

**The Role of the Ford Foundation in  
Shaping Family Planning Communication Policies in India**

**Shashwati Goswami**

*Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission, but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent. Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is an ongoing publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) under the general direction of James Allen Smith, Vice President of the RAC and Director of Research and Education. Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the RAC. These reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, most of whom have received grants-in-aid from the Archive Center to support their research.*

*The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and not of the Rockefeller Archive Center.*

India was the first country to undertake family planning as an official policy. It was also the first to develop an organized family planning communication process. The Ford Foundation led the field of family planning communication from the very beginning, and because the Foundation was already involved with India's family planning program, it was natural for its officers to expand their work into communications as well.

In 1959, after being involved with family planning in India for almost seven years, the Ford Foundation made its first attempt to help the program financially. In May 1959 Donald Ensminger, the Foundation's representative in India, wrote to Lieutenant Colonel B. L. Raina, India's Director of Family Planning, about "possible Ford Foundation assistance for strengthening the communication aspects of the Family Planning Program," suggesting that the Foundation begin a "five year Family Planning Action-Research-Training Program in Communication... in three to five geographic areas." The objective of the exercise would be

“scientifically to determine the role of all available methods of communicating information about family planning, for attracting interest, for gaining acceptances and for motivating continuous use of family planning practices.” He proposed basing such communication in a “sympathetic appreciation of local beliefs and attitudes,” and devising a “comprehensive educational program... to bring understanding of family planning principles and motivate adoption of whichever family planning practices are most acceptable.” He suggested a few areas in which the Foundation could help. These included funding for infrastructure and fellowships abroad, placing a Ford Foundation specialist in the office of the Director of Family Planning, and forming a Family Planning Communication Research Committee.<sup>1</sup>

In June 1959 Lt. Col. Raina responded to Ensminger that “the proposal on the communication aspect of the family planning program is under consideration and I will let you know at your Delhi address immediately some decision is reached.” The Indian government did not take long to decide. Raina wrote back in July of the same year that the Ministry of Health was ready to consider the first two proposals, of infrastructure and fellowships. It rejected outright, however, the idea of having a Foundation representative in India’s Family Planning office as well as the creation of a research committee on family planning communication.<sup>2</sup>

Other evidence suggests that Indian officials were, in fact, interested in those parts of Ensminger’s proposal. According to John and Pat Caldwell, “as early as May 16, 1957 Ensminger was [*sic*] reported to F.F. Hill that Colonel Raina had talked jointly to him and to Marshall Balfour, representing the Rockefeller Foundation, about developing educational materials for the Indian family planning program.”<sup>3</sup> In a 1970 report, moreover, Edward M. Humberger, a Ford Foundation family planning training associate, hinted that there had indeed been a “formal request for Foundation assistance” from the Indian government.<sup>4</sup>

Whatever the reality, in 1959 the Ford Foundation approved a grant of \$330,000 to the government of India for a period of approximately five years to assist in developing research on the communication aspect of the government's family planning program.<sup>5</sup> The grant focused mainly on: 1) strengthening the office of the Directorate of Family Planning with a qualified Indian public health physician and behavioral scientists; 2) administering a program of grants for small research projects in the preventive medicine departments of medical colleges or in the behavioral science departments of universities; 3) establishing and operating an action-research unit in the same departments of such institutions; 4) instituting a training program for equipping personnel in the research methods of this field; and 5) providing for a program of "higher training abroad for Indian personnel who will be leaders in this field."<sup>6</sup>

The Ford Foundation made the requirements and objectives of the training program and fellowships quite clear. The Foundation expected trainees to "head one of the field research project areas which would involve coordination of a fairly large family planning action program..."<sup>7</sup> The Foundation accordingly undertook elaborate discussions with various universities in the US regarding the training curriculum. The program's major requirements consisted of general training in public health, behavioral sciences, and health education, along with supervised field work in countries where family planning has been already developed. Correspondence between the Foundation's New Delhi and New York offices shows that the New York-based Institute of International Education (IIE) also took part in developing communication research related to family planning.<sup>8</sup> The Ford Foundation allotted amounts of \$89,000 and \$120,500 to IIE to finance eighteen new fellowships for 1962-63.<sup>9</sup>

