The Rockefeller Archive Center is pleased to announce the opening for research of the records of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association (DLMA), a non-profit association designed to rehabilitate, redevelop and revitalize Lower Manhattan. The DLMA collection encompasses 85.5 cubic feet of archival material documenting all aspects of the Association’s activities. The collection documents the DLMA’s creation in 1958 through the consolidation of the Downtown Manhattan Association and the Committee on Lower Manhattan, its most active and successful years of 1958-1974, its participation in the mid-1990s in the Lower Manhattan Project and its resulting updated Lower Manhattan Plan, and its role as the supporting organization for Lower Manhattan’s Business Improvement District (BID), the Alliance for Downtown New York. Its most recognizable achievement was to foster the development of the World Trade Center complex.

Material in the DLMA collection includes the meeting records of the Board of Directors and various committees, a limited selection of officers’ files, financial records, membership records, project files, DLMA publications, and reports and studies. The overwhelming majority of the records are contained in the projects series, which documents the creation, development and evolution (continued on page 19)

David Rockefeller, chairman of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, shows New York City Mayor Robert Wagner, Jr. the DLMA’s recommended improvements for Lower Manhattan during a meeting on November 20, 1963.

Grant-in-Aid Program for 2009

The Rockefeller Archive Center’s annual Grant-in-Aid Program offers support to scholars in any discipline who are engaged in research that requires extensive use of the archival collections housed at the Center. Forty-two scholars from around the world received funding from this program in 2008; for the list of current grantees, see p. 23.

The program’s awards provide reimbursement of up to $5,000 for certain receipted expenses related to research conducted at the RAC. Applicants for this competitive program must contact an archivist about the proposed research well in advance of the application deadline to determine the volume of relevant material and thus the length of the proposed visit, which help determine the award allocation. Applications must be postmarked or sent via email by November 15th each year, and the grant recipients will be announced at the end of March.

The grant application and guides to the Center’s collections are accessible from the Center’s homepage at http://archive.rockefeller.edu. Inquiries about the grant program should be addressed to the program administrator, Camilla Harris (harrisc@rockefeller.edu), Rockefeller Archive Center, 15 Dayton Avenue, Sleepy Hollow, New York 10591-1598; fax (914) 631-6017. Address research questions and collection inquiries via e-mail to archive@rockefeller.edu.
Nearly twenty-two years ago, in August 1986, I began my tenure as Director of the Rockefeller Archive Center. (My title was changed later to Executive Director.) This year I will leave the post, full of appreciation for the opportunities it has presented to oversee one of the most distinctive and important bodies of archival material in the world, to work with a superb staff, to meet researchers investigating a range of continually challenging and vital topics, and to assist that cluster of world-class institutions that provide the incredible archival resources at the Center.

While it is impossible even to summarize in this space all of the important or even the most significant events and accomplishments of more than two decades, some reflections are in order as the Center turns a page in its history.

At the core of the Center’s operations is the painstaking professional responsibility to open to scholarly access the documentary collections entrusted to our care. While in its fundamentals this task may appear to be routine, the incredible array of topics and activities represented in the Rockefeller enterprise requires staff commitment to mastering a vast body of knowledge. Without that commitment the Center could hardly achieve the hundredfold increase in on-site researchers and hundreds of inquirers whom we assist each year.

Perhaps nothing better characterizes what the Center has been about over the last twenty years than opening the Papers of Nelson A. Rockefeller, which document a half-century of an amazingly diverse and productive public and private life. This collection, made available through the generosity of Mrs. Nelson A. Rockefeller, has been made increasingly accessible to researchers since 1989, on such diverse topics as urbanization (NAR was the first presidential candidate of Rockefeller Center; one of the most important urban complexes of modern times); arms control (NAR developed one of the earliest nuclear arms control proposals when he was a Special Assistant to President Eisenhower); water pollution (the Environmental Bond Issue that he championed while he was governor of New York was path-breaking); the history of the Republican party (NAR campaigned for the party’s presidential nomination at a time when the party’s identity was changing and served as vice-president of the United States during a pivotal period in national political history); and Latin American business (NAR’s International Basic Economy Corporation was an entrepreneurial pioneer). In his private life he was a collector of an astonishing variety of art; a philanthropist whose impact was global, but especially important in Latin America; and a mentor to many, especially young professionals whom he inspired to achieve. I am extremely proud of the Center’s able and talented archival staff that makes the Papers of Nelson Rockefeller available upon request. Information packet for researchers containing a map and listing local lodging accommodations, is available upon request. Information about the Center’s holdings and programs is available online at http://archive.rockefeller.edu/
New Governance at the Rockefeller Archive Center

July 1, 2008 will mark another milestone in the development of the Rockefeller Archive Center. On that date the Archive Center will formally become a private foundation and will no longer be a division of The Rockefeller University, which will officially transfer all of its Pocantico Hills property to the new foundation. This will be yet another step in a transition that has been occurring for several years. In 2006 the Rockefeller Archive Center received a provisional five-year charter from the Regents of the State of New York and in 2007 was designated by the Internal Revenue Service as a private exempt foundation under section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Since 2006 the Archive Center has been operating at the direction of a new Board of Trustees that consists of David Rockefeller, David Rockefeller, Jr., Stephen Heintz (president of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund), Paul Nurse (president of the Rockefeller University), and Judith Rodin (president of the Rockefeller Foundation). It is chaired by Neil Rudenstine, the chairman of ARTstor and President Emeritus of Harvard University.

A major reason for this transformation is to create a governing body with full authority and responsibility. The Governing Council that oversaw the Archive Center’s operations from 1974 to 2006 was legally only an advisory body to the Rockefeller University’s trustees.

With a new board that anticipates drawing upon additional resources, the Archive Center has entered a period of change and growth, and anticipates a new era of accessibility and service to its researchers and donor institutions.

New President

As part of the new governance structure of the Rockefeller Archive Center, the board of Trustees has created the office of the President of the Rockefeller Archive Center. The first president will be Dr. Jack Meyers.

Dr. Meyers is now Assistant Provost at Yale, where he has responsibility for coordinating program-planning for the arts and humanities at Yale’s newly expanded campus. He also teaches a course at the Yale School of Management on philanthropic foundations and their different approaches to grant-making.

Prior to that, Dr. Meyers was Deputy Director and for a year, Acting Director, of the Getty Trust’s grant-giving program. He worked closely with the Director in overseeing all grants for research centers, libraries, archives, universities and other institutions, and he also led the reorganization of the Getty’s Information Technology programs. Earlier in his career, Dr. Meyers was the Program Officer at the Getty who was directly responsible for archival projects, technology, publications, and museum cataloging initiatives. Previously, he had been the Senior Program Officer and Assistant Director in the Division of Research Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities, where he also had supervision of grants for archival and reference works as well as database projects. Dr. Meyers earned his undergraduate degree at Yale (1972), and his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago (1980), where his field of concentration was English and American Literature.

Dr. Meyers will take the helm of the Archive Center full time beginning on July 1.

NEW ONLINE at archive.rockefeller.edu

The Rockefeller Archive Center Gallery http://archive.rockefeller.edu/gallery/ A multimedia gallery of audio, video and photographs that highlights aspects of the collections. Included are:


Three new exhibits:
“Extraordinary Visions, Enduring Voices: Women at the Rockefeller Archive Center,” created by Bethany Antos and Meg Hogan with Susan Irving and Bethany Francis

“Their Bellies are Being Satisfied: The Rockefeller Quest to Conquer Hunger,” created by Nancy Adgent


Also New Online:

New Collection Descriptions:
Blanchette Rockefeller Papers
Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association Records
Foundation Center Records

An updated Bibliography of Scholarship from the Rockefeller Archive Center

New Essays in the “Research Reports” feature of the “Publications” section (see the list of new essays on p. 22)
During the 1930s, the study of International Relations was of major concern to the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). Its annual report listed International Studies as a special field of interest as early as 1929, the year when its Social Science Division was created. One of the RF’s flagship projects in this area was the International Studies Conference, a scholarly network with the ultimate aim of improving and reforming relations among nations. Between 1932 and 1938 the RF appropriated several grants of altogether over $180,000 to the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation for supporting the International Studies Conference, with the last grant running out in 1940.

Commitment to research and education in international affairs and the work of the League of Nations within the Rockefeller family predated the RF’s involvement. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. had supported private research institutions like the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations since the mid-1920s. Personal gifts also went to the League of Nations and internationalist causes, such as the movement for U.S. membership in the Permanent Court of International Justice. As a young man, John D. Rockefeller 3rd cultivated a lively interest in international relations. He spent the summer of 1928 in Geneva, at the invitation of Arthur Sweetser, a member of the League’s Information Section and for the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation for running out in 1940.

Commitment to research and education in international affairs and the work of the League of Nations within the Rockefeller family predated the RF’s involvement. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. had supported private research institutions like the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations since the mid-1920s. Personal gifts also went to the League of Nations and internationalist causes, such as the movement for U.S. membership in the Permanent Court of International Justice. As a young man, John D. Rockefeller 3rd cultivated a lively interest in international relations. He spent the summer of 1928 in Geneva, at the invitation of Arthur Sweetser, a member of the League’s Information Section and for the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation for running out in 1940.
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Carnegie Endowment, visited the 1932 International Studies Conference in Milan, confessed that he “was rather surprised at the number of people present who are connected with institutions of one kind or another which are receiving aid from us at the present time.” In his opinion, the ISC had the potential to fulfill a task that the RF pursued, too, namely “a coordination of research programs in studies of international questions.”

