

Research Reports

from the Rockefeller Archive Center

SPRING 1998

Race, Poverty, and the Symbolism of the Child

by Ben Keppel

In July of 1997, I conducted research at the Rockefeller Archive Center for my second book, tentatively titled “Children of Change: Race, Poverty and American Life, 1965-1980,” which is a study of the symbolic importance of the child to political debates about race and poverty since the early 1960s. Given the long involvement of the Rockefeller philanthropies in the study of public health, child development, and the problems of the Southern United States generally, I knew that this archive would be important. However, I did not realize the full extent of its significance until I actually began sifting through the records at the Center.

My first book, *The Work of Democracy: Ralph Bunche, Kenneth B. Clark, Lorraine Hansberry and the Cultural Politics of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), explores the dilemmas faced by three African-Americans fated to be known, in different ways, as symbols of their nation’s growing engagement with the issue of race. In each case, I found that the celebratory public framework within which these individuals were presented made an imprint on the public memory that was more lasting than the messages that the recipients of this recognition sought to send from center stage. The tendency of simultaneously acknowledging and avoiding the subject of race has been an important pattern in the seemingly robust and open public discourse on racial issues in the postwar years.

As I finished that first effort four years ago, I was compelled to examine more explicitly an idea which had gained momentum over the course of my research and writing: that, to the extent the

civil rights movement had succeeded in changing the U.S., it had done so because the movement had forced Americans to see racism through the child’s eyes or, perhaps, as a tangible force in changing the world of the child — every child — in America. Forty years after the struggle of the Little Rock Nine to desegregate Central High School and more than thirty years after the showdown in 1963 between the black children of Birmingham and Bull Connor’s police dogs and the church bombings of the same year, these images continue to provide powerful punctuation to our continuing conversation about race, class and democracy. By 1996, I had decided to examine the symbolic place of the child in these debates by studying the lives of four advocates whose words and actions most resonantly conveyed the connection between race, poverty, and the child to the American public: the Southern writer Lillian Smith, the pioneering public television producer Joan Ganz Cooney, U. S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and the path-breaking civil rights attorney and children’s advocate, Marian Wright Edelman.

I had first thought about visiting the Rockefeller Archive Center because of the long involve-

Table of Contents

Norman R. Stoll and Parasitology	4
The Rockefeller Foundation’s Support for Dance	6
Grants for Travel and Research at the Rockefeller Archive Center	8
Regionalism and the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation . . .	12
The Decline of the Republican Left, 1952-1964	14
The History of Conservation and Ecology at the Rockefeller Archive Center	16
About the Contributors	19

ment of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) in trying to encourage racial progress in the South. One of the organizations which the fund supported most consistently was the Southern Regional Council, a fragile yet enduring advocate of interracial cooperation through a variety of home-grown initiatives in the fields of citizen education and economic development. Over the course of her public life, Lillian Smith had become one of its most ardent supporters. In addition, my interest in the role of the media in shaping public discourse on democracy, race and the child — which will be a central concern of my chapters on Joan Ganz Cooney and “Sesame Street” — drew me to the Center’s newly opened papers of the Markle Foundation and of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). Indeed, time spent in each of these collections paid off in important ways. The reports of the Markle Foundation conveyed the thinking of Lloyd Morrisett on the role of television in society. Morrisett, a personal friend of Joan Cooney, also had been an important ally in her effort to get the Children’s Television Workshop and its first series, “Sesame Street”, off the ground. In the SSRC archives I found important working papers completed for the SSRC’s Television and Social Behavior Committee, which have deepened my understanding of the academic and intellectual context in which Cooney and her colleagues operated.

It is testimony to both the quality of the collections and the outstanding efficiency of the archivists that I was able to locate important — and, in this case, entirely unexpected — material for another project, tentatively titled “Social Science from Behind the Color Line, 1900-1965.” While reading through the papers of the Russell Sage Foundation, I found an extensive survey of black social scientists completed for the foundation in 1971 by Edgar G. Epps of the University of Chicago and Glenn R. Howse of the Tuskegee Institute. This study will be very useful in the collaborative effort I am engaged in with Jonathan Holloway of the University of California, San Diego to document the contributions of scholars working at historically black institutions to American social science in the years before

1965. This find was a suitable capstone to a day of related searching in the papers of the General Education Board.

Of all my work at the Rockefeller Archive Center, the richest find for my study lay in the papers of the RBF. Before my visit, as I reviewed the finding aid sent to me by archivist Tom Rosenbaum, I saw listed files documenting the RBF’s support of the Washington Research Program and of the Children’s Defense Fund (CDF). I knew, from my reading on Edelman’s career,



John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and an unidentified youngster at the meeting that opened the sixth annual fund drive of the United Negro College Fund, April 19, 1949.

From the Rockefeller Family Archives

that CDF had begun its life as an arm of the Washington Research Project, a think tank and advocacy group formed in the aftermath of the Poor People's Campaign, a march to Washington initiated by Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968 to dramatize the issue of poverty and its connection to persistent racial divisions. In the aftermath of that event, the Washington Research Project was formed to provide "constant policing of the key federal programs on behalf of the poor."

These papers were an exceptionally important find for me. It is true that historians working on topics in twentieth-century history often face a sometimes overwhelming mountain of archival resources, but it is also the case that working on individuals and issues which extend so far into the present poses unique challenges. As a relatively young and very active participant in American public life, Marian Edelman has yet to deposit her papers in an archive. Until my contact with the Rockefeller Archive Center, I had expected that most of my material for this portion of my study would come from interviews and extensive press accounts of Ms. Edelman's career. Not until I reviewed these records myself (this took half of my week in the archives) did I realize that I had a very reliable paper trail with which to document the founding and early development of the Children's Defense Fund as an arm of the Washington Research Project. And to a degree that was far more public and explicit than even I had expected, I found, in grant proposals, the explicit rationale for the focus on the child. In the founding document of the CDF, I discovered the following:

"The rights of children are a natural expansion and refinement of the 1960s movement for civil rights and social justice. With the growing retreat on civil rights/poverty issues, children's rights may provide the most promising vehicle in the 70s [sic] for addressing broader issues of race and poverty in this country. While the courts under a regime of strict constructionism might be expected to retard the process of law reform through litigation in the area of school desegregation and welfare [sic], the opposite appears likely in the area of children's rights.

Courts are moving ahead with unprecedented vigor, for example, in educational finance, juvenile institutions, and in vindicating the right of every child—no matter how handicapped—to an education."

The annual reports, staff memoranda, and correspondence in these papers also testify to a most ambitious agenda, especially for an organization which was just becoming established: the poor quality of the juvenile justice system, especially in rural areas; protecting the privacy rights of minors in regard to their student records; the monitoring of the use of drugs by school districts to control the behavior of "problem students"; protecting unwed single mothers from invasions of privacy by the state; insuring that "handicapped" students receive equal access to a high quality public education. When historians of the Clinton presidency arrive on the scene they will find, among other things, early references to the involvement of at least two key "Friends of Bill" in CDF: his future wife, Hillary Rodham, working out of CDF's office in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and David Mixner, a key fundraiser and an important intermediary between the gay community and Bill Clinton in the 1992 presidential campaign, who, in 1973, was representing CDF in Denver.

