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Dean Rusk President

The president of the Foundation customarily comments upon a year's work at the time of the issuance of the Annual Report. The Report itself furnishes information upon the grants made; the President's Review attempts to look at these grants more broadly and to inform the public of the overall direction of Foundation interests and activities.

Having assumed office on July I, 1952, the incumbent President did not provide a review for 1952. The latter half of that year was largely given over to intensive preparations for the hearings of the Cox Committee of the Eighty-Second Congress, hearings which were actually held in December of that year. The detailed study of 40 years of Foundation history which this entailed left little time for reflection upon its future.

This present review covers the year 1953, with some reference back to 1952. But, again, the period was one involving preparations for Congressional investigation, this time by the Reece Committee of the Eighty-Third Congress. Since we do not wish this review to be silent on the subject of investigation, it is divided into two main parts.

Part One discusses the Congressional investigations and some of the underlying principles which have been at issue. Much of this is taken from a longer Statement filed with the Reece Committee by The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, a full text of which is available upon request.

Part Two contains comments upon the Foundation's program and major centers of interest in 1953 and serves to introduce the Annual Report which follows. A brief Part Three covers certain formal and organizational information included for the purposes of record.

# Part One

## The Foundation and Public Policy

The Course of Investigation

The Eighty-Second Congress established in 1952 a House Select Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations (the"Cox Committee").

The Report of the Cox Committee was generally favorable to the work of the foundations, moderate and thoughtful in tone, and gratifyingly free of partisan considerations. Its two recommendations called for the requirement of a public accounting by all foundations (which

The Rockefeller Foundation has furnished from the beginning) and for a reexamination of tax laws by the Ways and Means Committee to the end that a free enterprise system may make gifts to "our free schools, colleges, churches, foundations, and other charitable institutions."

In July, 1953, the Eighty-Third Congress established, after a lively debate and with a vote of 209-163, a Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. The resolution creating this Committee was introduced by Representative Reece, who had been a member of the Cox

Committee and had signed that Committee's Report with a reservation pointing to the inadequacy of time for a thorough investigation. Mr. Reece was named Chairman of the Committee and the following Representatives were appointed to serve with him: Jesse P. Wolcott (R-Mich.); Angier L.Goodwin (R-Mass.); Wayne L. Hays (D-Ohio); and Gracie Pfost (D-Ida.).

The Reece Committee opened public hearings on May 10, 1954, in Washington, B.C. It had been understood that the Committee planned to hear a "bill of particulars" from its own staff, testimony adverse to the foundations from a number of witnesses, and then rebuttal testimony

from the foundations themselves. After hearing only one witness in rebuttal testimony, Mr. Pendleton Herring of the Social Science Research Council, the Committee abruptly terminated public hearings on July 2, 1954, by a 3-2 vote.

The foundations were invited to, and The Rockefeller Foundation did submit sworn statements in reply to issues raised by Committee staff and other adverse witnesses. It was announced that the Committee would continue its work by means other than public hearings. As of the date of this writing, the Committee had not submitted a Report.

## On being investigated

Thoughtful citizens will agree that tax exemption privileges should not be abused and that public authority which grants such exemptions should assure itself and the public that tax exempt organizations are entitled to that status. Established educational, religious, and charitable institutions are interested that the public policy under which they operate be protected against the misconduct of those who would use tax exempt status for improper purposes.

The primary responsibility for applying the Federal laws regarding tax exempt institutions rests with the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department. If any organization considers that it has received an unfair or improper ruling, it can test the issue in the courts. Thus, normal procedure would call for the enactment of legislation by the legislature, administration of the law by the executive branch, and adjudication by the courts of disputes over the constitutionality of laws or the legality of administration.

It is well recognized that the Congress, through its Committees, requires investigative procedures to obtain the information which it needs to meet intelligently its heavy legislative responsibility. Where tax exemption legislation is involved, for example, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee must assure themselves, the Congress, and the public that legislation represents considered public policy and is being administered

with a minimum of abuse. And, indeed, if the Congress determines that it wishes a special Committee to look into tax exemption problems, our view is that we have an obligation to cooperate by furnishing the information desired.

Unfortunately, that is not the end of the matter; the validity of the investigative process is affected by the sense of responsibility with which it is used. Repetitious investigation imposes unnecessary burdens upon those under scrutiny and adds little, if anything, to the information of the Congress. Investigations which are basically accusatory in character may, in the absence of great care, exceed the proper role of legislative investigation and infringe the established rights and privileges of those being investigated.

Charges loosely framed or unsupported by facts offer no ascertainable issues on which to make reply and yet may damage reputable citizens and institutions. If fact-finding is distorted by partisan considerations, innocent bystanders are injured in the fray. If the same individuals act in both accusatory and adjudicative roles, injustice is the almost inevitable result.

That the Congress itself is concerned about investigative procedures is a hopeful sign that common sense and the traditional concepts of government by law will be sustained.
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## PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY AND FREE ENTERPRISE IN PHILANTHROPY

The Rockefeller Foundation has always acknowledged that its funds are held as a public trust. Our Trustees recognize a heavy public responsibility, arising from the in the hands of a Board of Trustees of responsible citizens, who contribute time and a lively interest to its activities and who select officers and professional staff to carry out their policies. The Foundation holds and invests its own funds and decides how to spend them for the purposes for which it was created. It is private in that it is not governmental; it is public in that its funds are held in trust for public rather than private purposes. As a social institution, it voluntary action of John D. Rockefeller in committing substantial private funds to a public purpose, from the policy and laws of the State of New York and of the United States which permit the Foundation to act corporately for a public purpose, and from the important privileges granted to educational, religious, and charitable institutions by certain Federal and State tax laws. Though dedicated to the public interest, The Rockefeller Foundation retains many of the essential attributes of a private, independent organization. It is nonpolitical and nongovernmental in character. Its policies and decisions are reflects of the application to philanthropy of the principles of private initiative and free enterprise, under public policies which have long recognized the benefits of such activity to a free society.

