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INTRODUCTION TO THE MULTICULTURAL PHILANTHROPY CURRICULUM PROJECT

Giving and voluntarism are deeply ingrained traditions in American life. Yet these activities are frequently overlooked in the curricula of the nation’s colleges and universities, or mistakenly portrayed as the exclusive province of elites.

To address this, the Center for the Study of Philanthropy at the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York is developing a variety of materials to illuminate the significance of philanthropic activities at every level of society. A series of curriculum guides is one of several resources designed to encourage the development of undergraduate, graduate and extension courses on multicultural philanthropy.

These materials reflect a variety of disciplinary approaches, examining the ways in which eleven different (but not necessarily mutually exclusive) groups—women, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, African Americans, Latinos, Northern Europeans, Southern and Eastern Europeans, Middle-Easterners, South and Southeast Asians, and East Asians—historically used their gifts of time and money to create nonprofit institutions, forge public/private partnerships, promote social and legislative change, build communities, and participate in public policymaking at the local, state and federal levels.

Each curriculum guide considers a variety of factors including: 1) the traditions of charity and mutual aid that different groups brought with them to the United States; 2) the ways in which these practices were adapted to the American social and political context; and 3) the role of philanthropy (i.e., the giving of time, money and/or valuables for public benefit) in enabling each group to claim a public role within the American democratic system.

Identification of the relevant literature has been another important goal. Each guide includes an annotated bibliography and additional bibliographic citations, which ultimately will also be available as part of a regularly-updated, comprehensive, on-line database on international philanthropy. Additional information on the on-line bibliography can be obtained by visiting the Center’s website at: www.philanthropy.org.

The curriculum guides and annotated bibliography, together with the other components of the initiative—volunteer guides, video/television programming, faculty seminars, and a Distinguished Lecturer series—reflect the Center’s ongoing commitment to enhancing public understanding of the role that philanthropy has historically played within the multicultural mosaic of American society.
As part of its education program to alert people to the presence, treatment, and prevention of endemic disease, the Rockefeller Foundation encouraged every means to dramatize Public Health efforts (Lee County, Mississippi, 1919)

Photograph courtesy of the Rockefeller Archive Center

Wrapping bandages for the Red Cross during World War I. Present in the photo are: John D. Rockefeller 3rd, John D. Rockefeller Sr., John D. Rockefeller Jr., Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, and Abby Rockefeller. Photograph courtesy of the Rockefeller Archive Center
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American political debates have recently focused on the scale and function of the American state. Critics from both the right and the left have charged that it has become too large, too centralized, and inefficient. Even today the historic tension between nostalgic notions of a flourishing unfettered capitalist economy amidst a democratic republic and the idea of a powerful, centralized global power, providing its citizens with prosperity, equality and a generous social welfare safety net animates much of our political discourse. Philanthropy plays a crucial role in these discussions, as it has in the history of the country, by providing nonstatist, private means through which citizen services may be provided.

This course explores the relationship between philanthropy and the American state, examining the process by which the state expanded its programs, institutions, and influence over more and more of both civil and political society. The first several weeks provide an overview of the nineteenth century, chart the rise of a national economic and cultural order, and demonstrate how philanthropy itself adopted the organizational structure and long term planning view of the corporation.

Between the 1920s and the 1960s, the American state underwent several periods of dramatic expansion: World War I, the New Deal, World War Two, the Cold War, the civil rights movement, Great Society legislation, and national cultural (NEH, NEA) initiatives. The expansion of the state was accompanied by an even larger proliferation of private, philanthropic institutions which helped shape public and private policy through the organization of volunteered time, money, and expertise.

The progression of state expansion did not simply result in the state adopting responsibility for areas historically dominated by the private
sector. Rather, expansion often occurred within the context of a commitment to relying on private knowledge, expertise, and institutions in the development and execution of public policy. It also occurred within the context of a liberal political structure which tried to remain decentralized, ad hoc, and essentially private. Philanthropic institutions played an important part in contributing to the contradictory development of a large-scale state that kept the trappings of a restrained government that depended for crucial input upon a third sector of volunteers.
Week 1  Introduction: Placing Philanthropy in Context

This week looks at the American political tradition, focusing on its ideological origins and the interrelation of democracy, capitalism, freedom, and aspirations for citizen security and equality.

