, and the Report unequivocally concluded: "We should avoid research for the sake of research without regard to its relevance."¹⁰

The major complaint of the Report was that "the advance of knowledge" had been interpreted and applied too narrowly -- "too rigidly confined within the conception of pure research." Even, in the one area where something broader and far-reaching might have logically been expected -- the humanities -- the Report noted poignantly: "It is a bit discouraging, too, to realize that even our approach to the humanities must be largely by way of research."¹¹ The committee believed that there were "other methods, equally important," by which knowledge could be advanced. Developments around the world in the past 20 years -- the spread of propaganda, dictatorship, and militarism -- had to give pause to all who saw the greatest need of our age as "more knowledge."

The Report took issue at length with scholarship and research that was "unrealistic, unproductive, and often unrelated to human aspiration or need." Some of its striking passages deserve citing:¹²

The mere accumulation of facts, untested by practical application, is in danger of becoming a substitute rather than a basis for collective action. Under the impetus of the scientific method, scholarship is inclined to become over-interested in the collection of facts for their own sake, and under-interested in the problem of the philosophy implied by the facts.

The sense of proportion which comes from some appreciation of the unity of knowledge is lacking; and shut up in his water-tight compartment the research worker is often unable to span the gap between his output and reality. Speciali-

zation has its legitimate place, and we do not underestimate its importance, but an equally pressing need today, it seems to us, lies in the development of a broad and comprehensive type of intelligence that can see the field of human knowledge in clearer perspective. Perhaps as much as anything else scholarship required what Professor Whitehead has called totality of vision -- a capacity for synthesis and integration, an ability not only to enumerate and describe but to evaluate. The end of knowledge is, among other things, the better understanding of the world. That goal will not be reached by the mere multiplication of men [sic] able to collect more facts, but by the increase of those who know, first, what facts need to be collected, and second, what value these facts have when assembled.

The Report frankly acknowledged the share of responsibility of the Foundation, and of other foundations, for this state of affairs:

That the Foundation -- and other foundations as well -- must share some of the responsibility for this emphasis on specialized research can scarcely be denied. We have given wide encouragement to the idea of research. We have held conferences and have created research centers and institutes. It is an entirely understandable phenomenon that a university or other institutions that desire to expand will expand in a direction in which there are funds to support it. We do not have to be cynical to admit that if a foundation announces an interest in anthropology or astronomy or physico-chemical reactions, there will be plenty of institutions that will develop a zeal for the prosecution of these studies. The responsibility which this inescapable fact throws upon a foundation is enormous. The possession of funds carries with it power to establish trends and styles of intellectual endeavor.

The Report recommended strongly that without abandoning support for research and the exploration of important fields of knowledge there be "no exclusive interest in research as an end and aim." It advocated "a shift of emphasis in favor not only of the dissemination of knowledge, but of the practical application of knowledge in fields where human need is great and opportunity is real." As a means of advancing human welfare, it argued, application of existing knowledge could be "as effective an instrument as research."¹³

There were other caveats as well. The Foundation had to abandon any idea of "fertilizing the whole field of scholarship," or of investing time and funds where it could make only marginal contributions as would be the case, it suggested, of a humanities program focusing on Europe and its advanced culture). To avoid frittering away assets and opportunities each program needed to follow "sharply defined objectives."¹⁴

What did this mean for the humanities? The committee confessed that it had approached the humanities "with considerable uncertainty." But it clearly affirmed, as "not open to question" the important place of the humanities "in any balanced and well conceived scheme of human welfare."¹⁵ The Report cited at length from an impressive memorandum drawn up by Jerome Greene at the committee's request.

Once again spokesman for the humanities, Greene chose to call his report "The Place of the Humanities in a Program of Human Welfare." In advancing knowledge through research he conceded that it was hard to find "strategic points of attack" for the humanities comparable to fundamental research problems in the physical and natural sciences. This limitation, however, and the imprecise or "incommensurate" character of the humanistic disciplines constituted, in his words, "not the slightest ground for disparaging either the interest or importance of the humanities or encourage the Foundation to support only activities susceptible of research on the model of the sciences." He divided activities that contributed to human well-being into two classes: the first, the accomplishments of science, which "extend the bounds of knowledge at the disposal of the human race from generation to generation," and secondly, those activities in the humanities which "discover and preserve for human

enjoyment the highest achievements of the past in the realms of thought and feeling and of literary and artistic expression." The first category helped the human race to master its physical environment, the second determined the use and enjoyment of the "human environment." The humanities -- "philosophy, literature, history, the fine arts" -- determine whether the human being will "be developed spiritually, intellectually, and aesthetically to his highest capacity and greatest happiness." The humanities were needed for the proper use of the leisure time that industrial society could make possible. One of his eloquent passages, quoted by the Fosdick committee, and communicating the same sentiments he had expressed at the Princeton meeting in 1930, read:

An interesting test of the importance we attach to the intellectual and artistic aspects of life are seen when we describe a community that we admire. The distinction is usually not in material terms but in terms of its intellectual and aesthetic resources: The beauty of public buildings and dwellings, of avenues and parks; the richness of art collections; the excellence and popularity of music and drama; schools, universities, and institutes of learning; and finally the diffused culture which is at once the cause and expression of all these amenities.

They all testify, he proclaimed, to "a disposition to make material welfare not the end but the means to a larger, higher, and happier life, and to make life less dependent on its material satisfactions."¹⁶

He argued that because the material and spiritual aspects of life were interdependent -- "human life must be considered as a whole" -- the Foundation with its goal of well-being throughout the world must appropriately "give a corresponding unity and balance to its philanthropic expenditures." If the objectives on the spiritual side were less clearly defined than in the case of the sciences -- or more difficult to coordinate -- he argued for tak-

ing advantage of such opportunities as may present themselves for making specific contributions."¹⁷

To promote the humanities he would place as first in importance endowment and equipment for research and teaching in the fine arts, literature and foreign languages. In these areas he included the "contributions of every civilization in all times."¹⁸ Not unexpectedly, he again urged support to fill gaps in knowledge of the civilizations of Asia. He wished to make foreign cultural treasures as readily accessible for all people as were those of their own culture.

Conceding that the humanities had suffered in the past from what he called "the snobbishness of the classical tradition" -- including the facile use of a classical lexicon of allusions as "an entry to intellectual gentility"-- he insisted that the classics, Western and non-Western, were on the contrary "a means of enlarging the common stock of ideas, the vocabulary of enlightened human intercourse."¹⁹ There was a subtle justification for humanistic studies, which derived from their "quality" and "nature" rather than from their particular substance and content.

In specific terms he called for raising standards and compensation for college teachers so that the best ("those of well-rounded personality as well as first-rate scholarship") could be attracted and retained. He called also for the recruiting of "promising young men and women" [the latter, as may have already become apparent, an unprecedented inclusion in Foundation vocabulary in those years] in some of the neglected fields of humanistic studies, in particular in the Asian civilizations of India, China, and Japan where a promising beginning was being made at a few universities.

Although accepting Greene's persuasive brief for a formal role for the humanities at the Foundation, the Report made clear, however, that a different kind of program was needed. Here, as in the other programs, it criticized the overemphasis on specialized academic research and vehemently criticized the technique of "fluid" research funds awarded under the older GEB program to selected prestigious universities and to the ACLS. The results had been overly narrow. The response to the question how best to support the humanities had been to encourage "the accumulation of data" in a disorganized, unsystematic way.²⁰

In line with this answer [noted the Report] our work is spread over the widest possible fields. The genesis of Coleridge's poetry; Indonesian customary law; the Dictionary of American Biography; mosaics, lamps and vases of Olynthus; exegetical commentary on the fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid; life and work of Hans Burgkmair; studies in Aeschylus; folklore of the Finns; studies in Balzac's realism; dictionary of Indo-European synonyms; Byzantine lyrics; administration of justice from Homer to Aristotle; Anglo-Saxon poetry; Roman economic history; Franco-American literary relationships; American Indian languages, including the Quilente and Tonkawa grammars, and the Nitinat, Zuni and Dakota texts -- these topics are random selections from a great range of research projects which the Foundation is supporting either directly, or through grants-in-aid to universities, or by blanket aid to the American Council of Learned Societies.

What does all this actually accomplish in stimulating aesthetic appreciation except in a limited number of highly specialized students? What connection is there between this concentration on research and the kind of public appreciation which will result in the community pictured by Mr. Greene? It frankly appears to your committee that a program in the humanities, based on a cloistered kind of research, is wide of the goal which the Trustees of the Foundation should have in mind. It is getting us facts but not necessarily followers. We have more detailed information about a great number of rather abstruse subjects, but that does not logically mean that the level of artistic and aesthetic appreciation in America has been measurably raised.

Not faulting the officers, the Report conceded that they had only followed the "general sailing directions" laid down by the trustees.

The fluid research funds had been awarded to the universities to be used at their discretion for faculty research, with little or no control by the Foundation over either projects or personnel except for annual reporting. Over the five-year period 1929-1934 about \$4,470,000 had been expended in this way by the Foundation as a whole, mostly in the social sciences. In the humanities \$690,000 had gone to seven key institutions. The funds, as the Report somewhat caustically noted, had gone to support a large number of highly diversified subjects not directly, or only indirectly, related to any interest of the Foundation. In the case of the humanities the funds had been utilized -- not inappropriately under the terms of the grant -- for archaeology, classical studies, and monographic studies in literature and languages ("archaeology, Greek, Latin, Semitics, Romance languages, etc."). The Report also complained of a lack of supervision over the administration of the funds; "faculty politics" and log-rolling rather than more substantive concerns, it noted, had at times played a role in the distribution of the funds. The fluid research funds prevented the Foundation's program from having the "sharp cutting edge" expected of it and, the Report charged, added up to abdication of responsibility.²¹

The fellowships and grants in aid awarded were also criticized for their diffuseness and specialized nature. Subjects in the humanities and social sciences included the early history of the Chinese Empire, the relationship of Japan and the West from 1800 to 1854, the historical evolution of contemporary capitalism, linguistics and ethnology of the hilotric tribes, and immigration into Australia up to 1850. That these projects -- and those cited under the earlier bill of indictment --

represented specialized but high-level research under way in the humanities and social sciences, and involved the most distinguished scholars, national and international, did not matter for the argument at hand. The projects bore little direct relationship to the interests of the Foundation; they were "far removed from reality, or from any possibility of affecting the welfare or happiness of mankind."²² The Report also criticized some of the small grants in aid -- some as little as \$50 (they ranged from \$50 to \$7,500 and averaged \$2,000). The very small grants were dismissed as "chicken feed." "The retail business," it noted, "is not properly the Foundation's forte. To give \$250 to a professor at the University of Helsingfors and \$145 to a professor at the University of Koenigsberg doubtless represents no wise use of funds."²³

* * * * *

In evaluating the humanities program the committee reiterated that its comments were not made in criticism of the officers. Stevens, along with the directors of the other programs, had submitted considerable material for the committee's use and had indicated the new outlines taking shape under his direction. "The officers," the Report noted approvingly, adapting the phraseology from a memo of Stevens, "have been conscious of the desirability of bringing the humanities from books, seminars and museums into the current of modern life."²⁴ It singled out for praise the support and encouragement being given to the study of Far Eastern languages and cultures, American regional drama, and the various "soundly conceived" library and bibliographical projects. Nor did it call upon the program to abandon its support for research, which, as in other fields, had a definite contribution to make -- "the stream of aesthetic appreciation

would run dry without it." It wound up its appraisal of the humanities with an admonition and a sweeping recommendation:

Our only point is that concentration on research as almost the sole method of approach runs a grave danger not only of sterility but of missing the center of the target. We would urge that the sailing directions be changed. Research is but one method and we have already done much to stimulate it. Let us no longer be cramped by that formula. In our opinion the officers should be asked to study other methods by which cultural appreciation can be developed and the values of the humanities brought more directly into contact with daily living.

It recommended that "no new developments in the program be encouraged until, through a fresh survey of all available techniques and methods, it has been determined whether there may not be new and more fertile directions for the stimulation of the humanities -- and this with particular regard to increasing the area of public appreciation."²⁵

Although only a small section of the thick Report was devoted specifically to the humanities program, John Marshall, who had joined the Foundation in 1933 as a humanities program officer, later recalled, they were "telling pages."²⁶ The Report in many ways incorporated Stevens' own thoughts and indeed he had contributed to it. He had inherited a program of the most traditional kind, including heavy commitments to classical archaeology and to general support for specialized research at the universities and through the ACLS. He too believed that the Foundation should adopt a broader interpretation of the humanities. "Thus," as Marshall later recalled, "Stevens was by no means unhappy when the trustee committee was appointed in 1933 to review the program nor when it recommended efforts toward working toward widening the area of public appreciation."²⁷ With Marshall's assistance, he had worked to provide

the trustees with information and recommendations. In 1941 Stevens noted that changes in the program had been made "for excellent reasons," which had been "recognized" as such "both before and after the Report [of 1934] appeared."

As early as 1931 Stevens, while at the General Education Board, had been involved in discussions at the Foundation involving the humanities. His restlessness with the status quo was already visible. "The reorganization of humanistic teaching and research must go together," he had advised President Mason. "Linguistic and manuscript studies will fall into proper place only as young men come along with new ideas." He was skeptical of reform being accomplished by assistance to older, established scholars alone. "It is perfectly clear that more help to the old-timers on their private research interests will strengthen present practices; for change, new programs are needed to catch young fellows before they are spoiled by the three-year grind on [graduate] courses."²⁸ He recognized the need for language training and urged support for the teaching of Russian and, to a lesser degree, Japanese and Chinese. If archaeology were to be continued, opportunities for excavations in the Americas were not to be overlooked.

In later years, echoing the debate in 1934, he continued to be critical of the "humanities of learning" at the colleges and universities: "By holding to the tradition of polite learning and exact scholarship humanistic scholars have kept their disciplines away from active life....They have put fact above interpretation or [above] the application of knowledge for social benefit....The old belief in a need to protect the fundamentals of tradition still dominates university disciplines so strongly that contemporary forces for humanistic development make slow progress in our

institutions."²⁹ The demand for exactness in evidence led to an examination of minutiae, which he viewed as a form of "imitation" -- an emulation of the techniques of the science -- and a divorce of scholarship and creativity. Arguing that the humanities "must use the past and present in ways to increase appreciation of man and his qualities and...stimulate free expression of human abilities," he summed up his philosophy:

To do this, the humanities draw on human experience in every period of history and at every social level. They have no part in 'pure research,' or in antiquarian knowledge for its own sake; their reference is always to human conduct and expression. Not analysis but synthesis is their function, and their subject whatever man says or has said of his place in the universe. Their approach to materials is artistic, philosophic, or religious, and their interpretation of man's experience vital for the present day. While the humanities so enable man to travel in time as well as in space to add to his own sense of human values, they are steadily encouraging both individuals and races to study themselves through the lives of earlier generations and to add their own part to the human record.³⁰

Years later, Stevens remembered with pride that the Foundation's humanities program "was the first anywhere to approach on a full front the entrenched columns of humanistic scholars and their generals" and to make a break in what he called "German rule" in the American universities.³¹

Stevens liked to make a distinction between the "humanities of learning" and the "humanities of expression." The humanities of learning had broadened out from the earliest definitions focusing on classical studies, linguistics, literature, and archaeology, and included many newer disciplines, but they all involved the accumulation of knowledge. The "humanities of expression" -- not unrelated to the more productive aspects of Dewey's progressive philosophy -- was the means by which all individuals created their "own scheme of values by uniting past learning with present experience." Scholars and teachers faithful to the "humanities

of expression" did more than merely transmit the human cultural inheritance; they served as critics and interpreters and helped "arouse powers of understanding, appreciation, and self-expression in others."³²

"The function of the humanities," Stevens once wrote, "is to make the individual a citizen of the world in matters of the spirit -- to create within him his own forms of mental, emotional, and spiritual freedom."³³ The humanities helped by creating a better understanding of the human spirit, past and present, and by developing powers of cultural appreciation and self-expression. In every generation the meaning of the past had to be recreated by individuals of knowledge and imagination. But, he warned, "if these men study the past to become knowers, not interpreters, we get antiquarians."³⁴ It was necessary to study the past to transmit its values and to inspire an appreciation for whatever had fresh meaning in one's own time. The humanities touched every level of human activity above that of mere subsistence. It was this broad definition of the humanities that Stevens described again and again and worked diligently to apply at the Foundation.

There was a major difficulty in a definition of the humanities which, as the Fosdick Report urged with Stevens' support, made "public appreciation" its cornerstone. "The Humanities have been at this task since the days of the first engrosser of manuscripts and of the first conscious critic," Stevens informed his colleagues in 1939. Although the humanists always had a public role and sought to address a wide audience, Stevens, as a scholar himself, understood that humanist thought and scholarship proceeded from an intensely private search for truth. The failure of American scholars to "grasp the significance of modern

ways of reaching human minds" could be explained in the way humanists traditionally worked. Over the array of disparate fields in the humanities, ranging from aesthetics to philology, or from archaeology to contemporary history, Stevens identified the one trait central to all humanistic disciplines: each depended on a close study of texts, documents, and language itself. This meant that each was intimately involved with meaning and interpretation -- of words, values, signs. With the exception of drama, Stevens wrote, "most mediums of humanistic participation and self-expression call for solitary workers."³⁵ The paradox lay in the fact that although the humanist sought a public audience humanistic scholarship stemmed first from an intensely personal encounter.

So far as the immediate applicability of humanistic scholarship was concerned, he recognized the need for scholars to work on studies whose fruits might not be of immediate use. "At the higher reaches of the humanistic disciplines, also, we may wisely encourage exhaustive studies by specialists of problems that have no apparent practical applications tomorrow....For the scholar, we should have the question What for? but not in the absolute sense of use-on-delivery tomorrow."³⁶ Stevens was not simplistic in his concern for the social benefits of scholarship.

* * * * *

While the Foundation moved toward a broadened definition of the humanities to supplant the classical tradition, a variant of the debate between "ancients" and "moderns" was underway at the American Council of Learned Societies. There, Mortimer Graves, Secretary of the ACLS, took the lead in proposing an even wider definition of the humanities.

For too long, he argued, the humanities had restricted their view solely to the Western classics; it was not enough to substitute modern Romance languages or German for Latin and Greek and call this piecemeal reform "modernization." Americans lived in a shrinking world where the Chinese, Japanese, and Russian languages were becoming as important to Americans as any European tongue. Every day's headlines brought these important peoples closer to Americans. Rather than cling to the outdated Eurocentric tradition, Graves argued that Americans should study the "uncommon" languages, or what he called, in jest, the "unusual" languages.³⁷

This advice echoed a voice heard for many years at the Foundation, and heard once again in 1934. Greene, first as an officer and then as a trustee of the Foundation, had long been an advocate of closer understanding of the Far East. His early associations with the Far East were extended by a career as an investment banker, and his travels kept him in contact with Chinese and Japanese scholars. As early as 1913, as noted, he had proposed that the Foundation extend its interests to include the humanities in Asia. These humanist contacts would "promote desirable intellectual contacts between East and West."³⁸ But neither in the war years which followed his first proposal nor during China's troubled decade of the 1920s had this plan seemed ripe. Still, Greene followed Japanese and Chinese affairs closely, and his position as a member of Harvard's board of overseers kept him abreast of American scholarship, both in its strengths and its weaknesses. In 1930, and again in 1934, Greene lamented the absence in the United States, of a body of trained specialists fluent in the languages of the East. Here then was a prime instance where a broader definition of the humani-

ties had an important corollary. Greene's views, supported by others, and reinforcing those of Graves, helped create a partnership between the Foundation and the ACLS to encourage the teaching of Asian languages.

Graves saw also that if the humanities were being neglected by the funding agencies -- a constant lament of the humanistic scholars and the professional societies in the humanities -- the cause of this neglect lay largely in their failure to adapt to the times. Humanists as a class "have not much concerned themselves with their social obligation," Graves wrote in one memo, arguing that if the humanities wanted their former preeminence restored they must not take refuge in obscurantist scholarship but must address the issues of the hour. "Perhaps a certain odor of heresy inheres in the idea that justification of humanistic studies is to be sought in their concern with modern life," Graves wrote. But without such an involvement he saw no hope of regaining the "preeminence in the intellectual structure which belongs by right to the humanities." "I believe," Graves declared, "that the defensive attitude thus almost unconsciously adopted by the humanities must be replaced by a determination to prove the impossibility of understanding the world we live in except upon humanistic presuppositions."³⁹ This point of view, eloquently expressed at the ACLS by a leading scholarly spokesman for the humanities, was shared by Fosdick, Stevens, and others at the Foundation.

In a program evaluation contributed to the trustee review committee for its Report Stevens had outlined the aims of the humanities program, older and newer, at the Foundation. Although respectful of teaching and research, he stressed the need for change and indicated

how in the past two years the program had already been moving in new directions -- towards a "modern humanities."

If in the years 1926 to 1932 the Rockefeller philanthropies had assisted materially in strengthening research in the humanities, the new need was to "increase the importance of cultural values in contemporary life." Research in the humanities should be judged by its potential for "creative uses and critical understanding" and its concern with the "continuing growth of cultural traditions." "The only value in knowing the past," he wrote, "is to equip us for the present." Reassuringly, he noted, the "modern humanities" would respect and reinforce "older cultural values useful for contemporary life."⁴⁰

Seeking emancipation from traditional and European-dominated culture, he also called attention to the "present urgent need for a larger appreciation of the American cultural heritage." He had no patience with those who out of ignorance asserted "the poverty of the American cultural tradition" and turned their attention insistently "toward the achievements of other peoples."⁴¹ Discussing the older GEB programs, he once wrote that while he admired Flexner's standards of excellence in scholars, Flexner "had asked nothing openly of them [the scholars] beyond a refinement of the scholarly traditions of Europe." The notion that Europe had a monopoly on culture had to be abandoned. American culture had to be studied and treated as a living thing. The Foundation's humanities program should support "the preservation and development of American cultural traditions with a view to their continuing growth."⁴²

The first step in "the discovery of ourselves," as he saw it, lay in an exploration of regional life. He singled out "drama" and

called to the attention of the trustees the drama center at the University of North Carolina as an outstanding example of regional culture contributing to national culture. Interpretive studies of regional culture would make Americans and non-Americans sensitive to the meaning of American life.

Support for "drama," especially at a growing number of university drama centers, offered a special opportunity. Those responsible for this work had as a group succeeded in resisting "the cramping influence of pure scholarship in their graduate schools."⁴³ Drama offered an opportunity for broad participation, a cultural experience engaging not only those taking part in the production but the audiences as well, and hence "a strong social force in any community." Drama centers would have a broad impact on colleges, high schools, and community groups, and an immediate impact on "public taste." Aid to centers for American drama would be, in the phrase adopted by the Fosdick committee Report, "one way of bringing the humanities from museums, seminars, and books into the stream of modern life."⁴⁴

Another objective of the program would be to elevate "American studies" in academic circles. New critical, interpretive studies would evoke a heightened appreciation of the American cultural heritage, and help make American culture "a part of daily living."

Internationally, the focus of the program should be on "the usefulness of cultural relations as a means to international understanding."⁴⁵ To improve channels of information the Foundation should continue to assist research libraries in this country and abroad. Plans were being made to provide fellowships so that librarians in key international

research centers might receive technical training in this country. It would also support international planning bodies engaged in cultural cooperation, as, for example, the International Committee of Historical Sciences. It would continue efforts to encourage the study of Far Eastern languages in cooperation with the ACLS. Finally, it would seek to explore cultural relations with Mexico and the nations of Central and South America.

Stevens' report urged that general support for more traditional scholarship in the humanities not be abandoned precipitously and the trustees had agreed to this. No area of human knowledge, he argued, could be developed or advanced without the help of specialists. The humanities, in particular, were subject to "the worst forms of popularization" and to superficial treatment at the hands of "enthusiasts" with "quick remedies." The universities needed help as "conservers [sic] of high standards for...cultural growth in every quarter of the world."⁴⁶ The reduction of support to the humanistic disciplines themselves and to scholarly work in the universities was "not a reflection on their validity." Indeed, if the gains resulting from support to the universities and to the ACLS under the old program were to be preserved, a continuing obligation had to be recognized.

