

Research Reports

from the Rockefeller Archive Center

SPRING 1997

Rockefeller Vision and the Making of the Museum of Modern Art

On the occasion of the 1996 Rockefeller Archive Center-Rockefeller Brothers Fund conference, From the Ground Up: Twentieth-Century Institution Building in Historical Context, Rona Roob spoke of the role of the Rockefeller family in the founding and subsequent success of The Museum of Modern Art. We are grateful that Mrs. Roob, chief archivist of the Museum, allowed us to publish an excerpted and edited version of her remarks. Eds.

In all great enterprises, accomplishments and progress come from the combined efforts of those who lead the way. Of particular importance to the founding and the continuing success of The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) has been the enlightened patronage and imaginative leadership of the Rockefellers, especially Abby (1874-1948), Nelson (1908-1979), Blanchette (1909-1992) and David (1915-).

In the 1920s, a time when very few Americans or American museums were collecting and exhibiting late nineteenth- or twentieth-century art, three influential, public-spirited women, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller and her friends Lillie P. Bliss and Mary Sullivan, got together to found the first American institution devoted exclusively to modern art and to the work of living artists.

Abby Aldrich had been introduced to the museums of Europe and America by her father, Senator Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island, a collector primarily of western European art. Some twenty years after her marriage in 1901 to John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (JDR Jr), with the encouragement of the architect Duncan Candler (who designed the playhouse for the Rockefeller home at Pocantico Hills in Tarrytown, New York) she became interested in modern art, especially prints by living American artists, such as Maurice Prendergast, Arthur B. Davies, Edward Hopper, John Marin, and John Sloan. She tactfully kept

her purchases out of sight of her husband, who did not share her enthusiasm.

By 1940 Abby Aldrich Rockefeller had given the Museum over 1,400 prints, the core of its magnificent collection in this medium, and in 1949, a year after her death, the Museum honored her by naming its Print Room after her. Abby Aldrich Rockefeller's quiet, firm support of the ideals of the Museum and her friendship with its first director, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., were important factors in its early success. Philip Johnson recently recalled that she was like the Queen Mother; she never meddled and was interested only in building a great institution. In 1929, when the Museum opened, Mrs. Rockefeller was fifty-five years old.

Lillie P. Bliss, a New Yorker, had been collecting Post-Impressionist and contemporary art since the Armory Show of 1913, where she bought Odilon Redon's *Silence* (ca. 1911) and some of the other works with which she started her collection. She was also a close friend of the painter Arthur B. Davies (1862-1928), a chief organizer of the show. In 1921 she helped to per-

Table of Contents

The Rockefeller Foundation and Danish Eugenics	5
Lawrence K. Frank and the Rockefeller Philanthropies, 1923-1936	7
Grants for Travel and Research at the Rockefeller Archive Center	9
John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s "Gift to France" and the Restoration of Monuments, 1924-1936	12
Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Development of African Studies	14
Nelson Rockefeller and the Promotion of Culture in New York City	16
About the Contributors	19



Hospital Corridor at Saint-Remy by Vincent van Gogh, 1889.
Gouache and watercolor on paper.

© 1997 The Museum of Modern Art, New York

suade the Metropolitan Museum of Art to assemble an exhibition of modern works before 1910. The hostile reaction to this exhibition was a factor in the Metropolitan's decision not to consider undertaking another show of this kind for some time. It now became more apparent than ever to the progressive-minded that New York needed an independent museum devoted to modern art.

Mary Sullivan had taught art in New York before her marriage to the successful New York lawyer, Cornelius J. Sullivan. Her first major works were acquired at the 1927 auction of the John Quinn collection, including Derain's *Window at Vers* (1912) now in MoMA's collection. The painting was purchased by Abby Aldrich Rockefeller at the auction of the Sullivan collection in 1939 and given to the museum in Mrs. Sullivan's memory.

As Nelson A. Rockefeller (NAR) would later write: "It was the perfect combination. The three

women among them had the resources, the tact and the knowledge of contemporary art that the situation required. More to the point, they had the courage to advocate the cause of the modern movement in the face of widespread division, ignorance and a dark suspicion that the whole business was some sort of Bolshevik plot."

All three women knew each other well, visited galleries together and frequently met for tea. In 1929 when they began to search for a director capable of defining the new museum, they sought the advice of Paul J. Sachs, whose course in museum connoisseurship at Harvard University had trained a generation of museum curators, directors, and art dealers. Sachs recommended Alfred H. Barr, Jr., his former student, to whom he believed the challenge of defining the new museum could be entrusted.

Barr, at age 27, already had profound convictions about modern art. In 1920 he had taken a course in medieval art at Princeton with Professor Rufus Morey, whose meticulous analysis of influences, currents and cross-currents constituted a method that could be adapted to any historical sequence. Morey's approach influenced Barr's plan for a course on modern art at Wellesley College that he taught six years later, the first such course ever given in an institution of higher learning.

In 1927-28 Barr, on leave from his teaching, visited and was deeply impressed by the Bauhaus in Dessau, Germany, where painting, graphics, architecture, crafts, typography, cinema, photography and design were practiced together in one large, modern building. The combination of the Bauhaus model and the adaptation of the Morey method constituted the basis of the plan for the new museum, which Barr submitted to the trustees in 1929. The plan was radical because it proposed an active and serious concern with all the arts. For almost sixty-eight years, MoMA has adhered to the general outline of this initial multi-departmental plan, adding new programs whenever necessary.

On September 19, 1929, a provisional charter was granted to MoMA by the State of New York, and on November 9, the museum opened in

rented space on the 12th floor of the Heckscher Building at 730 Fifth Avenue with a loan exhibition of works by Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat and van Gogh. From this show the museum was to acquire, by bequest or gift, eight masterpieces, among them van Gogh's *Hospital Corridor at St. Remy* (1889) and Gauguin's *Portrait of Jacob Meyer de Haan* (1889). The new museum was an instant success; indeed, in the first four weeks, attendance totaled 43,000 visitors. In less than two years the Heckscher Building could no longer handle the traffic, and on May 3, 1932, MoMA reopened in new quarters at 11 West 53rd Street, a large, five-story limestone townhouse leased from the Rockefeller family who lived around the corner.

Lillie P. Bliss had died in 1931, bequeathing her collection of Cézannes and other modern French paintings to the museum on the condition that an endowment capable of maintaining the collection be raised within three years. The trustees debated committing to a permanent collection: it would be difficult to raise funds during the Depression, and were permanence and modernism compatible? The trustees finally voted to meet the terms of the Bliss bequest, and on March 12, 1934, Cornelius Bliss, Lillie's brother, presented the deed of gift to Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and A. Conger Goodyear, president of the museum's Board of Trustees. An important aspect of the Bliss bequest allowed the museum to sell or exchange works from the Bliss collection to acquire other important or needed objects. This enabled MoMA to acquire, for example, in 1939, Picasso's *Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J. R. M.)* (1907) in exchange for Degas's *Racecourse* (1884). Later on the Museum acquired van Gogh's *Starry Night* (1889) and *Portrait of Post-Master Roulin* (1889) by this method. The generous terms of Bliss' will set a precedent for others, including Mrs. Rockefeller's gift of 181 paintings, drawings, and watercolors in 1935.

In 1936 MoMA acquired four properties on West 53rd Street and began construction on what is now the center part of the present museum building, designed in the International Style by architect/trustee Philip Goodwin and the young

Edward Stone. NAR chaired the Building Committee and was influential in hiring Stone. During construction from 1937 to 1939, the museum moved its gallery space to the concourse of a new building in Rockefeller Center on 49th Street.

