

STUDY FOR THE FORD FOUNDATION
75 East 56th Street,
New York 22, N.Y.

May 12, 1949

STAFF-COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM #14

SUBJECT: Minutes of Meetings of May 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9, 1949
San Francisco

Conclusion on Program Areas Reversing the usual sequence, we shall give first the conclusion on program areas of the last day of meeting, Monday, May 9. To go back a bit, throughout all the meetings ran a continuous thread about priority for program areas and the criteria for their selection. From the beginning, the inter-relatedness of several of the areas was apparent and it grew more obvious as the meetings progressed.

In the midst of discussion of Carroll's program area, of which Marquis's was a part, Marquis placed on the black-board an outline of the area of human relations. The outline, which is given elsewhere in this memorandum, was a modification of Carroll's, and since it seemed to be broad enough to apply to other programs, discussion gradually shifted over to concentration upon it. Out of this there developed some thirteen program sub-areas within the over-large area of human relations. These divided naturally into four "basic" sub-areas and nine "application" sub-areas and after considerable discussion of criteria, committee members voted for priority according to problems among each group. The composite ranking was as follows:

1. International relations
2. Government and law
3. Family
4. Economic organization
5. Industrial relations
6. Minority tensions
7. Community
8. Business organization
9. Neighborhood

1. Growth, development, and adaptation
2. Values and motivations
3. Communication
4. Modification of behavior.

Suggested by Don Marquis and refined later by Don Price, the chart (see next page) was an effort to create a useful structure into which each of the above sub-areas could be placed, including in addition pure and applied research and application. Some of the committee felt that the sub-area headings were dissimilar and therefore could not easily be compared. Some of them (e.g., Minority Tensions) were problem-oriented whereas others (e.g., Government and Law) were not. The purpose of the chart was to group these area headings by distinguishing between (1) needs, (2) forms of organized activity by which these needs are met, (3) processes by which these activities are improved, and (4) the relationship of knowledge to such processes of improvement.

The group agreed that although a program area would have its chief focus on a heading in one of the four columns, it would be justified and presented to the Trustees by virtue of its relation to a need or needs in column 1. Thus, for example, a number of the proposed program areas fall in column 2, since they constitute forms of group activity by which certain needs are met. Presentation and justification of any one of these program areas would require relating it to some one or more of the items in column 1. This would be done by answering the following question: In what way is this group activity deficient so far as fulfilling human needs is concerned? "Deficiency" was defined as the difference between the present status of the activity and the desired status. This difference between present and desired status would be measured in terms of factors in column 1, that is, in terms of a deficiency in contribution to human welfare.

The deficiency would constitute the point of departure for justification in presentation to the Trustees. The form, or forms, of group activity by which the deficiency in need could be removed would be set forth (column 2). Then the general processes or tools by which such activities could be improved would be stated (column 3), including, where required, additional basic knowledge (column 4).

Thus, if a program area were in column 4, it would be presented and justified by derivation from column 1 through columns 2 and 3. Similarly, a program area in column 3 would be justified and presented by derivation from column 1 through column 2, and a program area in column 2 would be presented and justified by derivation from column 1.

This chart appeared to have the utility of encompassing all program areas recommended thus far. It further served to differentiate the different characters of programs involved, and to provide a basis for relating different types of program areas. Finally, it linked each program area to one or more needs, thus providing a possible basis of comparison between program areas.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Social (Aggregate Individual) Needs or Problems</u>	<u>Forms of Group Activity by which these needs are met:</u>	<u>General Processes by which these activities may be improved by a foundation or its grantees:</u>	<u>Basic Knowledge of:</u>
Survival	International Relations	Research Planning, e.g. Special Commissions	Knowledge and control of natural processes
Security -	Government -	Education and Training	Individual growth and development, individual values and motivations
Physical	International	Media of Dissemination:	
Psychological	National	Publications	
Economic	State or provincial	Libraries	
	Local	Associations, Conferences, etc.	
Health -	Economic Institutions:	Development of Leadership	Modification of behavior including communications
Physical	Business	Demonstration - support of sample applications for testing and social adoption	
Mental	Labor		Social organization and control
	Agriculture		
	Social Groups, e.g., racial or cultural minorities		
	Professional organizations		
	Educational Institutions		
	Religious Organizations		
	Voluntary Societies		
	Community		
	Neighborhood		
	Family		