At the end of the nineteenth century the modern organization of nation-states had been established. In England, Germany, and France the state shaped the transformation in a process driven by public aims and the imperatives of statecraft. During the same time, the rise of the American modern state, however, was more influenced by an openness to experimentation than the firm guiding hand of an established elite. Lacking guidelines, characterized by improvisational vigor and a chaotic potency, the process evolved through individual decisions. The private strategies of business men molded American corporate capitalism. And they were able to array a large coalition of Americans around a form of government quite sloppily identified as *laissez-faire*.

More than today there was a large area of civic life that lay outside the boundaries of government. Large numbers of the unemployed received no assistance. Welfare as we know it did not exist; neither did unemployment insurance, housing assistance, medical care, food stamps, nor social security. Local governments did not themselves construct bridges, or parks or museums. Schools, even those accepting public funds, were often privately run. Yet the needy were helped, civic amenities were erected and the children of indigent workers had a chance at education.

Side by side with government, there operated a range of organizations whose aims, though quite disparate, were to influence the quality of social, civic and public life in America. This is what is here meant by philanthropy: “the giving of time and money for public benefit.”
Discussion and Research Topics

The first week introduces the main ideas and issues of the course, relating philanthropy, liberalism, democracy, individualism, and capitalism. Discussion might focus on the rise of big business, industrialization, the central role (or conception) of the “private” and the “individual” in capitalism and liberalism.

1. What is civil society?

2. What is the relation of public need to private rights?

3. How does a culture, that emphasizes private solutions to public problems, address such issues as poverty and the effects of industrial inequality?

4. Why would a society that trumpets *laissez-faire* also accept the notion of a philanthropic imperative?

Recommended Readings

ON PHILANTHROPY


Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America, Book II, chapters 5-7.*
ON LIBERALISM


Week 2

Nineteenth-Century Philanthropy

This week provides a broad overview of nineteenth-century philanthropy, which tended to be informal, individualistic, and ad hoc.

Early nineteenth-century capitalism was rural, agricultural, and competitive, but individuals lived in interdependent families and communities, relying extensively on kin and neighbors. Local government was small and ineffective and viewed many social and economic issues as functions of individual choice as opposed to government responsibility. With the state playing a limited role in the lives of Americans, religious groups, benevolence associations, and assorted volunteer combinations provided charity, education, fire protection and other services.

Most philanthropy in the nineteenth century was limited and local, as typified by the history of education and the provision of welfare services. The role of missionaries in the nineteenth century offers another interesting insight into the limited state, with missionaries serving virtually as agents of international relations, maintaining cultural and intellectual ties with other nations, and providing American entrepreneurs, scholars, public, and state officials with the best available information about other countries.

During the mid-to-late nineteenth century more systematic and organized philanthropic activities emerged, many of which were public-private partnerships. This is typified by the establishment of large civil institutions, such as museums and parks, particularly Central Park in New York City. Two more examples of philanthropic efforts now achieving a wider importance were the Civil War Freedmen's Bureau and the U. S. Sanitary Commission. In these instances, philanthropic individuals and groups collaborated with the state. They provided the expertise and most of the funding, while receiving either limited public monies, special charters or land. Despite such organized efforts, nine-
teenth-century philanthropy was episodic insofar as it was organized around specific projects and rooted in the aim to serve specific communities.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. Discuss the ways in which the public and private sector work together to shape civil society. Does this expand democracy or does it limit and circumscribe it?

2. Why were philanthropists more concerned with the pursuit of civic grandeur than with the needs of the poor? Did they expect anything in return for these displays of largesse?

3. Discuss the role of museums in society. How do museums make a difference in the lives of urban citizens and in the tone of a city and its culture? Why would wealthy individuals contribute their holdings to public museums?

4. Do missionaries fit the philanthropic mold?

Recommended Readings


Week 3  

Gospel of Wealth

This week examines the rise of corporate capitalism and the reorganization of the economic and social order. At the end of the nineteenth century the America of independent farmers made way for a nation of dependent workers. The corporation drove much of this transformation. Breaking with traditional modes of organization, it served as an integrating force: it operated on a national, rather than local, scale; it consolidated diverse entrepreneurial and productive practices and integrated what had been separate or tangentially related local economies. The shift in the economy undermined the autonomy of local communities and paved the way for the emergence of a new national economy.

Elite philanthropists furnished many cities like New York and Chicago with an imposing cultural infrastructure. These cities could not pretend to the grand cultural importance of Paris or London but their wealthy patrons helped make them into world cities with museums of art and natural history, zoos, botanical gardens, opera houses, symphonic halls, and public libraries.