My archival findings will fortify my study in a number of important areas. My selections from the records of the Markle Foundation add depth to my research on the early intellectual rationale behind "Sesame Street". Working papers in the SSRC archives have added a new dimension to my examination of the role of social science in the shaping and reshaping of children's television during the 1970s. Finally, the records of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund have enabled me to find an unmatched archival record of the establishment and early development of the Children's Defense Fund. My own experience strongly suggests that, as historians of American social policy move their inquiries into the "post-civil rights" era and to legislative landmarks such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the holdings of the Rockefeller Archive Center will continue to be a vital resource.

Norman R. Stoll and Parasitology

by Richard Hankins

Parasitology is a discipline that has changed markedly since the beginning of the twentieth century. Initially a zoologically influenced pastime concerned with morphology, taxonomy, and life history, it has undergone massive transition since the First World War. By the 1970s parasites were the objects of study for medical researchers, veterinarians, and zoologists as well as a plethora of basic scientists including pharmacologists, molecular biologists, and biochemists. Immunological studies have been particularly influential in this transition: redefining parasitic infections in terms consistent with their bacterial and viral counterparts.

While such studies have “modernized” parasitology and ensured its integration within veterinary schools, the medical geography of the parasitic diseases of man has left them peripheral even to modern Western medicine. In my current project I am trying to outline the scientific, social, political, and economic factors that have shaped the development of parasite immunology and thus parasitology in the twentieth century. Along with providing a disciplinary history, such a study should shed light on the recent social relations of “tropical disease” as well as the interactions between medical and veterinary knowledge.

During a recent visit to the Rockefeller Archive Center I viewed the papers of Norman R. Stoll (1892-1976), an important actor in the development of parasite immunology studies. Stoll entered into the study of parasites via a circuitous route. While teaching school he became a part-time doctoral student in lymnology but eventually became interested in parasitology through a friendship he

developed with the eminent parasitologist William W. Cort, whom he met regularly at the Douglas Lake Research Station. In 1921 Cort offered Stoll a minor research position on a hookworm expedition to Trinidad which he accepted, taking a leave of absence from his teaching job. The following year Stoll was a member of a similar expedition to Puerto Rico, and he spent most of 1923 and 1924 at the Peking Union Medical College, where Cort was Exchange Professor. During these early studies he devised the Stoll dilution egg count method, an enduring technique that secured his position within the field. Subsequently, Stoll's studies were transferred from Michigan to Cort's faculty at Johns Hopkins University, from where he graduated Sc.D. in 1923.

After a number of years as a junior researcher at Johns Hopkins, Stoll was offered a Chair at the University of Puerto Rico where he would have been able to develop his interests in human hookworm studies. By this time, however, he had come to the attention of Theobald Smith and Simon Flexner of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, and they were keen to attract him to a position in the Institute's Department of Animal Pathology at Princeton. On March 13, 1926 Flexner met with Stoll and, under the threat of his loss to Puerto Rico, offered him the position of associate within four days of their meeting. Although the position at the Rockefeller Institute was somewhat junior in comparison with the offer in Puerto Rico, Stoll was excited by the prospect of being associated with the eminent parasitologist, Theobald Smith, and chose to move to Princeton.

Smith's influence was to resonate throughout Stoll's future work, yet Stoll remained distinctly a student of William Cort's thinking. As such Stoll can be located within a distinct “school” of scientists associated with Cort at Hopkins who went on to develop a recognizable parasite immunology research tradition in America. This group included such eminent parasite immunologists as J. H. Sandground, L.G. Talliaferro, C. A. Herrick, H.W. Brown, M.P. Sarles, J.E. Stumberg and E.H. Sadun, all of whom studied for the Sc.D. degree at Johns Hopkins, and William Talliaferro, author of



Dr. Norman R. Stoll, 1937.

From the Rockefeller University Archives

the axiomatic text, *The Immunology of Parasitic Infections* (1927), and notable malarial immunologist, who worked alongside Cort as a member of the Hopkins faculty before moving to Chicago in 1924.

E.H. Sadun explained most clearly the nature of Cort's approach. As a medical student at Pisa Sadun was taught to think of parasites merely as discomforts of man, and at Harvard's zoology department he learned that parasites were "interesting individuals"; but under Cort's "benign and firm guidance," Sadun explained, "I began soon to learn looking at man and his parasites, not as competitors for the center of the universe but as participants in an endless game of tug-of-war. I began watching with interest the dynamic balance between these two opposing forces under the name of host-parasite relationships. I began trying to help now one side and then the other under the name of 'factors which influence natural and acquired resistance'. I began looking for signs of the struggle through openings such as serological tests, blood counts, tests for the presence of enzymes, and many others which acted as windows for an insatiable peeping Tom." Such an approach marked a significant break from both the contemporary zoological focus on parasites, and the medical/veterinary treatment of parasites in terms of disease syndromes. While not exclusive to this group, this approach is strongly characteristic of their work.

In conformity with this tradition Stoll proposed initially to work on *Haliq maselamiro*s in rats, as a model of hookworm infections. By chance, however, a more promising host and parasite were available for study at the Princeton laboratories. Parasite-free lambs had been bred as a by-product of Theobald Smith's investigation into calf diarrhea, and a number of these were available for use in a reinfection experiment. In these experiments Stoll chose to use the parasite *Haemonchus contortus*, which was both closely related to hookworm and a major agricultural pest in much of the world. The results of these experiments were to be highly influential within the field of parasitology for the next thirty years. Stoll demonstrated in the lambs the development of "self cure and

protection" in response to challenge with *Haemonchus* — thus demonstrating in a controlled manner for the first time a resistant state to a nematode parasite. His conference reports and papers on this subject continued to be cited for decades.

The choice of the terms "self cure" and "protection" reflected the cautious influence of Theobald Smith. Contemporary thinking assumed cellular and humoral immunity was not applicable to infections with large parasites. Smith warned Stoll of the dangers of challenging directly this idiom, especially when factors such as the strain of sheep used or competition from other parasites could not be entirely discounted as contributory factors. "Self cure" and "resistance" were descriptive rather than analytical terms chosen deliberately for their vagueness and their disassociation with contemporary immunological language.

Stoll went on to extend his studies of resistance to parasites in sheep to rabbits and cats, in which he demonstrated similar reactions. The primary importance of this work was that it opened up a previously neglected area of investigation. Further, the demonstration of immunity to nematodes suggested that it may be possible through the development of vaccines to control many serious human and animal parasitic diseases. Stoll continued sheep experiments for some fifteen years before transferring to studies of the life history of the sheep tapeworm, *Moniezia expansa*. His early work can be considered to have formed an important cornerstone in the developing subject area of parasite immunology.

Stoll's most influential scientific work occurred very early on in his career. Although he remained at the Rockefeller Institute (later the Rockefeller University), he was for long periods unhappy with the administration of the Animal Pathology department and particularly resented the management of Carl TenBroeck, who became its director in 1930. During this period his productivity was stifled by what he later referred to as a "mood of mediocrity" from which conscription during the Second World War was "a release". The

announcement of the closure of the Princeton laboratories in 1947 brought an emotional response from Stoll. In part he blamed his own lack of productivity in recent years for the closure, although in later years he explained the closure as the inevitable outcome of a number of clashes of character. The inadequacy of Carl TenBroeck, he believed, had undermined the scientific credibility of the Princeton staff.