For about a year, the RF had been debating internally what approach it should take towards the discipline of International Relations. One suggestion involved funding exchanges of prominent intellectuals. This was a very traditional idea, based on the assumption that frictions between nations could be eliminated if eminent intellectual leaders from different countries met face to face and disseminated the resulting good feelings at home. Another model that was discussed within the foundation in the course of 1931 and 1932 was the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Established in 1925 as a private forum to promote cross-national understanding in the Pacific Rim region, the IPR began to receive support from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in 1926, a financial commitment that the RF continued. The expectation that the ISC would eventually transform itself into a global version of the IPR convinced RF staff to aid the ISC in 1932. Support from the RF came at a critical time for the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation. In 1931, the League of Nations had cut the budget of the Institute by 40%, and France, as the other principal donor, followed suit the same year. As Institute funding from official sources decreased, the Rockefeller grants increased. In 1938, funding from the RF exceeded that of the French government.

Between 1932 and 1935, the RF and the International Institute collaborated largely harmoniously. Rockefeller grants paid for additional staff at the Institute so that it could function as a secretariat for the ISC and liaise between the national groups. The Conference grew and stimulated the formation of International Relations institutes in smaller countries. On several levels, RF officers were pleased with the progress the ISC made. After the 1933 conference, John Van Sickle of the Paris office noted that “the meeting in London has, I believe, exercised a considerable influence upon the thinking of the scholars from other European countries. It was a revelation to many of them to see the organization of Chatham House, the quantity and quality of its research work and the prestige and influence which Chatham House exercises upon public opinion and political leaders generally.” Considering that Chatham House represented the model for national foreign affairs institutes, this was a remarkable success. Edmund E. Day, the head of the Social Science Division, noted that the ISC adopted more and more features of the IPR, and that the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation’s status as an international body enabled it to make more influential suggestions than a national body could. In March 1934 Day declared himself to be optimistic about the ISC: “It promises now to be an important agency in the promotion of better international relations.”

However, despite all the achievements and high hopes for the future, the foundations also recognized problems that arose from the way the ISC was organized. First, the conferences frequently failed to produce new scientific insights. Memoranda were prepared by the national groups and only made available to other groups shortly before the conferences. Cross-national research remained elusive. Second, conference discussions were often used by national groups to present the policy positions of their respective governments instead of scholarly opinions on a particular problem. This phenomenon was known within the RF, as shown by a memo covering the 1934 conference in Paris where the Italian and Polish groups insisted that their delegates would not be able to voice their personal opinions but had to represent those previously formulated by national committees.

Nevertheless, the Rockefeller Foundation continued to see the ISC as the best way to fulfill the aims of its International Relations program, and in September 1935 it decided to increase its grant to the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation. This was an experiment to see whether the ISC mechanism could develop — but soon the collaboration between the RF and the Institute turned sour. Two issues troubled the Social Science Division. The first source of dissatisfaction lay in the very nature of the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation as an international organization. Although the RF officers recognized the prestige and legitimacy that the Institute gave to the ISC, they also increasingly regarded the Institute as too inefficient and bureaucratic and started to suspect that RF grants were really used to prop up the ailing Institute. By threatening to stop its financial commitment to the ISC, the RF gained a greater degree of control over how its grants were spent. RF officers also increasingly perceived smaller research institutes with an international staff as a better set-up for cross-national collaborative research.

Other doubts arose. From the beginning the RF put emphasis on the influence the conferences could have on policy-makers, but this influence was not materializing in a convincing fashion. The ISC publications were regarded as too inaccessible to have a real impact, and the conferences themselves were seen as too formal. RF officers based in Paris were a lot more optimistic about the potential policy impact of the ISC than those on the other side.

(continued on page 27)
“Their Bellies Are Being Satisfied”: Agriculture and Rockefeller Philanthropy

Editor’s note: This essay is adapted from the recent in-house exhibit and the current online version on the RAC website at http://archive.rockefeller.edu/.

Agriculture has long been a Rockefeller family special interest. Humanitarian concerns about hunger, health, and underlying poverty led to the establishment of formal, institutional agricultural programs in the United States through the General Education Board (GEB) and worldwide through the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). During the 1960s, the term “Green Revolution” was coined to describe the results of crop improvement initiatives funded by the RF. Scientific farming methods and technology exported from the U.S., such as soil analysis, irrigation, mechanized equipment, chemical fertilizers, pesticides, and genetically modified hybrid seeds, revolutionized the production of crops, primarily cereal grains, that were dietary staples for indigenous populations. The ultimate validation of the Green Revolution’s impact in substantially reducing hunger may have been the awarding of the Nobel Prize to a scientist at the RF, Dr. Norman Borlaug, in 1970.

“Millions of the people in the developing countries might not be knowing Dr. Borlaug,” wrote Indian Junior Agronomist N. J. Mudholkan in a congratulatory note to the RF, “but through his sweat and endeavour their bellies are being satisfied. This is perhaps the noblest cause for which the Nobel Prize has been awarded.”

The long legacy of Rockefeller agricultural philanthropy was rooted in the mid-19th century rural upbringing of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. (JDR, 1839-1937). In his autobiography, Random Reminiscences, he recalls that his “first business enterprise” was raising turkeys “with the assistance of my mother. I owned some turkeys, and she presented me with the curds from the milk to feed them. I took care of the birds myself, and sold them all in business-like fashion.” As an “amateur landscape architect” later in life, he delighted in creating pleasing views on his properties in Ohio, New York, and New Jersey, and also in buying and selling home-grown plants and produce in business transactions among his various estates. According to a January 24, 1912 New York Times article, JDR particularly liked apples and “usually harvests more apples than he can use. The surplus supply is sent to local and New York Hospitals. He ships away a great many barrels every year to these institutions.”

Under John D. Rockefeller, Jr’s management, the Rockefeller family continued to enjoy the health benefits of raising quality food and the satisfaction of donating the surplus to local needy families and institutions. In 1930, concerned that the farm was not operating efficiently, JDR Jr. commissioned a survey of the 179-acre Pocantico Hills farm. The survey’s inventory listed 6 beehives; apple, peach, plum, pear, quince, and cherry trees; and five acres on which workers cultivated vegetables including potatoes, corn, oats, mangolds, beets, carrots, spinach, peppers, cauliflower, eggplants, parsley, grapes, strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, and currants. A 35-acre dairy farm supported 30 cattle and an 11-acre poultry farm contained 1091 chickens, 27 ducks, and 30 guineas. The survey commented on positive practices such as crop rotation, use of a hot bed for starting seedlings, and application of the farm’s horse manure for fertilizer; but it also highlighted problems that confirmed JDR Jr’s suspicions about inefficiency. Rather than discontinue farming...
altogether, JDR Jr. decided to implement the survey’s recommendations. He enlisted his son Nelson’s assistance in modernizing the farm buildings, and assigned his oldest son, John 3rd, the task of assembling a quality herd of dairy cattle. By 1944, Rockefeller cows were setting records and winning awards.

“I suppose no one deludes himself into thinking that a private farm pays,” JDR Jr. wrote to his father on September 23, 1931. “I have not myself great interest in farming, nor have I any knowledge of it. On the other hand, Abby and I have felt that a farm centre at Pocantico . . . would be of interest to the children and would be another thing that would help to tie them to the place.” As adults, JDR Jr.’s five sons exhibited their concerns about agriculture, the environment, and economic development in various ways. JDR 3rd established what would become the Agricultural Development Council in 1953, and, as a long-time trustee of the RF, was particularly supportive of Asian initiatives such as the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI). Nelson focused on Latin America and founded the American International Association for Economic and Social Development (AIA) and the International Basic Economy Corporation (IBEC). Laurance became an advocate for environmental protection and land conservation. At Winrock, his Arkansas farm, Winthrop raised Santa Gertrudis cattle, soybeans, sorghum, rice, wheat, and oats. Winrock operated much like a research farm, open to 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, and other groups that visited to observe innovations. David and his wife, Peggy, raised Simmental cattle. She co-founded the American Farmland Trust, a non-profit organization that pioneered the use of conservation easements to protect agricultural lands from development.

Although the Rockefellers were far from dependent on farm income, they understood the relationship between agriculture and economic prosperity, and a number of their philanthropic foundations addressed this connection. The General Education Board (GEB), for example, was chartered in 1903 to aid education in the U.S. “without distinction of race, sex or creed.” Much of its work was aimed at improving the agrarian economy in the rural South. But the Rockefeller philanthropy with the most significant impact on agriculture in the 20th century was the Rockefeller Foundation. In 1943 it joined with Mexican Department of Agriculture to form the Office of Special Studies to increase food crop production and to improve agriculture education. Plant pathologist J. George Harrar headed the RF’s pioneering agriculture program in Mexico. Generally regarded as the father of the Green Revolution, Harrar later served the RF in various capacities, including president.

RF agronomists in Mexico focused on three goals: improving soil productivity, managing pests, and improving forage crops. Although research began with corn, it soon extended to wheat, sorghum, potatoes, and rice. Plant pathologist Norman E. Borlaug joined the RF/Mexican government Cooperative Wheat Research and Production Program in 1944, and when the RF and the Ford Foundation established the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) in Mexico in 1966, Borlaug was appointed to direct its International Wheat Improvement Program. CIMMYT’s objective was to perform scientific research in genetics, plant breeding, plant pathology, entomology, agronomy, soil science, and cereal technology. By the mid-1960s Mexico’s average wheat yields had risen to over 40 bushels per acre from the 1943 level of 11.5 bushels per acre. Borlaug’s research had produced highly productive dwarf varieties that could resist rust fungus and could withstand large amounts of artificial fertilizer and varying amounts of daylight and water.

Success in Latin America encouraged the RF to expand their agricultural programs. In 1956, the RF and the government of India created the Indian Agricultural Program (IAP), aimed at increasing cereal crop production through development of high-yielding seed and strengthening graduate education in agriculture. The Indian government supplied land, facilities, and local staff salaries, while the RF provided scientists, equipment, and field program expenses. In addition to making grants for Indian scientists to pursue research in the U.S., the RF also funded a post-graduate school at the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in New Delhi. Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University was the first of several higher educational institutions in India based on the American land grant college concept.