Since the thirteen sub-area headings voted upon May 8 were in columns 2, 3 and 4, it would be the staff's job to relate them to the other columns. In order to assist the staff, the group suggested the major deficiencies or problems in each one of the nine topics voted on (which fall for the most part in column 2). The purpose of listing those problems was to permit the staff to formulate the relationship between need, group activity, etc.

Outline for Area
of Human Relations

Marquis's outline for operational approach in the area of human relations seemed general and broad enough to apply to other programs. It follows here:

1. Promotion of research and agencies for research in social science: e.g., creating qualified personnel, multiplying effectiveness of qualified people to train and affect others.

2. Utilization of knowledge:

a. Study of policy decisions, e.g., how to use experts; how to present knowledge. (Robert Merton's work is a reference on this.)

b. Professional avenues of application. (Professions like psychiatry, applied economics, law and teaching could be developed further if scientific bodies of information were developed for each of them, and their professions developed as an active and effective means for promoting the application of knowledge. City and community planning, for example, could implement utilization of known facts.)

c. General dissemination for broad public use. For example, in adult education and in the schools.

3. Basic or fundamental knowledge:

a. Formulation of new, significant problems.

b. Values and motives

c. Communications

d. Change

e. Nature of materials. (Interdisciplinary examination of the individual. We need an effective classification of people).

4. Developmental (or practical or oriented) research. Would include demonstration projects; also Carroll's areas such as minority tensions and industrial relations. Also publication, pilot application, materials of training for application, support of agencies

for application.

5. Intercultural check - a) between the United States and foreign cultures; b) for promotion of similar knowledge in cultures outside the United States.

6. Selected high-risk, self-multiplying applications in "social engineering".

7. Methods or channels.

Presentation of
Program Areas

Although considerable attention was given to the presentation and criticism of program areas of several members of the committee during the meetings, it will not be possible here to present more than a few of the chief impressions. One of these was the inter-relationship of several of the programs. Marquis, for example, developed sub-areas on values and motives, modification of behavior, and communications for basic research in the broad area of human relations developed by Carroll. He would develop programs in these sub-areas to obtain knowledge for use; for example, he would not treat values in the usual ethical sense but as a function of the culture being studied. Throughout his presentation ran the idea of material to be used as a means of going somewhere without directive as to destination.

Jones, whose program area was also within that of human relations, related it to Marquis's in the sense that the purpose of his program was to obtain basic objective information. The chief emphasis of his program, within human relations, fell upon the early growth of the individual and its influence upon his later behavior.

Odegard sketched in the many government opportunities and needs both in research and dissemination of knowledge. Basic research in human relations would contribute as much to his areas to others, but at the same time he put the number-one need as trained personnel in government. He would establish a system of retooling and re-education for experienced people in government - perhaps in the manner of the Nieman fellows at Harvard in journalism. He suggested a Commission of Inquiry on recruitment, training and retirement of government personnel, particularly for those at the top policy level; and a study of recruitment of elective political leadership, which would be breaking entirely new ground. He mentioned the lack of communication from the government to the public, between departments within the government, and within government departments. In international relations, he suggested that while the rift between the USA and USSR could not be tackled in cultural or political affairs, rapprochement might be attempted in technical or scientific areas. (The Ford name is still powerful in the USSR because of Ford pioneering in mass production).

In a brief presentation Lauritsen noted that this country has always been weak in basic research in natural science. Although the natural sciences were now being adequately supported, he believed the basis of the support was not necessarily permanent or sound, and he pointed out that the importance of basic research was usually unappreciated and was mistakenly supposed to be wasteful and unproductive. Following up Odegard's suggestion in international relations, he suggested that the committee propose foundation support for the natural sciences abroad.