While 1947 presented the combined hardships of the closure of the Princeton laboratory and the discovery that his wife had developed leukemia, that year also signaled the beginning of a renaissance in Stoll's career. In the preceding year he served as president of the American Society of Parasitologists and gave as his closing speech a paper titled "This Wormy World." This heavily researched work, inspired by his early overseas work and wartime service on Guam, attempted to quantify the amount of human suffering caused in the world by parasitic infections. The resultant paper attracted reviews in *Time* and *Newsweek* and was said to have been "the most widely read and quoted publication in helminthological parasitology since the war."

Following the death of his wife, Stoll moved to New York, relocating his research to the Manhattan campus of the Rockefeller Institute, and continuing the axenic culture work of his friend, Rudolf W. Glaser, who died suddenly in that year. Stoll failed to develop a strong relationship with Herbert W. Gasser, the director of the Rockefeller Institute, but when Detlev W. Bronk became the director in 1954, Stoll's career began to develop more rapidly than ever before. By 1956, Stoll had made no progress on the career ladder in his twenty-nine years at the Institute and received only a very modest wage. In 1956 Stoll's salary began to increase, possibly as a response to a job offer from the University of Maryland. Within six years his income had doubled and in 1962, at the age of 70, he was promoted from Associate — a title he had held for thirty-five years — to Member and Professor, and in June 1963 he was made Professor Emeritus. What should have been the autumn of Stoll's career instead marked a return to his lost dynamism in what he himself called "almost magical years." During this period he regained his

interest in hookworm studies and traveled widely as a World Health Organization adviser. He continued working and attending meetings until November 1976, shortly before his sudden death on December 30, 1976.

Norman Stoll's life and works had a considerable influence on the development of parasitology. Not only was he a scientist of some repute, he was also a charter member of the American Society of Parasitologists and through various positions one of its longest serving officials. Further, his achievements in publicizing the extent of parasitic disease in the world were notable. His early researches significantly changed the disciplinary boundaries of parasitology and promoted attempts to develop vaccines to nematode parasites. Leadership appears to have been very important to Stoll as a working scientist, since he excelled under Smith and Bronk, yet stagnated under TenBroeck. While this study has provided insights into the relationship between medical and veterinary parasitology and their associated knowledges, it has yet to be fitted into a larger narrative on the development of parasitology. However, such personal and institutional insights will greatly enrich the social history of parasite immunology I now wish to write.

The Rockefeller Foundation's Support for Dance

by *Julia Foulkes*

I visited the Rockefeller Archive Center in April and May of 1997 to investigate the Rockefeller Foundation's giving in the arts, with particular attention to dance, from the 1930s to the 1970s. I examined the grant records of the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), supplemented by earlier materials from the General Education Board, the RF's administrative files, and documents on the formation of Lincoln Center in the papers of John D. Rockefeller 3rd and correspondence in the collection of E. B. Young, one of Rockefeller's associates. I expected to find little material on dancers or dance companies



From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

Charles Campbell, a staff member of the Elma Lewis School of Fine Arts in Boston, with a group of students before their performance in a dance demonstration workshop, July 25, 1971. In December 1969 the Rockefeller Foundation awarded the school a four-year grant of \$330,000 in support of its dance programs.

themselves, but I was pleasantly surprised to find that the RF had given many grants to dance. Most of these grants occurred in the 1960s, the later years of the time period in which I am interested.

The records indicate that giving to the arts caused considerable debate within the RF from the 1930s to the 1950s. Foundation officers questioned whether the arts should be placed in the education or humanities divisions, and wrote memos back and forth defining the arts and humanities and articulating their worthiness. David Stevens, director of the Humanities Division (1932-1949), spent considerable time teasing out the importance of the humanities, and

his associates John Marshall and Charles Fahs (the division's director, 1950-1962) debated the philosophical components of the arts. The material reveals the intellectual liveliness of the RF officers themselves as well as their awareness of the significant role the foundation had in defining and shaping these fields.

The early grants to the arts in the 1930s and 1940s reflected a hesitancy on the part of the foundation. Officers wanted long-range results but not sustained commitments to continual funding. Grants focused on college drama programs, on libraries and museums, and on developing the film library of the Museum of Modern Art. Soon, though, the RF recognized that the arts were the "weakest point in our record," according to David Stevens, and attention turned more resolutely to the arts. They started by gathering definitions: of the fields, their leading practitioners, and the audience. In the early 1950s, the officers honed in on the "nonverbal" or performing arts, ever elusive to strict definitions. Grants to performing arts organizations swelled in the 1950s and 1960s.

Aid to dance mirrored this general trend of hesitancy within the foundation and developed even more slowly. The RF gave very few grants in the field of dance to actual practitioners — individual artists or companies — until the 1960s. Instead, they funded books on dance, the development of Labanotation to record dance, and a 1956 survey on the status of dance across the country by Anatole Chujoy, a dance critic. Most of the officers' curiosity was about ballet. John Marshall expressed little interest in modern dance, and the close connection between the Rockefellers and Lincoln Kirstein assured the residential standing of the New York City Ballet in Lincoln Center as early as 1957. The political ties of modern dance to the left worried the officers in the early 1950s and prompted the RF staff to check through the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee for references to modern dancers. Findings of leftist activity affected a 1954 grant to the American Dance Festival hosted by Connecticut College; the grant was approved only when the most political of the invited dance companies was dropped on "artistic grounds."

The tide turned in the 1960s, however, and grants to modern dance rose sharply under the leadership of Norman Lloyd, a pianist, composer and educator who in 1965 became director of reorganized Arts Division of the RF. Lloyd had composed for modern dancers since the 1930s and was an unequivocal proponent of the significant American contribution of modern dance to the world's arts. Another reason for the expanded support for modern dance may have been a desire to counter the huge, long-term grant that the Ford Foundation in 1964 gave exclusively to ballet companies and schools.

The RF made a great effort to bolster modern dance in the mid- 1960s by attempting to form a repertory company, to be associated with the Juilliard School, run by José Limón, and designed to preserve the classics of modern dance and the challenging works of a variety of current choreographers. The resolute individualism of modern dance choreographers, coupled with disorganization, mismanagement, and the worries of Juilliard staff, led to the dissolution of the American Dance Theatre after one week of performances. RF officers then focused on setting up university residences for leading choreographers, gave more money directly to dance companies, and began to search for arts organizations with educational and social purposes, as cities and campuses erupted around them in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The material I searched through bolsters my belief that modern dance suffered from its association with political activity and the avant-garde. While the RF officers recognized their lack of attention to dance and the significance of dance in the American arts, this awareness did not lead to a large monetary investment in the field. I think the difficulty of defining the purposes of dance, specifically mentioned in initial reports on giving in the arts, the absence of strong institutional structures in dance, and the prospect of long-term funding caused RF officers to be wary. Even when Lloyd gathered his considerable forces behind modern dance in the late 1960s, it was difficult to organize a project that had any long-lasting impact. For modern dance, he specu-

lated that perhaps it was a “case of something happening thirty years too late.” Modern dance continues to survive, however, burrowed in college and university physical education departments and in New York City’s “downtown” dance scene in the East Village and Chelsea. It seems that even when such large organizations as the Rockefeller Foundation direct money to modern dance, its historically marginal place is hard to overcome.

Grants for Travel and Research at the RAC

The Rockefeller Archive Center invites applications for its program of grants for travel and research for 1999. This competitive program makes grants of up to \$2,500 to U.S. and Canadian researchers and up to \$3,000 to researchers from other nations who are engaged in research that requires use of the collections at the Center.

