

“A Full Round of Life for All”: Transforming Near East Relief into the Near East Foundation

By Michael Limberg

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

michael.limberg@uconn.edu

© 2013 by Michael Limberg

The Near East Foundation (NEF) declared in 1934 that it aimed to achieve a “full round of life for all” through its work in the Near East. A report explained that a full life included “health and hygiene for individual and community, economic security through effective agriculture and industry, happy homes with rights and opportunities for childhood and womanhood, the brotherhood and co-operation of national and racial and religious groups, and above all the fullness of culture and spiritual faith.”¹ These goals reflected NEF’s hopes for a full social transformation in the Middle East, and show the growing influence of development ideology on its leadership. They also reflected major changes in NEF’s goals from its origins as a relief organization.

Expanding its vision of aid from emergency survival to creating a “full round of life” helped Near East Relief (NER) transform itself from a wartime humanitarian aid society into a professional development agency. This transformation did not come easily or immediately. Internal conflicts within NER during the late 1920s highlight that reorganization required changes in both personnel and the organization’s theories of social uplift. However, by the early 1930s, the new NEF had reorganized staff and fundraising. It emphasized new core priorities to transform whole societies instead of aiding individuals or groups in need. The organization’s

leaders embraced social science metrics and began considering economic, as well as moral and social uplift. Ultimately, the NEF's move from wartime aid to development assistance marked a key shift in American involvement in the Middle East from religious uplift to social transformation.²

NER's emergency humanitarian aid during World War I got Americans involved in the Near East on a massive scale. Several relief committees quickly formed when reports on violence toward Armenians began reaching the United States. These merged into the American Committee for Relief in the Near East (ACRNE) in 1915, which was incorporated as NER in 1919. ACRNE and NER used massive public fundraising campaigns and religious fundraising networks in the United States to collect millions of dollars for refugees. Publicity campaigns also brought in warehouses full of donated clothes and nonperishable goods. James Barton, Foreign Secretary of the Congregational Missions Board, served as the chairman of NER's Executive Committee, the group that set policy and oversaw the organization. He and others such as Robert Speer and John Mott helped to ensure NER's cooperation with religious organizations and missionaries operating in Turkey, Syria, and across the Near East. NER staff built close ties to the U.S. government; several U.S. Army personnel were seconded to NER to direct relief programs, and the U.S. Navy provided invaluable help with transportation for people and goods as well. NER collaborated with Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration in the Caucasus and received tons of supplies through their channels. Powerful political figures such as Hoover, William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, and Elihu Root served on the Board of Trustees.³

This aid helped keep hundreds of thousands of refugees alive during and after WW I. At first, the organization focused specifically on aiding Armenians and other Christian minorities

uprooted by the war and the Armenian Genocide. NER donated food and clothes to the displaced and helped protect and shelter minorities all across eastern Anatolia, Armenia, and Syria. Even in the winter and spring of 1920, internal figures estimated that NER distributed food to more than half a million people. NER leaders also claimed that at least a million people across the region survived World War I and its aftermath due to their assistance.⁴ Hundreds of Americans fanned out across the region, beginning in port cities, but gradually expanding their distribution networks into the interior. NER's ground operations used a mix of full-time relief workers and loaned or part-time workers from missionary or philanthropic organizations already operating in the Near East. As funding and personnel grew, the organization's programs and influence expanded to match. NER began funding non-Christian refugees as well, a major shift for an organization founded with a Christian appeal. In another decision with long-term implications, NER also founded or took over dozens of orphanages across the entire region. In many cases, orphan work was unplanned as an organizational goal, but taken up when workers on the ground saw a need. By 1920, NER estimated its orphanages housed 54,000 children and provided meals or partial care for 48,000 more orphans or needy children who lived near relief centers.⁵

Three leaders predominated in shaping the early policy of ACRNE and NER during and immediately after WW I. Cleveland H. Dodge helped launch ACRNE by tireless fundraising and generous use of his own substantial fortune. The Dodge family had longstanding ties to the Near East and to American philanthropy, and Dodge was a close friend and political adviser to Woodrow Wilson. He was also a devout Presbyterian who melded his belief in practical philanthropy with a drive to advance the Kingdom of God. Dodge found an ally in James Barton. Both men came to relief work in the Near East largely out of a sense of religious and national

duty to the region's Christian populations.⁶ Charles Vickrey was NER's third pre-eminent early administrator. He served as the organization's General Secretary, and spent a great deal of time traveling in the Near East to assess conditions, talk with NER's in-country staff, and meet with State Department officials and local government leaders. Henry Morgenthau played an important role in starting ACRNE and raising public awareness of the relief crisis, but his involvement began decreasing as early as 1918 or 1919.