The Foundation commissioned a number of narrative reports out of the \$330,000 grant.<sup>10</sup> During the period of 1965-69 the program conducted a total of eleven studies in various Indian

states. The Central Family Planning Institute undertook two of them, the Planning Research and Action Institute did another, and the Ford Foundation itself ran a third study under the direction of M.W. Freyman. H.W. Mitchell, an independent consultant, conducted another six. Mitchell also ran four more studies in 1967. The Institute of Economic Growth of the University of Delhi initiated another study and the Ministry of Health had done two others in 1960. These studies, however, were mostly experimental.

It is not clear how the Indian government's initial reservations about setting up a Communication Action Research Committee vaporized, but in 1960 the government established a Central Family Planning Communication Action Research Committee (hereafter, Central FPCAR Committee). The Indian Ministry of Health constituted the committee with the following as members: Prof. P.N. Mahalanobis, Hony Statistical Adviser of the Cabinet Secretariat, S. N. Ranade, the Principal of the Delhi School of Social Work, the Ministry of Health's Financial Advisor, the Director of Central Health Education, Donald Ensminger, the Ford Foundation's representative, the Commissioner of Family Planning, and Lt. Col. Raina. The committee had the authority to bring in outside members as well.<sup>11</sup>

During the early 1960s the Ford Foundation also employed a team of consultants who spent much of their time advising the centers and helping them develop constructive programs. Prominent Ford-appointed family planning communication consultants in India included Moyer Freyman and his wife Katherine Freyman. In May 1962 George F. Gant of the Ford Foundation in New York wrote to Ensminger about the appointment of Dr. Betty Mathews and Dr. Dorothy Nyswander, specialists in family planning communication research, as health education consultants for India. The Indian family planning program, Gant wrote, had been using the Directorate of Audio Visual Publicity of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for most

of its broad-scale communications program. With the help of Dr. Nyswander and the Freymans, these publicity services could be further rationalized so as to focus on target groups. A lot of data was being gathered regarding the factors that influenced the acceptance of family planning, but much of it remained unprocessed. Gant hoped that the consultants could help to exploit this information as well. The Foundation also planned field evaluations of these efforts for the first time, and there were further plans to observe one day of the year as a special family planning day involving village leaders, among others. These two consultants, according to the letter, had experience in developing community education programs with a social research background. Gant made a case for there being a special need for such consultants and asserted that they could be hired using the money earmarked for fellowships and training abroad. The letter ended by emphasizing that “these two consultants would not only be essential for the communication research work, but could also make major contributions to the planning and implementation of the Intensive Districts Program and the new National Institute of Health Administration and Education.”<sup>12</sup>

In March 1961 the Foundation approved a second grant for communication research in family planning, this one of \$603,000. In 1961 and 1962, the Central FPCAR Committee selected the following six institutions as the centers through which action research could be undertaken:

- The Central Health Education Bureau New Delhi, which was transferred to the Central Family Planning Institute in 1964
- The Demographic Training and Research Center, Bombay, 1961
- The Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, June 1962
- The Department of Statistics, University of Kerala, Trivandrum, November 1961

- The Institute of Rural Health and Family Planning, Gandhigram, July 1962
- The Planning Research and Action Institute, Lucknow, February 1963<sup>13</sup>

The Central FPCAR Committee defined the purpose and methodology of the action research program as “to help build an effective national family planning program” and “to test and demonstrate improved techniques of motivation and communication about family planning techniques to be incorporated into the national program.”<sup>14</sup>

The Central FPCAR Committee was to focus on “knowledge, attitude and practice” (KAP), to ascertain the reasons why family planning was not being accepted, to design and administer an action program testing out a hypothesis and, finally, to evaluate effectiveness in relation to a baseline survey. To conduct the action program, each center selected a demonstration area where in most instances the center organized a communication program in cooperation with the existing family planning staff and clinics. The Central FPCAR Committee also made research grants to eleven other institutions spread over Maharashtra, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, and Bihar in the years 1962-67 for subjects ranging from family interpersonal relations to district action research programs. The Committee sought to incorporate as many places as possible and to spread the research over a wide area.

