

REPORT OF THE STUDY  
FOR THE FORD FOUNDATION  
ON POLICY AND PROGRAM

*November, 1949*

PUBLISHED BY THE FORD FOUNDATION  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

## THE STUDY COMMITTEE

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR.

*Chairman*

THOMAS H. CARROLL, D.C.S.

WILLIAM C. DEVANE, PH.D.

T. DUCKETT JONES, M.D.

CHARLES C. LAURITSEN, PH.D.

DONALD G. MARQUIS, PH.D.

PETER H. ODEGARD, PH.D.

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING, Ed.D.

## STAFF OF THE STUDY COMMITTEE

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR.

*Director*

WILLIAM McPEAK

DYKE BROWN

*Assistant Director*

*Assistant Director*

PAUL BIXLER

DON K. PRICE

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	9
INTRODUCTION	13
HUMAN WELFARE	17
PROBLEMS OF HUMAN WELFARE	25
FIVE PROGRAM AREAS FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF HUMAN WELFARE	49
Program Area One: The Establishment of Peace	52
Program Area Two: The Strengthening of Democracy	62
Program Area Three: The Strengthening of the Economy	70
Program Area Four: Education in a Democratic Society	79
Program Area Five: Individual Behavior and Human Relations	90
Conclusion	98
THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM	100
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF THE STUDY COMMITTEE AND STAFF	138

## PREFACE

**I**N THE Fall of 1948, anticipating final settlement of Federal Estate matters and the probable receipt during 1949 and 1950 of income from the gifts of Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. Edsel Ford in amounts sufficient to permit The Ford Foundation to undertake a greatly expanded program, the Trustees asked Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr. to organize and direct a planning study of policy and program for the Foundation.

On November 22, 1948, the Chairman of the Trustees wrote Mr. Gaither as follows:

“The Foundation was established for the general purpose of advancing human welfare, but the manner of realizing this objective was left to the Trustees. Now that the time is near when the Foundation can initiate an active program, I think that its aims should be more specifically defined.

“The people of this country and mankind in general are confronted with problems which are vast in number and exceedingly disturbing in significance. While important efforts to solve these problems are being made by government, industry, foundations, and other institutions, it is evident that new resources, such as those of this Foundation, if properly employed, can result in significant contributions.

“We want to take stock of our existing knowledge, institutions, and techniques in order to locate the areas where the problems are most important and where additional efforts toward their solution are most needed.

“You are to have complete authority and responsibility in this undertaking, and you are to have a high degree of discretion, subject, of course, to general policy approval of the Trustees, in the means you

edge. In the area of government and international affairs the Committee secured the opinions and points of view of officials in state and federal government, representatives of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies, business and professional leaders, and the heads of private organizations concerned with world affairs. In this and other fields the presidents of many leading universities contributed generously. The views of military leaders were sought and obtained. The viewpoint of labor was solicited. Conferences were held with the heads of many small enterprises — often sole proprietorships — as well as heads of large corporations.

The work of the Study Committee was concluded in November 1949, when its General Report containing the Committee's conclusions and recommendations was submitted to the Trustees. It is significant that this Report, which followed some 22 special and individual reports, carried with it unanimous Committee endorsement.

The Trustees of The Ford Foundation wish to express their grateful thanks and deep appreciation to all those who contributed so generously and so effectively to the Study.

The work of the Study Committee, assisted by its Staff, represents, in the judgment of the Trustees, one of the most thorough, painstaking, and significant inquiries ever made into the whole broad question of public welfare and human needs. Their recommendations were accepted unanimously by the Trustees and are believed to represent the best thinking in the United States today.

The findings of the Study Committee are, in the opinion of the Trustees, of sufficient general interest and importance to warrant the publication of the General Report in its entirety. Publication of the Report was therefore authorized by special action of the Trustees on September 6, 1950. The opinions expressed in the Report are, of course, those of members of the Study Committee and not necessarily those

THE FORD FOUNDATION

of the Trustees. Action taken by the Trustees on the Report, as well as a summary of the considerations underlying that action, has already been published in the Report of September 27, 1950, by the Trustees of The Ford Foundation.

HENRY FORD II  
*Chairman, Board of Trustees*  
*The Ford Foundation*

October, 1950

## INTRODUCTION

**T**HE MISSION of the Study Committee was to make recommendations based upon the best available thought concerning the ways in which The Ford Foundation can most effectively and intelligently put its resources to work for human welfare.

In preparing this report and its supporting monographs and memoranda the Committee has consulted more than a thousand persons, men and women of recognized ability and reputation in varied fields of activity and in many parts of the country. Among these were business, labor, and professional leaders, all of whom gave their time and counsel without stint. Numerous university faculties spontaneously organized meetings and conferences and voluntarily prepared reports for the Committee. Unsolicited letters, many containing valuable suggestions, were received from numerous parts of the United States and from several foreign countries. The dominant tenor of these reports and letters was one of unselfish eagerness to assist the Committee's work. The knowledge that at this critical time a great new foundation dedicated to human welfare was seeking counsel on basic policies and programs seems to have caught the imagination and raised the spirits of individuals throughout the world. All were quick to appreciate both its tremendous opportunity and its equally great public responsibility.