Most of the discussion of the free enterprise system in America has focused upon its accomplishments in lifting the figures of national production and the general standard of living to levels never before attained in any other country. With government controls limited, the release of the energies behind individual initiative has been given, we believe deservedly, a large measure of the credit for these extraordinary results. Less attention has been paid to the reliance we have placed upon the philanthropic impulse of private citizens. This has been left in large measure free from government control and has been given positive encouragement through the tax laws. The result has been an impressive, voluntary outpouring of wealth for charitable, educational, scientific, and religious purposes, transforming material wealth into opportunities for pursuing the enduring values of the mind and spirit.

The voluntary association of private citizens for the carrying out of public tasks is deeply rooted in our tradition and saves us from a dismal choice between leaving many tasks undone or handing them over to an all-pervasive government. It has been argued that the favored tax position of schools and colleges, foundations, and a large number of charitable activities rests upon the propositions that they do what government itself would otherwise have to do from public funds and that independent organizations can do many of these tasks better than could government. While there is evidence that such views have had a strong influence, a more fundamental basis for the public policy on the matter appears to us to be the importance, in a free society, of encouraging the widest diversity of individual and group effort in order that citizens may share directly in the privileges and responsibilities of free institutions.

President Eliot of Harvard, speaking in 1874, before our Foundation was established, said:

*... In England and the United States, the method of doing public work by means of endowments managed by private corporations, has been domesticated for several centuries; and these are the only two nations which have succeeded on a great scale in combining liberty with stability in free institutions. The connection of these two facts is not accidental. The citizens of a free State must be accustomed to associated action in a great variety of forms; they must have many local centers of common action, and many agencies and administrations for public objects, besides the central agency of government. , . . To abandon the method of fostering endowments, in favor of the method of direct government action, is to forego one of the great securities of public liberty.*

These are among the basic considerations which have led the Congress, the legislatures of the 48 states, and the courts to shape the laws and public policy in such a way as to encourage private philanthropy. The principles involved were brought to our shores by the first settlers and have been reflected in official attitudes throughout our history. The Congress has affirmed its support of this policy by recent increases in the permissible deductions for charitable contributions made from individual and corporate incomes. One of the two recommendations of the Cox Committee was the following:

2. That the Ways and Means Committee take cognizance of our finding that the maintenance of private sources of funds is essential to the proper growth of our free schools, colleges, churches, foundations, and other charitable institutions. We respectfully suggest that the committee reexamine pertinent tax laws, to the end that they may be so drawn as to encourage the free-enterprise system with its rewards from which private individuals may make gifts to these meritorious institutions.

We conclude that the underlying public policy is firmly established and represents not only a traditional attitude of long standing but the present policy of Federal and state governments.

We wish to emphasize that The Rockefeller Foundation has conformed to all applicable laws and authoritatively expressed public policies, and will continue to do so. This is our duty as citizens, and was clearly the wish of our founder.

We shall be attentive to the views of responsible critics, but we do not expect to treat criticism as legislation or to accept the adverse witnesses who have testified before the Reece Committee as exponents of public policy. Our Trustees would violate their trust if they should fail to bring to bear upon its performance the full extent of their experience and judgment and should substitute therefor the least common denominator of divergent views from every quarter.

Where public interest and private initiative are subtly merged, as in the case of an endowed foundation, how is the public interest safeguarded? In the case of The Rockefeller Foundation, continuous effort is made to do so along several lines.

First, and most important, the Trustees and officers in the performance of their duties are infused with a deep sense of public obligation. Having been entrusted with decisions to spend funds for the public good, they bring to their tasks the best of their judgment and skills, a dis-

interested rather than a partial view, and as much imagination and insight as their capacities permit. Their decisions can not hope to win universal approval, and occasional mistakes may occur, for these are inevitable accompaniments of risk-bearing. In judging the record of these Trustees and officers, it is not reasonable or proper to use, as a test, one's agreement with each individual decision. The fair test is the seriousness and general competence of the attempt,

on the part of Trustees and officers, to discharge faithfully their difficult duties.

Second, we appraise our own judgments through the advice and counsel of many others who can contribute the wisdom of experience and special knowledge. This is a continuous process, systematically pursued by the officers, involving consultation with hundreds who give generously of their time and thought to the problems presented. Some of it is reflected in a more formal arrangement when competent individuals are invited to serve the Foundation on boards of consultants on such matters as medicine and public health, agriculture, or legal and political philosophy.

Third, we respond fully to our obligation to conform to all relevant laws, to make regular reports to public authorities to whom such reports are due, and to use our best efforts to furnish information requested by any official body.

Fourth, The Rockefeller Foundation keeps the public informed as to its activities through regular publications which are given wide circulation.

## The Tax exemption Privilege

American governments. Federal and state, from their earliest days have used the tax laws as effective and versatile instruments for the encouragement of voluntary private philanthropy. This encouragement has taken a variety of forms: exemption of philanthropic enterprises from income tax, exemption of bequests to philanthropic organizations from estate and inheritance taxes, exemption of inferivos gifts to such organizations from gift taxes, permission to deduct contributions to such organizations from income otherwise subject to tax.

Although tax privileges in one or more of these various forms doubtless have an important influence on the organization of foundations today, it should be noted that the tax element played no significant part in the creation of The Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board by John D. Rockefeller. In 1903, when the General Education Board was founded, there were neither income nor estate taxes, and although the Sixteenth Amendment, authorizing a Federal income tax, had become part of the Constitution before the incorporation of The Rockefeller Foundation in May 1913, the first income tax law under the new amendment was not enacted until the following October, and the tax which it imposed was at too low a rate to have an appreciable influence.

The statement was frequently repeated in the course of investigation that a large part (sometimes placed at 90 per cent) of the funds distributed by tax exempt foundations represents money which, but for the tax exemption privilege, would belong to the government. As to our Foundation this assertion is not correct.

Nor can it be supposed with any certainty that a repeal of the existing income tax exemption of foundations would result in any significant increase of the public revenues.