The Central Family Planning Institute served as the program’s principal coordinating agency. The Department of Family Planning, however, also created a social science research unit to look after various programs in demography and communication action research. A number of workshops were organized that enabled researchers from FPCAR centers to exchange notes as well as to develop a standardized methodology and to learn from each other.

During the grant period the Foundation made three important changes in the grants to relate them more effectively to the actual needs of the program:

The Foundation transferred an amount of \$32,400 from staff support to the fund for research grants to Indian institutions at the Indian government's request.

In June 1962, the ministry requested that the Foundation provide funds for more fellowships than had been planned, and the Foundation therefore shifted funds from the foreign consultant budget line to the fellowships line.

Because the ministry could arrange its own financing to set up the three centers, the grant amount of \$543,231 was withdrawn. The ministry utilized it for other needs of its family planning program, which required foreign exchange.<sup>15</sup>

The Ford Foundation's own views regarding the communication research program, however, started to take a different turn by the mid-1960s. In 1965, Rey M. Hill, the Foundation's deputy representative, wrote to Douglas Ensminger about the "unhappy situation" of the two grants. According to Hill, the first grant was never satisfactorily accounted for. Yet the unused amount had been transferred to the 1961 grant, bringing the total to \$692,500. Of this, an amount of \$68,100 was retained for expenditures in the states, conducted under the Foundation's supervision. The letter goes on to say that the Ministry of Family Planning had received sufficient funding from the Indian government and therefore never needed the money. Yet the ministry wanted that fund to reimburse the past expenditures for which they were unable to give firm accounting.<sup>16</sup>

It is interesting to note that even though Foundation officers understood that the ministry did not need the money, they still never considered withdrawing it. Rather, they decided to add that remaining money to the \$1.9 million earmarked to help India accelerate family planning under the circumstances that prevailed in 1965. Foundation officers were also not very sure whether they should allocate the money for post-expenditure payment, as the Indian government

was asking, or to take a tougher stand to hold back the entire \$549,900. In Hill's opinion, the second option would have been more helpful for the family planning program, as otherwise it might also create embarrassment for Lt. Col. Raina. He added, however, that refunding would be "on the side of progress."<sup>17</sup> The Foundation thus ultimately decided that the remaining amount of \$543,300 for communication research would be spent on vehicles, equipment, and the like.

In 1969, Robert Queener, assistant to the Foundation's representative in India, submitted a grant evaluation report suggesting that the area in which the projects had been least successful was in developing the necessary central leadership for the FPCAR program. The two central government research coordinators that the grant document had specified had never been appointed. Most FPCAR center operatives felt the action research and family planning programs remained disconnected. Family planning communication research, however, had been effectively institutionalized, particularly in the six FPCAR centers.<sup>18</sup>

In 1967, the Assistant Director of the CFPI's Social Research Division, Dr. Kamala Gopal Rao, prepared a compendium on *Social Research Related to Family Planning in India* wherein she discussed the various projects taken up by the FPCAR centers.<sup>19</sup> In 1969, a sociologist in the Social Research Division, Dr. D.C. Dubey, also published a report on *Family Planning Communication Studies in India*, in which he analyzed the findings of the family planning communication programs.<sup>20</sup> These studies clearly find that family planning communication action research had been successfully institutionalized and that government support as well as leadership had been adequately established.

In his 1969 report Queener observed that the findings of the Dubey and the Rao studies neither found an immediate audience in the Department of Family Planning nor were incorporated in the family planning program. According to the two reports, Queener noted,



Bhatia believed that senior administrative officials were never convinced that communication research was necessary or that it could inject new wisdom into the program. Dubey and Rao held Bhatia responsible for the failure to create a departmental coordinating cell and to maintain close supervisory contact with the research centers. They also observed that although the FPCAR centers conducted a number of research endeavors, many of the centers used relatively unsophisticated statistical research methods and had taken samples that were too small to enable a reliable conclusion that could be regarded as representative of a larger population. Inadequate guidance by the Central government had also resulted in lack of clarity in the research standard.