Some interpreters suggest that these were all part of a larger effort on the part of a new elite to lay claim to social significance by creating a distinguishing cultural environment. Thus, the privileged sought to erect class barriers around the plays of Shakespeare. They campaigned to keep the New York museums closed on Sundays, the one day when workers could come with their families. They became expert devotees of the venerated paintings of the European masters and the great music of the respected composers. By “sacralizing” art into high culture, the argument goes, they sought to “invent a tradition” only to hijack it for themselves.

But others have viewed this very differently. Responsibility cannot be put off for long. Leading men of capital recognized the danger of seg-
regulated cultures. If the lower orders were to be educated in a common moral order, if they were to share an esteem for "knowledge, piety and taste" and be exposed to the civilizing influence of culture they must be granted access. By endowing museums, orchestras and libraries, "responsible capital" made the grand legacy of high culture available to the masses.

Either way, philanthropy became a much more complicated matter. It possessed a class texture and was more than the simple act of selfless giving for the greater glory of the polis.

The founding elite of the early republic were Virginia planters. Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe fastened upon the nation the ethos of Richmond and Monticello. But after the Civil War the new leaders were neither farmers nor southerners. Urban-based corporate capitalists Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller were not only pioneers in the corporate economy but also advocates of private responsibility for civil society.

In an 1889 article entitled "Wealth," Andrew Carnegie asked what the rules are for employing the unprecedented riches being assembled by men of his ilk. He proclaimed capital's moral duty to commit the same aggressive ardor employed in getting rich to systematically plowing these profits back into society. The man who dies rich, Carnegie preached, dies disgraced. Carnegie went on to build libraries, colleges and cathedrals while funding educational trusts, scientific research and peace organizations. Following his credo, he distributed more than $350,000,000 in his lifetime.

The pioneers of industry negotiated between the nineteenth-century conception of philanthropy as local and limited and a new more national philanthropy which was directed toward integrating the nation. Rockefeller provided philanthropy to Baptist institutions and hired the Baptist minister Frederick T. Gates to organize his philanthropy. Carnegie's organized program of library construction was both specific and individual as well as national and systematic.
Discussion and Research Topics

1. How does culture relate to social order? What is the relationship of liberalism to governance? Of civil society or "cultural capital" to social order? Is there a moral argument at the core of Social Darwinism?

2. Why would there be a need to create a unifying cultural standard? Did it not exist?

3. Why did Rockefeller, and others such as Carnegie, go to some lengths to rationalize their behavior when they could simply have said: "This is my money. I made it. I enjoy it."

4. Why did early giving have much to do with the church?

Recommended Readings


Helen L. Horowitz, Culture and the City: Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago from the 1880s to 1917 (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1976).


Week 4  Progressive Era Reform

This week provides a broad overview of Progressive Era reform movements in order to illuminate the changes in *laissez-faire* economics and politics. After Reconstruction, reform movements sought to modify the emerging centralized political and economic order. The Populists demanded government subsidies to ensure the survival of the independent farmer; women's suffrage was a means to ensure political purity in an era of seemingly increased political corruption; federal regulation of railroads (ICC) sought to ensure economic stability and thus preserve competition; prohibition sought to provide moral leadership; and the professionalization of knowledge and industry was a means to ensure both efficiency and success based on merit rather than patronage or class.

The responses to corporate capitalism were a complex mixture of public and private demands for increased regulation of the market and a more just social order. Between 1890 and 1920, the state expanded its activities, adopting civil service reform, expanding the army, regulating business, extending suffrage, and supporting prohibition. These activities, however, were still primarily limited to economic regulation and not yet involved in issues of social, intellectual, and cultural leadership.

Still, as many of these reform movements recognized, the first step in making these changes was to expand the powers of the state. In the name of varied and often conflicting goals, reformers found that their crusades intersected over one issue: the growth of the state and its responsibilities.

As the locus of state power expanded, debates turned upon several issues: the precise steps that the state should take to correct abuses and inequities; the extent to which the state itself could become abusive or destructive of democratic rights; whether state control could lead to a weakening of American individualism; how the state should go about its
interventions, especially in view of the country's division of governmental power between states and central authority.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. What was the relationship between private philanthropy and public policy in the Progressive Era?

2. How effective was private philanthropy in transforming the social function of the state?

3. How did major events, such as mass immigration and the U.S. involvement in World War I, effect the state-private philanthropy relationship?