True, a fund which had been distributing all, or the major part, of its income in grants might not be able to deduct more than a limited percentage of this total in computing its income subject to tax, though it might well be held that the usual limitation is inapplicable to a corporation whose sole authorized activities consist of charitable operations and grants. In any event, the removal of the exemption might serve to influence some boards of trustees, as a matter of provident discharge of their trust, to discontinue grants and substitute direct operations in such fields as scientific research, health, or public welfare, on such a scale that the clearly deductible costs of operation would exhaust the income, leaving nothing against which the tax could be assessed. Although the benefits which could be derived from such direct operations might be of great significance, there would be a corresponding loss of flexible and strategic financial reserves available for the support of research and scholarship in established institutions of learning — particularly where uncommitted funds are needed to follow up on promising new leads in scientific and scholarly investigation. Even though it would be possible to discourage the grant-making function of foundations by changes in existing tax laws, these changes would not insure additional funds for the public treasury and might, in fact, work against the public interest.

It should further be noted that under their present status the funds of The Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board are a part of the general stream of enterprise which produces taxation for the support of the public treasury. As has been indicated, their funds are invested largely in corporate stocks and other types of securities.

The Rockefeller Foundation pays substantial taxes through the corporations whose stocks it holds. We are advised that during 1952 the Foundation's share of corporate taxes, based upon its own holdings of corporate stocks, amounted to approximately $12,785,000. Our two foundations also pay other taxes; for example, the transportation tax on the travel of staff, the tax included in rent and on supplies, and social security taxes on payroll, to name a few. When the Foundation or Board makes a philanthropic gift, such funds or the income therefrom go quickly into the payment of salaries and travel, the purchase of equipment and supplies, and a wide range of similar uses which are tax-yielding in character. Apart from money which goes directly into the public treasury as taxes, both The Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board have contributed substantially (over $75 million) to tax-supported institutions and agencies, such as state universities, public boards of education and boards of health. These contributions have been much larger than any income tax we might have paid had we not been tax exempt.

In broader terms, the activities of such agencies as endowed foundations make an important contribution to the economic structure upon which government finance must rest. If, for example, the support of economic research makes it possible for both business leadership and government to understand more clearly and more accurately the surging processes of our productive system and, on the basis of such knowledge, to make decisions which level off the

peaks and troughs of the business cycle and sustain a high and steady national production, the benefit to the public purse is obvious. It is even more obvious that the virtual elimination of yellow fever, the sharp reduction in malaria and hookworm, have direct economic benefits as well as those which are measured in terms of the physical welfare of human beings.

The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board are large net contributors to, and not charges upon, our national wealth and public treasury. We believe that we clearly pay our way.

What has been said is not intended to depreciate the value of the exemption from Federal and state income tax of activities of a charitable, educational, or religious nature.

The need for more, rather than less, private enterprise in such fields adds importance to the encouragement which legislatures have given through such exemptions to the prospective donor.

The importance of the exemption should not, however, be unduly exaggerated in terms of dollars, nor should the fact of exemption be made an excuse for characterizing foundation funds as government funds, or for restricting such funds to fields in which government itself operates, or for projecting government into fields which are better left to the private citizens of our richly diverse society.
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## Intellectual surveillance

Much of the testimony heard in the course of Congressional investigation bears directly or indirectly upon a fundamental and sensitive problem of foundation activity —that of foundation control over studies aided by foundation funds. The implied premise of much of the criticism of foundations to be found in the testimony is that foundations should be held responsible for the views expressed by those who receive foundation grants. This, in turn, rests upon die premise that the power of the purse means control over the product. The criticism fails because of the errors in its premises. The product to be expected from a foundation grant of the type so frequently criticized in testimony is an intellectual product. The exercise of control would frustrate the principal object of the grant, namely the unimpaired thinking of the scientist or scholar. If the answer were to be determined in advance, there would be no need to make the grant or conduct the study.

Under our general practice, we consider that our responsibility is to make a sound judgment at the time a grant is made, a judgment which encompasses the importance of the purpose for which the grant is requested and the capacity and character of the individuals and institutions who are to make use of it. But having made the basic judgment that the recipient has the capacity and character to carry out the study, we exercise a minimum of further control. Ordinary prudence and the obligations of our trust require that we insist upon financial accounting, to assure ourselves that funds are used for the purposes for which they were appropriated. Where a second grant to a particular undertaking is up for consideration, some assessment of the work done under the first grant is necessarily involved.

Subject to the foregoing, it has been our consistent policy not to attempt to censor or modify the findings of scholars and scientists whose work we are supporting financially, this long-standing policy, which we believe to be wise, rests both upon principle and upon very practical considerations:

i. For the Foundation to exercise intellectual supervision over its grantees would require the Foundation itself to formulate an officially approved body of doctrine in almost every field of human knowledge. This is not our role, and is quite beyond our intentions or our capacities.

2. In most cases, the Foundation could make itself responsible for scholarly or scientific conclusions only if it, with its own staff, substantially repeated the studies in question as a basis for its own finding. This, too, we could not undertake except where our own staff is engaged in research, as in virus diseases and agriculture.

3. The role of surveillance would add enormously to the staff and overhead costs of the Foundation and consume philanthropic funds for unnecessary and socially undesirable functions.

4. The Foundation is almost never the sole contributor to the recipient of a grant; in fact, in the vast majority of cases it is a minority contributor. We see no basis in principle for the Foundation to assert a right of control taking precedence over national governments, state legislatures, departments of education, boards of trustees of colleges and universities, faculties, other private donors, publishers, etc. For foundations to attempt to exert such authority would lead to the confusion of responsibility.

5. No institution, scholar, or scientist of character would accept a grant which is conditioned upon intellectual control. To any scholar worthy of the name, nothing is more important than his intellectual freedom.

6. The Foundation necessarily makes a grant before the results of the studies financed by the grant can be known. It is difficult to see how this order of procedure could be reversed.

The considerations outlined above seem to be conclusive against the exercise of intellectual control by a private foundation over the recipients of its grants. We believe that a free society grows in strength and in moral and intellectual capacity on the basis of free and responsible research and scholarship. We shall continue to support vigorously this concept which lies at the heart of free institutions and we will oppose any effort by government to use the tax exempt status to accomplish indirectly what could not be done directly under the Constitution.
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## Foundation support for social studies

In a formal sense, The Rockefeller Foundation undertook financial support for social studies when, in 1929, it was consolidated with The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and continued an interest already well developed by the latter philanthropy.

