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British awards for Bob Hope and Mr Rusk

Washington, June 25.—Bob Hope, the entertainer, Eugene Ormandy, the conductor, and Mr Dean Rusk, the former Secretary of State are among 14 Americans who will receive honorary British titles for their contributions to Anglo-American friendship next week, the British Embassy here announced.

Mr Ormandy, conductor of the Philadelphia Orchestra, has been made honorary Knight Commander (KBE), the same award will also be conferred on Mr Rusk and Mr Walter Annenberg, the American Ambassador in London from 1969 to 1974. As the KBE awards are honorary, they do not confer the title “sir”.

The presentation will be made by Sir Peter Ramsbotham, the British Ambassador, on July 1 to mark America’s bicentennial celebrations and the forthcoming visit by the Queen.—Reuter.
Mr. Aldrich Could Be Sir Winthrop in Britain

WHEN wealthy Winthrop W. Aldrich presents his credentials as the new American ambassador to Queen Elizabeth's Court of St. James's, the attractive young Queen could, quite properly from the British viewpoint, greet him as Sir Winthrop. She won't, however, because to do so might create what the diplomats call an incident.

As an American citizen, Ambassador Aldrich is not permitted to use that prefix of respect even though he has been a Knight Grand Cross of the British Empire for four years and is entitled to wear a handsome six-pointed star bearing the inscription, "For God and the Empire.

The order, which is limited to 70 men, was conferred upon Aldrich by British Socialist Ambassador Sir Oliver Franks, in the embassy in Washington in 1948 for his work in obtaining Yankee money to shore up Britain's sagging economy. And, in addition to the knighthood, Aldrich holds the first king's medal authorized by the late King George VI for service to the empire.

Thus the 67-year-old financier, former chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank of New York and a warm friend of President Eisenhower, will occupy the highest position in Britain of any American ambassador since the Revolution. By contrast, his predecessor, Walter G. Gifford, managed only an honorary fellowship in the Middle Temple, a sort of lawyers' guild, during his two-year tenure in London.

Mrs. Aldrich was made a Dame Grand Cross of the British Empire at the same time her husband was knighted.

Honorary speaking, Ambassador Aldrich is starting on the top rung of the ladder. Most ambassadors tell for years in the international goodwill industry and garner nothing more impressive than a few honorary degrees from various universities. (This is an old American custom, too.) One of our recent ambassadors to Britain, Lewis Douglas, was the degree champ. He collected eight of them and a ninth is waiting for him at the University of Sheffield. They won't mail it to him.

It's a fine thing that the British hold our new ambassador in such esteem, but the disturbing thought must occur to Aldrich that the honor could have grave political consequences. Suppose he's telling one day with some of his fellow knights and one of them inadvertently calls him Sir Winthrop with.

Mr. Aldrich Could Be Sir Winthrop in Britain

When leading Whig, W. Aldrich presents his English counterpart to the British public, one of the leading Whig politicians, a statesman who was himself a statesman. Aldrich was a member of the Whig Party, which controlled the government from 1714 to 1727. He is said to have had a great influence on the Whig Party and on the development of the British constitution. In the 18th century, Aldrich was a strong supporter of the American Revolution and was one of the leaders of the Whig opposition to British rule. He was a member of the British House of Commons and later of the British Parliament. Aldrich was a supporter of the American Revolution and was one of the leaders of the Whig opposition to British rule. He was a member of the British House of Commons and later of the British Parliament.
Mr. Aldrich Could Be Sir Winthrop in Britain WHEN wealthy Winthrop W. Aldrich presents his credential as the new American ambassador to Queen Elizabeth's Court of St. James's, the attractive young Queen could, quite properly from the British viewpoint, greet him as Sir Winthrop. She won't, however, because to do so might create what the diplomats call an incident. As an American citizen. Ambassador Aldrich is not permitted to that prefix of respect even though he has been a Knight Grand Cross of the British Empire for four years and is entitled to wear handsome six-pointed star bearing the inscription, "Kor God and the Empire." The order, which is limited to 70 Then, was conferred upon Aldrich by British Socialist Ambassador Sir Oliver Franks, in the embassy in Washington in 1948 for his work in obtaining Yankee money to shore up Britain's ailing economy. And, in addition to the knighthood, Aldrich holds the first King's medal authorized by the late King George VI for service to the empire. Thus the 67-year-old financier, former chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank of New York and a warm friend of President Eisenhower, will occupy the highest position in Britain of any American ambassador since the Revolution. By contrast, his predecessor, Walter J. GirTord, managed only an honorary fellowship in the Uddla Temple, a sort of lawyers' guild, during his two-year tenure in London. Jlrs. Aldrich was made a Dame Grand Cross of the British Empire at the same time her husband was knighted. Honorarily speaking. Ambassador Aldrich is starting on the top rung of the ladder. Most ambassadors toil for years in the international goodwill industry and garner nothing more impressive than a few honorary degrees from various universities. (This is an old American custom, too.) One of our recent ambassadors to Britain, Lewis Douglas, was the degree champ. He collected eight of them and a ninth is waiting for him at the University of Sheffield. They won't mail it to him. It's a fine thing that the British hold our new ambassador in such esteem, but the disturbing thought must occur to Aldrich that the honor could have (crave political consequences. Suppose he's tea-ing one day with some of his fellow knights and one of them inadvertently calls him Sir Winthrop with-1 Just think what the Democrats in earshot of an unreconstructed 1 could do with "Sir Winthrop" out-1 Just think what the Democrats in earshot of an unreconstructed 1 could do with "Sir Winthrop" out 'Democrat 1 in the grassroots in 1956!
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To the Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation

Gentlemen:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a general review of the work of The Rockefeller Foundation for the period January 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946, together with detailed reports of the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Foundation, the Director of the International Health Division, and the Directors of the Medical Sciences, the Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities.

Respectfully yours,

Raymond B. Fosdick
President
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DURING 1946 the appropriations of The Rockefeller Foundation amounted to $19,481,576. This figure, representing an increase of approximately $8,000,000 over the total for 1945, includes a grant of $7,500,000 to the General Education Board. This grant is discussed on page 44 of this Review. The income of the Foundation from investments during the year was $8,492,732. This income was supplemented by a balance of $590,697 remaining from the previous year and by a bequest under the will of Robert Marsh, Jr., amounting to $36,764. In order to meet the appropriations made during the year it was necessary to draw from the Principal Fund to the amount of $9,883,000.

Ever since the Foundation was created in 1913 the Trustees have not hesitated to appropriate from the Principal Fund for projects of challenging importance. In the years since 1913 sums totaling $105,317,128 have thus been drawn from capital, and $288,937,305 has been appropriated from income. The Principal Fund as of December 31, 1946, amounted to $138,005,205.

The appropriations for 1946, excluding the grant to the General Education Board, were distributed for the most part in five major fields, roughly as follows:
A detailed statement of the appropriations made in 1946 appears at the conclusion of this report, beginning on page 269. Of the money appropriated during the year, excluding the sum to the General Education Board, 56 per cent was for work in the United States and 44 per cent for work in other countries. This contrasts with 64 per cent for work in the United States in 1945 and 36 per cent for work abroad.

The year 1946 was marked by the gradual reopening of former fields of Foundation activity. Exclusive of public health work, which is carried on by Foundation staff members all over the world, there were 48 major grants in 1946 for work in foreign countries, and 35 of these were for use in Europe. The year before, there were 23 grants for work abroad, 18 of which were in support of European activities. Some of these grants were small, intended to help institutions through a period of post-war adjustment and provide a chance for formulating new programs and training new men. The largest appropriations for work outside the United States included $500,000 for restoring and rehabilitating colleges and universities in China, $250,000 in support of the experimental agriculture program in Mexico, $150,000 to the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Switzerland for research on the organic chemistry of natural products, $162,000 for additional research faculty in the social sciences at Nuffield College, University of Oxford, and $350,000 to the Centre National de la Recherche
Scientifique for equipping 35 leading natural science research laboratories in France and for conferences of natural scientists.