4. Ultimately, did the expansion of state authority curtail democratic rights as feared by some?

Recommended Readings


Week 5  The Rise of the Large Philanthropic Foundation, 1890-1920

In the Progressive Era, as Americans pursued a search for order, they extended the rule of the expert to many new areas of society, confident that problems could be solved through good will, investigation and organized effort.

Complex factors shaped Rockefeller and Carnegie’s willingness to establish large philanthropic institutions: the fear of social decay (e.g. uncharted urbanization, the dangers of segregated cultures), religious imperatives, and the emerging national economic order which systematized production. Philanthropy during this era was transformed, adopting the professional, rational, expert character of the corporation. It sought to reform the social and intellectual order through professionalization.

Elite philanthropy became institutionalized along corporate lines, seeking to guide, direct, and disseminate rational, expert knowledge and to inform policy-making. Philanthropic institutions sought to reform established systems of giving, making philanthropy more reflective of the emerging large-scale, national economic and social order.

This week provides a broad overview of the establishment of philanthropic institutions, such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board, and the Carnegie Institution of Washington.
Discussion and Research Topics

1. Discuss changes in the organization of philanthropy. Did the rise of philanthropic institutions violate or reaffirm liberal ideas about the decentralization of power?

2. How was the new institutionalized philanthropy different from the less formalized philanthropy of the nineteenth century? Discuss or analyze the missionaries' focus on knowledge, education, and cultural practices compared with the early twentieth-century focus on education.

3. Suggest possible targets of philanthropic research—e.g. unemployment, poor housing, discrimination—and match the list you would have created with the targets of philanthropy early in the century. What accounts for the difference?

4. To what extent did science and expertise reinforce and show continuity with established/traditional ideas?

Recommended Readings


For more detailed and focused studies on education, professionalization, and philanthropy, see:


This week focuses on the role of elite philanthropy in the development of science and medicine. During its first two or three decades, modern philanthropy concentrated on the natural sciences. Science was seen as objective and rational, and often identified as the root of American prosperity and progress. The scientific method empowered human inquiry, by opening knowledge to empirical evidence and analysis.

The scientific paradigm fit with the economic and intellectual culture of capitalism and liberalism insofar as it was oriented around expert and rational knowledge, it flourished in the private sector and not the state, and was based on the hierarchy of merit rather than patronage or class. Science moved forward because of intelligence, ingenuity, and rigor and was seen as driven by laissez-faire democracy.

Science provided philanthropy a model for how to remake the social order. While science progressed through the creation of highly trained professional intellectual communities, so did philanthropy conceive of the creation of new expert intellectual communities (dominated by scientists, medical experts, and social reforms) who could remake the social world along scientific, rational, and expert lines. Foundations and philanthropists focused on the creation of medical knowledge hoping to eradicate disease, disseminate hygiene information, and create a healthier, more efficient physical environment.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. Discuss the scientific method.

2. Discuss the transfer of authoritative knowledge from religion to science.
3. Discuss the transformation of the university and the professionalization of knowledge.

**Recommended Readings**


The Great War and the Volunteer Tradition

The First World War marked an important shift in the role and scope of the government and in the relation of philanthropy to the state. Americans had for a long time viewed war as a European malady. George Washington had warned against foreign entanglements. When World War I broke out many hoped to keep Americans off the killing fields. And for three years this aspiration resulted in a policy that was more or less neutral. Americans hoped that neutrality and the free exchange of goods and ideas would keep America out of the quagmire.

Once the U.S. did enter the war, the national commitment to liberalism and the ideal of a small state meant that the government did not have the institutional power, networks, and precedents to command the private sector (which had control over resources). Embroiled in war, “the most destructive of all wars,” in President Wilson's phrase, the nation faced the reality of conflict with no governmental apparatus to centralize the response and mobilize the effort. The small state was forced to turn to the private sector in order to mobilize.

Wilson would base the government's management of war on so-called “dollar-a-year men” who were volunteers from the corporate sector. Private individuals “volunteered,” lending the private sector's great expertise and leadership skills to the public effort.

The public-private partnerships of WWI were typified by the War Industries Board (WIB), which helped provide the domestic scaffolding for the war. Many similar boards were set up which drew upon the expertise of volunteers from industry and the foundations. The combined effort strengthened the bond between these two sectors and the perception of a common outlook and agenda. Little wonder that Americans would soon be hearing that what was good for business was good for America.
Another example of the government's reliance on private philanthropy was typified by the Red Cross, a private agency which took on wartime responsibilities for the government ranging from the provision of sexual prophylaxis to medical and recreational assistance.