In much broader terms, the Foundation came to believe that its commitment to promote "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" compelled it to give attention to the baffling complexities of human relations — to the processes by which men earn a living and the difficulties they encounter in working out tolerable relations among individuals, groups, and nations.

From the beginning the Foundation never considered that it had or should have solutions to social problems behind which it should throw its funds and influence. It has had no nostrums to sell. Its approach rested upon a faith that the moral and rational nature of man would convert an extension of knowledge into an extension of virtue, and that he could make better decisions if his understanding could be widened and deepened.

The experiences of World War I and the painful uncertainties of the postwar and depression period seemed to reflect a growing and menacing gap between man's technical and scientific capacity and his apparent inability to deal with his own affairs on a rational basis. In any event, it did not appear that we could escape fundamental political, economic, moral, and social problems by concentrating upon "safe" scientific subjects. Successes in public health were to mean rapidly falling death rates and increased population pressures upon resources. The study of nuclear physics, at first only a brilliant extension of man's intellectual curiosity, was to lead to hydrogen weapons.

There was no illusion about the rudimentary character of the so-called social sciences or about the severe limitations which are encountered in attempting to apply the methods of the physical sciences to man's own behavior. Nevertheless, it was felt that there might be sufficient regularity about human behavior to permit fruitful study, and that a scientific approach might evolve methods of study which, if not a direct application of techniques developed in the older sciences, might lead to surer bases of knowledge than we now have.

A further impulse behind the interest in social studies was a conviction that the strengthening of our own free institutions required a better understanding of the processes of a free society and the framework within which a citizen enjoys the privileges and bears the responsibilities of liberty itself. At a period when free institutions came under challenge from totalitarian ideology of both the left and the right, it was felt that penetrating studies of our own free economic and political institutions would help them to withstand assault.

It was fully appreciated that social studies would involve controversial subjects. It was felt, however, that a private foundation could, without itself taking sides on controversial issues, make a contribution by supporting objective studies which might illuminate such issues and reduce contention.

Three brief excerpts from our records throw light upon the way in which the Foundation has approached the support of the social sciences

Memorandum which indicates principles followed by the memorial to fund projects

The Social Sciences division has no "nostrums" to sell. In choosing the objects of grants the guiding tendency should be not to pronounce answers but to discover truth — not to manipulate new forces but to understand them — not to choose society's path but to illuminate it. Page 22
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## Empirical Studies

It has been suggested to the Reece Committee that foundations have had an adverse effect on scholarship and research through an undue emphasis on empiricism and "a premature effort to reduce our meager knowledge of social phenomena to the level of applied science."

The history of the intellectual processes by which man has accumulated knowledge shows that observation, experimentation, induction, deduction, and verification have each had an important role to play and that it is by their skillful and imaginative combined use that we have been able to push back the frontiers of knowledge. Without empirical examination, general propositions fail to establish and maintain contact with reality; without general concepts, fact

finding becomes aimless wandering and produces helter-skelter collections of unrelated bits and pieces. By observation and experimentation man refines his ideas about the world in which he lives; by other rational processes he reduces his masses of fact and impression to a degree of order, and gives them meaning. After enough regularity has been exposed to justify the construction of a general theory, then and only then can occur the crucial test of verification.

Throughout this process the questions "What is it?" and "How does it happen?" are among the tools man uses while seeking an answer to the underlying question, "What does it mean?"

The interplay of observation, experimentation and theorizing has produced brilliant results in the natural sciences, enabling man to fight back at disease, to harness new forms of power, and to wrest a more abundant living from his environment. But even in the case of the natural sciences, the path he has travelled has been a tortuous one, filled with false leads, imperfect observation, inexact experiment, theories which claimed too much, and contradictory facts for

which he could find no adequate explanation. New ideas have had to run a gantlet of prejudice and entrenched opinion.

Today's firmly held truth is modified by tomorrow's fresh discovery. And still today, as man looks out from peaks of knowledge which he dared not hope to scale, he sees still higher peaks on the distant horizon and vast fields of ignorance still to be explored. The process continues — with new findings, new mistakes, new instruments, new techniques, and most important of all, new concepts and fresh imagination.

It was inevitable that an attempt would be made to apply the methods of the natural sciences to human affairs. (…) It should not be surprising that this attempt would encounter major obstacles — as did the efforts of those who first tried to apply Newton's physics and Lavoisier's chemistry to biology and medicine. The techniques appropriate to the laboratory were insufficient for the study of man in his social environment; the circumstances of study were different in fundamental respects; conditions could not be readily controlled so as to study one factor at a time, as the physical scientist often does. The basic equipment of the scientist was nevertheless required: careful examination of the evidence, an objective approach to data, a lively and fertile imagination in the construction of hypotheses to be tested, and, throughout, a clear recognition that there must be a joint emphasis on speculation and experience. Beyond that, techniques had to be revised and improved; the danger of seeing too much had to be avoided; and the disconcerting influences of undetected factors had to be faced. Although his problems of procedure were difficult enough, the social scientist also faced the resistance and even hostility of man himself, with his personal or group interests affected and his emotions

and traditional patterns upset by new knowledge.

The social scientist persists in his effort to learn more about human behavior, despite the modest beginnings and the challenging complexity of his task. He believes that he is beginning to know something, even though he is sure that he does not know everything. He is in position to throw some light on some situations, knowing better than most where his present limitations are.

These few examples are given to illustrate that our knowledge about human affairs is increasing, even if slowly and imperfectly, and that such knowledge as we have can contribute practical benefits while the search continues. If there are claims being made which seem overreaching, if social scientists are in disagreement among themselves and with the layman, if there are many questions which can not be answered, all this is entirely normal. If there are errors and a danger that we shall be misled by errors, the safeguard is the classic and traditional one: free debate, the empirical testing of opposing views, and a standing invitation to confront error with truth. Our society is deeply in debt to the best of the social scientists. They are among the most important of today's pioneers.
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## Alleged Subversive activities

here have been allegations that the foundations have promoted "un-American" or "subversive" action. The Rockefeller Foundation would never knowingly participate in or support un-American or subversive activity. (…)

The Foundation refrains as a matter of policy from making grants to known Communists. This rests upon two elements, the clearly expressed public policies of the United States, within which we operate, and the increasing assaults by Communism upon science and scholarship which would lead us, on intellectual grounds alone, to withhold support.

