

Historical Perspectives on Philanthropy and the Humanities in the United States and Australia

By Darwin H. Stapleton, Ph.D.

Executive Director Emeritus, Rockefeller Archive Center, The Rockefeller University

stapled@rockefeller.edu
darwin.stapleton@yahoo.com

© 2010 by Darwin H. Stapleton

Prepared for the Second Australian Symposium on Philanthropy and the Humanities,
Trinity College, University of Melbourne, 29-30 March 2009

This morning I will explore historical links between philanthropy and the humanities, in part by looking at the Rockefeller Foundation's humanities program and certain aspects of the history of the humanities in Australia in the 20th century. I also will refer substantially to my own discipline – the history of technology, science, and medicine – and to my personal experiences. Further, I will make some recommendations regarding how humanists and philanthropoids might be more effective collaborators.

Consideration of the past can lead to a renewed sense of purpose and direction. And, whether we are writing grant proposals, creating a new grant program, or seeking encouragement in a time of economic straits, reflection on where we have been is a necessary prologue to planning where we want to go.

And a caveat: I am not in any way speaking on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller family, or any of the Rockefeller philanthropies. While for more than two decades I had the privilege of working closely with many Rockefeller organizations – a circumstance which definitely colors my remarks – I come to you today very much as a humanist and observer of philanthropy, not a spokesman.

Viewing the DVDs of the first symposium, and talking with Elizabeth Cham and John Byron, it is clear that there are strong commitments to the future of the humanities in Australia, as well as continuing concerns about the future. Taking a historical perspective, many of these concerns and fundamental problems are not new.

A fundamental problem for the humanities is that, to put it bluntly, we have lost our central place in learning. The sciences, broadly speaking, have claimed it. A recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* argued that jobs in the humanities are dwindling “because of conscious policy decisions by colleges and universities” in favor of other disciplines.¹

The earliest Australian statement of concern regarding the displacement of the humanities in higher education that I have seen is in the Macrossan Lectures for 1945 at the University of Queensland, in which reference is made to the need to “recapture the ground which has been lost by humane studies over the last twenty-five years ... [because] we have been fighting a losing battle against the specialist.”² This statement echoed the views of the Spanish intellectual José Ortega y Gasset who, in two widely-read books published in 1929-30, criticized higher education throughout the Western world for becoming too specialized in its subject matter and thereby forfeiting its mission to instruct successive generations in the central tenets of culture. He argued that so-called educated persons were “more learned than ever before, but at the same time more uncultured.” Ortega y Gasset’s prescription for the problem of cultural transmission was to center university education only on essentials, which for him included history, sociology, and philosophy, as well as physics and biology, but not any laboratory sciences or anything else that focused on methodologies or techniques.³

Competition with the sciences certainly was on the minds of the contributors to the volume *The Humanities in Australia*, published in 1959 with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation. It was the first major project of the Australian Humanities Research Council, the

ancestral body of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. The idea for the Council came from Brian Elliott, a lecturer in English literature at the University of Adelaide, who had spent a year in Canada under a Carnegie Corporation grant. It was his “enthusiastic reports on the Canadian Humanities Research Council” which coalesced the interests of Australian humanists and led to their first meeting in November 1954.⁴ Subsequently the Council obtained a grant from the Carnegie Corporation “to cover four years of cooperation with our sister body the Canadian Humanities Research Council in the exchange of Canadian and Australian scholars.” The Australian federal government also committed to subsidizing the Council.⁵ Thus in Australia were philanthropy and the humanities, as well as government support, joined at that formative time.

The Humanities in Australia opens with a foreword by Robert Menzies, who immediately strikes the tonal chord by observing that:

Today the popular accent is on the physical sciences, the fullest development of which is essential to the improvement of the world’s material standards. But there is a danger in concentrating our facilities too much into one channel. The troubled history of the twentieth century offers sad proof... that humanity can be overthrown by mechanical skill and the worship of the purely material.