For 1999, the Center will supplement its regular grant program with additional targeted grants in two areas: conservation and ecology, and the history of The Rockefeller University. The Center holds a number of collections for the study of conservation and ecology (see page 16).



The Department of Animal and Plant Pathology in Princeton, NJ, which the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research operated between 1916 and 1950. Photo by McLaughlin Aerial Surveys.

From the Rockefeller University Archives

The archives of the Rockefeller University document the rise of biomedical research in the twentieth century, particularly in physiology and immunology, and contain important materials on twentieth-century science in general.

The deadline for all grant applications is November 30, 1998; grant recipients will be announced in March 1999. 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 the Center and a guide to its collections, can be found on the World Wide Web (<http://www.rockefeller.edu/archive.ctr/>)

1998 Grant Recipients

In March the Center announced that 53 scholars have received grants under its 1998 program, and that its targeted grant programs have awarded grants to twelve scholars to study the history of the social sciences and to six scholars for the study of The Rockefeller University. All 71 recipients, their institutions, and research topics follow.

General Grants, 1998

Victoria L. Bestor

Fulbright Researcher and Research Associate, Doshisha University, Kyoto and East Asia Program, Cornell University.
"The Rockefeller Legacy in Japan."

Nicholas Casner

Assistant Professor of History, Boise State University.
"The Rockefeller Foundation and the Creation of County Public Health Units in the American West."

Douglas Chamberlain

Ph.D. Candidate, Oxford University, England.
"Cultural Interaction between Anglo-American Elites: Oxbridge's Influence on Harvard, Yale and Princeton, 1902-1941."

Marisa Chambers

Ph.D. Candidate in Economic and Social History, University of Liverpool, England.
"Preventive Disease Campaigns in British West Africa, 1900-1948."

Kaiyi Chen

Technical Services Archivist, University Archives, University of Pennsylvania.
"St. John's Medical School and the Development of Medical Education in China."

Carlo Corea

Ph.D. Candidate in History, State University of New York, Stony Brook.
"Own Story': Ethnic Consciousness and Juvenile Delinquency in Boston, 1915-1929."

Julie Cormack

Research Associate in Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.
"Dr. Davidson Black: A Scientific Biography."

Stephen Cross

Independent Scholar.
"The Biologist as Public Intellectual: Julian S. Huxley."

Laura DeLuca

Ph.D. Candidate in Anthropology, University of Colorado.
"Influence of Wildlife Policy on Local People in Ngorongoro Conservation Area."

Todd DePastino

Lecturer in History, Penn State University.
"From Hobohemia to Skid Row: Homelessness and American Culture, 1870-1950."

Bobby Donaldson

Ph.D. Candidate in History, Emory University.
"New Negroes in a New South?: Color, Class, and Culture in Georgia, 1890-1930."

Brian Donovan

Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology, Northwestern University.
"White Slavery and Gender Politics: Crusades Against Forced Prostitution in the Early 20th Century."

Robert Eisinger

Assistant Professor of Political Science, Lewis & Clark College.
"The Illusion of Certainty: Explaining the Evolution of Presidential Polling."

Maryo Ewell

Associate Director, Colorado Council on the Arts.
"The Arts and Community Building."

Max Friedman

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of California, Berkeley.
"Nazis and Good Neighbors: German 'Alien Enemies' and United States Security in Latin America, 1941-1945."

Eugenia M. Fulcher

Chair, Medical Assisting Department, Swainsboro Technical Institute.
"Dreams Do Come True: How Rural One-Room Schools Influenced Lives of African Americans in Burke County, Georgia."

Marybeth Gasman

Ph.D. Candidate in Education, Indiana University.
 “Charles S. Johnson’s Leadership and Ability to Capitalize on Philanthropy while President of Fisk University.”

James Goode

Professor of History, Grand Valley State University.
 “Archaeology and Nationalism in the Middle East, 1919-1939.”

Paul Hillmer

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of Minnesota.
 “John D. Rockefeller and Cleveland Charities: An Examination of Cooperative Philanthropy.”

Glenford Howe

Research Officer,
 University of the West Indies, Barbados.
 “Disease and Medicine in the West Indies, 1492-1960s.”

Yeh Hsueh

Adjunct Faculty Member in Education, Tufts University and University of Massachusetts, Boston.
 “Jean Piaget and Educational Reform in the U.S., 1920-1960.”

Adrienne Jones

Associate Professor of African American Studies,
 Oberlin College.
 “Struggle Among Saints: Black Women in the YWCA, 1870-1970.”

Mary C. Kahl

Research Associate, Center for Women in Government,
 State University of New York, Albany.
 “The Title X Debate: Policy and Politics of Family Planning.”

Ken Kalling

Director of Scientific Research,
 Museum of Tartu University History, Estonia.
 “Estonian Science and the Formation of the Independent State during the 1920s and 1930s.”

Ana Maria Kapelusz-Poppi

Ph.D. Candidate in History,
 University of Illinois, Chicago.
 “The Formation of a Public Health Discourse in Western Mexico, 1930-1960.”

J. Kehaulani Kauanui

Ph.D. Candidate, History of Consciousness,
 University of California, Santa Cruz.
 “Mapping Anatomy, Locating Indigeneity: Race Classification and the Science Studies of ‘Hybrid Hawaiians’.”

Alexei Kojevnikov

Associate Historian, American Institute of Physics.
 “Niels Bohr and the Copenhagen Network in Physics.”

Nikolai Kremontsov

Senior Researcher,
 Institute of History of Science and Technology,
 Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg.
 “The Art of Giving and the Art of Taking: The Rockefeller Foundation in Russia, 1922-1934.”

Mary M. Kritz

Senior Research Associate in Sociology,
 Cornell University.
 “The Rockefeller Foundation’s Role in the International Population Movement.”

Peter Linder

Assistant Professor of History & Political Science,
 New Mexico Highlands University.
 “Nelson A. Rockefeller, Foreign Investment, and Agriculture in the Venezuelan State of Zulia, 1945-1958.”

John Logan

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of California, Davis.
 “Defining Industrial Citizenship: The State and Workers’ Rights in the United States and Canada, 1933-1953.”

Margaret Lowe

Assistant Professor of History,
 State University of New York, Potsdam.
 “The Mind/Body Problem: College Women’s Attitudes toward Their Bodies, 1875-1930.”

Maureen A. McCormick

Ph.D. Candidate in History of Science,
 University of Oklahoma.
 “Cold War Conservation: International Science, National Resources and Reproductive Life.”

Susan Miller

Ph.D. Candidate in History & Sociology of Science,
 University of Pennsylvania.
 “Girls in Nature/The Nature of Girls: Transforming Female Adolescence at Summer Camps of the Girl Scouts, YWCA, and Camp Fire Girls, 1900-1939.”

David Mindell

Dibner Assistant Professor of the History of Engineering and Manufacturing, Program in Science, Technology, and Society, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 “Datum for its Own Annihilation: Feedback, Control, and Computing, 1916-1945.”



Public health nurses receiving instruction in a laboratory at St. Luke’s International Medical Center in Tokyo, Japan, in 1932. Nursing in Japan is one of the many topics that grant-in-aid recipients will examine at the Archive Center this year.