Herbert Hoover and Bernard Baruch provide interesting examples of the voluntarist, associationalist approach that characterized so much of the domestic American response. Hoover directed food relief programs in Europe in an unofficial capacity for the U.S. government. He raised relief funds from American businesses, voluntary associations, media groups, religious organizations, and individuals. Hoover's "philosophy," referred to as cooperative individualism or associational voluntarism, suggested that laissez-faire capitalism's unfettered competition should be moderated by cooperation between the business community and the state to assist the needy through charity. Bernard Baruch made his fortune on Wall Street, served as a critical adviser to Wilson and directed the WIB.

In the aftermath of the war the U.S. pursued the ultimate progressive goal: a rational basis for ending war forever by creating a bureaucracy—the League of Nations—that would mediate international controversies, put an end to force and create a viable international community. But the treaty establishing the League was not ratified by the American Congress.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. Discuss the philosophical and practical tensions between a free and open market and war time needs for efficiency and rapid response.

2. What were the implications of running a war with men drawn from industry and corporate America?

3. Why were philanthropists and foundation officers during this period devoted internationalists? What conception of politics, liberalism, and human nature did this position believe?

4. Discuss the range of responses in the business community to the war.

5. Why did the League of Nations idea fail to capture American support?
**Recommended Readings**


The First World War and the crisis surrounding mobilization helped initiate a re-evaluation of the public-private sector relationship. The war, the heated post-war debate over the structure of peace, the domestic scenes of turbulence over race, radicalism and labor all contributed to a form of retrenchment variously termed normalcy, isolationism or an end to progressivism.

Those who believed that economic and social stability required expert knowledge and directed planning, found this era of foreign and domestic political retrenchment troubling. In response to the state's and the public's repudiation of leadership in planning, foundations, elites, philanthropists, and scholars formed coalitions to establish institutions to cultivate and disseminate expert social scientific knowledge. Applying the scientific paradigm to the social world, social science proponents hoped to discover the proper organization of society and economy and thus re-make the social order along more efficient, harmonious, and productive lines.

The process of creating social scientific expertise proceeded to develop solutions to issues of public import. The development of knowledge, expertise, and policy took place in foundation think tanks. Foundations and social scientists worked together to launch research projects and issue reports that were to provide the knowledge base for government to shape public policy. In this way the foundations that were the engines of philanthropic research envisioned a collaborative, advisory role in the running of the state.

This week's focus is the rise of social scientific and policy making institutes, such as the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the Brookings Institution, and the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER). They served as critical centers in the creation of a new policy-making elite and dramatically altered the institutional balance in the making of public policy.
Discussion and Research Topics

1. The settlement houses, islands of individualistic reform, underwent significant changes in these years giving rise to a professional corps of social workers. Discuss the implications and how this related to the topic of this week.

2. How did philanthropy help shape university programs for the development of expertise?

3. To what extent did the development of “independent” and “autonomous” intellectual institutes reflect a commitment or a repudiation of liberalism? For example, what was the position of the leading philanthropic foundations on the issue of immigration restrictions?

Recommended Readings


The rejection of the League of Nations was a renunciation of an international agenda, which had America leading a global transformation to a liberal, democratic, and capitalist order. Foundations and missionaries had long advocated internationalist policies with American leadership promoting the peaceful resolution of international disputes. The repudiation of the League denied internationalist elites, such as Elihu Root and Nicholas Murray Butler, the public sanction necessary for American leadership.

Despite this repudiation, the foundations established private centers which would maintain relations between nations and develop domestic knowledge about different parts of the world. Like the social science centers, these internationalist centers were predicated on the idea that the development of rational, enlightened, and expert knowledge would result in effective rational policies. The centers were also predicated on the idea that non-statist institutions should take a leading role in the development of knowledge and social and international relations.

Internationalist elites argued that relations between nations were not just between governments, but between scholars, artists, businessmen, cultural institutions, and students. Thus, the private sector and not the state was central to the maintenance of peace. Internationalists hoped that American participation in the League of Nations would provide official sanction to a more participatory global relationship. Without this sanction, elite philanthropy began to establish the institutional infrastructure for a private foreign policy elite.