The Study Committee had four major objectives as it collected and analyzed data from hundreds of interviews and conferences and from thousands of pages of written materials. The first was to arrive at a clearer understanding of the meaning of "human welfare", as this term, though the keystone of the Foundation's charter, is not further defined or elaborated there. The Committee's conception of human welfare is stated in

Chapter I. As will be seen, it is in large measure synonymous with a declaration of democratic ideals. This concept emerged from the study materials and was present in the minds of the Committee and its advisers, either implicitly or explicitly, throughout their work. It is the consensus of men of judgment today that the real hope for the advancement of human welfare lies in the reaffirmation in practice of democratic principles.

The Committee's second task was to consider the ways in which human welfare is most thwarted and threatened; in other words, to evaluate the magnitude and intensity of the major problems confronting mankind today. The considerable evidence which the Committee received concerning these problems is reviewed in Chapter II. In its analysis, as well as in its later formulation of programs, the Committee found that the democratic concept lent perspective and served as a standard of judgment.

In the Committee's opinion the evidence points to the fact that today's most critical problems are those which are social rather than physical in character — those which arise in man's relation to man rather than in his relation to nature. Here, it was concluded, is the realm where the greatest problems exist, where the least progress is being made, and where the gravest threat to democracy and human welfare lies.

In Chapter III the Committee reports on its third task — that of proposing, in broad terms, programs which The Ford Foundation might sponsor in attempts to cope with some of these problems in our society. In formulating these programs the Committee consulted leaders and workers in many fields, considered the nature and extent of current efforts, and received advice for important new work. The Committee believes that these problems may be attacked and human welfare furthered by programs in the areas recommended in Chapter III: the establishment of peace, the strengthening of democracy, the strengthen-



ing of the economy, the improvement of education, and the better understanding of man.

Lastly, the Committee sought to define the type of organization and operating procedures most appropriate for programs of the kind proposed and for a modern foundation with resources as large as those of The Ford Foundation. The Committee's recommendations on this subject, which are set forth in Chapter IV, rest on a careful study of the policies, procedures, and practices of the larger foundations, and upon the experiences of their trustees, officers, and recipients of grants. Such proposals as have been made are designed to maintain freshness, boldness, and flexibility of operation as well as to ensure a high degree of public responsibility.

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR., CHAIRMAN  
THOMAS H. CARROLL  
WILLIAM C. DEVANE  
T. DUCKETT JONES  
CHARLES C. LAURITSEN  
DONALD G. MARQUIS  
PETER H. ODEGARD  
FRANCIS T. SPAULDING

November 1, 1949

## CHAPTER I

# HUMAN WELFARE

**T**HE AIM of The Ford Foundation is to advance human welfare. The Study Committee's conception of the basic elements of human welfare is presented below.

Fundamental to any consideration of human welfare is human survival. All efforts to prolong life, to eradicate disease, to prevent malnutrition and famine, to remove the causes of violent accidents, and, above all, to prevent war, are efforts to forward the welfare of man.

The improvement of physical standards of living is clearly a basic part of human welfare. Living standards can be considered high enough only when the inhabitants of this country and the entire world have been freed from undue anxiety about the physical conditions of survival and from inordinate preoccupation with obtaining those conditions. Of course, the goals of human welfare are not merely survival and the improvement of physical standards of living. Not until the physical requirements of life and good health are well met may men progress toward the fullest realization of their mental, emotional, and spiritual capacities. All are essential to the achievement of human welfare.

**HUMAN DIGNITY** — Basic to human welfare is the idea of the dignity of man — the conviction that man must be regarded as an end in himself, not as a mere cog in the mechanisms of society. At heart, this is a belief in the inherent worth of the individual, in the intrinsic value of human life. Implicit in it is the conviction that society must accord all men equal rights and equal opportunity to develop their capabilities and must, in addition, encourage individuality and inventive and creative talent.

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

**PERSONAL FREEDOM AND RIGHTS**—Also basic to human welfare is the right of each person to enjoy the largest measure of liberty consistent with the equal claims of other persons. Freedom cannot, of course, be absolute but must be enjoyed under a rule of law so that all may share equally in its benefits and opportunities.

Human welfare requires tolerance and respect for individual, social, religious, and cultural differences and for the varying needs and aspirations to which these differences give rise. Within wide limits, every person has the right to go his own way and to be free from interference or harassment on grounds of nonconformity.

**POLITICAL FREEDOM AND RIGHTS**—The Committee believes that inherent in the concept of human welfare are freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of association; self-government; justice; and the right and opportunity of every citizen to play a real and effective part in his government.