THE ISOLATION OF SILENCE

War not only destroys, it isolates; and isolation means intellectual stagnation. The flow of ideas across boundary lines, the free exchange of periodicals and books, the cross-fertilization of minds working in the same scientific and cultural fields — these are among the tragic losses of war. "Speech is civilization itself," says Thomas Mann. "The word, even the most contradictory word, preserves contact — it is silence which isolates."

It is difficult to assess what has been lost in these years of silence and intellectual darkness. The humanists of France, whose leadership gave Western Europe its cultural prestige, were driven underground, cut off from each other and from the rest of the world. The great Swiss groups in organic chemistry carried on their activities behind impenetrable walls. We cannot know what was in the tortured minds of the Polish mathematicians. Still less do we know the thoughts of the great topologists and analysts of the Russian mathematical school. Of the Hungarian biologists we have little information — either as to what they did or are now doing. Biochemistry and physiology were able to maintain some degree of momentum here in the United States, but they lacked the stimulation which previously had come from the brilliant group of biochemists and physiologists of Denmark and Sweden. Mathematics and geophysics are well developed in Finland, but the voices of their scientists were not audible to the rest of the world. Equally silent were the laboratories in Paris and Oslo and Utrecht and Prague. From Germany,
where, as we are just now learning, a few scientists were able to continue their work in pure research, little has been heard.

This enforced silence has brought losses which are in a sense irreparable — irreparable because they represent lost opportunities and lost time. The list of such losses is all the more formidable because it is blank. It is the list of unknown goals which otherwise might have been reached. It has on it, in invisible ink, the record of the advance which might have occurred in the cancer problem, had all the imaginative sterol chemists of the world known, in dependable detail, the work which was going forward at the Memorial Hospital in New York. It contains the results which might have flowed out of an evening’s conversation between some group of English, American, French, Belgian and Swedish scientists, discussing the problem of protein structure; or what might have happened in literature or the arts or philosophy if the humanists of Western Europe had been free to speak with awareness and imagination to the rest of the world. Invisible on this ghostly list are the beginnings of great new discoveries in genetics, in enzyme chemistry, in nutrition. Perhaps a major entry on the list is the record of what might have been accomplished if all the energy and knowledge and unselfish cooperation which were devoted to making the atomic bomb had been applied instead to some of the great basic problems of biology and medicine.

But this belongs to the past. This kind of result is what the insanity of war leads to. It is the present that we must deal with and the future that we must face. The immediate task of the present is the reestablishment, across all boundary lines, of the scientific and cultural ties that have been broken. The challenge of the future is to make this world one world — a world truly free to
engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere.

TYING THE THREADS TOGETHER AGAIN

In 1946 representatives of The Rockefeller Foundation visited every country in Europe except Russia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania and Greece. It is hoped that in 1947 arrangements can be made by which contacts with these latter countries will be established.

In spite of the fact that Western Europe is staggering under the greatest catastrophe in its history, there are signs everywhere of intellectual resurgence. Some news commentators have reported that Europe as a cultural entity is wounded beyond hope of recovery, but such pessimistic prognostications are not borne out by the reports of the Foundation's representatives. There is an intellectual vitality in Europe which is too deeply rooted to die easily. In terms of brains and skill, of human values and creative talent, Europe is still perhaps the world's greatest powerhouse. While there is no hope of immediate recovery, and years must elapse before the physical and spiritual damage of this war can be erased, Europe's chapter in the history of civilization is by no means finished, nor have her unique contributions to the advance of mankind been terminated.

Ever since V-J Day the Foundation has made a determined effort to see what could be done to get research started again and to tie together the threads that connect Europe's intellectual life with the rest of the world. All five divisions of the Foundation have participated in this effort, i.e., Natural Sciences, Medical Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences and Public Health. The work, as has been indicated, has had two purposes: first, by grants which necessarily had to be modest in
character, to provide equipment or support to a few of the universities, libraries and research centers; and second, to create, as far as physical conditions made possible, methods of communication by which these institutions, isolated by the war, could establish contacts with each other and with the rest of the world.

The list of appropriations at the end of this report gives in detail the grants made in 1946, and it is not necessary to do more than call attention to a few of them that bear on this point. In the natural sciences, for example, grants for fundamental research in the total amount of approximately $350,000 were made to the universities of Upsala, Oslo, Utrecht, Leeds and Oxford, the Karolinska Institute in Sweden, the Carlsberg Foundation in Denmark and the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Switzerland. The sum of $250,000 was given to the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris for equipment and supplies in 35 of the leading research laboratories of France. A grant of $100,000 was made to this same organization for a series of international conferences in such fields as chemical genetics, protein structure, enzyme chemistry and cellular physiology. Another appropriation made possible the meeting of the International Astronomical Union in Copenhagen, to which delegates came from all over the world. Similarly, $50,000 was appropriated to the National Academy of Sciences in Washington for an international gathering that brought together in October 1946, in a conference in the United States, scientists from Italy, England, France, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Hungary, Holland, Norway, Rumania, Poland and Finland. Russian delegates were invited but were unable to attend.

It is important that Russian scientific thinking should
be brought into the international stream. A grant toward this general goal was therefore made to the American-Soviet Science Society, which is a liaison agency serving the interests of American scientists by helping to keep them informed of scientific developments in the Soviet Union, and aiding Soviet scientists in their relations with their fellow scientists in the United States, through the interchange of periodicals and publications.

In the medical sciences a grant of $250,000 was made late in 1945 to the Royal Society of Medicine in England to set up a Central Medical Library Bureau, but the project did not get under way until well into 1946. The function of this new bureau is to make a union catalogue of medical periodical literature published during the war years, and to supply the medical libraries of Europe with microfilm copies of outstanding items. Twenty microfilm machines or readers are already in the hands of participating libraries, with a larger number on order; and microfilming is proceeding at the rate of about 5,000 pages a day.

In 1946 a series of appropriations in the medical sciences, totaling roughly two hundred thousand dollars, was made to support basic research and teaching in the universities of Zagreb, Zurich, Brussels, Cambridge and London. Another grant made it possible to publish in English and French, for wide distribution, many of the excellent studies in clinical and laboratory work produced in France since 1939.

Appropriations in the field of the humanities in the last few years have included extensive grants to the American Library Association for the selection and purchase of scholarly journals and books for European libraries and research centers destroyed by the war. The books in this category are for the most part reference...
books, with about 500 titles in each set. The scholarly journals number approximately 350 and cover the fields of the medical, natural and social sciences, as well as the humanities. The idea in supplying them broadly where they are needed has been to fill the gaps in Europe's knowledge of what has been happening in the field of scholarship in the rest of the world.

Other appropriations for books have been made to the National Central Library of London for the destroyed collections of Great Britain, and in 1946 the sum of $50,000 was given to help in the purchase of books for the ten leading libraries of Poland, whose losses in the war averaged 66 per cent, or a total of nearly 1,500,000 books.

In 1946, also, a grant of $33,000 was given to the University of Oslo for the development of its work in the humanities.

In the social sciences, grants in excess of half a million dollars were made in 1946 to British and Continental institutions for research in international relations and economics. These are listed later in this report. A special appropriation of $55,000 made possible the purchase and distribution in European libraries of some 40 sets of from 300 to 350 books each, representing the more recent publications in the social sciences. This was in addition to the items in this category already mentioned.