And then he warns:

If we are to escape from this modern barbarism, humane studies must come back into their own; not as enemies of science, but as its guides and philosophical friends...⁶

A following chapter titled “The Nature of the Humanities,” consciously or unconsciously, obsesses on the struggle between the humanities and the sciences for prestige and for resources. Humanists are defined in terms of how they differ from scientists in research strategies, in

subject matter, and in presentation of information.⁷ Humanists are praised for not being absorbed by the contemporary, because “however signal may be the victories of discovery won by modern science, man is no more deeply concerned about the ultimate questions than he was in ancient Greece or the Middle Ages.”⁸ The essay goes so far as to state, in an apocalyptic vein:

One of the most dangerous fallacies of our time is the belief that humane studies are dispensable luxuries that can be neglected with no great loss. A society which neglects its masterpieces is a society on the path to destruction.⁹

In a final passage the authors pull back from that brink somewhat, but remain pessimistic, arguing in a manner similar to Menzies:

The humanities are more important than ever in a technological civilization; unless... science, technology and the humanities can learn profitably to co-operate, the outlook for our civilization is indeed a bleak one.¹⁰

A few years earlier than this report a great figure in Rockefeller philanthropy, Abraham Flexner, voiced similar concerns about the situation in the United States. Flexner argued that “in the United States [the humanities have] fought a losing battle. The sciences, medicine, and engineering have their palaces... but where is the university that possesses a palace... for English literature, history, classical studies, foreign languages and literature, and art ...?”¹¹

This lament is a continuing one. A 2004 study of humanities funding in the United States found that:

In the early years of the twentieth century, supporting humanistic scholarship was very far from the minds of America’s wealthiest donors... Medical research, public health, and

applied social science held sway... Their quest... did not lead them to see history, philosophy, or other humanistic disciplines as practical tools for investigation. And to this day, most American foundations have persisted in looking to the future, trying to spark innovation, and pressing for social change.¹²

While as a generalization this may be useful, it perhaps downplays too much the significant philanthropic support of the humanities in the United States or, for that matter, in much of the world, in the 20th century. Let me turn to the record of the Rockefeller philanthropies. In 1926 the Rockefeller-funded General Education Board hosted a national conference of scholars in the humanities “to discuss their needs for humanistic research.” Persuaded by the discussion there, the Board gave large endowment grants for the humanities, mostly to elite American universities. Then in 1932 the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) created a division of the humanities to provide continuing support. The new director called for an investment in the humanities that would “contribute to a spiritual renaissance by stimulating creative expressions in art, literature, and music; by setting and maintaining high standards of critical appreciation; and by bringing the intellectual and spiritual satisfactions of life within the reach of greater numbers.” The program that was proposed included fellowships for international travel and study, the building up of libraries, support of programs of publication (particularly by scholarly organizations), and, notably, exhibits, films and drama to bring culture to a wide audience.¹³

The Rockefeller Foundation humanities program, which expended hundreds of thousands of dollars each year after it was begun, quite early came into criticism. An internal review committee argued that “a program ... based on cloistered kind of research, is wide of the goal which the Trustees of the Foundation should have in mind.” The trustees probably were

objecting to grants such as that funding the Princeton University Modern Language Department's study of the medieval French and Spanish poems celebrating the life of Alexander the Great: according to the department's report on the project "only the younger members of the group could have hoped to see [the work] completed during their lifetime" without RF support.¹⁴

Responding to the committee's critique, the Humanities program increased "support for work with more direct applications to present-day needs," and reported to the board of trustees that "general grants to American universities to strengthen humanities research have ended," although approximately one-tenth of its annual funding continued to go to scholarly organizations that *were* providing research grants for the "cloistered research" that the trustees did not want to support.

I want to meditate for a few moments on the trustees' choice of the word "cloistered" to refer to scholarly research in the humanities. The monks and nuns of medieval Europe studied, preserved and extended the knowledge passed on to them primarily from Greco-Roman and Arabic sources. Working in their cells in remote monasteries and convents they read great treatises, thought great thoughts, and laid the intellectual foundations of Western civilization, all the while drawing on the philanthropy of wealthy nobles and merchants, *and* building and operating the most advanced industrial complexes of their times. Being "cloistered" is now synonymous with being secluded and apart from the world – but actually the "cloistered" monks and nuns were humanists of the type I would want us to be today: contemplative, but deserving society's support and working on the frontiers of technology.