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE DUTY OF SERVICE**—Human welfare also requires that power at all levels and in all forms—political, economic, or social—be exercised by those who possess it with a full sense of social responsibility; further, that every person recognize a moral obligation to use his capabilities, whatever they may be, so as not merely to avoid being a burden on society, if he can help it, but to contribute positively to the welfare of society.

## HUMAN WELFARE AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

The Committee's concept of human welfare is closely related to the ideals of democratic peoples—belief in human dignity; in personal freedom; in equality of rights, justice, and opportunity; in freedom of speech, religion, and association; and in self-government as the best form of government. Through the fuller realization of these ideals the life of the

individual would become more productive, purposeful, gracious, and secure. In the belief that any successful attempt to improve the lot of mankind must be made on terms compatible with these fundamental principles, the Committee used them as a base in estimating the gravity of human welfare's problems and as a standard in considering programs for their solution.

Democracy does not, of course, consist of the numerical aggregate of these principles or in the exaltation of one at the expense of another. It consists rather in a meaningful relationship among them, resting always on the fundamental conviction of the dignity of man.

These democratic ideals represent for the Committee a particularly significant expression of human welfare since they emphasize man's most crucial problems — the intricate relationships among human beings and social organizations, now so heavily marked by tension and disorder.

While our ultimate concern is with the individual, it is clear that only in society can his full development take place. Modern man cannot forsake society in search of freedom; freedom, for him, exists only within and by means of the social order. Men are no freer than the arrangements and conditions of society enable them to be. In the complex modern world large-scale and complicated arrangements are necessary to provide the social and economic conditions under which freedom can be assured. One of the primary functions of government is to ensure the presence of such conditions, guarding continuously, however, against the danger that in the process it may take over too many of the individual's activities or decisions, and thereby undermine his moral energy and initiative.

Recent developments have brought increasing general awareness of how dependent men are on one another. No longer can individuals, or nations, retreat into self-sufficiency. Men live together whether they want to or not; all are thrust, from birth, into an immense network of political, economic, and social relationships. This interdependence can be the most

abasing of conditions in societies where men are enslaved as tools of other men or of a state machine; it can be the source of greatest satisfaction if it means the enrichment of personal life by the sharing of the best by the most — through a realization of common interests, common efforts, common humanity, and common fate.

Our political institutions do not themselves constitute democracy. They can only establish a climate in which democracy may flourish. Majority rule and peaceful concurrence by the minority, which are terms of democracy, have validity only when the majority exercises its power both with restraint and with concern for the problems and attitudes of the minority. Both sides must have that essential respect for themselves and for each other which makes them unwilling to be either masters or slaves.

Our political institutions will, then, have real meaning and a good chance of survival only if they reflect a way of life in which all the myriad nonpolitical associations and relationships between people and organizations breathe the spirit of democracy. When the democratic spirit is deep and strong in a society it animates every phase of living: economic, social, and political relations among groups and nations, as well as personal relations among men. This integration of democratic ideals with the life of individuals and with society can be realized only when it is lived — when it has become an established attitude and custom, a way by which men work and live each day of their lives — not just an abstract theory. Only then will democracy permeate the entire structure of our society, bringing with it a wide diffusion of contentment and confidence.

The real meaning of democracy for the people of this or any generation lies in how it is interpreted in action, how it is applied in their daily lives, in the means it uses, and in the character of its institutions and practices. No one pretends that democracy here or elsewhere is now perfect or that it will ever become perfect. For this is the essence of

democracy, that it is a system of principles and not of rigid rules, that these principles must be reinterpreted as times and conditions change, and that the need for new interpretation and application will always exist.

Clearly, therefore, in speaking of democracy, the Committee is not thinking merely of the form of our institutions and organizations, which are but means or instruments for men's requirements. To identify present forms too closely with democratic ideals is to make idols of the forms, thereby hindering their improvement for the service of mankind.

In times of uncertainty many people tend to resist change, in the illusion that democracy and its institutions are made more secure by an unchanging order. This, we believe, strikes at the very heart of democracy by denying to it the right to grow. For democracy's greatest strength lies in its ability to move constantly forward in action toward the increasing fulfillment of people's needs and the greater achievement of its goals. It is man's faith in this ability which assures the survival of democracy.

#### DEMOCRACY ON CHALLENGE

During its investigation the Committee was constantly reminded that democracy is on challenge in the world today. A great new foundation can thus most appropriately make its entrance into human affairs with a reaffirmation of democratic ideals and with the expressed intention of assisting democracy to meet that challenge and to realize its ideals.

The crisis in the world today requires that democracy do more than restate its principles and ideals; they must be translated into action. We must take affirmative action toward the elimination of the basic causes of war, the advancement of democracy on a broad front, and the strengthening of its institutions and processes. National conduct based solely upon fear of communism, upon reaction to totalitarian tactics, or upon the immediate exigencies of avoiding war, is defensive and negative.