The creation of an internationalist foreign policy establishment to generate expert knowledge and maintain relations with individuals and groups in diverse nations took several forms. One was the establishment of institutions like the Peking Union Medical College which sought to
promote American values of expertise, democracy, and knowledge in other countries. Another was the development of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) to promote intellectual, cultural, and political dialogue among scholars and policy-makers in different countries. The IPR provided an institutional structure to exchange ideas, hoping that increased dialogue would lead to better understanding and thereby reduce the causes of war. A third form of foreign relations institution was typified by the Council on Foreign Relations, which sought to bring together American elites to discuss and collaborate on foreign policy issues.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. How large was the State Department in the 1920s?

2. How was foreign policy developed in these years; who were the players?

3. What were the priorities of American foreign policy in these years?

4. What were the principles of foundation-based foreign policy?

5. The creation of the various kinds of independent institutes brought heretofore marginalized people into the centers of policy making. For instance, the IPR brought together scholars of diverse political backgrounds and disseminated their ideas. Did these institutes reaffirm or challenge established class or political ties?

6. Also, to what extent did philanthropists and foundation officers' commitment to liberalism and the free exchange of ideas allow diverse political views to be asserted?

Recommended Readings


The Great Depression and the Crisis of Philanthropy

The end of the 1920s brought a stock market crash followed by a wholesale collapse of the free enterprise system. Hoover's faith in capitalism and the associative state remained unchallenged. Accordingly he kept the existing economic and policy-making system already in place. Hoover, like so many others, saw associationalism and private experts as the keys to sustaining American democracy and prosperity.

Hoover's model of voluntarism ultimately failed: private experts were unable to remedy the economic downturn. Hoover, nonetheless, sought to stay within the limits of voluntarism, by relying primarily on consensus building. Despite some initial cooperation from business, Hoover's request that corporations keep workers on the job was ignored. Hundreds of thousands of American workers ultimately lost their jobs. The private philanthropic world continued to study and analyze expert medical, scientific, and social science knowledge, but made no attempt to dissect the problem of the Depression. Voluntarism and philanthropy proved incapable of addressing a problem that would soon engulf all of the resources of government.

Franklin D Roosevelt became president by promising to provide broad and decisive leadership. Roosevelt offered a more flexible approach, one that at least hinted at expansion of government responsibility. Drawing on the example of the expansion of state power during WWI he promised to launch a complex of programs to fight the Depression with the authority and power granted Wilson to fight World War I.

This week has two foci. The first is on Hoover's presidency, particularly his failed attempts to rectify the economic crisis, and his ultimate loss to Roosevelt. The second is on the New Deal, which marks the establishment of the modern American welfare state. This week provides a broad overview of New Deal programs, and charts the eclipse of elite private institutions as players in New Deal planning.
Though the New Deal programs altered the social outlook from a reliance on self plus philanthropy to a reliance on the self plus the state, the government during this era increasingly adopted the tools and methodologies of foundations:

It drew upon the expertise of academic specialists who formed the Roosevelt Brains Trust;

It employed the meliorative elements of the philanthropy method. It did not question the rights of private property. It did not move to make revolutionary change in the economy. Banks and industry were allowed to remain private. Wealth was not redistributed;

In such programs as the National Recovery Act (NRA) and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA), it used the planning approach that the foundations advocated.

**Discussion and Research Topics**

The literature on elite philanthropy during the Depression is sparse. As research topics, students should investigate how foundations and the centers of expertise that they supported (like Brookings, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Bureau of Economic Research) coped with the crisis. In addition, in regards to foundations and elite think tanks, the following questions should be answered.

1. Did their elite culture isolate them from the devastation of the Depression?

2. Were they at work on other options for meeting the crisis?

3. Did they find that the crisis, which was taxing government to its full extent, was simply beyond their capacity for response?

**Recommended Readings**


War in any fashion imposes challenges and changes. All the more so in the United States which had almost convinced itself that World War I had been a war to end all wars. For as long as it could, the nation had staved off the thought of war and the attendant preparations for war. Now when combat finally became unavoidable, the nation had to make a rapid about-face, mobilize, and put itself on a war footing.

War footing required even deeper levels of control over the economy than the economic depression had involved. Control over allocation, distribution and the establishment of national interest priorities all involved unprecedented regulation over the economy. Individuals with backgrounds in industry, business and the academy were brought into government, massively expanding the opportunities for public-private partnerships.