From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

Jennifer Mittelstadt

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of Michigan.
"From Rehabilitation to Responsibility: Welfare, Work, and Gender, 1950-1962."

Andrew Morris

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of Virginia.
"Farm Demonstration and the Public-Private Sector."

David P. Munns

Ph.D. Candidate in the History of Science, Medicine and Technology, The Johns Hopkins University.
"The Creation of a New Astronomy: Radio Astronomy in Australia after 1950."

Rita Pemberton

Lecturer in History, University of the West Indies, Trinidad & Tobago.
"Health and Social Conditions in the Caribbean, 1900-1950."

Rick Perlstein

Freelance Writer.
"Cultural History of the 1964 Barry Goldwater Presidential Campaign."

Daniel Porsch

Ph.D. Candidate, Tuebingen University, Germany.
"The Study of International Affairs in Great Britain during the Inter-War Period."

Susan Poulson

Associate Professor of History, University of Scranton.
"Single-Sex vs. Coeducation at Historically Black Colleges and Universities."

Andrew Rich

Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science, Yale University.
"The Evolution of U.S. Think Tanks and the Political Uses of Expertise: From the Progressive Era to the Eve of the 21st Century."

Natalie Ring

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of California, San Diego.
"The 'Problem South' in the National Imagination, 1900-1930."

Reinhard Siegmund-Schultze

Assistant Professor, Institute for History, Humboldt University, Berlin.
"German-American Mathematical Communication between the World Wars."

Susan Solomon

Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto.
"The Art of Giving and the Art of Taking: The Rockefeller Foundation in Russia, 1922-1934."

Timothy Sullivan

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of Maryland.
"Crashing the Party: The Republican and Conservative Parties in New York State, 1962-1980."

Aya Takahashi

Postgraduate Student, University of London, England.
"Western Influence on the Development of the Nursing Profession in Japan, 1870-1938."

Bradley Tatar

Ph.D. Candidate in Anthropology, University at Albany.
"Globalization, Politics and Economic Development in Latin America: A Social Interactionist Approach."

Sheryl Wade

Development Director, Virginia Foundation for the Humanities, and Research Faculty, University of Virginia.
"The Gilded Age Philanthropists: Men of Iron and Gold."

Jean Whelan

Ph.D. Candidate in Nursing, University of Pennsylvania.
"Employing Nurses: The Conversion of Nurses from Private Duty to Staff, 1923-1963."

Michael Ybarra

Freelance Writer.
"Senator Pat McCarran and the Postwar Internal Security Crisis: The Making of McCarthyism."

Ann Yrjala

Public Health Nurse/Post-Graduate Student, International School of Helsinki/Abo Akademi University, Finland.
"The Development of the Public Health Nursing Profession in Finland, 1920-1950."

Targeted Grants for Research in the History of the Social Sciences, 1998**Anthony Chen**

Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.
"The Making of Postwar Sociology."

Hunter Crowther-Heyck

Ph.D. Candidate in the History of Science, Medicine, and Technology, The Johns Hopkins University.
"Organization Man: Science, Systems, and Expert Politics in the Work of Herbert A. Simon."

Hughes Evans

Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, University of Alabama, Birmingham.
"The History of Child Sexual Abuse in America, 1850 to the Present."

Christian Fleck

Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Graz, Austria.
"Rockefeller Fellowships and the Emigration of German-Speaking Social Scientists."

Jerry Gershenhorn

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
"Melville J. Herskovits and the Radical Politics of Knowledge."

Kevin Jones-Kern

Visiting Assistant Professor of History,
Bowling Green University.
"The Evolution of Modern American
Physical Anthropology."

Jochen Kirchhoff

Ph.D. Candidate, Institute of Modern History,
University of Munich, Germany.
"The Impact of Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
Support on German Social Science, 1923-1936."

Joy Njuguna

Independent Scholar.
"Traditional Political Education and its Relevance
in Multi-Party Politics in Kenya."

Diana Selig

Ph.D. Candidate in History,
University of California, Berkeley.
"Creating the 'Whole Child': Social Science, Social
Welfare and the Redefinition of Childhood, 1900-1940."

Peter Sheehy

Ph.D. Candidate in History, University of Virginia.
"Shrinking the Group and Expanding Therapeutic
Culture: The Origins and Rise of Group Psychotherapy."

Mark Solovey

Assistant Professor, Integrative Studies Department,
Arizona State University West.
"The Social Science Research Council's Role in the
Post-World War I Debate about the Intellectual Identity
of the Social Sciences."

Casey Walsh

Ph.D. Candidate in Anthropology/Historical Studies,
Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research.
"Manuel Gamio, the Social Science Research Council,
and the Emergence of Migration Studies: 1922-1930."

Targeted Grants for Research in the History of The Rockefeller University, 1998

Olga Amsterdamska

Lecturer, Department of Science Dynamics,
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
"Science in the Clinic: Research in the Hospital
of the Rockefeller Institute."

Sabine Brauckmann

Guest Scholar, Theory and History of Medicine,
University of Munster, Germany.
"Paul Alfred Weiss: From Field Theory to Molecular
Ecology: Biological Concepts of a Cell Biologist."

Rogers Hollingsworth

Professor of History and Sociology and Chairperson,
Program in Comparative History,
University of Wisconsin-Madison.
"An Organizational Study of Excellence in Bio-Medical
Science: The Rockefeller University during the
Twentieth Century."

Hannah Landecker

Ph.D. Candidate, Program in Science, Technology,
and Society, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
"A History of Tissue Culture: In Vitro Technologies in
Experimental Biology, 1907-1967."

Bernard Unti

Ph.D. Candidate in History, American University.
"Humane Society: A Cultural History of Organized
Concern for Animals in the United States, 1866-1940."

Ton van Helvoort

Honorary Researcher, Department of History,
University of Maastricht, The Netherlands.
"Experimental Models in Cancer Research."

Regionalism and the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation

by Philip J. Nelson

As it came of age in the 1930s, the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) launched an area studies program which channeled funds to researchers and institutions doing scholarly work in four geographical areas: the Far East, Latin America, the Slavic countries of Europe and Asia, and North America, primarily the United States. Although World War II temporarily interrupted overseas projects, the Humanities Division spent \$3 million on regional studies over a fourteen-year period ending in 1947. During this period the division was led by David H. Stevens, a former professor of English at the University of Chicago who was its director between 1932 and 1949, and John Marshall, the division's assistant director (1933-1940) before his promotion to associate director (1940-1962).

Initially, the officers of the Humanities Division sought to fund activities which would take the humanities out of its narrow, classical, and often Anglo orientation. They hoped to make the humanities more relevant to everyday life, moving toward the enhancement of the esthetic and spiritual sides of life in the face of mounting scientific and technological authority. They also hoped to use the humanities for the promotion of

democratic ideals on a worldwide basis. During and after the war, the Humanities Division's concerns expanded to include the necessity of a new worldview of human culture such that the "foundation of world organization [could] be laid without coercion." A world growing smaller, more interdependent, and seemingly more perilous year by year demanded a greater role for the humanities, not only in disadvantaged areas of the world, but especially in the U. S.