When MoMA re-opened at 11 West 53rd Street in May 1939, NAR was the newly elected president. For the first time, the museum had ample exhibition and office space, and an auditorium for viewing films on the premises. President Roosevelt spoke on the radio during the opening ceremonies, saying, "in encouraging the creation and enjoyment of beautiful things we are furthering democracy itself. That is why this museum is a citadel of civilization."

Four months after the reopening, during the first of the museum's many grand-scale Picasso exhibitions, Germany invaded Poland, and World War II began in Europe. European lenders, anxious about the safe return of their loans, were allowed to store them at MoMA for the duration of the war, and they were cared for as though they were museum property. Many of these works later became museum property, such as Picasso's *Girl with a Mandolin* (1910) which was loaned to the show by Roland Penrose and purchased by NAR, who gave it to the museum.

Nelson Rockefeller also created MoMA's Inter-American fund, enabling the museum to acquire David Alfaro Siqueiros's *Ethnography* (1939) and José Clemente Orozco's *Dive Bomber and Tank* (1940) and, ultimately, to put together the most important collection of modern Latin American art then in an American museum. In 1949 René d'Harnoncourt was named MoMA's director. His close relationship with NAR and his great knowledge of primitive art influenced NAR's collecting and founding of the Museum of Primitive Art, which, in 1969, became a wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art named for Nelson's son, Michael, who perished collecting such art in New Guinea in 1961.

D'Harnoncourt, Alfred Barr, who became director of Museum Collections with responsibility for building the permanent collections of the Museum, and Dorothy C. Miller, curator of Museum Collections, were instrumental in advis-

ing Nelson, Blanchette, and David Rockefeller in establishing important modern art collections which have come to, or have been promised to, MoMA.

The resulting connections between the museum, the Rockefellers, and Pocantico Hills are numerous. For example, NAR, working with Barr, commissioned a design from Matisse for the rose window at the Union Church in Pocantico Hills, which is dedicated in memory of Abby. The day after Matisse died, Barr received a letter from him confirming the completion of his design; it was probably Matisse's last letter.

In July 1952, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) awarded a five-year grant to the International Program of the Museum to develop a full program of foreign-circulating exhibitions and to support U. S. representation at international festivals. In 1953 the International Council was established as an advisory board to the Program, with Blanchette Hooker Rockefeller as its first chairman and president. Blanchette, the wife of John D. Rockefeller 3rd, had been active in the affairs of MoMA since 1949 and was elected a member of the Board of Trustees in December 1952. In 1958, at a time when many Americans derided modern art or thought it communist and subversive, Rockefeller support to the

International Program that helped send *The New American Painting*, the first major exhibition of Abstract Expressionism, to eight European cities. From 1960 to 1970, the International Council and Program furnished U.S. embassies abroad with art and selected the American section for the Venice Biennale.

In 1959, in anticipation of its thirty-fifth anniversary, the museum began an ambitious capital campaign because it was in serious need of space for educational purposes and for exhibitions. In 1960 Mrs. Parmalee Prentice, John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s sister, gave her house and property next door to the Museum. Under the leadership of David Rockefeller, then chairman (presently chairman emeritus) of MoMA's Board, and Blanchette Rockefeller, then president, Philip Johnson designed two new wings to the east and west, an addition to The Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Garden, and a renovated lobby. The East Wing provided needed space for temporary exhibitions— 5400 square feet of galleries uninterrupted by supporting piers. The acquisition of the former Whitney Museum space on 54th Street provided room for a garden restaurant. Substantial contributions for the expansion came from the RBF, the Rockefeller Foundation, JDR Jr., Nelson, David, and Blanchette. In May 1964 when MoMA reopened, David Rockefeller escorted Lady Bird Johnson through the galleries.

David Rockefeller's twentieth-century art interests have always been more modern than contemporary, but during the period of his first chairmanship (1962-72) MoMA held two of its most controversial, and in retrospect, important exhibitions: *The Art of Assemblage* (1961) and *The Responsive Eye* (1965). The choices were daring, and criticisms were harsh. David Rockefeller remained unflappable and supportive of the staff, characteristics that were especially invaluable between 1968, when d'Harnoncourt retired as director of the Museum, and the "painful but earnest trial and error period", that occurred before Richard E. Oldenburg was named director in 1972. At this time Blanchette Rockefeller had become president of MoMA (1972-1985).



Photograph by Erich Hartmann. Courtesy of Magnum Photos, Inc.

From left to right: Adlai Stevenson, Lady Bird Johnson, Peggy and David Rockefeller, Alfred Barr, Jr., Richard Koch, and Sarah d' Harnoncourt at the reopening of the Museum of Modern Art on May 25, 1964.

Blanchette Rockefeller provided enlightened leadership through the 1970s and 1980s. Two of her most important gifts were de Kooning's *Woman II* (1952) and Clyfford Still's *Painting* (1951), an Abstract-Expressionist landscape. The Abstract Expressionist galleries on the second floor are named in her honor. In 1979 Blanchette accepted an Oscar on behalf of MoMA's work in film.

By the time of its fiftieth anniversary in 1979, MoMA had become the model for new museums and gallery spaces for modern art throughout the world. MoMA's international role as a primary resource for loans, exhibitions, scholarship, and expertise had continued to grow. Funds were needed to support that growth, and the museum met the challenge in an innovative way — by leasing the air rights over its property, an idea from Richard Koch, then MoMA's Director of Administration and General Counsel. César Pelli was chosen as the architect, the result being the MoMA building we know today.

A highlight of the 1990s has been the gifts to the museum of major collections that will enhance its already unparalleled holdings. Foremost among these are promised gifts from David and the late Peggy Rockefeller shown in a MoMA exhibition in the summer of 1993, including Matisse's magnificent *Girl Reading* (1905-06), and Cezanne's important *Boy in a Red Vest* (1888-90). These will someday join other such masterworks such as Rousseau's *Dream* (1910) and Matisse's *Dance* (1909), both among the many gifts of NAR.

The vision and generosity of the Rockefeller family were instrumental in creating The Museum of Modern Art, and have continued to enrich the museum's programs and collections immeasurably over the past sixty-eight years. When Gertrude Stein said to the young Alfred Barr, "You can't be a museum and be modern," she was mistaken. Thanks in great part to Rockefeller vision the museum has more than survived; it is indeed a successful modern museum!

Rona Roob

The Rockefeller Foundation and Danish Eugenics

A large grant from the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) in 1938 enabled the creation of an Institute for Human Genetics and Eugenics at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. The funds facilitated the formal institutionalization of work in human genetics and eugenics in Denmark under the leadership of Tage Kemp.

Despite Denmark's leading role in the area of eugenic legislation — in 1929 Denmark passed the first national sterilization act in Europe — no serious attempt to establish an academic research center to study issues of human heredity was made until the mid-1930s. However, Norway (1916), Sweden (1921), and Germany (1927) had established publicly financed research institutes in human genetics and eugenics. The older eugenic legislation in Denmark was administered by psychiatric medical experts based in forensic medicine and by clinical doctors from the institutions for the mentally retarded. But as the first sterilization law was followed by four other eugenically oriented laws, the need for medical expertise in the field of human genetics became stronger.

Negotiations between the University of Copenhagen and the RF began in 1934. The foundation had made prior contributions to other areas of medical research in Denmark, such as psychiatry and serology, and it was through the leading Danish serologist, Oluf Thomsen, that the RF became aware that Denmark might be a venue for future grants in human genetics and eugenics.

