

Barrell - May

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDING "SOCIAL (HUMAN) RELATIONS"

AS A PROGRAM AREA FOR THE FORD FOUNDATION

The problems or questions with which the proposed program area, "Social (Human) Relations," deals are fundamental in the promotion of human welfare. Examples of such problems are:

1. The determinants of effective leadership.
 2. The factors which determine optimum size of organization.
 3. The factors which determine the patterns of successful communication.
 4. The development of a theory of communication within and across group lines.
 5. The determinants of the relative spheres of effectiveness of economic freedom for individuals and of government planning in a "mixed" society.
 6. The determinants of industrial peace.
 7. The determinants of prejudice which underlie the problem of assimilation of minority groups.
 8. The development of effective international economic policies suitable to the political responsibilities of the United States.
- Significant progress toward the answers to such problems will have important effects on the daily life of individuals everywhere.

As indicated in the March interim report, if we consider the impact of these problems upon individuals the following criteria suggest themselves:

1. Numerical impact - i.e., how many individuals are affected?
2. Time impact - when and for how long will such individuals be affected?
3. Severity impact - how seriously are such individuals affected, or to what extent will they be benefited by the alleviation or solution of the problem?

In my March interim report four program areas were recommended, i.e.:

1. Social (Human) Relations.
2. Education and Training.
3. Stability of the Economy.
4. Conservation of Resources.

All of these suggested program areas are deduced from problems, progress toward the solution of which is important to the human welfare. Entirely apart from Ford Foundation consideration, the area of Social (Human) Relations ranks first in my opinion because one or another of the problems with which it deals affects all people, quite directly, during practically all waking hours of their lives, and with a high degree of severity which is witnessed by the lack of understanding resulting in seriously strained relations almost everywhere. Progress toward the solution of those problems will make for improved relations which per se will open the road for progress in other areas.

In contrast, the important problems of the education and training program area affect all persons at one time or another, for differing periods of time and in substantially varying degrees of severity. Similarly, although all persons are affected by economic instability and lack of, or insufficient conservation of, resources, the day-in and day-out characteristic of the time factor for Social (Human) Relations is absent in these two program areas, and the degree of severity differs more markedly among individuals, groups, and nations than in the area of Social (Human) Relations.

In rating the program areas for possible Ford Foundation support, the following criteria were considered:

1. Comparative need.
2. Comparative feasibility of the mechanisms and techniques available.
3. Comparative significance of results which can be hoped for or expected.

The first of the above-mentioned criteria, i.e. comparative need, suggests that no important area will be completely without support and that preferential weight should be given to a program area, the requirements of which appear to be more urgent than those of another. Although it is not easy to rate these four suggested areas, all of which are in serious need of support, it would appear that probability of support for conservation of resources by governmental units would be far greater than for the other three; that support of work leading to increased economic stability on a broad basis might likely be granted by government and/or other foundations; that support of a program developed and executed by non-educators to awaken the public to the importance of the real needs of education, emphasizing both the short- and long-run implications thereof, might very possibly come from other foundation sources, though not from the government; and that support for the area of Social (Human) Relations by the government or by other foundations on a highly extensive basis is unlikely. The latter statement is made because the area might well be described as more "dangerous" than any of the others. The level of study and research in the area is likely to be more "basic" and thus more difficult for rationalization of government support. In addition, the government will itself necessarily be a subject of critical study as a result of activity in the program area. Similarly, really bold support by highly conservative foundation

only if carried
out by other
foundations

Why not FF

managements is unlikely because present organizational relationships, management techniques, and social organization may be greatly changed as a result of work in this area.

Turning to the comparative feasibility of the mechanisms and techniques available, the presence of organized centers in a few places and of individuals in many places imbued with an appreciation of the need for, and well-qualified to undertake, work in one or more of the components of the program area of Social (Human) Relations gives promise of success if ample financial support over a reasonably long period of time is provided for a group of well-integrated centers of Social (Human) Relations.

It appears completely feasible to expect that a well organized, non-professional national commission for education might succeed in arousing public interest and action for the benefit of education by finding and publicizing weak and strong points in educational systems. It is reasonable to expect also that such a commission could develop suggested patterns of effective educational attack on an emerging basis.

Interdisciplinary studies, conferences, and provision for publication of results and for their presentation to suitable action agencies by selected universities or groups of universities represent feasible means, both for decreasing economic instability and for planning more effective utilization and conservation of resources.

In short, the available instrumentalities or mechanisms and techniques through which support of the Ford Foundation would be utilized in each of the program areas referred to appear entirely feasible.

Application of the criterion of comparative significance of results which might be hoped for or expected leads, in my opinion, to emphasis on the Social (Human) Relations program area. Important as progress toward the achievement of the major objectives of the other three program areas may be, i.e. (1) achievement of a higher level of educational effectiveness and more widespread educational opportunities; (2) attainment of a higher standard of living with elimination of the economic ills which accompany cyclical fluctuations of great amplitude; and (3) assurance of a decent minimum of resources for peoples everywhere and the development of a thorough appreciation of the need for effective conservation, the maximum benefits of such worthwhile accomplishments would not be realized in the absence of more complete and more precise understanding of Social (Human) Relations. With a given investment of funds by the Foundation, more significant results in the promotion of the human welfare can be expected, in my opinion, in the Social (Human) Relations area than in the others listed in the March interim report. As a result of such progress, it may be expected indeed that, as stated above, the road will be opened for progress in other areas in which the relations of individual to individual, individual to group, and group to group play such a vital part.