The officers believed that Americans had not only neglected to develop an understanding of other cultures, but that they had failed to establish a vital and balanced image of their own. As a people, Americans were still struggling with creating an optimistic, unified, and mature identity in a culturally challenging and sometimes chaotic world. In particular, the officers criticized academia as being too subject-specific and discipline-bound to adequately bring fresh interpretations of the American experience to the appreciation of the general public. Too, they lamented a lack of training programs and curricula offerings which would help create the leaders of the future. The problems of a mass society demanded scholars who were competent both as researchers and teachers, and who would apply their knowledge not just to antiquities, but to current social conditions. In promoting a program of American studies based on regional cultural and historical awareness, the officers of the Humanities Division overlapped with a regionalist reform movement which already had engaged the ongoing mass society debate in the 1930s.

Two identifiable but not mutually exclusive intellectual strains composed the regionalist movement. One was a literary and folk revolt against the presumed imperious and homogenizing effects of mass society on the individual and indigenous regional traditions. The other aspect looked toward regionalism as a social-science tool, heavily emphasizing geography, climate, an incipient ecological understanding, and regional economic patterns. The problems of the whole constituted by mass society could only be accurately understood by analyzing the circumstances of its main parts. Essentially, then, the key to the whole was found in knowledge of the unique

roles of its components. In its attempt to understand the evolution of modern mass society during the 1930s and 1940s, the Humanities Division drew on both regionalist strains of thought; indeed, it made little effort to differentiate between them, and thus often launched its projects in the humanities along both broad theoretical and practical fronts.

By 1943, the Humanities Division had authorized studies of four regions in North America: French Canada, the Eastern Maritime area, the Connecticut Valley, and the Northern Plains. In a report that year, the officers expressed satisfaction with the regionalist approach: "We know what before we had only believed to be true—that a lack of awareness of the cultural situations in the various regions of the continent on the part of . . . [those] in the fine arts, is a primary impediment to the cultural growth they might be fostering." The officers believed that a full flowering of the humanities required that scholarship be brought down to the level of real life, and that participants in the fine arts listen to people from all walks of life. This effort at identification of unity within diversity; the bridging of gaps between occupations, classes, and civil boundaries; and the encouragement of a grass-roots, participatory movement, rather than the often inflexible, traditional, and sometimes esoteric ruminations and procedures of time-bound institutions, not surprisingly coincided with the all-out effort required of Americans by the reality of total war.

This regionalist approach led Stevens and Marshall to consider funding programs with a decidedly more social-activist aura about them. The officers believed that people demanded a turn toward realism in their cultural functions. The new methodology therefore stressed research based on community outcomes, and the discovery of knowledge, not for its own sake, but for the role it could play in the solution of social problems. The challenge of fascism, for example, had provoked a new appreciation of "humane values"; the communication of that wisdom necessarily involved teachers and the entire educational process. The Humanities Division was determined to develop the educational

programs and leaders who would shape the future democratic tradition.

A prime example of how all the concerns fostered by regionalist thought gelled in one project was the RF's appropriation in March 1944 of \$25,000 for a three-year study in the Life and Traditions of Montana, generally called the Montana Study. The Montana Study was originally conceived as an experimental educational program whose objective was to get the university off the campus in ways that were productive of support for Montana's hard-hit rural communities and families. For thirty years, Montana's small towns had experienced adversity, first in the agricultural recession of the 1920s, then in the Dust Bowl and the Great Depression, and finally through the war-induced population exodus. The study's plan called for experts from the six-unit University of Montana system to fan out across the state to conduct needs surveys, get public feedback on critical social and economic questions, inventory the state's cultural resources, and teach adult education courses in various locales.

Technically, the Montana Study was not a regional project, because the state of Montana belonged to more than one region. Nevertheless, it constituted a regionalist exercise in both spirit and practice, because it attempted to deal directly with an area whose people had similar problems, and it was carried out by using local initiatives for change based on an understanding and mobilization of cultural resources of the Northern Plains region (as represented in Montana). Driven by its director, Northwestern University philosophy professor and community activist Baker Brownell, the study evolved beyond the original plan into a full-blown community development project. But the study rapidly became bogged down, mired in controversy over funding, rivalry between the study's institutional "friends," and attacks from people convinced that it was a "socialist" organization. Despite the enormous interest in its practices shown by many different groups in the U.S. and around the world, the RF declined to provide further funding for the study in 1947, especially when the State of Montana failed to live up to its funding obligations. The RF

declined several later requests for aid in reviving the study, chiefly on the grounds that these plans did not speak directly enough to the humanities.

Whether it was due to the political fallout from the Montana Study or simply a change in policy, by 1948 the Humanities Division modified its regional program by decreasing support to projects limited to the U. S. and increasing support to universities which had both American and foreign area studies. By 1950, the overriding theme was one of global understanding, and the regional approach quickly became relegated to a secondary and supporting position. Regionalism as an intellectual organizing principle was on the wane, and its use by the RF in America never again achieved the levels of the mid 1940s. But while it was actively applied, regionalism provided an alternative vision in the mass society debate, and strongly informed the development of American studies as a new academic discipline.

The Decline of the Republican Left, 1952-1964

by Steven T. Wagner

Historians have tended to portray the history of the United States in the twentieth century as a series of liberal reform movements spawned by the rise of industrial capitalism. Within this context the Democratic Party has been



New York State Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller (left) and U.S. Vice President Richard M. Nixon at a rally in Glen Oaks, Long Island on September 28, 1960, during Nixon's presidential campaign. A United Press International Photo.

From the Rockefeller Family Archives

more closely identified with liberal reform, while the Republican party, if considered at all, has been more closely identified with conservatism, slowing reform by desperately attempting to maintain the status quo. This depiction fails to recognize the liberal wing that existed within, and often dominated, the Republican party throughout much of this century.

Now that Republicans have vilified the very word “liberal,” it is easy to forget the important role the party played in the creation of America’s liberal society. This is the party that abolished slavery; enacted civil-service reform; drafted the nation’s first regulatory, anti-trust, consumer protection, and conservation legislation; and charted America’s course to its current position of global leadership. Today, however, the Republican party is regarded as the party of the right, and liberals within its ranks are branded as mavericks or misfits.

My dissertation will explain the demise of this liberal, progressive voice within the Republican party by examining the liberal-conservative rivalry within the party between 1952 and 1964. The election of Dwight D. Eisenhower to the presidency of the U.S. in 1952 marked the high-water mark for liberal Republicans. By 1964 they had all but disappeared as a force within the Republican party.

Historians have just begun the task of explaining how conservative Republicans won the battle for control of the Republican party in the 1960s. This scholarship concentrates almost exclusively on the rise of the party’s right wing. What is missing is an explanation of the disappearance of liberal Republicans, who had maintained a vital presence in their party since its inception and had dominated their party’s presidential nominations from 1936 to 1960. Furthermore, by concentrating on the 1960s, when the right made its ascent, the literature fails to recognize the importance of the intraparty liberal-conservative dialogue of the 1950s, during which time the conservative wing of the party became increasingly frustrated with the liberal tendencies of the sitting Republican president.

The reason the left wing failed, I believe, was that when the Republican party took control of the White House, conservatives favored a com-

plete overturn of the New Deal/internationalist philosophy. When the liberal wing of the party, which controlled the policy agenda, not only failed to do this but expanded the systems of social welfare and global security, the conservatives revolted. After 20 years of Democratic rule, conservatives were disgusted by what they considered “me-tooism”: liberal Republicans’ inability to distinguish themselves from Democrats. This explanation does not contradict the work historians have done on the rise of the right; instead, it tells a different side of the story.