The international eugenic movement was at a turning point in the 1930s. Mainline eugenic practices, based on unreliable scientific investigations, were abundant in the U.S. Growing criticism of such practices was voiced by reform-minded scientists, with much of it directed at the leading American research center, Charles Davenport's Cold Spring Harbor Record Office of Eugenics. RF officials were sympathetic to this criticism and made it clear that mainline eugenic projects

would not receive financial support from the RF. At the same time, however, the RF was eager to support research in human genetics, even though they realized that most work in human genetics was closely linked with, and even governed by, eugenic concerns. It soon became apparent that Denmark represented a possible arena in which to solve this dilemma.

Oluf Thomsen had recommended Tage Kemp, one of his bright, young scientific assistants, for a Rockefeller fellowship. Though Tage Kemp had already published in various medical fields, he seemed to be interested in making human genetics and eugenics his future career. Kemp received his first Rockefeller grant in 1932 and traveled to the U.S. to visit Cold Spring Harbor, where he studied Davenport's work methods and carefully examined Davenport's enormous eugenic register. Kemp, as the sole Danish delegate, also participated in the Third International Eugenics Congress in New York. His reports from this visit convinced the RF to fund the promising student because Kemp received not just one but two more Rockefeller grants.

The first grant supported experimental work in Copenhagen, while the second underwrote visits to a variety of outstanding genetic centers in Europe. The latter grant not only provided the RF with a means to receive information on the state of the art of human genetics in most European countries, but it also prepared Kemp for the task of establishing an institute for human genetic research of his own in Copenhagen. This institute was financed by the RF and equipped and run according to the most modern and advanced principles in Europe.

The RF records at the Rockefeller Archive Center spell out in detail the negotiations between Copenhagen, what kind of minute information the RF collected about Kemp personally and the Danish research environment in general, as well as Danish eugenic legislation.

Three main factors explain the RF's decision in April 1936 to invest \$90,000 to establish an Institute for Human Genetics and Eugenics at Copenhagen University.

The first involves Kemp's personality and professional qualifications, as well as his critical views of mainline eugenics. Daniel O'Brien, an RF officer, regarded Kemp as a scientist of "unquestioned integrity and thoroughness of purpose, in a field where these attributions are needed more than in most scientific investigations. Race biology today [1939] suffers immensely from mixture with political dogmas and drives, [but] Dr. Kemp, through his personality and training is as free from these as possible."

A second reason entailed Copenhagen's favorable scientific milieu, Kemp's respected position there, and the possibilities for future interdisciplinary work. Denmark had a long and proven tradition in genetic research (for example, Wilhelm Johannsen and Oyvind Winge), and several institutions specializing in psychiatry and mental retardation that welcomed the plans to establish a new institute.

Lastly, Denmark's particular demographic and social structure influenced the RF's decision. The Danish population was very homogenous, stable, and, more importantly, very thoroughly registered. Multiple generations of Danes lived in the same village or even on the same farm. Denmark was an Eldorado for family studies. In addition, the extensive registration of the mentally retarded and the insane, conducted under the auspices of the Ministry for Social Affairs, provided an important source for the heredity studies of such disorders.

The Institute for Human Genetics and Eugenics was established in 1938 and flourished for a quarter of a century. In 1956 it hosted the First International Congress on Human Genetics. After the retirement of Tage Kemp in 1960, the institute changed its scientific emphasis. Whereas other institutions experienced a boom with the advent of prenatal diagnosis, the institute experienced a period of stagnation. The institute still exists, but now as a department within a larger biochemical institute.

Lene Koch

Lawrence K. Frank and the Rockefeller Philanthropies, 1923-1936

Lawrence Kelso Frank (1890-1968) was an officer with the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), the Spelman Fund of New York, and the General Education Board (GEB) from 1923 to 1936. Best known for his work in promoting child development research and parent education under the auspices of these foundations, Frank also played an important role in formulating and implementing the social science and educational programs that these foundations sponsored. What makes Frank an especially interesting figure is his attempt to explicitly formulate the purposes and goals of the programs in which he was involved. A prolific writer, Frank authored a number of reports, memoranda, and journal articles that outlined an agenda for the research and educational programs that he organized and promoted. Frank wanted to see knowledge produced and disseminated in order to construct a pacified and managed social sector, one in which competition would be replaced by cooperation, and where social conflict and disorder would be diminished. More specifically, by furthering the production of knowledge in the fields of culture and personality, child development, and the social sciences, and in sponsoring the diffusion of such knowledge among parents, teachers, and social workers, Frank hoped to foster the rearing of friendly, sensitive, and cooperative personalities who would be at home in the new harmonious social order that he envisioned.

Frank's first important project for the Rockefeller philanthropies was his report on "The Status of Social Science in the United States," which was commissioned in March 1923 by Beardsley Ruml, the LSRM's new director. In his report, Frank bemoaned the condition of the social sciences in the U.S. as being dimly speculative, scholastic, and "dialectical." What was needed, he argued, was the development of a new social science which would be oriented to the experimental method and to the study of the empirical phenomena of social life. More particu-

larly, social science should focus on human behavior within a variety of social contexts. Such a focus on behavior would provide a common framework for the social sciences and thereby foster interdisciplinary approaches, as well as enable the social sciences to assist in the advancement of social reform. Formulating a technocratic approach aimed at managing, pacifying, and "reforming" the social by means of the experiment upon and the alteration of behavior, Frank wrote: "There is need of experimental study on group behavior and the formation and breaking of habits, particularly in infants.... When it is realized that political reforms, health education, and indeed practically all social improvements wait upon the slow change of habits of thought and behavior, the importance of these studies on habit formation and habit breaking will readily be seen."

Frank was placed in charge of the child study and parent education program of the LSRM in the fall of 1923, and directed these programs until the foundation was dismantled in January 1929. But he continued to concern himself with the social sciences during this time. Frank attended most of the Hanover conferences, which were held annually from 1925 to 1930. These conferences provided interdisciplinary groups of social scientists an opportunity to discuss important concerns and problems in their disciplines, and, most significantly, they established a context for exploring and creating an interdisciplinary approach based on the empirical study of behavior. During this period, Frank elaborated a special vision of a behavior-oriented approach to social science in a series of papers published in major academic journals. In these pieces he suggested that the task of social science was not simply to passively observe and describe the social, but to actively construct and manage the social. Genuine social science would come into being, Frank proposed, only when it had developed techniques for the breaking and forming of habits, techniques which would foster a conflict-free, neighborly, and relatively homogeneous social sector. As Frank put it, "a social science will truly begin with the discovery of a technique for direct-

ing, and controlling, as we may say, men's behavior, that is, establishing the habits necessary to a social life and then keeping them in continuous and exclusive operation."

Frank's program in child study and parent education should be understood in the context of his overall agenda for the development of the social sciences and the construction of the social. He saw the diffusion of new methods in child rearing—methods which were to be based on scientific research in child development—as “the master technique of human progress,” and he believed that the new modes of child rearing would alleviate the social problems and tensions associated with the “cultural lag” generated by the rapid technological change that was characteristic of modern industrialized societies. It was thus the task of parent education programs, such as those sponsored by the Child Study Association of America and the American Association of University Women, to promote and diffuse the new enlightened child-rearing practices while encouraging mothers to discard the old, obsolete, traditional methods of raising children. Ultimately, Frank hoped, research in child development and the dissemination of the results of this research to parents would play a fundamental role in the construction and management of a pacified social sector.

