

Research Reports

from the Rockefeller Archive Center

SPRING 1999

RF Support for Non-Professional Drama, 1933-1950

by William J. Buxton



From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

A scene from the Cornell University (ca. 1939) production of "Let's Get on With the Marryin'."

“The Rockefeller Foundation,” as Norris Houghton (quoting Lewis Mumford) wrote in his 1941 survey of amateur theater in the U.S., “has appreciated that ... ‘A community whose life is not irrigated by art and science, by religion and philosophy, day upon day, is a community that exists half alive. A person who has not entered into this realm has not yet reached the human estate.’” Houghton added that “Broadway has been little interested in such irrigation; so it has seemed to this Foundation... that the non-professional theater was the ditch through which the arid field might be watered.”

Given that Houghton’s study was funded by a grant from the Humanities Division (HD) of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), his perspective was not entirely unbiased. But his remarks were nonetheless in accord with the views of many others in the non-professional theater community who had come to rely on Rockefeller programs for support and encouragement.

The driving force behind the Humanities Division’s diverse and extensive initiatives in drama was its long-time director, David H. Stevens. A former English professor at the University of Chicago, Stevens had an academic interest in theater and was a strong advocate of community and university drama. In line with its reorientation towards the elevation of cultural standards and the preservation of humanistic values during the mid-1930s, the HD embarked on an ambitious program of strengthening and deepening initiatives in non-professional theater that had shown particular vitality and promise.

The plan was to work through institutions where there had already been a “fairly developed interest” in the form of an established budget for staff and supplies as well as a permanent investment in building and equipment. Moreover, the institutions to receive support would be those that, *inter alia*, offered courses in play writing, were open to experimental production, included training and research in speech, taught drama at a graduate level, and had aided dramatic work in

Table of Contents

The Presidency of Charles S. Johnson at Fisk University	5
The RF in West Africa	7
1999 Grant Recipients	11
The Rockefeller Foundation and Canadian Medical Education	14
The General Education Board and the U.S.D.A.	16
The Trojan Horse: The Biochemical Laboratory of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 1921-1939	19
About the Contributors	22
Grants for Travel and Research	23

secondary schools, colleges, and communities in the region in which they were located.

To flesh out this program, the HD canvassed the views of a group of prominent drama educators at two meetings held in January and February 1934. Invited to take part in the discussions were Arthur Quinn of the University of Pennsylvania, Allardyce Nicoll of Yale University, Frederick Koch of the University of North Carolina, A.M. Drummond of Cornell University, and E.C. Mable of the University of Iowa.

It was perhaps predictable that four of the universities represented in the meetings were to be found among the “five centers having a strong claim to support for the teaching and creative writing and production of drama”—namely Cornell, Iowa, North Carolina, Western Reserve/Playhouse Foundation of Cleveland, and Yale—which were initially chosen for generous funding for their drama programs. These institutions “were, or seemed likely to become, major centers for training leaders in creative dramatic art for college and community service, thus advancing the development of drama as a college and a regional activity.”

The five centers in question were all of recent vintage, reflecting the fact that the study of drama was, at least relatively speaking, a late-comer to the American academic scene. Given that all five drama programs offered instruction at the graduate level, they were viewed by the HD as potential repositories of knowledge about the theater arts. Reflecting this concern, a key priority of the RF program was to encourage the building of resources for the study and practice of drama.

The support for Yale was particularly noteworthy in this respect. From 1934 to 1936 a total of \$42,000 was allocated to the Drama Department in the School of Fine Arts at Yale, largely to build up its holdings in theatrical history. This included photographs and illustrative materials on costumes, production, and stage design. This collection was to become a primary source of information for teaching and graduate work at the university, as well as for other universities and theater organizations.

The HD was not only concerned with cultivating the growth of knowledge in the field of drama *per se*; it also appeared to take into account whether a program had received previous federal and/or philanthropic funding. Iowa, for instance, had already been the beneficiary of support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and had been designated by a federal program as a regional training center for teachers and directors, both in professional circles and in schools, colleges, and communities.

The Carnegie grant Iowa had received was an extremely generous one; \$100,000 had been earmarked by the Carnegie Corporation for use in a building program for the fine arts that totaled \$306,000. While the RF grants were generally not of this magnitude, they did in some instances carry on the Carnegie tradition of providing support for building and infrastructure projects. In the case of Iowa, \$32,500 was provided in 1934, not over \$25,000 of which was to be allocated for building a workshop to be used to design and manufacture scenery, costumes, and lighting equipment.

The Rockefeller Foundation Humanities Division expressed considerable confidence in the regional work of the Cleveland Play House in 1936 by offering a matching grant of \$38,000 to retire the mortgage on the Play House’s complex of buildings. The Play House Foundation successfully raised an equal amount, and then used funds formerly allocated to debt payments to expand its training program for teachers in northeast Ohio.

The support given for building and reconstruction of theater facilities could be understood as part of a broader effort of the RF to help amateur theater programs cope with the ravages of the Great Depression. With the shrinking of assets and the decline in revenues attendant upon the collapse of the economy, ongoing building projects were suddenly placed in jeopardy, and it is not at all surprising that renovation became a staple part of the RF drama program. More generally, RF support was intended to help drama programs that had flourished prior to the Depression get back on their feet.

Cornell was provided funding to help it restore its work in rural New York, which had suffered

from the economic downturn. In the case of North Carolina, the university administration had cut appropriations to the drama department quite drastically in 1933, making it unable to support Koch's work without outside help. In both instances, the RF funding was intended as a stop-gap measure, to allow the two departments to carry on their activities and to strengthen their programs until such time that their respective university administrations would be able to resume support at previous levels.

Underlying the RF's willingness to underwrite the drama programs at the University of North Carolina and Cornell was a recognition that both were carrying out valuable and important extension work that would be jeopardized if emergency funding were not forthcoming. Cornell's program in drama had exerted an important influence in the western half of New York State, particularly in the areas of teaching, creative writing and production. At the University of North Carolina, RF funding was used to establish seven extension centers, "both white and Negro" for the teaching of drama in rural areas.

The RF also looked favorably upon drama programs that had carried out their extension work within school systems. The dramatic arts project at the University of Iowa, located in the Department of Speech, had supervised the production of plays in secondary schools throughout Iowa. Since 1927 it had also managed a large annual play festival. Cornell had not only established a good outreach program for teachers in secondary schools, but many graduates of the program went on to hold positions in universities and colleges as well as in community and professional theater. In conjunction with the Cleveland Play House, the Department of Drama and Theater at Western Reserve emphasized teacher training and close relationships with high schools.

The active extension initiatives of the Rockefeller-supported drama programs were indicative of another feature, namely their status as regional centers from which influence radiated outwards to the surrounding areas. The University of North Carolina played this role in the southeast, Iowa in the mid-central states, Cornell in western New York, Western Reserve



Spring 1937. Washington State Theatre road company and staff pose before the ten-ton truck which carried settings and equipment on tour.

From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

in the eastern Great Lakes region, and Yale in the New York urban area. By the late 1930s, this set of regional centers had been extended to the west coast where Stanford University and the Washington State Theater Project received HD support for their work in drama.

This capacity to serve as centers for diffusion was rooted in the programs' evident ability to integrate themselves with other departments and ventures. Cornell made use of New York state historical and traditional materials in music and drama extension activities. This took the form of a joint project with the department of music and drama, under the general control of the school of agriculture. At Iowa, the HD was supportive of the dramatic arts project's efforts to apply research on speech to theater through its controlled laboratory experiments on the instruction of drama. The Department of Drama and Theater at Western Reserve was well connected with other units in the university, with adult community theaters in northern Ohio, with the artistic and professional community in Cleveland, and with the Playhouse Foundation.

What made the effective growth of centers of diffusion possible, in the view of the HD, was, of course, strong and effective leadership; Drummond, Koch, Mable, and Nicoll had all established themselves as leading figures in university drama. The issue of leadership appeared to be a decisive factor in the RF's decision to fund Western Reserve University and the Playhouse Foundation of Cleveland so generously.

Barclay Leathem, director of the Graduate School Department of Drama and Theater at Western Reserve, had shown a singular capacity to forge close and effective alliances with the professional and artistic community of Cleveland. Correspondingly, Frederick McConnell, who directed the Playhouse Foundation, was thought to be something of a drama visionary with his advocacy of a new type of theater, which would not only reflect community but also embody "the best technique and the highest demonstration of the genus theater as a professional activity and an art form."