Originally, NER's predecessor organizations envisioned their work as primarily crisis-based. They would ameliorate the immediate need and then draw their work to a close. Much of ACRNE's wartime aid aimed at helping refugees survive, without a lingering sense of obligation. This focus more or less fit with the temporary, disaster-relief model of humanitarian work developed during the nineteenth century and expanded during WWI.⁷ American relief work in Western Europe operated with a similar framework for temporary aid, and both the government-run ARA and private relief programs steadily drew down their work and departed by 1923. By 1920, NER's Executive Committee declared, "The committee should seek to withdraw completely from general relief work with the coming harvest and should leave to the governments in control of the areas, as largely as possible, all responsibility for repatriation and rehabilitation expenses."⁸ The organization's leaders particularly hoped to cease distributing direct aid in the form of food or monetary aid as soon as possible. They accepted the need for some continuing work over the next few years, particularly with orphans. NER sought a twenty-five-year term of incorporation from Congress in 1919 as a hedge for those sorts of long-term possibilities. Yet NER still hoped to turn long-term work over to governments or to religious organizations operating permanently in the region.⁹

Events in the Near East, long term-commitments to orphans and refugees, and the lure of achieving long-term social change overturned NER's original plans. Famine conditions and violence in the Near East continued long after the official October 30, 1918 armistice between the Ottoman Empire and the Allies. Allied troops occupied Constantinople and areas of the Anatolian coastline, but violence against Armenians continued in the interior. In Syria, political and social turmoil during Faisal ibn Husein's brief rule and the subsequent French takeover meant delays in turning refugee work over to a local government. NER's operations in the Russian and Armenian Caucasus region supported both Armenian refugees and Russians caught in the chaos and civil war following the Russian Revolution.

Fighting and the need for aid increased in 1921 and 1922 as Turkish Nationalists began resisting the Allies. Greek forces occupied Smyrna, and clashes between irregular forces scattered through Eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus escalated once again. A new wave of Armenian refugees needed food, shelter, and resettlement. Tens of thousands of ethnic Greeks living in Anatolia fled the advancing Turkish Nationalists, culminating in September 1922 with a massive evacuation from the burned-out ruins of Smyrna. Tens of thousands more people were uprooted in the 1923 population exchanges between Greece and Turkey. The exchanges forced ethnic Greeks out of Turkey and ethnic Turks out of Greece, straining the ability of both governments to cope with the new refugees and accompanying social and political upheaval. Given these circumstances, NER administrators felt they could not draw down aid as originally planned. Early in 1920, the Board of Trustees admitted "with the present unsettled political conditions in the Near East we cannot wholly withdraw the support [from refugees and orphans] without disastrous consequences."¹⁰ An Executive Committee report to the Trustees in January 1921 still promised a rapid end to general relief. Yet that report also noted NER still had more

than five hundred workers deployed in the field.¹¹ By February 1920, NER was already planning survey visits by Barton and other organization leaders to determine what aid projects would need long-term continued support.

Even without new outbreaks of violence, NER's huge population of orphans rapidly forced the organization to re-evaluate the length and scope of its proposed commitments. Once begun, orphan relief had rapidly grown into a cornerstone of NER's work. Images of starving orphans were central to NER's appeals for aid. During WW I and its immediate aftermath, NER framed its work with orphans as vital to the long-term survival of Christian minorities in the Near East. The organization painted orphan relief as part of conjoined Christian and American responsibilities to the needy.¹² "Rescue" programs to find and claim Christian girls forced into marrying Muslims fit this rhetoric and added to NER's commitments. NER administrators then found themselves with practical and ideological constraints against abandoning their charges.

Taking care of thousands of children would be a long-term proposition. Orphanages took in children of all ages, including thousands under the age of five. The vast majority were Armenian, often very far removed from their original homes and any remaining extended family. NER tried hard to draw down its orphan population through transfers to government support and outplacement programs and set an aging-out cutoff at sixteen years old, after which an orphan was expected to find a job and housing on his or her own. Still, particularly with the youngest children, NER faced the prospect of a decade or more of continued care. The Executive Committee recognized this by appointing Ernest Riggs, a Congregational missionary, as the Educational Director for its orphanages. Riggs worked with staff members of the American colleges in the Near East and with Paul Monroe of Columbia University (a noted expert in rural education and modernizing educational systems) to design some sort of long-term plan for the

orphans. Orphanages would remain a major part of NER's vision and budget through the rest of the decade.