The IAP’s All India Coordinated Cereal Improvement Projects concentrated on one crop at a time. Sponsored by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and jointly operated with state institutions, each project studied soil fertility, water management, economics, entomology, pathology, and genetics. The first program, launched in 1957, was on corn; later programs focused on sorghum, millet, wheat, and rice. Plant research alone did not solve the problem of an inadequate supply of usable food grain. Importation of mechanized equipment increased efficiency; use of pesticides prevented crop loss from pests such as the sorghum stem borer; and secure, temperature-controlled storage buildings for seed supplies significantly increased the quantity of viable seed for future crops. Although the RF closed the IAP in the early 1970s, the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) continued to function as part of the Conquest of Hunger program until 1983.

Following the success of the Mexican and Indian programs, the RF
and the Ford Foundation joined forces in 1960 to establish the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in the Philippines. Ford funded buildings and equipment, while the RF assumed responsibility for the scientific direction and management. The University of the Philippines gave IRRI a long-term lease on its site adjoining the College of Agriculture at Los Baños. As a first step toward developing more productive strains of rice, IRRI gathered and cataloged a collection of seeds and genetic material, then compiled a bibliography and a library of publications about rice from around the world. At the suggestion of Dr. Dorothy Parker, Associate Director of the RF, the I.R.R.I. International Bibliography of Rice Research was published in 1963 as a resource for rice scientists.

Meanwhile, fields were irrigated, experimental crops were planted, and research and training programs were started. In 1964 IRRI-funded studies determined that success in experimental plots had not translated to the average farmer’s fields, in part because the latter did not typically have irrigation facilities or funds for commercial fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides. As a result, IRRI personnel realized that adapting rice to regional conditions and production needs would be a more feasible solution than recommending idealistic, but prohibitively expensive, changes in agricultural practices. Plant breeders developed rice varieties that were “short, stiff-strawed, early maturing, disease-resistant, and non-sensitive to time of day.” (Early maturation meant farmers could harvest two crops a year.) Other varieties targeted increased yield. Agronomists, chemists, and engineers worked alongside the seed breeders, testing fertilizers, pesticides, and nutritional components, designing multiple-cropping schemes, and devising unique mechanical devices including tandem tractors, electric rat fences, and a low-cost rice seeder.

In late 1966, IRRI named its first major rice variety, IR 8, known as “Miracle Rice.” IRRI distributed seeds to governments and agricultural stations throughout Asia, and the Philippine government sponsored a campaign to encourage the planting of Miracle Rice. President Ferdinand Marcos even sent the Shah of Iran a packet of IR 8 seeds as a coro nation gift! By 1968, Miracle Rice yields regularly measured double the pre-IRRI average harvest of 4.5 tons per hectare. After success in the Philippines, the RF convened an international symposium, “Strategy for the Conquest of Hunger” in 1968. During the next decade, the RF and the Ford Foundation formed the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) to analyze the dilemma of ever-increasing population growth and inadequate food production in Third World countries.

Few, if any, parts of the world have been untouched by the Green Revolution. Despite its spectacular success in alleviating famine, critics blamed its emphasis on mechanical and chemical solutions and concentration on cereal grains for environmental degradation, a reduction in biodiversity, and a rise in factory farms at the expense of subsistence farmers. “I believe it is far better for mankind to be struggling with new problems caused by abundance rather than with the old problem of famine,” Dr. Borlaug argued in his Nobel acceptance speech. Even in the 1960s, some programs sought to address the needs of small farmers, and three Rockefeller philanthropic initiatives continue to attack the hunger/poverty cycle at the family unit level.

Winrock International operates worldwide in collaboration with USAID and other private and government organizations. Programs in Nepal, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Cameroon, South Africa, and Egypt target individual farmers, particularly women, to increase short-term income while conserving natural resources and protecting the environment for sustained yield.

The Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), a collaboration between the RF and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, seeks to reduce hunger and poverty in Africa by developing pest and disease-resistant seeds, including cassava, millet, and sorghum, that can withstand the continent’s harsh climate and unpredictable rainfall, yet increase yield. Scientists train local farmers (many of whom are women) to improve soil and water quality while conserving natural resources.

A more personal family venture seeks to renew the same bond to food and the land that John D. Rockefeller Sr. experienced in rural New York. In 1997, David Rockefeller and his daughter, Peggy, established the Stone Barns Center for Food and Agriculture in memory of their wife and mother, Peggy McGrath Rockefeller. Located in the reconstructed buildings previously occupied by JDR Jr.’s dairy cattle, the Stone Barns is a non-profit model farm and education center that promotes sustainable agriculture using environmentally responsible methods. Agriculture continues to be a central theme in the philanthropic legacy of the Rockefeller family.
Lives in the Balance: The Refugee Scholar Experience

Editor’s Note: One of the most interesting programs of the Rockefeller Foundation in its 95-year history was its Refugee Scholar Program to aid promising and notable scholars fleeing the spread of totalitarianism in Europe in the 1930s and 1940s. Many RAC scholars who have received little attention have examined aspects of this program (see the “Refugee Scholars” section of the online Bibliography of Scholarship at the Rockefeller Archive Center; 1975-2007 in the “Publications” section of the RAC website.) The program was the subject of a recent exhibit at the Archive Center assembled by Susan Irving and Kristin Bollas with Carol Radovich. Their exhibit provided an overview of the program and focused on several scholars who have received little attention. The article below is adapted from their exhibit.

Several collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center help document the lives of individuals caught up in the chaos of anti-intellectualism and racial and religious intolerance as Nazi rule spread throughout Europe in the 1930s and 1940s. The collections also document the network of institutions and programs created by scientists and academics in refugee nations in an attempt to help colleagues who lost their positions and faced arrest, deportation and possible death. Important elements of this network included the Rockefeller Foundation, with its program to aid refugee scholars, the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars, and the New School for Social Research, which provided employment and support for many deposed scholars.

The Rockefeller Foundation (RF), established in 1913, was active internationally in public health, medical sciences and education, the humanities and the social sciences, and had established contacts throughout Europe. As racial and religious discrimination began to disrupt German life in the 1930s, the foundation established a new program to assist German scholars seeking refuge from persecution. The RF funded Refugee Scholar programs that first aided Spanish refugees fleeing the Spanish Civil War and continued to aid those attempting to leave Austria, Germany, Czechoslovakia and France. Although the program officially ended in 1945, a new program modeled after the earlier success reemerged in the 1950s with the Hungarian Refugee Committee.

The RF’s refugee scholar efforts were directed by RF officers located in New York and abroad, many at the RF’s Paris office. Daniel O’Brien was at the Paris Office throughout the war, even when the office moved to Lisbon. O’Brien traveled extensively and talked to scholars to assess their situation. He corresponded with John Marshall in the RF Humanities Division; Marshall, in turn, worked closely with Alvin Johnson of the New School to locate university positions for the displaced scholars. Thomas B. Appleget, Vice President of the RF from 1927 to 1949, was a driving force in the Refugee Scholar Program. His postwar report, “The Foundation’s Experience with Refugee Scholars” (1946), chronicled the three major stages of the program and listed the 303 scholars helped by the program, while acknowledging with sorrow those who “failed to reach America.”

An especially important figure in the operation of the RF’s program was Alexander Makinsky, stationed in Paris as the secretary of the Rockefeller Foundation Health Commission to Europe. Born in May 1900 in Makou, Persia, Makinsky graduated from the Imperial Law School, St. Petersburg in 1918 and earned degrees at the Ecole des Sciences Politiques, Paris and the Collège des Sciences Sociales. In 1925, while working for the RF, he married Princess Catherine Melikoff of Georgia. In Spring 1940 he and O’Brien were at the Paris Field office, where Makinsky aided displaced scholars by arranging funding, helped to arrange visas, obtained transportation documents, and secured employment positions in foreign countries to help as many scholars as possible. As war approached and France fell to German occupation, Makinsky was forced to close down both RF French offices and move his people to Lisbon. Through the tireless efforts of Makinsky, O’Brien, and other RF staff, many scholars and their families were able to make their way out of Europe to England and America through the RF field offices in Paris and Lisbon. Makinsky continued to work for the RF in Europe until the end of World War II, and then moved to the New York Office. In the Spring 1946 he resigned his post and took a position at the Coca-Cola Company.

Like many RF officers, Makinsky chronicled his wartime ordeal and efforts in his officer’s diary. Among those outside Europe who sought to aid their besieged colleagues was Alfred E. Cohn, one of the first cardiologists in the U.S. and one of the four organizers in 1933 of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars. He served the committee in various roles in its 12 years of operation. Dr. Cohn’s personal

Archival Notes
papers in the Rockefeller University Archives reflect his ongoing involvement and commitment to the cause of the Emergency Committee. As one of its founders, he shared the beliefs articulated in its call to action to American universities: “An ancient university tradition is now challenged in Germany. Race, nationality and political partisanship have been set above the ideal of universal learning. It is everywhere incumbent upon university faculties, to be alive to the dangers which threaten them and by a declaration of faith to range themselves on the side of freedom of speech and freedom of teaching and to make known, in all solemnity, that they intend to maintain the historic duty of welcoming scholars, irrespective of race, religion and political opinion, into academic society and of protecting them in the interests of learning and human understanding.”

Conceived as a temporary group in May 1933, the Committee changed its name in 1938 to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars to respond to the spread of racist and nationalistic policies throughout Europe. The Emergency Committee raised money for displaced scholars and primarily made funds available through grant-in-aid programs to colleges and universities. Later, a special fellowship project extended aid to artists, writers, and other professionals. When the Committee disbanded on June 1, 1945, it had assisted about 500 displaced professionals.

One beneficiary of this network of support was Jean Wahl, a philosophy professor from Sorbonne University in France widely known for his specialization on modern English and American philosophies. Wahl benefited from the aid of the New School when he was invited to teach at an American college in 1940. He ran into some bad luck when he was arrested and sent to La Sante prison, where he was held for 36 days before being sent to a concentration camp by the Germans. With the help of a sympathetic doctor and nurse, Wahl’s name was put on list of prisoners to be released, and eventually he made his way to America for the remainder of the war. He later returned to the Sorbonne to continue his teaching and work.