The effective leadership was closely bound up with the demonstrated capacity to engage in

experimental and innovative work related to drama. In some cases, this took the form of the drama programs having close connections to repertory companies. This was evident at North Carolina, where the drama department was aligned with the Carolina Players, and at Western Reserve, where the programs of the Department of Drama and Theater and the Cleveland Play House were closely integrated. Innovative work also involved, in some instance, the forging of links with other forms of artistic expression and media technology.

In 1936, \$8,000 was allocated to Yale's Drama Department for the purchase and maintenance of a motion-picture camera for teaching and creating permanent records of productions. At Yale, Stanley McCandless and George C. Izenour were given support for new developments in stage lighting. The drama program at Cornell was closely aligned with creative writing, folklore, music, and local history.

Paul Green's innovative play writing at North Carolina brought to bear the idiom of classical music on theater through his refinement of what he called "symphonic drama." His richly textured pageant *The Lost Colony*, which was performed annually at Roanoke Island beginning in 1937, served as a model of this form of theatrical expression. Indeed, it was the hope of the HD that drama programs known for their novel work in theater production, such as those at Iowa and North Carolina, would exert a positive influence on programs that had been less successful in this respect, such as that at Cornell.

By the late 1930s the scope and focus of Rockefeller support for drama underwent a re-orientation. Mirroring an evolution that had occurred earlier in the RF's Social Science Division, the HD moved away from concentrating its support on major theater centers towards an approach that was on the one hand more inclusive, and on the other, more integrative in nature.

Support was gradually extended beyond the five original centers to include projects linked to Stanford University, Columbia University, Dillard University, the Stevens Institute of Technology, and the Washington State Theater. As part of the HD's expanding program in Canada, support was

given to the University of Alberta, the University of Saskatchewan, and McGill University. Funds were also provided in 1943 to help the nascent Western Canada Theater Conference, modeled after the National Theater Conference (NTC), get off the ground.

Parallel to the increase in the number of institutions funded, a new emphasis was given to programs that helped to develop networks and institutions for non-professional drama, particularly on a national scale. Consequently, the HD began to provide support with the intent of complementing and strengthening the work of national theater agencies. For instance, Vassar College received a grant of \$10,500 in 1937 to underwrite a summer institute for directors and other leaders of the Federal Theater Project (FTP). This program was intended to not only support the FTP, but also to help advance two other national drama initiatives, the Dramatists Guild and the NTC.

The NTC had been closely tied to the five drama centers that had originally received major funding from the HD. This linkage appears to have been a decisive factor in the HD's decision to generously underwrite the NTC's activities. A total of \$266,825 was granted to the organization during 1938-1950. Moreover, the NTC was also supported indirectly through grants to the Department of Drama and Theater at Western Reserve. Some of these funds were earmarked specifically to defray some of the administrative costs of maintaining the NTC headquarters at Western Reserve.

This move of the HD towards support for integrating and co-ordinating theater at a national level was accompanied by a growing penchant to fund ventures which took stock of the nature and development of non-professional drama. These included Hallie Flanagan's retrospective reflections on the Federal Theater Project, Norris Houghton's survey of amateur theater, and Barclay Leatham's report on drama activities in Canada.

The insights provided by these accounts—which addressed the place of non-professional drama within the broader context of North

American cultural life— may well have fueled an apparent shift in the overall priorities of the HD which became evident in the early 1940s. The initiatives funded under the umbrella of the NTC were increasingly marked by efforts to find common ground between non-commercial drama and Broadway-based productions and to encourage exchange and collaboration between what the HD had previously considered to be contending and antithetical expressions of American theater.

The Presidency of Charles S. Johnson at Fisk University as a Model for Collaboration between Philanthropy and Black Higher Education, 1946-1956

by Marybeth Gasman

White philanthropic organizations have had a checkered history in their efforts to assist historically Black colleges (HBCUs). While the philanthropies helped establish and expand HBCUs, there were numerous occasions when philanthropic organizations exerted control over the curricula of these institutions in ways that detracted from the quality of education.

Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee experienced many of these difficulties during its early years, as demonstrated by historians James Anderson and Joe Richardson. However, under the presidency of Charles S. Johnson, ties with white philanthropy propelled Fisk University to national prominence. Johnson, Fisk's first Black president, was able to use philanthropy to achieve his goal of advancing education for African Americans without compromising the independence of Fisk.

A review of Johnson's presidency answers some fundamental questions pertaining to the relationship between historically Black colleges and philanthropy. These questions include: How can philanthropy most effectively assist in the growth of HBCUs? What kind of assistance can

philanthropy provide to increase scholarship and leadership opportunities for African Americans? How can philanthropy bolster the goals of Black education without dictating curriculum? Johnson was able to make significant accomplishments in all of these areas.

Although remembered primarily as a sociologist and architect of the Harlem Renaissance, Johnson's efforts to advance education for African Americans, specifically his role as president of Fisk University, have not been carefully examined by historians. Adept at working with philanthropists, Johnson was not only able to collaborate with individual organizations but could also initiate cooperative efforts among various philanthropic institutions.

In August of 1998 I visited the Rockefeller Archive Center to conduct research for the completion of my dissertation. The visit was essential due to the close ties between Rockefeller philanthropy, Fisk University and Charles S. Johnson.

Johnson initiated and administered projects sponsored by the General Education Board (GEB), the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), and the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). My research illustrates the gradual change in ideology among philanthropists in the 1940s. Because philanthropic organizations asked for Johnson's input and leadership on important projects, the results were better-suited to the needs of African Americans. This shift toward enlightened self-interest by philanthropies serves as a model for future interactions between Black education and philanthropy.

Charles S. Johnson became heavily involved with the RF during his tenure as director of the Fisk social science department and the race relations institute. Seeking to put an end to the lack of materials and research on race relations in the U.S., the LSRM initiated the development of the Fisk social science department.

In 1927 the LSRM authorized a \$200,000 contribution for the recruitment of several esteemed social scientists and an administrator for the overall program. Johnson's associations with Leonard Outhwaite of the LSRM and Edwin Embree of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, coupled with his research

accomplishments, helped him to gain the position of the chair of the newly formed department. Outhwaite and Embree were aided in their desire to select Johnson by Julius Rosenwald, who agreed to supplement the LSRM's funding in order to make up Johnson's salary and pay his research expenses.

While at Fisk, Johnson used his considerable writing talents to persuade philanthropies to support numerous projects. As a result, the Fisk department moved to the forefront of American social science. Many considered Fisk's department to be the most important at any college in the South—Black or white. With a faculty that included Johnson, Robert E. Park, and E. Franklin Frazier, the distinction was understandable.

Although most Fisk faculty members were required to route their project proposals through President Thomas Elsa Jones, Johnson corresponded directly with philanthropists. This is evidenced by the large volume of Johnson correspondence in the GEB archives. The correspondence illustrates a relationship of mutual respect. The GEB's regard for Johnson's talent and ambition is mentioned in numerous phone conversation summaries meticulously submitted by GEB administrators.

Under a storm of controversy, Johnson was selected in 1946 as the sixth president of Fisk, its first Black president. Johnson was not the first or only choice for president. His competition included Charles H. Wesley, Rayford Logan, Benjamin Mays, Carter G. Woodson, Charles Thompson, and Ira De A. Reid. Although supported by Fisk alumni after his inauguration, Johnson faced heavy opposition during the selection process. Many alumni, including W.E.B. Du Bois, were aware of his close ties to white philanthropy and regarded him far too moderate for their tastes.

Despite the local and national controversy, or perhaps because of it, Johnson's selection provides an excellent example of the role of alumni within the university setting. Further, it illustrates the diversity in Black leadership and thought during the mid-1940s. Curiously, one group that did not support Johnson's candidacy

was the white philanthropists. Both the GEB and Edwin Embree of the Julius Rosenwald Fund felt that Johnson's talents would be best utilized in research rather than administration. This was true despite alumni perceptions that he was a puppet of white philanthropy.