In the field of public health, emergency grants for equipment and supplies in the total amount of approximately $230,000 were made in 1946 to institutes of hygiene and other health activities in countries like Poland, Holland, Norway and Yugoslavia. In addition, complete sets of a score of public health journals for the years 1939-1946 inclusive were distributed to 23 institutes of hygiene located in 17 different countries all the way from Turkey to Holland.
Fellowships and travel grants constitute, of course, an excellent method of tying together the intellectual life of Europe with the rest of the world. Travel difficulties have impeded the process, but since V-J Day the Foundation has been able to award 240 fellowships and travel grants to Europeans, distributed as follows: Public Health 84; Medical Sciences 77; Natural Sciences 21; Humanities 26; Social Sciences 32. Of this total, 212 came to the United States and Canada, while 28 went to various countries in Europe. The number from each country was as follows: Belgium 15, Czechoslovakia 23, Denmark 31, Finland 12, France 16, Germany 1, Great Britain 40, Greece 2, Italy 1, Netherlands 19, Norway 35, Poland 11, Rumania 1, Sweden 15, Switzerland 3, Yugoslavia 15.

Balanced against the vast needs of Europe, these activities, of course, scarcely make a beginning in solving the problem. Private funds are utterly inadequate in meeting the situation. One of the promising developments of 1946 was the successful launching of UNESCO, under the United Nations. With imagination and leadership, and supported by ample funds which only governments are in a position to provide, this organization may play the leading role in reestablishing the intellectual contacts of the world.

The Distribution of Medical Care

One of the troublesome problems of our generation is how we are to make available to the entire population the preventive, diagnostic and curative services of modern medicine. The lag between the brilliant development of medicine as a technology and its broad distribution to the public has in recent years become increasingly evident. The art of medicine has forged far ahead of the organization by which it is made widely available. The
statistics of the draft in this last war cannot be explained except on the basis that a large portion of our population receives insufficient and inadequate medical care.

Health, like education, is not only an individual asset; it is a national asset as well. The idea of free education to serve all the people is now so completely accepted everywhere that we overlook the fact that to our forefathers it was a revolutionary concept. Similarly, our generation has had to adjust its thinking about the distribution of medical care; and we have traveled a long road in arriving at the conclusion that some way must be found by which the burden of illness can be equitably spread. The constitution of the new World Health Organization, established under the United Nations, states the matter in words with which most of us would probably agree: "The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition."

This ultimate aim seems to be almost universally accepted. Differences of opinion arise as to how the aim is to be achieved. Increasing attention is being given to arrangements whereby physicians may make available to their patients all the benefits of an art which is so complex that no single practitioner can master it all or keep up with its rapid progress. Much more thought and careful application of planning will be necessary before interchange among individual physicians, hospitals and medical schools can bring to every patient the advantages of combined effort, without sacrificing the assets of close doctor-patient relationships.

Perhaps the controlling barrier to the provision of adequate medical care in recent times has been economic. Illness is unpredictable, and its economic burden
is also unpredictable. A family can ordinarily determine how much of its income will go for rent, clothing or food, but no one can decide in advance what a year's cost of sickness will be. The removal of that barrier seems to require either a compulsory or a voluntary system of insurance on an over-all community basis—an some pre-payment device that would bring, in Winston Churchill's words, "the magic of the averages to the rescue of the millions." In Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and parts of Canada, for example, and in the Scandinavian countries as well, the governments themselves have assumed the responsibility, and the costs of medical care are a charge against government budgets. Here in the United States the large size of the country and a traditional interest in utilizing local initiative have led to a variety of experiments based on the principle of voluntary insurance, but it cannot be said that any one of them thus far fully answers the need.

For a number of years The Rockefeller Foundation has been interested in the development of this problem. It financed the comprehensive study on the cost of medical care that was undertaken some 15 years ago; and more recently it has contributed to studies and experiments of several organizations, including the Committee on Research in Medical Economics, the Group Health Cooperative (in New York City), the Medical Administration Service and the Bingham Associates in Massachusetts.

In 1946 the Foundation underwrote to the extent of $250,000 the Health Insurance Plan for Greater New York. This project, known as the HIP, is preparing to conduct a program of voluntary health insurance in the New York City area for employed persons earning less than $5,000 a year, together with their dependents. Al-
though the provision may be later modified, enrollment is confined to employee groups, with employers contributing at least 50 per cent to cover the employees of their companies. At the moment the HIP is one of the most comprehensive plans for medical service in the country, providing preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic aid which includes laboratory work, X-ray, physical therapy, hospitalization and visiting nurse service at home. The participation of the City of New York and of the United Nations, which have undertaken to join the plan for the benefit of their employees, immediately guarantees that the program will start on a large and representative scale. The presence of several first-class medical schools and teaching hospitals in the New York area offers the opportunity for integrating medical education with a thoroughly modern plan for medical care.

Experiments like the HIP are needed in this period of adjustment between old and new concepts. Not only will these experiments serve to train administrative personnel, but they will throw light on many technical questions relating to group practice, about which we now know far too little, as well as on methods and objectives of medical education. The attainment of an adequate system of medical care is bound to be an evolutionary process which will require study and experimentation over a period of years. It will require open-mindedness, too, and the realization that conceptions of social justice change from generation to generation. Stagnation and death await ideas and social arrangements which have lost their power to grow.

The Campaign Against Mosquitoes

For centuries malaria has thrived on the chaos of war. One of the bitterest series of battles of World War II
was fought over an area whose contact with malaria goes back to immemorial times. From the days of Cicero and Virgil to the latter part of the nineteenth century, literature and history have furnished constant references to the deadliness of the "Roman Airs." Even as late as 1887, over 20,000 people a year died in Italy of this disease.

With the discovery of the malaria parasite and its vector, the Anopheles mosquito, came the long-awaited possibility of freedom from malaria. In 1924 The Rockefeller Foundation, in collaboration with the Italian Health Department, began a demonstration and practical application of scientific principles of malaria control, including and emphasizing an attack on the mosquito vector. Malaria morbidity rates in 1939 had dropped to almost one eighth of what they were in 1924.

A large factor in the reduction of malaria in Italy since 1887 has been the great amount of intelligent land reclamation. Work in the Tiber Delta was begun by the Italian Government between 1885 and 1890, but it was not until after World War I that extensive agricultural drainage and colonization were seriously undertaken. Within a few years, brush, forests and swamps were replaced by farms which supported large herds of cattle, extensive vineyards and market gardens. Modern villages made their appearance, and excellent highways connected every farm with its market center.

But World War II again brought a setback in the struggle against malaria, due to the systematic destruction by the German Army of the great land-reclamation projects. In some areas, such as the plain surrounding Rome, the appearance of the countryside when the Germans were driven back resembled that of 1880 before the earliest advances in land reclamation had been
made. The smashing of pumps, the blocking and mining of canals, and the deliberate diversion of sea and river water tremendously increased the breeding of *Anopheles* malaria mosquitoes, while the customary application of larvicides was rendered hazardous if not impossible.

In the whole of Italy the incidence of malaria in 1944 was five or six times as great as before the war. Indeed, in Littoria Province, south of Rome, malaria rates were 55 times their normal prewar figure.

At the invitation of the Surgeon General of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations of the United States Army, and of the Allied Control Commission for Italy, members of The Rockefeller Foundation Health Commission organized a Malaria Control Demonstration Unit to undertake studies of the use of DDT against a particular type of house-infesting mosquito: the *Anopheles labranchiae*, a malaria vector. Initial studies were made in the region near Naples, with results that were promising enough to warrant a larger and more extensive program in the Campagna di Roma on both sides of the Tiber River. The Naples experience had shown that spraying of buildings was most effective when DDT dissolved in kerosene was used. Armed with knapsack sprayers, teams of workers borrowed from the Hygiene and Health Department for the Commune of Rome systematically covered a 120-square-mile area, spraying the walls and ceilings of every room in every building, from large apartment houses to rabbit hutches. Marshy areas were also sprayed by Army planes with tanks of DDT or Paris green mounted in the bomb-bays.