The case of Michel Grolin and his family illustrates how difficult it was to keep track of people amid the chaos of the Nazi juggernaut. Michel Grolin was a renowned French scholar of Russian literature. A Russian by birth, he moved to Germany after the Russian Revolution and studied under Professor Max Vasmer in Berlin. He later moved to Paris with his wife, Raissa Bloch-Gorlina, and daughter Dora. Raissa was also an accomplished scholar under the pen name Raisa Blokh. A poet, historian and medievalist, she published two books: Moj gorod (1928) and Tisina (1935). Professor Andre Mazon considered Grolin the best French scholar of Russian literature, but feared that he would be sent to a concentration camp. Mazon pushed for Grolin’s name to be included on the New School for Social Research’s list of desired scholars. Another refugee scholar, Waclan Lednicki, also sent a letter detailing Grolin’s work to John Marshall at the RF. He too thought Grolin would make a fine addition to any American university. But the Grolins never made it out of Europe. In 1941 funding was provided for their employment, but by then contact with couple had been lost. In 1942 Grolin’s sister wrote that she feared the worst for her brother. Word later reached the New School that Grolin had been captured and sent to a German concentration camp. His wife was arrested in 1943 trying to cross into Switzerland; after her arrest Dora died. Years later it was learned that Michel Grolin had died on May 9, 1942 at Auschwitz. His name can be found at the Central Database of Shoah Victims’ Names.

Dr. Hedwig Hintze was the leading scholar of the history of the French Revolution. Hers is a heartbreaking story of near escape. Although born in Germany to Jewish parents, Hedwig was baptized and educated at a Protestant school. In 1910 she began working for the Friedrich Wilhelm University, where she studied under, and later married, Otto Hintze, a well respected German historian. She graduated summa cum laude in 1924 from the University of Berlin with her Ph.D. in the history of the French Revolution. From 1928 until 1933 she was a Privatdozent in Berlin, and later became the first woman to be named chair of the history department at the University of Berlin. With the rise of Nazism Hedwig Hintze was forced to resign from her position in 1933. From 1933 till 1935 she lived in exile in France, in part to save her husband from any mistreatment because of his association with her. She taught at the Office de Documentation Internationale Contemporaine, in Vincennes, France. But she later returned to Germany to care for her ailing husband. In 1939 Hedwig applied to both the RF and to the Emergency Committee in an attempt to flee Germany. Otto Hintze died in April 1940, leaving Hedwig destitute without her husband’s pension. In October 1940 Hintze received a grant from the RF for a position at the New School for Social Research. After several unsuccessful attempts to leave Europe for her post at the New School, Hintze finally secured a Cuban visa with the RF’s help. But she was detained on her way to Lisbon and her visa was revoked. She returned to the Netherlands, still without funding or a way to escape. On July 14, 1942 Hedwig
The story of Emmy Noether, an accomplished and highly regarded mathematician, is a happier one. Born in 1882 in Germany to a prominent Jewish family, she received her doctorate in mathematics in 1907 and became a Privatdozent at the University of Göttingen in 1919. Through her research she developed the Noether theorem in physics, first published in 1918 and still used in theoretical physics today, along with her work on the Noether rings. The rising climate of anti-Semitism following World War I and the surge against the intellectuals forced Noether out of her teaching position at the University of Göttingen. On May 12, 1933 Noether was granted a two-year position at Bryn Mawr College, facilitated by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation toward her salary. She took up her position at Bryn Mawr for the 1934–1936 terms and was considered to be an outstanding faculty member. Noether was one of the lucky few who made it out of Germany prior to the enforcement of the strict limitations on emigration during the latter half of the 1930s.

Abraham Pais was a theoretical physicist and one of the founders of particle physics. Born on May 19, 1918 in Amsterdam, Pais joined a Zionist student organization the NZSO while attending the University of Amsterdam. After graduating from the University in the spring 1938, he continued his education at the University of Utrecht where he earned a Ph.D. in July 1941. In March 1943 Pais went into hiding to avoid the Gestapo, arrest and deportation. He spent much of the next two years in hiding, but he was arrested in March of 1945. He was released after a friend intervened on his behalf. Later that year he produced his first publication since the onset of the war. He went on to work with Niels Bohr in Copenhagen, and in September 1946 he moved to the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. He joined the Rockefeller University as a professor of physics in 1963.

The collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center document the wartime experiences of many individuals and institutions, including these few scholars and foundation officers who did their best as mankind suffered through the darkest of times. Not all stories end on a happy note, but they are all stories worth telling for they all should be remembered.

Archival Notes
Susan Irving, Archivist
Kristin Bollas, Archival Assistant

Family Vacation: The Rockefeller Family Trips West and Their Impact on Parks

Between 1924 and 1933, John D. Rockefeller (JDR) Jr. gave almost $6 million towards national and state park projects through personal gifts and funding from Rockefeller family philanthropies. Family vacations during this period had a significant influence on the nature of family giving for the parks. Indeed, the family had not returned home from the first of these important trips when John D. Rockefeller, Jr. made his first personal gift for park purposes.

From June 23 to August 10, 1924, JDR Jr. and his three oldest sons — JDR 3rd, Nelson, and Laurance — traveled through the American West, visiting the Grand Canyon, Mesa Verde, Santa Fe, Denver, Yellowstone and Glacier National Park. While visiting Mesa Verde, JDR Jr. had noticed that the ruins there were protected from damage, looting, and exploitation, but that the interpretation of the area was in need of additional funds. On July 10, 1924, from a hotel in Denver, JDR Jr. sent $3500 towards the cost of completing an interpretive museum to Jesse Nusbaum, the Superintendent of the Mesa Verde National Park. This initial gift was divided into three components: $1000 for completion of the museum, $1500 for the completion of the furnishings of the museum, and $1000 for excavation work in the Spruce Tree Canyon Caves and elsewhere.

In subsequent correspondence between 1924 and 1926, Nusbaum described the progress of the archaeological digs, the construction of the museum, the construction of the exhibit cases, and provided JDR Jr. with updates on the Nusbaum family. In December 1926 JDR Jr. made additional pledges of between $5000 and $6000 for four new rooms for the museum and an additional $1000 to $2000 for exhibit cases. In a letter to Nusbaum, JDR Jr. explained that he wanted the Mesa Verde museum to be both appropriate in architectural style and of adequate size to house the collection. Moreover, the collection should contain Native American items exclusively from people who lived on the mesa. Nusbaum had earlier expressed his frustrations about the donation of inappropriate artifacts, and JDR Jr. wanted to give Nusbaum support in writing for the idea that the mission of the museum should be focused.

Family vacations brought the Rockefellers into a special relation-
ship with one federal official who had a lasting impact on Rockefeller giving for the national parks. Horace Albright, the superintendent of Yellowstone in 1924 and later the Director of the National Park Service, helped the Rockefellers plan their first Western trip in 1924. On June 2, Albright wrote to the Rockefellers about the final arrangements for the trip, suggesting that they travel to Glacier and Yellowstone national parks. Because of the short time allotted, Albright recommended a second visit to “see the wilderness part of the park which I think is its greatest charm. I am particularly anxious that a camping trip may be taken another year; because the boys will want to see the great buffalo herd, and will want to camp awhile in distant sections of the park where game of all kinds abound. I shall take pleasure in arranging for such a trip next year.” The next trip was two years later, in 1926, and included JDR Jr, his wife Abby, and the three youngest sons: Laurance, Winthrop, and David. The family traveled to Mesa Verde, California, Yellowstone, and Jackson Hole, Wyoming, and, as Albright had suggested, they also went camping.

JDR Jr. was so pleased with the 1926 trip that he sent a Christmas gift (a check for $1000) to the Albright family. Included with the gift was a letter in which JDR Jr. expressed his appreciation for the work that Albright and his colleagues were doing for America: “The second visit to various of the national parks which we made last summer was not necessary in order to make it quite evident to Mrs. Rockefeller and me that you and some of the other Park Superintendents with whom we have had such pleasant relations are rendering service to the people of this country utterly out of proportion to the financial recognition which the Government makes therefore. Your zeal to make available for the people generally the many wonderful things which Yellowstone Park embraces is almost comparable to the zeal which lead men and women to become missionaries. How fortunate the people of this country are in having as curators of their national playgrounds men of such high ideals and unselfish purpose as yourself, few can realize; but we do fully.”

Besides the personal donations of JDR Jr., funding for improvements of the parks also came from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), which the elder John D. Rockefeller had established in October 1918 in honor of his wife and JDR Jr’s mother. The LSRM followed the late Mrs. Rockefeller’s interests in missionary work and support of the welfare of women and children. The aim of the entire program was to achieve concrete improvement in the conditions of life and to contribute realistically to public welfare. The LSRM supported interpretive museums at Yosemite and Yellowstone and trailside museums in other parks, conducted studies and outlines of future educational programs of the national parks, assisted in acquiring land for national parks, and funded studies by the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, and the Playground and Recreation Association of America.

The gifts to the national parks that resulted from the first family trip west in 1924 were by no means large donations. Their significance was that they were personal and heart-felt, and they established a relationship with National Park Service staff that ultimately led to larger gifts, including the park at Jackson Hole.

Michele Hiltzik
Senior Archivist
“Hawkers of Hate”: Nelson A. Rockefeller’s 1964 Warning on Extremism


Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, I move that the following language be inserted in the proposed 1964 Republican Platform as a new full paragraph between the present sixth and seventh paragraphs under the section headed “For a Free People.”

“The Republican Party fully respects the contribution of responsible criticism, and defends the right of dissent in the democratic process. But we repudiate the efforts of irresponsible, extremist groups, such as the Communists, the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society and others, to discredit our Party by their efforts to infiltrate positions of responsibility in the Party, or to attach themselves to its candidates.”