Accepting long-term responsibilities for orphans allowed NER administrators to begin dreaming of permanently transforming Near Eastern societies. By early 1920, at least some of the individuals on the Executive Committee began agitating for a more expansive vision of orphan care. Charles Vickrey wanted American expertise to turn NER's orphans into a new generation of Near Eastern leaders. He proclaimed,

“It may be doubted if any American organization has ever had an opportunity equal to ours in shaping the future of the Near East. The 100,000 children now under our care, wisely guided will become the leaders in a New Era in the Old World. They will be the trained agriculturalists, the mechanics, merchants, manufacturers, bankers, educators, lawyers, doctors, governors and national leaders of the New Near East.”¹³

Vickrey's dream would entail years of extensive work and investment in infrastructure and personnel. It would require NER to take up some of the goals for social transformation that had, until that point, been the purview of missionary schools. Armed with this new transformative vision, NER's educational and orphanage experts began designing a regimen that focused heavily on industrial and vocational training in addition to academic work. Vickrey launched a major campaign in 1923, International Golden Rule Sunday, designed to raise money for NER's orphanage work and foster “a new generation of Golden Rule children with higher ideals of unselfish service leading to a New Near East and a better world.”¹⁴

Beyond just training orphans and aiding refugees, NER's leaders began to explicitly envision their work as vital for guiding the Near East to a new and better future and to connect that vision to practical efforts for modernization and social change. To an extent, a vision for guiding the future of the Near East had always been implicit in NER's aid to Christian minorities. NER, like many American missionaries in the Near East, had hopes that Christian communities

(once infused with Protestant vitality and modern scientific knowledge) could lead the Near East to a better future. NER's early appeals emphasized Armenia's long history as a Christian nation and Armenians' racial superiority over their Muslim neighbors. However, by 1923, NER worked with a wider range of racial and religious populations. The organization's leaders began thinking of ways to use these new constituencies in shaping the region's future. They began moving farther away from an explicitly Christian vision of a new Middle East, though Christian identity would still permeate the organization at least through the 1930s.

Equally important, several new leaders joined Barton and Dodge in guiding NER policy in new directions. Thomas Jesse Jones brought his experience as an early sociologist and race expert to NER, serving on a number of committees in the mid-and late-1920s. Jones, who served as Education Director of the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, was a prominent advocate of rural education and development. He pushed for rural extension programs and vocational industrial work based on the Hampton Institute/Tuskegee model of practical development for backwards people.¹⁵ Paul Monroe served on several committees as an expert on education and on the Near East; he also had experience and extensive connections through advising the Iraqi and Jordanian governments on creating a new school system. Most importantly, Barclay Acheson moved up from working in the field to direct overseas operations in 1921. Acheson, a Presbyterian clergyman and former instructor at the American University of Beirut, held a variety of Executive Committee and administrative posts during the 1920s. He was more directly involved with field operations than most of the Executive Committee. His growing influence over policy moved NER into rural extension work and away from a strictly emergency program. Cleveland H. Dodge died in 1926 and his son Cleveland E. Dodge assumed his place among NER's leaders. After years assisting his father in administering NER and his family's philanthropic interests,

Cleveland E. Dodge's rise meant a nearly seamless transition of organizational leadership as he continued his father's push for a new type of relief work.

By 1924 NER faced a clear moment of decision. Most fighting had ended. Stable governments were in place or forming in Turkey, Greece, Armenia, Bulgaria, and Syria, NER's major operating areas. NER administrators noted new budget constraints. Fundraising appeals no longer brought in as much money as they did during the war or immediate refugee crises, so the organization would have to contract or refocus its work in the field. Refugees and orphans still needed assistance, and clearly would for years to come, but most of the organization's leaders welcomed the chance to re-assess their work and decide what directions they should focus on in the future. Even as some on NER's Executive Committee pushed for "a simplified constructive program, centering as largely as possible in orphanage, industrial training, and child-welfare work," others, such as Acheson and Dodge, began to push for a bigger attempt to change the religious and social framework of Near East societies.¹⁶ A massive project to survey American philanthropy and local needs throughout the Near East became a battleground between factions.