Stevens recommended that the "fluid research funds" for the universities be continued at a reduced level until 1937 in the hope that the universities would then assume responsibility. The Foundation would continue to support the humanities at the universities, but in "new strategic ways" that would match more closely its own special interests and concerns.

the Foundation's interests, especially the promotion of Japanese and Chinese studies in the United States, which Graves had undertaken in keeping with the mission of the ACLS to advance the interests of important but neglected fields of study in the humanities.⁴⁷

The decision to continue to support traditional humanistic research and teaching despite the change in emphasis was a necessary one. As Stevens noted in 1939, "an abrupt ending of support would have been unfortunate from the standpoint of good will toward the Foundation as well as for the scholarly enterprises that depended on our assistance." By continuing even reduced support along the older lines to the universities and the ACLS, the Foundation showed "its regard for moral obligations and for continuing good relations with scholarship generally. Above all, it helped preserve the significant accomplishments made under its older appropriations while liquidating its older program."⁴⁸

The passing of the older program of fluid research funds had a sequel in an exchange in 1938 between President Harold Dodds of Princeton, then a new trustee of the Foundation, and President Fosdick over "free research funds versus strictly controlled projects." Dodds wrote: "I believe one thing to be true, and that is that you will mine less and less gold from university hills if the controlled project continues to dominate the scene."⁴⁹ Fosdick made clear that it was the trustees and not the staff that had been most critical of these funds. Drawing his examples from the social sciences -- "picked at random from a staggering list" he conveyed to Dodds "how unhappy our past experience in the field has been." "Generally speaking," he added, we found this money [between 1929 and 1934] being used in a bewildering and chaotic kind of way."

Not only was there a lack of systematic integration or concentration in administering them, but "definite resentment" on the part of the universities "at any attempt we made to improve the situation." Although he recognized the limitations of the "controlled project," he was adamant about upholding the new policy against unrestricted funds and warned his fellow trustee that "...if we revert to the fluid research principle, we must be prepared to see a lot of money wasted."⁵⁰ No one would ever reconcile the two divergent points of view; the "controlled project," if understandable from the point of view of a Foundation with special utilitarian, social concerns, remained a source of discontent in academic circles.*

* * * * *

Stevens once wrote that there were three types of programs possible in the humanities -- "the conservative, the liberal, and the experimental" -- and that there was no reason to be restricted to any one. Although the Foundation continued to work in all three categories, he liked to believe that after 1934 it favored the latter two. The Report of the review committee in 1934 had endorsed Stevens' recommendation that the "aims of the Foundation [in the humanities] should be to find those important tasks not now being done and to assist in the development of persons for their accomplishment."⁵¹

*Jacques Barzun wrote with some justification, "It is not unfair to say that foundations were the first to conceive of the university as an instrument.... In this belief the university is not so much supported as used for ends defined by others." Barzun acknowledged that foundations were not alone in this respect, as government and industry have also called upon the university. Ironically, Barzun noted, the early foundation executives tended to come from the academic world.

Stevens had a good idea of some of the important tasks "not now being done" if the goal of public appreciation of the humanities was to be served. Three new fields now encouraged by the Foundation -- 1) regional drama, radio, and film as media of communications to heighten public appreciation of the humanities, 2) American studies, and 3) languages -- formed the heart of the new program. (Not until later did Latin American studies assume the same degree of importance.)

If "public appreciation" was the goal, it was not the scholarly contributions of the humanities but broader cultural activities that attracted Stevens. Of all the ways to appeal to a larger public, drama suited the former professor of English best. Drama, in Shaw's phrase, was "what literature does at night." As Stevens put it, "The arts of the theatre draw on the past as well as the present, and when successfully used have an immediate effect upon the public."⁵² Thus, because of its effects, the "broad participation that dramatic work required," and its effectiveness as "a strong social force," a program in the theatre was ideally suited to respond to the trustees' instructions to enhance public appreciation of the humanities.

Attracted by the populist and democratic impulses that were revitalizing American theatre in the 1930s, Stevens looked upon the work of the Federal Theatre Project and the WPA's cultural activities in general with interest and sympathy. One of his reports also speaks approvingly of the Soviet Union's network of publicly funded experimental theaters. Stevens sympathized with those who wanted to see a strong, decentralized network of American theaters and regional companies which would take serious drama to the countryside. Barrett Clark, a theatre

critic and biographer of Eugene O'Neill, caught his eye in 1935 with an article in the New York Times. While it was fashionable to lament the demise of the old professional road shows and the many dark stages on Broadway closed by the depression, Clark argued that dramatic productions, far from dying, had merely moved from the stages of well-known theatres to college campuses and newly organized little theaters.⁵³

After touring the country, Clark had returned to New York to report that these theaters were usually better than the hackneyed road companies and their fare often more diverse than anything Broadway dared. "Casual observers of the present state of drama and theatre in this country," Stevens wrote, "wrongly deplore the decline in the number of productions in New York." Stevens agreed with his friend Clark that it was too early to bury American drama. If these "casual observers" would look over their shoulder, they would see a growing public "west of Broadway" (in Clark's phrase).⁵⁴

"Last year," Stevens reported in 1935, "the Federal Office of Education listed 22,000 public schools in which dramatic activity is under direction," and there were "something like 1,000 new plays a year published by American distributors using mail-order techniques to reach buyers."⁵⁵ Some indication of the mass market that the amateur or local theater might on occasion reach was provided by the sales figures of the best-selling plays listed by Samuel French and other agencies. At one publishing house a serious play, Dust of the Earth, was paying all of the publisher's overhead, while "at a lower level of theatrical entertainment" the gripping tale of Aaron Slick of Punkin Crick had been produced 50,000 times and had sold over one million copies. Given this kind of distribu-

tion, the non-professional theatre could rightly be classed as one of the mass media. The regional and little theaters offered the humanities a chance to reach wide audiences.

There was no doubt of course that the motion pictures had made serious inroads on the theater, but while the movies might be killing vaudeville and the road companies alike, and while Hollywood might be luring Broadway's best writers and actors with more lucrative rewards, it did not follow that the demand for serious drama had declined in America. "The true index to that demand is not the number of New York performances given a new play," Stevens observed, "but the printed copies sold and the royalties paid for its noncommercial productions."⁵⁶ Stevens' index measured only an aggregate demand and omitted important qualitative considerations, but it underscored the immense vitality of the country's theatre and the possibilities of its market -- if only good material were available.

The Foundation's early program in drama thus moved from the center of the Broadway theatre world toward the regional and amateur theatre. The program's goals were to sustain a national movement of little theaters and university theaters, to improve their coordination (through the National Theatre Conference which Foundation grants helped reorganize), and to help these theaters find better plays for a public eager for good theatre. Working with Barrett Clark, who headed a playwrights' service which offered plays at a discount to amateur groups, Stevens fostered a plan to make serious plays available to these theaters at reduced royalties.

The largest grants went to university drama programs, although

two community or independent theaters in Cleveland and Seattle received substantial support for their ambitious attempts to reach beyond the usual local frontiers. One of the aims Stevens had in mind when funding university programs was the development of the next generation of leaders in this field, and from 1933 until 1948 funds from the Foundation and the GEB were concentrated on the leading university programs. Stevens singled out the University of North Carolina, the University of Iowa, Case Western Reserve, Stanford, and Yale as centers of excellence. Yale's outstanding drama department -- arguably the best in the country -- received funds for technical experimentation which led to the development of a new stage-lighting system (the work of George Izenour). The University's scholarly interest in the history of drama was encouraged by a grant to help it organize a theater archive. A grant also provided a camera unit which allowed Yale to start a film archive of its productions and at the same time use the movies as a teaching aid.

The University of North Carolina, Iowa and other institutions were chosen as "centers having a continuing influence on the cultural life of large sections of the country."⁵⁷ Here the interest in reaching a wide popular audience coincided with an interest in American studies. With strong interest in regional culture, Stevens saw a regional theater as a natural, if not the principal, outlet for the expression of values that the mass media deliberately ignored in its search for a common national culture. Grants and fellowships, Stevens hoped, would not only help the nonprofessional theatre reach out to popular audiences but develop playwrights who could make use of a local idiom and speak to regional needs. The outstanding example of this program was the University

of North Carolina, where the Carolina Playmakers toured the state, created a competitive high school program, and opened two summer theaters at either end of the state to reach prospective audiences more effectively. The program funded the Carolina playwright Paul Green (whose pageant The Lost Colony was still running forty years later!) Stevens liked to recall that Green, Betty Smith (A Tree Grows in Brooklyn), and Thomas Wolfe, the famous novelist, all worked at one time in the theatre department at Chapel Hill with its director Frederick Koch.⁵⁸

If the theater seemed to offer a natural opportunity for work in the humanities, it was less clear how the Foundation might work in the emerging media of radio and film. From 1935 to 1940 the Foundation made a number of interesting, if inconclusive, experimental grants aimed at developing educational programming in radio and at the production of documentaries and educational films. In this area Stevens delegated the responsibility to John Marshall, his assistant director. Marshall, an early radio enthusiast, accepted his assignment with alacrity. Foundation funding enabled one educational radio station, WLXAL of Boston, already known for its programming in both news and music, to undertake further experimentation. Already the first educational station with nationwide reach, WLXAL received further funding to beam its "American Scene" weekly review to South America and Europe. The grant to the station and its parent corporation, the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation, represented in the somewhat prim words of the annual report, "a type of public service that radio may properly provide if it is to realize its possibilities as a cultural medium."⁵⁹

Marshall also commissioned a survey of radio's potentialities for

elevating musical standards of taste. After an initial effort by the National Music League in cooperation with a New York radio station proved unsuccessful, Marshall found a research team led by Paul Lazarsfeld at Princeton able to employ a more rigorous way of gauging both the size of an audience and its reactions. (Lazarsfeld's program, begun at Princeton and continued at Columbia, proved useful in wartime to the Office of War Information.) In the attempt to improve radio programming the humanities officers also helped launch a promising venture in Chicago where a consortium of urban universities designed several radio shows later picked up for syndication by the radio networks. Some programs were designed to inform as well as entertain; several programs and discussion panels were devoted to the exploration of the news in depth. Fellowships were also provided to university and other educational broadcasters, which offered them an opportunity to improve their technical skills with the cooperating CBS and Mutual networks.

* * * * *

Stevens' interest in regional drama was part of a larger concern for American culture. He was aware that in the United States there were many subcultures. One of his hopes for the regional theaters, not entirely realized, was that local playwrights and directors would cooperate to articulate distinctive regional traditions and traits. One director -- Frederick Koch of the Carolina Playmakers at the University of North Carolina -- proved to be adept at encouraging local playwrights. (Indeed, Koch had become famous in North Dakota earlier for his folk pageants, which were written by untrained amateurs including farmers and housewives.)⁶⁰ Stevens' first efforts in American studies (grants to the Universities of

Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico respectively) included work on the Indians of the Southwest. The objective here was to uncover authentic local traditions, or local cultures, which contributed to the mosaic of American life. In his first overviews of the humanities program Stevens explained that just as a motorist would not attempt a long journey without a map, it would be unwise for the Foundation to plan work on preserving or extending American culture without recourse to a "cultural map."⁶¹ Before scholars and writers could make sense of the American tradition, they must first have access to its materials. Many of the initial grants, therefore, had as their goal the compilation or preservation of source materials. Stevens aided the Library of Congress and Alan Lomax to record the songs of black laborers in the South; aid, channeled through the ACLS, allowed American literary scholars and historians to photocopy historic records in British and European archives relating to early American history and literature. Preservation of such records, Stevens realized, was not an end in itself, but before critics and historians or playwrights and novelists could interpret a culture, it was necessary to know the resources of the landscape. The interpreters, the literary critics, and the historians would then be in a far better position, Stevens wrote, to extract "characteristically American" cultural traits out of the regionalism and the diversity.

For these reasons, Stevens supported with enthusiasm the newly emerging discipline of "American studies" -- a hybrid of literature and history in search of the "characteristically American." In his critique of the older program in the humanities both at the GEB and at the Foundation, Stevens had pointed out that the traditional definitions

employed had ruled out support for such new disciplines as American studies. When Capps had decided in 1929 to fund archaeological work, his grants went exclusively to work outside the United States, while no less exciting digs in New Mexico and Central America were ignored. The classical tradition had blinded Americans to treasures closer to home.

The study of "the American cultural tradition" soon emerged as one of the principal subjects of interest. Almost every year from 1934 to 1942 there were grants made under this rubric, although many were quite small. (John Lomax, for example, received \$350 which, a reading of the record shows, went to outfit Lomax's car for recording equipment, an expense not covered by Library of Congress money.)⁶² The grants to regional theaters and to Clark's Lost Plays project already noted also came under this program.

American studies as a Foundation interest emerged in the first years of the new program and then grew into a broad stream. The climate of opinion was favorable. American intellectuals were seeking to rediscover a distinct American identity. Large grants went to the Newberry Library in Chicago, the Huntington Library in Pasadena, and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., for fellowships. Designed in part to insure that Foundation fellowships in American studies would cover the entire country, they were also directed to areas where the officers had reason to believe that regional studies of importance were underway. Thus, J. Frank Dobie's work at Huntington on the folklore of the Southwest was funded, while the Newberry Library's grants included not only historical studies but autobiographies and a grant to the Chicago novelist Nelson Ahlgren. Among the individuals whose work was aided in this program were several

distinguished expositors of the American literary tradition: Henry Nash Smith, whose Virgin Land became a classic restatement of the "frontier thesis"; Alfred Kazin, whose work On Native Ground had just been published when the Foundation began making grants in American studies; and Howard Mumford Jones, whose literary histories are still standard works today -- all received some assistance from one of the participating regional centers.⁶³

The Foundation's grants were never limited to literary scholars or to purely literary studies, however. Indeed, Stevens cheerfully contributed funds under the American studies label to such straightforward historical works as Dumas Malone's definitive biographical study of Thomas Jefferson as well as Adrienne Koch's critical analysis of the correspondence between Jefferson and Madison. Foundation funds also helped produce the first scholarly edition of the papers of Abraham Lincoln. Thus, in addition to the literary studies which became one of the hallmarks of the American studies movement, the Foundation also sought to support biography, political thought, and collections of primary sources.

* * * * *

Language, in the view of the trustees and officers, was an area in which the Foundation might work to improve international understanding. Stevens and Marshall found themselves beset by individuals with keys to improving international communication. They early on resolved to resist those who championed the creation of "artificial languages," as for example, the champions of Esperanto. "We were consequently under very heavy pressure," Marshall recalled, "from people who were concerned with

Esperanto to give support to efforts to make Esperanto an international language."⁶⁴ Stevens was convinced by the counterarguments of Edward Sapir and others who maintained that Esperanto was inadequate to fulfill its mission as a universal language. Because its make-believe vocabulary was constructed on Romance language roots, its cognates would have no recognition outside that family of languages and even in Europe, the linguists noted, it would fail to bridge the gap between the Germanic, Slavic, and other tongues. Language scholars also noted that all languages evolve over time, and thus any attempt to create an artificial or constructed language seemed doomed to failure.

In the course of their consultations Stevens and Marshall learned that the most likely candidate for a universal "second" or "auxiliary" language was English, and efforts were already under way to encourage its universal use. Spanish, although handicapped by geographic limits, was almost as widespread "and in the Western Hemisphere especially it presented strong claims for consideration."⁶⁵ Encouraging the study of these two languages, the humanities officers believed, would constitute a practical step toward promoting international understanding.

The program in language study came to have two separate objectives. The first goal was to increase American understanding of non-European cultures, and of such important but less commonly studied languages as Russian (and later, in 1939, Turkish and Arabic). "More Americans," said Marshall, "ought to know more languages."⁶⁶ A second goal came to be the encouragement of English and Spanish as auxiliary languages as a way to facilitate international communication. Both programs also encouraged support of basic research in linguistics and the study of teaching

techniques. Research in linguistics, which led the Foundation to support some of Boas' and Sapir's work on American Indian languages, shaded inevitably into questions of how languages were acquired and taught.

The language program, both in the teaching of the less usual languages and in the teaching of English and Spanish as auxiliary languages, proved successful. Somewhat immodestly the officers believed they had discovered a formula. "Interestingly enough," a communication to the president and trustees in 1940 explained, "the problem in each of these undertakings turned out to be the same. It was one of simplification." Whether the problem was teaching the next generation Chinese and Japanese for advanced graduate study, or giving Army officers a quick introduction to German, or teaching a businessman in Hong Kong or Mexico City enough English to trade with his counterparts in the United States, "the task in each instance was that of stripping the language to its essentials, organizing these essentials in a logical system, and communicating the system to learners."⁶⁷

The Foundation funded several alternative approaches to the teaching of languages; but perhaps the most interesting, and certainly the most radical attempt to "strip a language to its essentials" was Basic English. The work of two gifted British linguists, C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, Basic English was essentially a highly simplified English vocabulary consisting of only 850 common words. This minimal list, so small that it could be printed in five columns on one page, seemed to promise that foreign students or immigrants to England and the United States could master a language once regarded as formidable in its complexity and arbitrary spellings. Despite its deceptive simplicity, much

thought had gone into the choice of words. While the vocabulary could be learned quickly, mastery of the combinations and instruction in grammar required guidance from teachers trained to teach Basic.⁶⁸

When Stevens met him in 1932, I.A. Richards was already well-known on both sides of the Atlantic for his epochal Principles of Literary Criticism, but the author of this manifesto of the "New Criticism" was also a student of Chinese, and Stevens listened to Richards outline his plans for using Basic -- as it was referred to in characteristically abbreviated form -- as a means of teaching English in China.⁶⁹ The program that Richards and his associates at the Orthological Institute of China attempted to launch in Northern China "was possibly the most comprehensive of modern programs of this kind," Stevens later wrote. Ambitious, boldly presumptuous in its assumption that the people of China would respond to "news print and posters put up in villages" and Basic "loudspeakers in the streets" blaring forth lessons, Richards' followers would have attempted to make English the second language not only of the educated in China but of the villagers as well. The Foundation funded it enthusiastically, but the experiment had hardly begun in 1937 when the Sino-Japanese war broke out, scattering the teaching staff and closing the Peking Institute. "The work in China of Richards and his followers never came to fruition," Stevens lamented.⁷⁰ Whether it could ever have succeeded in accomplishing its ambitious goals is at the very least open to speculation.

* * * * *

In some ways the prototype for all of the subsequent work in area studies was the program funded by the Foundation and administered by the American Council of Learned Societies in the 1930s. The first and most suc-

cessful phase was in the production of a first generation of specialists in the "exotic" languages and cultures of East Asia. Although hardly a full-blown area studies program, this early concern for languages and cultures hitherto outside the American curriculum was the forerunner of the area studies programs of the 1940s and 1950s. In East Asian studies the Foundation's partnership with the ACLS produced an exceptionally able generation of scholars.

Throughout the two decades in which the Foundation maintained its active support for East Asian studies, the involvement of the Foundation's officers with the ACLS was often intimate. Stevens and Marshall not only maintained close contact with their counterparts, they often sat in on fellowship meetings and took an active, if secondary, role in the decisions. One of Stevens' first steps as director of the Humanities programs at the Foundation and the GEB was to borrow the services of the ACLS' Mortimer Graves for a short interval. As a consultant to the Foundation, Graves developed the rationale for the program and outlined the course of action which he and the ACLS hoped to follow. For a brief interval, then, Graves had been virtually a member of the Foundation's staff. (This arrangement was carried one step further in the joint program with the ACLS on Latin American studies; Irving Leonard, the Council's choice to do much of the field work, was named a program officer in 1937.) Parallel to the Fellowship program, the ACLS also sponsored special committees on each of the less common regions it proposed to study. Alongside the Asian studies committee were committees on Latin American, Slavic, and Near Eastern studies. Priority, at least in terms of receiving Foundation funding, went to East Asian and Latin American studies.

Once the initial fellowship program was underway, the Foundation

looked about for ways to strengthen American research facilities. In some instances, with an eye to the employment of its crop of younger fellows, it encouraged several universities to proceed with new courses and departments in Asian studies. This commitment to fund several major centers of research and teaching, in the midst of the depression, enabled several universities to plan with some confidence their future expansion into this new field. In 1935 and again in 1937, Yale received grants to develop Far Eastern studies. Along with Yale, the University of Michigan received Foundation grants to perfect texts and teaching methods in Chinese.

In 1927 the Foundation made several grants to develop the field. Additional support to the American Council of Learned Societies aimed at the production of a systematic inventory of Chinese and Japanese collections in American libraries. Again under the supervision of the American Council of Learned Societies, a second Humanities grant created a small fund -- for use at the ACLS committee's discretion -- for aiding individual scholars or small research projects. Finally, in addition to the grants mentioned above to Yale and Michigan, the Humanities division supported Japanese studies at Columbia, making further grants to supplement the university's funds for library purchases and general expenses connected with the Japanese studies courses.

This pattern of expenditure continued for several years. In 1938, for instance, the Foundation gave the University of Chicago \$25,000 to buy "standard works in the Chinese language necessary for the building up of a sound program of advanced work in Chinese history and literature."⁷¹ This fund for book purchases supplemented earlier grants to the University which seem to have been given in support of the work of Herrlee Creel, one of the first ACLS-RF fellows. Cornell, Princeton, and the University of

Pennsylvania also received grants for additional work in some area of Asian studies.

Throughout these years the Foundation provided extensive support for the work of Karl Wittfogel who, with a team of Chinese assistants, prepared translations and collected manuscripts for a long-term study of Chinese dynastic histories. The dynastic histories, once translated and edited, provided important source materials for the study of ancient China. In a similar fashion, Humanities grants aided Chinese philosopher Hu Shih to collect Chinese texts and prepare an introductory text on Chinese thought.

The Foundation also supported Japanese studies, enabling Columbia University to bring Sir George Sansom to the United States to advise on its Japanese studies program and to serve as a visiting lecturer. ("Sir George's duties over a period of thirty-five years in Japan as counsellor to the British Embassy have given him a thorough understanding of the history and the cultural movements of that country," the annual report for 1939 explained to American readers.)⁷²

"Now the demand for these languages is upon us," Stevens noted in his program review for 1941, once the United States was involved in the war, "what the Foundation has done during eight years [1933-1941] is small by comparison, but its part has helped make these subjects a serious concern of American universities through the staff work of young scholars formerly on our fellowships."⁷³ His description was accurate. The first fellowships awarded by the GEB and the Foundation before the war had produced an outstanding corps of specialists in Chinese and Japanese studies. Charles Burton Fahs, the first fellow in Japanese

studies (and later Stevens' successor as director for humanities at the Foundation) rendered valuable wartime service; Robert Reischauer (brother of Edward Reischauer), the second fellow appointed in Japanese, completed a historical study of early Japan before his untimely death in the Sino-Japanese war; John King Fairbank, later the country's best known China expert, Earl Swisher, Arthur Wright, and others were trained under the early program. These Foundation fellows soon held the best chairs in the country. The second group, trained in wartime, would also make outstanding contributions.

* * * * *

If the theory behind the humanities program seemed perfected by the end of the decade, the practice remained anything but tidy. Anyone looking through the annual reports of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1929 to 1939 for a pattern in spending by the humanities program would be baffled. Not only had the new program inherited certain long-term commitments -- the fluid research funds, for example, were not completely paid out until 1939 -- but the Foundation also experienced serious constrictions when the depression deepened in the mid-thirties. Compared to the Carnegie group or the Rosenwald Fund, whose securities dropped so precipitately that its income failed to meet even its previous commitments, the Rockefeller Foundation weathered the depression in relatively easy fashion. But if the Foundation suffered no comparable embarrassment, it nonetheless found its ability to maneuver seriously circumscribed. Emergencies -- or what foundations might often term opportunities -- also claimed part of the general budget. The Nazi harassment and dismissal of German professors prompted a number of American groups to organize relief

efforts, and the Foundation became one of the principal financial backers of this venture. There were other, less spectacular, instances where funds somehow had to be found; the net effect, of course, was to cut further into program expenditures.

Marshall, Stevens' associate in these years, in a retrospective memorandum written in 1959, described the Foundation's activities in the 1930's: "Alan Gregg used to say that in terms of financial commitment the Foundation was as clean as a hound's tooth; in terms of moral commitments, it looked like a snag at low tide."* In the humanities these commitments were especially numerous. From the International Education Board, the Foundation inherited obligations for several "brick and mortar" grants, including aid to Oxford for the expansion of the Bodleian Library and obligations to support the American Academy in Rome and its counterpart in Athens, the American School for Classical Studies, which remained active in archaeological digs and in training new generations of archaeologists. Continuing assistance to the Fogg Art Museum derived from the older program in the humanities, as well as other commitments to the Library of Congress, the Cambridge University Library, and various European libraries. The grants to universities of fluid research funds, of course, continued. Marshall complained that Stevens and he "had to preside at the liquidation of two empires, those of fluid research funds and of archaeology." The transition to the new program was not easy.

Since there was little money left for the new program departures in regional theater, American studies, and language, the grants tended to

*Unititled memorandum dated march 16, 1959; "Program and Policy" files Rockefeller Archive Center.

be small, such as the grant for \$350 to John Lomax for his work, mentioned earlier, in recording the folklore and songs of Southern blacks; it represented supplemental assistance to a larger project conceived and funded at the Library of Congress, whose own assistance to the project did not extend to equipment. Without the Foundation's contribution for recording equipment in Lomax's car, his great collection of music might never have been converted into permanent records. The small grant fitted Stevens' larger purposes of exploring the diversity of American culture.

Soon larger challenges loomed on the horizon.