Queener remarked that during the grant period twenty-four people were sent on study fellowships abroad, mainly to the US. The goal of the training was to produce competent health educators fully conversant with communication action research. The fellowship scheme did help a few of the FPCAR centers, but its results were far below target. Interestingly, three of the FPCAR centers did not send any trainees for the fellowship. Ford Foundation also sponsored seven health educators from India to attend a conference organized by IPPF in Singapore in February 1963.<sup>21</sup>

Fellowships in various subjects were also offered by other organizations during the grant period. The Population Council offered ten of these and the Worcester Foundation offered five. Bhatia notes that in 1962-63, the Ford Foundation sent 14 people to the US on fellowship in the area of Communication and Education and offered two people fellowships in India itself.

In April 1963, Lt. Col. Raina prepared the document "Family Planning Program, Report for 1962-63," which basically narrated the activities of the family planning program during that period.<sup>22</sup> In the document, he accepted that "the extension education wing of the program is yet to be fully developed." He added, however, that "a great deal has been done to increase people's

general awareness of family planning.” As examples, he listed the printing and distribution of posters, pamphlets, folders, films being produced, leaders’ camps being organized, and so on. The document contains a few comparatively vague lines on communication research, but does not spell out the objective and the approach being undertaken.

According to the 1970 report compiled by Edward M. Humberger, these initial grants “moved the Foundation even more into the forefront as an innovator and change agent... [with this] New York made clear its commitment to India’s population program.” He felt that the initial grants could be considered successful in their own right, and that “the real success was that in spite of a cautious and hesitant environment a role of leadership was established.”<sup>23</sup>

By the time of the Third Five Year Plan, another Ford grant was in the offing to the tune of \$12 million. According to Humberger, the Foundation’s consultants had been very closely associated with the government during the preparation of India’s five year plans, which allowed them to identify many gaps in the program, gaps that the grant proposed to address. The grant included a provision for “continued research and training in the communication aspects of family planning to provide a sound basis for educational effort.” The Foundation proposed a sum of \$800,000. Of this, \$500,000 was earmarked for a communication research program and \$300,000 for training in social psychological research. The Foundation revised the proposal, however, because, as Humberger explained, “New York stated that it did not consider it wise to provide the total rupee cost... because it would give the impression that these program phases were Ford Foundation property as well as an impression that they constituted a foundation program.”<sup>24</sup> To this Humberger added, almost as a passing thought, that the situation of the US in respect to foreign expenditures was also not very conducive, and hence, “New York felt a

social responsibility not to aggravate the balance of payment situation...” The Foundation therefore excluded Communication from the grant.

A document entitled “Family Planning in India and The Ford Foundation,” compiled by the Ford Foundation in February 1968, took stock of the role of the Foundation in family planning program.<sup>25</sup> The document discussed further areas of possible collaboration between the Foundation with the family planning program in India. Regarding “Communication and Motivation” the document accepted that:

One of the most formidable tasks in the family planning program is to communicate information and knowledge about family planning in order to create public awareness and interest which, when carried further through individual and group motivation, will hopefully lead to trial and acceptance of family planning on a widespread basis.

The document further notes that

There are three interrelated methods by which the tremendous tasks of communication and motivation are being and will need to be successfully accomplished. The first of these methods is mass communication and the use of media. The second is closely related to the first except that it utilizes somewhat different channels and techniques and falls generally within the private sector; that method is commercial advertising. The third method which depends upon individual contact and group work is the process of extension education.

The document commends the Mass Education and Media Division of the Department of Family Planning for the activities through which it was able to generate a high level of awareness of family planning in the towns and the cities. It made clear, however, that there remained “serious handicaps to creating the same degree of awareness in rural areas through mass communication efforts.” Still, the document saw a bright future in the area of commercial advertising.