In spite of its trustees' concerns about a "cloistered kind of research," the Rockefeller Foundation persisted in its support of the humanities throughout the 20th century, although there was a movement toward what were called more "democratic and inclusive" projects that were

aimed at engaging various publics in order to “bring intellectual and spiritual satisfaction to more people.”¹⁵ In the 1960s a critical self-analysis of the humanities program referred to a “possible overemphasis on supporting the tools of research – a preoccupation with method and information-collecting – at the expense of supporting interpretation and evaluation.”¹⁶ But even then the RF continued some direct support of humanistic scholarship through its fellowship programs. The tension between supporting “cloistered” research and the application of that research has been a continuing theme in the history of philanthropy and the humanities and is unlikely to change.¹⁷

I began with a strong statement about the value of the humanities. I feel equally strongly about philanthropy, an act which is regarded as a corollary of faith by all major religions. I can do no better in defining it than the brief description by John D. Rockefeller Sr., a devout Baptist, who said that “the best philanthropy [is] ... the help that nourishes civilization at its very root.”¹⁸ Modern organized philanthropy has been characterized as “a sector in which we are allowed to pursue truth, even if we are going in the wrong direction; allowed to experiment, even if we are bound to fail; to map unknown territory, even if we got lost. It is a sector in which we are committed to alleviate misery and redress grievances, to give reign to the mind’s curiosity and the soul’s longing, to seek beauty and defend truth when we must...”¹⁹

We are here to consider how that nourishment occurs, and how it can be strengthened. I want to look at three problems in that relationship: independent research versus collaboration; responding to national cultural currents; and the matter of small and large grants.

One issue in the funding of the humanities is the image of the lone researcher in advancing knowledge. In both science and the humanities we have the image of the single great individual as the source of insights, of new ideas, of inspiration. The awarding of Nobel prizes

over the last century has reinforced the image of academic research as conducted by an individual, perhaps with a collaborator or two, in the trying and lonely pursuit of some distant goal, with few others appreciating the sacrifice and imagination required until the hard-won result is forthcoming.

But as a historian of science I must assert that the reality of modern science does not support the Nobel thesis: on the frontiers of their fields scientists work in teams, and collaborate closely with auxiliary engineers, technicians, and yes, administrators. Archivists know this intimately, and have attempted to develop collection strategies that go beyond the tradition of acquiring the personal papers of great scientists to document entire organizations that underlie modern science. When I have gone into Rockefeller University laboratories to appraise their records, and when I have conducted my own scholarly research on aspects of the history of the university, I have found overwhelming evidence of the teamwork involved in modern science.

The humanities also have fostered the mythology of the singular, perhaps I should again refer to the “cloistered,” scholar. Professor Graeme Turner, past president of the Australian Academy of the Humanities, has labeled this a common, if questionable, assumption about humanities research.²⁰ I suggest as a case study of the myth of the lone researcher the British historian Arnold Toynbee, well-known for his sweeping review of civilizations, *A Study of History*, which helped to create the field of global history.

Is it appreciated that much of his scholarship rested on a team of researchers and writers that was heavily funded by the Rockefeller Foundation – in the amount of \$300,000 from 1939 to 1952?²¹ And that subsequently his global travels, including to Melbourne to deliver the Dyason Lectures in 1956, were also partly supported by the foundation?²²

One of his most valued collaborators was the young William H. McNeill, a great historian of global history in our time, and later Toynbee's biographer.²³ McNeill came to Toynbee's team from the University of Chicago on a one-year Fulbright fellowship in September 1950, and Toynbee soon wrote to the Rockefeller Foundation to say that McNeill:

not only [does]...writing of first-class quality, but [has] established excellent relations with the other members of the team. McNeill's Fulbright Fellowship is not renewable for a second year, and it would be really disastrous if we found ourselves unable to keep him on...²⁴

It would be difficult to find a clearer affirmation of the importance of teamwork.