We recognize the necessity for government to seek out and deal with subversive activity from any quarter. In this, government is entitled to the sympathetic assistance of all responsible citizens. Where freedom and security are balanced against each other and it becomes necessary to locate the line which separates permitted and prohibited conduct, difficult decisions have to be made which reach into the fundamentals of our society. For example, the definition of subversion is a matter of extreme difficulty.

On broad grounds of public policy, we believe that private citizens and organizations should approach unofficial definitions of subversion with the greatest caution. This is not merely because the task is difficult, as the Congress has found it to be on the official plane. If private organizations and associations should produce their own definitions of "subversion" and should act toward their fellow citizens on die basis of such private definitions rather than of those furnished by duly constituted authority, the mutual confidence and trust which are the cement of our democratic society would rapidly crumble away. The presumption of innocence is more than a luxury to be enjoyed in settled times; it is a vital element in a society of free men who work together by consent and not by force. Under the American system, tyranny in government can be struck down at the ballot box, but it is far more difficult to hold private organizations to proper standards if these organizations intrude upon security activities which are at the heart of the governmental function.

We attempt to set standards for our activities and appropriations which go far beyond any definition of subversion. We believe objective scholarship to be inconsistent with attitudes predetermined by a totalitarian ideology or with conclusions which are reached to conform to a dictated pattern. The search for the highest quality, for scholars and scientists of complete integrity, for men and women of fine character and acknowledged capacity for leadership necessarily means that questions of loyalty arise only in the rarest instances.

But we have always kept in mind the importance of the nonconformist in the advancement of human thought. This is not Communism — it is the antithesis of Communism, which regiments its followers and tolerates no dissent from the dogma of the Kremlin. Mistakes can and will be made and private organizations can not guarantee a perfect record, any more than can an intelligence agency of government itself. So long as there is alertness to the dangers involved, and reasonable effort to avoid them, we believe that the public interest will be adequately protected. It would be gravely injurious to the public interest if fear should lead to such restrictive procedures as to impair seriously the work of the foundations at the frontiers of human knowledge.
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## The Foundation’s International Interests

The international character of the Foundation's work has been one of its major characteristics. Whether in medicine and public health, natural sciences, agriculture, social studies, or the humanities, the Foundation has sought the most fertile ideas, the most urgent needs, the most capable men, and the most promising institutions wherever they could be found. There are a number of considerations which support this attitude.

First, Mr. Rockefeller's philanthropic interest was world-wide in scope, and was rooted in the sympathetic concern which Americans have shown throughout our history for the needs of people in other lands.

Second, an attack upon certain types of problems, such as yellow fever, malaria, or wheat stem rust, compels a pursuit of the problem across national boundaries.

Third, the general body of knowledge, scientific or otherwise, is an international heritage and grows through the labor of scientists and scholars in many centers of learning, in many laboratories, in many countries. The most cursory glance at the list of Nobel Prize winners and the most elementary understanding of the history of our culture make it clear that this is so.

Fourth, any philanthropy which is committed to an interest in the well-being of mankind throughout the world can not reasonably ignore the vast problems which are comprised in the term "international relations." If this was true in earlier decades, it is underscored with fateful emphasis by the statement of the American Secretary of State at the 1953 meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations that "Physical scientists have now found means which, if they are developed, can wipe life off the surface of this planet."1

We accept as an established fact that the United States is involved in international affairs and that this involvement produces an impact upon every home and every citizen. It is as much a part of the environment in which we live as is the air we breathe.

This recognition does not mean that The Rockefeller Foundation has any formula of its own as to just how the problems of international relations should be resolved. We have no corporate position on such questions as World Government, Atlantic Union, the role of the United Nations, international trade policies, regulation of armaments, security alliances, and so forth. We believe that problems of relations among peoples and governments are proper subjects of examination and study, that knowledge about them is to be preferred to ignorance, and that reliable information will put men into position to make wiser decisions.

In the field of international relations, the Foundation has pioneered in what has come to be called technical assistance, primarily in such fields as medicine, public health, and agriculture. In addition, it has provided support for studies or for creative work in such fields as international economics, international law, comparative government, history, creative arts and the so-called "area studies," i.e., studies which cut across cultural boundaries and establish a

bridge of information and understanding despite differences in language, race, creed, or cultural tradition.

We have attempted to be helpful and cooperative in our attitude toward existing machinery of international cooperation, whether the League of Nations, the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, etc. Where an international body is undertaking work in which the Foundation has an interest, an occasional grant has been made by the Foundation to support such work. On other occasions officers and staff of the Foundation have been loaned to international organizations for particular jobs, as in the field of medicine and public health. In working with international organizations, or with foreign governments, the Foundation does not enter into the political discussions and decisions which might be made

by those bodies. Our collaboration rests upon a joint interest in activities appropriate to philanthropy.
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# Part two

## Comments on a foundation program

One of the purposes to be served by the publications of The Rockefeller Foundation is to make known the main lines of its interests and the considerations which lead the Foundation in some directions and not in others. More often than not, applicants for grants from The Rockefeller Foundation receive the disappointing answer that their proposals must be declined as lying outside its program. Undoubtedly many applications never reach the Foundation because such an answer is reasonably predictable from a reading of its published reports. But what is a "program?" Why is it necessary for an endowed foundation with broad freedom of action to limit voluntarily the scope of its interests? Is there not some contradiction between a program and the flexibility which characterizes such funds?

A moment's reflection will show that a foundation established to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world must make choices, for the simple reason that its resources are limited and man's needs are infinitely vast.

Further, many undertakings require concentrated and persistent effort if significant results are to be achieved, and such concentration prohibits the dispersion of limited financial and human resources over a wide range of miscellaneous activity.

The determination of the main lines of interest of a general purpose foundation is the principal burden of its trusteeship. The process follows no simple rule of thumb; although experience develops lessons and maxims which carry weight, even these need continuous review. Program

evolves against a background of complex and sometimes contradictory factors; judgments as to the most urgent needs and the practical possibilities of advancing upon them; the appraisal of the real capacity of the available funds; the need for sustained effort; the need for adjustment to change; the strengthening of established ideas and institutions; the exploration of new ideas; the need to extend basic knowledge; the need to make existing knowledge more generally avail-

able; the existence of trained leadership in a particular field; to name a few. It should cause no surprise that the trustees and officers of the many philanthropic funds find a wide variety of answers; indeed, their freedom to choose is a guaranty of the diversity of approach and technique which enriches a free society.