As president of Fisk, Johnson maintained a unique relationship with the GEB—one that was different from that of previous Fisk presidents. Although he sometimes wrote twice a day for funding, Johnson, unlike past Fisk leaders, maintained autonomy for himself and the institution. In order to understand this change, it is necessary to review associations that former Fisk presidents had with the GEB. Papers in the GEB archives clarify the nature of the GEB's dealings with Fisk presidents James Merrill, Fayette McKenzie, and Thomas Elsa Jones. Although Anderson and Richardson studied the GEB's impact at Fisk, neither of them have analyzed it from the perspective of the Black college president. James Anderson is for the most part highly critical of the GEB's relationship with historically Black colleges, whereas Joe Richardson rarely finds fault with the GEB.

After reviewing GEB records, it became evident to this author that the GEB stood on middle ground. In some cases the GEB was intrusive and overbearing—for example, during the presidency of Fayette McKenzie—while at other times, it was content with the activities at Fisk. The pattern that emerges is that the GEB was more inclined to grant autonomy if presidential policies and practices were organized and showed vision.

The GEB kept Fayette McKenzie, a young and somewhat disorganized leader, under a close eye on the accounting and reporting methods of the institution. In fact, when the GEB became aware of trouble brewing on the Fisk campus, it sometimes became so involved in the day-to-day operations of the college as to paralyze the leadership. Later, during Thomas Elsa Jones' tenure, the GEB took a more hands-off approach. The new type of relationship that began under the presidency of Jones came to fruition under Charles S. Johnson.

While changing trains in Louisville, en route to a Fisk Board of Trustees meeting in New York

City in 1956, Johnson collapsed and died at age 63 on the platform. While many institutions of higher education are able to recover quickly from the loss of an important leader, Fisk was not so resilient. Johnson was the main link between Fisk and philanthropists. His career cut short, he had neglected to train a protégé in the ways of navigating through philanthropic waters. He had not had the chance to pass on the many ideas that he had for the future of Fisk—perhaps discussed with philanthropists, perhaps not. This problem, as well as the increased dominance of the United Negro College Fund in HBCU philanthropy, erased many of the gains Johnson had made. Johnson's successor, Stephen Wright, did not have the connections on which to draw for funding and thus was not able to match the achievements of Johnson.

The RF in West Africa

by Marisa Chambers

During the nineteenth and early twentieth century, notoriously high mortality rates among Europeans living in West Africa led to the region's undesirable reputation as "the white man's grave." Colonial rule was hampered by death and illness among officials. In 1863, Richard Burton described the Lagos Government house in Nigeria as a "corrugated iron coffin or a plank lined morgue containing a dead Governor once a year". In Britain, such commentaries added to concerns that disease in the tropics would prove a considerable obstacle to the operation and expansion of the British Empire. In part, the development of the discipline of topical medicine arose from such economic concerns, and research into tropical diseases and practical disease control measures began to be conducted.

My work aims to analyze campaigns against yellow fever and Bilharzia in West Africa in the first half of the twentieth century, providing insight into the research and practical control work conducted by a number of institutions both within and external to the British Colonial Office.

In 1916, the International Health Board/Division (IHB/D) of the Rockefeller



From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

Dr. Hideyo Noguchi in Accra with Dr. N. Paul Hudson of the West African Yellow Fever Commission, 1928.

Foundation (RF) declared it was expanding its investigations of yellow fever beyond South America and into West Africa, a suspected endemic area. Unfortunately, World War One hampered this work, until finally, in 1920, the IHB sent a commission to West Africa to investigate yellow fever in the region. This commission comprised of eminent men, well known for their work against the disease, including General W.C. Gorgas, R.E. Noble and Juan Guiteras. Although they failed to find any cases of yellow fever during their visit, they concluded that the disease was present and advised further investigations.

In 1925, under the auspices of the West Africa Yellow Fever Commission, a laboratory was established at Lagos, Nigeria under the directorship of Henry Beuwwkes to conduct research solely on yellow fever in the hope that this would lead to the eventual formulation of control measures. The aims of the research program

were diverse but included epidemiological studies of yellow fever in West Africa, in particular in comparison with yellow fever in the Western hemisphere; the isolation of the causative organism; discovery of the mode of transmission; the identification of endemic areas and the study of febrile conditions in Africans in the hope of identifying yellow fever and securing material for bacteriological and pathological study in the laboratory. A smaller laboratory was also established in Accra on the Gold Coast on an intermittent base which conducted research along the lines of the Lagos laboratory.

The research conducted at Lagos was extensive, varied and helped considerably by the presence of specialist staff, such as epidemiologists and bacteriologists. Laboratory work was pioneering and added considerably to contemporary knowledge of yellow fever and enhanced research techniques. However, as this work

has been thoroughly documented in the edited volumes *The Plague Killers* by William Greer and *Yellow Fever* by George Strode I decided to concentrate my investigations on work conducted outside the laboratory.

Intensive studies were done on the vector of yellow fever; the *Aedes aegypti*. Its breeding habits and behavior was investigated and several other *Aedes* mosquitoes such as the *Aedes vittatus* and *Aedes africanus* were demonstrated to transmit yellow fever. Extensive surveys of the mosquito population in various towns, including Ibadan and Lagos, were also conducted, providing valuable data on types and levels of mosquitoes in specific areas.

The West Africa Yellow Fever Commission also had several dedicated field staff posted in specific field offices in West Africa. The field office in Ibadan was of particular interest to the West Africa Yellow Fever Commission as it was in the area suspected to be endemic.

Field staff dealt with the human element of yellow fever. They investigated reported cases of yellow fever and surveyed the African population hoping to find ongoing yellow fever cases which would provide valuable pathological material. African hospitals were searched for potential yellow fever cases. They also took histories from Africans looking for previous suggestive fevers to gain insight of past yellow fever incidence. This time-consuming, labor-intensive manner of surveying the indigenous population continued until 1928 when they began to use "protection tests" which they considered a reliable determinant of past incidence of yellow fever.

This test involved the injection of human blood sera into a susceptible monkey who was then infected with yellow fever. If the animal failed to develop the disease, the test was positive, the blood serum had "protected" the monkey, conferring an immunity which the donor was believed to have developed following a past yellow fever infection. Beeuwkes noted that: "The test is cumbersome, time consuming, and requires large numbers of animals, but it is at present the most promising measure at our command." Despite its

problems, the staff of the laboratory made considerable use of the protection test in an attempt to discover and map out endemic areas. Africans were the predominant subjects of this procedure and blood of African children was tested in particular as this was believed to indicate recent yellow fever activity.

However, the protection test was expensive and staff had to limit the extent of surveys using the test. Therefore, they did not replace other methods of field investigation. African children were kept under observation by field workers investigating febrile conditions and searches for suspicious fever cases continued. Innovative methods for detecting the presence of yellow fever were also developed. For example, "sentinel" monkeys were caged and put in various sites in Ibadan. They were then watched closely by field investigators. If the monkeys developed symptoms of yellow fever then this would indicate to researchers that the disease was present in the area. This method proved unsuccessful and was only tried once.

The refinement of the protection test, which replaced monkeys with mice, reduced the cost of the test considerably, making it practical for use in large-scale surveys. Work with the test was intensified and expanded geographically after 1931 when the mouse protection test was applied. Surveys of the African population using protection tests became the main focus of the laboratory until its closure in 1934. The capacity of the laboratory in Lagos proved insufficient for such extensive work, and some sera had to be sent to the IHD's laboratory in New York to be subjected to protection tests. Blood sera was taken from the indigenous population all over West Africa in an attempt to develop a picture of yellow fever incidence in this region. Certain regions were subjected to more intense surveying than others. For example, southwestern Nigeria was extensively surveyed yet few protection tests were conducted on samples from Sierra Leone.

The laboratory was closed in 1934 and the IHD moved its operations into East Africa to conduct surveys there using the protection test. Although

the work of the West Africa Yellow Fever Commission did not lead to the direct formulation of control measures, Beeuwkes was in no doubt of the value of these protection test surveys:

Protection test surveys nevertheless carried out in West Africa to date have provided information of the greatest value in connection with the epidemiology of the disease in the region. They have demonstrated in sections studied that no area has completely escaped infection, that widespread unrecognized epidemics have occurred in many parts in the interior as well as in the coastal regions, that reported cases are no index of the actual incidence of the disease, that the infection can exist at least temporarily in the sparsely populated desert regions of the north, and they have provided fairly definite ideas as to the northern limits of the disease.