If we read the acknowledgements sections of books, as well as the archival record, we find indications that collaboration is the common. The recent study by John Byron and Sarah Howard of the Australian Academy of the Humanities showed that about half of all humanities researchers were working collaboratively in their research projects.²⁵

I believe that collaboration not only is important and valuable for the humanities, but should be encouraged by philanthropy. Scholars in the humanities need not significantly alter their research in order to be more attractive to prospective funders, but will need to shed the lone-researcher myth as they describe their projects. This will require giving or sharing credit in ways that humanities scholars are not used to doing – fully recognizing the contributions of graduate students, administrative staff, and colleagues, for example. In other cases this will require being more forthright and even aggressive about organizing collaborative research projects. I fully recognize that it is not easy to work collaboratively: even when there are just two collaborators who envision a 50-50 sharing of their work, each should plan to do 60% of the

project. But from my own multiple experiences with collaborative projects I can affirm that they are worth the effort.

Collaborative projects, well and logically conceived and presented, seem to attract more philanthropic support than projects presented by a single individual or organization. To refer once more to my personal experience: when I wanted to develop an experimental electronic records project at the Rockefeller Archive Center I was able to create a partnership with the Smithsonian Institution Archives, an organization that shared the Rockefeller Archive Center's long-term commitment to scholarship and preservation of research materials. Together we could demonstrate the experience, the need and histories of success that won us a nearly half-million dollar foundation grant for the project.²⁶

One of the wonderful aspects of our world of rapid international communication is that it is possible to do teamwork with individuals throughout the world. I was a co-organizer of the International Network for the History of Malaria in the 1990s that published three volumes of essays with contributors from almost every continent. Much more simply in recent years I provided significant assistance to a British writer over a period of months without any face-to-face meeting or even a telephone conversation. A second significant problem for philanthropy and the humanities is responding to national cultural currents. In the 1930s and 1940s the Rockefeller Foundation recognized that English literature departments in leading American universities had provided little space for the study of American literature and theater, even though there was a century's development of a distinct and vibrant American body of material. The foundation helped to initiate new programs, initially called American Civilization, and later generally called American Studies, that typically were situated in English literature departments, but that drew on specialists from other departments, as well. Many of the professors who were

drawn to the new programs had found that their interests were insufficiently appreciated by their peers.

A few years ago my wife and I wrote a biography of a college president who had begun his career as a professor at Princeton University after World War II. During the war he had been a race-relations officer for African-American naval troops stationed at Pensacola, Florida and consequently began to read literature by and about African-Americans to better understand the pervasive racism that he had to deal with on a daily basis. At Princeton there was no place for him to follow up on this literature except in the American Civilization Program, to which he soon gravitated. Foundation support had created a program that gave him an academic niche in which he flourished.²⁷

The situation in Australia at about the same time appears to have been similar. When Charles B. Fahs, Assistant Director of the Humanities for the Rockefeller Foundation, visited Australian universities in 1952, he wrote in his diary that he was told that “interest in Australian writing has lagged” and that the University of Melbourne “needs a lectureship in Australian literature.” He must have viewed English literature departments in the context of modern culture because he wrote in his diary that even those humanists teaching in technically-oriented universities had “little concern for contemporary literary culture,” and made “little effort at direct link[s] to the present.”²⁸ He was also told that the humanities bore little on education in the law.²⁹ In that situation, he reflected, “Perhaps in terms of humanities in daily life in Australia, the press, the libraries and the State directors of education are more important than the universities.”³⁰ This remark had an echo as recently as 2002, in a comment by an American critic that was cited approvingly by a student of Australian literature:

...one reason for the difficulties literature departments have these days in getting funding [is that] society no longer needs the university as the primary place where the national

ethos is inculcated in citizens. That work used to be done by the humanities departments in colleges and universities, primarily through literary study. Now it is increasingly done by television, radio talk shows, and by cinema.³¹

While I do not believe that humanities departments were ever the “the primary place here the national ethos [was] inculcated in citizens,” I do accept the implication that culture is exogenous to humanities departments, and that philanthropists and philanthropic organizations may be more attuned than humanists to the spaces and places in which cultural education occurs.