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

If such a defensive attitude is allowed to control our planning and thinking, our national effort will be diverted unduly to expedient and temporary measures from the more important tasks ahead, and we may grow like the thing we fight.

When democracy is threatened by war we must be prepared to defend it by military action. But military strength is not enough. We must at the same time press democracy forward by reaffirming its principles in action. Without the resulting internal vitality and stability, national security in the long run is unattainable.

## THE ROLE OF A FOUNDATION

This view of democracy is one of challenge to a modern foundation. By the character of its response The Ford Foundation will determine the degree to which it will help carry toward maturity the modern concept of philanthropy.

The history of philanthropy is the record of a continuously evolving philosophy of giving. At one time the gifts of individuals and benevolent organizations were intended largely to relieve the suffering of "the weak, the poor and the unfortunate." Philanthropy was thought of merely as temporary relief for evil conditions which would always exist and about which nothing fundamental could be done. With the establishment of the modern foundation a much greater concept came into being. The aim is no longer merely to treat symptoms and temporarily to alleviate distress, but rather to eradicate the causes of suffering. Nor is the modern foundation content to concern itself only with man's obvious physical needs; it seeks rather to help man achieve his entire well-being — to satisfy his mental, emotional, and spiritual needs as well as his physical wants. It addresses itself to the whole man and to the well-being of all mankind.

A foundation is, by its nature, especially well equipped for this task.

It has no stockholders and no constituents. It represents no private, political, or religious interests. Most foundations may, if they deem it wise, expend their total resources within any period they wish. This freedom from entanglements, pressures, restrictive legislation, and private interest endows a foundation with an inherent freedom of action possessed by few other organizations.

Further, a great foundation possesses an extraordinary stature in the public mind. By law, as well as by its charter, it is dedicated to human welfare. Its responsibility is to the public as a whole. In political and social issues it cannot be partisan. This very nonpartisanship and objectivity gives to the foundation a great positive force, and enables it to play a unique and effective role in the difficult and sometimes controversial task of helping to realize democracy's goals.

The breadth of The Ford Foundation's objectives imposes a duty on it to put its resources at the disposal of those who can contribute most significantly to the advancement of democracy. The Foundation must be constantly alert to the problems and needs of our society; it must continuously stand ready to help in those strategic areas where the greatest progress can be made toward democratic goals, and wherein human needs and aspirations can be most effectively fulfilled.

The needs and problems of human welfare far exceed the total of all available foundation funds. Of the two billions of private monies expended annually in the United States for philanthropic purposes, only three percent are provided by foundations. Yet foundations have succeeded in making contributions of the greatest benefit to mankind. The real significance of a foundation's spending lies not in the amount expended but in the care and wisdom with which its programs are selected.

These facts clearly indicate the need for the Foundation to concentrate its support upon those problems which are at once the most important and which obstruct progress in the most directions. Successful



## THE FORD FOUNDATION

work upon them is likely to have the effect of a catalytic agent. Such concentration means, of course, that support will not be available for work in other areas; this is an inevitable result of selectivity. The Trustees and officers of the Foundation must at all times remain alert, however, to the dynamic nature of the needs and problems of human welfare and must stand ready to reorient their programs as conditions and opportunities change.

The Foundation is free to interpret its own function in society and to act boldly in implementing that interpretation. The opportunity is great; the responsibility is equally great. If the opportunity is met with foresight, good sense, and courage, it is our opinion that the Foundation can play a vital role in the furtherance of democracy, and consequently in the advancement of human welfare.

## CHAPTER II

### PROBLEMS OF HUMAN WELFARE

THE Study Committee has analyzed the problems of modern society in the light of its conviction that the advancement of human welfare lies in the increasing realization by men everywhere of democratic objectives.

Among the numberless problems which beset mankind, the Committee concentrated upon those which now appear most important—those which affect the greatest number of people and most severely restrict their achievement of the goals of democratic society. Its findings are set forth below.

#### THE THREAT OF WAR

##### 1. *America in the International Scene*

The Committee and its advisers agree unanimously that the most important problem confronting the world today is to avoid world war—without sacrifice of our values or principles—and to press steadily toward the achievement of an enduring peace. There was varying opinion concerning the imminence and probability of war but full unanimity upon its consequences: the total involvement of all peoples, the vast destruction of human life and material resources, and the possible obliteration of the conditions necessary for democratic survival.

In analyzing the problem of war, the Committee was guided by its conviction that efforts to remove the basic causes of war must be unremitting. The current exigencies of international tension demand and deserve our serious and sustained attention; and the Study Committee

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

and its advisers emphasized the need for adequate military preparedness and for international measures to protect the free world against aggression. Nevertheless, the Committee was convinced that, in addition, we must not diminish but must accelerate endeavors to build the world-wide foundations and structure for permanent peace.