The Rockefeller Foundation has never attempted to locate the boundaries of the key phrase in its charter purpose — the well-being of mankind. The attempt would appear presumptuous and, in any event, would have little value in giving direction to the Foundation's work. The central question is not what would or would not contribute in some way to man's well-being, but which of many worth-while possibilities should claim the Foundation's attention. As a practical matter, choices have to be made, and the fabric woven of these choices is what is known as program.
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## Changing conditions and changing program

A foundation program necessarily responds to changes in the contemporary scene. The wisdom of the founder in conferring a maximum of freedom upon the Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation is confirmed by a backward glance over the turbulent events of the four decades of its corporate life. The years since 1913 have been disturbed by two world wars and several lesser conflicts, by violent and non-violent revolution, by inflations and depressions, and by breathtaking scientific and technical development. Surely it is not historical myopia to suppose that these have been decades of unusually significant change in patterns of life and habits of

thinking in every continent.

For the Foundation, as for everyone else, these great events have produced uncertainty and a need for readjustment. Undertakings of promise have been engulfed, scientists and scholars have been diverted or driven from their tasks, laboratories and libraries destroyed. As Raymond B. Fosdick put it, the Foundation "has carried on its work under a leaking roof, and in retrospect much of its activity seems to have been a patch-and-repair job." But the period also challenged

private philanthropy with exceptional opportunity; the times demanded the utmost of man's intellectual and moral resources and men responded brilliantly, if unevenly, in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. To build is usually more difficult than to tear down, whether the structure is a growing science, a viable economy, a stable peace, free institutions, or deeper understanding among peoples of different cultures. A foundation is fortunate in its freedom to consult man's hopes for the future rather than his disappointments of the past; and to bring to the task of buildirig what Wallace Buttrick called "tenacity of patience and purpose."

Even in the brief period since the close of World War II, larger events have affected the activities of The Rockefeller Foundation in important ways. (…)

The Rockefeller Foundation, a nonpolitical and nongovernmental philanthropy, has not presumed to propose a formula for peace. It believes, however, that scholarship can make an important contribution through the dispassionate examination of ideas and problems involved in international relations. It believes, further, that "the infinity of threads that bind peace together" must include many of a private character, strengthening and deepening knowledge and understanding across national and cultural boundaries. For its part, the Foundation continues substantial support for intercultural studies on a broad basis and for scientific and scholarly exchange.

(…)
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Again, a foundation whose activity is not limited to a single country is affected by the appearance, since World War II, of a considerable number of newly independent nations as full members of the world community. Freed now from supervision by others and with full responsibility for their own affairs, these nations face the task of erecting, as promptly as possible, viable political and economic systems of their own. Though such generalizations are hazardous, these new states are burdened with low living standards, rapidly increasing populations, and resources too limited to assure rapid and substantial improvement in real per capita income. They lack sufficient numbers of trained personnel in almost every field, nor do they have the educational facilities to meet their scholarly, scientific, and technical requirements. They themselves now have not only the problem of interpreting their rich cultures to others, but also that of increasing their own understanding of other lands and peoples. In such situations there are challenging opportunities for private philanthropy. The Rockefeller Foundation, which has worked in most of these countries for many years on a cordial and disinterested basis, is considering carefully what its present contribution can be.

If changes in the world scene such as these affect the program of the Foundation, so does the impressive increase in funds which have recently become available from other sources for the type of work in which the Foundation has long been active. National governments and international and regional organizations now devote substantial resources to public health, scientific and cultural exchange, technical assistance, scientific research, demonstration projects, education, and a wide range of similar activity. Business corporations are spending large sums for research in connection with their own enterprises and are increasing their contributions to educational and research institutions on a broadening basis. American universities are establishing cooperative relations with universities abroad, with mutual benefit.

Finally, many new foundations have recently appeared in the United States in response to public policies and tax laws which encourage their formation, and some of them have substantial resources.

These developments create no problem of "competition " among those who have philanthropic funds in charge, for needs and opportunities leave room for all. It is but natural, however, that a particular foundation will wish to use its funds to the best advantage in relation to its charter purpose; to do so it must be attentive to what others are doing.

The situation emphasizes anew the peculiar advantages of a private foundation: its flexibility, its capacity to make commitments over considerable periods of time, its comparative freedom from political complications, and its ability to support the search for knowledge without undue regard to shortterm practical results.

In later sections of this review are to be found brief discussions of some of the principal centers of interest of The Rockefeller Foundation in 1953. For reasons already suggested, its program is not static but in motion, with trailing as well as leading edges, For example, The Rockefeller Foundation is now inclined to leave to other agencies the conduct of field operations in public health. Public health techniques have become widely familiar; other and much larger resources

are being committed by governments and international organizations. The Foundation has, therefore, largely concluded its own role in such operations. But adequate medical and public health services require highly trained personnel — doctors, nurses, engineers, administrators, Rapidly increasing demands for improved health care and the growing complexity of the health sciences themselves create major problems in medical education. The need for larger resources and better facilities for the advanced training of medical personnel is general, but it is especially marked in the less highly developed countries where an effort is being made to move into'what is for many of them a new era in health standards.

The Foundation, meanwhile, continues to pursue its virus research program, both in its own laboratory and field stations and through grants to support significant research elsewhere. The first instance —public health operations — reflects a withdrawal of Foundation support; the second — professional medical education — some intensification of interest; and the third — virus research — continued persistence in an endeavor in which many years and substantial sums have been invested.

As adjustments in its program go forward, the Foundation recognizes a responsibility to consider carefully the effects of changes upon the educational and research Institutions and

the fields of investigation involved. Even though its own role may be small in relation to a large field, a foundation can create a certain amount of confusion if it moves fitfully from one task to another. The ability to persist is an important asset, but so is the ability to move in new directions.