In the 1930s, Frank shifted from an emphasis on altering the behavior of the individual to the redirection of culture as the primary method for promoting reform and social order. He thus came to believe that the way to create a pacified and wholesome social order was not simply by focusing on changing the specific behavior patterns of individuals, but instead was by stressing the reconstruction of the culture as a whole and by disseminating the new cultural values and practices to the general population. Although his new approach to the promotion of social order was in significant respects more of a shift in emphasis rather than a repudiation of his earlier approach, Frank did become, during the 1930s, more concerned with issues such as culture and personality, and the diffusion of new cultural values and practices through education, aesthetic

experience, and youthful experimentation with gender relations and roles.

In October 1931 Frank became Associate Director of the GEB and remained a GEB officer for the next five years. He was put in charge of its program in child growth and development in 1933, and also assisted in the formulation of the GEB program for reorganizing secondary education. This program was designed to alleviate the demoralization of adolescents resulting from the widespread unemployment and despair about the future which was pervasive during the 1930s. Frank and the other GEB officers hoped that the utilization of the methods of progressive education in high schools would assist in keeping a greater number of adolescents in secondary schools and thus lead to a wider diffusion of wholesome and cooperative cultural practices and values among the adolescent population. Frank believed that child development and the study of culture and personality could play an especially significant role in reforming secondary education by illuminating the formation of the ego-ideals and superego in the adolescent. According to Frank, “it should be emphasized that modification of our social life must involve a re-direction of the ego-ideals and the superego of individuals, since our competitive, aggressive and chaotic economic political life is in large measure a reflection of the ambitions and aspirations that have become a set pattern of individuals during the adolescent years.”

Especially interesting is Frank's promotion of the culture and personality approach during the 1930s. He organized the Seminar on the Impact of Culture on Personality which was held at Yale University during the 1932-1933 academic year. The anthropologist Edward Sapir directed this seminar with assistance from sociologist John Dollard. Frank also was the major organizer of an interdisciplinary conference on “human relations” that was held at the Hanover Inn in Dartmouth, New Hampshire, during the summer of 1934. Frank conceived this conference as part of the GEB program for reorganizing secondary education. The conference was specifically charged with formulating an approach for developing

teaching materials on human relations for adolescents. The participants included Dollard, Margaret Mead, and Robert S. Lynd. Under Frank's informal guidance, the conference produced an outline that was an important statement of the culture and personality point of view. Mead later credited this conference with having a significant impact on her *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (1935) as well as on a volume which she edited, *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples* (1937). She also suggested that Dollard's *Criteria for the Life History* (1935) was inspired by the 1934 Hanover conference.

While working for several different Rockefeller philanthropies during the 1920s and 1930s, Frank came to elaborate on the goals and purposes of the foundation projects in which he was involved. He saw himself as a social reformer who was attempting to create an orderly and harmonious social sector, and he believed that the production of knowledge in child development, culture and personality, and social science would contribute to his agenda for social reform. Well-intentioned as Frank was, however, it is important to recognize that his project for social reform was fundamentally technocratic. Along with many other reformers, social scientists, educators, jurists, philanthropists, and other professionals of his era, Frank came to eschew open political debate and conflict; instead, he embraced the production and dissemination of expert knowledge as the privileged route to reform.

Dennis Bryson

Grants for Travel and Research at the Rockefeller Archive Center

The Rockefeller Archive Center, a division of The Rockefeller University, invites applications for its program of Grants for Travel and Research at the Rockefeller Archive Center for 1998. The competitive program makes grants of up to \$1,500 to U.S. and Canadian researchers and up to \$2,000 to researchers from abroad in any discipline, usually graduate students or post-doctoral scholars,

who are engaged in research that requires use of the collections at the Center. The Center's collections include the records of the Rockefeller family, the Rockefeller University, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other philanthropies and associated individuals.

For 1998, the Center will supplement its regular grant program with additional targeted grants in two areas: the history of the social sciences, and the history of The Rockefeller University (founded in 1901 as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research). The Center recently opened the archives of the Social Science Research Council and holds extensive social science materials in the archives of the Russell Sage Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, and Rockefeller family. The archives of The Rockefeller University document the rise of biomedical research in the 20th century, particularly in physiology and immunology, and contain important materials on 20th-century science in general.

The deadline for all grant applications is November 30, 1997; grant recipients will be announced in March 1998. Inquiries about the program and requests for applications should be addressed to Darwin H. Stapleton, Director, Rockefeller Archive Center, 15 Dayton Avenue, Sleepy Hollow, New York 10591-1598. The grant application, along with detailed information about



President Richard M. Nixon with Governor Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas at the White House, July 7, 1970, one of more than 2,000 images from the recently acquired William E. Davis Photograph Collection. Davis, a photographer in Little Rock, often was called upon to photograph events in Rockefeller's business and political careers.

William E. Davis Photograph Collection

the Rockefeller Archive Center and a guide to its collections, can be found on the World Wide Web (<http://www.rockefeller.edu/archive.ctr/>).

Forty-eight scholars have received stipends to conduct research at the Rockefeller Archive Center during 1997. This year's recipients, their institutions, and research topics follow.

General Grants 1997

Christian Alcindor

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, Rutgers University.

"U.S.-Haiti Relations from 1957 to 1969: Anti-Communism, Nation-Building, and Racial Diplomacy in the Age of National Liberation."

Daniel Belgrad

Assistant Professor of Humanities and American Studies. University of South Florida.

"Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1935-1950."

Jeffrey Belnap

Assistant Professor of Humanities. Division of Fine Arts, Brigham Young University, Hawaii Campus.

"Mediating Tehuanantepec: Regionalism, Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Twentieth-Century Mexico."

Stanley Blake

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

"The Underdevelopment of a People: The Brazilian Northeast, 1889-1945."

Thomas Bonner

Distinguished Professor of History
Department of History, Wayne State University.

"A Biography of Abraham Flexner, 1866-1959."

William Buxton

Professor. Department of Communication Studies, Concordia University, Quebec.

"Dramatizing North America: Rockefeller Support for Theatre, 1930-1950."

Emily Cahan

Assistant Professor of Psychology.

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Wheelock College, Boston.

"Child Welfare and Child Psychology: An Uneasy Alliance."

Laura Calkins

Assistant Research Scientist. Center for the Education of Women, University of Michigan.

"Creating an International Technical Regime: Radiation Safety and Science Policy in the Atoms for Peace Era, 1948-1968."



Laura Spielman Rockefeller Memorial Archives

Children of tubercular families on Hunter Island, Pelham Bay, in the 1920s. Children and public health are among the themes to be explored by this year's recipients of Archive Center grants-in-aid.

Vernon Clarke

Independent Filmmaker. Videotape Associates.

"For the Well Being of Mankind — The Julius Rosenwald Fund."

Lina de Faria

Visiting Fellow. Casa de Oswaldo Cruz, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro.

"Backstage at the First Rockefeller Mission to Brazil: An Unwritten Story."

Scott Flipse

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, University of Notre Dame.

"To Save Free Vietnam and Lose Our Souls: Religion, Humanitarianism, and the American Commitment in South East Asia, 1954-1966."

Julia Foulkes

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

"Dancing America: Modern Dance and Cultural Nationalism, 1925-1950."

Michael Fultz

Associate Professor. Educational Policy Studies Department, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

"African-American Teachers in the South, 1890-1960."