The time has come for the Republican party to face this issue realistically and take decisive action. It is essential that this Convention repudiate here and now any doctrinaire, militant minority, whether Communist, Ku Klux Klan or Bircher which would subvert this party to purposes alien to the very basic tenets which gave this party birth.

Precisely one year ago today on July 14, 1964 [sic], I issued a statement wherein I warned that:

“….The Republican party is in real danger of subversion by a radical, well-financed and highly disciplined minority.”

At that time I pointed out that the purposes of this minority were “….wholly alien to the sound and honest conservatism that has firmly based the Republican party in the best of a century’s traditions, wholly alien to the sound and honest Republican liberalism that has kept the party abreast of human needs in a changing world, wholly alien to the broad middle course that accommodates the mainstream of Republican principles.”

Our sole concern must be the future well-being of America, and of freedom and respect for human dignity – the preservation and enhancement of these principles upon which this nation has achieved its greatness.

During this year, I have criss-crossed this nation fighting for those principles, fighting to keep the Republican party of all the people – and warning of the extremist threat, its danger to the party and its danger to the nation.
The methods of these extremist elements I have experienced at first hand. Their tactics have ranged from cancellation by coercion of a speaking engagement before a college audience to outright threats of personal violence.

These things have no place in America, but I can personally testify to their existence. And so can countless others who have also experienced:

Anonymous midnight and early morning telephone calls.
Unsigned threatening letters.
Smear and hate literature.
Strong arm and “goon” tactics.
Bomb threats and bombing.
Infiltration and take-over of established political organizations by Communist and Nazi methods.

These extremists feed on fear, hate and terror. They have no program for America – no program for the Republican party. They have no solution for our problems of chronic unemployment, of education, of agriculture, or racial injustice or strife.

These extremists have no plan and no program to keep the peace and bring freedom to the world.

On the contrary – they spread distrust. They encourage disunity. And they operate from the dark shadows of secrecy.

They have called President Eisenhower “a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.”

They have labeled a great Republican Secretary of State, the late John Foster Dulles, “a Communist agent.”

They have demanded that the United States get out of the United Nations and that the United Nations get out of the United States.

There is no place in this Republican party for such hawkers of hate, such purveyors of prejudice, such fabricators of fear; whether Communist, Ku Klux Klan or Bircher.

There is no place in this Republican party for those who would infiltrate its ranks, distort its aims, and convert it into a cloak of apparent respectability for a dangerous extremism.

And make no mistake about it – the hidden members of the John Birch Society and others like them are out to do just that!

These people have nothing in common with Republicanism.

These people have nothing in common with Americans.

The Republican party must repudiate these people.

I move the adoption of this resolution.
In the more than 80 years since restoration work began in Williamsburg, Virginia, the reconstructed town has been much more than an architectural tribute to the colonial era. The leaders of the restoration project had other ambitions and, together with national leaders at various times of strife, worked to transform the restoration project into an inspirational showplace of American ideals.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s involvement with Colonial Williamsburg began, in part, because of a chance meeting in 1924 at a Phi Beta Kappa dinner in New York City. While at the meeting, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. made a brief acquaintance with Dr. W.A.R. Goodwin, rector of the Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg and a driving force behind the work being done to restore the colonial city. Encouraged by reports of Rockefeller's work on the French restorations, Goodwin wrote twice to ask Rockefeller to help support restoration work and encouraging him to visit Williamsburg. Though demurring initially, Rockefeller, while attending the dedication of the Phi Beta Kappa Memorial Hall at the College of William and Mary on November 27, 1926, agreed to authorize that a sum of money be used in the creation of sketches that would visualize Goodwin's conception of the restoration. The following month, Rockefeller purchased the (Ludwell)-Paradise House in Williamsburg, beginning a lifelong interest in the project of the physical restoration of the town and its place in American history.

Unlike his father, who stressed the importance of progress and industrialism, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. idealized the past and the values associated with it. He hoped that Colonial Williamsburg would help current Americans connect with their colonial ancestors and that they would be reinvigorated by the ideals of that earlier generation through an appreciation of their way of life and struggles for independence. No longer would people just be reading about the Revolution and its participants, but they could walk around and, in essence, be transported back in time, seeing how the country began in a way they had never before experienced.

This view of Williamsburg, its place in history and its connection to contemporary America was one of the driving forces behind the military education programs for soldiers and sailors stationed at nearby bases during World War II be threatened by the war abroad.

Members of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., along with commanding officers at nearby Fort Eustis, devised a plan to allow Colonial Williamsburg to contribute to the war effort through the creation of an official training program that would accompany the military's orientation program for soldiers and sailors. They believed that the soldiers' experience with Colonial Williamsburg would give "the fighting men a clearer understanding and appreciation of why we are in this war and what we are fighting to preserve."

The group decided that the program would begin with the men and the Cold War. As America inched closer to involvement in the fighting in Europe and Asia, some saw the ideals of the Revolution threatened by the events occurring abroad. Rockefeller and Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. (the non-profit branch of the project) sought to use the restored colonial capital as a way to display those values of the Revolution that they believed to be threatened by the war abroad.

Members of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., along with commanding officers at nearby Fort Eustis, devised a plan to allow Colonial Williamsburg to contribute to the war effort through the creation of an official training program that would accompany the military's orientation program for soldiers and sailors. They believed that the soldiers' experience with Colonial Williamsburg would give "the fighting men a clearer understanding and appreciation of why we are in this war and what we are fighting to preserve."

The group decided that the program would begin with the men and the Cold War. As America inched closer to involvement in the fighting in Europe and Asia, some saw the ideals of the Revolution threatened by the events occurring abroad. Rockefeller and Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. (the non-profit branch of the project) sought to use the restored colonial capital as a way to display those values of the Revolution that they believed to
Colonial Williamsburg and its historical significance. They were also shown the film “I Am Williamsburg,” which detailed the history of the restoration project. Following the introduction, the men were divided into groups of about 30 men each and each group was assigned an escort to accompany them around the town. The men returned to the Lodge for lunch, followed by a continuation of their tour of the town, finishing at approximately 4 p.m. (1600 military time).

According to a memo written by Kenneth Chorley, president of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., following the first visit, the program was judged to be a success. “Seventy-five percent of the men return to Fort Eustis tremendously enthusiastic about what they have seen and heard,” said one of the officers who attended the program, while “the other twenty-five percent would not be interested in anything.”

In time the program became so successful that it was expanded to include Camps Lee and Peary, as well as Portsmouth and Fort Story Hospitals. Additionally, Rockefeller agreed to provide approximately $300 a week to pay for such aspects of the program as coffee for the troops as well as for guides and attendants.

Rockefeller received a number of letters from soldiers during those war years who wrote of their appreciation of Williamsburg. One of the most notable letters was from Robert Friedberg, whose letter to Rockefeller was widely published by the military. “Of all the sights I have seen, and the books I have read, and the speeches I have heard,” Friedberg wrote, “none of them made me see the greatness of this country with more force and clearness than when I saw Williamsburg slumbering peacefully on its old foundations.”

Following the end of the war, tourist travel to Williamsburg increased. Often these tourists included former servicemen and women, now married with families of their own with whom they wished to share their earlier experience at Williamsburg. At the same time, the United States found itself once again on its way to war. Having seen the success of the military program during World War II, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, son of the restoration’s founder and an organizational leader at Colonial Williamsburg, contacted the United States Army in 1951, during the Korean War, to ask if the Army would be interested in reviving the program. The younger Rockefeller thought it key that the new Cold War program focus not so much on anti-Communism but focus on pro-Americanism by stressing the positive aspects and ideals of American life.

The format of the new program was similar to the World War II program. The Army was very supportive of this idea, and Earl D. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army, even considered expanding the program with Williamsburg to include such historic sites as the Alamo and Bunker Hill. Between February and September of 1951 over 7,000 servicemen came to Williamsburg, most from Fort Eustis, as well as a few members of the Air Force from nearby Langley Field.

During World War II and the Korean War, Colonial Williamsburg thus embedded itself in service to the nation as the showplace of those eternal American ideals forged during the era of the American Revolution. Physical restoration of the colonial capital where such patriots as Jefferson and Washington lived and breathed made it possible for later generations of Americans, especially American fighting men, to feel a connection with those patriots and to rekindle their ideals in new times of crisis.

Meg Hogan
Archivist

The Legend of Sleepy Hollow Restorations

Editor’s note: This essay is adapted from a paper given at the Fall 2007 Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference in Williamsburg, Virginia.

During the 1920s and 30s, John D. Rockefeller; Jr.’s name became synonymous with well-organized, expertly done historic restoration projects. As the success of his involvement with the restorations in France (particularly the work at Versailles) and in Colonial Williamsburg became along the Hudson River in New York: Philipsburg Manor in North Tarrytown; Sunnyside, located in Tarrytown; and Van Cortlandt Manor in Croton-on-Hudson, New York. The earliest and arguably most influential restoration project was Philipsburg Manor: The Philipse Castle Restoration, as it was initially called, became a model for future restoration projects in the Hudson River Valley.

Although the Philipse Castle property was originally a Dutch
Rockefeller bought the Elsie Janis South, he argued. Early days of this country in the "Tarrytown is as representative of the "Janis' desire to sell the house, due in large part to her poor health. Janis herself corresponded with Rockefeller; who expressed his wish that the house would be "preserved as one of the outstanding places of historic interest on the Hudson," while making it clear that he was unable to aid in any type of restoration.

The story could have simply ended with Rockefeller's reluctance to enter into restoration work, but by the mid-1930s he had become acquainted with various members of the Tarrytown Historical Society, including its president, Dr. Hugh Grant Rowell. Rowell's main concern, reflected in much of his correspondence, was the future of the Janis property. As the property became increasingly at risk, Rowell's letters become more frequent and verbose, full of ambitious plans involving the house: "Confidentially, our real move would be to get our hands on the Janis house, establish that as historical and social center; and shift from 19 Grove [Street] to that place," he confided in one letter: "I could stand them on their heads with the Janis place."

