Planing

Notes for Rowan Gaither on Program Five Conference, San Francisco, May 2, 1951; Dr. Hans Speier, Dr. Donald Marquis, Dr. Leo Doyle, and Mr. Dyke Brown

A. Comments on Certain of the Activities on Page 1 of the Agenda, Program One.

We discussed briefly the authorized programs and projects in the Program One area. Two general comments and a number of specific observations were made.

General Comment #1:

Impressive as the list of authorized projects looks, it was noticed that the list as it stands at present does not yet reflect clearly an orientation toward the achievement of integrated objectives in this area. This is perhaps inevitable at this stage, but seems to deserve serious consideration.

General Comment #2:

A number of the proposed projects in Area One have important behavioral science aspects and overlap therefore, to varying degrees, with Program Five. This holds true in particular of the following projects:

Survey of UNESCO needs and projects
Free Russia Fund, Inc.
Areas of Strategic Importance
Fighting Group Against Inhumanity
International Press Institute
Specific Exchange Projects (under Exchange of Persons)
Ideological Conflict

Observations on Specific Projects:

1. Survey of UNESCO Needs:

Dyke told us there was a plan for a survey of UNESCO needs by someone who could provide guidance for possible

Foundation activities, but that plans for the particular individual had fallen through. Marquis suggested they might consider Walter Laves, who resigned last year after three years as Deputy Director of UNESCO in Paris. He was formerly a professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago and is at present visiting professor at the University of Michigan. His plans for the summer and next year are not known. Because of his extensive firsthand experience and his sound, realistic and thoughtful approach to problems of international organization, he might be very useful in making such a survey. Speier, who also knows Laves, concurs in every respect.

Another expert who may be well qualified to be helpful in carrying out such a survey was mentioned by Speier: his name is Arvid Brodersen, at present professor of Sociology at the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research, New York. Brodersen is a Norwegian sociologist who visited the United States as a Rockefeller fellow in the early 30s, distinguished himself during the war as a liaison person between the Norwegian underground and the anti-Hitler elements in the Germany occupation forces in Norway, and was decorated for his service to the United Nations by General Eisenhower. After the war he worked for several years in the Social Science

Division of UNESCO headquarters at Paris. Like Laves, though on a somewhat lower level, he has an intimate knowledge of UNESCO problems and European research personnel and capabilities in the behavioral science field. He speaks Norwegian, French, English and German fluently, is a thoughtful person with good judgment and experience as well as intense interest in behavioral science problems to the solution of which UNESCO might contribute.

2. Free Russia Fund, Inc:

Fund, Inc., activities is particularly evident with respect to the plans of Professor Philip Mosely. It is our understanding that Mosely plans to utilize Russian exiled scholars and experts for the development of knowledge on the Soviet Union by having them work in cooperation with American researchers. Both the experiences gained in this cooperation and the actual results of the work to be done by these mixed teams will be of considerable interest to Area Five.

3. Areas of Strategic Importance:

Marquis made two gratuitous comments on the proposal itself:

- a. Judged by itself it is a well-informed, thoughtful and comprehensive proposal, especially good in the organizations of mechanisms for coordinating with other centers, with
 educational outlets, with policy-makers and with foreign study
 centers.
 - b. The proposal reflects a primary interest in

historical and documentary studies, that is, library scholarship; and while it occasionally mentions empirical and field studies, these aspects of the problem are not as thoroughly exploited. For example, there is no recognition of the major problem of population and fertility, and very little place is given to social psychological studies of attitudes, beliefs and goals.

The state of

The most important consideration in evaluating this proposal is to place it in perspective in a general program for the development of area training and research centers throughout the country. For example, at present there are five university centers well advanced in their programs for work on South Asia: Cornell, Pennsylvania, Yale, Berkeley and Harvard. The question arises: Should these centers be expanded or should another be added? Such a question can be answered only by comprehensive consideration of the total available resources in the country. Surveys on this basis have been carried out recently by the SSRC Committee on World Area Research. Their report by Richard Heindel is in the material shipped you from the SSRC office. A further very thorough study of resources and needs for South Asia centers is in final draft form. problem raised by the Stanford proposal illustrates very neatly the general problem which the Foundation's staff will face in many respects, viz .: How can one evaluate a single proposal before a comprehensive survey has been made of the resources and needs in the entire area with which the proposal is concerned? In this instance we are fortunate that over the past three years the SSRC committees have been actively working on this problem and completed studies are available to us.