Notes, Chapter II

1. Report of the Committee on Appraisal and Plan, December 11, 1934. Hereafter cited simply as Report. (Rockefeller Archive Center: Series 900, Box 22, folder 170).
2. "The world-renowned intellectual freedom of Germany is a thing of the past," Weaver reported. (RAC: Diary of Warren Weaver, entry for May 24-25, 1933.) Foundation officers circulated their diaries, using them in effect as a form of interoffice memoranda. See also Warren Weaver, Scene of Change: A Lifetime in American Science (New York: Scribners, 1970).
3. At Göttingen, where the Foundation and before it the International Education Board had been supporting the work of Richard Courant and others, the Nazi purge was especially severe and galling to the Foundation. On this episode, see Alan Beyerchen, Scientists under Hitler: The German Physics Community and National Socialism, 1933-1945 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
4. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to Raymond B. Fosdick, April 21, 1933. (RAC: 910.1.1).
5. Ernest M. Hopkins to Fosdick, November 16, 1934. (RAC: 900.21.160). Fosdick's description of himself is found in a reply to Hopkins, November 21, 1934, in the same file.
6. Hopkins to Mason, November 16, 1934. (RAC: 900.21.160).
7. Hopkins to Angell, November 16, 1934. (RAC: 900.21.160).
8. Fosdick to Hopkins, November 21, 1934. (RAC: 900.21.160).
9. The original memorandum quoted by the Report is entitled, "Principles and Policy of Giving," October 22, 1913. (RAC: 900.21.163).
10. Report, pp. 42 and 45.
11. Report, pp. 40-41.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 46, 47.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
16. Jerome Greene, "The Place of the Humanities in a Program of Human Welfare," [dated only "winter, 1934"], (RAC: 911.2.9 and quoted in the Report, p. 71).
17. *Ibid.*

Notes, Chapter II

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Report, 71-72.
21. Ibid., pp. 93-97.
22. Ibid., p. 83.
23. Ibid., p. 89.
24. Ibid., pp. 72-73.
25. Ibid., p. 73.
26. In a retrospective memorandum (untitled) dated March 16, 1959. (RAC: 911.1.8).
27. "The Reminiscences of John Marshall," an oral history memoir in the Oral History Collection, Columbia University, and in the Rockefeller Archive Center, p. 87. (Hereafter cited as Marshall, oral history, with page number.)
28. Stevens to Max Mason, November 2, 1931. (RAC: 911.1.1).
29. "The Humanities Program of the Rockefeller Foundation: A Review of the Period 1934 to 1939," pp. 6-7. (RAC: 911.2.11).
30. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
31. Stevens to Raymond B. Fosdick, May 25, 1950. (RAC: 911.1.5).
32. "Humanities Program, 1934-1939," p. 5.
33. "The Humanities in Theory and Policy," March 31, 1937. (RAC: 911.2.10).
34. Ibid.
35. "The Humanities Program...1934 to 1939," pp. 21-22. (RAC: 911.2.11).
36. "Theory and Policy," March 31, 1937.
37. According to John Marshall, "Graves developed the concept that there should be a concerted effort on the part of the American Council of Learned Societies to develop scholarship in what he, with characteristic humor, called 'the unusual languages.'" Marshall, oral history memoir, p. 59.

Notes, Chapter II

38. For Greene's first suggestions, see his memo "Educational and Other Needs in the Far East," October 22, 1913 (RAC: 900.21.163), and for evidence that he continued to urge this course from 1930 to 1934, there is an important memo prepared for the trustees meeting of 1930, "Eastern Asia as a Field for Humanistic Studies," no date [1930], (RAC: 900.22.166).
39. Mortimer Graves, "The Place of the Humanities in International Understanding," [n.d.], (RAC: 200 R.195.2337.)
40. "Aims of the Program in Humanities," November 18, 1934. (RAC: 911.2.9).
41. "Program in the Humanities," March, 1934. (RAC: 911.2.9).
42. "The Humanities in Theory and Policy," (1937), (RAC: 911.2.10).
43. "Program in the Humanities," March, 1934.
44. "Aims of the Program in Humanities," November 18, 1934.
45. "Program in the Humanities," March, 1934.
46. "Aims of the Program in Humanities," November 18, 1934.
47. Ibid.
48. "The Humanities Program of the Rockefeller Foundation: A Review of the Period from 1934 to 1939," p. 14. (RAC: 911.2.11).
49. Harold Dodds to Raymond B. Fosdick, April 28, 1938. (RAC: 900.24.1S7).
50. Fosdick to Dodds, May 3, 1938. (RAC: 900.24.187).
51. "Aims of the Program in Humanities," November 18, 1934.
52. Ibid.
53. Barrett Clark, "West of Broadway," New York Times, October 27, 1935.
54. "The New Program in the Humanities," April 10, 1935. (RAC: 911.2.10).
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid.
58. Stevens, A Time of Humanities, pp. 82-83.
59. Annual Report, 1939, p. 280.

Notes, Chapter II

60. See the account in Kenneth MacGowan, Footlights Across America (New York, 1929).
61. "Aims of the Program in Humanities," (1934).
62. Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1934 (Washington: Library of Congress, 1935).
63. A year by year listing of grants in American Studies from 1933 to 1954 can be found in the Program and Policy files, 911.3.16 and 911.3.17.
64. John Marshall, oral history, p. 108.
65. Trustees' monthly bulletin, March, 1940.
66. John Marshall, untitled memorandum, March 16, 1959. (RAC: 911.1.8).
67. Trustees' monthly bulletin, March, 1940, p. 4.
68. The bibliography on Richards, Ogden, and Basic is quite lengthy; a recent appraisal of Richards' work can be found in John Paul Russo, "I.A. Richards in Retrospect," Critical Inquiry, 8 (Summer, 1982) pp. 743-60.
69. Diary entry, June 3, 1932.
70. Stevens, Changing Humanities, p. 37.
71. Annual Report, 1938, p. 337.
72. Annual Report, 1939, p. 338.
73. David H. Stevens, "Review of the Program, 1939-1941." (RAC: 911.2.13).
74. John Marshall, untitled memorandum, March 16, 1959. (RAC: 911.1.8).
75. Ibid.

III

INTERNATIONAL HORIZONS, 1939-1949

"Long before the Second World War," Stevens wrote in 1947 in one of his last program reviews, "it was obvious that the neglect in American scholarship of the major world culture areas outside of Western Europe kept poor our humanism, weakened our diplomacy, and jeopardized our effective participation in world organization."¹ The war brought a sudden need for area specialists and linguists, and proved, better than any possible foundation study, the importance of an internationally minded definition of the humanities. Area studies programs and new curricula devoted to the study of foreign cultures became the vogue in the years after 1945. When the movement became widespread the Foundation and the ACLS had already been working on this challenge for a decade.

The war had also brought home the lesson that American "well-being" was inextricably tied to that of all mankind. The Rockefeller Foundation's charter never seemed more relevant or appropriate than in the days immediately following the Second World War when the United Nations was being organized, a lasting peace seemed within reach, and the wartime cooperation and euphoria of victory seemed to foreshadow a concerted international attack on the problems of economic development, health, and education. If there was an illusory quality about much of this internationalism, the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation shared it. They looked forward to using their two decades of international contacts on behalf of the new international institutions. In the humanities, where international understanding had been one of the principal goals,

the officers set to work looking for ways to help restore cultural relations with Japan and Germany, to rebuild European intellectual life, and to cooperate with UNESCO.

* * * *

During the war itself the humanities program played a special international role. The outbreak of war posed a particularly acute danger not only to humane values but also to European and British art treasures, churches, and national monuments. The destruction of such architectural and historical treasures as Holland House in London underlined early the potential damage to libraries, art museums, and cathedrals. The British National Buildings Record was established as a central recording center for architectural plans and as a center for inventorying the destruction wrought by Hitler's bombs and V-2 rockets. Volunteer workers lent their time and services to photograph, measure, and sketch a long list of endangered buildings of historic or architectural importance.

The Foundation aided this British enterprise with two grants in 1941 and 1943 totalling \$36,200. The Foundation's grants made it possible for the National Buildings Record to hire professional architects and staff workers and better organize the volunteer work. The value of this improvised band of architects, artists and patriotic amateurs was soon recognized by the British government and British funding sources which, by 1943, had begun to add their contributions to the Foundation's grant.²

A similar effort, not limited to the British isles, was launched by the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas, an American group of scholars whose animating figure was

William Dinsmoor of Columbia University. As Allied Forces were preparing to invade Europe Dinsmoor and other American scholars foresaw that the fighting would endanger European historic sites.* To a certain extent some damage was inevitable but the committee (which worked under the aegis of the American Council of Learned Societies) hoped that by preparing guides to historic monuments and other cultural centers the destruction by Allied invading forces might be minimized. The Foundation supported this work in 1943 and 1944 with grants which made it possible to appoint staffs of art historians and other experts. Working at the Frick Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, both in New York City, these teams compiled descriptive guides and maps which pinpointed the location of endangered buildings.

The chief value of this committee's work may have come after the war, however. One of its subcommittees was charged with monitoring the seizure of art works from occupied countries, and in the aftermath of the war this master list proved highly useful in tracking down the treasures which the Nazis had plundered.

Another preservation project owed its origins to a bizarre transatlantic phone call from Daniel Patrick O'Brien, a Foundation officer stationed in London. O'Brien phoned the New York office with important news of an opportunity which should not be passed by in his judgement, which involved sensitive negotiations and priceless

*In reporting this grant the Foundation's annual report for 1943 went into some detail about the work of the sections or subcommittees, including a list of the countries to be mapped; the report went into far too much detail for the War Department, which ordered the report withheld, for in addition to mentioning the committee's work on Italian art treasures, there was a reference to mapping sites in France at a time when the D-Day landings were still in the offing.

art treasures -- and which could not be discussed over the telephone because of wartime censorship. John Marshall, the humanities officer who received the call, later remembered his conversation with O'Brien, punctuated with interruptions and conducted in a guessing-game style:³

After about 20 minutes of such interrupted talk, I got the drift of what O'Brien was attempting to get over.... The gist of his message was that there was a large collection of invaluable drawings and prints in a location near London that could not be named. The owners of it, who might not be mentioned, feared that this collection might be destroyed by bombing, for the building that housed it was well-known, easily seen, and really a sitting duck for the Germans. The owners could not be identified nor could they in any way be mentioned if a plan could be formulated and financed to microfilm the entire collection. By repetition and emphasis O'Brien made me quickly understand that he was referring to the royal collection of manuscripts and prints, including for example the largest collection of the drawings of Leonardo da Vinci, which he knew that I knew was housed in Windsor Castle. O'Brien made it clear particularly under wartime conditions that the budget of the owners could not be drawn upon for the job and that they could not be put in the position of accepting what might be misconstrued as charity.

With this in mind, Marshall made arrangements with the American Council of Learned Societies which formally requested royal permission to copy the priceless prints and drawings. The Foundation, in turn, awarded the ACLS two separate grants totalling \$170,000 for the project which, in the Foundation's annual report for 1941, appeared as a vaguely-worded item, "microfilming materials in Great Britain."⁴ Fortunately, the precaution taken proved to be unnecessary; the originals survived, and Windsor Castle itself escaped German air raids. As inadequate as photocopies would have been in lieu of the originals, the Foundation had good reasons for thinking these defensive measures a wartime duty and it had acted expeditiously at a time when no other agency -- either private or governmental -- appeared to have been able or ready to do so.

* * * *

The war years brought a sense of urgency to the language programs. The need for intensive study of Asian languages in particular was a challenge that the Foundation and the ACLS felt compelled to tackle. "Early in 1941 the Rockefeller Foundation granted the ACLS what for those days was a very large sum," Mortimer Graves later remembered.⁵ This Foundation grant of \$100,000 enabled the ACLS to sponsor an emergency program at Monterrey whose intensive training courses became the model for the Army's now-famous foreign language school and later for universities throughout the country. At the same time, earlier work in linguistics -- funded by the Foundation also -- proved to have a surprising degree of practicality. In the course of its fluid research funds and its grants to the ACLS the Foundation had supported a number of studies by linguists and anthropologists of American Indian languages, an area so esoteric that it had been singled out in the trustee review of 1934 for its distance from the Foundation's more immediate goals. Graves, however, saw a way in which such research could be made to pay immediate dividends:⁶

One of the most readily available young "linguistic scientists" was Dr. Mary R. Haas, who had written grammars and dictionaries on certain Indian languages of the central United States. She was invited to Washington and asked to apply the same kind of linguistic talents to Siamese [Thai]. At the Siamese Embassy she learned that there was a group of Siamese studying engineering and similar subjects at the University of Michigan. She moved to Ann Arbor and began applying the techniques she had learned through American Indian languages to describing Siamese. This was the foundation upon which she later produced the textbooks and dictionaries of Thai which are probably even today the best available to the American for elementary study of Thai.

By 1941 the "unusual" languages had become the "strategic" languages. The first generation of distinguished scholars in East Asian studies has already been mentioned. During the war further grants continued to be made for a second group of scholars. In an evaluation

prepared in 1959 one scholar called this an "impressive record of accomplishment in the field," and wrote: "Through its contributions to the ACLS for the Council's various programs of grants-in-aid and fellowships the Foundation has supported the training of a majority of present (American) personnel at work in the exotic languages."⁷ Stevens was understandably proud of the role his grants had played first in producing a group of distinguished historians and linguists who became the indispensable leaders in American area studies, and, second, in creating new academic departments and disciplines in the universities. "The practical services rendered by the Humanities division during the war," Stevens recalled with satisfaction in later years, "were of vital importance and surprised many skeptics who had insisted on thinking of the humanities as a useless luxury."⁸ He did not mention the danger that the same critics might be persuaded that the humanities could always be as "useful" as the support for foreign language and international studies turned out to be at this time.

* * * *

Though neither the war nor the State Department's intense courtship of Latin American nations created the Foundation's interest in Latin American studies, both worked to accelerate it. "It is no longer possible... to make payments on appropriations for work in the occupied areas of Europe," as the annual report for 1940 explained rather candidly the shift in resources to Latin American institutions.⁹ The occupation of Western Europe by the Nazis and the subsequent curtailment of European universities led the Foundation's directors to look to other research centers, and in the

humanities Stevens decided to channel a greater percentage of the budget into American and Latin American institutions.

Even before the war years, however, the Foundation had made some important, if small, steps in the field. In fact, the humanities program had taken an interest in Latin American studies at the same time it initiated its work with the American Council of Learned Societies on Asian languages, but for a variety of reasons this field did not develop as rapidly or as successfully as did the emerging area studies programs on the Far East or, for that matter, in Russian and Slavic studies. The ACLS had formed a study committee for Latin America, but this committee did not organize itself until 1936. Working in cooperation with the Social Sciences Research Council and directed by Lewis Hanke, a prominent historian of Latin America, the joint committee outlined a five-year plan and soon brought out the first Handbook of Latin American Studies. In 1937 the humanities division signalled its growing interest in the field, by appointing a third officer, Irving Leonard, with responsibility for developing the field in conjunction with the ACLS committee.

Leonard and the humanities division also began to work in a systematic way to develop libraries and archives in collaboration with the American Library Association and the Hispanic Foundation, a division of the Library of Congress. This latter foundation had been created by a bequest from Archer Huntington, whose gift spurred Congress to set aside additional funds in 1939 for a new wing. But even these private and public funds did not suffice to organize the Library's extensive holdings, and the Rockefeller Foundation provided funds to hire additional specialists to catalog or inventory the holdings and make them accessible to scholars.

Although the sums involved were relatively small, the Foundation's grants made it possible to issue bibliographies and guides and to bring the Library of Congress's collection into use.¹⁰

Meanwhile a survey of Latin American libraries conducted by the American Library Association, and funded by the Foundation, prepared the way for a larger program of assistance in the 1940s to libraries south of the border. Separate grants to the University of Chile, to the library school at Sao Paulo, Brazil, and to the national library in Mexico City helped train a corps of professional librarians and link these important centers with American libraries.

In these first grants the Foundation relied on the American Library Association and the American Council of Learned Societies for guidance when it ventured abroad. But even in the late 1930s, before the humanities division began undertaking larger projects abroad, there were some exceptions to this rule. A grant to the Pan-American Union for an experimental broadcasting program in Spanish and Portuguese might be mentioned while in Buenos Aires the Argentine-North American Cultural Center received a small grant for its work in promoting the study of English and American literature. Highly popular, the Argentine center at one point had as many as 3,600 students studying English and taking introductory courses in American literature.¹¹ These grants, however, remained largely without sequel; not until the Foundation turned its attention to Mexico did it find the right conditions for advanced work in the humanities.

* * * *

"In all Latin America," one Foundation report from this period concluded, "it would be difficult to find a combination of institutional

work in the humanities as successful and satisfactory as that of three native establishments in Mexico City which are receiving aid from the Foundation."¹² These three institutions -- the College of Mexico, the National Institute for Anthropology and History, and the national university -- formed a closely linked triumvirate of research institutes which, in the face of stringent budgets, severe competition for the developing country's scarce resources, and occasional political pressure, nonetheless managed to create one of the outstanding centers of higher education in the Americas.

Although the College of Mexico was destined to become the principal institution with which the Rockefeller Foundation would work, it was the anthropological and archaeological studies of the National Institute which first attracted the attention of the Foundation. Established in 1939 as the chief Mexican agency for the preservation of the country's pre-Hispanic and colonial monuments, the National Institute also directed the national museum and the national archives, and ran the country's school of anthropology. This rambling administrative structure was largely the creation of a Mexican archaeologist, Alfonso Caso, whose direction of the excavations into Mexico's Aztec, Mayan and Olmec past had made him one of the most distinguished scholars of his generation. Through its museum and historical work, the National Institute became one of Mexico's chief graduate schools, offering advanced work in anthropology, archaeology, and history, and professional training in library, museum and archival work.

"It is possible that Dr. Caso's Institute is attempting to absorb too varied a number of educational institutions," Leonard confided somewhat

skeptically to Stevens in 1940, "but he is gradually gathering about him a progressive and able group of young scholars, scientists, and administrators, who give promise of a successful reorganization which is sorely needed. The absorbing of various institutions," Leonard concluded, "...springs from a desire to remove those institutions from political influence, thereby making possible the modernizing of the services they render."¹³ In 1940 Leonard recommended support for the Institute's graduate training in anthropology since he judged this program the best developed; but, in general, he added, the National Institute merited support because its ambitious program was "directly related to the fundamental realities and needs of Mexico and Central America."¹⁴

From the outset the Foundation viewed the National Institute not only as a graduate training center for Mexican scholars but as a regional center which would set standards for all of Central America. With this in mind, the Foundation's first grant in 1940 helped Caso and his associates arrange a working program with a leading American anthropologist, Robert Redfield of the University of Chicago. Redfield agreed to help recruit American instructors and research associates who could fill in the gaps on Caso's faculty, and Foundation funds paid this expense entirely. A second part of Caso's plan called for development of the Institute's library, and here the Foundation agreed to supplement Mexican funds.

Two years later this initial grant was increased by another vote of confidence, an appropriation of \$70,000 for fellowships, salaries, equipment, and field work. In both the grant made in 1940 and the larger

grant of 1942 the chief element was money for fellowships; the second appropriation provided for no less than 17 fellows, and the Institute soon played host to fellows from six Central American nations and Columbia, Venezuela and Haiti as well as the United States. Of the Central American fellows, only one failed to take a high administrative or leadership post upon return.¹⁵ The success of a parallel program in library administration led the Mexican government to create a separate school for librarians; the Institute, with American advisers paid for by the Foundation's grant, turned its attention to organizing Mexico's regional archives and museums. In little more than a decade, the Foundation spent approximately \$125,000 to support these graduate programs. Caso and the Institute used these funds well: at each stage, the visiting American professors were gradually phased out and replaced with Mexican graduates (who often benefited from Humanities fellowships which allowed them to study in the United States). Though Redfield sat on the Institute's governing board -- a three man panel consisting of Caso, Redfield and Pablo Martinez del Rio -- the selection of faculty and fellows was entirely in the Institute's hands and from the beginning the Foundation had placed the administration of the grant -- a large sum for those days -- entirely in the hands of the Mexican institution.

* * * *

Of all the Foundation's efforts to work with Mexican institutions in the humanities, none was more successful or fruitful than its twenty-year partnership with the Colegio de Mexico. Even more decidedly than in the case of the National Institute, the Foundation's grants to the Colegio came

at a crucial moment and helped the young institution to its feet in the early 1940s. Subsequent grants, sustained for slightly more than twenty years into the 1960s, helped this graduate and postgraduate institute train an outstanding generation of Mexican historians and finance a landmark series in Mexican historiography, until finally the Colegio became known throughout Latin America as the premier institute for advanced studies in the humanities and social sciences.

The Colegio began as a refuge for Spanish Republican scholars forced to flee their university posts by the violence of the civil war or the vengeance of the Franco regime in the aftermath of the Loyalist defeat in 1939. Daniel Cosío Villegas, who had once taught in Madrid, was serving as Mexican ambassador in Lisbon in 1937 when he broached the idea of offering refuge to Spanish scholars to Mexican president Lázaro Cárdenas.¹⁶ The Cárdenas government, which had backed the Spanish republic, needed little persuasion. In the darkest hours of the Spanish Civil War, Mexico stood out as the most hospitable refuge for the displaced Spanish scholars.

A Mexican equivalent to Alvin Johnson's University in Exile, the Casa de España opened its doors in 1938 with Cosío Villegas as a member of its board of directors and his distinguished colleague in the Mexican diplomatic corps, the man of letters Alfonso Reyes, as its first president. The Casa de España metamorphosized into the Colegio when, in 1940, the Mexican government decided to incorporate it into the national university. In its earliest years the Colegio had a highly improvised quality, captured well by a description of its facilities in the Foundation's monthly report to the trustees:

One passing by the place would hardly suspect that this modest two-story house on a quiet residential street of Mexico City is the home of the most important center of humanistic studies in Latin America. Situated on the Calle Sevilla, just off the broad boulevard of the Paseo de la Reforma, it is surrounded by homes, and from the outside looks like one of them. But go inside and you find that the dining room has been converted into a lecture hall, the drawing room is a library, the bedrooms are offices and study cubicles, and even the garage which adjoins on the right has been made into a classroom. A patio in the rear has been able to maintain its original function as a square of greensward with a border of shrubs and flowers, but beyond the patio is a garden house recently transformed into offices and classrooms for the new department of linguistics. The College of Mexico has wasted no space on¹⁷ luxuries, and spends precious little of its funds on housing.

The decision to merge this informal institution into the university would have guaranteed the College a share of the university budget, but at the same time it threatened to kill the spirit of the institute or at least to curtail its independence as an advanced studies center.

From the outset the funding of the Colegio had caused difficulties for its backers. When the Casa de Espana had been first established in 1938, rumors reached the Foundation field staff in Mexico that some of the funds used to create this remarkable institution had been brought from Spain.¹⁸ By 1940 it was clear that, in fact, most of the funds came from the Mexican government. At the same time salaries at the Casa, and later the Colegio, were considerably higher than those paid at the National University. Appointment to the Casa also enabled its fellows to pursue their research or teaching full time, while at the National University full-time positions were still the exception to the rule. The Casa de Espana excited little envy because it had originally been established as a temporary center from which the Spanish exiles might find new positions in Mexico or in Latin America. The Colegio, by contrast, appointed

several Mexican scholars alongside the distinguished exiles and for the first time offered them the same advantageous appointments and pay scale. At stake in the merger between the Colegio and the National University, then, were important questions about the independence or the autonomy of the Colegio as well as the issue of professional standards. It was in these circumstances that the College's president, Alfonso Reyes, approached the Foundation.

Described by one Mexican colleague as the "epitome of the universal scholar," Reyes was known throughout the Spanish-speaking world as much for his writings as for his service as the Mexican ambassador to Brazil and Argentina. Reyes had given strong backing to the idea of the Casa, and Mexican president Lazaro Cardenas chose him to direct the new institution. His spirit and his political gifts were exactly the kind to recommend him to norteamericanos as well. Leonard's portrait captured these qualities well: "He is personally charming, something of an idealist, but his diplomatic experience has given a practical tinge to his idealism."¹⁹ (Stevens similarly remarked that Reyes' all-embracing scholarship would have been perfectly understood at the Harvard of Royce and Gildersleeve.) When Leonard visited Mexico in 1940, Reyes had a chance to present his case directly to the Foundation, and Leonard's diary makes clear some of the problems which Reyes hoped to solve discreetly by obtaining the Foundation's help:²⁰

Reyes discussed the difficulties that beset his work arising out of the jealousies and resentments of Mexican nationals towards Spaniards, but indicated that real progress was being made in absorbing Spanish scholars into the intellectual life of the nation. The organization is, apparently, a pet project of President Cardenas, and because of the election this

year its continued existence is not definitely assured, but Reyes expects to transform the Casa into an Institute of Higher Studies, to be above the university level and more completely divorced from political influence.