Weekly inspections for mosquito larvae and adults were made for almost a full year to determine the effectiveness of the measures taken. How effective they were is illustrated by the statement of a member of the
Health Commission team: "The total catch of adults for the 120-square-mile area by our inspectors for the season probably does not equal the number formerly found in one day in one good-sized pigsty." The only new case of malaria infection discovered during the last summer season occurred in a three-month-old infant whose mother was said to have suffered a relapse at the time the baby was born. Thus, it has been shown that where *A. labranchiae* is the only vector, malaria can be controlled through a single application of DDT once a year.

Three times before in the history of the Roman Cam­pagna the abandonment of hydraulic works due to war and the consequent cessation of agriculture brought on a widespread plague of malaria. Each time, two centuries were needed to bring the area back to a normal state of health. The fourth time that war devastated this area, it took one thorough application of DDT to reduce the danger of malaria infection almost to zero.

While the malaria mosquito in Italy is being elimi­nated, its cousins, the yellow fever mosquitoes in Africa, are likewise under attack. In the Dark Continent, cam­paigns are still in the reconnaissance stage. This Review for 1943 reported the reopening of a laboratory in Lagos, Nigeria, to serve as a distribution center for yellow fever vaccine, to supplement yellow fever research in the Foundation’s Entebbe laboratory in the Uganda area in Eastern Africa, and incidentally to start stalking once more the deadly jungle mosquitoes.

The close of the war has brought new vigor to these two laboratories at Lagos and Entebbe. Fresh research personnel has been recruited and the laboratories now closely supplement each other’s programs, working under the joint auspices of the Foundation and the
Colonial Medical Research Service of the British Government in London. The two organizations each contribute half the budget.

A new event in 1946 was a major epidemic of yellow fever extending over 5,000 square miles in Nigeria, but centering in Ogbomosho, one of the many crowded native cities found in the forest areas of that region. There were a number of deaths, but it became clear that this first major outbreak in 15 years was the classic type of urban yellow fever caused by an old enemy, the *Aedes aegypti*. The jungle type of yellow fever is more easily studied in East Africa, where it occurs unmixed with the urban variety and where *aegypti* does not complicate the picture. Jungle yellow fever is caught only by human beings who enter the forest or who live on its outskirts. In this eastern section of the broad African belt the disease is apparently maintained by arboreal mosquitoes and animals until it is transmitted to man.

There is much supporting evidence for the theory that monkeys, whose population in this region is estimated at 400 per square mile, keep yellow fever alive, aided perhaps by a mosquito. The mosquito strongly suspected is the *Aedes africanus*, which breeds in tree holes and at night bites the monkeys which sleep in the trees. This still does not bring yellow fever to the ground where men can catch it. There are, however, certain arboreal monkeys which enter home gardens to steal bananas and thus bring themselves within the range of both men and another mosquito, *Aedes simpsoni*. Contaminated originally by the *africanus* mosquito, the monkey may in turn contaminate the *simpsoni* mosquito, which in its turn relays yellow fever to the human victim.

Much of this comes under the head of enlightened conjecture, but yellow fever research in the African
laboratories is proceeding vigorously, and the mys-
terious activities of African mosquitoes are beginning to
be a little less puzzling than they were formerly.

THE MAGIC-WAND THEORY OF MEDICAL ADVANCE

The increasing availability of money for research in
medicine is beginning to embarrass our medical schools.
Where is the trained personnel coming from to make use
of these funds? The general public has contributed en-
thusiastically to such special causes as infantile paralysis,
cancer, heart disease and tuberculosis. Recently,
through the National Institute of Health and the scien-
tific branches of the armed forces, the Federal Govern-
ment allocated over $6,000,000 for similar specialized
projects.

But from what source are we to get the scientists and
technicians competent to work in these fields? Their
training is a matter of years of preparation and it cannot
be extemporized.

There seems to be a widespread public belief in what
might be called the magic-wand theory of medical ad-
vance. This theory has been stimulated by the dramatic
development in recent years of such remedies as insulin,
penicillin, the sulfa drugs and the blood substitutes.
According to this theory, our research laboratories stand
ready at any time to turn money into scientific discov-
eries; in other words, the bottleneck to further advance
is the lack of funds; with adequate funds we can buy a
cure for cancer or infantile paralysis or any other disease
which afflicts mankind.

The bottleneck, of course, is not the lack of funds; it is
the lack of capable and thoroughly trained investigators
to use the funds. The medical schools, to which we must
look for these investigators, do not possess and cannot
now obtain the fundamental facilities through which alone this increasing demand can be met. Indeed, many of our medical schools are in the position of a cook asked to prepare a wedding feast for which the champagne has been furnished but no water to boil the potatoes.

A survey of American medical schools indicates beyond question that what is urgently needed is not money earmarked for projects, but free funds for the training of physicians. The imposing endowments of former years dwindled during the days of panic and depression; interest rates have been cut; and sources of replenishment have been dried up by heavy taxation or by curtailment of legislative grants. The increased cost of living is tempting—indeed in some cases, is forcing—the teachers of medicine to abandon their work in the medical schools and to take up private practice.

There are in the United States today 70 medical schools offering full four-year courses in medicine. Twenty-four of these receive their major support from state legislatures, and three more are aided by less substantial sums provided by city governments. All the rest are maintained solely by tuition fees, endowment income and gifts. Even the tax-supported schools depend upon private sources for important parts of their programs.

The total budgets of these 70 schools approximate $25,000,000. With this money they must not only produce the doctors we need, but they must carry on most of the country's research into the cause and cure of disease. One of our most famous medical schools has recently reviewed its budget and has decided that even without expanding into new fields—merely to meet reasonably well the responsibilities it is already carrying—
it must spend about double its present appropriation.

Our medical schools desperately need money — but not for projects. They need it for salaries, for basic plant facilities, for clinical services. It is popularly supposed that the foundations can carry the financial responsibility for medical education, but nothing could be further from the truth. The total sum available from foundations for medical education and research is only about $3,000,000 to $4,000,000 annually, and much of it — far too much of it — is restricted to special diseases.

This is not the place for a discussion of further government subvention of education; that subject is certain to receive an active hearing elsewhere. But in so far as our medical schools rely on private support — and many of the best of them do — that support should be intelligent and discriminating. We cannot build research without the foundations of trained personnel. We cannot grow orchids in a greenhouse that lacks coal.

**The War's Effect on Science**

Nothing that war touches escapes blight. There is a popular belief that science made rapid progress between 1939 and 1945, but this belief has little basis for support. It is now generally recognized that the feverish activity of scientists in war time is essentially not scientific. They are primarily engaged in the application of existing knowledge to certain specific and narrow problems. They have no time for pure research, and their contributions to basic knowledge are infrequent and on the whole unimportant. They are drawing on the reserves of the past. They are using up the supply of basic discoveries which an earlier generation has given them. They are digging recklessly into the stock pile of existing knowledge. The gap between knowledge and use in
science is always narrow; the effect of war is to close the gap almost to the vanishing point.

It is not in war but in peace that the advance of knowledge, as distinguished from the application of knowledge, finds its most favorable environment. The practical applications of knowledge are the dividends which basic science from time to time declares. When basic science is even temporarily interrupted, then it is necessary to pay these dividends out of surplus, and obviously this process cannot be long continued without bankruptcy.

It is necessary to drive home the point that war does not contribute to basic science. On the contrary, it blocks its progress and, through perverted applications, debases the whole concept of the dignity and glory of man's conquest of nature.