NER's survey project, first proposed in 1924 and completed in 1927, marked a key moment in the organization's transition to a permanent entity focused on development rather than emergency aid. Struggles over applying its findings also revealed personal and ideological splits in the NER leadership. The way NER conducted the survey revealed the organization's emerging focus on economic and social problems. The information collected, focusing heavily on government policies, economic conditions, and social needs, showed the increasing influence of social science methodology and theory in shaping the ways Americans sought to exert influence over the region.

The survey sprang from a November 1924 meeting of NER leaders and the administrators of American colleges and missionary institutions held in Constantinople. All agreed that new political, economic, social, and religious conditions in the Near East required them to reassess what they knew of local societies and to reformulate their work to meet current needs. The recommendations emerging from that meeting structured the questions and issues in the survey. NER would do the primary organizing and compiling, though Americans working for missionary boards, the YMCA and YWCA, medical institutions, and schools would all contribute by assessing local conditions and compiling figures. NER leaders would make no final decision about the future of their organization until the survey was over.¹⁷ The Executive Committee approved the survey in early 1925, and planning began in earnest.

The survey committee hoped to put American philanthropy in the Near East on a scientific basis and establish long-term goals. As their final report claimed, the survey “was undertaken on the assumption that programs and policies can only be developed intelligently in the light of all the pertinent facts, a matter-of-fact procedure that is a commonplace in business and industry but has been little utilized in planning the work of social agencies.”¹⁸ NER put together a committee of outsiders to run its survey, hoping for impartiality and an outsiders’ perspective. Participating in the survey committee brought Monroe and Jones into close contact with NER, though both had been occasionally involved before. The survey committee also reached out to experts in social science research to help compile and apply their findings. They hired Dr. Frank A. Ross, a statistics expert at Columbia University, C. Luther Fry of the Rockefeller-funded Institute of Social and Religious Research, and Elbridge Sibley, a sociology graduate student, also at Columbia University, to travel abroad and write the final report. Their involvement highlights a larger trend for NER in the mid-1920s, in which academic experts and

professional aid workers began to participate, even to dominate, in advisory committees and research groups.

The survey had both practical and larger, more ideological components. Part of the survey work aimed simply to inventory NER assets to identify unnecessary projects and material, resulting in detailed reports of property, personnel, and goods. Other parts of the report catalogued the American religious and philanthropic enterprises already operating in the region, but reports also covered political, economic, and social conditions in countries across the Near East. NER collected information about transportation networks, imports and exports, agriculture, tax policies, health and sanitation, education, demographic change, women's rights, and religious/racial divides in each country's social matrix. Americans in the Near East had long worked on these problems as part of their missionary outreach, particularly education, health, and women's rights. However, the survey pointed to an emerging emphasis on economic well-being and social transformation that transcended evangelization, targeted work with Christian minorities, or short-term aid.

The survey reports, as well as discussions at the 1927 Constantinople conference that put together the results, exacerbated tensions within the organization's leadership. According to Acheson, by early 1927 several distinct factions within the NER leadership were becoming clear. One, led by Charles Vickrey, organized around continuing work along current orphan-care lines, using Golden Rule fundraising tactics, and focusing on Christian minorities. Another, centered on John Mace, largely departed or was forced out of NER by Vickrey after they rejected his fundraising program and his leadership style, though they wanted a similar agenda of continued work with orphans in the field. Many from this group joined the growing Near East Colleges Association. A third group led by John Voris sought to turn NER into "a kind of

interdenominational mission board.”¹⁹ Apart from these groups, Acheson began building a loose coalition with Jones and some of the other philanthropic experts. Barton also worked with them over the next several years.

Barton, Acheson and others on the Executive Committee began pushing Vickrey out of the leadership at NER. Vickrey had a chance in March 1927 to win the Executive Committee over to his scheme for a new Golden Rule-based organizational agenda and fundraising plan, but he failed to convince the other factions. NER would continue using Golden Rule publicity appeals temporarily, but started splitting off that part of the organization. Acheson admitted that NER leadership remained divided after the survey. Jones, Monroe, and others all advocated different variants of new programs—“each, like a great surgeon, is inclined to think that his particular hobby is the panacea for the world’s ills.”²⁰ Acheson however, stated in a rare burst of emotion that he conceived the core “of the present problem as being THE DEMONSTRATION OF THE FACT THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR A PERMANENT ORGANIZATION TO DO WORK OF A SOCIAL SERVICE AND COMMUNITY SCHOOL CHARACTER [emphasis original].”²¹ Acheson’s vision and leadership would be heavily reflected in NER’s coming reorganization.