The document also proposed to establish a new National Institute of Population and Health. Among many proposed departments, it was to include one on Communication and Motivation. It listed six objectives for the department:

- a. To develop and provide training courses of all kinds, particularly for those who will be conducting training or as demonstrations in methods of teaching or communicating.
- b. To work closely with training and services institutions for paramedical personnel, family planning workers, communication and media specialists, etc.
- c. To carry on research and development in new methods of communications, teaching aids and so on.
- d. To assist advisory committees for research grants and demonstration project grants in media, communications, field education, etc.
- e. To stimulate and encourage research in other agencies, in training institutions, and in the private sector.
- f. To provide consultation.

The general environment for technical assistance during this fifteen-to-twenty-year period was a movement from a congenial, flexible atmosphere in 1955, in which foreign aid and advice were welcomed, to a guarded, controlled atmosphere by 1970. According to Humberger, this was a natural movement away from dependence and towards self-determination. As Ensminger wrote, however, “the relationship between donor and recipient nation is not an easy one.”<sup>26</sup>

“In the early phases of Foundation assistance the unified political structure of the government i.e. the dominance of the Congress Party, made the government relationship relatively flexible. If an idea or approach was accepted by the leadership, open opposition and resistance were minimized.”<sup>27</sup> He enlists the following as the tentative causes of the shift in attitude and behavior:

- A war with China in October 1962.
- A war with Pakistan in September 1965.
- Two successive monsoon failures in 1965 and 1966.
- The general election of 1967.
- The discovery of CIA/Defense Department activities in 1967.
- Some agricultural breakthroughs since 1968.
- A spiraling rate of population growth.

Humberger quoted Ensminger, who had written that “another aspect of the environment which affects the foundations’ relationship with the Indian government is the growing feeling that foreign advice and technologies are not relevant to the Indian social-cultural or developmental context.” He felt that it too often relied on “Western methodologies to solve Indian problems, methodologies which may neither be applicable nor desirable.” Likewise, the great number of Western researchers using India as a case study data which yield little return for India is producing an adverse climate for foreign involvement.”<sup>28</sup>

Ensminger suspected that the ministry gets too many offers for funding and, rather than reject them, sits on the offer till the time that the organizations themselves withdraw the offer. He further commented that the Foundation had also grown a lot and changes in the top level personnel in the New York office had also had an impact on the Foundation’s relationship with the ministry.

In a July 1970 confidential document, Ensminger expressed serious criticisms of the report compiled by Humberger earlier in the year. He felt “horrified,” he wrote, “by the conclusion and inferences he [Humberger] draws in the absence of accurate knowledge of what actually happened or the actual environmental situation.” He accepted that the files of some

crucial meetings and discussions had not been accurately maintained and thus created gaps in the picture. He went on to explain the political atmosphere in India as well as that in the New York office during the initial years of the family planning program. When Indira Gandhi became the prime minister, he noted, she created a Division for Family Planning within the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and also renamed the Ministry of Health as the Ministry of Health and Family Planning. This appeared to express India's seriousness about a national family planning policy. According to Ensminger, however, the prime minister was "simply reacting to pressure from the developed countries."<sup>29</sup>

Ensminger also criticized the Health Minister, Dr. Sushila Nair. Because Dr. Nair had been Mahatma Gandhi's physician, he argued, she also shared his views on family planning. Gandhi had believed in natural birth control rather than artificial contraception. Ensminger alleged that, because she wanted to be a cabinet minister, "she paid lip service to family planning, but her every move was directed towards diverting budgeted funds from family planning activities to build up public health infrastructure." Ensminger believed that the Ford Foundation could only work in the area of family planning through a Planning Commission. He also related in the document how the connection between Lt. Col. Raina and the Ford Foundation had undergone change in the meantime. "When Lt. Col. Raina was 'pushed out' as Commissioner for Family Planning," Ensminger wrote, "he took full charge as director of [the] Central Family Planning Institute" (CFPI), and transferred to the Institute "as many of the functions as he could from the office of the Commissioner of Family Planning. The net effect has been confusion between CFPI and the Commissioner for Family Planning." Ensminger said that Lt. Col. Raina was very unhappy that the Ford Foundation did not support CFPI on certain issues.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, in August 1967 Rey M. Hill wrote to George F. Gant in the New York office

expressing his displeasure at “Lt. Col. Raina’s meddling in what is plainly none of his business,” and that he had “brought pressure through the embassy in Washington.”<sup>31</sup>