The Colegio survived this first crisis without Foundation help and continued to exist as a government-funded but autonomous institution. But its problems were far from over, and in 1942 the Colegio again found itself under severe pressure from the ministry of education. William Berrien, Leonard's successor as the RF officer responsible for Latin American studies, visited Mexico in May, 1942, and recommended Foundation support. "During the past year," Berrien reported to Stevens, "drastic curtailment of the Colegio's budget by the present Minister of Education make it doubtful that the Colegio can continue the work of the Centro [de Investigaciones Historicas] unless outside help is forthcoming." This, Berrien added, would be a tragic loss since the historical center was regarded as the most promising of the Colegio's departments in the humanities and the Colegio itself "represents in many ways the serious beginnings of a liberal arts and research institution which needs help and encouragement."²¹

Stevens and the Foundation responded favorably to this appeal in 1942. The Rockefeller Foundation's contribution to the Colegio's work in historical studies, the first of many such actions to come, arrived at a crucial turning point in the evolution of the Mexican institution. It would be claiming too much for the Foundation's grant to say that it saved the Colegio or that it guaranteed its independence, but it is no diminution of the achievement of the Colegio's founders to note that the Foundation's timely support in 1942 enabled them to proceed with

their work confident that, with or without government funding in the year ahead, their seminars would continue. The triumvirate which ran the Colegio -- the president, Alfonso Reyes, Eduardo Villasenor of the Bank of Mexico, and Daniel Cosío-Villegas -- were too able and influential to need outside help in their fight to keep the institute free from political or bureaucratic interference.

William Berrien saw things aright in a letter sent to the humanities officials from Mexico City. After explaining the Colegio's embattled position and recommending strongly that the Foundation act quickly, Berrien wrote to Stevens that the real problem was not one of immediacy or of tiding over the Mexican research center. "The problem at hand now," he reported, " ... is the existence of the Colegio and what it stands for. They have enough money to keep going through 1943, even if they get nothing from the government for that year." The point, which Berrien had been quick to grasp, was that Colegio was seeking more than just supplemental income -- although admittedly that too was needed in 1942-43. But men like Reyes, Villasenor, Baz [Gustavo Baz, a surgeon on the board of directors] and Cossio [sic] are not primarily interested in the possibilities of a year's existence, but rather the development of serious study and training in Mexico."²² The directors of the Colegio de Mexico were building not for the moment but for the future, and what the Foundation's assistance meant was that they could plan for a continued existence. And the recognition of the quality of the Colegio's work implicit in the grant gave the institute an important trump in its negotiations with the government's budget-makers and helped pry loose additional funds from private backers. Recognition from the Rockefeller

Foundation served to underline the abilities as well as the needs of the able men who led the Colegio, and this factor may have been as important as the money itself.

If Latin American studies in the United States developed somewhat unevenly, Russian and Slavic studies matured more quickly and the Foundation's grant-making fitted closely into the ACLS' planning. But despite the fact that Mortimer Graves in his first report to the Foundation had identified Russian and Slavic languages as crucial for American scholarship,* the Humanities program did not become seriously involved with Russian and East European studies until the war years.²³ In 1939 and 1940 Cornell received two small grants from the Humanities division to develop its Russian studies programs, then under the direction of Ernest Simmons, and a few grants-in-aid before 1940 had been devoted to the preparation of texts for teaching Russian.

Beginning in 1942, however, the tempo picked up. In the next seven years the Foundation spent nearly a million dollars for language and other humanistic scholarships in Russian and Slavic studies. Following a conference with the country's few specialists, the Humanities program began channeling major support to the leading institutions for the study of

*In keeping with his thesis that Americans needed to understand the changes underway in distant places, and that real understanding could not be achieved without the humanities, Graves' perception of the Soviet Union and its relation to the West is interesting:

For almost two decades the peoples of the Soviet Union have been building a new civilization. We of the West have seen this process mainly as the development of a new political and social structure and the advance of industrialization. But it would not be difficult to sustain the thesis that these phenomena are not the change itself, -- only the symptoms of change. The fundamental fact is the construction of a whole new ideology.

Graves became so interested in these issues, Marshall recalled, that he learned Russian "passably well." John Marshall, oral history memoir, p. 243.

Russian history and, to a lesser extent, for studies of East European languages and thought. Cornell, the Hoover Institution at Stanford, and the Russian studies institutes at Columbia and Harvard were the principal beneficiaries. "This expenditure was systematically planned and executed," Marshall recalled, and much like the grants for Asian studies, seems to have met the academic community's needs in accordance with a systematic plan.²⁴ In 1946 the Humanities officers recommended major support for the Hoover Institution's important collections, and the resulting appropriation of \$200,000 was one of the larger grants in this area. Almost simultaneously, the Foundation's program in the social sciences made two large awards to Columbia University to help that university organize and launch its Russian Institute, which soon became one of the leading centers in the field. In addition to these grants, the Humanities also backed Harvard's Russian studies program and gave additional funds for summer language training.

Perhaps even more basic than these grants, which supported advanced research institutes, were the Foundation's grants for library and bibliographical aids. In addition to the holdings of the Hoover library, there were important collections at the New York Public Library and in the Library of Congress. The latter collection was still largely uncatalogued when the Foundation offered funds to help organize this important scholarly resource. Similarly, a grant to the ACLS, working in this instance in cooperation with the Social Sciences Research Council and the American Library Association, enabled the ACLS to conduct a nationwide inventory of Russian language holdings.

Teaching needs were not forgotten, either, for in 1943 the Foundation, recognizing the difficulties faced by teachers in finding authoritative works on Russian thought and history, approved a plan submitted by the ACLS aimed at "making basic works about Russia, by Russians, accessible in English translation."²⁵ The first grant of \$50,000 underwrote the expenses of translating and publishing a series of books on Russian literature, art and theatre, Russian history, and the economic geography of the Soviet Union. In less than five years the translators and their editors had 26 new books in print and several more on the way to completion. The Foundation renewed its support for this program with additional grants in 1947 and 1949.²⁶

At the same time, scholarly books were only part of the solution to the problem of obtaining a flow of information from the Soviet Union. Soviet censorship, compounded in these years by wartime chaos, and the lack of American expertise made it difficult to get current information on even routine questions about the Soviet economy or similar topics of interest to Western audiences. Thanks to a measure of wartime cooperation between the United States and the Soviets, some of the restrictions formerly imposed by Stalinist officials eased and for the first time there was a glimmer of hope that scholarly communication might be facilitated. Still, the difficulties in getting Soviet books and journals during wartime were great:²⁷

Besides needing translations of important Russian works, universities, institutes and news-gathering agencies in this country and abroad are urgently in need of a better supply of publications originating from the Soviet Union. Most of the standard older works which should be in the libraries of those scientifically interested in the Russian field are out of print and unobtainable except at rarity

prices ... Current books, periodicals, newspapers and magazines are almost impossible to obtain except in single copies. Information on what the Russian presses are producing is hard to secure. Though there are current Russian bibliographical publications, no American library has a complete file of them, especially of recent numbers.

One result of this interest in the flow of information proved permanent; in addition to the translation series and the reference works, Foundation grants to the ACLS led to the creation of the Digest of the Soviet Press, which subsequently proved to be of great value not only to librarians and scholars but to a much wider public as well.

* * * *

In the years immediately following the war the Foundation faced a multitude of choices. American universities clamored for funds to launch new area studies programs; the call for general education, perhaps the strongest single educational force in the immediate post-war period, claimed attention too. To a certain extent the two movements pulled the colleges and universities in opposite directions, making planning more difficult. Quite apart from institutional needs to replace wartime losses, the war years disrupted individual lives and plans. Research in the humanities had by no means come to a halt during the war, but publication had been curtailed and the careers of hundreds of scholars and writers deflected.

Abroad, the Foundation's traditional friends and colleagues in European universities faced especially difficult hours in the postwar chaos. Nazi occupation had been a catastrophe for higher education everywhere. In the German universities, where the Foundation's programs in the natural and social sciences had invested large sums in the years

before 1933, independent or free investigation had been virtually eliminated. In many occupied countries, entire universities had been closed. But even those that remained open found that the destruction of academic freedom and the lack of communication in wartime made it impossible even to keep abreast of work in the free nations. The need for reconstruction and reform was obvious, but in many national budgets educational and cultural affairs necessarily took a back seat in deference to more pressing needs for housing and rebuilding industrial plants. In this climate, appeals for American aid were persuasive and hard to resist.

Not only in the humanities, but across the entire range of its programs the Foundation made a concerted effort to help meet these needs. In the humanities division, the first priority went to those organizations which, like the American Council of Learned Societies, were capable of planning for an entire field or for important constituencies. In the years from 1944 to the end of the decade the list of grants for the humanities included numerous appropriations to such bodies as the ACLS or planning committees set up by the Council; the American Library Association; and such professional organizations as the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, and the American Philosophical Association. In addition to supporting the international work of the American Library Association, which at the time was still busy supplying American books and journals to the libraries and universities in Europe, the humanities division also gave money for the planning efforts of the Humanities Research Council of Canada and a similar body in Australia. The humanities also made major

gifts to the University of Oslo in Norway in 1946 and to three provincial French universities -- Lyons, Bordeaux, and Toulouse -- the following year. British universities were aided through a grant to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, the central coordinating agency for research in Britain, while the universities of Birmingham and Bristol each received separate grants for work in literature and drama respectively. Finally, funds for exchange programs went to the American-based Institute for International Education.

Within the United States these grants for postwar planning were seen as part of a larger concern for the state of the country's universities and liberal arts colleges. The war came as a profound shock to a generation which had thought that the tragic lessons of the First World War would prevent recurrence, or, often in the face of evidence to the contrary, that the United States could remain aloof from a war in Europe. Moreover, in many of the nation's classrooms there was a sense of failure, a vague belief that somehow the colleges and universities had failed to communicate the essentials while getting the details right.

Fosdick, writing in the annual report for 1942, captured this despair over the failure to communicate larger values by quoting the memorable rebuke issued by Henry Seidel Canby to American scholars. Canby, then serving as president of the Modern Language Association, took humanistic scholarship to task for its failure to see the real needs of the age. "Well might this generation say to its teachers," Canby concluded, "'I asked for bread, and you gave me a stone.'"²⁸

In an emotional meeting of the Foundation's trustees, held only a few days before the United States entered the war in December,

1941, Douglas Southall Freeman pleaded for a better understanding of the role that the humanities might play in preparing the nation's future leaders. Following this meeting, the trustees appointed a special committee to review the program in the humanities and to study the relations between the Foundation's support for research and the general status of the nation's educational system.

That this committee was not displeased with the work of Stevens and Marshall is shown by its acceptance, in March 1942, of the officers' plans to add new lines of work, primarily in American history and literature. At the same time the officers and trustees agreed that the larger problem of the educational system's health should not be overlooked. The Foundation accordingly commissioned several regional surveys of teaching and research in the humanities and made plans for a national inquiry -- "a general survey of the state of the humanities in American universities and colleges."²⁹

From 1942 to 1945 the Foundation actively pursued these inquiries, and Stevens invited the major professional organizations to conduct surveys of their disciplines and to submit proposals for Foundation funding. Stevens also commissioned Wesleyan professor Fred B. Millett to do a survey of teaching in the liberal arts at about 15 of the country's leading universities and liberal arts colleges.³⁰ By the war's end, educational planners were armed with studies advocating the rethinking of "liberal" or "general" education. In addition, in 1942 and 1943 the Foundation approved appropriations to assist curricular changes at four institutions -- Stanford, Princeton, Wesleyan, and Vanderbilt.

The impetus for reforming the college curriculum received its most powerful reinforcement from Harvard College. The report of a faculty committee, which came to be known as the "Redbook" for its cover, warned that as specialized publications and monographs increased, scholarship in the humanities ran the "danger of forgetting its prime purpose."³¹ This lengthy document, certainly one of the most thorough-going studies of the theory and practice of higher education, agitated opinion far beyond the parlors and classrooms of Cambridge. Widely publicized and discussed in the magazines and journals of opinion as well as at other colleges and universities, the Harvard Redbook outlined the theory of general education and explained in learned fashion the historical evolution of the American college, its deficiencies, and the necessity for a common core of liberal arts education for its undergraduates. In a final section, the Harvard faculty report recommended a series of fundamental courses, to be mandatory for all Harvard undergraduates, among them, "Great Texts of Literature," "Western Thought and Institutions," and "possibly a related course in American democracy." Ironically, for all the support it lent to the movement for general education, the Harvard report was never fully implemented at Harvard. It remained important, however, as a statement of principles.³²

The Foundation's survey, the Harvard Redbook, the adoption of new courses of study at Stanford, Princeton, and M.I.T. all signalled to the smaller colleges and to the public that a new period in American higher education had begun. In the postwar years the effort to strengthen the humanities became a general movement; in this sense, the Foundation's few grants in 1942 and 1943 may said to have helped launch the

movement. Although the Foundation was in the vanguard at first, it quietly slipped to the rear of the ranks when the battle seemed fully engaged on all fronts. Thus, by 1945, the Foundation was for all practical purposes no longer entertaining applications for similar efforts to experiment with the curriculum at other schools. Instead, the Foundation pursued its older strategy of working closely with the ACLS for its planning activities and with national or regional professional associations. The Foundation, however, in the five years from 1945 to 1950 made further grants to Princeton for creation of a course in American civilization and to Harvard for a series of studies, conducted by the graduate school of education and the history department, on the evolution and philosophy of American education.

On the subject of general education, the Foundation blew hot and cold for another decade. Its occasional grants for general education were less than a systematically developed program. Even where it is arguable that the grants had discernible impact -- and here one might cite the grants to Princeton in 1941 and 1943, which enabled the university to revise its undergraduate curriculum and overhaul its liberal arts programs -- the fact remains that the number of these grants was never large, nor was the level of expenditure significant in terms of the humanities' overall budget. And yet general education remained an item in the program description in the decade from 1945 to 1955, a period which spanned the terms of three Foundation presidents. Understandably, the relative encouragement given to educational problems and the individual preferences of each president had a marked impact on the humanities program's occasional experiment with curricular reforms.

Throughout this period there were trustees who wanted to see the Foundation do more in the area of education and chief among them were those trustees who were university presidents. In the previous decade Fosdick's review in 1934 of the Foundation's operations had not entirely pleased his fellow trustees James Angell, president of Yale, and Harold Dodds, president of Princeton. As noted earlier, Dodds in particular had taken issue with the recommendation of the committee on appraisal that the Foundation abandon grants for fluid research funds and shift to "controlled" or Foundation-sponsored projects.

The universities continued, however, to hunger for unrestricted funds. By the time Chester I. Barnard succeeded Fosdick in 1948, the discussion of general education had broadened the debate to include the relations between teaching and research. Accordingly, in 1948-49, the Foundation reexamined what it might do to improve college teaching and the general balance of teaching and research within the university. Throughout these periodic discussions Dodds remained convinced that the Foundation's officers did not fully appreciate the view from the college or university president's office. Writing to the Foundation's vice-president, Lindsley F. Kimball, presumably more sympathetic than Fosdick, Dodds complained about the overriding emphasis on research. "I know the officers talk over mutual problems a great deal," Dodds began in one overture. "But the fact remains that, so far as I know in the years I have been on the Board, the Foundation has not been conspicuous for its interest or authority in respect to the overall problems of colleges and universities."*33

*One might suspect an organized campaign among the university presidents then on the board. Shortly after Dodds had spoken on the need to restudy liberal education, Karl Compton of M.I.T. recommended that the humanities staff look at the relationship between liberal education and the state of

* * * *

This internal discussion took place against a background of increasing criticism directed toward the larger foundations. In 1952 Abraham Flexner fired off a rather severe indictment of their leadership in a small book.³⁴ One of the principal victims of Flexner's attack proved to be the Rockefeller Foundation, or more precisely, his former colleagues the GEB and the Foundation, whom Flexner blamed for the imbalance in American higher education between the sciences and the humanities. In a chapter entitled "The Neglect of the Humanities," a charge to which many American foundations would undoubtedly have had to plead guilty, Flexner summed up his indictment of philanthropic leadership by accusing the foundations of failing to understand the subtle relations between the humanities and the sciences, between research and teaching, and between the colleges and universities and the larger educational system. The element of proportion and balance that he had tried to introduce at the GEB had been lost. As Flexner put it, "a judicious critic would probably maintain that humanism has fairly well held its

culture in the country at large. Neither Dodds nor Compton ever suggested that the responsibility for a program rested with anyone but the officers, after raising the issue, Dodds bowed out of the discussion. In the area of education, Dodds preferred the Carnegie Corporation's record. "I've always admired the Carnegie Corporation for its interests in the health of the educational system," Dodds said in an oral history memoir on the Carnegie philanthropies. "I sat on the Rockefeller board for many years. I suppose 80% of our appropriations, at least, went to universities, but at no time were we significantly involved in a program of administration, operation, or objectives of the institution ..." And in the same interview, Dodds said, "I always discovered that I had gotten more from my contact with the Carnegie Corporation, informally, that was of use to me here (Princeton) than I did on the Rockefeller board as a member." Dodds in Carnegie Corporation project, pp. 38-39, in the Oral History Collection of Columbia University.

own in Great Britain and on the Continent, but in the United States has fought a losing battle."³⁵

In retrospect, it might be thought that the Foundation's subsidies to the American Council of Learned Societies, its decisive support for language training programs, and its early recognition of American and area studies programs might have earned it at least a partial exemption from Flexner's sweeping charges. He might also have cited the work of the Guggenheim Foundation in addition to the Rockefeller's and to a certain extent that of the Carnegie Corporation, which if it had no fulltime humanities staff or formal program, had nonetheless funded projects in art and music appreciation, adult education, and museum and library work of importance to the humanities.

Although Flexner's charge of neglecting the humanities applied to all American foundations, a more specific set of charges was reserved for the default of the Rockefeller and GEB officers. To Flexner they had failed in an even higher responsibility; in his eyes the Rockefeller boards almost alone among American philanthropies had had the resources and talents to work in so subtle an area as the humanities. If the Foundation and its affiliated boards had belatedly recognized the humanities -- i.e. in the mid-1920s -- they had failed entirely to reinvigorate humanistic studies in the same manner in which they had breathed life into the social sciences. To restore the humanities to parity with the natural sciences or the social sciences would have required a commitment of sustained resources, a vast infusion of funds, and the production, necessarily slow, of a new generation of scholars.

Flexner traced the defective vision of the Foundation to the reorganization of 1928. The larger purpose in creating a humanities program at the GEB had not been understood, and the earlier intellectual vision had vanished. Citing one grant of \$2,500 made by the reorganized GEB after 1928 for incidental expenses (!) for a "study of eating behavior" conducted at a university which ought to have known better, Flexner demanded indignantly "Who reads the books, if written?"³⁶ Worse still, the method carried over into the work of the Rockefeller Foundation as well, particularly in the humanities.³⁷

Literally hundreds, perhaps thousands of such grants have been made. A few doubtless may be useful; but the method is wrong. The sound procedure is to strengthen or create institutions. There is no way of estimating the competency of the institution to which or the individual to whom a small grant, running from one to three years, is made; nor can their effects be evaluated. In the days of Gates and Buttrick, the General Education Board used, so to speak, cannon; from 1930 to 1940 it has usually employed a shotgun.

Confused about its purposes and ineffective in its methods, the work of the Rockefeller Foundation in the humanities was hesitant, ill-considered, and likely to have no lasting effect. "Between 1932 and 1940," he wrote a sharp criticism of his successors, "the Rockefeller Foundation appropriated more than \$10,000,000 to humanistic enterprises." Pausing only to take note of a few significant exceptions -- appropriations to the Bodleian Library and the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago -- he maintained that "the rest, which was the major part of that total, went mostly into small grants that could not possibly have had any lasting effect."³⁸

Flexner's own practice at the GEB had convinced him that to appropriate large funds was preferable to engaging in what Wallace

Buttrick, one of the presidents of the GEB, had derisively dubbed the "retail business" in philanthropy. "If presidents and faculties cannot be trusted, if they cannot formulate programs that deal with sound objectives, they do not deserve support," Flexner wrote in 1951. Using as an example the University of Chicago, which had become a major institution, he added, "President Harper and his distinguished faculty were in no need of directives, large or small."³⁹ Although Flexner's own policy at the GEB in medical education can hardly be said to have been based on so simple a faith, it remains broadly true that he and the older GEB consistently favored large blocs of funds committed to single institutions which could then utilize the funds in a flexible and unrestricted way. Flexner's critical essay, written in retirement, framed an issue in the history of foundations never satisfactorily resolved.

Was Flexner's indictment fair, and on target? "Flexner to the contrary notwithstanding," Charles Burton Fahs, Stevens' successor, wrote to Dean Rusk as the latter was just entering his duties as president of the Foundation, "there is no peculiar merit in large foundation grants as compared to small ones." The real test, Fahs thought, depended on flexibility: "In either case (large or small grants) the method should be suitable to the situation. Philanthropy can be timed by choosing the large, spectacular, and easily justified as well as by scatteration."⁴⁰

As other critics have noted, one of the handicaps of the humanities in competing for foundation funds was their relatively smaller scale of operation. The physical sciences require elaborate apparatus; the social sciences need funds for surveys or computers; the humanities

generally need only access to libraries and time. As one critic put it, "it was easier to get a half million than five thousand dollars from a foundation."⁴¹ Cinderella among the big spenders, as Jacques Barzun has expressed the same idea, "the humanities don't fit in."⁴² Despite Flexner, in a sense, the Rockefeller Foundation's practice of smaller grants was a tribute to its sympathetic understanding of the needs of the humanities.

The case against foundations, or stated more accurately, against the long-range effects of their giving has been cogently argued over the years by Barzun. After giving a brief summary of some useful innovations attributable to the foundations (including in one account recognition of the ACLS program in foreign language study supported by GEB and the Rockefeller Foundation), Barzun took aim at the emphasis on innovation and novelty. Attacking what he called the "principle of compulsory newness," Barzun over the years pilloried the subtle condescension which he found to be the hallmark of foundation-university relations. He claimed with some accuracy that in the choice of new fields of work foundations assumed that the older, more traditional subjects should continue to be funded by the universities and colleges themselves. "This purely academic work would go on in its old-fashioned way and be paid for out of old-fashioned endowments."⁴³

Emphasizing innovation at the expense of the traditional, Barzun and Flexner agreed, inevitably put the humanities at a disadvantage. So too social utility, the Foundation's yardstick, tended to deemphasize the humanities in favor of the social sciences. Foundations, Barzun claimed, always felt more comfortable with "objective" studies and hard facts. This

"taste for the tangible produced a bias toward natural and social science, on the one hand, and toward the performing arts on the other" -- the latter, Barzun explained, because they were capable of reaching a mass audience. He concluded:

"The regard for humanistic scholarship was also high, but the scholar's needs ... seemed to defy established order of thought. The humanities gave rise to no projects properly so called, were not expensive enough, and promised few social benefits. Their work remained invisible. To support it was like gambling, sums too small to be exciting on a horse altogether too dark."⁴⁴

Barzun argued that this attitude could not have been without its negative impact on the financial health of universities, on salary inequities among professors, and on the quality of teaching itself. It was the humanities that were hurt the most. In the final analysis the humanities were concerned not with the discovery of fact alone but with evaluation, judgment, and taste. An emphasis on research, and particularly one calling for measurable results, inevitably betrayed a misconception of the humanities, yet with few other ways to judge the contributions of the humanistic scholars, college and university administrators came to regard the foundation grant or fellowship as a sign of grace. The foundation grant, according to its critics, had thus introduced a subtle corruption into academic life, encouraging a neglect of the educational and teaching functions of colleges and universities.

Some foundation officers would have agreed in part with such critics as Flexner or Barzun. "There is," Fahs admitted in one internal discussion, "some legitimate argument that foundation patterns of aid fail to help humanistic education in the United States where help is most needed - in the colleges."⁴⁵ His attitude explains, at least in part, the

series of grants which the humanities program made in the early 1950s to liberal arts colleges and to a few large private universities for their undergraduate teaching programs.

As president of the Foundation, Chester Barnard encouraged a re-examination of spending patterns and program emphases. At the end of his first year, Barnard tentatively concluded that "it may be that considerable change of program is in order." He commented also on the "advance of knowledge," the formula adopted in 1918-29, and on the counter argument that the diffusion of knowledge was an end or goal fully equal in value to research. "I think," Barnard reflected in 1949, "we may be reaching the point where a strong shift of emphasis from research to education may be due." Barnard predicted that research funds would be forthcoming from the federal government and industry. "Research being now in relatively good position, well sold or even oversold to the public, should we not broadly recognize education as the strategic area not so likely to be recognized by the other money sources?" he asked.⁴⁶

Despite Barnard's skepticism about the utility of giving "research" a blank check, there was in fact no major shift in the Foundation's funds away from research education as a whole. Barnard's successor, Dean Rusk, was even less sympathetic to the critics. In what amounted to a reply to critics such as Barzun and Flexner, Rusk took up the challenge posed in their books and articles in his first presidential statement:⁴⁷

Though the Foundation and the campus have broad objectives in common and have benefitted from several decades of fruitful collaboration, there is enough difference in their respective roles to give rise to a divergence of view on certain points of financial and administrative policy. A foundation may wish to stretch its limited funds as far as possible; a university gives high priority to basic

and firm support for its central task of providing a well-balanced educational program of high quality for its students. A foundation may wish to give new ideas and new techniques a chance to make their way; the university will also be concerned with its ability to occupy and consolidate the frontier thus opened up. A foundation hopes that a college or university will fully explore other sources of support; but the campus feels that it would benefit from a measure of relief from the pressure of fund-raising. Most colleges and universities urgently need endowment and capital plant, a need accentuated by the larger enrollments on the near horizon; but large capital grants for more than a few institutions would be beyond the financial capabilities of a single fund.