Spaulding, too, pointed out the importance which Marquis's basic research in communication and forms of human organization would have for the area of education in which his chief interest lies. He went on to present education in the light of a "crisis" in the world, contrasting it to those areas which must take longer development. What we can do fast is important, and education can fill such a need.

Spaulding found that fitting education into the area of human relations as outlined by Marquis was difficult and that setting it up as a single foundation program area also did not seem possible. Instead of general support to education, he favored the creation of an autonomous board at top level to evaluate educational programs and to promote the use of the best available knowledge. Such a board, as he conceived it, would be a planning and grant-making commission made up of laymen; it would have no ties with the Ford Foundation except to receive an annual grant of \$3-5 millions yearly for ten years. To forestall bureaucratic tendencies, its accomplishments would be reviewed at the end of eight years by a group outside the foundation and the commission. He visualized the board as more nearly like the National Youth Commission than like the group of experts often used to pull education up by its bootstraps. Throughout his presentation he emphasized the application of existing unused knowledge as in counselling and techniques as represented by such possibilities as the motion pictures.

DeVane developed suggestions for foundation activity in the humanities in some detail. He placed first the recruitment and support of teachers and scholars, including in this the attraction of brilliant recruits from small undergraduate colleges to graduate schools, Ford fellowships, support of teachers in emeritus, grants in aid to men of ideas, and grants in aid for publications. He suggested support for experiments in college teaching methods and in graduate school methods. Other ideas were regional centers for encouragement of young artists, and the study of two contrasting cultures - an old culture evolving recently into a modern form (Turkey, for example) and another in decline (for example, Scotland).

DeVane later presented the humanities program as supplementing and filling out the one suggested by Spaulding. He pointed out that the committee's ideas were now shaping up in two forms: what might be called repair jobs for immediate action; and long-range improvement, including basic research. In the humanities one might see the problem as developing thinking leaders for the long pull and encouraging literary people and others to spread the best current ideas to the public at large. Leisure was one of our growing problems; here he gave as one example of attack in the humanities area his suggestion of experimental centers for work in the theatre, radio and television.

Agreements About
The Final Report

The following broad agreements about the final report to the Trustees were affirmed (in some cases reaffirmed):

1. The report, recognizing that the president and staff to-be-appointed must be given considerable leeway for decisions about program selections, is to be drawn up as a background for further investigation prior to operation rather than as a blueprint or operating directive.
2. The report will suggest several program areas for possible action and will reject certain other areas.
3. It will indicate the importance of operation in the general area of the social sciences.
4. It will include a general treatment of problems; and in this treatment certain problems will be excluded from initial foundation operation and the exclusion justified.
5. It will include discussion of the broad area of human relations and an evaluation of the component sub-areas.
6. It will include, with the evaluation (point 5), suggested priorities for foundation investigation and operation.
7. It will include a chapter or section on "Aids to Judgment" (e.g., Brown's "Importance Criteria").

Assistance to
Colleges and
Universities

The need of colleges and universities for financial assistance has become so great that a section or supplement of the final report will probably be given to it. College officials frequently ask for money without strings attached, and are sometimes in the position of trying to justify deficit spending. The committee discussed the question it poses for the foundation at some length, and the following points seem to represent its thinking:

1. The foundation is sympathetic to the needs of colleges and universities, but in no case can the foundation give assistance solely on the basis of financial desperation.

2. The foundation should not give money to colleges and universities except for something which will in some way advance its objectives.

3. In general, money cannot be given for buildings or physical plant unless essential to the advancement of foundation objectives.

4. It should never give sums ample enough to allow college and university trustees to flunk out on their financial responsibilities and duties. (Matching grants or other such techniques might possibly prevent this).

5. The cost of overhead should be accommodated in grants.

6. The total problem of assistance to colleges and universities is so great that other sources (such as government, business groups, community organizations, etc.) have perhaps even greater responsibility for it than the foundation.

7. The staff should study the problem and re-examine the above six points of tentative agreement.