However, this was not the end of the IHD's involvement with yellow fever in West Africa. In 1942, the Rockefeller Foundation entered into discussions with British officials on the possibility of opening a co-operative yellow fever program in West Africa. It was agreed that the British West African governments would partly fund the program, but that the RF would provide the bulk of the money required. This program was entitled the West Africa Yellow Fever Service and began operation in November 1943. Its aims were multifold. It was to supply yellow fever vaccine, test its potency before distribution; conduct research into the epidemiology of yellow fever, paying particular attention to the newly discovered jungle yellow fever; and conduct protection tests on both humans and monkeys to enhance current knowledge of yellow fever distribution. It was hoped that the West African governments would be able to take over from the IHD in 1949. The laboratory was sited at the buildings once occupied by the West Africa Yellow Fever Commission.

The epidemiology of yellow fever, in particular the study of jungle yellow fever in West Africa was to be studied in several ways: by trapping wild animals and testing them for susceptibility to the disease; systematic protection tests on animals; insect studies, mainly on mosquitoes; and field investigations using a mobile laboratory to travel to areas where yellow fever was known to be active.

Considerable efforts were made to study yellow fever in mosquitoes and monkeys. Mosquito-catching stations were set up in the Illaro Forest Reserve near Lagos using African boys as human bait. They stood in pairs on platforms hung at various heights on trees and caught mosquitoes which landed on themselves or each other. The entomologist identified the mosquitoes which were then ground up and injected into mice. In 1947, they began experiments injecting mosquitoes with radioactive isotopes, enabling researchers to follow their behavioral habits and flight patterns.

As with the earlier RF Lagos laboratory, protection tests constituted a major part of their work. However, this time, humans were not the sole focus. As part of the attempt to unravel the mystery of jungle yellow fever monkeys were hunted to obtain their blood serum for protection tests to see if monkeys were a potential yellow fever reservoir. For example, in November 1946, Dr. Macnamara, a member of the laboratory, went on a monkey shooting tour by the River Niger. He shot and bled 50 monkeys. Dr. Richard Hahn commented that "All in all he was quite successful and had one rather narrow escape after shooting a monkey in a locality where they are more or less revered."

Human protection tests also continued. In the first six months of the laboratory's operation, 313 sera were examined. Again, researchers concentrated on children as these would give information regarding yellow fever activity during the recent years when the RF was absent from West Africa. For example, researchers concluded from protection tests conducted on humans and monkeys in the area around Lagos that there had been a recent outbreak of yellow fever within 15 miles of Lagos which had gone unnoticed at the time of occurrence by medical personnel.

In 1949, the West Africa yellow fever service began to wind down, and in 1950, the RF withdrew from all yellow fever research and field work throughout the world.

An analysis of the RF laboratories in West Africa reveals how an American philanthropic institution operated effectively within the British colonial regime in West Africa. In particular, the

West Africa Yellow Fever Commission laboratory interacted extremely productively with the Colonial Medical Services. The laboratory had the staff, equipment and experience necessary for extensive yellow fever research but lacked experience of working in Africa. Thus they used the knowledge and connections of the colonial Medical Service to help in their studies. They relied on Colonial Medical Officers to help them to collect blood samples for testing; indeed many samples were collected by MO's alone and sent to the RF laboratory. Medical Officers also provided valuable information, reporting suspected yellow fever cases for the RF staff to investigate and obtain pathological material. Although neither laboratory never directly contributed to yellow fever control measures in West Africa, their work contributed considerably to knowledge of the disease in the region.

1999 Grant Recipients

In March the Center announced that 36 scholars have received grants under its 1999 general grant program, and that its targeted grant programs have awarded grants to two scholars to do research in the history of conservation and ecology, to two scholars to do research in the history of The Rockefeller University, and to one scholar for a residency to study the history of basic medical research. All 41 recipients, their institutions and research topics follow.

General Grants, 1999

Paulina L. Alberto

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, University of California.
"Local Histories of Public Health: The Rockefeller Foundation's Yellow Fever Campaign in Salvador, Brazil, 1923-1930."

Silvia Alvarez

Master's Candidate. Department of Art History, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal.
"The Saõ Paulo Biennial and the Portuguese Representation: The History of the First Fifteen Editions, 1951-1979."

Warwick Anderson

Associate Professor and Director. Centre for the Study of Health and Society, Melbourne, Australia.
"Development of Public Health in the Colonial Philippines."

David Berol

Ph.D. Candidate. Program in the History of Science, Princeton University.
"The History of Crystallographic Methods in Structural Biology."

Victoria Lyon Bestor

Independent Scholar and Research Associate. Cornell University.
"The Rockefeller Legacy in Japan."

Sanjoy Bhattacharya

Wellcome Post-Doctoral Research Fellow. Department of History, School of Cultural Studies, Sheffield Hallam University, England.
"The Eradication of Smallpox in India, 1900-1977."

William J. Buxton

Professor. Department of Communication Studies, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.
"Rockefeller Support for Projects on the Use of Motion Pictures for Educational and Public Purposes, 1935-1942."

Anvar Buzurukov

Director. Eurasian Mountain Center, Russia.
"The Role of USA Charity Organizations in Creating and Supporting Protected Areas: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the National Park System."

Gisela Cramer

Lecturer. Department of History, University of Hamburg, Germany.
"The Office of Inter-American Affairs, 1940-1946."

Donald Critchlow

Professor. Department of History, St. Louis University.
"Radical Dichotomies: Sexual Politics and Policies and the Federal Government."

Elizabeth Danto

Assistant Professor. School of Social Work, City University of New York.
"Freud's Free Clinics: The Economics and Culture of Social Services in the History of Psychoanalysis."

Juanita De Barros

Lecturer. Department of History, York University, Toronto, Canada.
"Health and Culture in Colonial Guyana: The Emergence of a Creole Public Health Policy."

Murat Erdem

Research Assistant. Department of American Culture and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey.
"Turkish-American Relations, 1945-1960."

Elizabeth Fitting

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of Anthropology, New School University.
"Agricultural Research for the Nation: Discourses of Development and Food Security at CIMMYT, 1940-1960s."



Nelson A. Rockefeller with the Mexican artists, Rosa Covarrubias (seated second from left) and Frida Kahlo (seated second from right), Mexico City, 1943.

John L. Harvey

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
Pennsylvania State University.
"Philanthropy without Flags or Frontiers: LSRM Support
for History and the Social Sciences in France and
Germany, 1922-1931."

Soma Hewa

Independent Researcher.
"The Protestant Personality and Higher Education:
An Inquiry of American Philanthropy Beyond the
Progressive Era."

Glenford Howe

Research Officer. Board for Outreach and Distance
Education, University of the West Indies, Barbados.
"Disease and Medicine in the West Indies, 1492-1960."

Andrew Johns

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
University of California, Santa Barbara.
"The Republican Party and the Democrats'
War in Vietnam, 1960-1969."

Shirish Kavadi

Senior Research Officer. Foundation for Research
in Community Health, Pune, India.
"Public Health and Medical Research in India:
The Role of the Rockefeller Foundation, 1950-1970."

Shula Marks

Professor. Department of History, School of Oriental
and African Studies, University of London, England.
"A History of Social Medicine in South Africa."

Karin Matchett

Ph.D. Candidate. Program in History of Science
and Technology, University of Minnesota.
"Scientific Agriculture on Both Sides of the Border:
Mexican and U.S. Collaboration in the Twentieth Century."

Holly McGuire

Ph.D. Candidate. Program in American Culture,
University of Michigan.
"Meeting on the Home Front: Early 20th Century
Middle-Class Reformers and Working-Class Domesticity."

Lothar Mertens

Research Associate. Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany.
“The Rockefeller Foundation and German Science after 1933.”

Graeme Mount

Professor. Department of History,
Laurentian University, Canada.
“A History of the Foreign Relations of Trinidad-Tobago, 1962-1995.”

Rangaswamy Muraleedharan

Associate Professor. Department of Humanities
and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology,
Madras, India.
“The Rockefeller Foundation’s Experimental Work
on Agricultural Malaria in South India, 1930s-1940s.”

Servando Ortoll

Research Professor. Social Research Center,
Universidad de Colima, Mexico.
“The Rockefeller Foundation, Agricultural Research,
and Curriculum Development in Three Agriculture
Schools in Mexico.”