Antonio Gaztambide-Geigel

Associate Professor. Department of General Social Studies, School of Social Studies, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras.

"Nelson A. Rockefeller and U.S.-Caribbean Relations, 1946-1960."

John S. Gilkeson

Associate Professor. Department of American Studies, Arizona State University West.

"America as Region and Nation."

Lynn Gorchov

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
The Johns Hopkins University.
"Sexual Science and Sexual Politics:
Sex Research and the Politicization of Sex, 1921-1956."

Richard Hankins

Ph.D. Candidate. Centre for the History of Science,
Technology and Medicine, University of Manchester.
"Immunity to Parasites: A History of Professional
Interaction in Twentieth-Century Biomedical Sciences."

Rhodri Hayward

Research Associate. Department of History,
Lancaster University, United Kingdom.
"The Brain and the Self: Neuroscience and the Public
Understanding of Science and Medicine, 1920-1960."

Cheryl Hicks

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
Princeton University.
"Women, Prisons and Race in the State of New York,
1890-1940."

Ben Keppel

Assistant Professor. Department of History
University of Oklahoma.
"Children and Social Change."

Julie Kimmel

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
The Johns Hopkins University.
"The Invention of Personnel Management:
Reconstructing Authority in the Corporate Workplace,
1920-1950."

Dean Kotlowski

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
Indiana University.
"Politics and Principle: Richard Nixon and
Civil Rights Policy."

Gwenael Kropfingier

Research Assistant and Masters Candidate. Institut
d'Histoire du Temps Present and Universite Paris,
Sorbonne, France.
"French Scientific Policy in the Twentieth Century:
A Case Study of Henri Longchambon, 1896-1969."

Deepak Kumar

Coordinator. History of Science Division, NISTADS,
New Delhi, India.
"Medicine and the Raj."

Susan Lederer

Associate Professor. Department of Humanities,
The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine.
"Blood Relations: Blood Transfusion in
Twentieth-Century America."

Rebecca Lemov

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of Anthropology,
University of California, Berkeley.
"White Shoe to White Collar: Bureaucratic Anthropology
and the Birth of the Information Age, 1930-1955."

Amy Marver

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of Art History,
University of California, Irvine.
"Home-made Modern: The Museum of Modern Art and
the Domestication of European Modernism in America,
1929-1939."

Philip Nelson

Instructor in History. Department of Liberal Arts,
Hawkeye Community College, Waterloo, Iowa.
"The Small Community in Mass Society, 1940-1960."

Gabor Pallo

Senior Researcher. The Institute of Philosophy
of the Hungarian Academy of Science.
"Rockefeller Foundation Assistance to Migrating
Hungarian Scientists."

James C. Riley

Professor. History Department, Indiana University.
"William P. Jacobs and the Early Stages of Kerala's
Health Transition."

Sean Savage

Associate Professor. St. Mary's College,
Notre Dame, Indiana.
"JFK and LBJ: An Analysis of Party Leadership."

Connie Shemo

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
Binghamton University.
"American Missionary Medical Education for
Chinese Women, 1870-1951."

James Siekmeier

Visiting Fulbright Professor of History
Universidad Mayor de San Andres, La Paz, Bolivia.
"United States-Bolivian Relations, 1940-1970:
Aid, Development, and Instability."

Marianne Stevens

Ph.D. Candidate. Institute for the History and Philosophy
of Science and Technology, University of Toronto.
"The Full-Time System Takes Off in Canada: How Private
and Government Funding Led to Full-Time Clinical
Teaching and Research, 1919-1939."

Eric Strahorn

Ph.D. Candidate. University of Iowa.
"The Role of the Rockefeller Foundation in
India's Green Revolution."

Ann Marie Stuart

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
"The Rockefeller Foundation and Developments in Public
Health in the South Pacific, 1920-1940s."

Colin Talley

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of the History of Health
Sciences, University of California, San Francisco.
"A Social History of Multiple Sclerosis in the
United States, 1870-1960."

Andrea Tone

Assistant Professor. School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Tech, Atlanta.
 "Devices and Desires: Women and the Commercialization of Contraception, 1873-1973."

Effy Vayena

Ph.D. Candidate. Program in History of Science and Technology, University of Minnesota.
 "Development and Dissemination of the Pap Test. An Historical Analysis."

Sheryl Wade

Director. Annual Funds and Grants, Huntington College.
 "The Industrialists of the Gilded Age: Men of Iron and Gold."

Steven Wagner

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History
 Purdue University.
 "The Decline of the Republican Left, 1952-1964."

Andrew Wood

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
 University of California, Davis.
 "Yellow Fever and the Condition of the City: The Politics of Sanitation in the Port of Veracruz, Mexico, 1914-1932."

Donald Wright

Ph.D. Candidate. University of Ottawa.
 "The Rockefeller Foundation and the Development of History as a Social Science in English Canada, 1930-1957."

Robert Zeidel

Lecturer. Social Science Department,
 University of Wisconsin, Stout.
 "Examining the Immigrant: The National Research Council and the Study of Human Migration during the 1920s."

Targeted Grants for Research on Africa, 1997**Michael Chege**

Director. Center for African Studies and Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Florida.
 "A Pioneering View of the Rockefeller Foundation's Contribution to African Studies in Two Parts: The Founding of the International African Institute in London, and the Training of Economic Managers after Independence."

Richard Glotzer

Associate Professor. Department of Africana and Latino Studies and Department of Human Ecology, State University of New York, Oneonta.
 "Special Relationships: Rockefeller Philanthropy, Anglo-American Relations and Post-War Africa, 1945-1965."

Richard Hull

Professor of African History. Department of History,
 New York University.
 "The Rockefeller Foundation in East Africa, 1960-1974."

Brenda Plummer

Professor. Department of History and Department of Afro-American Studies,
 University of Wisconsin, Madison.
 "African Studies in American Perspective: A History of Separate Development."

John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s "Gift to France" and the Restoration of Monuments, 1924-1936

The travel grant I received from the Rockefeller Archive Center enabled me to complete doctoral dissertation research begun in January 1995 on John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s (JDR Jr.) joint financial and administrative roles in the restoration of the former royal palace of Versailles and other French historic monuments between 1924 and 1936.

Following his extensive trip through France in the summer of 1923, which included visits to Versailles and Reims Cathedral, JDR Jr. commissioned Harold Sheets, then director of marketing for a Standard Oil subsidiary in Paris, to gather detailed information on the status of these and other endangered French monuments. Based on Sheets' reports, and out of an expressed concern for the future enjoyment of these buildings, JDR Jr. proposed a monetary "gift to France" in May of 1924 to assist the French government in their preservation.

According to the terms of the gift, an independent *comite franco-americain pour la restauration des monuments*, comprised of the American architect, Welles Bosworth, and noted French diplomats and businessmen, was to oversee the disbursement of the funds in compliance with a set program. This program included sums for the much-needed reconstruction of the roof and steeple of Reims Cathedral, which had been demolished by German bombardiers during the First World War, and the prevention of further structural deterioration at the former royal palaces of Fontainebleau and Versailles. The French governmental architects in charge of each historic monument were to submit project proposals to the committee, along with project budgets, schedules, and deadlines. The committee was to authorize payment upon the completion of work and the presentation of governmental vouchers.