Rockefeller remained unmoved by Rowell's many appeals on behalf of the Janis property, so Rowell embarked on a small-scale public campaign, submitting articles to the local newspaper in addition to maintaining his frequent correspondence with Rockefeller. These articles, gently but pointedly pressured Rockefeller to reconsider involvement based on his previous projects: "Tarrytown is as representative of early days of this country in the North as Williamsburg is of the South," he argued.

Rowell's public campaign succeeded. In February of 1940, Rockefeller bought the Elsie Janis property and subsequently donated it to the Historical Society together with a substantial monetary gift. Rockefeller appears to have intended to avoid involvement in the development of the property, but the simple act of purchasing it and donating it inextricably linked him to the restoration aspects of the project.

If Rockefeller thought he was done with Rowell, he was mistaken. Beginning with a harmless request — "If it is not burdening you too much, I would like, on occasion, to submit reports of progress and also, in some instances, to ask for a specific reaction in re certain points" — Rowell's "reports" appear with increasing frequency. His letters cover such varied topics as the sale of the old Historical Society property, the society's move to the Manor House, the creation of a "Rockefeller Memorial Room" in the Historical Society, and the appropriate name for the new property (Philipse Castle Restoration was eventually chosen). The typewritten letters were never brief, sometimes extending up to ten pages. A letter from Rockefeller illustrates that it was difficult to keep pace with Rowell's prolific letter-writing: "Dear Professor Rowell, Your letters of June 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th are received with interest…"

Matters regarding the house began moving quickly, and the restoration work began almost immediately under the auspices of the Historical Society. Rowell's reports became more technical, and Rockefeller's responses covered such issues as stucco, show case lighting, floor beams, fireproofing, and similar questions. Because Rowell often required specialized restoration information, Rockefeller recruited staff members from Colonial Williamsburg to act as consultants, including Kenneth Chorley, Finlay Ferguson, and A.E. Kendrew. With their aid, the restoration work was completed swiftly: "It looks as though by the end of the first twelve months you will have accomplished as much at the Philipse Castle as we have accomplished in Williamsburg in the last twelve years," Rockefeller marveled.

During the course of restoration work, the decision was made to move the Historical Society to a different location, and leave the Restoration as a stand-alone project. With Rockefeller's help, the Historical Society purchased a new home at One Grove Street in Tarrytown. On July 4, 1943, the Philipse Castle Restoration was opened to the public. By 1947, Rowell could report that business was brisk. "Business at P[hilipse] C[astle] R[estoration] continues to build up," he wrote to Rockefeller: "We are about 250 ahead of last year. Yesterday we had 53 — and the snow is not cleaned up yet on the roads by any means. Bookings are beginning to come in. It is encouraging."

Even before the restoration work at Philipse Manor was complete, Rockefeller was solicited to help preserve another local landmark. In 1940, Rockefeller received a phone call informing him of the impending sale of Sunnyside, the home of Washington Irving. Descendants of Irving still lived in the house on the border of Tarrytown and Irvington overlooking the Hudson River, but they feared they would need to sell the house and its contents soon. Rockefeller turned to Rowell for additional information on the situation. Rowell quickly responded in his typical fashion, full of ideas. He reported to Rockefeller that Irving's descendants "wish that [the home] somehow become a national shrine, rather than scatter the comprehensive collection of Irvingiana."

Rowell, still fully immersed in the restoration of Philipse Castle, stated that the Historical Society could not handle a second restoration effort, nor could they gamble with "the uncertainty of tourist traffic in terms of the war." Still, he submitted such reports as "Certain General Points Regarding the Adaptability of..."
Sunnyside to Use as Combination of Museum/Family Residence and Possibly Restaurant Concession or Simple Club.” Rockefeller was slow to respond to these ideas, but in September 1944, he visited Sunnyside and came away convinced that “Irving’s home has an historic interest and lure for tourists.” The following summer – July 1945 – he purchased Sunnyside.

Unlike the Philipse Castle project, Rockefeller did not purchase the property directly; rather, he used the Sealantic Fund, one of the many Rockefeller philanthropies, to purchase the house and land. The restoration work was completed under the auspices of the Fund, with Hugh Grant Rowell listed as the “Director” of the Sunnyside Restoration Project. As with Philipse Castle, Rockefeller employed many consultants from Colonial Williamsburg to aid Rowell, who in 1947 expressed his pleasure in the restoration work: “I shall now light up the blow torch and exhort my merry men to new deeds of deringdo, plastering, carpentry and what not.” Again, the work went quickly. Two years after its acquisition, on October 4, 1947, the house was dedicated, with Rowell and Rockefeller both providing speeches.

The two restoration projects in neighboring towns shared similar problems of management and maintenance, yet they operated separately. The Historical Society was struggling, to a certain extent, to manage and maintain what was now referred to as Philipsburg Manor and Sunnyside, but Rockefeller continued to be involved in Philipsburg Manor and Sunnyside. With the help and encouragement of his staff, Rockefeller decided to create and endow a separate organization to operate the two restorations. In March of 1951, the Board of Regents of New York State rejected the initial proposal for incorporation, but later “indicated willingness to approve incorporation under the Education Law.” Later that year Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Inc. was chartered and firmly established, fully independent of Rockefeller’s direction. In the 1980s its mission expanded beyond the original three projects to include the Union Church of Pocantico Hills (1984) Montgomery Place in Annandale-on-Hudson (1986) and Kykuit, the Rockefeller Estate (1994). To reflect the broader geographical scope of its sites, the organization changed its name to Historic Hudson Valley in 1987.

From John D. Rockefeller, Jr.’s initial refusals in 1929 to aid in restoration projects through his increasing involvement in the 1940s to his eventual creation and endowment of Sleepy Hollow Restorations, we catch a fascinating and informative glimpse into Rockefeller’s inexpressible passion for the preservation of history through historic restoration.

Bethany J. Antos
Assistant Archivist
The Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association Records Now Available

(continued from page 1)

of many of the important projects advocated, recommended or endorsed by the DLMA in the realm of land use, redevelopment, and traffic and transportation improvements. Accompanying photographs, audio and visual materials are available in Special Collections Series 1081. This companion collection contains approximately 1,100 photographs and 900 slides.

The DLMA consists of individual and organizational members representing many of the prominent businesses in the Lower Manhattan community. In addition to rehabilitating, redeveloping and reinvigorating Lower Manhattan, the association’s objectives are to maintain and expand Lower Manhattan’s position as the world’s preeminent leader of finance, commerce and shipping, and to transform the area into a total community by expanding residential capacity and introducing all the amenities of urban community life, including social services and facilities and programs in education, recreation, and the arts.

The founding of the DLMA is interconnected to the aims, goals and objectives of its first chairman, David Rockefeller, and those of the Chase Manhattan Bank. In 1955 Chase National Bank (often linked with the Standard Oil Company and its largest shareholders, the Rockefeller family) merged with the Manhattan Company (commonly known as the Bank of Manhattan, which had been founded by Aaron Burr in 1799 as New York’s second bank, preceded only by Alexander Hamilton’s Bank of New York). Historian Robert Caro has called the Chase Manhattan Bank “very probably the single most powerful financial institution on the face of the earth” in the quarter century following World War II. The powerful new Chase Manhattan Bank was looking to make a colossal statement, and there was no better way than to build a flagship headquarters. David Rockefeller, as Executive Vice President of Planning and Development and chairman of the committee responsible for the location of the new headquarters, chose Lower Manhattan. This was a bold and risky decision based on the potential strength of both the Chase Manhattan Bank and that of the Lower Manhattan financial district.

Despite its rich history as the former capital of the United States, in the 1950s the area many had claimed as “capital of the world” was undeniably in decline. Rents and occupancies were low and vacancies were high, while many of the existing public and private facilities were deteriorating and suffering various levels of obsolescence. Lower Manhattan was rapidly losing to its competition—the posh new facilities offered in midtown. Robert Moses “pointed out that many Wall Street businesses had already moved uptown or were about to leave the city altogether; if any more left, Chase’s decision to remain would be a colossal blunder.” David Rockefeller recalls in his Memoirs. “The construction of a new Chase headquarters could make a difference but by itself would not be enough. If the physical infrastructure and public services were not radically upgraded, the exodus from Wall Street would continue.”

David Rockefeller credits Robert Moses with the idea that led to the DLMA: “Moses suggested that I put together an organization that could speak on behalf of the downtown financial community and offer a cohesive plan for the physical redevelopment of Wall Street to persuade the politicians to allocate the necessary resources.” The new organization was officially established in 1958 through the consolidation of the Downtown Manhattan Association, Inc. (founded as the City Hall Park Association in 1937) and the Committee on Lower Manhattan, Inc. (originally organized as a committee of the New York State Chamber of Commerce) as the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, Inc. with David Rockefeller as its chairman.

To study the activities of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association requires an understanding of the area itself. In the terms specified by the DLMA, Lower Manhattan refers to the area south of Canal Street, generally bordered to the west by the Hudson River, to the east by the East River and to the South by the Battery and New York Harbor, geographically encompassing approximately one square mile. Lower Manhattan is often hailed as the financial capital of the world and it has a rich history of shipping and commerce through the port of New York. Lower Manhattan was the earliest area settled by the Dutch when it was known as New Amsterdam and once housed the entire population of the city of New York. Early government activity of the newly forming United States of America also centered in Lower Manhattan. George Washington bid farewell to his troops at Fraunces Tavern (54 Pearl Street) in 1783 and was inaugurated as the country’s first President at Federal Hall in 1789. New York City served as the capital of the United States from 1785-1790 at which time Fraunces Tavern (the oldest structure still standing in Manhattan) housed the offices for the Departments of State, Treasury and War. Today government activity in Lower Manhattan is representative of all levels of government and is mainly concentrated in Civic Center including City Hall, the Municipal Building and Foley Square.