To balance these assets in the public interest is a matter of art and judgment, to which officers and Trustees give constant attention and upon which responsible outside advice is regularly sought.
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## Foundation program and the need of higher education

A substantial portion (54 per cent) of the grants made by The Rockefeller Foundation in 1953, as in earlier years, went to institutions of higher education in the United States and abroad. This occurred despite the fact that the Foundation's charter does not direct it specifically to support education, as was the case with the General Education Board.

Indeed, the prior existence of the Board, also established and endowed by Mr. John D, Rockefeller, strongly suggested that "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" might lead the Foundation outside the field of education.

With a wide range of choices open to it, the Foundation has placed the larger part of its funds in the hands of colleges and universities. Why? The record suggests three principal reasons. First, the support of higher education in itself makes a powerful and attractive claim upon a foundation seeking to promote general well-being. Second, at an early stage the Trustees of the Foundation saw that its funds would be dissipated without enduring benefit if they were applied at the consumer level of human need, i.e., by trying to alleviate distress through relief to individuals or selected groups. The search for "root causes'\* and a concentration upon the ex-

tension of knowledge, activities with high intellectual, aesthetic, and moral value^r set also opened the possibility that limited funds might make a significant contribution to the welfare of mankind as a whole. But the extension of knowledge and its imaginative application to human affairs are among the great concerns of the colleges and universities.

Third, major advances in human welfare, whether in health, food production, or intercultural understanding, require the leadership and insight of highly trained minds. The limiting factor in much of what is called technical assistance is the shortage of qualified personnel; the pace at which a particular effort can proceed is often determined by the time required for training. And, again, institutions of higher education are the training centers from which such leadership must come.

Hard-pressed college and university administrators are calling attention to trends in the financing of higher education which pose troublesome and complex problems for the campus, and which have caused The Rockefeller Foundation to give fresh attention to the relation between the grants it makes and the longer-range needs of the recipient institution.

Though the Foundation and the campus have broad objectives in common and have benefited 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 possible 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.

(…)

There can be little doubt about the validity of the Commission's concern. The increasing reliance upon student fees, annual giving, governmental and corporation contracts, and short-term foundation projects limits the ability to plan an orderly development over a period of years and to draw to the campus a body of scholars and teachers who can be assured the status and funds they need. Anyone who is in frequent contact with the campus will understand why presidents warn of "projectitis," will confirm the fact that scientists and scholars in charge of departments or laboratories are too often required to take time from their professional work to

maintain the flow of short-term support, and will know that tenure in faculty appointments is frequently withheld because an institution can not risk a long-term commitment for work being supported by short-term contracts or projects. And in the background is the danger that the educational and research program of a particular campus will come to reflect not the considered best judgment of its own trustees and educational leadership, but an accidental constellation of activities resulting from short-term earmarked support from a wide variety of sources.

The Rockefeller Foundation has been considering ways and means of reducing the impact of such problems, insofar as its own grants are concerned. Thus far, it has taken modest steps in two directions. First, it has extended the time period and the amounts of grants to a few activities to which it had previously made short-term appropriations. These grants provide more freedom and stability for the recipient and, incidentally, effect a saving to the Foundation in time and administration.

More importantly, the Foundation has experimented with grants in the middle range between projects and endowment in a number of cases where the work is closely related to the Foundation's program, where considerable development was in process on the basis of short-term contract or project support, and where there was an urgent need for some type of stabilization. In these cases, the Foundation provided funds to be available over a long period which could be used or conserved depending upon the regularity of short-term support, and which would permit those in charge to plan more freely and to make commitments to personnel on an assured basis.

While the Foundation continues to examine the nature of its grants in relation to the needs of the campus for stable funds, it continues to believe that there is a place for relatively small, short-term appropriations. This is particularly true where die emphasis is upon the professional advancement of an individual scholar or scientist, where a new idea or new technique is being tried out, or where the small increment from the Foundation makes up the difference between the need and other available resources. The matching grant, as well, retains its usefulness, for it brings to the support of higher education funds which might not otherwise come to its assistance and makes it possible for the Foundation to assist where the entire need would be beyond its reach. The remarkable growth of our colleges and universities and their multiple legitimate needs make it clear that financial support must come from the widest variety of sources which, taken together, must make it possible for these institutions to preserve, enrich, and transmit our intellectual and cultural heritage.
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## Interdisciplinary Problems

The four Divisions of The Rockefeller Foundation, i.e., Medicine and Public Health, Natural Sciences and Agriculture, Social Sciences, and Humanities, reflect a familiar grouping of certain scientific and scholarly disciplines. Although Foundation grants and activities are ordinarily reported under divisional headings in the Annual Report, the boundaries between divisions and disciplines are only approximate, marked not by fences but by interlocking relationships.

In the concluding section of this brief review3 attention is drawn to the major centers of Foundation interest and activity in 1953. It will be apparent that each of these involves several disciplines and, in most cases, more than one of the Foundation's Divisions. The individual research scholar knows that to advance in his own field he often needs the help of others, and that his own fresh discoveries may have important effects outside his own discipline, sometimes in unexpected ways. The stubborn refusal of intellectual or human problems to fit snugly into watertight compartments can be illustrated in many ways. Advances in biology and

medicine open the way for improved public health and falling death rates; these in turn frequently mean rising populations and, in some places, pressures on available foodstuffs and raw materials; they may also mean political conflict arising from the gap between enlarged demand and limited supply. The effort to improve the health, the education, or the economy of a community or region often demonstrates how the three are inseparably linked and move together.

If specialization and division of labor are no less essential and productive in the intellectual field than in business or government, there goes with them the need to surmount any artificial barriers thereby erected and to keep in view the whole made up of inseparable parts. The need is particularly important for an institution like a foundation, which attempts to relate advancing knowledge to human well-being.

The Rockefeller Foundation is giving increased attention to the mutual support which various aspects of its program can render to each other. Medical education in an underdeveloped area is related to population studies and to attempts to find a basis for increased food production. Fundamental research on important food crops such as wheat and corn is part of a broader effort which includes increased support for the examination of the potential resources of the sea, of the use of microorganisms for food, and of the mysteries of photosynthesis. The attack of the natural scientists upon the food problem is accompanied by a continued interest in eco-

nomics, and particularly agricultural economics.