As early as 1926, it had become apparent to the committee that additional financial support from

JDR Jr. would be necessary to complete the work at Versailles and the other monuments. In March of that year it had been reported that French contractors were not guaranteeing any contract beyond a period of three months because of the grave financial crisis in France, and that they were reserving the right to raise their prices within the three-month period should there be significant fluctuations in the rate of exchange. Although the report had been based on rumor, real increases in material and labor costs in France during the mid twenties, coupled with an astonishing number of unfinished projects, were important factors in JDR Jr.'s decision to pledge a second gift in 1927.



Reims, au Lendeman de la Guerre Éditions Jean Buday & C^{ie} a paris-3 rue de cherche-moi, 1927.

Whereas the first gift went towards roof repair and building consolidation at the three monuments, Rockefeller's second gift provided funds for less urgent repairs and restorations. The work

covered under this second gift included the reconstruction of the queen Marie-Antoinette's "Little Theatre," and "Hameau," an eighteenth-century model hamlet, as well as the removal of several nineteenth-century colossal statues from the main palace's Court of Honor. It was also during this second phase that French architects turned their attention towards the adjacent town of Versailles, citing the need to preserve the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century "look and feel" of Versailles well beyond the perimeters of the palace. The French government's eleventh-hour purchase of a nearby eighteenth-century town-house with a generous loan from JDR Jr. in 1934 and the slated demolition of nineteenth-century structures around the royal stables exemplified the expansive restoration fever then in vogue in France.

Publicly JDR Jr.'s *comite franco-américain* gave the appearance of an autonomous decision-making body. However, JDR Jr. privately steered the committee's funding decisions through Welles Bosworth, with whom he had maintained confidential correspondence over the course of the committee's active operation. Both he and his committee drew harsh criticism from many French citizens who had viewed any foreign involvement in the restoration of French monuments as an undesirable intrusion into the internal affairs of France.

Although American and French sources disagree on the exact dollar amounts of JDR Jr.'s "gifts to France," in a 1936 memo, Robert W. Gumbel, JDR Jr.'s financial adviser, placed the final figures at one million dollars for the first gift and 40 million francs, or approximately \$1.85 million, for the second. Of the total of \$2.85 million, 76 percent went to the restoration of Versailles, 20 percent to Reims Cathedral, and four percent to Fontainebleau.

JDR Jr.'s "gifts to France" occupy an intriguing position chronologically as they are bounded by his controversial acquisition in 1923 of the famed French Rochefoucauld ("Unicorn") tapestries now at the Cloisters Museum in New York and his efforts to purchase and dismantle a French chapel in the town of Chauvirey (also for the Cloisters) in 1936 and 1937. In both instances,

Rockefeller Family Archives

JDR Jr. met with considerable grassroots opposition in France, and his actions contributed to the strengthening of French laws limiting the expropriation of cultural artifacts. Since Welles Bosworth was negotiating the purchase of French antiquities such as medieval manuscripts for JDR Jr. at the same time that he was overseeing the restoration efforts, one wonders whether JDR Jr. felt a moral obligation to help preserve the French architectural patrimony in exchange for the works of art and architecture he was taking out of the country.

JDR Jr.'s French restorations overlap with his other personally funded restoration projects, most recognizably (for Americans, that is) Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia, begun in 1926. At Williamsburg as at Versailles an expansive restoration sensibility (i.e., a propensity towards complete restoration entailing the obliteration of all aspects of a monument or site which fall outside a desired chronological or stylistic framework) had taken over, and while it resulted in beautiful and highly imaginative architectural interpretations of life in the eighteenth century, it had left little room for exceptions or anomalies — or for anything built or modified after the historical period in question. In France, museum officials had established clear linkages between historical periods and historic monuments (Versailles = seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France, Fontainebleau = sixteenth-century France) and they distributed —and at times swapped— fine and decorative art objects to achieve an unrelenting stylistic consistency at these locations. Although JDR Jr. usually left the details to the architects in charge of the various projects, he enabled this particular restoration philosophy to prevail through the financial and administrative structures he himself had created. In this respect, his restoration projects constituted an exceptional and critical moment in the history of historic preservation practice both in the U.S. and abroad.

Martin Perschler

Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Development of African Studies

The Rockefeller Foundation (RF), the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF), and the General Education Board (GEB) have a long history of support for projects involving Africa and African studies. This interest in Africa, particularly prior to 1960 when such funding became more widespread, suggested the importance of records held in the Rockefeller Archive Center to my dissertation on the beginnings and development of academic African studies in the U.S. My visit to the Rockefeller Archive Center and study of files related to Africa and African studies confirmed that impression and indicated the centrality of the Rockefeller philanthropies and administrators in the development of this discipline.

Perhaps most relevant for my study were records pertaining to the establishment of formal programs of African studies in U.S. universities. These were found in both the GEB and RF archives. While individual scholars had promoted study of Africa in colleges and universities as early as the first decades of the twentieth century, most notably William Leo Hansberry at Howard University and W.E.B. DuBois at Atlanta University, the first organized attempts at establishing formal African studies programs with university support came in the late 1930s and early 1940s. World War II and the accompanying military campaign in Africa, strategic concerns, and debates about colonialism made African studies viable as a national interest. It also highlighted the dearth of knowledge about Africa in the U.S. Less than ten American scholars had done fieldwork in Africa prior to World War II.

The RF and GEB helped lead the effort to expand U.S. knowledge of Africa. In 1942 the University of Pennsylvania and Fisk University approached the RF and GEB respectively for support for establishing programs in African studies, invoking national interest and “objective” research as justifications for funding. While

Pennsylvania had started an African collection in its University Museum before the war, the concept of establishing a formal African studies program seems to have arisen after the U.S. Army started an Army Specialized Training Program on North Africa at Pennsylvania in 1941-1942. The previous interest in Africa of a few scholars, most importantly Heinrich Wieschhoff, the Curator of the African Section of the museum, along with the injection of funds and language courses from the Army program, created an infrastructure for an African studies program. W. Norman Brown of the Oriental Studies department, representing a Committee of African Studies at Pennsylvania, asked David Stevens of the RF for \$5000 to build up a library of Africana, disseminate information on Africa to scholars and institutions, and hire additional faculty. After some debate, the RF granted \$3000 to the University of Pennsylvania in January 1943 to continue the initial stages of a study of African languages and cultures. In appropriating similar levels of funding in 1944 and 1945, RF officers noted that Pennsylvania appeared a logical location for a center of African studies in the U.S.

Almost concurrently in 1942, Charles S. Johnson of Fisk submitted to Jackson Davis of the GEB a proposal to create an African studies program. Johnson headed the Department of Social Sciences at Fisk, and he and Davis knew each other well, having worked closely together with officers of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Julius Rosenwald Fund. Johnson's proposal also emphasized the possible military value and scientific increase in knowledge from organized linguistic and anthropological research on Africa. But as a black university, Fisk could also train African-Americans for careers in agriculture, medicine, and mission proselyting in Africa who, according to the proposal, could prove more valuable than white trainees in promoting U.S.-African relations. Interestingly, although Fisk had two African-American Africanists on its faculty (in anthropology and linguistics), the GEB chose to support Fisk's request by granting \$10,000 for South African-born, British-trained anthropologist Edwin W. Smith, working at the time at the

Kennedy School of Missions in Connecticut, to be a visiting professor at Fisk for one year (1943-1944) and organize an African studies program. Apparently Davis felt that Smith, an acquaintance and a former president of the Royal Anthropological Society, had more experience as an administrator in African studies and brought added prestige and authority to the faculty.