At the time the DLMA was formed, Lower Manhattan had a working population of approximately
400,000 and a residential population of 4,000. Employment in the area focused mainly in the financial and shipping sectors, with small representation from other industries such as transportation, communications and wholesale distributors. The area had for the most part been left out of the post-World War II industrial boom. “In June 1958, when our association was organized, the words that best described the fringes of Lower Manhattan were erosion, decay and exodus,” noted one report. “Potentially valuable acreage either lay idle or was underutilized in block after block of low-rise, low yield, decrepit structures housing marginal enterprises. A sorry network of rotting piers and primitive waterfront facilities ringing the perimeter completed the scene of economic waste and blight.” This was the landscape as the DLMA began its operations.

The DLMA has served as a vehicle for Lower Manhattan’s business and institutional leaders to interact, develop common goals and objectives and to work in concert with the public and with representatives at every level of local, state and federal government to facilitate implementation of its plans and long-term vision. According to the “Agreement for Consolidation,” the specific objectives of the association are to foster, promote and support: physical improvements; sound redevelopment and preservation of economic values; improvement of transit, traffic and transportation facilities serving the area and parking facilities in the area; preservation, rehabilitation and restoration of buildings, structures and sites of historical interest; establishment and maintenance of non-profit publicly accessible museums, libraries and other cultural, educational, recreational, humanitarian, patriotic and civic facilities and programs; and to honor organizations and individuals that have rendered distinguished service to the area.

To accomplish these objectives, the DLMA’s main course of action has been to initiate, or to commission, studies, surveys and reports and to disseminate these findings, and to subsequently support those proposals deemed to promote Downtown and oppose those that would be a detriment to the area. In this vein, the DLMA’s First Report, published on October 14, 1958, presented a comprehensive view of the current conditions and offered a series of recommendations toward the strategic revitalization of Lower Manhattan in the fields of traffic and transportation, land use and the proposed designation of several major redevelopment areas. Among the many recommendations were a variety of street widenings and closings to alleviate crowding and congestion, comprehensive rezoning of the entire area, a plan to demolish and/or modernize the east and west side waterfront piers, and the proposed relocation of the Fulton Fish Market and the west side produce market known as Washington Market.

The historical legacy of the Association will surely be connected to its role in the creation of the World Trade Center. At the Executive Committee meeting of June 15, 1959, the DLMA considered a May 25 memo written by McKinsey & Company, Inc. regarding preliminary study of a World Trade and Finance Center. The memo states that the “growing orientation of American management to a worldwide point of view raises the possibility of, and perhaps the need for, a physical center for international trade and business in the United States – a center where United States and foreign business and financial interests can meet to do business; where representatives of the United States and foreign governments are available for consultation and aid; and where facilities are available to expedite business transactions. Such a center might accelerate the development of international business and act as a symbol of this country’s growing world leadership in the international business community…. New York
City is in all likelihood the logical place for such an international center.” As David Rockefeller reports in his Memoirs, the DLMA sponsored the first plan for the World Trade Center in 1960: “DLMA commissioned Skidmore, Owings and Merrill to develop a plan for a 13.5 acre site that included a 70-story hotel and office building, an international trade mart and exhibition hall and a central securities building” to be located along the East River between Old Slip and Fulton Street. This 1960 report also recommended giving the Port Authority the authority to plan and build the complex. Ultimately to insure political cooperation from New Jersey, and utilization of the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad (PATH) terminal, the World Trade Center complex of seven buildings, including the 110-story twin towers, was built on the west side in the area previously occupied by “radio row” and the Washington Street produce market.

The Association also certainly had its share of frustration and failure, illuminating the intricate combination of public, private and governmental support needed for any project to succeed in New York City as well as the perseverance, determination and sustained resources needed to see it become reality. Expansion of the Second Avenue Subway, Westway and construction of the Lower Manhattan Expressway are all examples of major projects advocated by the DLMA that for a variety of reasons never came to fruition. Westway, a highway project to be built on landfill along the Hudson River, failed after its federal funding collapsed as a consequence of legal opposition from environmentalists.

In the case of the Lower Manhattan Expressway, the DLMA joined forces with Robert Moses. As his biographer explains, “Moses had long been planning to construct expressways across Manhattan island itself. Even before the war, Moses had planned at least three such expressways – all elevated: an Upper Manhattan Expressway at approximately 125th Street; a Mid Manhattan Expressway at either 30th or 36th Street; and a Lower Manhattan Expressway that would run across Broome Street and connect the Holland Tunnel with the Williamsburg and Manhattan bridges.” David Rockefeller and the DLMA were possibly Moses’ biggest downtown allies in the battle to build the LME. “Our continued support for the Expressway is not only for reasons of traffic improvement or increased tax revenues, or enhanced real estate values;” the DLMA noted in its Second Report. “We are convinced that this undertaking will add more employment opportunities, will create improved and upgraded jobs in the area, and will result in higher wages and better living conditions.” Following large-scale organized community opposition, the Board of Estimate rejected a budget appropriation for the Expressway, but the DLMA continued to show support for the ill-fated project.

After initiating a variety of traffic and transit improvements and successfully expanding the capacity to house local businesses, the DLMA shifted its focus to increasing residential capacities in Lower Manhattan and expanding the available social, cultural and recreational services suitable for the development of a truly multi-purpose 24-hour total community in Lower Manhattan. The concept of utilizing the Battery Park area for a large-scale affordable housing project had been endorsed as a portion of DLMA’s First Report. Detailed plans for Battery Park City were introduced in 1966 by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and architectural consultant Wallace K. Harrison. The Governor’s plan proposed the development of 98 acres of landfill on the Hudson River from the Battery to Chambers Street for use as middle and low income housing, light industry, schools, religious houses of worship, a library and museum, a civic center and a hotel. “Battery Park City (BPC) represents the largest and most complex single urban real estate development ever undertaken in this country.” Ultimately, after many years and vast transformation of the project, the as-built BPC bore virtually no resemblance to its original vision.

Another significant project was the cultural development of South Street Seaport, a 33-acre site that includes a state-sponsored Maritime Museum, restored buildings, recreational, entertainment and shopping facilities, and a fleet of ships for public educational use. South Street Seaport serves as both a wonderful asset for every day use by current Lower Manhattan citizens and a reminder of the maritime lifestyle and historical significance of the port of New York.

Overall, the DLMA has been quite successful in its aims. In the 15 years spanning 1958-1973, nearly 47 million square feet of new office space was created in Lower Manhattan and the area’s workforce had expanded to 500,000 while its residential population grew to approximately 33,000. This new office space alone would be considered the fourth largest office center in the United States. Only two other cities (Chicago and Washington) have as much office space in their central business districts as Lower Manhattan added during this period. Of course, the centerpiece of this building boom was the World Trade Center complex which, at its height, contained 13.4 million square feet of office space, representing approximately 4% of the entire available office space in Manhattan at the time. But the development in the area extends far beyond simply the construction of the World Trade Center.
the Home Insurance building (completed in 1965) and the Jacob Javits Federal Office Building (completed in 1968) are just a few of the construction successes.

The number of educational facilities in Lower Manhattan dramatically expanded as a result of the new development in the area. New schools and colleges included the Borough of Manhattan Community College (Washington Street urban renewal project), New York University Graduate School of Business, and a newly constructed two-block campus for Pace University and the DLMA-sponsored Murry Bergtraum High School in the Brooklyn Bridge southwest urban renewal area. In addition to Battery Park City, residential expansion included Chatham Green, Chatham Towers, and the Southbridge Towers. There was also significant expansion of community services, including the Beekman-Downtown Hospital and a downtown branch of the New York Public Library. A short list of cultural and recreational accomplishments includes the Museum of the American Indian, located in the former U.S. Custom House, the Whitney Museum of American Art and the restoration of Bowling Green Park.

The DLMA collection serves to document a model of what many regard as successful urban renewal based on collaboration between the public and private sectors and various agencies of all levels of government. In many ways any study of the activities of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association is truly a snapshot of the history of New York City, its position as the dominant urban center of New York State and the United States, as well as its place in the global economy. Urban and regional planning are dominant themes throughout, but the records also illuminate the complex maze of elected officials, city agencies, commissions and public authorities that must be navigated, with all of its significant players, from the local community board to the Board of Estimate, City Council, City Planning Commission, the Mayor’s office, as well as the participation of such powerful entities as the Port Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and community groups such as the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council.

The activities of the DLMA are, in the words of the DLMA’s Fourth Report in 1973, “a powerful testimony to what can be accomplished when public minded private interests and all levels of government join to take a long bold and outward look at community needs and potential, and then work in concert to bring about constructive change.”

Robert Battaly
Senior Archivist

New Scholarship
Online at archive. rockefeller.edu

More than twenty new essays by RAC researchers and staff are now available online in the “Research Reports” feature of the “Publications” section of the RAC website. The new essays are listed here alphabetically by author:

Gavrus, Delia. “Perfect Timing: Policy Change at the Rockefeller Foundation and the Establishment of the Montreal Neurological Institute”

Hinck, Laurie. “Intersections and Detours: Tracing Standard Oil’s Trails through Grand Teton National Park”

Little, Branden. “Band of Crusaders: American Humanitarians, the Great War and the Remaking of the World”

Lossio, Jorge. “Geography, Nationalism and Mining Development in the Emergence of High-Altitude Pathologies”


Peterson, Paul D. “Improving Potato Production in Mexico: John S. Niederhauser and Rockefeller Foundation-Sponsored Research during the 1950s and 1960s”

Peper Mooney, Jadhiga E. “‘Global Man’ Meets Local Women: Examining Public Health, Fertility Regulation, and Gender Equity in Chile”


Plotkin, Mariano. “Modernity, Development and the Transnationalization of the Social Sciences in Argentina and Brazil, 1930-1970”

Rose, Kenneth W. “John D. Rockefeller and the Golf House in Lakewood, New Jersey”

Rose, Kenneth W., “John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and the Forest Hill Housing Development (Cleveland)”

Rose, Kenneth W. “Partners in Housing Reform: The Apartment Developments of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Charles O. Heydt, and Andrew J. Thomas”


Rose, Kenneth W. “The Rockefeller Foundation’s Fellowship Program in Turkey, 1925-1983”


Scholthof, Karen-Beth G. “The Development of Plant Virology and Serology in the Early 20th Century”

Stern, Alexandra Minna. “Tropical Disease Campaigns in Panama: The Entanglement of American Colonial Medicine and Medical Humanitarianism”

Stradling, David. “The Hudson River and the Boundaries of Environmentalism”

Yiyou Wang. “Art Dealers, the Rockefellers and the Network of Chinese Art in America”
In March, 42 scholars were awarded grants to conduct research in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The grant recipients, their institutions, and research topics follow.