Kenneth Osgood

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
University of California, Santa Barbara.
“Psychological Warfare and the
Making of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1953-1960.”

Catha Paquette

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History of Art and
Architecture, University of California, Santa Barbara.
“U.S. Reception of Mexican Art, 1940-1955:
New York’s Museum of Modern Art.”



From the Rockefeller University Archives

Peyton Rous in his laboratory, May 1923. Dr. Rous became a Nobel Laureate in 1966.

Roland Petchey

Lecturer. Department of General Practice,
University of Nottingham, England.
“Joe Collings: Unrecognized Pioneer
of Modern General Practice.”

Brenda Gayle Plummer

Professor. Departments of History and Afro-American
Studies, University of Washington.
“African Studies in American Perspective:
A History of Separate Development.”

Natalie Ring

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
University of California, San Diego.
“The ‘Problem South’ in the National Imagination,
1890-1930.”

Pierre-Yves Saunier

Researcher. UMR 5600 du Centre National
de la Recherche Scientifique, France.
“The Urban International, 1910-1950.”

Emanuela Scarpellini

Researcher of Contemporary History,
Department of History, University of Turin, Italy.
“The American Way-of-Life and the Coming of
the Mass Market in Italy (1950-1965).”

Kerry Smith

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
State University of New York, Binghamton.
“‘That They Be Saved from Death before Conception
Takes Place’: Black Medical Professionalism, Education,
and Eugenics, 1900-1945.”

Susan Wirka

Ph.D. Candidate. Graduate Program
in Women’s History, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
“Houses, Gender, and Professionalization: Women and
Early Twentieth-Century American Housing Reform.”

Leila Zenderland

Professor. Department of American Studies,
California State University.
“Inheriting Mental Illness: Scientific Debates
and Popular Perceptions, 1918-1945.”

Targeted Grants for Research in the History of Conservation and Ecology, 1999**Neil Maher**

Visiting Fellow. Department of History,
Harvard University.
“Planting More Than Trees: The Civilian Conservation
Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental
Movement.”

Molly Rozum

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History,
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
“Grasslands Grown: A Twentieth-Century Sense of Place
on the North American Prairies and Plains.”

Targeted Grants for Research in the History of The Rockefeller University, 1999

Shelley McKeller

Ph.D. Candidate. Department of History, University of Toronto, Canada.

“Surgical Leadership and Innovation: Profiles in the History of Modern Surgery in the U.S. and Canada, 1880-1950.”

Abigail O’Sullivan

Ph.D. Candidate. Modern History Faculty, Oxford University, England and Visiting Scholar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

“The Nobel Laureates: An Analysis of Scientific Achievement.”

Residency in the History of Basic Medical Research

Luiz Castro-Santos

Associate Professor. Department of Social Sciences and Health, University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

“Exporting Professionalism’ to Brazil: The Politics of Medical Education and Institution- Building in Science.”

The Rockefeller Foundation and Canadian Medical Education

by Marianne P. Stevens

One of the most interesting and significant gifts made by the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) soon after World War I was a five million dollar grant toward Canadian medical education. The decision to do this and the effect of the gift are the focus of my doctoral dissertation. What has unfolded from this research is a story, not only of international aid to Canadian medical teaching and research, but also a record of the changes to Canadian medical education immediately following the war which finally took medical teaching from the nineteenth into the twentieth century.

In December, 1919, John D. Rockefeller Sr. (JDR Sr.) gave an additional \$50 million to the RF. On December 18, 1919, JDR Sr. wrote to the RF saying that “The Canadian people are our near neighbors.....closely bound to us by ties of race, language and international friendship.” He noted the great sacrifices made by Canadians in the war that had just ended and concluded with the statement that, “if your Board should see fit to use any

part of this new gift in promoting medical education in Canada, such action would meet with my cordial approval.” The announcement would not take long—by December 25, 1919 Canadian medical school deans were aware that they might receive a welcome financial boost, but there were no guarantees.

One of the most challenging research questions was why Canadian medical schools, of which there were only seven at the time, were selected as gift recipients. The Canadian schools were included in Abraham Flexner’s 1910 report on all 155 medical schools in North America. This text, although almost ten years old, was available and well-known to both the RF staff and the Rockefeller family. What the Canadian schools lacked in quantity they made up for in quality; even Flexner noted that the situation in Canada was hardly as grave as that in the worst American schools.

The Archive Center material documents a number of Canadian ‘ties’ to the Rockefeller family and the RF, including: Rev. Dr. Charles Aubrey Eaton, who had been pastor of JDR Sr.’s Euclid Ave. Baptist Church in Cleveland as well as uncle to the Pugwash, Nova Scotia financier Cyrus S. Eaton (C.A. Eaton had broached the subject of aid to Canadian colleges as early as 1917); in 1864, Rockefeller Sr. had honeymooned in parts of Canada (Niagara Falls, Montreal and Quebec City); and Jr. enjoyed trips to the Canadian Rockies.

Sir William Osler, whose medical text is said to have inspired Frederick Gates to encourage aiding medical education and research, was a student at both the Toronto and McGill schools, and was a professor at McGill before moving on to help found The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

William Lyon Mackenzie King, who would become Canada’s longest serving Prime Minister, became a respected friend of the Rockefellers after he orchestrated a peaceful outcome to the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company massacre in Ludlow in 1914 (King coached JDR, Jr. through the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations hearings that followed the tragedy and remained in New York City until 1919 as a consultant for a number of organizations including the RF);

and, finally, JDR, Jr.'s successor as President of the RF, George Edgar Vincent, was a cousin to the eminent Toronto farm machinery manufacturers, the Masseys.

Although these connections were not reasons to aid Canadian medical education in themselves, the combination of factors no doubt had a role in JDR Sr.'s generosity. Vincent himself consulted with his cousin Vincent Massey and with King as to how the five million dollars should be distributed among the Canadian medical schools.

Richard Pearce of the RF medical division spent much of the first half of 1920 crisscrossing Canada visiting and re-visiting Canadian medical schools, at times accompanied by Vincent. A summary of these visits is found in a bound volume of his diaries (1916-21) at the RAC.

His conclusion was that medical education at University of Toronto was the best in Canada, with McGill a close second. "These have very definite programs for improvement and should be helped to the greatest possible extent financially," he wrote in his report. Following his recommendation, Toronto and McGill received one million dollars each. The medical schools in Winnipeg (University of Manitoba) and Halifax (Dalhousie University) were deemed solid enough to be allotted \$500,000 each. The decision on the disbursement of the remaining monies was left for further evaluation.

One interesting point brought out by the confidential evaluations was the opinion that the RF money should be doled out in installments. In this way, if progress was not made according to plan, pressure could be brought to bear on the school and if necessary, the annual flow of money would end. The parental tone of these memoranda is, however, conspiratorially benign: the record shows that once designated, the money was destined for the school no matter what the setback.

Although the RF would give additional funds for specific projects at Canadian medical schools, such as the Montreal Neurological Institute or the School of Nursing in Toronto, the five million dollar gift of 1919 was the only large gift given for "general" improvement of Canadian medical education. Coincident with the RF gift, Canada

began to develop its own system of research endowment. By 1919, funding of medical education and research moved, once and for all, away from minimal government support and dependence on student fees. In fact, many schools moved to decrease class size and raise entrance standards in order to improve the quality of applicants and control burgeoning classes. Government funding continued to improve, and the establishment of organizations such as the Medical Research Council of Canada would take much of the financial burden of research from the small amount raised from medical school fees alone.

Ultimately, the significance of the RF's five million dollar gift went far beyond that of an infusion of capital. Because the condition of gift was to source matching funds, the one million dollars allocated to McGill's medical school, for example, actually became more than six million dollars, some of which was used for other university departments.

Furthermore, the process of evaluation and visits from Vincent and Pearce serendipitously gave Canadian medical schools an opportunity for self-evaluation as well as to determine where each one wanted to venture in the post-WWI era of medical research and teaching. It would be the RF gift, and in Toronto \$500,000 from the Sir John Craig and Lady Eaton Endowment, that funded some of the initial forays into the Full-Time System of medical education. One of the legacies of the process are the reports compiled by the medical schools, including detailed analyses of each department's resources and personnel as well as "wish lists" for teaching and research if the RF grants came through.