While these attempts to institutionalize African studies in U.S. universities were notable for their rapid response to world events, the RF's interest in academic African studies did not simply begin with World War II. In the 1930s it had approved grants to the School of Oriental and African Studies in London for research in African linguistics and to the British Institute of African Languages and Cultures, thereby strengthening the foundations of African studies generally and creating a relationship with several well-known British scholars of Africa. RF administrators saw such support as urgent and sustaining programs that helped bolster the administrative controls of European nations throughout Africa, thereby maintaining "reasonable relations" with "native tribes." As the RF and GEB placed more importance on creating university-based African studies programs in the U.S., Jackson Davis and Joseph Willitts (of the RF) contacted several of the British scholars they had met earlier and asked for their evaluations of U.S. scholars and resources, occasionally even sponsoring visits to the U.S. by well-known scholars of Africa, such as British linguist Ida Ward, to consult with RF officers.

These early grants and contacts signify an expanding network of persons interested in Africa which soon grew to include other foundation administrators and scholars as well as government officials (both British and American) and businessmen. Indeed, the founding members of the academic-oriented African Studies Association in 1957 included several representatives from each of these areas, a mix that would be anathema only a decade later. The small number of people with any expertise interested in African studies ensured a close relationship among many and a strong amount of individual influence. While

the Pennsylvania and Fisk programs founded as professors left or focused on other areas (both programs had ended by 1948), the first three major U.S. university-based African studies programs developed around such well-known scholars as Melville Herskovits (Northwestern), William O. Brown (Boston University), and James Coleman (UCLA).

The reasons behind the RF and GEB's promotion of African studies, i.e., providing a sound basis for U.S. foreign policy, establishing a base of academic knowledge, "developing" Africa economically and politically, and retaining African countries as allies of the West against the Soviet Union, continued after the war as well, as demonstrated by numerous grants disbursed over the next twenty years. Much support went to individual scholars (both American and British) for research, writing, and consultations with RF or GEB officers about the state of African studies in the U.S. Other grants went to conferences that generally included government officials, foundation representatives, businessmen, and scholars from the U.S. and abroad to discuss African and African studies issues such as economic development and South Africa. Additional funds went to the African-American Institute, the International African Institute, and the University of Cambridge to start the *Journal of African History*.

The RF and GEB records reflect the personal nature of many of the grants apportioned before 1960, as well as the dependence of foundation administrators on trusted scholars and experts to evaluate new proposals. At the same time, certain patterns emerged in grant-giving, such as continual encouragement of U.S.-British cooperation, an effort to expand African studies into the humanities, and a tendency to give support to experienced, proven scholars and institutions. Moreover, many of the grants to African studies meshed with projects in Africa underwritten by the RBF's West African Program and the RF's University Development Program. Research, contacts, and suggestions on one side were used to support the other and vice versa.

The Rockefeller Archive Center collections pertaining to Africa were invaluable in uncovering

these institutional and individual relationships among foundations and universities in developing African studies. My work in these files also has suggested other important subjects for my study, in particular, the role of African-American scholars and colleges in the growth of African studies, and the ways in which various foundations and organizations (for example, the Council on Foreign Relations) interacted with and promoted African studies.

Rebecca Pels

Nelson Rockefeller and the Promotion of Culture in New York City

The Rockefeller family has played a significant role in the city of New York's cultural life. John D. Rockefeller 3rd's association with Lincoln Center, John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s with The Cloisters and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller's with the Museum of Modern Art have been well-documented by historians, but Nelson A. Rockefeller's (NAR) interest in cultural matters has received far less scrutiny. This essay will discuss Rockefeller's collaboration with Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia in an effort to create a major new cultural institution in New York City. Although unsuccessful, their efforts paved the way for the creation of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts twenty years later.

In 1935 New York Mayor LaGuardia announced the formation of the Municipal Art Committee. From 1935 to 1939, the brief period during which the Committee operated, it successfully established and ran the Municipal Art Galleries and promoted summer festivals at which participated both prestigious and less well-known cultural institutions, including the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Metropolitan Opera Company, and the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. The third major component of the Municipal Art Committee's activities was to plan for a Municipal Music and Art Center. LaGuardia

considered this to be perhaps the most important part of the Committee's program. In September 1936 he hoped that "the art center with its opera house, symphonic concert hall, city auditorium and art galleries [would be] one of the outstanding tasks to be completed in his administration." The Municipal Art Committee was the official agency in charge of developing plans for the new cultural center. Its importance to the Mayor led him to consult with powerful public officials such as Adolf A. Berle, then City Chamberlain and later Under Secretary of State, and philanthropists such as Nelson A. Rockefeller and his mother, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller.

The Rockefeller family had demonstrated their interest in the project on several occasions. They housed the headquarters of the Municipal Art Committee at Rockefeller Center rent-free, and NAR regularly donated funds to the Committee. He and his mother also had a personal stake in the new project, since their Museum of Modern Art had outgrown its present facilities and was seeking a new home.

Nelson Rockefeller and his associates collaborated with the Municipal Art Committee in several ways. Architect Wallace K. Harrison, who became the master planner of Lincoln Center, had made studies of European opera houses and developed plans for an opera house at Rockefeller Center. Both he and NAR made these available to LaGuardia's Municipal Art Committee. Rockefeller and Harrison proposed a site for the new municipal cultural center between 51st and 53rd Streets and 5th and 6th Avenues, north of Rockefeller Center. NAR also attempted to sell his vision to the possible constituents of the new institution, the Metropolitan Opera Company, the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, and the Museum of Modern Art, but they were often disconcerted by LaGuardia's apparent lack of action, and the project's uncertainty and complexity. One such delay caused the Museum of Modern Art in 1937 to decide to erect its own building on land owned by the Rockefellers, while not completely abandoning the idea of becoming a constituent of the municipal center.

By 1938 Nelson Rockefeller and the Municipal Art Committee had four plans under consideration, all located on the site between 51st and 53rd Streets and 5th and 6th Avenues. Each of these plans called for a substantial contribution from New York City, primarily in the form of land, and envisioned the city picking up the cost, in whole or in part, for improvements to adjacent streets and plazas. These plans ranged from an ambitious design costing a total of \$19,988,800, with an expected municipal contribution of \$10,900,800, to the most modest one estimated to cost \$8,998,300, with a city share of \$3,998,300. Plan #1 included an 11,000-seat auditorium to be converted into an opera house and a concert hall, and a Municipal Art Gallery. A second building would be the home of an art museum. The third component would be the Museum of Modern Art which, despite its inclusion in the site, would remain privately owned and run. On the other end, plan #4 proposed a 3,500-seat auditorium, but no additional art museum to supplement the Museum of Modern Art.



Rockefeller Family Archives

Groundbreaking ceremonies for Lincoln Center, May 14, 1959.

The municipal government took no action on any of these plans. The only evidence of LaGuardia's continuing interest in the art center came in May 1938 when he asked Robert Moses, the head of the city's Parks Department and as such in charge of all the city-supported cultural institutions, to review the four plans presented by NAR and the Municipal Art Committee. Rockefeller was reassured that Moses would pro-

vide the leadership that he believed had been missing to date for the implementation of either of their plans. He congratulated the Mayor: "Couldn't be more pleased. Ready to cooperate with you and Bob. Feel more optimistic about the project now than ever before."

But Moses' assessment was very discouraging. He found that Plan #1 was too ambitious and too costly to the city. He further believed that none of the institutions called on to participate in the project were ready to bear the expense of building and maintaining new structures. Moses suggested two alternative plans. The most ambitious one was the only one that appealed to LaGuardia. It consisted, primarily, in a single building including an opera house and a concert hall that could be joined into a 9,500-seat auditorium. LaGuardia asked Moses to form a committee with Nelson Rockefeller and Adolf Berle among others to study the feasibility of this new plan. But ultimately, nothing came of this final initiative.