There is another phase of the matter, equally vicious. War interferes with the proper training of scientific personnel. At least, here in the United States we allowed it to interfere. Like any procedure which expends capital resources without providing means of replenishing them, the interruption of advanced training in the basic sciences seems to cost little at the moment, and it serves an emergency by releasing manpower. But it is a policy of desperation which places a crippling mortgage on the future. It grinds up the seed-corn of scientific progress in the next generation to make a day's feed for the war machine.

The consequences of this unintelligent policy are now upon us. There is a serious, even an alarming, shortage of adequate personnel in almost every field which requires advanced thinking. Whether in physics or chemistry or the biological and medical sciences, the situation
is the same. In subjects like bacteriology, biochemistry, anatomy, biophysics and physiology, it is almost impossible to find younger men with adequate teaching and research qualifications. We have sacrificed the seed-corn. We have lost a generation. Our governmental policy was dictated by considerations of immediate need and was geared to the exigencies of the moment.

But this was not the case in Russia or in England. In both these countries policy was guided by the long view far more effectively than with us. In Russia, students of ability in most branches of science were kept in their laboratories, while Great Britain, with some difficulty to be sure, succeeded not in eliminating, but in minimizing interruption in the training of her future scientific teachers and leaders.

American democracy seems to learn its lessons the hard way. It does not realize, until too late, that human erosion, like soil erosion, can jeopardize the future. Surely out of the bitter experience of this war should come the realization that trained personnel is our most valuable asset in science. It is criminal folly to gamble with the future by policies which dissipate that asset. A nation which loses so much of its technical strength that it runs the risk of being unable to meet the needs of the next generation may find that Pyrrhic victories are as disastrous as defeats.

The Telescope on Mount Palomar

The funds for the erection of the giant 200-inch telescope on Mount Palomar in California have been supplied by three Rockefeller boards: The International Education Board, the General Education Board and The Rockefeller Foundation. In 1946 the Foundation
made a final grant of $250,000 to complete the project, bringing to a total of $6,250,000 the funds appropriated to the California Institute of Technology for this unique instrument of scientific research.

The first grant was made in 1928. The project presented extraordinary engineering and mechanical difficulties, and a number of years elapsed before successful solutions were found for the problems of casting so large a block of suitable glass, of grinding and polishing it to a precise curvature within a few millionths of an inch, and of supporting the huge mass of 530 tons so that the telescope could be moved almost without friction to follow the pinpoint of a star across the skies.

The project was delayed more than four years by the war, but the grinding of the lens is now essentially completed, the supporting structure is ready, and it is expected that final assembly will occur during the summer of 1947, with the whole equipment in operation by the end of the year. This equipment includes not only the 200-inch telescope, but the smaller observatories for the three auxiliary or "scout" telescopes, as well as a dormitory, a power plant, water and gas systems, a small museum and seven cottages for the maintenance staff.

What is the justification for this huge expenditure of money and effort? The answer, in general terms, lies in the unconquerable exploring urge within the mind of man. This new telescope will project man's sight into the universe two times farther than it has ever gone before — to a distance more than a thousand million light-years away. It will open up an unexplored sphere 8 times the volume of that which has hitherto been sounded. What lies beyond the limits of our present knowledge? Do the stellar systems extend on indefinitely, or is a boundary finally reached beyond which
there are fewer and fewer nebulae? What is the true interpretation of the immense velocity with which all the stellar systems appear to be receding? Is it a pseudo-velocity caused by a curvature of space or by some property of light? Why from the dim frontiers of space do the countless Milky Ways send light that with strange uniformity shifts always to the red end of the spectrum? Since stars and nebulae are vast aggregations of atoms or atomic fragments, reacting on each other under conditions of pressure and temperature beyond anything that can be duplicated in man’s laboratories, what secrets can we learn that will add to our knowledge of fundamental physics?

But this knowledge is dangerous, it will be said. Of course it is dangerous. All knowledge is now dangerous. Indeed, knowledge has always been dangerous. For knowledge means power, and power can be used for evil purposes as well as good. But the answer does not lie in trying to curb science or fix boundaries beyond which intellectual adventure shall not be allowed to go. Such a course, even if it could succeed, would return us to an animal existence in which mere survival was the only goal. The search for truth is, as it always has been, the noblest expression of the human spirit. Man’s hunger for knowledge about himself, his environment and the forces by which he is surrounded, gives human life its meaning and purpose, and clothes it with final dignity.

Civilization is not being betrayed by science. The betrayal, if it comes, will be by men who do not know how to use science wisely. The telescope on Mount Palomar is a mighty symbol of man’s unique distinction: his aspiration to know. Whether that distinction will become the instrument of his own destruction depends upon how rapidly he can travel the long road toward goals.
of social organization and moral control that are now only faintly seen on the horizon.

**Telescopes Are Not Enough**

While we cannot put brakes on intellectual adventure, it must be admitted that there is a lack of balance about our studies and our research that imperils the future. The disproportion between the physical power at our disposal and our capacity to make good use of it is growing with every day that passes. We are in the midst of a revolution in our physical environment so vast and so rapid that our minds can scarcely keep up with it. But there are other things that cannot keep up with it, either — notably our social ideas, our habits of life and our political and economic institutions. Our political institutions, for example, are mainly rooted in the eighteenth century, but our swiftly evolving technology is largely a twentieth century phenomenon. We have one foot in a civilization that is dying and another foot in a civilization that is struggling to be born. Consequently we live a kind of bifurcated existence, and the gap between what we know and what we need to know becomes wider and deeper.

As a result there is developing a dangerously tilted situation in our society, an intellectual imbalance, which can no longer be ignored. Our knowledge of human behavior and social relations is not adequate to give us the guidance we need; and the fundamental issue of our time is whether we can develop understanding and wisdom reliable enough to serve as a chart in working out the problems of human relations; or whether we shall allow our present lopsided progress to develop to a point that capsizes our civilization in a catastrophe of immeasurable proportions.
What is needed is a broader basis of research, a more vigorous backing of objective and competent efforts to define and analyze the intricacies of human relationship. We need to know what our social organization is, how it operates, how it will react to alterations and changes. We have created a society so interdependent that issues are no longer simple, individual and local; they are complex, social and world-wide. And they are beyond the experience of most of us. International trade and finance, national income and its distribution, wages, profits, prices, purchasing power, employment and unemployment, collective bargaining, housing, crime, population, agriculture, transportation, and the social, economic and political organizations that deal with these matters — these are a few topics, selected at random, about which we must have deeper and more adequate knowledge if our society is to be kept in equilibrium. Russia has an economy of scarcity; the United States has an economy of abundance. What does this mean in terms of world unity? What are its implications? How can the two economies be reconciled so that they can live in peace together on the same planet?

A prominent figure in Washington recently remarked that we must have "a sufficient mastery of nature so that permanent world peace will be a reality and not a mere hopeful expression of faith." With all due respect, it is this mastery of nature which threatens to blow our civilization into drifting dust. What we really need is a mastery of man's social nature — knowledge and more knowledge of the on-rushing social consequences of our machines, consequences which, because they are too intricate to be easily understood, are shaping our lives to ends we do not want but cannot escape.

The encouraging factor in this whole situation is the
universal ground swell of interest in the direction of greater emphasis on the social sciences— an interest that is developing in colleges and universities everywhere, as well as in public bodies and foundations. This interest is heightened by the proof, which recent years have afforded, that the objective investigation of problems of human relations can produce results of incalculable practical value, when properly trained research workers, imbued with scientific detachment and integrity, are given an opportunity to carry on their activities with adequate resources.