It seems unlikely that the investigation of a complex of questions will show a uniform advance across a broad front. Significant gains will turn upon fresh insight at particular points, upon success in following up promising leads, and pon the capacity of individuals or institutions to open up new horizons. Here, Foundation funds are a flexible and strategic reserve, to be employed in support of a breakthrough for the benefit of the total effort.

In some fields, fruitful collaboration among disciplines is far advanced, as that among the biologist, the chemist, and the physicist in investigating the life processes. In others, such as the study of international relations, scholars are searching for an effective way to relate the many separate disciplines whose contributions are needed by the central core of international politics. Whatever the field, the Foundation believes that the main impetus toward collaboration must come from scholars who are driven to it by their own necessities rather than from the artificial stimulus of grants made on the thesis that all interdisciplinary effort is worth-

while. Both in its own arrangements and activities and in the grants it makes, the Foundation will try to be alert to opportunities for focusing a variety of points of view and specialties upon major problems. It has no single formula for doing so and does not expect to find one where

experimentation and continuing adjustment are indicated. Specifically, it does not take a theoretical position on the utility of group research as contrasted with the single scholar.

Each has its value and the technique is best determined by the scholars themselves.
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## Centers of Foundation Interest in 1953

Professional Medical Education

Virus Research

Medical Care

Human Behavior

Agricultural Program

Basic Research in the life sciences

Population Studies

The Functioning of free societies

Since the early 1930’s the Foundation has provided financial support to studies in politics and economics which throw light upon the functioning of free institutions. In 1953 the larger number of these grants went toward studies of the economies of the United States and Western Europe.

(…)

An understanding of free institutions is deepened by comparative studies of societies which seem to act upon different underlying assumptions.

## International Relations

The records of the Foundation show many grants aimed at the reduction of international tensions and the strengthening of the processes of international cooperation. A foundation chartered to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world can not yield to the pessimism suggested by the past four decades of war and destruction; the search must continue for constructive steps to a more rational international life.

## Intercultural Understanding

This interest might have been discussed under the heading of international relations. It is treated separately, however, in order to emphasize the importance of understanding across cultural frontiers quite apart from political considerations.

Specifically, the

Foundation has been interested in the encouragement of (i) studies in the United States of the major cultural traditions elsewhere; (i) American studies in other countries; and (3) cross-cultural studies elsewhere, where the United States is riot involved.

The Arts, Literature, Historyy and Philosophy

The Development of Individual Capacity
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## Division of Medicine and Public Health

The Past year brought further development of the Foundation's interest in improving health and wellbeing in underdeveloped countries. In contrast with earlier efforts, which concentrated on the direct control or elimination of specific plagues like yellow fever, malaria, or hookworm, the present program adopts an indirect approach.

Its immediate purpose is the development of local institutions for the training of personnel and the prosecution of research, which in turn may bring permanent benefits to the areas concerned. The early results of such a program are far less spectacular than the immediate effects of campaigns against specific diseases, but success, if and when it comes, is expected to be much broader and more permanent.

An assistance program which depends upon the continuous importation of trained technicians and materials necessarily implies a continuous dependency of the underdeveloped regions of

the world, If all countries are ever to become free and equal in anything other than a technical political sense, they must be helped to establish their own "capital plant" for the production of their own trained personnel and techniques most appropriate to local conditions.

Several of the grants listed under the heading Professional Education are illustrative of a policy of Jong-term investment in overseas production of trained personnel and new techniques. For some years to come, Europe and the United States seem likely to continue to be principal contributors to the pool of knowledge shared by the Western world. This is especially true with respect to basic discoveries in the sciences related to health. The relatively high concentration of trained talent and developed research facilities in these areas continues to attract a large portion of the Foundation's funds devoted to the Development of the Health Sciences.
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## Division of Natural Sciences and Agriculture

For about TWENTY YEARS modern experimental biology received main emphasis in the program of this division of The Rockefeller Foundation. In fact, about 80 percent of the financial support recommended over the period 1932-1952 was devoted to various aspects of modern biology. The remaining 20 per cent was divided about equally between support of science as a whole, and support of special projects outside the biological program which were aided because of their unusual nature, outstanding quality, and special importance.

Over recent years, however, the Foundation has been developing an increasing interest in agriculture. Begun originally as an isolated experiment, involving activities in Mexico only, this agricultural interest has expanded in several respects. Geographically, the expansion first extended to Colombia; it now embraces, in one form or another’s a large part of Central and South America. More recently, the agricultural work has included very restricted activities in India, and it has influenced substantially the programs in the United States and in Europe. Most recently of all, preliminary studies of agricultural opportunities in the Far East have been undertaken.

A generalization of the form of Foundation support to agriculture has also occurred. This work was begun in both Mexico and Colombia as a concrete and limited operating program, carried on by a staff composed partly of Foundation employees and partly of local scientists. By now, in addition to these operating activities, the Foundation's widening interest in agriculture has been manifested through scholarships and fellowships, grants in aid to individuals, and appropriations to groups or institutions.

The basic concepts of the agricultural program have also become generalized. Concerned originally with improvement of basic food crops and with modern scientific agriculture in its usual branches, the Foundation has now developed a broader interest in the food problem of mankind, This has led to support of studies in areas quite outside conventional agriculture.
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## Division of social sciences

Funds for research on the functioning and management of the economy were appropriated for the work of scholars in both Western Europe and the United States. The research projects supported covered a wide range of topics, but all were addressed to the general objective of providing a deeper understanding of the processes and problems of the economy and, therefore, of the factors bearing upon economic stability. Many have relevance to international as well as national issues.

Men can no longer dodge problems as in earlier days by moving to a "frontier." They now live increasingly in metropolitan communities and work in large organizations. How human beings, individually or in groups, "get on" is a steadily more important and more difficult matter. Ail the insights and experience of the men of affairs, the journalists, the politicians, the novelists, the historians and philosophers are relevant to the problem, But we need as well more precise

and ordered knowledge about the behavior of people and groups than we now have. Grants made by The Rockefeller Foundation in 1953 in support of research in the field of human behavior and intergroup and interpersonal relations were addressed to that end.