The underlying causes of war are many—poverty and disease; the tensions which result from unequal standards of living and economic insecurity; racial conflict; and the forces generated by political oppression and conflicting social theories and beliefs. Half the people of the world are either starving or lack adequate food, and illness and disease are widespread. Such conditions produce unrest and social instability, and these, when aggravated by ignorance and misinformation, produce a climate conducive to conflict.

The comparative good fortune which favors this country enables it to help mitigate these conditions. Even when this action requires departure from our traditionally passive foreign policy, national interest dictates such a course as well as concern for the plight of other peoples. Detachment offers no safety in this closely interdependent world; a threat to peace anywhere endangers the security of all.

The strength of the free peoples of the world to resist totalitarianism and to achieve the conditions of a durable peace lies in their continuous advancement toward democratic objectives. Men submit to authoritarianism when hunger and frustration undermine their faith in the existing order. Faith in any order can survive only where that order holds more hope for the future, if not more benefit for the present, than does the totalitarian alternative.

As the tide of communism mounts in Asia and Europe, the position of the United States is crucial. We are striving at great cost to strengthen free peoples everywhere. The needs of such peoples, particularly in underdeveloped areas, are vast and seemingly endless, yet their eventual well-

being may prove essential to our own security. To improve their living standards they must import and use knowledge, guidance, and capital. The United States appears to be the only country able to provide even a part of the urgently needed assistance.

Ignorance and misunderstanding add greatly to the unrest which stems from material lacks. The ignorance of the uneducated poses a danger as great as prejudice induced by the suppression or distortion of information. And our own ignorance of other peoples—of their traditions, institutions, and aspirations—diminishes the effectiveness of our efforts for international cooperation. When knowledge and ideas go unshared the minds of men have no common ground upon which to meet. Yet in many parts of the world ignorance and misunderstanding are fostered by political restrictions upon the free interchange of information and ideas—by barriers to travelers, scholars, and students, and by the exclusion or censorship of radio, motion pictures, newspapers, magazines, and books.

Further, the world lacks international machinery adequate to ensure that the rule of law shall govern relations between nations and make all countries secure from aggression. The institutions intended to achieve international security have not yet proved powerful enough.

All the Committee's advisers recognized that the achievement of lasting peace will require the maximum exercise of man's intellectual, scientific, and moral capabilities. In the present world crisis we must seek to control those explosive situations which might at any time precipitate war, but at the same time we must not permit ourselves to be diverted from the fundamental task of constructing an enduring peace.

## *2. The Domestic Scene Under the Threat of War*

A careful appraisal of the effect of the world crisis upon the functioning of democracy here at home led the Committee to several conclusions.

## CHAPTER III

# FIVE PROGRAM AREAS FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF HUMAN WELFARE

### *INTRODUCTION*

**WHAT** should The Ford Foundation do concerning today's problems of human welfare? In what areas and in what ways can it contribute most to the increased realization of democratic goals, and thus to the advance of human welfare?

In the Committee's opinion the most important problems of human welfare now lie in the realm of democratic society, in man's relation to man, in human relations and social organization. Even the largest of foundations, however, could not support simultaneous attacks upon all the important problems embraced in this area; careful choice is obviously necessary.

In selecting the programs which follow, the Committee has been influenced by a number of considerations. Since The Ford Foundation does not have sufficient resources to undertake the solution or alleviation of all problems, it should concentrate strategically upon those areas showing maximum promise of progress, including the relief or elimination of significant factors which tend to block it. The less risky, though often more expensive, task of following up any break-through would be left to others. By proceeding in this manner the Foundation can remain sufficiently flexible to redirect its operations to strategic attack upon still other important problems as conditions change and circumstances warrant.

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

From this viewpoint the Committee faced the task of selecting from many important problems the ones which should, in its opinion, receive prior attention. For maximum effectiveness the Committee sought problems common to a number of areas of human welfare, so that the solution of one problem would contribute to the solution of others.

The Committee found it necessary to consider the relative urgency of problems. Almost any problem can be attacked by efforts to solve it quickly and directly, with perhaps only temporary success, or by more basic work requiring greater time and effort but leading, at least in some cases, to more permanent results. A problem's urgency is therefore an important guide in determining whether to attack it on a short-range or a long-range basis.

In analyzing the problems of human welfare in the light of these considerations, the Committee reached several conclusions. First, that the exigencies of the world crisis and of present political and economic problems require immediate attention. Program Areas One, Two, and Three are directed toward the establishment of peace, the strengthening of democracy, and the strengthening of the domestic and world economy. While efforts in these areas will also involve long-range work, they are directed in large measure toward immediate objectives.