A few years later Rusk also pointed out that "more than two dozen universities in the United States alone have annual incomes which exceed that of the Rockefeller Foundation."⁴⁸

That the Foundation could give money in the area of education no one doubted -- the needs were immense. Although Fahs, as director for humanities, recommended several grants in the years from 1950 to 1954 for educational experiments, in retrospect this line of grant-making was not a major activity. The officers' real opinions surfaced in a memo which pointedly described the humanities' efforts to bolster the liberal arts. Such grants, Fahs and the officers agreed, should "meet the felt need in the Board of Trustees" but "not involve large expenditures."⁴⁹ In any event few of these grants seem to have had any lasting impact.

* * * *

Given the goals identified by the internal review of 1934 -- wider public appreciation of the humanities, fostering international understanding, and moving away from predominantly classical fields of scholarship in the American university -- did the humanities program as directed by David Stevens from the mid-1920s to 1949 achieve "lasting"

results? To be sure, large and spectacular appropriations were virtually ruled out by the depression and the burden of previous commitments; nonetheless it was an active program even if small grants were the practice. Fosdick himself seemed inclined to think that the humanities program had had only mixed success. Although he paid the humanities handsome compliments in his history of the Foundation, in private he expressed reservations. He believed the program had not gone far enough in freeing itself from traditional academic scholarship and in reaching out to a broader public. Writing to a friend, the writer Francis Hackett, Fosdick confessed, "Of all the areas with which the Foundation dealt, I always felt more uncertain about the Humanities." He revealed in this letter some idea of his feelings about the success of the program in accomplishing the mission laid out for it in the trustee review of 1934 (in which, it will be recalled, he had written): "I do not blame the trustees if the plan went askew, because after all they followed the advice of the officers in a field where they themselves (the trustees) were not especially competent to go." He went on to say that the Foundation had followed the advice of the American Council of Learned Societies and "other agencies made up, I fear, largely of academic personnel. We followed academic patterns although we understood in our hearts the wide gap between academic conceptions and the common life of man."⁵⁰

Few of his colleagues fully appreciated the enduring quality of Stevens' work. His often cumbersome prose and his administrative talent inevitably suffer when compared with the nimble writing and administrative talents of Flexner and Fosdick.⁵¹ Yet Stevens possessed a number of virtues as an administrator that must be weighed on the scales.

In a lesser way Stevens' work in the humanities can be compared to Warren Weaver's leadership in the natural sciences. A recent study of Weaver's role as "scientist-entrepreneur" describes him as the "overseer of a far-flung system of academic scientists" and credits him with outstanding leadership in his choice of new fields ripe for work, that is to say precisely the kind of accomplishments Fosdick and the trustee review committee foresaw for the Foundation. If Stevens cannot be entirely credited with the kind of entrepreneurial leadership that Weaver gave, he nonetheless had admirable goals in mind and he lined up his grants and fellowships toward those goals. In his selection of new research fields and no less in his choice of people -- his choice of recipients of funds was described by one of his associates as "uncanny" -- he displayed exemplary judgment.⁵²

In area studies which he encouraged, there is ample evidence of his contribution. In a recent volume of essays commissioned by the American Historical Association (The Past Before Us), a review of the field of Asian history looks at the practitioners in Chinese and Japanese history. In Chinese history the essayist, John Whitney Hall, cites as "recognized giants" John King Fairbank, Arthur Wright, Herrlee Creel, Franz Michael, and George Taylor -- a distinguished group of America's first generation sinologists. No better proof is afforded of the success of the Foundation's fellowship program in Asian languages and Asian studies, which it supported in partnership with the ACLS, than the fact that four of these five held either Foundation or GEB fellowships which financed much of their preparatory work. In Japanese studies Robert

Reischauer figured on this list, as did Charles Burton Fahs, who later became director of the Foundation's humanities program. With few exceptions the choice of participants in this ACLS-Foundation partnership to develop Chinese and Japanese studies proved to be of an unusually high order. An evaluation in 1949 by Chadbourne Gilpatric, a Foundation program officer, justifiably concluded that this fellowship program achieved as high a success rate as could be hoped for and was in large part responsible for training an entire generation of scholars in a new area.⁵³

Stevens believed that the Foundation had "turned the program in humanities ... toward greater effect on contemporary society." In place of a few highly trained scholars as interpreters of the past the program looked toward influencing contemporary appreciation and taste in large segments of the population. Although the officers did not lose touch with scholars, they were released from relations exclusively confined to the scholarly world. Their broader contacts were with individuals outside universities and colleges, with practitioners in drama, film, radio, and popular culture, which were generally not of great interest to traditional scholars. Libraries and museums, which served both scholars and the general public, also found favor. The program tended to avoid music and art, in both academic and popular forms, because other agencies, notably the Carnegie Corporation, were lending them support. There is no doubt that the program after 1934 stressed "a better use of means to disseminate knowledge rather than of ways to increase knowledge."

Where the academic world was involved, Stevens maintained his collaboration with the ACLS. With the Foundation's older program, a "general program of stimulation," behind it, it was necessary to work with the universities in a different way and encourage them to develop new humanistic interests in specific areas. In this vein Stevens had encouraged the study of foreign languages, and had, as the trustees had sought, worked in drama, film and radio. He had without a doubt helped widen public appreciation of the humanities, working especially hard to make theater available in every section of the country.

The criticisms of Flexner and of Fosdick were not entirely justified. Insofar as any foundation program in the humanities can have a lasting impact, Stevens' program made its mark. Without neglecting academic scholarship, it channelled energies and resources into new and worthwhile lines of work. It identified underdeveloped fields and used the available funds -- which were often limited -- purposefully to cultivate them. It sought out talented and resourceful individuals and provided them with fellowships for both graduate training and independent research. He helped move the Foundation, as the trustee review of 1934 had instructed, from an emphasis on research (often of the narrowest sort) to a concern for a wider dissemination of knowledge and the potential contribution of the humanities to the quality of life.

Notes -- Chapter III

- 1) "The Humanities Program of the Rockefeller Foundation: A Review of the Period, 1942-1947." (Rockefeller Archive Center: 911.2.14), p. 5.
- 2) Annual Report, 1943, pp. 229-30; John Marshall, oral history pp. 335-336.
- 3) John Marshall, oral history, p. 334.
- 4) Annual Report, 1941, p. 269.
- 5) Quoted in A Time of Humanities, p. 62.
- 6) Ibid., pp. 62-63.
- 7) Freeman Twadell, "The Program in Linguistics and Language Study." [September, 1959]. (RAC: 911.3.18)
- 8) "Humanities Program, 1942-1947," p. 1.
- 9) Annual Report, 1940, p. 7 and, for the shift in Humanities' spending patterns, p. 283.
- 10) Annual Report, 1939, pp. 330-31.
- 11) Annual Report, 1940, pp. 300-303.
- 12) Monthly Bulletin to the Trustees, October, 1944, "The Humanities in Mexico City." (RAC: 323R.22.178).
- 13) Irving Leonard (memorandum) to Stevens, August 14, 1940. (RAC: 323.23.192).
- 14) Ibid.
- 15) Trustees' Bulletin, February, 1948, p. 15. (RAC: 323.23.192).
- 16) On Daniel Cosío-Villegas' distinguished career, see the introduction by a former Foundation officer, John P. Harrison, to Cosío's American Extremes (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1964), and the obituary in the American Historical Review, vol. 81: number 4 (October 1976), pp. 1016-17. On the creation of the Colegio, see Patricia Fagen, Exiles and Citizens: Spanish Republicans in Mexico (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973).
- 17) Trustees' Bulletin, November 1947.
- 18) George C. Payne to John Marshall, January 3, 1942; and Payne to Stevens, October 13, 1942. (RAC: 323R, Box 22, folder 177).
- 19) Diary, Irving A. Leonard, February 13, 1940.

Notes, Chapter III (continued)

- 20) Ibid. (Copy filed RAC: 323R.22.177).
- 21) Berrien to Stevens, May 19, 1942, (RAC: 323R.23.192).
- 22) Berrien to Stevens May 19, 1942 (RAC: 323R.23.192).
- 23) Graves' memorandum, "The Place of the Humanities in International Understanding," is discussed in chapter two. (RAC: 200R).
- 24) John Marshall, oral history, p. 243.
- 25) Annual Report, 1947, p. 235.
- 26) Ibid., 1949, pp. 295-96.
- 27) Ibid., 1947, p. 237.
- 28) Annual Report, 1942, p. 40.
- 29) David Stevens, "Report to the Trustees' Committee on Humanities in American Institutions," February 15, 1943. (RAC: 911.1.3).
- 30) Published as The Rebirth of Liberal Education (New York; Harcourt, Brace, 1945).
- 31) Harvard College Committee on General Education. General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945), p. 205.
- 32) For a discussion of the Harvard Report's fate, see Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in Its National Setting (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).
- 33) Dodds to Kimball, February 27, 1951. (RAC: 911.4.36).
- 34) Funds and Foundations (New York: Harper, 1952).
- 35) Ibid., p. 130.
- 36) Ibid., p. 84.
- 37) Ibid.
- 38) Ibid., p. 131.
- 39) Ibid., p. 125.

Notes, Chapter III (continued)

- 40) Fahs to Rusk, "Major Support to Humanistic Education," October 26, 1954. (RAC: 911.1.6).
- 41) William Whyte, quoted in Merle Curti, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press), p. 235.
- 42) "Again, the government's support of science, and the foundations' of social science, have stirred the public conscience lest the humanities turn into a Cinderella. Efforts have been made to "find the money" and give Cinderella her traditional one night fling. The trouble is she works by herself, is not project-oriented, and does not fit in." Jacques Barzun, The American University, p. 61.
- 43) The House of Intellect (New York: Harper, 1947), p. 189.
- 44) Ibid., p. 182.
- 45) Fahs to Rusk, October 26, 1954. (RAC: 911.1.6.)
- 46) Chester I. Bernard, "Reflection at the End of Year One," July 1, 1949. (RAC: 911.1.4.).
- 47) Annual Report, 1953, pp. 39-40.
- 48) Ibid., 1957, p. 15.
- 49) Joseph H. Willetts to Lindsley Kimball, March 5, 1951. (RAC: 911.1.6).
- 50) Raymond B. Fosdick Papers. Fosdick to Francis Heckett, January 31, 1952.
- 51) Warren Weaver, in an oral history memoir, commented on Stevens' often opaque style. "There was a kind of shy and mysterious obscurity about his prose that has always seemed to me just a little of a joke. I mean it was a little of a joke that the Director of the Humanities would be the one whose writing had this particular character." (RAC: Weaver oral history, p. 255).
- 52) Interview with Chadbourne Gilpatric.
- 53) Michael Kammen, The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. Gilpatric's evaluation can be found at the Rockefeller Archive Center, 911.1.4.

Chapter IV

Interpreting Cultures and Reexamining History, 1949-1962

A clue to one of the difficulties in the Foundation's efforts to aid education in the late 1940s and early 1950s can be found in the officers' discussion of the survey courses at the base of the general education programs. Everyone could agree on the high principles of a liberal arts education, Charles Burton Fahs conceded, but the difficulty came in deciding what would be taught in the required courses. As a veteran Far Eastern specialist and area studies proponent, this was not an idle question to Fahs. "The 'heritage of Western civilization' is an inadequate and anachronistic concept as a criterion for educational content in this century," Fahs wrote, curtly dismissing one of the pillars of many of the general education programs.¹

"I agree that the 'heritage of Western civilization' is an inadequate and anachronistic concept for education today," the classicist Edward F. D'Arms replied in a way that probably summed up the staff's divided opinion. "As a starting point, however," to "explain how we came to be what we are and methodologically as a means of acquainting the student in some detail with material which can be controlled before passing on to less familiar material, it is a useful concept and one which should not be entirely discarded."²

Faced with a choice between educational philosophies which pointed in different directions -- an emphasis on international area studies or a focus on a general education -- the humanities program, under Fahs, unequivocally chose area studies. The humanities grants for area studies grew logically from the earlier programs of the ACLS and the Foundation in the "unusual," or uncommonly studied, languages. Support

for these programs after 1949 differed from the Foundation's earlier work in a number of ways, but perhaps the most important change occurred in the reduced weight given to language study and applied linguistics. Stevens and Marshall had supported a number of experimental teaching projects, and after the success of the intensive language courses during the war years, the humanities officers concluded that this was an area in which the Foundation had made its mark. ("In the last years," Marshall wrote in 1949, "the officers have been increasingly reluctant to recommend grants for work that looked to improvement in the teaching of modern languages.")³ This new emphasis did not rule out work in linguistics -- in the 1950s there were important projects in India, Egypt, and Latin America for linguistic analysis -- nor did it eliminate the need for continuing efforts to encourage language study, a fact the officers recognized in a grant to the Modern Language Association for a survey of the nation's language needs. But with the academic landscape undergoing significant alteration as a result of the success of Asian, Latin American, and other areas studies programs, a second generation of problems emerged. "Far Eastern, Latin American and Slavic studies," Fahs wrote in a review of the Foundation's work on behalf of these areas in 1949, "are not only past the pioneering stage, but may have nearly reached the limit of the amount of graduate training which can be justified until new outlets for the Ph.D.s so trained are developed."⁴

"The basic concept of area studies," Fahs explained in 1949, "is the application of many or all of the social science and humanistic disciplines, sometimes also natural science disciplines, toward a better understanding of a single region, well defined in both geography and

time."⁵ By 1949 many American universities had assembled interdisciplinary teams of scholars to work on the problems of interpreting other cultures. These area studies programs differed from traditional academic activities in that they arranged both the field of study and the course of study along geographic rather than disciplinary lines. An economist and a historian at work on Japan found that they had more in common with each other than with their departmental colleagues. Graduate study in such fields came to require area specialists not only with mastery of the language and an academic discipline but also related knowledge in the history, literature and human geography of an area.

Fahs was a striking example of this first generation of area specialist. If he is less well-known today than such figures as John King Fairbank or Edwin Reischauer, it is perhaps in large measure because his career as an administrator left few books or card catalog entries bearing his name. Yet along with Fairbank and Reischauer, as noted earlier, he was one of the first generation of Asian scholars produced by the earlier Foundation-supported program, and in fact, had been the first fellow chosen by the selection committee of the ACLS program for Japanese and Chinese studies. After studying in the United States at Northwestern and the Institute for Pacific Relations, Fahs went to Japan for intensive language study in the 1930s. With the outbreak of war his expertise became of immediate importance and after serving in the Office of Strategic Services he became director for research and intelligence for the State Department's Japanese desk. When he joined the Foundation in 1946, he first divided his time between the humanities and social sciences programs; three years later, at the end of 1949, he

became Stevens' successor as director for humanities. Given his background, Fahs was admirably suited to direct the Foundation's efforts on behalf of area studies and international understanding, and he needed no persuasion that a continuing extension of the American horizon was an overriding need.

The program that Fahs fashioned, and which operated until 1962, gave its first priority to increasing American understanding of foreign cultures.⁶ Area studies programs in American universities were the means to this end, but Fahs added two parallel components. First, he believed it desirable to support high-level research centers abroad. As a consequence, Japanese, British, French and other foreign universities received Foundation funds for specialized study in areas of interest to the Foundation's program. Although this allocation of scarce funds inevitably reduced the chances of secondary American centers, it provided important supplementary contacts and gave foreign scholars timely reinforcement. Secondly, as a natural corollary to the support of area studies programs at home, Fahs sought to encourage the study of the United States abroad and funded several centers for American studies overseas.

For a variety of reasons there were a number of important modifications of the humanities program in 1949. "Some of the fields in which we have been active can properly be written off," Fahs wrote in an overview of the program, suggesting as prime examples support for libraries, museums, radio broadcasting, and other interests of the older program.⁷ At the same time Fahs argued forcefully for expanding the program's international work. While Stevens had by no means confined his grant-making to American institutions -- as the occasional grant to British

institutions or the important series of grants in Mexico demonstrated -- the humanities program under Stevens had largely been concerned with American universities and cultural institutions. "It was natural that the humanities program in its early years in the Rockefeller Foundation should have been concentrated in large part in the United States," Fahs conceded. Yet he maintained, "It is time for humanities to spend an increasing proportion of its budgets in more needy parts of the world."⁸ The older prejudice, implicit in the trustee review of 1934, against working abroad in the humanities had abated, and with Barnard's encouragement, Fahs interested himself in recruiting additional officers who were area specialists and in channeling a larger percentage of the budget abroad.

Another major change came shortly after Fahs assumed the director's post. The two-decade partnership between the ACLS and the Foundation was dissolved. Although his first program statement seems to have envisaged the continued use of such "middlemen" as the Council and its constituent academic organizations, Fahs and his colleagues decided that the ACLS' general program of support for scholarship ran at cross purposes to the Foundation's interests in subsidizing costly new interdisciplinary programs. Moreover, Fahs disagreed sharply with the ACLS on its support for unrestricted research projects. "Indeed, the American Council of Learned Societies in its own allocation of fellowships and research grants," he wrote, "has gone on record against any effort to choose between subjects, a position which the officers do not believe they can share and still perform their Foundation functions effectively."⁹

These decisions to end a partnership of over twenty years with the ACLS and to cut back spending for fundamental work in libraries, museums, and other allied institutions were based on a close examination of the Foundation's spending in the humanities. Before submitting a memorandum outlining the contours of the new program, Fahs asked his colleagues, Marshall and Gilpatric, to itemize the Foundation's previous expenditures on behalf of each discipline and professional organization.¹⁰ On the basis of this record, the humanities officers concluded that adequate support had been given to the professional associations which were now encouraged to look elsewhere for funding. By the time Fahs submitted his program to Barnard, and eventually, the trustees, he had a clear idea of what should not be undertaken. "First, we are not concerned with the development of any profession or subject as such," he explained, "whether it is history or philosophy, drama or music."¹¹ Although the officers continued to follow their separate disciplines, the emphasis after 1949 now fell on interdisciplinary work relating to projects or courses of study. When one philosophy professor wrote to inquire about the Foundation's support for philosophy, the humanities office replied that while the Foundation did indeed intend to make some grants for philosophy in its new program, it had no program in philosophy. The Foundation would support projects in philosophy or in history, but each grant would be measured by its contribution to a broader problem, socially or intellectually defined. It was a principle that prevailed from Fahs' time on.

* * * * *

From the outset, the new program had a clear interest in one special area of philosophy. Barnard, whose election to the presidency of the Foundation in 1948 roughly coincided with the review of the humanities program, encouraged Fahs and the humanities officers to explore epistemological problems and the broader theory of communications.

As a former president of the New Jersey Bell Company, Barnard had more than a passing interest in the theory of communications. Barnard was convinced that effective communication was an essential part of the management of large enterprises and that the insights drawn from corporate communication or from communication within any enclosed system might reveal significant parallels with the larger society. "More and more it is coming to be understood how fundamental the faults and limitations of communications are to the ills of society," he wrote in the 1948 annual report. In his first statement as president of the Foundation he boldly proposed radical surgery on the traditional classification of Foundation programs, suggesting that the "secular needs of mankind" might be reduced to three headings, "Population, Communication, and Cooperation."¹²

Not surprisingly, given this presidential interest, Fahs' first statement of his program contained a new heading devoted to "language, logic, and symbolism."¹³ For the next few years the officers, but principally Gilpatric, who had studied philosophy first at Harvard and then with Collingwood at Oxford, searched for some profitable avenues to advance philosophical research in communications. Interpreting their mandate broadly, the program officers supported a number of philosophers and linguists concerned with analyzing the structure of language and

thought -- among them, Jean Piaget, Roman Jakobson, and Charles Morris, to single out only three of the better-known grant recipients whose work the humanities program supported for a sustained period.

* * * * *

The Foundation's involvement with Piaget's experiments dated back many years. As early as 1925 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial had funded Piaget's work at a Swiss educational center, the Institut Jean Jacques Rousseau, which became the most important center in Europe for the study of child psychology and cognition. In the interwar years the Institut was affiliated with the League of Nations' International Bureau of Education and later was incorporated into the University of Geneva. Its influence grew in the 1930s when its leading rivals for eminence -- in Austria and Germany -- were forced to close. Students came from across the entire continent to take the Institute's graduate courses and to watch Piaget's fascinating experiments with young children, who struggled with puzzles and geometric forms presented to them by the psychologist's assistants.

By the 1930s, therefore, the Institute's work was well known and the social science officers of the Foundation, who had inherited the interest in Piaget from the Memorial, intended to withdraw. In the midst of the depression the university and the canton of Geneva, which financed the university, were both hard hit. The government and the university lost additional funds when the semi-public bank in which their funds were deposited went under. Foundation officers in both the social sciences and medicine agreed that it would be a loss to scholarship everywhere if the Geneva center were forced to close or curtail its work, especially at a time when comparable German and Austrian centers had closed their doors. The Foundation, therefore, continued

its support. From 1925 to 1937 Piaget's work in psychology was sustained by successive Rockefeller grants, from the Memorial and then from the Foundation.¹⁴

What reinforced the Foundation's decision to continue support to Piaget in the 1950s, this time from the humanities budget, was the growing awareness of the philosophical implications of his subtle experiments. Convinced that the development of the human mind reflected an orderly structuring of thought, Piaget devised crafty experiments to demonstrate the capacities of different age groups to handle abstractions, solve puzzles, and deduce elementary theorems of geometry. "Unless all signs are amiss," one American account of his work concluded, "Piaget is the chief bandit in the theft of epistemology from normative philosophical treatment and its transmutation into a psychological specialty." Piaget's work on the growth of the child's ability to reason was among the most interesting work underway in psychology, and was hailed by empiricists, even though they found his work "too speculative," and philosophers, who often found his underlying theories the more intriguing part of his work. "But when all the disclaimers and reservations are in," the psychologist William Kessen wrote in 1962, "it remains the case that the Geneva school has told us more about the child's knowledge of the physical world than any other researcher or school."¹⁵

* * * * *

Despite the officers' belief that further grants for "applied linguistics" and language training programs would provide only diminishing returns, they by no means lost interest in linguistics as a potential

field of interest. In 1949, in review of their program, the officers wrote that they could not disregard "the potential importance of developments in general linguistics"; they had therefore asked Professor Roman Jakobson "to review for them the status of work in this field."¹⁶

By all accounts Jakobson was a remarkable scholar.¹⁷ Marshall, who wrote the section of the program review on language, later confessed his regret that the Foundation had not supported the Russian scholar earlier. Indeed, the humanities division had had the opportunity. During the war, Jakobson had been considered for a Foundation stipend as a refugee scholar but had not been selected. (A Humanities fellowship went, however, to his brother Sergius Jakobson for work with the Library of Congress to organize and catalog its Slavic collections.) By 1949 Roman Jakobson had established himself, first at Columbia, then at Harvard, as one of the leading theoreticians and scholars in linguistics.

In his capacity as consultant to the humanities program, Jakobson outlined an ambitious research agenda to support studies in linguistics. While American linguists had done much painstaking work in the previous decades collecting information and analyzing, most notably, American Indian languages, Jakobson noted that they had not produced an exhaustive description of any one language which could serve as a model for further study. Accepting this challenge, the humanities acted upon Jakobson's call for "comprehensive analytical descriptions of single languages" by funding his work at Harvard on Russian.¹⁸ In 1950 the Foundation contributed \$50,000 to Harvard to support Jakobson's work for five years and in 1955 renewed its support for an additional three years. For nearly a decade, then, the

humanities division supported one of the most systematic attempts to describe the functioning of a complex language. Although the study was intrinsically a rigorous investigation into the relationships between thought and language, the grant was capable of practical justification as well. The announcement of the grant added the expectation that "the study will help in the teaching of Russian, which has been handicapped by the lack of authoritative analysis and description."¹⁹

In his report to the Foundation Jakobson identified a number of areas on the frontiers of linguistic analysis and philosophy of potential interest to the Foundation. He mentioned mechanical translation devices (a subject, incidentally, of great interest to President Barnard and the director for natural sciences, Warren Weaver) and work on artificial languages. The latter, of course, had been ruled out by Stevens and Marshall in the earlier program and the former was judged another program's responsibility. Finally, Jakobson identified as the "central scholarly task" of the field the impact of language on thought.