Many factors contributed to the LaGuardia administration's failure to achieve the desired cultural center. The organizations that were to be integrated in the project, such as the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Opera Company, the New York Philharmonic Symphony Society, the (to-be-created) Solomon Guggenheim Museum, and others, feared that the municipal center might overshadow their individual organizations and be a threat to their identities.

In the end, no agreement could be reached between the institutions and the city, and LaGuardia would not take the necessary steps of buying or condemning land for the project. Without assurances that they could obtain land for their new structures, the institutions could not sell their old buildings or begin to raise funds. In 1940 NAR interpreted the city's inaction as the result of Mayor LaGuardia's failure to assume fully his leadership role. He explained to Municipal Art Committee chairperson Aida Breckinridge that he "had pointed out [to the Mayor] that the responsibility for the initiative for the next step [probably referring to the necessity of condemning land for public use] can only come from him. He created the Municipal Art

Committee and has not wanted the leadership to slip out of his fingers. Therefore he must assume the responsibility which comes from that leadership." Failure to do so, Rockefeller believed, put an end to the project.

The grandiose Municipal Music and Art Center as envisioned by LaGuardia, his advisers, and his Municipal Art Committee remained unrealized until a set of circumstances in the 1950s and 1960s made the building of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts possible. These included the urgent need for new homes for the Metropolitan Opera Company, the New York Philharmonic Symphony Society, and the Julliard School for Music; Robert Moses' willingness to assume a leadership role in the project's realization as chairman of the city's Slum Clearance Committee; and the existence of a federal urban renewal program that transferred federal funds to cities in an attempt to rehabilitate slum areas. The sponsors of the Lincoln Center project, with John D. Rockefeller 3rd at their helm, still had to surmount innumerable difficulties before Lincoln Center was completed.

It could be argued that had it not been for NAR's crucial intervention one such difficulty would not have been overcome. The city's representatives and those of the Lincoln Center Corporation could not reach an agreement as to who would pay for the cost of the Library-Museum and the dance theater now known as the New York State Theater. The situation was deadlocked until Governor Rockefeller suggested in 1960 that the funding for the 1964 World's Fair provided an opportunity for the state to support Lincoln Center. In September 1960 his administration authorized a \$15 million contribution to the dance theater, provided the city matched the state's grant. The State Theater would be a showcase for the performing arts for the duration of the Fair. After two years the building's ownership would revert to the City, which would then lease it to Lincoln Center to be occupied by the New York City Ballet and the New York City Opera. Nelson Rockefeller finally had helped create a new arts center for New York City.

Murielle Vautrin

About the Contributors

Dennis Bryson holds a Ph.D. in history from the University of California at Irvine. His paper, "To Know and to Produce 'The Social': Lawrence K. Frank, Knowledge, and the Production of 'The Social,'" will appear in a forthcoming issue of *Poetics Today*. He is currently working on the relationship between the elaboration of knowledge and the management and pacification of the social in the United States during the early twentieth century. He can be reached at 1319 Oak Avenue, Apt. 3D, Evanston, IL 60201 or via e-mail: Bryson-dennis@norcmail.uchicago.edu.

Lene Koch is a historian and holds a Ph.D. in technology assessment. She recently published a monograph on the history of eugenics in Denmark (*Racehygiejne i Danmark, 1920-1956*, Gyldendal, Copenhagen 1996) and is currently studying the history of eugenic sterilization in Denmark, 1929-1967. She is a senior research associate at the Institute of Public Health at the University of Copenhagen where she also examines the development of predictive genetic testing in the health services. She is engaged in several research projects financed by the European Community and a member of the Danish Ethical Council, established in 1987 by the Danish Parliament. She can be reached at The Department of Health Services Research, Institute of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Blegdamsvej 3, 2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark or through e-mail: Lene.Koch@socmed.ku.dk.

Rebecca B. Pels is a Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Virginia. She is currently writing her dissertation, "Creating African Studies: The Politics of Area Studies in the United State, 1945-1965" with support from the Institute for the Study of World Politics. Her research examines the intersection and implications of institutional and personal networks and objectives involved in developing an academic discipline and determining American foreign relations during the Cold War. Inquiries may be addressed to 327 Prospect Street, Vermillion, South Dakota 57069, e-mail: rpb3n@virginia.edu.

Martin Perschler, a doctoral candidate in Architectural History at the University of Virginia, is currently completing archival research in France for his dissertation, "L'Esprit de France: Architectural Restoration and the Politics of the French Third Republic, 1919-1936." He has recently presented a paper on the connection between inter-war politics and historic preservation in France at the Twenty-ninth International Congress of the History of Art in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. He can be reached via e-mail: mperschler@compuserve.com.

Rona Roob was named Chief Archivist of The Museum of Modern Art Archives in July 1996 and has been associated with the Museum Archives Program since its founding in 1986. She regularly contributes a column titled "From the Archives" to the Museum's *MoMA Magazine*, lectures, and publishes articles on the museum and related subjects. Mrs. Roob is also a Trustee and currently a Vice-President of the Archives of American Art. Send inquiries to her at The Museum of Modern Art Archives, 11 West 53rd Street, New York, NY 10019-5498 or via e-mail: rroob@moma.org.

Murielle Vautrin has recently completed her Ph.D. in history at Brandeis University. Her dissertation, "Government and Culture: New York City and Its Cultural Institutions, 1870-1965," explores the partnership established between the city of New York and some of its cultural institutions. She is currently revising her dissertation for publication, as well as an article, "Black Women in the Abolitionist Movement: Their Vision and Their Experience," to appear in the Summer 1997 issue of *Abafazi: The Simmons College Review of Women of African Descent*. Please send inquiries to her at 15 Chandler Street, Somerville, MA 02144.



Hugh H. Smith Photograph Collection

Dr. Telford taking blood from stricken patient in India, 1952-1953.

Conference Proceedings

Philanthropy in Cultural Context: Western Philanthropy in South, East and Southeast Asia in the 20th Century, the proceedings of a 1994 Archive Center Conference organized by Professor Soma Hewa (Department of Behavioral Sciences, Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta, Canada), will be published this summer by the University Press of America. Fourteen papers presented at the conference are included. Call UPA at 1-800-462-6420 to order a copy.

The fall 1997 issue of *Minerva* will include papers presented at a conference co-sponsored by the Rockefeller Archive Center and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund in April 1996, "From the Ground Up: Twentieth-Century Institution-Building in Historical Context." Essays included in the proceedings are by James Anderson, Marcos Cueto, Daniel Fox, Vanessa Northington Gamble, Barry Karl, Lily Kay, Nathan Reingold, and Paul Weindling.

Rockefeller Archive Center

15 Dayton Avenue
Sleepy Hollow, NY 10591-1598
Telephone: (914) 631-4505
e-mail: archive@rockvax.rockefeller.edu



Research Reports from the Rockefeller Archive Center is an annual publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center, a division of The Rockefeller University. Edited by Erwin Levold and Ken Rose, *Research Reports* 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. Published reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received Archive Center grants to support their research.

Ideas and opinions expressed in the reports are those of the authors and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center or The Rockefeller University.

∞ This publication is printed on acid-free paper ∞

Design: Mitelman & Associates Ltd., Tarrytown, NY

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit 6
Tarrytown, NY