To join together the rise of studies of national literatures and cultures with the question of where culture is learned, I suggest that it is as incumbent upon humanists to consider how to reach the public as it is for philanthropists and philanthropic institutions to find ways to properly fund that outreach. From recent discussion with John Byron I know that this question remains part of the discourse regarding the role of the humanities in Australia. I realize that in this room I am speaking to many of those who are taking on that challenge.

Humanists need to recognize that there is no deep conflict between pursuing their own research agenda and – if they are to receive philanthropic support – reaching a wider audience than just their colleagues. In this electronic era historical projects developed for scholarly purposes can be readily converted into projects for the public: articles written for journals can be edited into on-line exhibits; parts of research that tell vital and interesting stories can become video documentaries; knowledge of important historical events can be translated into articles that are published in the wide range of magazines that reach educated but non-scholarly audiences; hard-won research can be utilized in museum exhibits and museum catalogs, and in historical restorations.

But such projects require of humanists changes in vocabulary, re-thinking one's cherished concepts, and often forswearing the detail that often is regarded as a sign of intellect. Focusing in on the kernels of truth, the central information and ideas, and considering how to communicate them concisely, effectively, and plainly, usually are not skills that are honed in the academy, but are necessary for reaching a broader public. When I sent in an essay to a popular historical magazine, based on years of my own research on the earliest uses and global effects of the insecticide DDT, the editors challenged me in the re-write to inject conflict and drama into the story. That required considerable reworking of my proudly-developed academic writing style, and accepting the idea that creating dramatic tension was an acceptable historical technique – but after all, if it was good enough for Herodotus...? In the event, while I am proud that the scholarly version of my work was published in an international journal with a circulation of 2500, the popular version appeared in a magazine with a circulation of 200,000, was included in a reader for global history courses at the university level, and is accessible on the world wide web.³²

Outreach to the public does have potential costs. It certainly is possible that public airing of scholarship will result in controversy. If as humanists we are seekers of truth, and skeptics of received truth, not everyone will want to hear us or learn from us. Truths engaged by new ideas are, and should be, controversial. They challenge myth, overturn assumptions, and confront prejudices. Both humanists and philanthropists have to be prepared to defend the truths that emerge from scholarship.

A third issue for philanthropy and the humanities is the problem of small and large monies. Perhaps it is a disconcerting thought for university development officers, but as Dr. Joseph Meisel, an officer of the Andrew Mellon Foundation pointed out at the first of these

symposia, for humanists small amounts of money may have large results. Fellowships and stipends, for example, require relatively modest amounts of money, but are critical to the humanities.

In 1946, when the Rockefeller Foundation received a report on the state of the humanities in Australia, a fundamental complaint therein was that there were very few Australian fellowships for travel abroad, and that those that were offered were described as “little better than an invitation to penny-pinching and semi-starvation, or else makeshift borrowing, by those ambitious to undertake them.” These were contrasted with Rockefeller, Carnegie, Harkness, and Nuffield grants and fellowships, which, according to the report, “the Australian looks upon...with envy.”³³ One Australian Sinologist who received a RF fellowship to travel to the United States and the Far East in 1950 remarked that:

At a time when it has become nearly impossible for scholars to travel the world on their private means [,] the assistance provided by your Foundation to people like myself is an inestimable service which I know is profoundly appreciated.³⁴

The situation had improved significantly by the time of the publication of *The Humanities in Australia* in 1959 when it could be reported that research funding in the humanities was “much better than anything attempted twenty years ago and ... [was] making a lot of work possible.” Still, the report argued that “what we need is a greater number of unrestricted travelling scholarships for research so that a first-class man [sic] can count on getting abroad after the M.A. stage.”³⁵