He also issued a clarification regarding Humberger’s comments on the changing relations between the center and the state after the 1967 elections. He said that the Ford Foundation had been dragged into the electoral campaign in the West Bengal Assembly elections and had been tarred as affiliated with the CIA, among other misunderstandings. Eventually, however, it was West Bengal as a state that insisted on the continuation of the services of the Foundation-appointed consultant, Kirk Mosley.

Ensminger vehemently rejected Humberger’s conclusion that the role of the consultant had been minimized because of the government’s “anti-foreign consultant policy,” describing it instead as a natural process. It is interesting to note, however, that in his report Humberger substantiated all his statements by quoting extensively from a report written by Ensminger himself.

In the 1970s, Dr. James Goddard arrived in India to direct the Ford Foundation’s involvement in the country’s family planning program. The Foundation tried to redefine its role in the program during this period. As far as family planning communication was concerned, Tyagi, the Assistant Commissioner of Communication in the Department of Family Planning, had died suddenly and it had “upset Frank [Wilder] emotionally.” According to a May 1970 document prepared by Ensminger, USAID was “planning to provide consultancy support in mass communication on a continuing basis.”<sup>32</sup>

In May 1972, Harry E. Wilhelm, who succeeded Ensminger as Ford representative, wrote to John Cool (who had initially been a Project Specialist posted in India and was the one who oversaw the termination of the grant in 1976), regarding the Family Planning Communication

research grant. He recommended that the grant be closed. He strongly expressed his displeasure at a two-year delay in the production of a critique of the 1969 Queener evaluation report, which was to have been submitted by Dr. Moye Freyman, director of the Population Centre of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (as mentioned above, he had previously served as a consultant to the family planning communication research program in India). Wilhelm, however, personally read through the report and issued his own critique of the grant.<sup>33</sup>

The Foundation, Wilhelm found, had assumed family planning to be an issue mainly related to health and medicine, and had therefore believed that “medical people with additional public health training and social research orientation could successfully carry out the motivational and communication research required. Of the 24 individuals sent for training under this project seventeen were medical doctors.”<sup>34</sup>

None of the FPCAR centers had been established in university departments of social sciences, while more than half were in health-related institutions. Wilhelm doubted whether the level of competence required for high quality communications and motivational research studies existed even in the best universities in the world in the 1960s. According to him, therefore, “part of the difficulty encountered in administering and implementing this grant was the general problem of upgrading the quality of social science training and field research capacity.” Hence his comment that “it was almost naïve to think that FPCARs could do much beyond the KAP [knowledge, attitude, and practice] type studies which they did actually undertake.”<sup>35</sup>

Wilhelm also expressed serious unhappiness with the way information regarding the research work carried out under the communication research program was being disseminated. Although the Deputy Commissioner of Research and Training was supposed to do this, he doubted that “the Deputy Commissioner was ever strong enough to discharge the function.”<sup>36</sup>



In the meantime, the Demographic Communication Action Research Committee had also been dismantled, its activities now being supervised by an expert committee comprised wholly of administrators and medical officers. Wilhelm was therefore pessimistic about the “future of the FPCAR centers.” In spite of all the money the Foundation had allotted to the program, the basic issue of “what would be researched, who will do the research and who will actually use the research results, remain.”<sup>37</sup>

Still, Wilhelm did not see the outcome of the grant in an entirely negative light. In his view, as a result of the communication research grant, people had been sensitized to the need for communication in family planning, and this was visible in the government’s growing financial support for the program. The problem remained, however, of “how to identify, train, and motivate competent social scientists to work in this field... and how to link the results of relevant research to program design and implementation.”<sup>38</sup>