**Patricio Abinales**
Professor, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, Japan.
“Epidemics, Diseases and State Formation in Post-War Southeast Asia: Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines”

**Svetlana Arkina**
Visiting Scholar, Davis Center, Harvard University.
“The Evolution of the Privileged Tax Treatment for American Nonprofit Organizations”

**Leandro Benmergui**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park.

**Luis Eduardo Bosemberg**
Associate Professor, History Department, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia.
“The Relations between Nazi Germany and Colombia, 1933-1945”

**Jeffrey Brison**
Assistant Professor, Chair of Undergraduate Studies, Department of History, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
“The Rockefeller Foundation, and the Canadian Social Science Research Council’s Arctic Survey” and “The Memory of Mackenzie King: A Canadian Biography and Canadian History”

**Kyle Bruce**
Senior Lecturer in Strategy, Economics and Strategy Group, Aston Business School, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
“Democracy or Seduction? The Demonization of Scientific Management and the Deification of Human Relations”

**James Burns**
Associate Professor, Department of History, Clemson University.
“Colonial Cinema in the African Diaspora”

**Ernesto Capello**
Assistant Professor, History Department, University of Vermont.
“Writing the Gringo Patron: Popular Responses to Nelson A. Rockefeller’s 1969 Presidential Mission to Latin America”

**Gaia Caramellino**
Doctorate in History of Architecture and Town Planning, Department of Architectural and Industrial Design, First Faculty of Architecture, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy.

**Katherine Carroll**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Art History, Boston University.
“Modernizing the American Medical School, 1893-1940: Architecture, Pedagogy, Professionalization, and Philanthropy”

**Elisabeth Clemens**
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.
“What You Can Do: Voluntarism in American Political Development”

**Deborah Del Gais**
Curator of Asian Art, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design.

**Xiaoping Fang**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, National University of Singapore.

**Judith Godden**
Senior Lecturer, School of Public Health, University of Sydney.
“The Rockefeller Foundation and Gwen Burbidge: Dreams, Ideals and Struggles over Australian Nurses’ Role in Public Health”

**Kenneth Goings and Eugene O’Connor**
Professor and Chair, African American and African Studies, The Ohio State University (Goings)/Managing Editor, The Ohio State University Press (O’Connor)
“African Americans and the Classics at Historically Black Colleges and Universities”

**Frances Gouda**
Professor, History and Gender Studies, Department of Political Science, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
“Knowledge as Instrument of Power: Medicine and Social Science in the Colonial Laboratory of the Dutch East Indies, 1900-1942”

**Sarah Griffith**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, University of California, Santa Barbara.
“Conflicting Dialogues: The Institute of Social and Religious Research and the Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast, 1921-1925”

**Jason Guthrie**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park.
“A Laboratory of Liberalism: The International Labor Organization and the Social Politics of Development”

**Laurel Hitchcock**
Research Consultant, School of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham.
“The Creation of Federal Services for Crippled Children, 1925-1945”

**Yu-Ling Huang**
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Sociology, State University of New York at Binghamton.
Sarah Johnson
Ph.D. Candidate, College of Nursing/Colege of Graduate Studies, Medical University of South Carolina.
“Healing in Silence: Black Nurses in Charleston, South Carolina, 1896-1948”

Craig Kriedel
Curator, Museum of Education, University of South Carolina and Professor, Department of Educational Studies, University of South Carolina.
“The General Education Board’s Human Relations Series and Secrets of Success Educational Film Projects”

John Laprise
Ph.D. Candidate, Media, Technology, and Society Program, School of Communication, Northwestern University.

Cheryl Lemus
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, Northern Illinois University.

Shiyung Liu
Assistant Research Fellow, Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica.
“From Japanese Colonial Medicine to American Standard Medicine in Taiwan: Transitions in the Medical Profession in Post-war Taiwan”

Daniela Manica
Ph.D. Candidate, Social Anthropology Program, Institute of Philosophy and Human Sciences, State University of Campinas (Unicamp), Sao Paulo, Brazil.
“Contraception, Reproductive Sciences and Population: The Work of Dr. Elsimar Coutinho”

Sarah Miglio
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, University of Notre Dame.
“Civilizing the World: The Progressive Religion and Politics of Chicago, 1890-1925”

Kathleen Nehls
Ph.D. Student, Department of History, University of Georgia.
“Red Tape, Race, and Reform: State-building and the Politics of Health in the American West, 1920-1935”

Sarah Payne
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, University of New Mexico.
“Cleaning Up after Sex: An Environmental History of Contraceptives, 1880-2006”

Gracia Ramirez
Ph.D. Candidate, School of Creative Industries, Napier University, Edinburgh, Scotland.
“The American Film Institute’s Support for Experimental Filmmakers and Film Education, 1967-1977”

Eleanor Sacks
Independent Researcher.
“History of U.S. Community Foundations”

Brian Schmidt
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
“The Professional Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations, Vol. II”

Alicia Schortgen
Assistant Professor of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Dallas.
“Revisiting the Filer Commission: 30 Years of Private Philanthropy and Public Needs”

Cherry Schrecker
Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Nancy, France.
“The History of Radiobiology to 1970 and the Contributions of L.H. Gray”

Aaron Shkuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, The University of Chicago.

David Soll
Ph.D. Candidate, American History, Brandeis University.
“From the Catskill Waters to the Manhattan Streets: New York City’s Water Supply and the Transformation of Space”

Stacie Taranto
Ph.D. Candidate, History Department, Brown University.

Sinclair Wynchank
Senior Lecturer (part time), Department of Paediatrics, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.
“The History of Radiobiology to 1970 and the Contributions of L.H. Gray”

Richard M. Yon
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Florida.
“Emerging from the Shadows: The Vice Presidency in the Modern Era”

Neici Zeller
Adjunct Professor, Loyola University and Lecturer, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Dewen Zhang
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History, State University of New York at Stony Brook.
“Mobilizing Chinese Women for the War of Resistance, 1937-1945”
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The Rockefeller Foundation and the Search for International Order
(continued from page 5)

of the Atlantic. The enthusiasm that Tracy B. Kittredge displayed in his reports to the New York office often met with incredulity and sarcasm, as the frequent comments that his New York colleagues scribbled on the margins of his letters testify. Of course, the U.S.-based officers were the ones who had to justify RF support for the ISC to the Trustees, and the international atmosphere of the late 1930s certainly did not inspire confidence. This was not the fault of the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation or the ISC, but it eroded the RF’s commitment to intellectual cooperation in the cause of peace. “There is increasing distrust of the results to be expected from conferences carried on by academic or near-academic people,” noted Sydnor Walker, Assistant Director of the Social Science Division. “We are rather afraid since the political tension has so increased that the ISC will become less realistic and more academic.”

By July 1939, shortly before the last International Studies Conference in the inter-war period, RF officers had lost all enthusiasm for a project they had embraced just a few years earlier. Walker confessed to a colleague that she could hardly begin to brace herself to attend the upcoming conference.

The advent of World War II terminated Rockefeller support for the International Studies Conference, and in 1945, when the RF reformulated its post-war strategy, it decided to phase out its support to foreign affairs institutes. Although the ISC meetings resumed after the war – the last one was held in 1950 – the grants were not renewed. Nevertheless, the ideals of intellectual cooperation and cross-national scholarly exchange remained alive within the Rockefeller Foundation.

Director’s Comment
(continued from page 2)

A. Rockefeller a continuing yet still largely untapped resource for understanding modern history.

Technological innovation also has been characteristic of the archival services of the Center. The Center initiated its continually-elaborated web site in 1995. Access to biographies of Rockefeller family members, to descriptions of the collections, to the Center’s cumulative bibliography, and to information about the Center’s conferences and workshops have long been features of the web site. Recent additions have included staff-created exhibits, which include selections from the Center’s rich collection of photographs; digitized versions of the Center’s Newsletter and Research Reports (as well as researchers’ reports that only appear online); and “In Their Own Words,” selections of written and audio documents from Rockefeller family history.

Last year, after five years of intense preparation, the Center added to its web site Rediscovery for Internet, a database that gives researchers a means of searching information in the finding aids for the Center’s open collections to identify pertinent files. The 200,000 files now included will continue to be expanded as new materials are made available to researchers.

Looking forward, the Center’s Collaborative Electronic Records Project – a joint effort with the Smithsonian Institution Archives – is creating a means of storing, preserving, and accessing at least portions of the enormous e-mail files that are the key records of the operations of many of the Center’s depositing institutions. This cutting-edge effort is receiving global attention and is likely to establish the Center as a leader in electronic records management in the 21st century.

All of this would mean little if it were not for the several thousand researchers who have mined the Center’s collections and who have created a diverse and important array of books, articles, documentary films, web sites, exhibits and other means of disseminating knowledge. I deeply appreciate their commitment to scholarship and what that scholarship has done to shape our understanding of history.

Darwin H. Stapleton
Executive Director
A “Future Housewife for Rocky” receives an autograph from Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller as he campaigns for re-election in Onondaga County, New York, October 5, 1970. This year marks the centennial of Rockefeller’s birth on July 8, 1908.

The Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter is an annual publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. It is intended to highlight the diverse range of subjects covered in the collections at the Center and to promote scholarship in the history of philanthropy and related fields.
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