There can be no doubt that the Rockefeller Foundation’s fellowships have been an outstanding example of the value of this kind of philanthropy.³⁶ Fellowships of a few hundred or a few thousand dollars revolutionized every field in which they were used, including the

humanities. About 12,500 such fellowships, over a thousand of which were in the humanities, were awarded in the heydays of the program from 1916 to 1970. Giving researchers a few months of travel, or a year to study or write made huge differences in career trajectories.³⁷ From 1965 to 1969, for example, the Rockefeller Foundation's humanities programs offered fellowships in "Imaginative Writing" that provided mid-life support for a range of poets, novelists and writers. The poets Jean Valentine and Louise Glück, and novelists Cormac McCarthy and Philip Roth were among the approximately one hundred whose literary lives were significantly affected by these fellowships.³⁸

Entire fields of humanistic endeavor were changed by such programs. One fellow from the 1930s reported in 1948 regarding his humanities fellowship in the field of communications:

...looking at the field of visual and radio education objectively, and with the perspective of the eighteen years that I have been working actively in it, the good that [Rockefeller philanthropy has] done and the impetus that [it has given] to the whole field in the late thirties is of inestimable value. The list of leaders in the field today [is]... a living and perpetual tribute to what you have done in this... important area.³⁹

Philanthropists and foundation officers might consider that attention to such matters are noticed: one Rockefeller Foundation program in the humanities in the 1970s that offered small grants noted that "people were impressed that 'of all the RF's worldwide activities...we could still take the time to make such [small grants]'. "⁴⁰

The dilemma for philanthropists and foundations is what John D. Rockefeller's philanthropic adviser, Frederick T. Gates, and later Abraham Flexner, called "scatteration," which they defined as the spreading of grant monies widely and without clear purpose. They ridiculed small grants as unlikely to achieve notable results, compared to the kinds of steps they

were able to take in the late 19th century and early 20th century with Rockefeller's millions – such as founding the University of Chicago, Rockefeller University, the Peking Union Medical College, new libraries for Cambridge University and the League of Nations, and attacking hookworm disease, malaria, and yellow fever on a global basis.

Similar giant steps remain crucial to the humanities today: endowing chairs, constructing great libraries, the acquisition and preservation of research materials, long-term funding of publication projects – without this level of philanthropy the humanities will not be visible, vital elements of the intellectual landscape.

To return to the dilemma of large and small monies. In the early 1990s Nobel Prize winner Torsten Wiesel was a new member of the board of the Rockefeller Archive Center which was reviewing the Center's program of making \$3000-\$4000 grants to scholars for them to travel to the Center to conduct research for two weeks or more. Dr. Wiesel, a neuroscientist, was understandably incredulous that such miniscule grants made critical contributions to scholarship. It took some discussion by the historians and archivists on the board to convince him that significant work in the humanities was actually supported by grants of that size.

It is true that those in the philanthropic field cannot be expected to work routinely with small grants. To take the extreme case, I have been told frequently that requests to the Ford, Rockefeller, Mellon, McArthur and other large foundations cannot be in less than a quarter or even a half-million dollars if they are to be taken seriously.

What is necessary to deal with this dilemma is for humanists and philanthropoids to work together – each recognizing the needs and circumstances of the other – to package support for the humanities in ways that make sense for both. The Rockefeller Foundation, for example, in the last fifteen years no longer has awarded individual fellowships in the humanities, but has given large grants to universities and academic institutions for fellowship programs. These “re-grants”

are widely advertised as “Rockefeller Fellowships” in the humanities although the foundation does not participate in the awards process.

I have two brief concluding remarks:

First, in the best tradition of the humanities, I suggest that these primarily historical reflections have shown that some of today’s significant concerns regarding philanthropic support, and the state of the humanities, in Australia today are not fundamentally new. From documentation in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives such concerns in Australia can be traced back to the end of World War I, and they appear to be roughly parallel to those in the United States. While not all concerns are exactly the same, it should give us heart, rather than discourage us, to know that these issues are not just inherited, but probably are ingrained in modern society. We should look back to see what has worked, what has not, what are areas of growth, what are areas of change, and then look forward to what the humanities need to be in the rest of 21st century.