The liberal-conservative factionalism within the Republican party, which resulted in the defeat of the Republican left, presages the so-called “crisis of liberalism” that most historians tie to domestic social upheaval and the trauma of Vietnam in the late 1960s. This project opens up a new perspective on liberalism’s demise, not by looking further at the crisis within the Democratic party or inter-party debates during the 1960s, as most historians have done, but by looking at the demise of liberalism within the Republican party a decade earlier. Since the Republican party went on to win five out of the next six presidential elections, the defeat of liberalism within its own ranks had a profound effect on the future of liberalism itself.

Two stages of the political career of Nelson A. Rockefeller are crucial to my study of liberal Republicanism in this period. In the first stage, Nelson A. Rockefeller played a key role in the Eisenhower administration, first as one of three members of the Reorganization Advisory Committee (subsequently known as the Special Committee on Government Organization and the President’s Advisory Committee on Government Organization), then as Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), and finally as Special Assistant to the President for Foreign Affairs. In my study of Rockefeller’s papers from this period (Record Group 4, NAR Personal, Washington D.C. Files), I sought evidence of areas where Rockefeller may have influenced the already moderate Eisenhower to take more liberal stands on certain key issues. Such evidence was particularly evident in Rockefeller’s work at HEW, which was created out of the old Federal Security Agency upon the recommen-

dation of the Reorganization Advisory Committee. While Under Secretary, Rockefeller played a key role in HEW's plans to add ten million Americans to the nation's social security system, to finance the construction of schools in underdeveloped sections of the nation, and to develop a health re-insurance plan to make health care more accessible to millions of Americans. This last example gives particularly good insight into the type of "liberal" Rockefeller was. Rather than propose a health-care system financed by the federal government through payroll deduction, Rockefeller, always a champion of private enterprise, proposed a re-insurance system where the government's role would be limited to encouraging private insurance companies to extend coverage by guaranteeing high-risk policies.

The second stage of Rockefeller's career that I found useful to my study was his role as a presidential candidate in 1960 and 1964. For this portion of my research I found the newly opened New York Office files (Record Group 15, NAR Gubernatorial, Series 22) and the papers of Graham Molitor particularly helpful. Also useful were the Press Office and Speeches series (Record Group 15, NAR Gubernatorial, Series 25 and Speeches). Rockefeller's candidacy for the 1960 Republican nomination was short-lived, but it demonstrated to front-runner Richard Nixon that if he hoped to win the general election he would have to make some concessions to Rockefeller and his liberal supporters. This realization led to the "Compact of Fifth Avenue," known to conservatives as the "Munich of the Republican Party," in which Nixon, in an attempt to avoid a fight on the floor of the convention, compromised with Rockefeller on several platform positions.

The liberal-conservative split in the Republican party was never more apparent than in the campaign for the 1964 Republican nomination. Billed as the sensible alternative to right-wing candidate Barry Goldwater, Rockefeller had his best chance to win the nomination, and perhaps the presidency, in 1964. When personal matters and Goldwater's extraordinary grass-roots organization combined to deprive Rockefeller of the nomination through the primary process, he

continued to play a key role by encouraging other liberal or moderate candidates, such as William Scranton and George Romney, to challenge Goldwater.

My study of Nelson Rockefeller's liberal influence on the Republican party is an integral part of my dissertation on the decline of the party's left wing. I am grateful to the Rockefeller Archive Center for providing me with the financial assistance that was necessary to conduct this research.

The History of Conservation and Ecology in the Rockefeller Archive Center's Collections

*by Darwin H. Stapleton
Director, Rockefeller Archive Center*

For 1999, the Rockefeller Archive Center will offer a special series of grants in support of research in the Center's collections on the history of conservation and ecology. (For details about the grant program, see page 8.) The 62 million pages of documents at the Rockefeller Archive Center include major bodies of original source material for the study of conservation, environmentalism, and ecology dating from the late 19th century into the 1980s. These records engage issues relating to the environment and the field of ecology from two directions. First, the Rockefeller family has had a deep interest in the preservation of the American landscape, both as an object of contemplation and appreciation (derived from religious belief), and as a matter of patriotic pride. Second, many Rockefeller philanthropic institutions have been interested in the management of the natural order as a means of promoting the welfare of humanity. These interests have ranged from the practicalities of increasing the production of food and fuel to investigations of fundamental biological, chemical, and physical principles.

This essay offers a brief and general overview of the Center's collections relating to conservation and ecology. Prospective researchers should

call or write the Center to ask about materials related to their specific topics.

Rockefeller Family Archives

John D. Rockefeller, Sr. purchased large tracts of land for his estates in Ohio, New York, New Jersey, and Florida, and personally supervised much of the improvement of the land in accord with his concepts of landscape. In Cleveland he donated to the city Rockefeller Park, and its development and maintenance are documented in his papers. As a businessman, JDR Sr. was a major purchaser of land as an entrepreneur in the petroleum, mineral, and timber industries. The records of the Office of the Messrs Rockefeller contain, for example, a body of material on the Everett Timber and Investment Company in the Pacific Northwest, 1891-1953.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr. continued his father's fascination with landscape by further developing the family estate at Pocantico Hills, New York and by pursuing a similar program at Mt. Desert Island, Maine, for what later became Acadia National Park. JDR Jr. undertook massive acquisitions of land for preservation purposes at Jackson Hole, Wyoming (the basis of the Grand Teton National Park) and along the Palisades portion of the Hudson River in New York and New Jersey. He was involved in federal, state, and city conservation projects in North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and other locales. A selection of JDR Jr.'s correspondence with Horace Albright, the head of the National Park Service from 1916 to 1933, was published in 1991 as *Worthwhile Places* (Joseph W. Ernst, ed.).

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Papers contain three rather different types of materials related to the environment. During NAR's forty-year involvement in Latin America (1938-1979) he was first a leader in public health projects that involved land drainage, insecticide spraying, and other alterations of the environment; and from the 1940s through the 1960s he promoted the development of modern agriculture, personally operating farms in three Latin American nations. In 1969 he was asked by President Nixon to undertake a comprehensive review of American

relations with Latin America, which included consideration of natural resources. Materials on these subjects are in NAR's papers as well as in related collections of the American International Association and the International Basic Economy Corporation.

NAR's years as governor of the State of New York (1959-1973) are fully documented in his papers. They contain material on the environmental bond issue of the early 1960s that provided funds for water quality improvement and the purchase of parklands, on the management of the Adirondack and Catskill preserves, and on a range of issues associated with the management of land and water resources in New York State.

In the early 1970s NAR was chairman of the National Water Quality Commission, a federal body which attempted to develop a national policy on water resources. The Archive Center holds 59 cubic feet of the committee's records, which include original research materials, testimony, and the internal workings of the committee.

Laurance S. Rockefeller has continued JDR Jr.'s interest in land preservation. His papers are not yet open for scholarly research, but some documentation of organizations that he developed, such as the American Conservation Association and Jackson Hole Preserve Inc., are available to researchers. His work in this area is the subject of a recent book by Robin Winks, *Laurance S. Rockefeller: Catalyst for Conservation* (1997).