More basic and long-range efforts are needed, however, for more lasting contributions toward these goals. No enduring solution of many present crucial problems can be achieved until we remove the deficiencies resulting from the acute shortage of leaders throughout our society, and until we can reduce the alarming prevalence of public apathy, ignorance, and irresponsibility. This requires a broad strengthening of our educational system. Program Area Four is directed primarily to that end: to the improvement of education in order that we may have an increasing supply of qualified leaders and a more alert and enlightened public.

The evidence of individual and group unrest, dissatisfaction, and con-

## FIVE PROGRAMS

flict suggests, however, that education is no cure-all. The Committee has concluded that permanent progress toward the solution of most of the problems heretofore discussed — from war to individual adjustment — requires a better understanding of man himself. Every one of these problems ultimately involves man and his conduct and relations with other men. Efforts to increase such understanding must be intensified. Program Area Five has this as its purpose: to learn more about man, what he needs and wants, what incentives are necessary to his productive and socially useful life, what factors influence his development and behavior, how he learns and communicates with other persons, and, finally, what prevents him from living at peace with himself and his fellowmen.

The Committee noted that this time range of possible programs corresponds in some degree, though not completely, with the three general approaches to problem solution which a foundation may sponsor — research, education, and application. Research, involving the search for new knowledge, may provide the most basic solutions but it generally requires much time; education, including academic preparation and all types of dissemination of information, tends also to be lengthy but may produce results more quickly than research; while application, which focuses existing knowledge directly upon problems, may be expected to produce results at shorter range.

The five program areas recommended below are not therefore completely distinct in method or unrelated in content. On the contrary, they were chosen with regard to their interrelation and with full confidence that progress in any one would contribute to success in the others. In fact, the Committee believes that substantial progress in each depends heavily upon some success in all the others. Further, activity in no one of these program areas is restricted entirely to one approach; each of them in fact involves in varying degrees the principal approaches of established effectiveness: research, education, and application.

**PROGRAM AREA ONE:  
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE**

THE FORD FOUNDATION SHOULD SUPPORT ACTIVITIES  
THAT PROMISE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORLD  
PEACE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORLD  
ORDER OF LAW AND JUSTICE.

*The Foundation should support activities directed toward:*

- A. *The mitigation of tensions which now threaten world peace.*
- B. *The development among the peoples of the world of the understanding and conditions essential to permanent peace.*
- C. *The improvement and strengthening of the United Nations and its associated international agencies.*
- D. *The improvement of the structure and procedures by which the United States Government, and private groups in the United States, participate in world affairs.*

**IN THE opinion of the Committee and its advisers the transcendent importance of preventing war and preserving peace requires that The Ford Foundation support immediate efforts toward this end.**

The Committee's earnest desire to discover ways to minimize the probability of war is balanced by the sober realization that effective action toward this end is extremely difficult. The primary responsibility for coping with the problems of war rests in the hands of national governments and the United Nations. In no way can a private foundation take an official part in diplomacy or international affairs. Nor is the Com-



mittee unaware of the relative insignificance of the resources which The Ford Foundation might devote to this task, in comparison with the substantial sums expended by other foundations and private agencies, to say nothing of the billions of dollars spent by government.

#### NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

A realistic appraisal of the international situation nevertheless leads, in the Committee's opinion, to the conclusion that time is short and that effort supported by the Foundation, if it is to lessen the likelihood of war, probably must have its effect by 1955. The world crisis, intensified by the atomic arms race, is of the first urgency. In terms of the United Nations as an organization, one thing is clear: by 1955, the year in which the Charter of the United Nations automatically comes up for review, the world will have profound evidence as to whether the United Nations will ultimately become an instrumentality capable of maintaining world peace.

This Committee believes that activities supported by the Foundation must, to be effective in the immediate future, have a prompt impact upon the policies of national governments or the United Nations — either directly through responsible officials or indirectly through the effect of an informed and interested public opinion. Such an impact may be achieved by aiding in the formulation of policies, by assistance in improving the procedures by which they are planned and carried out, or by help toward developing public understanding of the issues and their significance.

The bases of enduring peace cannot, of course, be constructed within a few years. We shall indeed be fortunate if in our lifetime we make substantial progress toward lasting peace between nations. Small beginnings on this long-range task must, however, be undertaken now;

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

for if war is averted in the months ahead, we will still face the endless task of building a permanent world order of law and justice.

Program Area One is therefore based upon the premise that the avoidance of war is, in the state of the world today, the greatest single contribution to lasting peace. Recognizing the urgency of conditions which might precipitate conflict and the great need to strengthen the structure of international organization, the program area is focused on activities and projects of immediate effectiveness.