4. Fighting Group Against Inhumanity:

We share the high opinion expressed by Paul Hoffman of the Fighting Group Against Inhumanity in his report to the Board of Trustees. Support of the Fighting Group has been urged by the U.S. Government. It is our understanding that the Foundation support will be used primarily for the purpose of the "searching service" of the group and for other political activities in which the group is engaged. Speier, who knows the activities of this group and some of its leaders, remarked that the Fighting Group Against Inhumanity collects data on conditions in the Soviet zone of Germany during the course of its work which constitute a rich source of information on conditions in the Soviet zone. It appears desirable to explore whether the Foundation support cannot be used either simultaneously or in a supplementary function for the purpose of adding to our knowledge of conditions in the Soviet zone. The interests of the office of the U. S. High Commissioner in Germany as well as of the Department of State with respect to the Fight Group are primarily in support of its political program, whereas the unique research opportunities which the files of the group offer have not been the center of U. S. governmental interests.

5. International Press Institute:

This project clearly falls into area One but being

concerned with the international implications of mass communications is also of interest to area Five. Since the area of communications is very broad and extends over various programs of the Foundation, it might be necessary to undertake a survey of the research needs and opportunities in the whole field of communication so as to develop principles for the support of individual projects in various program areas.

last meeting in San Francisco. In view of the fact that by this time not only in Program One but also in Program Four a substantial amount has been allocated for the support of projects in the general field of communication, it seems advisable to give renewed consideration to the proposal made months ago of calling a conference on communications preparatory to the development of principles which would guide the Foundation in the future allocation of funds in this area. The notes you kept at the last meeting will contain the names of persons tentatively suggested at that time as participants in such a conference.

6. Specific Exchange Projects:

The nature of the proposals for specific exchange projects makes clear the necessity for the formulation of a general Foundation policy on exchange of persons. It is apparent that these cannot be easily evaluated as separate projects since each has merit. This leaves the door open for an almost unlimited flood of proposals.

The first step preparatory to the formulation of a general policy should be a review of present knowledge and current evaluation of exchange programs. Marquis has looked into SSRC activities in this field. The Committee of International Cooperation in Social Science has prepared a bibliography of work on exchange of persons by Richard Heindel. Rex Crawford, University of Pennsylvania, last week attended a conference of college counsellors of foreign students, in Denver, to try to discover what their special problems and needs are. Metraux, Yale University, has just completed an historical study of the exchange of persons and of its objectives, and this should be of interest for background purposes. Linsley Kimball of the Rockefeller Foundation is currently interested in this problem and is discussing some possible research.

Recently the State Department received a report in which Hadley Cantrell, Princeton University, participated dealing with the current procedures used in the Department of State and in particular in the administration of Fulbright funds in order to evaluate the success of the Government exchange programs. The report contains detailed recommendations of research.

Inasmuch as Program Five might become quite interested in the support of research centers abroad in the field of behavioral science, the exchange of scholars, as part of the general exchange of persons program, should receive particular attention. It may be possible in many cases to combine the support of foreign research centers with an exchange of scholars program.

At our last meeting you asked Marquis to determine whether the SSRC would accept a commission, for a pittance, to survey this problem. The answer is yes.

7. Ideological Conflict:

Interest of Program Five is obvious and in the absence of recently information on Troy, we have nothing to add to previous discussions.

- B. Programs Two and Three in their present form do not raise any questions of overlap.
- C. Of the projects listed under Program Four, the items dealing with communications are, of course, of particular interest to Program Five as well. The comments made above, with reference to the "International Press Institute" apply here.