Second, I believe that that my brief review of historical evidence supports Peter Goldmark’s assertion at the first of these symposia that at least in the Anglo-Saxon world the humanities and private philanthropies are “deeply interrelated.” Each should go forward in the confidence and knowledge that they have been, and should continue to be, partners in the preservation of culture. That partnership is a deeply human and vital endeavor.

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author’s permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author’s consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Ken Rose and Erwin Levold. Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

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

ENDNOTES:

- ¹ Thomas H. Benton [William Pannacker], "Graduate School in the Humanities: Just Don't Go." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 30 January 2009, p. A34.
- ² "Macrossan Lectures, 1945: The Present and Future of Australian Universities." typescript, folder 68, box 6, series 410, Record Group [hereafter RG] 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives [hereafter RFA], Rockefeller Archive Center, (RAC) Sleepy Hollow, New York, USA.
- ³ José Ortega y Gasset, *Mission of the University*, editor and trans. Howard Lee Nostrand, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1992, pp. 28-29, 32, 49-50, 60, 69, 81. See also Rockwell Gray, *The Imperative of Modernity: An Intellectual Biography of José Ortega y Gasset*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- ⁴ A.N. Jeffares to Roger Evans, 15 November 1954, and Grant action, "Toward the Development of a program in American Studies." 31 October 1955, folder 162, box 13, series 410, RG1.2, RFA; A. Grenfell Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia: A Survey with special reference to the Universities*. Sydney: Halstead Press, 1959, p. xiii.
- ⁵ A. Grenfell Price to Charles B. Fahs, 5 March 1957, folder 156, box 13, series 410, RG 1.2, RFA.
- ⁶ R.G. Menzies, "Foreword." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, p. xi.
- ⁷ A.G. Mitchell and J.A. Passmore, "The Nature of the Humanities." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, pp. 2-3.
- ⁸ A.G. Mitchell and J.A. Passmore, "The Nature of the Humanities." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, p. 5.
- ⁹ A.G. Mitchell and J.A. Passmore, "The Nature of the Humanities." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, p. 11.
- ¹⁰ A.G. Mitchell and J.A. Passmore, "The Nature of the Humanities." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, p. 13.
- ¹¹ Abraham Flexner, *Funds and Foundations: Their Policies Past and Present*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952, pp. 130-131, 133-134.
- ¹² James A. Smith, "Historical Perspective on Foundation Support for the Humanities." in Loren Renz and Steven Lawrence, *Foundation Funding for the Humanities: an Overview of Current and Historical Trends*. New York: The Foundation Center, 2004, p. 15.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*; John Marshall, "Proposed Program in the Humanities." 7 August 1932, folder 9, box 2, series 911, RG 3.1, RFA; "Program in the Humanities." c. March 1934, folder 9, box 2, series 911, RG 3.1, RFA; David H. Stevens, "Aims of the Program in the Humanities." 18 November 1934, folder 9, box 2, series 911, RG 3.1, RFA; "New Program in the Humanities." folder 10, box 2, series 911, RG 3.1, RFA.
- ¹⁴ "Report of the Work of the Modern Language Research Group for 1928-29. Medieval French and Spanish Poems on the Alexander Legend." 25 March 1929, folder 6995, box 676, series 1.4, General Education Board Archives, RAC.
- ¹⁵ Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report for 1980*. New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1981, pp. 39-40. This section of the report reviews the history of the Rockefeller Foundation's humanities program.
- ¹⁶ *Annual Report for 1980*, p. 40.
- ¹⁷ A 1982 assessment of the humanities programs at the Rockefeller Foundation reached this conclusion: Joel Colton and Malcolm Richardson, "The Humanities and 'The Well-being of Mankind': A Half-Century of the Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation." December 1982, folder 44, box 8, series 911, RG 3.2, RFA.
- ¹⁸ John D. Rockefeller [Sr.], *Random Reminiscences of Men and Events*. New editor, originally published in 1908-1909, Tarrytown, New York: Sleepy Hollow Press and Rockefeller Archive Center, 1984, p. 93.
- ¹⁹ Joel L. Fleishman, *The Foundation: A Great American Secret*. New York: Public Affairs, 2007, p. 16, quoting John Gardner, who was a founder of Common Cause and Independent Sector, and a former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (USA).
- ²⁰ Graeme Turner, "Data and the Humanities." PowerPoint presentation, n.d., at: <http://dspace.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/46946>. Site accessed on 17 March 2009.
- ²¹ Trustees' resolution, 26 February 1953, folder 403, box 45, series 401R, RG 1.2, RFA.
- ²² "A.J. Toynbee and V.M. Toynbee: Itinerary, 20 February 1956 to end of July 1957," folder 405, box 45, series 401R, RG 1.2, RFA; A.J. Toynbee, *Democracy in the Atomic Age*. Melbourne, 1957.
- ²³ "History Doyens: William Hardy McNeill." At: <http://hnn.us/roundup/comments/52526.html>. Site accessed 4 March 2009.