American philosophers increasingly agreed. Even before "language, logic and symbolism" appeared in the annual reports as a descriptive tag for grants being made, Foundation fellowships or modest grants-in-aid had been going to a number of philosophers who later became international leaders in this line of inquiry. William Van Quine, perhaps the best known of these analytical philosophers, received a Foundation fellowship in 1945. In these same years, as mentioned earlier, the Foundation also supported the work of Charles Morris, a philosophy professor at the University of Chicago, who described his work as an attempt to construct a "general theory of signs." Morris' earliest work had been supported by a Guggenheim fellowship, but his book, Signs, Language and Behavior

(1946), a decisive event in the history of the new movement of semiotics, was written with the help of humanities grants-in-aid in 1945 and 1946.

It would be idle to pretend that the sustained support given to such scholars as Morris, Jakobson, or Piaget represented a coherent program. "Language, logic and symbolism" represented less a sharply focused and defined program than a line of inquiry which presented some unusual opportunities for supporting outstanding work. Beyond its support for such abstruse work as Morris' or Jakobson's on the margins of language and philosophy, the program also displayed a distinct interest in the history and philosophy of science. Humanities awards aided such philosophers as E.A. Burt, Ernest Nagel, and Sidney Morgenbesser for work in this area. Finally, the annual reports from 1945 to 1960 also show a steady interest in supporting some of the country's major philosophers in other areas. Among names that might be mentioned as of more than passing interest, Foundation grants-in-aid went to Max Black, Sidney Hook, and Abraham Edel. In ethics the Foundation supported Richard Brandt and it aided Susanne Langer for her renowned work in aesthetics.

The evolution of the program's interest in philosophy from the mid-1940s to the close of the next decade also came to reflect Fahs' special concerns. As time went by, the grants for philosophy tended to encourage an interest in Oriental thought. Here was an emphasis that fit into the larger program outlines with its dominant concern for area studies -- and may have been more defensible to the trustees. The case of Charles Morris is instructive. After his initial grants for work on communication theory, the Foundation encouraged him to travel to the Far East and acquaint himself with the systems of thought there.

There were other major efforts to encourage scholarly interest in the Far East. In 1948 the Foundation subsidized the decision of the University of Hawaii to renew its famous East-West symposia -- a series of conferences and colloquia interrupted by the war years. For the first time in over a decade it was possible to summon Japanese, Chinese, Indian and Western philosophers to pick up where they had left off in the 1930s. Following this important conference, the Foundation continued to take an interest in this East-West dialogue and in 1950, in a departure from a long-standing policy of not offering support to publications, the humanities program helped the University of Hawaii launch a new journal devoted to comparative philosophy.

In addition to these grants for the Hawaiian dialogues, Fahs also took an interest in exchange programs between the United States and Japan, discussed below. Individual grants-in-aid went to distinguished expositors of Eastern thought too. Twenty-five years before it was linked to the art of motorcycle maintenance, Foundation grants were supporting such expositors of Zen Buddhism as Abraham Kaplan of the University of California, Los Angeles, and the Buddhist scholar D.T. Suzuki, whose texts have remained standard introductions to the study of the subject.²⁰

* * * * *

If the Foundation did not have a program in history, a reader leafing through the pages of its annual reports from the 1950s might be excused for thinking otherwise. The history supported in its humanities program often seemed extensive enough to be a program in itself. By one rough estimate the humanities program spent nearly seven million dollars for historical research in the decade from 1950 to 1960.²¹ Some of this

expenditure was subsumed under the area studies label since the study of foreign cultures created a strong demand for historical research and writing. To a large extent the delineation of a region came to rest upon the assumption that a given area shared a common past as well as a geographic integrity.

When the decade opened, Fahs directed the work of three officers: Marshall, Gilpatric and D'Arms. By the end of the decade, the number of program officers had doubled. In the course of its emphasis on area studies, the humanities program added three specialists: John P. Harrison (Latin America), Robert W. July (Africa), and Richard H. Nolte (the Middle East), all of whom were historians. Yet even with a staff heavily weighted toward history, and despite the expenditure of several million dollars, Fahs and his associates did not intend to give the historical guild a blank check. In fact, the humanities officers were critical of the profession in the mid-1950s and were convinced that, like the universities, it too needed to widen its horizons. The chief aim of the Foundation's grants for historical work, therefore, was to encourage new critical thinking about the study of the past and to support historical research which would complement the area studies movement.

* * * * *

"The first place the officers looked for help in thinking about priorities in the field of history was to the historians themselves," Fahs recalled in a retrospective memo written in 1960. However, Fahs' perusal of the historical journals found "disappointingly little critical analysis of the output of the historical profession."²² Throughout his tenure as director of

the humanities program he remained a stern critic of the American historical guild's failure to establish some mechanism for agreeing upon research priorities. To be sure, Fahs noted, the historical journals were filled with historiographical essays, discussions of the philosophy of history, and above all, methodological disputes. But little thought seemed to have been given to the significance of most of the research undertaken. In one metaphor Fahs compared the historians of his generation to an army inching its way over an unknown terrain without any strategy or any commanding general. Although it occasionally made brilliant breakthroughs, this historical attack was sprawling and uncoordinated. Lacking any list of strategic targets, the historians argued over tactics. Surely, Fahs reasoned, the first and most important need was some idea of what research was important.

Part of the problem, as Fahs knew, came from the way in which American historians were trained. If every subject seemed equally important to the historians, this confused state of affairs had to be attributed in large part to the demands of the graduate seminar and the requirements for the dissertation. The tendency of the American graduate school was to subdivide fields into ever smaller subdisciplines and to narrow specialization to limited periods of time or place. Thus, what had once been progressive in the nineteenth century, when soaring romantic imaginations had required the stern discipline of Ranke's seminars, had gradually become artificial and pedantic in the mid-twentieth century.

The logical implication of this criticism would have meant some attempt to improve the education of historians, or to channel

funds into graduate programs which might challenge the status quo. That some of Fahs' staff saw this implication is borne out by a short memo prepared jointly by July and Harrison. "The training of historians," they wrote of the graduate schools, and particularly of their research seminars, "has tended to discourage imagination in the selection of research interests, concern with the contributions of other academic fields, interest in interpretive history, and an inclination to relate history to the world we live in."²³ Harrison and July then proposed the following:

There appears to be real need, therefore, for a program which tries to train historians to think about the values of history not only within but without the profession, which stimulates interesting research based on importance and need rather than availability of materials or the filling of gaps, and which stresses ideas rather than pick-and-shovel research as an end in itself. If one, two, or three advanced graduate seminars could be established with these directions in view, it might not be too long before a small but important group of young historians would be in evidence, qualified to write and to think about history in ways which would produce work more or less naturally in some of the fields we have been trying so long and so unsuccessfully to cultivate. The support necessary to establish seminars of this sort would not be great -- perhaps some fellowship funds or assistance toward travel. What would be difficult to overcome, however, is the almost certain opposition of history departments to doctoral dissertations not conforming to conventional patterns...

The historians on the Foundation staff were arguing for more imaginative and broader seminars and research topics. The Foundation did not show any zeal for following this trail, and one can only speculate on what the results might have been. In the same memo July and Harrison argued that the teaching of history in the secondary schools, if more difficult to change, was of no less importance. This, too, proved to be a line of

inquiry that the Foundation, and especially Rusk, had little interest in pursuing.²⁴

Some idea of the kind of history the officers in the humanities had in mind as a model can be culled from their passing references in praise of historians then at work. "Philip Curtin's tropical history program [at the University of Wisconsin] deserves exploration for what it might do for non-Western history," Harrison and July suggested. In the field of American history the officers referred frequently to the work of Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick and praised the training offered by Samuel Hayes. But, significantly perhaps, many if not most of their examples came from abroad. They particularly admired Geoffrey Barraclough's defense of contemporary history as the history of a unified global civilization and his broad interpretation of German history (which brought the story of modern Germany down to the Allied occupation). Similarly, the kind of interdisciplinary work directed by Fernand Braudel at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in Paris and by Daniel Cosío-Villegas at the Colegio de México also impressed the Foundation's historians. The list is neither exhaustive nor even fully representative, but it does serve to give some idea of what the program officers were looking for, and in almost every case what they praised was broad-gauged, and often interdisciplinary or comparative history. If the Foundation was willing to fund such research programs abroad, it found few comparable seminars in the United States. Area studies seemed the nearest equivalent possible in the United States in the face of existing rigid disciplinary lines.

It was the fundamental question of establishing priorities in research topics that worried Fahs and dominated the Foundation's thinking about the guild's reluctance to put its house in order. "History is of course of great importance," he conceded in 1956, "but is all history equally important?"²⁵ Similarly, a few years later Fahs lamented the reluctance of graduate schools to veto "trivial" research topics for dissertations and the tendency of the journals in their reviews to praise the smallest and least significant monographs. "It is rare to find in any historical journal a discussion of priorities for research in history or of why a study was worth undertaking except in the almost meaningless terms of whether the particular subject has been covered before or whether a given batch of manuscripts has been examined. Often, Fahs continued, "decisions [on topics] seem to be made in terms of whether materials are conveniently available rather than whether the results are likely to be significant."²⁶

In thinking about significance in historical research, Fahs seems to have turned almost instinctively to the natural sciences. He disliked equally, as reasons for the Foundation's support of a project in history, the argument that a topic had not been covered before and the argument that the researchers should be given a blank check to follow their inclinations because the utility or results were not "predictable in advance." Drawing on the natural sciences Fahs argued what he considered to be a misinterpretation of its methods:²⁷

Actually, the unpredictability of research...is not effective doctrine even in science. It is quite obvious that scientists constantly make decisions involving choice between research efforts and that this choice is made on the basis of their guesses

with regard to possible results....In fact, a major criterion for judging the greatness of a scientist or mathematician is his batting average in choosing significant problems. It is particularly true for the Rockefeller Foundation that all work, including that in natural science, involves judgments with regard to the probable significance of the research to be undertaken.

Fahs continued to maintain, as he had in his first memo on the subject in 1950, "Selection and interpretation are the essence of the problem of historical writing."²⁸

Throughout these internal discussions, there was another consideration often put forward. The "uses of history," "the social value of history," and "the utility of history" are phrases which recur in the Foundation's prose even to the point where Fahs described some kinds of popular history as examples of the "recreational uses of history." "The significance of historical writing lies in its relevance to contemporary problems, the contribution which it can make to contemporary thought." Its utility or social value depended on "its reaching consumers beyond the historical profession."²⁹

At times Fahs virtually directed a historical seminar on these questions. Because of the sizeable humanities staff in the mid-1950s periodic meetings were held, and Fahs often asked for papers summarizing the work in hand or a discussion of problems before the officers. One sally on history in this periodic round-table came from Nolte, the program officer who had inherited Middle Eastern affairs from Marshall. Taking his cue from Fahs' emphasis on "utility" -- and Fahs was well-known in

the office for his "utilitarianism"* -- Nolte posited "A Humanities Theory of Historical Relativity," or utility of history.³⁰

His theory of historical utility first claimed that significant history would aim at the "greatest benefit for the greatest number," that is to say, the largest possible readership. Utilitarian theory, Nolte continued, also must presume that all readers, like all citizens, were equal. Of course, as Nolte saw, the implications of this theory were the exact opposites of what Fahs had in mind; taken literally, this theory would have had the Foundation supporting popularizations -- the kind of "recreational history" Fahs scorned. Noting this chink in the utilitarian armor, Nolte puckishly formulated a second and more "relative" postulate: "All readers of history are equal, but some groups are more equal than others."

In a serious vein, he clearly captured the real thrust of Fahs' thinking. "Limited coverage means limited value." From the Foundation's point of view, Nolte continued, "competent historians may be divided into two sorts: pack rats and poets, or brickmakers and architects." One type of scholarship filled gaps, connected narratives, supplied missing links, and the like, and need not be entirely scorned for its humble but necessary role. Without bricks, the architect's grand design could not be

*This frequently-espoused utilitarianism led Marshall to characterize Fahs as "the most thoroughgoing utilitarian I ever met." On occasion, Fahs rode this horse too hard: one of the earlier drafts of his policy statement on history prompted Robert S. Morrison, later director of the medical sciences program, to tell Fahs, "Perhaps I should mention that the memo as a whole strikes me as unnecessarily utilitarian in tone." And, "...if the humanities don't watch out, we will soon find ourselves able to extend life indefinitely just when we have lost sight of all reason for living."

realized. But the Foundation's primary interest would have to remain with the architects:

Most historians, including the bulk of the AHA [American Historical Association] seem to fall into the brickmaking category, and their labors have resulted in a swelling host of monographs, small-scale histories, handbooks and textbooks. Perhaps most of them would be excluded from RF consideration by application of the First Law, i.e., on grounds of limited appeal. But where the shortage of bricks is such as to make construction of more important history difficult and unlikely, RF interest may be justified....

But the First Law suggests that our primary concern should be with the second category of historian: the poet, or architect. These are the historians who write for more than the historian; who are concerned more with interpretation than chronicle, more with continuity than particularity; who view history, like Toynbee, as a "search for historical light on the nature and destiny of man"; who consider history at its best as being at once an artistic creation and a useful guide to action both private and public.

This meant, he concluded, that "architects are more important than brick-makers unless there aren't any bricks."³¹

This formulation, partly in jest (and, needless to say perhaps, never intended for publication), captured the spirit of the program's attitude toward history. It also explained the difference in priorities when the Foundation worked abroad, for in some developing countries in which the Foundation was active, the historical profession needed bricks and brick-masons just as much as it needed interpretive architects -- unlike the United States where, as the officers saw it, there were simply too many of the former and too few of the latter. These conclusions in many ways shaped the Foundation's view for many years to come in favor of contemporary history, large-scale interpretive history, and the history of non-Western societies. To stimulate change in the historical profession

the director saw a clear need to tilt the Foundation's resources in the direction of the non-traditional:

If a foundation through this process of selective support should have an influence on the general direction of historical research, I think it is clear that our selection must be an even more restrictive one than the kind of selection that is eventually needed by the historical profession. In other words, if the present pattern of historical work is heavily biased in the direction of traditional lines of inquiry, a foundation program which was completely balanced between traditional and non-traditional lines of work would have little corrective effect. If we have ignored in practice many fields of research, e.g., medieval history, classical history, or the history of the American revolution, which of course have an inherent justification, it is because these fields seem adequately covered both by past publication and by present historical effort³² and will not be neglected even if there is no RF help.

Seeing global history as the logical corollary to both the Foundation's internationalism and the humanities program's support for area studies, Fahs gave his highest priority to the creation of a new interpretive world history. A global history of broad scope would help create the international perspective needed for a future world order. Such a history, to be "internationally acceptable," would perforce include "the role which all peoples have played in the development of our present, interlocking world society." A world history, conceived in the spirit of the eighteenth century dictum "above all the nations, humanity," would serve to create a sense of planetary citizenship.

Without straining the analogy, Fahs saw a parallel between the need in 1919 for a history which reconciled the European belligerents and a similar need after the Second World War for a history which taught an even more global internationalism. Along with Stevens, Fahs and his colleagues thought and acted in kinship with the spirit of H.G. Wells' defense in 1921 of his Outline of History:

In a very little while, with incalculably great benefit to mankind, we could have the broad facts of human history taught, as chemistry is taught today, in practically the same terms throughout all Europe. And later, as the students went on to a closer study of their own nation and its literature, they would do so with a sound sense of historical perspective, and with their disposition toward national egotism and conceit at least corrected. On minds prepared in this fashion it would be possible to build the new conceptions of an organized world peace that struggle so hopelessly at present against the dark prejudices of today.³³

Such a history was easier to prescribe than to write. The existing world histories seemed faintly anachronistic. Running throughout many of these earlier attempts to write world history were several implicit assumptions which, in the aftermath of the two world wars and the upheaval in the formerly colonized world, were no longer valid. Underlying many of these texts was a faith in progress that ill accorded with the facts of twentieth century brutality. And even the best of the older texts showed signs of a Eurocentric view of the world; many others blatantly identified the business civilization of the United States or the Pax Britannica as the highest pinnacle of human achievement. All too often textbooks designed for classrooms in secondary schools simply added a few chapters on colonialism and the rise of the Soviet Union to the older framework of European history. This Eurocentric view, the product of an age of European colonialism and Western expansion, seemed no longer adequate. Fahs, from his many years in Japan and other parts of East Asia, understood too that this kind of "imperial" history had its psychological impact on both the colonizers and the colonized. "Western-oriented history," Fahs once wrote, criticizing this partial view of the human race, "is a source of stupidity and arrogance in the West, but in Asia and Africa it is a source of more dangerous feelings of alienation, rootlessness and inferiority."³⁴

To use a more recent, and polemical, phrase, Fahs clearly believed that in an age of decolonization history itself would have to be decolonized. The international point of view demanded a history which would correct older biases and injustices. In the newer view world history no longer culminated in the establishment of European empires but in their dismantling. At the same time, Fahs was not an uncritical admirer of Asian and African nationalism. Nationalist and anti-colonial interpretations often filled the political vacuum left by older colonial schools of historical writing. Fahs was aware that nationalism in many parts of the developing world could be as dangerous and narrow-minded as it had been in the truculent countries of nineteenth century Europe. In this view, nationalist history was not so much desirable as inevitable. Yet the replacement of one partisan interpretation by another could never fill the moral vacuum in the new epoch's historical writing. If Fahs thus accepted the need to decolonize history, he refused to conclude that decolonization must inevitably lead to nationalist history or "third world" partisanship. Unfortunately the colonial regimes had not encouraged the training of skilled historians who could incorporate the history of their own people and traditions into broad-gauged historical accounts. "The officers know few adequately trained Indonesian historians -- this was not a field of study the Dutch encouraged," Fahs wrote of his experience in Indonesia.³⁵

Fahs believed that these problems required an emphasis on the more recent past. The rise and imposition of colonial empires, the gradual awakening of a nationalist response, and the post-World War II creation of many ill-prepared and impoverished new countries, were parts

of a continuous process; together, these historical topics constituted one of the central dramas of world history and each separate strand converged in the tapestry of contemporary history. The program in humanities favored history on the global scale and at the same time called for historical inquiry into the historical background of the contemporary era.

The humanities program looked for not one, but three different kinds of interpretive history: encyclopedic world history, contemporary history, and a third history which might be called, for want of a better term, world regional history -- or in one of Fahs' phrases, "history written across national lines." Of these genres, the first was obviously the most demanding and since the Foundation set near-impossible standards for this new world history -- that it be universal, scholarly, and free from any "obvious cultural bias" -- it is not surprising that few grants were actually made for work in this broad overarching category. To build a structure of thought large enough to encompass the entire globe's history required the kind of architectural skills that few individual practitioners of the art would claim or the kind of poetic license that even fewer would risk; collaborative ventures would have other disadvantages.

Yet there were individual historians who painted with broad strokes. In the work of Arnold Toynbee, Ralph Turner, Geoffrey Barraclough, and Fernand Braudel, the Foundation found efforts worth supporting. Although the officers followed with sympathy the collective enterprise of the UNESCO series on the history of mankind, a world history written by many different hands, they did not lend it support. In fact, the UNESCO decision to launch a vast, multi-volumed history of the human race from

its prehistoric origins to the present pointed to a number of the practical difficulties involved in the conception of "world" history.

Scholarly, universal in scope, and international in character, the UNESCO history of mankind met most of Fahs' requirements but nevertheless had an antiseptic, inoffensive, and uncontroversial quality.

None of these vices characterized the work of Arnold Toynbee. Perhaps the most widely read and discussed historian of the postwar era, Toynbee had begun his career in a fairly conventional way. Before the first world war Toynbee read the Greek and Latin classics at Oxford and was serving as a tutor and fellow in ancient history when the war broke out in 1914. During the war Toynbee worked on political questions for the foreign office and found himself caught up in the tangled issues which divided Greece, Turkey and the Western powers. For the rest of his scholarly career Toynbee kept one foot in the ancient and one in the contemporary world. After the war Toynbee became director of research at Chatham House, the headquarters of the prestigious Royal Institute for International Affairs. Dividing his time between his investigations of ancient history and his work as director of studies and editor of the Institute's annual Survey of International Affairs, Toynbee's first contacts with the Foundation came, to the subsequent embarrassment of the humanities officers, through the social sciences division. This was not wholly surprising because in the inter-war years at least Toynbee was best known for his trenchant comments on international relations in the Survey, which under Toynbee's editorship became a major voice for British opinion.

But in the long run, Toynbee's reputation rested upon his idiosyncratic interpretation of world history. It would be hard to over-

estimate the impact of Toynbee's A Study of History, whose first volumes appeared in 1934 and whose completion was aided by Foundation grants nearly twenty years later. A Study of History preached, and here the verb is not too strong, a message which lent itself to simplification and popularization. At the risk of over-simplifying this multi-volumed work, Toynbee's magnum opus argued in great detail that the major historical civilizations followed a similar pattern in their evolution and decay. These mature civilizations, identified by their creation of a distinctive intellectual or religious culture, seemed to arise from a specific environment which necessitated a creative response. The decay of these great civilizations, Toynbee maintained, was caused not so much by invasion, military failure or economic reversals as by the gradual erosion of an inner, religious faith and the vital purpose, of which military power, economic growth and artistic achievement were only external manifestations.

Toynbee further claimed to see parallels in the world's great religions, and in forcing many separate religious traditions into his patterns the British classicist often challenged some of the historical profession's oldest classifications of civilizations. Thus, his taxonomy of civilizations was alone sufficient to set off fierce debate among traditional historians. Even worse in the eyes of specialists in comparative religion were Toynbee's sometimes strained comparisons -- to take only one example, the similarities he posited between Christianity and the cult of Osiris in ancient Egypt. At the same time, although his views could hardly be called orthodox, his ideas on religion and the inner strength of civilizations were seized upon, especially in the United

States, by a wide range of moralists. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that it was precisely the most suspect of Toynbee's views which aroused the interest of the general public.³⁶

For all its defects, Toynbee's work obviously met a deeply felt need in a way that collaborative and scholarly reference books never could. "It is easy to criticize Toynbee -- I do not like his cyclical and religious interpretations," Fahs wrote in defense of the Foundation's grants which supported the British historian from 1948 to 1952 [and which, it might be noted, began before Fahs took over the directorship from Stevens] "but I wish we had more historians who had the courage to make such efforts."³⁷ To use Nolte's scheme, Toynbee was an architect not a brickmaker, and even more a poet than an architect. He was, in fact, sui generis. His academic critics hardly knew what to make of his work, and more than one accused him of writing prophecy or religious exhortation rather than history. Toynbee's imaginative vision of the past seemed worthy of support to the officers of the Foundation not for its scientific or factual claims, but for its breadth, its theoretical implications, and its metaphorical comparisons of radically different epochs. In funding Toynbee's history, Fahs (and Stevens before him) was supporting not scientific history but soaring, speculative, meta-history. As an architect, Toynbee would not do: his vast design proved too eccentric to accommodate the contentious profession of historians.

While Toynbee came as close as any historian could ever expect to becoming a household word, the opposite fate awaited the more judicious Ralph Turner. His name is probably not well known today even among professional historians. Yet Turner, who was professor of history at Yale for

many years, came closer than anyone else in his day to conquering the difficult summit imagined for world history by the Foundation's theorists. Turner had written two large volumes on the origin of civilization in the Fertile Crescent of the Middle East and Egypt and in the Indus valley and China, and apparently intended to carry these separate stories forward, in sequel volumes, down to the modern era.³⁸

More cautious in his conclusions than Toynbee, Turner relied on the existing sources and painted cultural history with less bold strokes of the brush. His originality lay elsewhere: if poetry and religion carried Toynbee away, Turner was one of the few among the guild of professional historians capable of conceiving the growth of civilizations over the millenia. Finally, as a capstone to his architectural structure, Turner conceived a final volume arguing that the recent past had marked a watershed in human affairs. The twentieth century, in Turner's scheme, would rest across the centuries of each separate cultural growth, a horizontal beam across vertical centuries of historic development. Turner's argument for the discontinuity of the twentieth century rested upon a range of evidence drawn from areas only beginning to be assimilated into social history: demography, new forms of energy, and changes in human diet and nutrition all entered into Turner's equation. Turner's broadly conceived work had obvious appeal at a Foundation which devoted much of its resources to such problems, and the interpretation placed on the discontinuities of the contemporary period helped reinforce the Foundation's own emphasis on contemporary history. Increasingly, the changes which most affected the contemporary world seemed to have their origins in the not too distant past. Fahs was quick to draw the lesson. "The greater

the rate of change in human affairs," a Foundation report concluded, "the more our thinking about the future is influenced by our understanding of the very recent past."³⁹

If Turner never finished the volume on the interpretation of contemporary history, the Foundation bears some part of the responsibility. Because Turner seemed such an ideal choice to direct a universal history project, Marshall suggested him to UNESCO's Julian Huxley as the most likely historian to outline and supervise the monumental international effort being launched. Thus, albeit indirectly, the humanities officers encouraged Turner to take on new but congenial work. When he died, in , Turner had helped launch the UNESCO project and had prepared the section on world history for the American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature (1961) -- but he never finished his own volumes.