A discernable shift occurred in this period in the views of the people at the helm of affairs toward locating communication in the broader area of social sciences. The Foundation sent a mission to India comprising of Dr. Reuben Hill, Dr. Edwin D. Driver and Dr. Moni Nag. The mission aimed “to identify the research priorities in population and family planning as defined by social scientists and administrators in India.” It also sought to identify “scholars and institutions which might undertake the needed research; and an analysis of the obstacles to the implementation of the research proposal.” The report stated that no one in the Delhi office of the Foundation was especially aware of the difference of population from family planning. The mission also realized that “many social scientists in India do not know where to go for assistance in research or in the financing of the projects.”<sup>39</sup>

A January 1969 letter from Davidson R. Gwatkin, a Ford Foundation program officer for population, written mainly to Oscar Harkavy, the Foundation's officer in charge of population, narrates his meeting with Everett M. Rogers. Rogers was a professor in the Department of Communication at Michigan State University who was involved with the diffusion of innovation project in the field of agriculture in Nigeria, India and Brazil. Gwatkin reported that Rogers added health and family planning to the project as an afterthought. Interestingly, the letter mentioned that "to familiarize himself with family planning, Rogers had assigned himself to teach a course on diffusion and to participate in still undefined research activities at the Michigan Center for Population Planning." Gwatkin said that he had agreed to brief Rogers on the family planning field prior to Rogers beginning serious research. He had asked Rogers about the possible collaboration of the academic communication community for population research and to that Rogers reportedly said that the community was too young, with Rogers at thirty-seven being one of the most senior researchers in the field.<sup>40</sup>

In an April 1975 memo-to-file, John Cool tried to explain why this friction of interest had happened. He looked at the historical context in which this particular area of Ford Foundation involvement had evolved. He noted that when Ford Foundation started its involvement with family planning program in India, it was the largest-ever commitment of external assistance to the Indian family planning effort. With the passage of time, that assistance had been "eclipsed by grants from USAID, SIDA, IBRD and UNFPA."<sup>42</sup> The Foundation had lost its central role.

With the changing of the guard at the Ford Foundation, its communication research area in family planning took a different turn. The Foundation tried to fortify the research area with more involvement in social science research. The Foundation thus ended its involvement in family planning communication, passing the baton onto USAID.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Ford Foundation Records (hereafter FFR), Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3352, 1959-66.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> John C. Caldwell and Pat Caldwell, *Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation Contribution* (London: F. Pinter, 1986), 42.

<sup>4</sup> Edward M. Humberger, "Population Program Management: The Ford Foundation in India, 1951-1970," RAC, FFR, Unpublished Reports, Box 18672, Folder 03673, April 1970.

<sup>5</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3351, 1959-66, D.O no. 10-35/50-FP dt 5, November 1959.

<sup>6</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3352, 1959-66.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3351, 1959-66.

<sup>11</sup> Gazette Notification No. F. 14-47/65-F.P.III, February 1, 1968, in *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 2610, 1959-66.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3351, 1959-66.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Kamala Gopal Rao, with Saroj Mullick, *Studies in Family Planning in India: A Review for Programme Implications* (New Delhi: Central Family Planning Institute, 1968).

<sup>20</sup> Dinesh Chandra Dubey and Aadesh K. Devgan, *Family Planning Communications Studies in India: A Review of Findings and Implications of Studies on Communications* (New Delhi: Central Family Planning Institute, [1969]).

<sup>21</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3351, 1959-66.

<sup>22</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 1996, 1964-67.

<sup>23</sup> RAC, FFR, Unpublished Reports, Box 18672, Folder 03673, April 1970.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> RAC, FFR, Unpublished Documents, Box 18673, Report No. 003688, 1968.

<sup>26</sup> Staff document prepared for the December 3-5 meeting of the Ford Foundation's International Division in Mexico City, November 26, 1969, quoted in Humberger, "Population Program Management."

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 1995, 1964-67

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

- 
- <sup>31</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 1996, 1964-67.
- <sup>32</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 3846, 1964-67.
- <sup>33</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 05900482, Microfilm Reel No. 3351, 1959-66.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>39</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 1995, 1964-67.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup> RAC, FFR, Grants, No. 06400303, Microfilm Reel No. 1995, 1964-67.