There are also many pieces of correspondence offering first-hand comments on specific battles at the recipient institutions, such as the government inquiry into large gifts and the Full-Time System that threatened the new way of teaching in Toronto, or the battle over power of appointments between the Montreal teaching hospitals and McGill's Faculty of Medicine.

Finally, my archival research at the RAC showed how the aid to Canadian medical educa-

tion represented a transition in the history of the RF. The gift to Canada was one of the first projects for the new President, George Vincent, and one which was focused on a particular pedagogical line during the first five years of existence, 1914-19, the RF, was interrupted by the crisis of war and only after the end of the war could the RF begin to develop a plan of action and sense of direction for its philanthropic efforts.

The General Education Board and the U.S.D.A.

by Andrew Morris

My interest in the Farm Demonstration program of the General Education Board (GEB) sprang from a perusal of a history of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which mentioned in an off-hand manner that the USDA had collaborated with a Rockefeller philanthropy in the creation of what became the USDA's Extension Service from 1905 to 1914. In light of my broader interest in how private charitable and philanthropic organizations have worked to expand state structures, this program seemed an excellent starting point to discuss these relationships.

The GEB's own literature cast the program as a model of the "demonstration" rationale for foundation philanthropy, where foundations would fund experimental projects that, if their worth was proven, would then be taken up as public policy. But as my research revealed, the GEB's involvement in the program became the center of a heuristic and bureaucratic battle that was supercharged with the swirling anti-Rockefeller sentiment of the 1910s.

Abraham Flexner characterized the program as an unmitigated success in a 1915 summary of the GEB's activities, claiming the "whole incident furnishes a perfect illustration of the valuable part that can be played by private beneficence." Raymond Fosdick's later history of the GEB essentially concurred. Flexner's statement captures the pioneering nature of this administrative collaboration, but downplays the single-mindedness of the GEB's participation and it obscures the conflict which eventually ended it.

The GEB, in the first few years after its creation in 1902, searched for ways to implement its charge to stimulate development of public education in the South. The first attempt was a program that provided "professors of secondary education" to state departments of education in the South, who essentially evangelized poor rural communities on the merits of providing public education. However, GEB officials, particularly its secretary, Wallace Buttrick, realized that the region's poverty restricted the tax base available to draw on for the support of public education. By taking a step back and addressing economic problems in the region, GEB officials felt they could secure the ground on which a fully developed school system could be established.



Deep (18") fall plowing in South Georgia by modern machinery, May 1910. District Agent Willis on left.

From the General Education Board Archives

They found their solution in Seaman Knapp, a USDA employee who had devised a teaching method for introducing "scientific agriculture" to farmers. By "demonstrating" these techniques by convincing a local farmer to adopt them, Knapp found he was much more successful than those who simply lectured, or than exhibits on government-run farms.

Knapp's methods were in use at the time under government funds to combat the incursion of the cotton boll weevil in a handful of southern states, but the GEB saw an opportunity to expand Knapp's program to more states and to address a wider array of technical problems in the region's

agricultural economy, and thereby strengthening the tax base of the area.

Buttrick and Knapp, under the supervision of Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson, inked a deal in 1906 whereby the GEB would pay the salaries of USDA “collaborators” in non-boll-weevil-infested states, thus extending the reach of the program into regions which Congress had refused to include (on the theory that its interference was justified only on the basis of the weevil being an interstate menace).

GEB money gave the Knapp method prominence with the USDA, and helped expand the program across the South to the point where over 600 agents were working in over half the counties in the South. The Knapp method was institutionalized in the Smith-Lever Bill of 1914, which created the Extension Service. At this point the GEB’s relationship with the USDA ended. In many ways this cooperation served to exemplify the possibilities of what private philanthropy could do to stimulate public policy.

But as Judith Sealander’s *Private Wealth and Public Life* notes, the revelation that Rockefeller money was entangled in the federal government unleashed a firestorm of Congressional protest which resulted in the GEB being prohibited from further participation in the program it had helped to develop, even as the merit of the program itself was widely acknowledged by Congress. Mounting anti-Rockefeller sentiment in Congress, stirred by its investigations into labor unrest in Rockefeller’s Colorado mines (culminating in the 1914 Ludlow Massacre) and signified by its repeated refusal to grant a Congressional charter for the Rockefeller Foundation from 1910 to 1913, was directed full force at what heretofore had been seen as an innocuous collaboration. In what seemed a symbolic triumph of Progressive Era protest, Rockefeller’s philanthropy was renounced by the federal government.

My research shifted the investigation of the relationship away from the Congressional controversy and into the offices of the USDA, where, I argue, the real conflict that ended the relationship originated. The USDA was the most precocious federal executive agency in the Progressive

Era. With its connections to land grant universities through a network of agricultural experiment stations, the USDA was already negotiating the landscape of federalism and creating structures to link decentralized states with centralized administrative coordination. It did so prior to the 1920s, a period which historians such as Ellis Hawley see as a watershed for such efforts. It also meant that the internal politics of the USDA were themselves a significant factor in the unfolding of the relationship between the GEB and the USDA. It was, in fact, internal power struggles over extension policy set off by the GEB’s involvement that led to the spark that flamed into controversy over the foundation’s role.

GEB money had helped Knapp’s star rise even faster than it would have on its own within the USDA. He had sole control over the field agents who worked with demonstration farmers, and his men in turn had great loyalty to this charismatic figure and his methods. However, a second important individual at the USDA, William J. Spillman of the Bureau of Plant Industry, was also developing an outreach program that came to be labeled “extension.” Rather than focusing on production, as Knapp’s men did, Spillman’s efforts, were directed toward farm management and marketing, and his work was eventually incorporated into the USDA’s Office of Farm Management. The two groups passionately fought to establish their program as the standard for the Department. Compromise was tenuously achieved when extension work was divided along regional lines, with the GEB-supported work in the South, and Spillman’s work in the North.

The GEB, and Buttrick in particular, were fierce partisans of the Knapp method. Buttrick tried to use Rockefeller connections to the University of Chicago to head off a project to fund an alternative agricultural outreach program sponsored by Chicago philanthropist Julius Rosenwald. Buttrick also independently set up several joint programs with the Universities of Maine and New Hampshire based on the Knapp method, circumventing the USDA and the tacit division of work between Knapp’s and Spillman’s forces. Moreover, the GEB had agreed to sponsor

a pet project of Wickliffe Rose and GEB ally Walter Hines Page. They planned to set up a “Rural Organization Service” within the USDA, financed by GEB funds, which would aim at creating economic and social organizations to help sustain rural communities. But disputes between the GEB and Thomas Nixon Carver, the Harvard economist hired to run the Rural Organization Service, led to a dissolution of the relationship. All of these incidents added to the resentment with the USDA over the GEB’s activism, and they particularly incensed William Spillman.

While the evidence of the GEB’s efforts to defend or extend the Knapp method are documented in the Rockefeller Archive Center’s holdings, key portions of the story are missing. This is most likely due to the loss of the GEB’s side of the USDA-GEB correspondence, and the correspondence of the Farm Demonstration program, from the Rockefeller Foundation offices at some point in the 1950s.

The GEB side of the story had to be reconstructed from the reports filed by Knapp and correspondence in other sources at the Rockefeller Archive Center, particularly the Rockefeller Boards Series in Record Group 2 of the Rockefeller Family Archives. The story

becomes much clearer, however, when supplemented with the records of the Extension Service at the National Archives in Washington D.C., as well as the unpublished biography of William Spillman, and a handful of Extension Service histories that reflect on various aspects of the controversy.

Though the Extension Service correspondence is also fragmentary, it provides a greater sense of Spillman’s role in the dissolution of the GEB-USDA relationship. It was, in fact, Spillman who alerted Senator William Kenyon of Iowa, a key opponent of the last attempt to charter the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913, to the fact that Rockefeller “agents” were operating within the federal government. With Spillman’s apparent aid, Kenyon and his Congressional allies orchestrated an effort to prohibit further cooperation on the grounds that Rockefeller’s malign influence should be expunged from public policy. A proposal was even briefly floated to rescind the Congressional charter of the GEB. Since the Smith-Lever Bill had already been passed, and opponents of the GEB, many of whom supported agricultural extension (particularly Southern Congressmen), proposed to supplant the GEB contributions with public money, even the GEB’s



Frank G. Brockman, A Corn Club Boy from Amherst, Virginia, and his 167 bushels of corn produced from one acre in 1912.