This is the encouraging part of the picture. The discouraging part is that the public generally— and this is true of our legislatures and some of our universities as well— does not appreciate the fact that the problems included in this kind of research are for a variety of reasons far more involved and complex than the problems which the natural scientists are facing. These new problems in social relations cannot be solved by literary pontification, by speeches, by partisan appeals, by emotional surges or amateur efforts. There seems to be a widespread belief that we are all social scientists, all of us are economists; and in this egalitarian democracy of ours any man’s ideas on any problem in sociology are as good as any other man’s. We need to realize that what is true of physics and biology is true in this area also. The same degree of special knowledge is required. Social issues cannot be clearly defined and understood except on the foundation of hard, painstaking work. We must have disciplined minds and the high integrity of objective scholarship; and the flow of first-class talent into these fields must be continuous and uninterrupted.

The same comments could be applied to the humanistic studies. They constitute a counterweight as important as anything in the social sciences if we are to keep
our civilization from capsizing. History, the arts, philosophy, ethics, languages and literatures—we cannot bring our world together in any kind of unity unless we build a foundation of understanding in fields like these. Here, too, we need knowledge and scholarship. It is an unhappy omen that while other nations concede to the United States a certain leadership in scientific and technological fields, few concede us any leadership at all in the realm of ideas. Only rarely is the American delegation at an international conference in any humanistic field the most distinguished group there. It is well known that our relations with Latin American peoples have been handicapped by the fact that they turn to Europe rather than to us for intellectual stimulation.

Support of humanistic study in the United States has lagged far behind that given to any other group of disciplines. It has been estimated that less than one per cent of all money spent in the United States for research and scholarly work is spent in the field of the humanities. Our age is so absorbed by the scientific spirit with its passion for exact measurements that we almost come to believe that because the cultural side of human life eludes those measurements, it can be divorced from the search for truth, or at least be shunted to a side-track, while the express goes through on the main line. Every contribution of the physical and social sciences to the problems of society is to be welcomed; but to expect those sciences to meet the spiritual hunger for hope and belief and beauty and permanent values is a form of superstition as withering as any which humanity has thus far outlived.

Certainly in our search for the means to control our own fate we must not overlook the possibility that the unity of mankind may be achieved by art or music, a
poem or a song, perhaps more effectively and more lastingly than by engineering or medicine or economics.

This discussion can perhaps best be summed up in two sentences by Lord Stamp, whose death in a London air raid was one of the great losses of the war: "Any truth is many sided, even simple truth. But the complex truth of today needs approach by many different methods and by many different types of mind before we can arrive at even an approximation of the truth."

It is not a segment of the truth that will make us free. Not alone by telescopes and test tubes can man survive. In a world that threatens to brush aside everything that intelligence stands for, the social sciences and the humanistic studies must be pushed with daring and determination.

Work in the Social Sciences

The Rockefeller Foundation in 1946 gave a larger degree of support to the social sciences than in many years past. The grants fell in four primary fields: international relations, economic research, problems in the functioning of American political democracy, and research and training agencies. Altogether $2,633,677 was appropriated for these purposes during the year. The Rockefeller Foundation is under no illusions that its grants in this area do more than touch the edge of the problems which challenge us. It can only hope that out of the activity which it has assisted will come some new approaches, some clarification of objectives, some trained personnel that will contribute to a more adequate understanding of human relations.

International Relations

The grants in this field went to agencies which conduct research and education designed to strengthen the
foundations for a more enlightened public opinion and more consistent public policies. Appropriations were made, for example, for certain strategic histories, so that the record of past successes and failures may be available for the guidance of the future. Thus, a grant was made to the Royal Institute of International Affairs of London to enable Dr. Frank Walters to write a history of the League of Nations. Another grant was made to the Council on Foreign Relations for a history of American foreign policy from 1939 to 1946 to be prepared by Dr. William Langer of Harvard. This parallels the grant of $152,000 made in 1945 to the Royal Institute to enable Arnold Toynbee to write a history of international relations from 1939 to 1949. An appropriation of $300,000 was made to the Food Research Institute of Stanford University for the preparation, in collaboration with experts from many countries, of a history and appraisal of the world's experience in handling food and agriculture during World War II. Another grant was for the purpose of assisting the United Nations Information Office to reproduce the documentation of the First General Assembly and Preparatory Commission of the United Nations. The Brookings Institution was given a fund which will enable Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, who was Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Organization and Security Affairs, to analyze the background of the development of the United Nations organization and to initiate studies and educational conferences on the problems that are emerging in the functioning of our new international machinery. Two grants were made that deal with the question of the social implications of atomic power — one to the University of Chicago and the other to Cornell University.

Grants for general research support in the total
amount of roughly $545,000 were also made to the following international relations agencies for studies, conferences and public education:

The Canadian Institute for International Affairs
The Institute of Pacific Relations
The Swedish Institute of International Affairs
The Institute of Economics and History at Copenhagen
The Centre d'Etudes de Politique Etrangère at Paris
The Christian Michelsen Institute in Norway
The Council on Foreign Relations
The Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies

ECONOMIC RESEARCH

The future course of political events in the world will be determined in large degree by the wisdom with which we guide or manage our economy. Wisdom in economic affairs cannot be achieved by rhetoric or force. The slow process of reason, of deepening understanding, of training competent experts, must go forward at many centers of research in many lands. The Rockefeller Foundation aided these efforts during 1946, by grants in the total amount of $370,825 to the following institutions:

University of Cambridge — Department of Applied Economics
Dutch Economic Institute — General budget
University of Oslo — Institute of Economics
University of Pennsylvania — Industrial Research Department — Labor relations
Yale University — Labor and Management Center
University of California — Bureau of Business and Economic Research
University of Manchester — Economics Research Section
University of Chicago — Industrial history
Nankai University — Institute of Economics

THE FUNCTIONING OF AMERICAN POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

Observers abroad frequently comment on the contrast between our industrial power to produce and our
political and administrative ineptitude. Certainly the development of social and moral wisdom in our collective life is a task of the highest priority, although no single organization can do more than sow a few seeds.

In 1946 four or five modest grants were made in support of studies in the functioning of American political democracy. An appropriation was voted to the University of Alabama for a study of the electoral process in the South under the direction of Professor Roscoe C. Martin. The University of Minnesota received a grant for research in the conflict and coordination of intergovernmental relations viewed from the standpoint of their interaction in one state — Minnesota. The University of Wisconsin received a grant for a study of the problems of housing, and an appropriation was made to the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Virginia. Further support was also given to Miami University for the demographic studies which are proving so fruitful.

**RESEARCH AND TRAINING AGENCIES**

Support was voted in the total amount of $16,000 to the following basic agencies in the social science field:

- The Social Science Research Council
- The Canadian Social Science Research Council
- Johns Hopkins University

In addition, the sum of $350,000 was appropriated in the social sciences for fellowships and grants in aid administered directly by the Foundation.

**OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE**

The history of our own culture and institutions here in America has been for many years a relatively neglected field. To be sure, the College of William and Mary offered a course in American history as early as 1731, but there were apparently no imitators among other
colleges before 1800, and it was not until a century later that the first chair of American literature was established.

As a result of this neglect—or rather, perhaps, the preoccupation of our scholarship with other fields—whole areas of American life and tradition are only now beginning to be explored at all adequately, areas such as our economic, social and intellectual history, the history of our science, medicine and technology, as well as of our art, music and drama. As yet only a beginning has been made in the study of the rich regional cultures which nourish whatever national culture today exists in the United States and Canada.

No nation can manage its future which does not understand its past. Research and study are needed of the bases of our American habits and traditions—a wider knowledge of who we are and where and what we came from, a fuller interpretation of American life to enable us to comprehend what we possess today and on what our tomorrow can be built.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that an interest of this kind involves no narrow nationalistic aim. The culture of the one world in the making is necessarily compounded of the diverse contributions of many peoples. Until a nation understands itself in relation to its own culture, it cannot intelligently harmonize and integrate its life into the larger pattern.