The survey findings led to NER creating the Conservation Committee in October 1928. The Committee began with a small, picked body of seven NER administrators and experts, including Cleveland E. Dodge, Barton, Jones, Monroe, and Acheson. These men, many of whom had been intimately connected with conducting the survey, set out to find what parts of NER should be conserved into a new, permanent offspring organization. A discussion during the first meeting affirmed the decision of everyone in the group to keep working in the Near East, arguing that “America had a tremendous contribution to make” for the region and its future.²²

The Committee was originally set up as an advisory body to the Executive Committee, but by July 1929 this group began setting the organizational policies that a lame-duck Executive Committee would implement. By early 1930, the Conservation Committee had closed many NER state committees and offices, cut staff, and began the transition to a new organization named the Near East Foundation. NER would remain as a shadow organization to manage bequests and investments until its Congressional incorporation term ended in 1944, but NEF took over and expanded NER's early work to develop the Near East.

NEF continued the orphanage work NER had prized so highly, but placed greater emphasis on trained professionals overseeing long-term projects to raise the social and economic standards of whole communities. As contemplated in 1930, NEF's mission was "To work with the people of the Near East to discover and remove the causes of their poverty, disease and retarded development," to alleviate conditions from "ignorance, famine, pestilence, and war ... To create in Near East communities a consciousness of the needs of their neglected childhood and womanhood ... To raise the standard of living in villages and rural communities by a non-institutional, extension program of education."²³ NER had already begun experimenting with rural extension work to teach farming, nursing, and hygiene in Macedonia and the Caucasus during the late 1920s. Harold Allen put together a team of American and Greek agricultural experts operating demonstration centers and lecture series in a number of Macedonian villages. Similar projects flourished under new NEF auspices, including rural extension programs in Turkey, Lebanon, Bulgaria, and Albania, and teacher-training work in Palestine. The scale of this new work was considerably less than NER at its height. Where NER in the early 1920s averaged nearly twelve million dollars each year in incoming funds, NEF's budget for projects and salaries during the years 1930-1933 averaged just over \$400,000 per year.²⁴ Yet the

organization's scope of activity and its vision for the Near East was, in many ways, broader than ever before.

NEF used emerging social science methods and concepts of economic well-being to quantify, shape, and explain its work. Where reports and publicity materials from the early 1920s focused particularly on emotional stories of children redeemed and individuals rescued, NEF's publicity and internal materials included many more maps, diagrams, and tables that illustrated and quantified projects and results. Making this switch required mental and organizational changes among the NEF leaders. A 1929 report admitted "we have also found that the discovery and use of what might be called a "social yardstick" in educational, health, child welfare, and other lines is almost as difficult as the discovery and use of a naval yardstick in disarmament conferences. Social progress has not yet invented a system of weights and measures and we are without precedent."²⁵ The Conservation Committee and then the NEF leadership asked experts at the Institute of Social and Religious Research to help set up a research department that would produce some of the needed data. They also increasingly sought to hire or promote experts with "modern training" in agriculture, economics, healthcare, or recreation to study social needs and help evaluate ongoing progress.²⁶

By 1934, NEF sought to achieve a "full round of life for all" through its work in the Near East. NEF still aided refugees and orphans, even providing some direct financial assistance or food aid when needed, but in the NEF, Jones, Acheson, Monroe and their allies clearly had larger social transformations in sight. They assumed that experiences and expertise from American development could be normative as the model for the world. NEF would continue to develop its new programs through the 1930s, struggling to raise funds and navigating tricky relationships with nationalist movements and resistant local leaders. The organization's evolution would

continue into the 1940s and beyond as it continued to work in the Near East and increasingly in Africa. President Truman cited NEF's work as one of the models for his Point Four program, highlighting ties between early development experiments and the era of "high modernization" to come.²⁷ In its search for a "social yardstick" and in organizing a permanent, professional staff, NEF foreshadowed many of the issues that other American development organizations (public and private) would deal with during the 1940s and 1950s.