-
- ²⁴ Arnold Toynbee to Joseph Willits, 13 February 1951, folder 403, box 45, series 401R, RG 1.2, RFA. The additional year of support for McNeill was forthcoming: Joseph H. Willits to Arnold Toynbee, 28 February 1951, folder 403, box 45, series 401R, RG 1.2, RFA.
- ²⁵ This is a reference to the LASP project.
- ²⁶ See <http://siarchives.si.edu/cerp/>
- ²⁷ Raymond B. Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952, pp. 256-259; Darwin H. Stapleton and Donna H. Stapleton, *Dignity, Discourse and Destiny: The Life of Courtney C. Smith*. Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 2004, pp. 42-44.
- ²⁸ Charles B. Fahs diary, 15 May 1952, 21 May 1952, 22 May 1952, RG 12, RFA.
- ²⁹ Fahs diary, 23 May 1952.
- ³⁰ Fahs diary, 18 May 1952.
- ³¹ J. Hillis Miller, *On Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2002, quoted in Graham Huggan, *Australian Literature: Postcolonialism, Racism, Transnationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 4.
- ³² Darwin H. Stapleton, "The Short-lived Miracle of DDT." *American Heritage of Invention and Technology* 15 (Winter 2000), pp. 34-41; Darwin H. Stapleton, "A Lost Chapter in the History of DDT: The Development of Anti-Typhus Technologies by the Rockefeller Foundation's Louse Laboratory, 1942-1944." *Technology and Culture* 46 (July 2005), pp. 513-540. See: http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/magazine/it/2000/3/2000_3_34.shtml. The Power Web version of the article was published in *Power Web: World History*. David McComb, editor, Dushkin, 2005, article 94, also can be accessed on-line only by purchasing an access code.
- ³³ Dixon Wecter, "A Report on Higher Education in the Humanities: Australasia 1945 – Australia." 2 August 1946, folder 68, box 6, series 410, RG 1.1, RFA.
- ³⁴ C.P. FitzGerald to Edward F. D'Arms, 10 December 1950, folder 64, box 6, series 410, RG 1.1, RFA.
- ³⁵ H.A.K. Hunt, "Factors Affecting Research." in Price, editor, *The Humanities in Australia*, pp. 179-80.
- ³⁶ I am including the General Education Board, International Education Board, and Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial fellowships in this generalization.
- ³⁷ The most recent comment on Rockefeller Foundation fellowships is in: Ludovic Tournès, "La foundation Rockefeller et la naissance de l'universalisme philanthropique américain." *Critique internationale* 35 (avril-juin 2007) pp. 188-189.
- ³⁸ Mary Ann Quinn, "The Rockefeller Foundation, Imaginative Writing, and the Wellbeing of Mankind." *Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter*, 2007, pp. 7-10.
- ³⁹ Paul C. Reed to Charles B. Fahs, 26 January 1948, folder 2368, box 234, series 1.2, General Education Board Archives, RAC.
- ⁴⁰ Mary Ann Quinn, "The Rockefeller Foundation's American Cultural Heritage Program." *Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter*, Spring 2004, p. 8.