For ten years The Rockefeller Foundation has been interested in promoting the field of American studies, and appropriations of roughly a million dollars have been made for this purpose. For the most part the Foundation has concentrated its support on interpretative studies which utilize and tend to give form and relevance to what is known. Three grants in 1946 il-
illustrate the present range of the Foundation’s activity in this area. The first allows for grants in aid by the Texas State Historical Association to men and women working on the interpretation of the Southwest. The grant also includes provision for a share of the editorial expense involved in the completion of *The Texas Handbook*, a compendium of Texas history and biography.

The second grant, to the University of Wisconsin, contributes toward studies of the process of the transformation of Wisconsin from “a wilderness lightly tied to Western civilization” to a highly developed and integrated segment of American life.

The third grant, to Northwestern University, will enable Professor Baker Brownell of the Department of Philosophy to devote a substantial portion of his time to continuing in other sections of the country studies of the kind he directed in the so-called Montana Study, studies dealing with the problems of the individual citizen in his participation in the community.

It is a significant fact that interest in American history and culture is developing in European institutions. Since the war the Foundation has made provision for visits to the United States of seven scholars responsible for North American studies in their universities. In addition, grants were made in three instances—at Cambridge, Oslo and Upsala—for working collections of books needed by these scholars and their students.

**The Meeting of West and East**

One of the important tasks of our generation—and perhaps it is the most imperative of all—is to find ways by which the ideological chasms which now divide the world can be bridged. We live in a time of political and economic diversity and cultural conflict far more
acute than anything our modern civilization has before known. It is not merely the Soviet system *versus* the West; ideological stresses and strains are present everywhere—China against the West, for example, India against the West, the Near East against the West. Somehow or other a basis must be found for accommodating the differing political aspirations and the conflicting cultural ideals of Eastern civilization and our own.

It is easy to preach tolerance. It is easy to say that irreconcilable and dynamic beliefs can live side by side in peace in the same world. But as the situation is developing now, there may not be time to achieve this tolerance. We may be moving toward catastrophe without even the desire to examine objectively the nature of the differences that divide us or to explore the possibility that widely separated cultures could reinforce and sustain rather than combat and destroy one another.

Perhaps the main difficulty in the situation is that the East and West do not understand each other. We know too little of each other's history or traditions. Only within the last decade has interest in Chinese and Slavonic studies been seriously awakened in the United States, and even now there is little appreciation of the impact which Eastern aspirations and culture are bound to make upon the West as the Orient stirs to new life. China, for example, is beginning to speak with authority, as a proud people, with a civilization thousands of years older than that of the West. In a recent address T. V. Soong, President of the Executive Yuan of China's National Government, sounded a new note: "Asia is tired of being regarded only in terms of markets and concessions, or as a source of rubber, tin and oil, or as furnishing human chattels to work the raw materials."
Since 1933 The Rockefeller Foundation has been trying to stimulate a widening interest in the languages, history, cultures and traditions of the East. Up to the present time approximately a million dollars has been appropriated for this purpose — a relatively modest amount when compared with the need. In 1946 five grants were made through the Division of the Humanities in continuation of this program. Two of the grants were for work in Europe, one to the Chinese Institute at the University of Leiden and the other for the development of Far Eastern studies at the University of Stockholm. Leiden’s Institute, under Professor J. J. L. Duyvendak, promises to become, in the next few years, the leading center for Far Eastern studies in Western Europe. The work in Stockholm is organized to benefit students of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and represents a collaborative effort of high promise.

A third grant was to the Institute of Pacific Relations for the preparation of English translations of source materials on Chinese history. The volumes which will be produced will be the first works in a western language to present the essential elements of Chinese history from original texts.

Since 1935 Princeton University has been developing studies of the more recent phases of Near Eastern life and tradition. Not only does it specialize in the languages of the Near East, but courses are given in the culture, religion, history and political institutions of the area, with a two-year graduate course designed to train for governmental, educational or business service. In 1946 The Rockefeller Foundation granted $42,500 for the development of this work.

The Hoover Institute for Slavonic Studies at Stanford University possesses unique resources for the advanced study of recent Slavic history and institutions.
Purchases and gifts of materials since 1917 cover all classes of documentation on historical events of European and Asiatic countries for the past 30 years. No other American library has comparable holdings on the Soviet Union, and these resources are now being systematically increased by purchasing agents in Central Europe, in Japan and in China. The Institute is in a strategic position to make its library one of the great centers of present and future scholarship in Slavic fields. In 1946 The Rockefeller Foundation appropriated $200,000 for research fellowships and administrative and service costs.

In this connection, mention might be made of the appropriations, voted in 1946, through the Foundation's Division of the Social Sciences, of $233,000 to the Institute of Pacific Relations, $60,000 of which went to the American Council and $173,000 to the Pacific Council. Much of the work of this organization is related to the training of personnel, the stimulation of language study and the conduct of research on problems of the Far East. It is part of the pattern by which, from many different directions and points of view, efforts are being made to bring the West and the East into closer understanding.

Colleges in China

China at the moment is a tragic country, with internal dissensions which seem irreconcilable. But in the long view the picture is not necessarily dark. Time has always been on China's side. Her history and culture go back thousands of years and there have been many periods in the past when conflict and civil war have torn her apart.

The Chinese have a physical and spiritual vitality, a
recuperative power, which is almost unique. They have learned how to surmount disaster, how to keep their social and aesthetic values vigorous and alive under pressures of demoralization and chaos. They are an extraordinarily gifted people, and unless global calamity overwhelms us all, they are destined to make a contribution to the life of man incalculable in its beneficial consequences.

At the moment they need help. The war with Japan has brought unparalleled dislocation in all phases of Chinese life. This is particularly true of educational institutions, just now struggling to keep alive against a crippling inflation.

There are 13 Chinese colleges and universities that in the past have been supported, in part at least, by American funds. Plans are now under way by which these 13 institutions, through federation and amalgamation, will be reduced to eight. Thus the University of Fukien is expected to combine with Hwa Nan, Nanking with Ginling; and one university is contemplated in the Shanghai area instead of four. In 1946 these institutions undertook a joint campaign in the United States for the means of restoration and rehabilitation. The Rockefeller Foundation was happy to be able to contribute $500,000 for this purpose.

INVESTING IN MEN

No money is ever wasted which is invested in the training of men. This is a principle to which the Foundation has subscribed for more than three decades. During this period, funds totaling $21,000,000 have been appropriated for advanced training through approximately 8,000 fellowships in all countries of the world and in practically all fields, from sanitary engineering to
Shakespearean scholarship. The results in terms of intellectual leadership and achievement have been gratifying beyond anything that was contemplated when the fellowship system was first inaugurated, and in the opinion of the Foundation no money which it has ever spent has brought such substantial returns. It has been an investment in brains, an underwriting of promising talent, and its consequences are today evident in many parts of the world.

In 1946 The Rockefeller Foundation continued and increased its regular fellowship programs and made certain special appropriations to help in the restoration of wartime losses in leadership. Two hundred thirty-six regular post doctoral fellowships were granted directly by the Foundation to citizens of 25 different countries. In addition, during the year, 65 regular postdoctoral fellowships were awarded from funds appropriated by the Foundation to citizens of the United States and Canada; these awards were made by the National Research Council in the fields of the natural and medical sciences, the Social Science Research Council in the social sciences, and the American Council of Learned Societies in the humanities. In 1946, too, under similar arrangements, the British Medical Research Council awarded advanced postdoctoral fellowships to eight British citizens.