Editor's 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 a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, 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 Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

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

ENDNOTES:

¹ "Near East Foundation Progress Report 1934 Economic Aspects of the Work," Box 133, Near East Foundation Records (NEF), Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

² Near East Relief and Near East Foundation are only beginning to receive the scholarly attention they deserve as part of both wartime humanitarian aid and pre-Cold War American development efforts abroad. Robert Daniel's *American Philanthropy in the Near East, 1820-1960*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970, used many NER sources, but few have published on the organization since; A chapter of Eleanor H. Tejirian and Hans Kieser's recent book are the most important recent publications with substantial material on Near East Relief. Eleanor H. Tejirian, "Faith of Our Fathers: Missionaries and NGOs: The Transition." In Eleanor H. Tejirian and Reeva Spector Simon, editors, *Altruism and Imperialism*. New York: Middle East Institute, 2002; Hans Kieser, *Nearest East: American Millennialism and Mission to the Middle East*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 2010; Reports by Sarah Miglio, Shaloma Gauthier, and David Rodogno based on research in the Rockefeller Archive Center's records have started exploring NER's work during the war and organizational changes in the 1920s. Yet neither report focuses fully on the transition from relief to development specifically in the late 1920s and early 1930s. This change is vital for its implications on later development work and its impact on other American missionary and philanthropic institutions in the Near East. Sarah Miglio, "America's Sacred Duty: Near East Relief and the Armenian Crisis, 1915-1930," Research Report, RAC, 2009; Shaloma Gauthier and David Rodogno, "Near East Relief's Caucasus Branch Operation (1919-1920)," Research Report, RAC, 2011.

³ See Robert Daniel, *American Philanthropy in the Near East, 1820-1960*, pp. 157-160.

⁴ U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. *Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Near East Relief Transmitted, Pursuant to Law, For the Year Ending December 31, 1920*. Sen. Doc. No.5, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921, p. 4 and p. 7.

-
- ⁵ “Minutes, Board of Trustees” June 24, 1920, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1919-1920,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ⁶ Miglio, “America’s Sacred Duty,” p. 2.
- ⁷ Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread*. New York: Routledge, 2011, pp. 3-4.
- ⁸ “Executive Committee Minutes,” February 19, 1920, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1919-1920,” Box 1, NEF, RAC. For information on how the American Red Cross stuck to a parallel temporary relief model even after NER began changing, see also Marian Moser Jones, *The American Red Cross: from Clara Barton to the New Deal*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013, pp. 195-197.
- ⁹ “Executive Committee Minutes,” January 10, 1922, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1922-1923,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹⁰ “Executive Committee Minutes,” January 22, 1920, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1919-1920,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹¹ “Report of Executive Committee to the Board of Trustees,” January 7 1921, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1920-1921,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹² NER made an appeal for “the resurrection of a race that has been faithful to the Christian faith for seventeen centuries and whom the Christian hearted people of America may at this Easter time save from starvation for important world service in the centuries that are to come.” “Executive Committee Minutes,” January 10, 1922, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1922-1923,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹³ Charles Vickrey, “Preliminary Report, Observations in Central Europe and the Near East, August-September 1920,” Folder “Near East Relief Minutes, 1920-1922,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹⁴ Charles Vernon Vickrey, *International Golden Rule Sunday: A Handbook*. New York: George H. Dolan, 1926, p. 22.
- ¹⁵ Thomas Jesse Jones, *Essentials of Civilization: A Study in Social Values*. New York: Henry Holt, 1929.
- ¹⁶ “Executive Committee Minutes,” February 7, 1923, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1922-1923,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹⁷ “Report of the Subcommittee of the Near East Relief to Study the Future Program,” January 25, 1925, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1924-1925,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ¹⁸ Frank A. Ross, C. Luther Fry, and Elbridge Sibley, *The Near East and American Philanthropy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929, p. 7.
- ¹⁹ Barclay Acheson Diary, January 1-April 29 1927 inclusive, Folder “Near East Foundation Acheson Diary 1936,” Box 135, NEF, RAC.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² “Quarterly Report of Near East Relief Activities, Secretary, Executive Committee, and Executive Secretary, Conservation Committee,” Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1929-1930 Conservation Committee,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ²³ “A Statement of Purpose and Program Formulated January 1930,” Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1929-1930 Conservation Committee,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ²⁴ James L. Barton, *Story of Near East Relief (1915-1930)*. New York: Macmillan, 1930, p. 410; “Second Annual Progress Report,” October 10, 1933, Folder “Annual Reports 1931-1934,” Box 2, NEF, RAC.
- ²⁵ “Quarterly Report of the Foreign Department,” September 30, 1929, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1929-1930 Conservation Committee,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ²⁶ “Conservation Committee Minutes,” March 15, 1929, Folder “Near East Relief Minutes 1928-1929 Conservation Committee,” Box 1, NEF, RAC.
- ²⁷ Harry S. Truman, “Address Before the Annual Convention of the American Newspaper Guild,” June 28, 1950. Accessed online, December 1, 2013, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=804>.