In a manner of speaking, the book setting forth Turner's ideas was written not by Turner but by the British historian Geoffrey Barraclough. "One of the distinctive facts about contemporary history," Barraclough insisted in An Introduction to Contemporary History, "is that it is world history, and that the forces shaping it cannot be understood unless we are prepared to adopt world-wide perspectives..."⁴⁰ Along with Turner, Barraclough held that the contemporary world differed fundamentally from earlier epochs and implied that East and West might have more in common with each other than with their historic precursors. To identify the causes of the "world-wide process of change which began around 1890," Barraclough argued persuasively that historians must look at such silent but cumulative factors as demographic growth, technological change, and

urbanization. It was important to reverse history's priorities and study the contemporary period; just as in the non-Western world the controversy seemed to focus on events in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, so too in the European and American contexts contemporary history had become the crucial and contested terrain. Turner's long view of human history, and Barraclough's perspective, had the virtue of confirming the importance of the historian constantly searching for the new meanings of the past for each generation.

In this influential exposition of contemporary history, the wheel came full circle for the Foundation's interests. Contemporary history, it turned out, was world history, and insofar as the world had a common history, it was the history of the last seventy-five or hundred years. At the heart of this sweeping reinterpretation of contemporary history there was also a rejection of the Eurocentric perspective still held, whether consciously or unconsciously, by most European, British, and American historians. Few historians contested the broad delineation of events, and many found exciting the research agenda outlined by Barraclough, but some could object that contemporary history's perspective tended to obscure vital differences in the past.

In Europe interest in contemporary history grew rapidly in the post-1945 period. Significantly, in several European countries the postwar years saw historians create new institutions designed to revitalize historical studies or, in many cases, specifically to address the problem of contemporary history. Within a period of five years, from 1946 to 1951, important centers for historical research were created in Naples, where the Italian Institute for Historical Studies was established

in 1946; in Paris at the sixth section of the Ecole pratique des hautes etudes, (1948); at St. Antony's College, Oxford (1950); and in Munich's Institut fur Zeitgeschichte (1951). The Foundation's program in the humanities supported all of them by the mid-1950s. Some -- most notably the Ecole pratique -- were not exclusively concerned with recent history, but all, and especially the Ecole pratique, home of the influential periodical Annales, were instrumental in the reorganization of historical studies in postwar Europe.

* * * * *

In the aftermath of the Second World War the Foundation's officers in the humanities expected historical writing to play an important part in the restoration of European civic and intellectual life. In Italy, where in the two years before the war nearly all of the country's outstanding voices of opposition had been silenced, Mussolini's government was never able entirely to nullify the influence of one scholarly senator, the historian-philosopher Benedetto Croce. His international stature had kept Croce relatively free from Mussolini's reach during the Fascist era, and if his isolation left his opposition somewhat impotent, Croce nonetheless had an opportunity to think about the problems of rebuilding scholarly life, the universities, and historical research. Although at the end of the war Croce was nearly 80 years old, he was far from ready to retire from public life and in 1946, in what might be considered his last major contribution to his country and to scholarship, Croce established the Italian Institute for Historical Studies. D'Arms, the humanities officer responsible for European

affairs, visited Naples in 1948 and found the great scholar, at age 82, frail and in poor health, but otherwise in good form:

...he is very alert and keen mentally, but with the privilege of the old, prefers to talk of himself and his current interests rather than in more general terms. He started to give EFD [Edward F. D'Arms] a sketch of current intellectual affairs in Italy, and commented briefly and objectively on the plight of intellectuals under Fascism. As a tendency of research everywhere, but particularly in Italy, Croce also referred to research as more German than the Germans. It is this positivistic trend in research which Croce is trying to combat in both his historical and philosophical studies and he insisted on the importance of the esthetic-moral approach to these subjects as developed in his own works.⁴¹

Under the Fascists the Italian universities had not dared to encourage research on recent Italian history nor did philosophers, historians and humanistic scholars in general feel free to examine critically the assumptions of the ruling party's political philosophy. Croce deplored both the loss of intellectual freedom and the retreat of scholarship -- or, at least, for those scholars who did not flee the country -- into antiquarian and safe topics. There was in any case a tendency in much contemporary historical and humanistic scholarship to concern itself with methodology and with the painstaking duties of fact-finding and collecting. Under the influence of positivism and of the nineteenth century German "scientific" historians, this tendency had become exaggerated -- hence Croce's reference to those Italian scholars whose research was "more German than the Germans.'" Against this concern for data and for facts, the Italian scholar defended the somewhat old-fashioned history of ideas and the search for meaning in history. A hint of his idealist philosophy comes through in the prologue to the

Institute's statutes in which Croce described the shortcomings of positivist and traditional history:

The result of this one-sided and deficient preparation is that we get philologists and learned men who do diligent research in documentary material, but who when asked to interpret the thoughts and actions of an age feel themselves inadequate and take refuge in conventional or trivial reflections or resort to applying⁴² whatever system of thought is currently in the mode.

Such history, in Croce's view, would never suffice to begin the moral rejuvenation of Italian education and scholarship.

Croce himself had never been affiliated with any university, and his independence -- both financial and institutional -- served to convince him of the need to create a private, postgraduate institute outside the framework of the university system. Once he had founded the Institute, Croce donated his library and his villa which had once belonged to the Italian philosopher Vico (1668-1744), to the new center. The Italian Institute for Historical Studies in Naples, Croce pointed out, was launched in the very house "where Giambattista Vico, in an age of great and rapid progress in physical, mathematical, and natural sciences, lifted his voice in a warning that these sciences would not satisfy the practical needs of mankind...."⁴³ Croce gave the new Institute not only a vision of its role but a substantial base on which to build its work; he accumulated a library of nearly 80,000 volumes, an impressive collection of books and documents which he took pride in showing his Foundation visitor.

Despite its history and its beauties, the library of the Institute lacked both recent periodicals -- which, of course, had been impossible to get during the war years -- and many standard works by British

and American authors. The Foundation came to its aid in 1949, three years after its inauguration, enabling it to purchase foreign books and journals. At the same time the grant, the first of many, made a modest contribution to the general support of the Institute and its primary mission, the training of a new generation of historians.

While Croce was the moral force behind the Institute's creation, its day to day direction had to be entrusted to other hands. In Federico Chabod the Institute found not only a capable scholar and administrator, but a man who embodied the kind of leadership and possessed the personal charm that any successor to Croce would require. Chabod, a professor of modern history at the University of Rome, served as the senior editor for the principal Italian historical journal, the Rivista Storica Italiana. Chabod's writings on European diplomatic history in the nineteenth century and on Italian history in the modern period commanded respect among European historians, while in Italy itself his work outlined a research agenda for his generation. Beyond his academic credentials, which were formidable, Chabod's role in the resistance movement in northern Italy pointed to the kind of moral commitment that Croce thought indispensable. Chabod served briefly as the president of the provisional government in his native province, the Val d'Aosta, at the end of the German occupation.⁴⁴

Around Chabod, D'Arms reported in 1948, there was a "general atmosphere of informality, industry, and high seriousness."⁴⁵ Even before the Foundation's grant in 1949, Chabod and Croce had attracted some twenty-five Italian postdoctoral fellows for historical work in the Institute's advanced seminars. In addition to working with Chabod and other part-time faculty members, these students also met with Croce approximately every fortnight. In addition to

providing books and additional fellowship money to supplement the funds that Croce and Chabod had raised from private sources in Italy, the Foundation's fellowship funds allowed Chabod wide latitude to recruit fellows from abroad and even to send his own students to foreign archives. In little more than a decade from 1949 to 1960 the humanities program gave the Institute several additional grants to further historical research; by the end of the decade a number of the Institute's fellows held important teaching posts and several American specialists had studied there, often with Fulbright grants.*

In the diaries of Norman Buchanan, a Foundation officer in the social sciences, there is a prophetic passage concerning the future of one French research institute. In an interview with French educational official Pierre Auger in 1947, Buchanan heard first-hand of a plan afoot to offer France's notoriously theory-oriented intellectuals better training in the social sciences:⁴⁶

There already exists in Paris an *ecole science pratique* [sic] which is composed of a number of sections, at present five in number. A.'s plan is to add a sixth section which would carry on essentially graduate work, i.e. courses, lectures, seminars, etc., in social sciences, particularly economics, statistics and geography....As he outlined it, he would, for example, draw two or three professors from the faculty of letters to give courses in economic history, two or three more from the science faculty to give courses in geography and history of technology, and the like...

When combined with professional economists who would "offer courses in economics as ordinarily studied," Auger's plan promised to create one of the most advanced groups for interdisciplinary research in the social sciences anywhere.

*Among the fellows at the Instituto were such distinguished Italian historians as Renzo de Felice and Roberto Vivarelli.

As Auger explained the French educational system to Buchanan, the latter grew more impressed with the plan's potential for emancipating the social sciences from the law faculties, where in the prewar French system they had been firmly relegated to a secondary place. "This is a structural change," Buchanan wrote, "which...might be far reaching in its effects."⁴⁷

The sixth section of the Ecole pratique des hautes etudes indeed was far-reaching in its effects not only on French intellectual life but on the practice of history everywhere. What emerged at the sixth section was an interdisciplinary seminar in economic history of great imagination and fertility. The impact of the sixth section, however, was not limited to the social sciences alone: the entire historical profession would claim the team of historians associated with the sixth section.

Founded in 1868 as an independent research institute by the French government, the Ecole pratique's name implied a concern for method and the teaching of research methods, not only in the humanities but also in mathematics, the physical sciences, and the biological sciences. But when the Ecole pratique was established, the social sciences were in their infancy and as a consequence never received the independent status they had achieved in the United States. In the tradition of "political economy," economics was taught in French universities in the law faculties. Conceived of as a tool for statesmen and civil servants, French economics tended, on balance, to be quite conservative methodologically and quite formal-legalistic in the classroom. At the same time, a serious by-product of this delegation of the social sciences to the law faculties was an almost complete divorce between French social theorists and any quantitative or empirical study of the economy. The graduates of the faculty of arts and letters received a superb education in

the humanities, but it was divorced from any understanding of economics and usually left its recipients equally unacquainted with sociological writings or the social sciences in general.

Many French intellectuals were convinced in the aftermath of the Second World War that this system needed reform. Not only had the old system tended to produce a university-educated elite who would often rise to high positions in the civil service or in politics with little or no understanding of economic questions, it had also produced a mirror-image in the intellectual theorists who disdained any protracted study of facts. The historian Lucien Febvre lent his authority to the new school, and pointed out to the Foundation that without a center for training teachers in the newer methods and approaches the French university system would go on reproducing itself:

Can we count on university teaching in the Faculties (notably the Faculties of Law which administer the teaching of political economy, and the Faculties of Letters which have supreme control over a sociology which is tied up with philosophy) to remedy this situation? Unfortunately no. The instructions they dispense, with an eye to professional examinations, to the young people in their charge is dogmatic and didactic instruction, having to do essentially with doctrines and not at all with the methodological, practical, and technical instruction which should be given the young workers so needed in economic and social activities.⁴⁰

The Foundation accepted the pleas of Auger and Febvre and in 1948 approved an initial grant of \$30,000 to assist the new section to create additional chairs in history, and to plan the development of its staff. It was understood from the outset that the French government was expected to assume the costs of further staffing as soon as its national budget permitted. In 1949 two of the staff posts were to be picked up by the French budget, and in

the following years fully endowed chairs would be added. With the help of the Foundation, an influential new institution began its existence.

This account explains the interest of the social sciences -- and it to the social sciences officers that the credit for developing the partnership between the Foundation and the Ecole pratique belongs -- but it does not explain why the humanities officers continued this relationship. At a time when both the social sciences and the humanities were pressing American scholars to broaden their horizons, to form interdisciplinary work groups, and to focus their researches on a common region or problem, the sixth section proved to be a model of teamwork, theoretical imagination and diligent research. In its letter to the Foundation announcing its first eight appointments, the French ministry of education informed the Foundation that its new section would have as members Messieurs Lucien Febvre, Fernand Braudel, Ernest Labrousse, and Charles Moraze among the historians and geographers. It would be hard to imagine a more influential group in the new social and economic history.

When he first appeared in the Ecole's correspondence with the Foundation -- his name misspelled by a French official as "Brodel" -- Fernand Braudel was only one of several claimants for Lucien Febvre's place as the leader of the Annales school.* But with the publication in 1949 of his now-famous study, La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II, Braudel assumed Febvre's mantle undisputed.⁴⁹ He combined considerable talents as a researcher and teacher with administrative skills, which in the decade after the publication of his book, enabled the school to build its seminars and expand its programs in several directions.

*Known by their journal's title, Annales d'histoire économique et sociale, Annales had been founded in 1929 by Febvre and Marc Bloch.

As a researcher, Braudel might be best characterized as a historian of wide vision. Braudel's world encompassed not only the history of fifteenth and sixteenth century Europe, his specialty, but also included in a broad, sweeping embrace the entire Mediterranean basin with its Muslim cultures to the east and south. Where the traditional accounts of European history drew sharp boundaries between the Muslim Orient and the Christian West, Braudel emphasized instead the economic and geographic ties which bound the two civilizations together in a close embrace. In jumping over the traditional dividing lines, Braudel went one step further to insist that the two rival civilizations facing one another across the Mediterranean needed one another to form a coherent unit. Where Toynbee's complex typology of civilizations and extravagant comparisons offended most professional historians, Braudel's more carefully delimited study suggested that such comparisons, if drawn between contemporaneous civilizations or cultures and if drawn on the same plane, might prove a fruitful source of new work.

If the terrain and the methodology were chosen with care, Braudel's ambitions for historical research were not modest. Or, as Braudel put it in the revised edition of La Méditerranée:⁵⁰

...it also represents an attempt to write a new kind of history, total history, written in three different registers, on three different levels, perhaps best described as three different conceptions of time....

Political events, and other episodes which loomed so large in traditional history, Braudel dismissed as the most transient of his three kinds of time and as the least important of the three registers. Like the psalmist, Braudel viewed man's days as fleeting; history, in the long run, was shaped more by geologic and historic epochs in which more basic geographic and

economic factors shaped the way in which entire societies earned their living. Running throughout Braudel's 1,244 pages on the epoch of Phillip II of Spain is a sense of tragedy in which the individual actors have little control of their actions. Braudel was not uninterested in the day to day events of narrative history -- indeed his work on the Mediterranean is filled with cameo portraits of the leading figures of the epoch and is often masterful in its accounts -- but his view of the long-run forces shaping societies and events left little room for narrative history's assumption that the individual was in charge of his own actions. In the conclusion to the revised edition, Braudel conceded that a certain fatalism colored his view of history:

...So when I think of the individual, I am always inclined to see him imprisoned within a destiny in which he himself has little hand, fixed in a landscape in which the infinite perspectives of the long term stretch into the distance both behind him and before. In historical analysis as I see it, rightly or wrongly, the long run always wins in the end. Annihilating innumerable events... it indubitably limits both the freedom of the individual and even the role of chance.⁵¹

It followed from this deterministic view of the past that to understand the present, historians and other social scientists had to take the long view. Contemporary history, though not entirely scorned at the sixth section, had a distinctly different flavor in France.

Such a summary account runs the risk of leaving the impression that Braudel and his younger associates thought history cut and dried, but nothing could be further from the truth -- as perhaps only a reading of Braudel's prose will show. At the same time, Braudel's important seminar on the Mediterranean was hardly in step with the other work supported by the Foundation on contemporary history, except as a Gallic counterpoint to the grandiose interpretation

put forth elsewhere. What attracted Fahs and the humanities officers, apart from the intrinsic importance of Braudel's work, was the way in which the sixth section was not only reorienting historical writing and thinking in France but was also encouraging interdisciplinary work and expanding research into areas of interest to the Foundation. Fahs and D'Arms seem to have visualized the sixth section as a French version of the area studies centers. Braudel himself was interested in Turkish history, and other members of his institute specialized in the Muslim world and the Russian and Slavic worlds.

Thus, in 1955 it was quite natural for the humanities program to offer Braudel a travel grant to enable him to see first-hand how such American universities as Columbia and Harvard organized their Russian studies institutes. At the same time, the humanities program picked up where the Social Sciences division left off; in 1955 humanities awarded the Ecole pratique a separate grant of \$60,000 for the development of its research programs, but primarily for its Russian and Turkish research projects.⁵² The officers continued to support the sixth section, even to the point of financing a later expedition to Turkish, Iranian and other Middle Eastern archives to photocopy documents for use by the Ecole's historians. By 1962, when the humanities and social sciences divisions were for a time merged, the Foundation had spent well over \$100,000 in support of the sixth section's work. While these dollars were increasingly a smaller and smaller percentage of Braudel's overall budget, they nonetheless won from him the enthusiastic praise that, thanks to their flexibility, each was worth four or five restricted dollars.⁵³ Here was an instance where "controlled projects" were not necessary and unrestricted funds could be awarded; the Institute was accomplishing in a bold and

free new way what the humanities officers and the Foundation believed needed to be done.

* * * * *

"We have for some time in the Division of Humanities been interested in finding out what was going on in European studies, and have been disappointed to find few, if any, sound and comprehensive programs," D'Arms wrote to Mex Beloff in 1954.⁵⁴ D'Arms, who had been following English educational developments closely, had been hopeful that one of the English universities would define an area studies program for Europe with an emphasis on modern European history. At Oxford there had been talk of a new degree in European history corresponding to traditional studies in English history or modern European languages.

"By a strange reversal of fortunes it now looks as though Oxford is going to do something about European studies after all," Beloff had informed D'Arms. "After a very hard fought debate, the Board of the Faculty of Modern History agreed last week to the idea of a B. Phil. in European history." The program that Beloff outlined with considerable enthusiasm to D'Arms was, in fact, a graduate program in European history:

This will be, like the other B.Phil. Degrees, a post-graduate degree, normally taking two years and ending with an examination and, in this case, with a short thesis as well. The general lay-out will be that candidates will do a general period of European history and a special subject within that period. Some kind of test will also be devised of the candidates' general grasp of historical materials and methods relating to his particular period. As far as the 19th century part of it is concerned and probably for earlier periods too, the special subjects will include some which involve a knowledge of literary and cultural history thus linking⁵⁵ the new degree to the original idea of European studies.

At Oxford this new specialization took institutional form at St. Antony's College, a newly-created college devoted entirely to graduate studies. Established in 1950 as the result of a gift from a French donor, St. Antony's gradually emerged as one of Europe's leading centers for modern and contemporary history. Its first warden, F.W.D. Deakin, had himself played a not unsubstantial role in recent history. Prior to World War II Deakin had been a Fellow of Wadham College and a tutor; during the war he rendered valuable service, heading the first British mission to Tito's partisans. Afterwards, Deakin served briefly as the First Secretary of the British embassy in Belgrade and later worked with Churchill on the latter's six-volume history of the war. His own historical writing, on the last period of Mussolini's Italy, was based on captured documents and was a major contribution to the study of the war, of Mussolini's foreign policy, and its costs to Italy.

Around such a man it would be possible to organize historical studies. "St. Antony's college is ideally suited as the base for this program," D'Arms concluded after visiting England that spring, "because of its foundation by a Frenchman to encourage contacts by continentals with Oxford and because of the proven interests of Deakin and the Fellows of St. Antony's." Moreover, as Beloff and Deakin pointed out to the Foundation representative, "except for Nuffield College in the social sciences, there is no recognized home for graduate studies at Oxford."⁵⁶ Under Deakin's leadership research groups on Europe, Central Asia, Slavic studies, and the Far East had already been formed; the group, meeting informally, on European history attracted a stellar assortment of historians from other Oxford colleges, and included, D'Arms noted, Allan Bullock, A.J.P. Taylor, and Hugh Trevor-Roper in

addition to Beloff and Deakin. Indeed, as Beloff had mentioned to D'Arms in passing, one of the strongest arguments for the new degree and the new graduate college was the sheer "wealth of teaching talent on European history which this university has available, and which is at present hardly being exploited within the bounds of our present syllabus."⁵⁷

Late in 1954 the Foundation agreed to back Deakin's initiative, and the trustees approved an appropriation of \$123,000 which provided the new graduate college with important sums for fellowships, travel and research expenses for its fellows, and funds to be used at St. Antony's discretion for visiting scholars, editorial expenses, or additional research materials. In 1959 this assistance was renewed for seven years with another grant of \$114,000; Foundation support for the research program thus spanned more than a decade from 1955 to 1966.

Nowhere was contemporary history more important than in the Federal Republic of Germany. There the horrors of the Nazi era still overpowered the civic life of the nation, and the endless discussion of German history, with its repeated reminders of the failure of Germany to establish a successful democratic state, cast grave doubts on the ability of the truncated republic in Bonn to function effectively. The Institut fur Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History) in Munich represented one effort by German scholars to grasp the nettle themselves. Originally conceived of in 1947 during the American occupation as a special historical institute to study the Nazi period it did not take shape until 1951 when it finally secured adequate funding from the federal government and various state governments of West Germany. From the outset it had a mission to collect documents from the

previous era and to publish periodic reports. The Institute's journal, the Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, soon became one of Europe's leading quarterlies devoted to contemporary history.

The Institute approached the Foundation early in the 1950s for supplementary funds, but for a variety of reasons D'Arms did not think its research program sufficiently developed to warrant Foundation support. By 1955, however, its initial publications and the clear pre-eminence of its quarterly convinced the humanities officers that its work was contributing an important lesson in the civic education of West Germans and that its historical research was first-rate and indeed of international importance.

The Institute had gradually broadened its research interests, since historians generally agreed that for an historical understanding of the immediate past and its atrocities the analysis would have to take into account not only the Weimar Republic's tortured existence but also the links to Imperial Germany. Thus the quarterly published in Munich continued to gain stature as one of the leading historical organs for research on late nineteenth- and twentieth-century history. The Institute remained committed, however, to a critical examination of the Nazi persecution of the Jews and the Holocaust. Its second director, Paul Kluge, conceded that a number of French, British and American scholars had written extensively and well on the topic, but Kluge insisted that the German historical profession needed to confront the issue of anti-Semitism as well. "It is, however, absolutely necessary that this question [be] dealt with by a German writer," he explained in 1955 to Kenneth Thompson, then a Foundation social sciences officer, at a time when there were disquieting signs of a resurgence of nationalist and anti-Semitic

groups. The treatment of the Jewish minority by the National Socialist regime, he said, was "not only unique in its magnitude of crime and victims, it is also a phenomenon whose analysis leads to the very core of Nazism and is therefore indispensable to the understanding of the epoch in general."⁵⁸

The willingness of the Institute's historians to grapple with difficult and painful issues especially attracted the sympathy of the humanities' officers. To D'Arms, it seemed clear that the Institute's research was of more than passing interest and might perform a valuable civic mission in tackling the most problematic issue in the German past. "We look upon our work not only from the scholar's point of view," Kluke wrote to D'Arms, "but always as citizens of a free community for whom the critical study of contemporary history is part of their historical responsibility."⁵⁹

In presenting their recommendation to the trustees, the humanities officers stressed the timeliness and quality of the Institut fur Zeitgeschichte research program. But the best reason for supporting the Institute may have been given by an outside American reviewer, who in summarizing the work and the philosophy behind the Institute's work, also made a pointed observation. The scholars at the Institut fur Zeitgeschichte, he wrote, "emphasize that the problems we associate with the National Socialist era -- nihilism, systematic persecution, resistance and collaboration, 'guilt by association,' -- are our common problems." And he concluded with a persuasive appeal for the study of contemporary history to which the humanities officers and the Foundation could be receptive: "We must all study Zeitgeschichte [contemporary history] in order to recognize our situation."⁶⁰

* * * * *

For all its emphasis on innovation or on sweeping interpretive work, some of the Foundation's best work in history came straight from the brick-makers' kilns. By any standard of measurement -- quality of scholarship, continuing utility, or its effects on other funding sources, especially governmental -- the Foundation's modest efforts in these years to provide support for the editing and publication of the papers of American statesmen and great historical figures must be counted a success. As to its catalytic effect on other funding sources, the Foundation's willingness to fund such long-term projects gave an important boost to the efforts of American historians who were campaigning at the time for federal support. When the National Historical Publications Commission, an advisory body of scholars, reported to President Eisenhower in 1954, it recommended the eventual publication of the papers of 361 outstanding Americans. The five highest priorities had assurances of support by the end of the decade, and publication of two of these statesmen's papers was undertaken with Foundation help.⁶¹

Much of the impetus for this line of work may be traced to the partnership between the Foundation and the Abraham Lincoln Association. The Foundation's earlier work in American studies, with its emphasis on preservation of records, had moved Stevens to take an interest in the work of the Lincoln scholars. Beginning in 1947, and with several subsequent grants-in-aid, both Stevens and Fahs supported the work of the Lincoln Association in bringing out an edition of Lincoln's papers. Although none of the officers at the time of the first grant viewed this support as anything but an isolated act, the grants for the Lincoln papers did in fact create a precedent. If Lincoln's papers merited publication --

and many of those which found their way into print were quite mundane, including routine receipts and chits that a frontier lawyer might have been expected to accumulate -- what could be said for such urbane statesmen as Hamilton, Madison, or the wily Jay? And the list might just as easily run down to twentieth century political leaders, as the national commission concluded.