During the last three years, the Foundation's fellowship programs have also included a type of award which varies from the usual procedure. After the United States entered the war, many of the promising young men and women who normally would have completed their technical training joined the armed services or worked in war laboratories or in other emergency government posts. To give some of them, at least, an opportunity to make up the training they had lost, the Foundation
instituted a series of emergency postwar fellowships. The usual stipulations as to age, academic status and future prospects were frequently waived. For some appointees the Foundation's aid supplemented the provisions of the G.I. Bill of Rights; for others, ineligible for these provisions, the Foundation underwrote the full cost. In the case of the natural sciences and the social sciences, the Foundation gave funds for postwar fellowships to be allocated by the appropriate national councils; in the medical sciences, awards were provided through 26 different medical schools. In the field of the humanities the Foundation operated directly. During 1946, 342 such fellowships were granted. Since 1943 the Foundation has appropriated $1,693,000 for this purpose, and 591 fellowships have been awarded from these appropriations. It is hardly necessary to add that these funds, although considerable, have been completely inadequate to meet the need.

Related to these postwar fellowships were appropriations designed to supply leadership in a field which war needs proved to be relatively undeveloped in the United States. During 1946, from funds given by the Foundation, 39 fellowships and scholarships in advanced applied mathematics were awarded by Brown University and New York University. Since 1942, $195,000 has been appropriated for this purpose, and assistance has been given to 153 individuals.

The Foundation's regular fellowships, its postwar fellowships, its postwar predoctoral fellowships, and the special grants for developing trained personnel in advanced mathematics are all concerned, of course, with younger men, those who are the potential intellectual leaders of the future. But there are older men of established reputation whom the war has shut off from contact with the scholarship of other nations. To meet this
situation, the Foundation expanded its program of travel grants, a technique hitherto employed for more specific purposes. These grants, providing travel and living expenses, enable the scholar to spend several months in resuming contacts with his colleagues in other countries. A total of 129 visitors, citizens of 27 different countries, were assisted during 1946. Of these, 17 each were from the United States and Great Britain, 12 from Czechoslovakia, 11 each from France and Norway, 8 from Denmark, 6 each from Mexico and Finland, 5 each from Poland and Yugoslavia, 4 each from Canada and Sweden, 3 from Belgium, and 2 each from Colombia, the Philippines, the Dominican Republic, Greece, India and Switzerland. Eight additional countries received single grants. The Foundation also made grants to institutions in France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Syria and the United States for the same purpose. Altogether, the Foundation gave $271,482 in travel grants during 1946.

The General Education Board

The largest single appropriation made by the Foundation in 1946 was $7,500,000 to the General Education Board for its work during the five-year period beginning in 1947. The General Education Board was founded by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., in 1902 for work in the field of education within the limits of the United States. It is an independent entity, with no legal connection with the Foundation, separately incorporated and handling its own funds. In the 44 years of its existence its total appropriations have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From principal</td>
<td>$162,824,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From income</td>
<td>124,824,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$287,649,529</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This expenditure falls into the following general classifications:

Universities and Colleges
  General Endowment, Buildings, Facilities and Current Expenses $ 55,575,862
  Teachers' Salaries 44,220,035
  Medical Sciences 98,835,792
  Natural Sciences 18,183,969
  Social Sciences 1,714,061
  Humanities 6,823,986
  Libraries 4,746,452
  Agricultural Education and Research 1,551,056
  Other Purposes 639,204
  Science of Education 25,784,792
  Public Education 13,577,181
  Agricultural Demonstration Work 1,180,870
  Fellowships and Scholarships 3,444,826
  Grants in Aid 1,457,589
  Miscellaneous 2,140,496
  Administration 7,773,158

$287,649,529*

The General Education Board has never hesitated to dip into its principal funds to support projects that seemed of outstanding importance. As the natural result of this policy, the Board has at last come practically to the end of its resources, except for the sum of $10,000,000 which, several years ago, was set aside as a capital fund for administrative expenses.

In recent years the program of the Board has been almost exclusively confined to the promotion of educa-

* This total may be divided as follows:
  White $200,770,248
  Negro 51,293,405
  General 35,585,876

$287,649,529

© 2003 The Rockefeller Foundation
tion in our southern states. One need present no argument to establish the fact that the South, despite its known potentialities and its recognized achievements, lags seriously behind the rest of the United States in many essentials. Whether measured by available investment capital, effective economic opportunity, personal and public incomes, state and local political administration, health and social welfare, or educational facilities, the comparative position of the southern region is one of disadvantage. The presence of 10,000,000 Negroes in the population — the major part of the Negroes in the United States — imposes burdens unequalled in other parts of the country and complicates many undertakings which are fundamental to the progress of the South.

While gratifying and truly significant advance has been made during the past 40 years in the development of educational institutions in this area, the need and the opportunity for the types of service the General Education Board has rendered, and under its charter is designed to render, have not substantially decreased during the life of this Board. Indeed, in some respects conditions in the South today are not as favorable as formerly. This is especially true in relation to the economic basis of southern life. The South is predominantly rural and agricultural. The introduction of farm machinery, the heavy loss and depletion of agricultural lands, and the drastic shrinkage of foreign markets for the leading cash crops of the area have dislocated and impoverished great numbers of the people and have restricted employment opportunities, private earnings and public revenues, with all the resultant limitations. Extensive readjustments in the economic life of the South, both agricultural and industrial, are now under
way. The need for their intelligent guidance is paramount if the South is to find a basis for the support of its own cultural institutions; and it is only through research and education that the goal will be achieved.

Perhaps no private agency or foundation is as well known or as widely respected in the South as the General Education Board. By working with regularly constituted agencies and institutions, by dealing realistically and helpfully with timely opportunities to advance long-term objectives, by backing sound educational leadership when it appears, and by assistance in the development of personnel through fellowships and training grants, the Board has played what seems to be a useful and constructive part in the development of southern education.

The Trustees of The Rockefeller Foundation felt that the work of the Board was too significant — not only to the South but to the nation — to be allowed to lapse, and the grant was made which will permit the Board's activities to continue, although on a reduced scale.

Applications Which Were Declined During 1946

During 1946 the Foundation was obliged to decline a total of 1,839 applications for financial aid, as compared with 1,028 in 1945. Although the increase was evident in all categories, 875, or 45 per cent, were from foreign sources. Some of these applications represented projects of interest to the Foundation but were declined because other opportunities seemed more promising. The great majority, however, were declined because they fell outside the areas of work in which the Foundation is attempting to be of service.

The Foundation does not make gifts or loans to individuals, or finance patents or altruistic movements in-
volving private profit, or contribute to the building or maintenance of churches, hospitals or other local organizations, or support campaigns to influence public opinion.

The applications which were declined during 1946 may be classified under the following headings: conferences and meetings, 13; continued aid to projects, 44; cures, remedies, investigations of theories and inventions, 59; development of educational and cultural institutions and projects, 209; European refugees, 46; fellowships, travel and training grants, 681; local institutions (including hospitals, theaters, libraries, museums and churches), 180; personal and medical aid, 68; public health projects, 30; publication projects, 72; research projects, 319; miscellaneous, 118.
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PURPOSE

THE Council on Foreign Relations is a non-partisan and non-commercial organization studying the international aspects of America's political, economic, strategic, and financial problems. It is not a trade organization and has no connection with any political party. Its membership is composed of men of many professions, with a variety of interests and views.

The Council holds meetings and conferences. It also carries on a program of research and publication.

The Council publishes the quarterly review, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, which has established itself as the most authoritative journal dealing with international relations.

The research staff of the Council prepares an annual survey of the foreign relations of the United States, an annual political handbook of the world, and individual volumes on special international questions.

The Council maintains a reference library in charge of a competent staff.

The Council's headquarters are at the Harold Pratt House, 58 East 68th Street, New York 21, where all the organization's activities are centered.
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