## POSSIBLE FOUNDATION CONTRIBUTION

The Committee believes that there are significant opportunities for The Ford Foundation to support endeavors which will have an impact upon national or United Nations policies or procedures. This support may be tendered in two ways. First, by giving direct assistance on request to those responsible for the formulation or execution of policy—research to develop facts, analyses of the issue at hand, or advice from expert consultants interpreting such data. Second, assistance to responsible officials may be given indirectly, by helping create the public awareness and understanding necessary for the execution of policy in a democratic system. To do this, the facts must be gathered, interpreted, and made public.

Opportunities to serve in these ways must inevitably change rapidly, and the feasibility of a particular undertaking at any given time will depend upon factors not now foreseeable: upon international conditions, upon the nature of specific projects welcomed by national governments or the United Nations, and upon the availability of men with the capabilities and prestige required for the job. Perhaps more than in any other program area, specific recommendations regarding what the Foundation can and should do must therefore be made by its officers and staff.

### 1. *Direct Aids to Policy Makers*

The United States and the United Nations have large staffs to provide the data required for the formulation of policy. Nevertheless, a comparatively small amount of help from private agencies may greatly increase the effectiveness of policy formulation and furnish independent information and advice by which policies may be checked and evaluated. This, of course, is no new observation. Government has always relied on the services of universities, private research institutions, and the press to provide a part of the information it requires for policy decisions. The Department of State, for example, with all its widespread network of facilities for collecting information abroad, has always been eager to have the supplementary information and criticism of independent students and observers.

The national Government and its agencies are handicapped in some ways by the nature of their position, as, for example, in obtaining reliable information from abroad. Data secured exclusively through official channels involve the danger of arousing the reactions that inevitably follow official inquiries, and the equal danger of getting information which is not wholly free from bias. Inquiries from private sources can often avoid these dangers. Moreover, domestic political considerations sometimes hamper efforts to get necessary data. The executive branch, for example, must guard against investigations which the legislature may regard as infringing on its prerogatives. Nongovernmental efforts are relatively free from such limitations.

Furthermore, the United States urgently needs to coordinate its entire foreign policy, which in practice means coordinating a great variety of official agencies. This involves problems of organization and procedure which are often difficult to study in an official setting, because the officials themselves, as well as their powers and jurisdictions, are involved. The

Congress and many of its major committees, the President and his Executive Office, all executive departments, and most of the independent agencies and regulatory commissions play various roles in international political and economic affairs. Many obstacles block the exchange of information among these bodies on any given issue; even to assemble pertinent information about the procedural and organizational problems involved is difficult, since each agency is sensitive about its jurisdictional privileges. The Executive Office of the President may study the organizational problems within the executive branch, but even this office experiences great difficulty in coping with certain problems of fundamental importance, such as determining how the executive branch can best work with the two houses of Congress and their major committees.

In many other situations our Government or the United Nations may welcome impartial and expert aid in the formulation of policy. Certain problems are of such fundamental nature that official agencies often find it difficult to achieve the objectivity necessary to arrive by themselves at definitive conclusions. Like all human endeavor, statecraft is fallible, and there is need for independent and objective analyses of important problems, regardless of whether the results agree with or differ from existing or proposed official policy.

Further, the officials of the United States and the United Nations operate under tremendous pressure of responsibility for daily decisions on current issues. They do not always have time to analyze long-range problems or to anticipate them in advance, and their personnel systems are occasionally not flexible enough to provide the experts needed for temporary purposes.

A number of critically important questions, the independent study and analysis of which would greatly assist the United States Government, arise in connection with the strength of the United Nations in the area of security. Is it advisable that the United Nations be given the enforce-

ment machinery provided for in Article 43 of the Charter, including the armed forces necessary to maintain international peace and security? Should efforts be made to establish a system for the regulation of armaments, as provided in Article 26? What is the relation of international control of atomic energy to the attainment of world security? Are amendments of the United Nations Charter necessary to general security arrangements? What is the relation of the veto to such security arrangements? Do such arrangements require an additional transfer of sovereignty to the United Nations, and to what extent is such a transfer feasible?

The Government faces similar difficulties in the question of channeling foreign policy through the United Nations. What relation should E.C.A., the North Atlantic Pact, and military aid to Western Europe bear to the United Nations, and to what degree and in what manner should their activities and those of other departments and agencies be conducted through the United Nations?

Examples of other urgent problems with similar foreign or domestic implications include: the policy of the United States in the event of Soviet withdrawal from the United Nations; the attitude of Congress toward the United Nations; and the need for general review of the United Nations Charter, and the whole system of international organizations including the United Nations, with respect to fundamental structure and their ability to do their jobs.

The United Nations operates under limitations similar to those affecting the United States Government. The U. N. would, for example, experience difficulties in single-handedly formulating policy with respect to such matters as the adequacy of the information and public relations program of the United Nations, the proper power and discretion of the Secretariat, or the relationship between the United Nations and other official international or regional organizations.