Here, too, some principle of selection had to be applied, and the officers might have well recalled Lincoln's remark that when filling a cabinet post he was creating "nine enemies and one ingrate." Under the earlier program it had been easy to justify such projects. The publication of basic documentation for American history contributed to public appreciation of the American past. It not only facilitated the work of hundreds of scholars by making available accurate editions of basic sources, but it also made it possible for public libraries to put collections of documents once available to only a handful of researchers within easy reach of more readers. When the program guidelines shifted from "preservation" and "public appreciation" -- the pass-words of the 1930s and 1940s -- to an emphasis on interpretation and synthesis the appropriateness of such support was questioned. "Future cases will have to be decided on their merits," Fahs wrote in 1960, "but with the most important projects already financed we anticipate that this will be a declining element in our program during the next few years."⁶²

But before Fahs shut the door on further applications, the Foundation's program in the humanities gave some partial support to the publication of the papers of Lincoln, Hamilton, Madison, and Woodrow Wilson, and supported similar work on the papers of MacKenzie King, Tocqueville, and Lafayette, who if not great Americans were certainly great figures in the history of the new world.

J.P. Mayer's work on Alexis de Tocqueville supported by the Foundation, produced improved editions of Tocqueville classics, while Louis Gottschalk's labor of love on Lafayette produced both a multi-volumed biography and launched a splendid edition of the papers.

Biography had found more favor under the earlier program. If the Foundation could claim no credit for aiding Julian Boyd in his celebrated edition of the Jefferson papers, it did give substantial support to Jefferson's foremost biographer, Dumas Malone, who in 1981 at age 89, completed his remarkable six volume study.⁶³ David Stevens and his staff had shown a fine impartiality when it came to Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians, and the humanities program gave some small but important support in the initial stages of the Hamilton papers project, completed in 1981 in 27 volumes.*⁶⁴ In addition to papers of the Founding Fathers, where the question of relative importance seemed reasonably established, the officers occasionally ventured into more recent periods, supporting Frank Freidel for a volume on Franklin D. Roosevelt and Marquis James for a study of Booker T. Washington. Finally, the Foundation also extended assistance for a biography of the Canadian leader, John Alexander MacDonald, who falls into none of the above categories.

By the end of the first decade of his directorship, Fahs had concluded that these rather old-fashioned projects no longer fit the program's interests. "Each of these projects had its justification," the officers concluded in a retrospective survey of activities in this area

*More recently, the Foundation has assisted Richard Morris in his efforts to track down the papers of John Jay; two of the projected three volumes have appeared to date. It has also contributed to a proposed series of the papers of great American women: Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Jane Addams.

in 1960, "but we suggest that aid for work of this sort...can now be curtailed."⁶⁵ Fahs added that the guidelines would not exclude all editing or all biographical work, but that such projects should be funded only where they clearly met a need in the context of the Foundation's concerns -- say in the history of a non-Western society, or where it could be justified under other program interests. Consequently, an important (and critical) biography of Premier Tojo fell within the boundaries as drawn by Fahs, as did a biographical study of the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce whose work was undergoing an important reevaluation. Similarly, when the staff's resident philosopher Gilpatric discovered the existence of important but unpublished papers by the late Ludwig Wittgenstein, Fahs approved funding a set of edited papers. The program guidelines with their more contemporary focus gradually excluded most historical editing, whether in history or not, but Fahs to his credit refused to make the guidelines a strait-jacket. "Thus in philosophy we have aided work on the papers of de Tocqueville, Bentham, Wittgenstein, Peirce, and Moore, and a biography of Peirce," Fahs explained. "In each case there was good reason to believe that aside from historical interest the work supported had something unusual to offer in the way of stimulus for contemporary philosophical thought."⁶⁶

Throughout his twelve years as director for humanities from 1949 to 1962, Fahs shaped and managed a versatile, multifaceted, internationally oriented program. Just as the Foundation's interest in Asian studies had grown from a fellowship program for language training into a more complicated one concerned with the various disciplines involved in area studies, so too there was a comparable evolution in the other

components of the humanities program. Where the program under Stevens had been designed largely to improve American university faculties (and had therefore limited most of its grants to American institutions and recipients), the program under Fahs and his colleagues took its international mission seriously. In Fahs' thinking the Foundation needed not only to help increase American understanding of the larger world, but also to promote an understanding of the United States abroad. But beyond this nation-to-nation exchange of information, Fahs saw a broader flow of cultural relations to be encouraged and which might involve three or more participants; no direct American involvement or interests need be involved. It was just as fundamental, Fahs reasoned, for Japanese scholars as for Americans to understand China or the Indonesian archipelago. At Fahs' urging the Foundation gave significant support to the Toyo Bunko, Japan's leading center for the study of China, and humanities fellowships often went to Japanese and Indonesian scholars for travel and research in other Asian nations. In the broader view, Fahs conceived of these exchanges not in national terms but in cultural ones, and the program was accordingly called not "international" but "intercultural understanding." Scholarship, as he saw it, could lead to mutual understanding and a reduction of friction among nations.

In one of the last articles he wrote in retirement, before his death in 1980, Fahs expounded upon the virtues of flexibility and the consequent benefits when a foundation emancipated itself from a strictly "binational" approach:⁶⁷

In my years with the Rockefeller Foundation I was fortunate in that I could recommend fellowships for students from any country to any country or to two or more countries. I did, for example, enable Japanese to study in India and Turkey. Dr. Lie Tek

Tjeng, now one of Indonesia's leading experts on Asia, was first enabled to go to the United States on a one-year Fulbright grant. When that expired the Rockefeller Foundation enabled him to study in Japan and also to return to Harvard to complete his doctorate. Study in both countries was, I think, essential to his development as a scholar and statesman. Each of the Japanese writers to whom we gave fellowships was offered the opportunity to spend half the fellowship period in a country or countries other than the United States. Thus, Fukuda Tsuneari went to England because of his interest in T.S. Eliot and there also fell in love with Shakespeare and drama. Ooka Shoheri, who had been a Stendhal expert, followed that author's peregrinations in France and Italy. When we gave a few grants for study in the United States to Indonesian labor leaders, we enabled them to stop in the Philippines or Japan en route to the United States to establish contact with labor leaders there. We let them visit Europe and, if they were Muslims, Mecca on their way home.

In short, whether sending Muslims via Mecca or Japanese to Indonesia, Fahs wanted to avoid restricting the Foundation's fellowships by narrow and artificial limits of time and geography. The fellowship, Fahs insisted, ought to be tailored to fit the research project and not the reverse. With time a particularly sensitive factor in the humanities, not the least of the merits of the fellowships during this period was the flexibility of their length. Although the fellowships were often lumped together under one heading in the budget, they were often not one administrative device but several. Thus, Fahs could offer as little as a month, and he and his lieutenants used these short awards extensively for travel awards. Generally, such travel grants went to senior scholars as a supplemental tool for achieving limited purposes. A conference deemed important by the Foundation's officers could be strengthened by recruiting a foreign scholar, or a critique of an existing program could be required of an itinerant scholar. On the other hand, in a program designed to promote international contacts in an age when air travel was relatively more

difficult, the Foundation felt justified in making periodic study-tours available for senior scholars. Marshall argued, for example, that events in the Middle East were in such flux that the leading scholars ought to visit the region regularly. Marshall argued persuasively, and a small fund was set aside for "visits to Islam" as one annual report dubbed them. While the Foundation had available fellowship funds for American and foreign scholars for use on sabbatical leaves of a semester or a year, Fahs and his field officers preferred to use the fellowship funds for lengthier awards designed to assist younger scholars. These awards might be renewed for up to three years, went as frequently to foreigners as to Americans and could be used for travel outside the United States.

Looking back at these years from a period of inflated dollars, restricted guidelines, and more rigidly structured programs, the freedom this flexibility offered seems idyllic. Nor was it only with fellowships that the program experimented. By the mid-1950s the Foundation's humanities program was pursuing a variety of interests grouped loosely around the central idea of "interpreting one culture to another." Just as American universities were studying foreign areas in their area studies programs, so was it desirable to create abroad institutes devoted to American studies. Between 1945 and 1962 Foundation funds bolstered these American studies centers abroad in a variety of ways. In a few of the stronger centers the humanities program made major investments, subsidizing research, the purchasing of books, and even the costs of visiting professorships. Universities in Japan, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries were the principal beneficiaries, though the pattern of grants may have only reflected the degree of interest already present. The larger grants went most frequently to Cambridge, Oxford, the Swedish

universities of Lund and Uppsala and the University of Oslo. In addition to these and three Japanese universities, the Amerika Institut at the University of Munich was singled out for its academic program, and universities in Manchester, Nottingham, Cologne, Bordeaux, Aarhus, Copenhagen, Ankara and even the University of Zagreb in Yugoslavia received grants for books and similar expenses. The Foundation's grants to facilitate intercultural interpretation and understanding also made possible the appointment of visiting professors at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the University of Montreal, and the University of Leiden (where Perry Miller taught on a Foundation grant). Frequently, however, support for American studies abroad involved modest contributions. Small sums for books were given to universities at Liege, Ghent, Paris, and Helsinki and individual researchers were assisted at two French universities.

In supporting dozens of university centers in a wide array of countries, the results were bound to be varied. In retrospect, a number of these American studies programs appear to have been hothouse growths only. Anti-American sentiment and international politics often played a part in curtailing the development of serious scholarship, or, in some cases, in the failure to consolidate university programs with the foreign government's support. Although there were clearly some failures in this program, in sharp contrast are the places where the Foundation's support proved to be decisive in helping local scholars establish solid, academic institutes of lasting value. Foundation grants-in-aid helped the British Association of American Studies and a similar German organization in their efforts to organize national societies and to claim a share of university budgets for their activities.

The establishment of American studies in the European curriculum was desired by many faculties. At a time when the subject was still controversial, the whole movement got an important boost when the Foundation backed an indefatigable Norwegian scholar, Sigmund Skard. One American described the episode:

... The Fulbright program was then a dream and an amendment. The Salzburg Seminar was not yet started. However, the Rockefeller Foundation was prepared to encourage European professors of English and Comparative Literature to move into the American field, and Professor Skard took the year 1946-1947 on a Rockefeller grant to prepare himself for the Chair in American Literature by study, travel, and book purchase in the United States.⁶⁸

The following year Skard created an American Institute at the University of Oslo, taking back with him books gathered from over a hundred different second hand book stores (and "collected in the Rockefeller Foundation store room in New York"). Skard credited the Foundation with providing his program with the decisive support; in 1946-1947 he said, the creation of such a library was "far beyond the means of my university."⁶⁹

Despite its impressive beginning, the new institute ran into trouble. Some of his colleagues failed to grasp Skard's desire to make it possible for Norwegian students to major in American literature or history; a philologist-colleague commented: "Americanistics? We have no Belgistics either!"⁷⁰ In any case, the Ministry of Education's plan to make American studies an area in which Oslo students could take a "major" or a "concentration" for a secondary school teaching certificate provoked opposition from the philologists and the English literature department. Eventually Skard's dedication prevailed. It took more than "three years of continuous battles and negotiations, proposals and counterproposals" but he eventually succeeded in establishing American studies on an equal

footing with other disciplines. He viewed his own efforts as but "one aspect of that widening of the Old World's narrow horizon which had been initiated by Marco Polo and Christopher Columbus" and saw the opposition of the philologists and the English literature specialists as the symbol of a "conservative and retrospective European isolationism."⁷¹

The Foundation's work on behalf of American studies met its warmest welcome in Japan, where interest in all things American was intense in the postwar era. In addition to its usual grants for books and for travel awards for Japanese fellows in American studies, the Foundation underwrote the costs of two exchange programs which greatly enhanced the training of Japanese specialists and gave a number of American scholars a chance to teach in Japan. A seminar at the University of Tokyo in 1950 attracted over 100 Japanese professors, administrators and students to hear a group of American professors from Stanford discuss the American economy and political system and its historical evolution. Following this experiment, the Foundation expanded its support, doubling its appropriation for the Stanford-Tokyo exchanges and funding a second set of seminars at Kyoto.⁷² There two Japanese universities -- Doshisha University and the University of Kyoto -- cooperated to co-sponsor with the University of Illinois a successor to the Tokyo seminars. Some idea of the legacy left by these two exchange programs (which also sponsored visits by the Japanese scholars to the United States) can be gathered from a report by one of the participants, the historian Merrill Jensen, who wrote:

If I were to single out the exchange program that I think did the most to get postwar American studies really underway, I would point to the Rockefeller Foundation-Stanford University-Tokyo University seminars in the 1950s. Those seminars were unique. They were intensive. They

went on three hours every morning, five days a week, for five or six weeks. I gave the history seminar in 1955. I have never worked so hard in my life and never had students, before or since, who worked so hard. It was in those intensive seminars in the 1950s that many of the leaders of American studies in Japan today were trained. ...I had twelve students in my seminar in 1955. Today six of them are professors of history in Japanese universities and they are teaching American history and doing research in the field. A seventh student is an internationally known economist.¹³

From 1950 to 1960 the two exchanges at Tokyo and Kyoto alone involved over half a million dollars. If seen as part of a larger package of aid to Japanese institutions, these seminars and exchanges (repeated and re-funded in 1954 and 1955 with the University of Michigan serving as the American sponsor) helped solidify American-Japanese contacts in a wide range of professions. For in addition to the American studies seminars -- which seem to have been unusually successful in stimulating Japanese scholarly careers -- Fahs also supported a wide range of other exchanges. Japanese journalists visited American newspapers and studied at the American Press Institute and Columbia University, while the Foundation's older interests in microfilming and library work led to two of the last grants in these categories -- support to a project for microfilming the records of the Japanese Diet and support for a national library school. When Fahs became director in 1949, he followed up an interest in Japanese educational debates and allowed several Japanese educators to travel on Foundation fellowships to make comparative studies of American and Asian educational systems. Grants for seminars on educational philosophy went to two Japanese universities. Finally, as mentioned earlier, Fahs had been eager to support Japanese specialists working in the field of Chinese studies, and the Foundation made grants to the Toyo Bunko. In several instances, notably the seminars

in educational philosophy and American studies, the Foundation's grants went to assist educational reformers who were widening the Japanese curriculum and expanding contacts not only with the United States but with other nations, including most notably the Philippines and Indonesia, where relations were still delicate.

Chapter IV Notes

1. Memorandum dated October 7, 1949. (RAC: 911.4.28).
2. Memorandum dated October 13, 1949. (RAC: 911.4.28).
3. An extensive review of the program in the humanities was apparently undertaken in 1949, an untitled carbon copy survives in the program and policy files for 1949. (RAC: 911.1.4a).
4. See Fahs' memorandum on area studies, dated June 10, 1949. (RAC: 911.1.4a).
5. Ibid.
6. Unlike David Stevens, Fahs did not write systematic reviews of his program every three to five years. The best and fullest statement of his interests and goals seems to be a memorandum prepared for the trustees in 1954, "Widening Our Cultural Horizons," November 12, 1954. Minutes of the Rockefeller Foundation, November 30-December 1, 1954, Appendix II.
7. These comments are found in the program review of 1949 under the label "Current Program." (Dated June 27, 1949 and initialled CBF, RAC: 911.1.4a).
8. Ibid.
9. According to Whitney J. Oates, "... the organization received almost a lethal blow when the Rockefeller Foundation announced that its support would terminate at the end of the ensuing three years." As Oates recalled, "The ACLS staff protested and even scolded in print the Rockefeller Foundation for the lack of wisdom it displayed in making this decision." In Warren Weaver, (ed.) U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 301.

John Marshall, who had formerly been associated with the Council, recalled this as one of the more controversial decisions taken by Fahs and the humanities group. ("This was a courageous position for Fahs to take," Marshall told an oral history interviewer, "because, as we foresaw, he was generally blamed for it. My long association with the American Council of Learned Societies made most people feel that I must have opposed the move, and nothing I could say would disabuse them of the idea." Marshall, oral history, p. 539. As Marshall remembered it, the move was supported unanimously. Apparently, the ACLS itself eventually came to regard the decision as an appropriate one, as it forced them to develop new programs and new sources of funds. From 1926 to 1950, the Rockefeller Foundation supplied two-thirds of the ACLS funds. Annual Report, 1950, p. 261.
10. A very useful report covering the years from 1933 to 1954 breaks down RF expenditures discipline by discipline and along area studies lines. See (RAC: 911.3.16 and 911.3.17).

Notes, Chapter IV (continued)

11. "Defining a Humanities Program," February 15, 1950. (RAC: 911.1.5).
12. Annual Report, 1948, pp. 19-20 and 12.
13. Charles B. Fahs, "The Program in the Humanities," February, 1951. (RAC: 911.2.15).
14. For the background and development of Piaget's work, see the archival files on the University of Geneva. At present these files, along with many others to be cited dating from the 1950s or more recently, have not been fully processed at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The references will give a series number and name the institution: series 803R, University of Geneva, 1932-1963.
15. William Kessen in Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, n. 83 (1962) p. 170. See also Kessen's remarks in a letter to Gilpatric, January 2, 1963. (RAC: 803R, University of Geneva, 1959-1963).
16. Program review, 1949; subheading: "Language." (RAC: 911.1.4a).
17. See the recent obituary in The New York Times, July 23, 1982.
18. Program review, 1949. (RAC: 911.1.4a).
19. Annual Report, 1950, p. 247.
20. A list of fellowships and grants-in-aid for support of work in philosophy can be found in the program and policy files covering the years from 1933 to 1954. (RAC:911.3.16; 911.3.17). After 1954, individual grants and fellowships are listed in the annual reports.
21. Charles B. Fahs, "Humanities Program and Related Foundation Interests in History, 1950-1960." (RAC: 911.3.18).
22. Ibid.
- 22a. Ibid.
23. "Notes on Humanities Program in History," November 2, 1960.
24. "... I am a little skeptical about the RF's getting into the place of history in the schools," Rusk wrote Fahs. "I don't quite see how we could do this responsibly or effectively without taking on the problem of the total responsibilities of the schools." Rusk to Fahs, October 14, 1960. (Unprocessed papers; program and policy series 911).
25. Charles B. Fahs, "History and RF Program," August 23, 1956. (RAC: 911.1.7).
26. See Fahs' preliminary draft of the memo cited in note 21. (Series 911, unprocessed papers on "history.")
27. "History and RF Program," August 23, 1956. (unprocessed 911 files).

Notes, Chapter IV (continued)

28. Fahs to Chester I. Barnard, "History in RF Humanities Program," February 1, 1950. (RAC: 911.1.5).
29. Ibid.
30. Richard H. Nolte, "A Humanities Theory of Historical Relativity, Or, Nolte's Outline of History," July 31, 1959. (RAC: 911.1.8).
31. Ibid.
32. Charles B. Fahs, "History and RF Program," August 23, 1956.
33. Quoted in David Stevens, The Changing Humanities (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), p. 85.
34. Memorandum, "World History -- Need and Possibility," October 17, 1960.
35. "Humanities Program...History," November 16, 1960.
36. Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History (London and New York, 1934-1954), 10 volumes. The comments of the American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature, (edited by George Howe, et al.) sums up the professional guild's verdict: "Unquestionably the most extended, important, and controversial restatement of the idealist position in modern times. The writing of this monumental work was inspired by the urge to span the conceptual gap between the view of the 'archivists' and the view of those who try to see history as a whole, as the unified life of man. It was also inspired by a conviction that the present age is a revolutionary one. Religion, though not necessarily the Judaic-Christian, is central to the author's theme."
For a sampling of more critical views, the most convenient source is, oddly enough, Toynbee's final volume which reprints his critics' views in extenso and Toynbee's rejoinders.
37. Charles B. Fahs, interoffice memo, February 10, 1959.
38. Ralph E. Turner, The Great Cultural Traditions: The Foundations of Civilization (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1941), 2 vols. According to John Marshall, Turner "was one of the most powerful people intellectually that I've ever encountered," but a difficult man to work with, apparently. Marshall recounts that after directing the initial planning and serving as chairman of the planning commission for the UNESCO history, Turner "encountered more and more opposition in the commission, and when he found that he could not have his own way he resigned, probably for the eventual good of the project. But he had certainly been instrumental in formulating the original plan and should always have credit for his contribution." Marshall, oral history, pp. 510-514.
39. Charles B. Fahs, "Humanities Program...History," November 16, 1960.

Notes, Chapter IV (continued)

40. Geoffrey Barraclough, An Introduction to Contemporary History (London: Watts, 1964), p. 2.
41. Diary, Edward F. D'Arms, April 26, 1948.
42. (RAC: 75¹/₂R, Italian Institute for Historical Studies, 1949-1952.)
43. Ibid. On Croce's view of history, see H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930. (New York: Random House, 1958), pp. 82-90.
44. For an appreciation of Chabod's importance within the European historical profession, see the essay by Felix Gilbert in John Higham, Felix Gilbert and Leonard Krieger's History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965).
45. Diary, Edward F. D'Arms, April 27, 1948.
46. Diary, Norman S. Buchanan, March 27, 1947.
47. Ibid.
48. Lucien Febvre to Norman S. Buchanan, November 18, 1947. (RAC: 500S, Ecole pratique, 1947-1948.)
49. Translated by Sian Reynolds as The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 2 vols.
50. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1238.
51. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1244.
52. The humanities officers regarded Braudel's center as the French equivalent of the type of interdisciplinary area studies centers they were busy funding in Britain and in the United States. A memo from Edward F. D'Arms to Fahs gives a clue to their thinking. "... Since the end of the war there has been little or no evidence of concerted French action for the study of the 'unusual areas' with the result that a great tradition and considerable resources of personnel and materials were being wasted."
D'Arms then listed Braudel's achievements in recruiting able younger scholars, including many from abroad, and concluded: "All of this represents no mean achievement against the real difficulties of inertia, tradition, and personal opposition. It is by far the strongest effort made by the French since before the war and its future promise is great."

Notes, Chapter IV (continued)

53. Braudel paid Fahs and the Foundation high praise indeed. In a letter to Fahs, Braudel wrote:

Je n'oublie pas combien votre aide nous a été précieuse. Elle nous avait permis en 1947 de fonder la VI^e Section de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, elle nous a aidé à un moment décisif en 1954 pour la création de la Section des Aires Culturelles. ("I have not forgotten how your aid has been valuable to us. It permitted us to establish the Sixth Section of the Ecole Pratique in 1947, it aided us at a decisive moment in 1954 in the creation of the section on cultural areas." Braudel to Fahs, December 22, 1960. (RAC: 500s, Ecole pratique, 1960).

54. D'Arms to Beloff, March 12, 1954. (RAC: 401R, Oxford University -- St. Antony's College).
55. Beloff to D'Arms, March 8, 1954. (RAC: 401R, St. Antony's).
56. Diary, Edward F. D'Arms, May 19, 1954.
57. Beloff to D'Arms, February 20, 1954. (RAC: 40LR, St. Antony's).
58. Kluge to Thompson, May 11, 1955. (RAC: 717R, Institut für Zeitgeschichte).
59. Kluge to D'Arms, June 9, 1956. (RAC: 717R).
60. Robert Koehl, "Zeitgeschichte and the New German Conservatism," Journal of Central European Affairs, XX (July, 1960), pp. 131-57. The quote is from p. 157.
61. "Humanities Program...History," November 16, 1960.
62. Ibid.
63. Among the many well-deserved tributes to Malone's work, see the appreciative review by Walter Clemons in Newsweek, July 27, 1981.
64. Harold C. Syrett, ed. The Papers of Alexander Hamilton (New York: Columbia University Press, 19 -1981). 27 volumes.
65. "Humanities Program...History," November 16, 1960.
66. Ibid.
67. From a letter to Joel Colton, December 2, 1979. (The article mentioned in the text appeared in the bulletin of the Japan Foundation, in Japanese.)

Notes, Chapter IV (continued)

68. Robert E. Spiller, "The Fulbright Program in American Studies Abroad: Retrospect and Prospect," in Robert H. Walter, (ed.) American Studies Abroad (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1975), p. 3.
69. Sigmund Skard, Trans-Atlantica: Memoirs of a Norwegian Americanist (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1978), p. 69, and p. 82.
70. Ibid., p. 133.
71. Ibid., pp. 114 and 144.
72. Annual Report, 1950; Annual Report, 1952, pp. 273-74.
73. In Robert H. Walker, American Studies Abroad, p. 134.