Material related to the Greenacre Foundation, an urban land preservation organization established by Abby Rockefeller Mauzé in 1968, also is available for research.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund Archives

The interests of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund generally have reflected those of the Rockefeller family, so the archives contain records of grants given to organizations with conservation interests, such as the Central Park Conservancy and the American Farmland Trust. In the last two decades the RBF has been heavily involved in the sustainable agriculture movement, particularly in Eastern Europe.

Rockefeller Foundation Archives

This vast archive documents the global activities of the foundation and connects with ecological matters at two points: public health and agriculture. The former area was a major focus of the foundation from its creation in 1913 to the early 1950s. Global programs aimed at the eradication of several infectious diseases, primarily hookworm, yellow fever, and malaria, included numerous strategies of environmental regulation and control, including drainage of



From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

"Louisiana heron brooding her young," photographed in 1919 by E.A. McIlhenny at a bird refuge owned by the Rockefeller Foundation. In the 1910s the RF and the Russell Sage Foundation helped preserve large tracts of land along Louisiana's Gulf coast; both transferred their lands to the state in 1920 but retained some rights to ensure preservation.

swamps, altering of watercourses, the distribution of mosquito-eating fish, and the spraying of insecticides. The foundation was a major participant in a singular attempt to eradicate mosquitoes from the entire island of Sardinia (Italy) in the latter 1940s.

In 1943 the RF initiated a program of plant breeding and agricultural innovations that became known as the Green Revolution. Elements of this program, such as substantial use of chemical fertilizers and insecticides, and specific methods of land management, have required consideration of the effect of the Green Revolution on local and global ecological systems.

The foundation has been active in so many areas of human endeavor in the 20th century that it is impossible to list all of the other areas in which its work has been related to conservation and ecological issues. But researchers should

take into consideration its strong support of the biological sciences in the 1930s and 1940s, and its funding of some aspects of urban planning.

The Rockefeller University Archives

Much of the research at The Rockefeller University (established in 1901 as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research) has related to the human physiology. However, a number of researchers have gone in directions that have been important ecologically. The leading figure in this area is René Dubos (1901-1982), whose early work on the antibiotic Gramicidin convinced him that the solutions to human problems lay in the better understanding of ecology, and thence to a conviction that the public needed to be far better educated about the functioning of the biosphere. The university archives contains a body of Dubos's scientific papers, some correspondence, and drafts of his publications. The Center's library has a major collection of his printed works.

Until the late 1940s the university had a plant and animal research laboratory at Princeton, New Jersey, which carried out important work on the transmission of diseases. More recently the university established a Center for Field Research at Millbrook, New York, which includes ecologically related research in its programs. The behavior of birds, particularly vocal communication, has been a major focus of study.

Other Archives

The General Education Board (1902-1964), active primarily in the American South, began promoting improved farming practices soon after it was established, and also promoted better sanitary facilities in rural areas. The short-lived Rockefeller Sanitary Commission for the Eradication of Hookworm Disease (1909-1915) pioneered in encouraging the improvement of sanitary practices in the American South in order to eliminate hookworm transmission; it served as the model for the International Health Board, established in 1913.

Researchers interested in outdoor recreation should examine the archives of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, which in the 1920s funded outdoor museums and other elements of regional and national parks. It also gave a large grant to

help establish the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Also in the 1920s the International Education Board provided fellowships and grants to forestry and agriculture students in Europe and the U.S.

The Russell Sage Foundation Archives document its support of the Regional Plan Association, which created comprehensive plans for the expansion of the infrastructure of the New York City region in the 1920s, as well as promoting the creation of the Appalachian Trail.

Personal Papers

The Archive Center holds several large bodies of personal papers that may be of interest to researchers in the fields of environmentalism and ecology. Kenneth Chorley's papers focus primarily on the development of Colonial Williamsburg, but there is abundant material on the management of Rockefeller property at Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Harold Fabian's papers are the records of a real estate agent who helped acquire the Jackson Hole lands for JDR Jr. The Nelson C. Davis and Wilbur Downs papers document professional lives committed to yellow fever and malaria eradication, including (in Downs's case) by means of the use of DDT. Louis Hackett's papers reveal the work of one of the most effective managers of yellow fever and malaria projects in both Latin America and Italy in the 1920s and 1930s. The papers of J. George Harrar, a plant pathologist who became head of the Mexican Agricultural Project in 1943, and was later president of the Rockefeller Foundation, are important to understanding the history of the Green Revolution.

About the Contributors

Julia Foulkes holds a Ph.D. in history from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. She is now revising her dissertation for publication with the help of a Rockefeller Foundation postdoctoral fellowship at the Center for Black Music Research of Columbia College Chicago. Her study of the development of modern dance in America pays particular attention to the confluence of racial, gender, and sexual issues and how they functioned in the larger movement of

cultural nationalism in the 1930s and changed in the shifting political climate of the 1940s and 1950s. She can be reached at the Center for Black Music Research, Columbia College Chicago, 600 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago IL 60605-1996, or via email at jfoulkes@popmail.colum.edu.

Richard Hankins is a final year Ph.D. student at the Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Manchester. Currently he is completing his thesis on the history of parasite immunology, and he is an active member of the University of Liverpool's veterinary history research program. He recently presented work on the WHO and the "modernization" of parasitology, which he is revising for publication. He can be reached at CHSTM, Mathematics Tower, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK or via email at Hankins@FS4.MA.MAN.AC.UK.

Ben Keppel is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Oklahoma. He received his Ph.D. from UCLA in 1992 and is conducting archival research on his second book. His first book, *The Work of Democracy: Ralph Bunche, Kenneth B. Clark, Lorraine Hansberry and the Cultural Politics of Race*, was published in 1995 by Harvard University Press. Inquiries may be addressed to him at the Department of History, University of Oklahoma, 455 West Lindsey, Norman, OK 73019, or via e-mail at bkeppel@ou.edu.

Philip J. Nelson holds a Ph.D. in history from Iowa State University. He currently teaches history at the University of Northern Iowa and Hawkeye Community College. His major publications include "To Hold the Land: Soil Erosion, Agricultural Scientists, and the Development of Conservation Tillage Techniques," *Agricultural History* 70 (Winter 1997): 71-90, and "The Rockwell Co-operative Society and the Iowa Farmers' Elevator Movement, 1870-1920," *The Annals of Iowa* 54 (Winter 1995): 1-24. He is at work on a manuscript entitled "Community Dreaming in the Rural West: The Montana Study, 1944-1947." He can be reached at 302 Reber Avenue, Waterloo, Iowa 50701.

Steven T. Wagner, a doctoral candidate in history at Purdue University, is currently writing his dissertation, "An Echo or a Choice? The Decline of the Republican Left, 1952-1964." Grants from the Rockefeller Archive Center, the Eisenhower Presidential Library, and the Purdue Research Foundation have supported this project. He can be reached at Purdue University, University Hall, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907 or by email at swagner@omni.cc.purdue.edu.



From the Rockefeller Family Archives

Conservation and ecology have been fields of concern for members of the Rockefeller family throughout much of this century. This photograph from 1933, taken from Dead Man's Bar in the Grand Teton National Park, shows the Tetons, Mt. St. John, and the Snake River. In 1927 John D. Rockefeller, Jr. began acquiring land in the Jackson Hole region that he later transferred to the national park. In 1999, the Rockefeller Archive Center will offer a number of grants for the study of the history of conservation and ecology. See page 8 for a description of the grant program, and the related story on page 16.

Rockefeller Archive Center

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

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



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 ¥