In sum, foundation-supported activities can, where such private aid

is proper and officially welcomed, provide important supplemental assistance to our Government or to the United Nations in the formulation and execution of policy. A foundation's private and independent status enables it effectively to support efforts which government might not properly or adequately undertake alone. A foundation can support studies and analyses by special committees, individuals, or research institutes where official agencies are hampered by foreign or domestic political considerations or by the appearance of self-interest. It can assist in the analysis of fundamental issues or policies where our Government or the United Nations may lack objectivity, talents, or time. It can, in appropriate situations, make available to the State Department or to the United Nations expert knowledge and judgment on important subjects. And it is relatively free to look ahead and attempt to anticipate problems upon which independent advance thought and study are of considerable importance for the adequate formulation of policy.

## *2. Policy and Public Understanding*

Our Government and the United Nations cannot effectively formulate or execute policy in international affairs without public understanding and support. While in some instances such understanding and support are automatically shaped by events, or created by the President, the State Department, or Congress, in numerous situations independent aid can be of significant supplemental value. This is particularly true where policy is initiated by the executive but is subject to later Congressional action, either in the form of appropriations or ratification.

Obvious limitations surround executive efforts to achieve wide public understanding of policies requiring legislative approval. Furthermore, official policy will generally be the better as a result of criticism by responsible and objective private groups and institutions and, when adjudged sound by them, such policy will have a better chance of public support.

Independent and nonpartisan efforts to secure the relevant facts and judgments and to make them widely available to officials, to interested groups, to the press, and to the electorate at large can thus render important assistance. This does not imply that a foundation should sponsor or support activities designed to propagandize the views of the State Department or any other agency or group. Quite the contrary, it must at all times preserve impartiality and objectivity in its activities, and if the results of undeniably expert and objective analyses are contrary to or critical of existing policy, their wide dissemination is perhaps even more important.

Foundation success in this field may at times require activities in public education long in advance of official policy formulation. In fact, a foundation can make a most significant contribution by anticipating critical issues and by stimulating awareness and understanding of them in advance of governmental action. Government is greatly hampered when public understanding lags behind the realistic requirements of international policy formulation.

Further discussion of agencies or mechanisms whereby such aids to policy makers and to the public understanding of policy might be provided is contained in Program Area Two and in Chapter IV.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE

The Committee and its advisers believe that the maintenance of peace depends in large part upon the willingness and ability of nations to improve and strengthen the United Nations to the point where that organization becomes, in fact, the structure of a world order of law and justice. As a nation we have placed our faith in the United Nations as the instrument for this purpose.

Before this goal can be fully achieved many problems must be solved

within the framework of the United Nations—problems which in their sweep and complexity seem almost overwhelming. In the course of this series of great tasks, many traditional concepts, such as that of sovereignty, will be subject to scrutiny and redefinition. The answers to the multitudinous problems which today stand between the United Nations and the full realization of its purposes will, in the final analysis, depend upon the supporting attitudes and policies of its member nations. The United States must therefore stand prepared to meet these problems, and their impact upon our interests, policies, and security, with vision and courage equal to the troubled times in which we live. The years immediately ahead are crucial, for upon the wisdom of decisions to be made within this period may hang the world's hopes for peace.

#### LONGER-RANGE EFFORTS

In stressing the primary importance of efforts which will have an impact upon official policies prior to 1955, the Committee is aware that many of these efforts, such as those designed to strengthen the United Nations, will— if successful—have effects lasting many years.

The Foundation's resources are limited; it cannot diffuse its efforts. It will be besieged with requests for the support of long-range projects directed toward peace, many of which relate to the four objectives of this program. The uncertainties of the future are such that the Study Committee does not recommend support for activities whose results will not be felt until after 1955, except in certain limited areas. These areas concern the education and training of persons for high level policy making in international affairs, plans for aid to underdeveloped areas of the world, and measures to increase international understanding and open the channels of world communication.

The conduct of international affairs requires men and women of the



highest competence and intellectual stature. Notwithstanding the gravity of the world situation, government is unable to find, attract, and hold either the quality or number of persons required. While the Committee fully recognizes this urgent need, it is also conscious of the fact that significant results cannot be achieved within the space of a few years. But it does believe that efforts toward this end must commence now.

The Committee further believes that the need to develop better leaders at high levels is equally as great in domestic as in international affairs, and that the processes for developing such leaders are the same in both spheres. General procedures whereby we may hope better to locate, train, and use persons of potential competence and stature are discussed in Program Area Four on education.

The Committee is aware of the great difficulties and complexities involved in efforts directed toward the improvement of the underdeveloped areas of the world and toward the increase of international communication and understanding. Despite its belief that foundation activity in these areas is unlikely to produce extensive results in the immediate future, the Committee believes that, because of their fundamental importance to permanent peace, the Foundation should explore the potentialities of efforts in these fields at an early date. Such explorations must be made in careful conjunction with private agencies and with the agencies of the United States and the United Nations working in these areas, and in the light of the rapidly changing international situation.