From the General Education Board Archives

former allies in the USDA did little to help. Knapp had died in 1911 and his son Bradford, who headed the program after him, apparently expended little political capital to retain the GEB's help.

One irony of the program was that at the same time that Congressmen sympathetic to Extension condemned the potential influence of private sources of great wealth, they stopped short of prohibiting the public-private arrangements which had helped nurture the Farm Demonstration program. GEB money had always been accompanied by funds from local bankers and businessmen, and Congressmen and the USDA hierarchy fought to prevent a blanket prohibition on any sort of public-private relationship.

In fact, the Extension Service would turn to a different sort of public-private troubled relationship as its agents became involved in organizing local farm bureaus to help support extension work. These bureaus formed the American Farm Bureau Federation in the early 1920s and thereafter exerted a powerful force in farm policy. Rather than a victory of the "people" versus the "interests," the GEB exclusion merely opened up the door for the increased influence of a coalescing interest group.

The sensitivity of the Rockefeller philanthropies to political attacks in light of the investigation of the U.S. Industrial Commission undoubtedly shaped Flexner's rosy portrayal of the relationship. But there was a feeling, particularly on Buttrick's part, that an excellent program had been sacrificed to political passion, and the report reflects their attempt to salvage some positive example from the situation. Moreover, later reflections suggested that the primary problem had been in administrative conflicts: an internal memo of the incident in 1919 pointed to Rockefeller-supported public health work and concluded, "this shows the kind of co-operation which is possible with a Federal Department if the Department head desires such co-operation." The farm demonstration model was replicated in small programs in the 1920s by the International Education Board in Scandinavia, and was taken off the shelf again in the early 1950s when the RF became involved in India's "Green Revolution."

My expansion of the study of the conflicts surrounding the Farm Demonstration program suggests that it should not be read as simply a Progressive Era morality play, nor as a clear-cut success on the part of the GEB. By examining the GEB's aggressive sponsorship of the program and the bureaucratic conflicts that ensued, it reveals the increasing importance of administrative structures as a site of political contention in the twentieth century. Opposition to the GEB in Congress also revealed that the Progressive rhetoric of the "people" versus the "interests" did not encompass all private interest: local private interests were still welcomed in collaboration, and they turned out to be far more "interested" in farm policy than Rockefeller philanthropy had been.

The Trojan Horse: The Biochemical Laboratory of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 1921-1939

*by Michael Barfoot, Christopher Lawrence,
and Steven Sturdy*

The history of the biochemical laboratory of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh 1921-1939 may sound like an obscure subject and of antiquarian interest only. In fact, the study of this institution sheds light on the structure of modern medical education. The biochemical laboratory was the Trojan horse by which the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) sought to introduce American academic medicine into Edinburgh. In doing this, because of the huge numbers of graduates trained in Edinburgh, reformers expressed their desire to transform the practice of medicine throughout the British Empire.

Before the First World War, only Germany had a medical education system based on a thoroughly academic footing. There professional scientists taught the preclinical subjects of anatomy and physiology while, in the wards, full time university professors with access to beds and laboratory facilities taught the clinical specialties. Meanwhile in the United Kingdom and United States,

honorary part-time hospital consultants took time from their private practice to teach students, often in schools with no university affiliation. The great exception to this generalization was The Johns Hopkins Medical School and its hospital in Baltimore. Hopkins was modeled on German lines and was the source of admiration for medical reformers on both sides of the Atlantic, including those in the RF.

The biological laboratory of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh was a joint endeavor between the Infirmary and the University of Edinburgh. It was first set up in 1921 under the direction of Jonathan Meakins, the University's Christison Professor of Therapeutics. Meakins was trained in clinical science and was an admirer of American full-time professorial units. Such units were just being introduced in Britain at this time, but were far from popular among consultants, most of whom valued private practice and some of whom resented what they perceived as the claims of laboratory science over the clinical art. The units were not in favor with the majority of the Edinburgh medical faculty, who preferred the time-honored part-time teaching system. It was Meakins who was chiefly responsible for prevailing upon the University and the Infirmary to build the laboratory in an old isolation ward on the grounds of the hospital. It was to have a dual function: conducting routine work for the clinical staff of the Infirmary, and providing Meakins and his assistants with the facilities for clinical research.

The history of the routine work of the laboratory proves to be a story almost in its own right. By the early twentieth century, biochemical urine analysis was a regular feature of clinical practice, in or out of the hospital, with most practitioners being able to carry out the simple procedures involved. But before 1920, testing for chemicals in the blood was scarcely recognized, tests being time-consuming and requiring special apparatus. During the 1920s, however, both the laboratory records and the clinical case notes show that Meakins and his successor were gradually able to make the lab indispensable in the management of various conditions. The introduction of insulin in 1923 particularly helped this move, as blood test-

ing for sugar was presented as essential to sound practice. In this way, Edinburgh clinicians were gradually educated into the procedures and practices of academic medicine.

Under Meakins' direction too, the laboratory quickly developed into a site for clinical research of a distinctly academic kind. With grants from the Medical Research Council, full-time research fellows conducted investigations that were relatively remote from the immediate practical concerns of the infirmary clinicians, and of a kind that those clinicians would not themselves have had time or the skills to pursue. Meakins and his collaborators concentrated chiefly on the application of physiological theories and techniques (measurement of basal metabolic rate, of blood gases, and of acid-base balance) to the elucidation of such conditions as nephritis, thyroid disorders and respiratory problems. In effect, Meakins' laboratory served not so much as a means of promoting collaboration between clinicians and academics, but rather as a site at which scientists could gain access to clinical material for the pursuit of their own relatively abstract research programs.

American industrialists at the turn of century, such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Johns Hopkins himself, made fortunes out of oil, steel, and railroads. Many of them saw the funding of higher education as a means to producing a more efficient, well-ordered and healthy industrial society. After the First World War, the RF, which had a serious interest in medical education, began targeting a number of British medical schools as potential channels for effecting wider reform.

In February 1923 Richard Pearce, the RF's Director of Medical Education, arrived in Edinburgh for a week of talks with local medical teachers and University officials, who had their own ideas about how RF money might help medical education in the city. Pearce was frank about the RF's concerns. It would not assist any project that gave anybody except the University the control of research. Pearce was particularly impressed with Meakins, and wrote back glowingly of him to the RF's New York office.

Pearce decided that if the RF was to influence clinical education in Edinburgh, it would be by advancing Meakins' program and prospects. As well as hatching a plan involving the expansion of Meakins' laboratory and supplementing his salary so that he could work full-time, Pearce hoped that Meakins would eventually be selected to fill the Chair of Medicine, which was due to fall vacant in two or three years.

Pearce realized that he was taking a gamble. A number of North American universities were already eyeing Meakins as a possible leader for their own medical reforms. Equally, there was no guarantee that the Edinburgh medical men would countenance his promotion from the Chair of Therapeutics to that of Medicine proper. Pearce proposed to support Meakins on annual grants so he could develop what Pearce called a "true university clinic" on a whole-time scale.

Pearce did not reveal these calculations to the Edinburgh faculty members, but he did indicate the possibility of RF support if they built up professional teaching, eliminated non-university teachers, and created more laboratory facilities. There followed seven months of negotiations between Pearce and the faculty over just what kind of proposals the RF would be prepared to support.

During these exchanges Pearce displayed a formidable talent for steering others towards his own desired goals. Quietly but firmly, he encouraged those aspects of the Edinburgh plans that conformed to his thinking and squashed those that did not. He played an astute political game, marginalizing those who seemed most set on other schemes, choosing to communicate officially with the faculty through those who seemed most sympathetic to his ideals of academic medicine, and privately getting Meakins to draw up plans and costs for a new clinical laboratory and a full-time chair.

By the autumn of 1923, the Edinburgh plans had been focused on the establishment of a new clinical laboratory for Meakins, and the creation of a proper full-time Chair in Therapeutics.

A faculty meeting was scheduled for Friday October 5th, when these plans would be considered for formal approval or rejection. Pearce arrived in the city on Monday for a final intense

round of talks and meetings, first with Meakins and then with those members of the faculty who were less likely to support his plans. Once again, he deployed his political skills to good effect. Not only did the faculty unanimously approve the proposals for a new clinical laboratory and a full-time Chair of Therapeutics, but they also agreed to the creation of a full-time Chair in Surgery. Pearce had got exactly what he wanted, and he had done so with remarkably little ruffling of feathers.

Rather more heat would be generated within Edinburgh itself, as differences flared up between the University and the Infirmary over the site of the clinical laboratory, and over the terms and conditions of the full-time surgery chair. But Pearce maintained a position of calm detachment, occasionally nudging the protagonists in the direction he desired, but leaving the in-fighting to those on the spot. Whether the majority of those involved even realized the extent of his influence is unclear. When the new clinical laboratory opened in 1928, and the Principal of the University, Sir Alfred Ewing, wrote to Pearce to thank him for the RF's support, Pearce smoothly replied to the effect that it was the faculty's idea all along.

Nothing could have been further from the truth. At the beginning of 1923, the Medical faculty was enthusiastically committed to a program of scientific development that was peculiarly Scottish and was intended to obviate the threat of purely academic clinical teaching. By the end of the year, Pearce had convinced the faculty to support precisely what they had originally opposed: full-time chairs. Faced with RF money, and the consummate managerial skills of RF officers, Scottish medical politicians had found themselves out-classed and out-maneuvered. For the time being at last, the greatest medical school in the British Empire had hitched itself to the wagon of RF internationalism.

This project is funded by Wellcome Trust Project Grant in the History of Medicine, with additional support from a Rockefeller Archive Center Travel Grant to investigate the Rockefeller Foundations' involvement in Edinburgh medicine. A version of this report has already appeared in the Wellcome Trust Review 1999.

About the Contributors

Mike Barfoot is Lothian Health Services Archivist and an Hon. Fellow of the Medical Faculty, University of Edinburgh. He has published on aspects of the history of 18th and 19th century Edinburgh medicine. He edited *'To Ask the Suffrages of the Patrons': Thomas Laycock and the Edinburgh Chair of Medicine, Medical History Supplement No 15* (London, 1995). He can be contacted at Edinburgh University Library, George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9LJ, Scotland, or via e-mail at <m.barfoot@ed.ac.uk>.

William J. Buxton is Professor of Communication Studies at Concordia University in Montreal (7141 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H4B 1R6, buxton@vax2.concordia.ca). His recent publications include (co-authored with C. Acland), *The Politics of Knowledge and Information: American Philanthropy and Canadian Libraries* (Montreal, 1998) and (co-edited with C. Acland) *Harold Innis in the New Century: Reflections and Refractions* (Montreal, 1999), along with "Reaching Human Minds: Rockefeller Philanthropy and Communications, 1935-1939", in T. Richardson and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy* (Stamford, Conn., 1999).

Marisa Chambers is a second year student at the School of History at the University of Liverpool. Her research examines programs of control of Bilharzia and yellow fever in the British West African colonies 1900 to 1948. She can be contacted at School of History, University of Liverpool, 9 Abercromby Square, Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK or e-mail at <chambers@liv.ac.uk>.

Marybeth Gasman, a Ph.D. candidate in higher education at Indiana University, is currently finishing her dissertation on the topic of philanthropy, leadership, and historically black colleges. Ms. Gasman will have an article, "Scylla and Charybdis: Navigating the Waters of Academic Freedom at Fisk University during Charles S. Johnson's Administration," published in the upcoming Winter issue of the *American Educational Research Journal*. She can be reached at 138 Perry Court, #2, San Antonio, TX 78209 or via e-mail at <mgasman@indiana.edu>.

Christopher Lawrence is Reader in the History of Medicine at the Wellcome Institute. He has published numerous studies in the history of medicine from 1700 to the present day. He is the author of *Medicine in the Making of Modern Britain 1700-1920* published by Routledge in 1994. He can be contacted at the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BE, England or by e-mail at <c.lawrence@wellcome.ac.uk>.

Andrew Morris is a doctoral candidate in the history department at the University of Virginia. He is working on a dissertation entitled, "An American Way of Giving? The Reformulation of Charity in the U.S., 1920-1960," which studies the role private welfare agencies played in shaping public social service provision. His most recent publication is "The Problem of Poverty in Post-bellum Providence," *Rhode Island History* (April, 1998). He can be reached at the Corcoran Department of History, Randall Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903, or by e-mail at <ajm8m@virginia.edu>.

Marianne P. Stevens is completing her dissertation "Dollars and Change: The Influence of Rockefeller Foundation Funding on Medical Education at the University of Toronto, McGill and Dalhousie, 1919-39" at the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology at the University of Toronto. Research for this project was funded by two grants from the RAC. She has presented a number of papers on aspects of this work, most recently at the 1998 ARNOVA Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington. She can be reached at IHPST, Victoria College, Room 316, 91 Charles Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1K7 or via e-mail at: <mstevens@on.aibn.com>.

Steven Sturdy is a lecturer in the Science Studies Unit, University of Edinburgh, and holds a Wellcome Trust University Award in the History of Medicine. He is the author of various papers on the history of physiology, clinical science and health policy, and the editor, with Roger Cooter and Mark Harrison, of *War, Medicine and Modernity* (Sutton, 1998). He can be contacted at the Science Studies Unit, University of Edinburgh, 21 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh EH8 9LN, Scotland, or by e-mail at <s.sturdy@ed.ac.uk>.

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 2000. The competitive program makes grants of up to \$2,500 to U.S. and Canadian researchers and up to \$3,000 to researchers from other countries 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 Rockefeller Archive Center's collections include the records of the Rockefeller family, the Rockefeller Foundation, The Rockefeller University, and other philanthropies and associated individuals.

For 2000, the Center will continue to award grants to support research on the History of the Rockefeller University (founded as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in 1901). The Rockefeller University archives include administrative records, papers of individual scientists (such as Alfred E. Cohn, Rene Dubos, Rebecca Lancefield, and Karl Landsteiner), photographs and films. The archives document the leading currents of biomedical research in the 20th century.

The Archive Center will also continue its five-year program of residencies for research at the Center on topics related to the History of Basic Medical Research, a subject richly represented in the archival collections at the Center.

The history of basic medical research is broadly defined to include most aspects of the history of the Rockefeller University, much of the history of the international medical, public health, and scientific research programs of the Rockefeller Foundation, and major elements of the histories of the Commonwealth Fund, Culpeper Foundation, Markey Trust, and Markle Foundation. Certain segments of the Rockefeller family archives also document the history of

basic medical research, such as the founding and support of research institutions. As a group, the archives of these institutions constitute one of the outstanding resources for the study of the history of basic medical research in the 20th century.

Scholars conducting substantial research in any aspect of the history of basic medical research are urged to apply. Prospective researchers may apply for residencies of one month, one semester (4.5 months), or an academic year (9 months). Stipends at the rate of \$5000 per month will be awarded to cover all travel, food and lodging, and research expenses associated with the residency.

NOTE: The general RAC research grant application cannot be used for this program. Please request a specific application for residency in the History of Basic Medical Research. Three letters of reference will be requested. Prospective applicants are urged to contact the Center prior to applying to determine the type and extent of records that will be useful for their research.

Special grants-in-aid will also be made in the history of international relations and economic development. There is abundant documentation in the archives of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller family and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund on many aspects of this topic. Applications, deadlines and grant amounts are the same as for the regular grant-in-aid program.

The deadline for all grant applications is November 30, 1999; grant recipients will be announced in March 2000. Inquiries about the programs and requests for applications should be addressed to:

Darwin H. Stapleton, Director
Rockefeller Archive Center,
15 Dayton Avenue, Pocantico Hills,
Sleepy Hollow, New York 10591-1598, USA
Telephone: (914) 631-4505 FAX:(914) 631-6017
E-mail: archive@rockvax.rockefeller.edu
The general grant application and a guide to the Rockefeller Archive Center's collections can be found on the World Wide Web at:
<<http://www.rockefeller.edu/archive.ctr>>.



From the Rockefeller Foundation Archives

Public health in the Philippines is one of the many topics that grant-in-aid recipients will examine at the Archive Center this year. Improvement of the water supply was one of the Rockefeller Foundation's goals there in the interwar years.

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