At the same time, traditional good works were extended to the families of the men who were called off to war. More significantly the nature of the enemy—a militaristic, totalitarian, and genocidal coalition—resulted in an outpouring of patriotic activities. Volunteers wrote pamphlets, made films, sold bonds, collected scrap metal, wrote letters to service men, and provided entertainment all in the name of the good war. Scientists, imbued with the same spirit of fighting to save democracy and the “American way of life,” worked round the clock to develop new weapons, ultimately creating an atomic bomb.

A number of important foundations had been involved in international activities, even in the period of American isolationism. Now they extended those involvements and exploited them to further American efforts in the global conflict. What had been dismissed by some as a trifling academic interest in foreign cultures and life overseas suddenly became a very important commodity. Scholars who had learned Japanese were suddenly a national asset in decoding information and
providing insight into a different mind set. The war gave retrospective legitimacy to the work these foundations had been doing in the thirties. The argument about the utility of knowledge in such fields as, for example, Asian culture, so difficult to make in times of peace and self absorption, now took on new salience. The need to know as much about the world as possible, created by the needs of war, would last far into the next generation and set the agenda for much foundation activity.

Indeed the aftermath of war would set at least three new agendas for philanthropy:

1. The desire to create a firm peace, through international coalitions committed to peace at any cost, opposed to militarism, especially the spread of the bomb.

2. The Cold War paradigm of a bifurcated world order in which the U.S. takes the lead among those nations that support and establish democratic institutions. One important example is the Marshall Plan and the related development of policies in support of foreign aid to rebuild Western Europe.

3. A new level of private public cooperation in dealing with the survivors: the refugees. Millions had been displaced by the war, and millions more had been made specific racial targets of the Nazis. The combined result was an uprooting of such proportions that the U.S. and its allies were forced to confront the challenge of international relief and refugee policy on a massive scale.

Discussion and Research Topics

1. How much difference do you think it made to the entire process of war and peace that there had been more that 25 years worth of foundation interest in world peace?

2. What was learned from the World War I mobilization effort—especially in the matter of the use of volunteer experts drawn from business—that helped shape the effort in the 1940s?
3. Discuss the impact of a war footing—replete with regimentation and war powers that approach the absolute—on public-private partnerships.

4. How were foundations brought into the war effort and what role did they want to play?

5. Discuss the role of foundation experience in shaping the decisions and positions taken by key foundation personnel in such matters as:
   a. The decision to drop the bomb
   b. The steps that led to the Cold War
   c. The Marshall Plan and the development of the UN, NATO and SEATO.

6. The war created enormous displacement. What were the foundations and individual American philanthropies willing to do in a period that one historian has described as the time when no one was his brother's keeper?

7. The post-war situation presented public policy foundations with a bundle of new challenges. Which were the major foundations that turned to matters of foreign policy and ideology and what did they do to either insure their independence or to create a close relationship with government?

**Recommended Readings**


Week 12  The Cold War: Redefining Education & the Attack on Freedom

In the decades following the Second World War, the state extended its interest and its role in education and the production of knowledge. The GI bill expanded government involvement in colleges by offering a vast veteran population tuition assistance. But in the light of the Cold War, knowledge—scientific, technological and humanistic—came to be viewed as a crucial resource. It took no great imagination to understand that the Atom Bomb was born of scientific advance or that technology was a factor in national defense.

Rather than demobilizing after the war, a consensus emerged that American global leadership was necessary to safeguard against future war and to contain the Communist threat. The crisis of mobilization during both world wars indicated that the market did not meet all the nation's needs and that many of those needs, especially the creation of academic expertise and technology for warfare, were essential to national security.

Both foundations and the state increasingly funded scientific research, which seemed to hold the key to American national security. In addition, in 1957 Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which dramatically expanded the scope and level of federal funding for education. In this new environment academic experts increasingly operated in both public and private roles to help shape public policy.

The expansion of the state through the absorption of the programs, policies, and individuals of the private sector, also led to a weeding out of segments of American intellectual, cultural, and philanthropic life that, in the context of nationally-directed thought, were judged suspect. Internationalist associations like the International Institute of Education, the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), and the Rockefeller Foundation came under heavy fire for being penetrated by subversive
ideas. In 1949, when communist forces successfully took control of China, many anti-communist politicians demanded to know why the U.S. had not supported the Nationalist movement more vigorously. The early 1950s saw a vigorous attack on Asianists, with the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and the IPR subjected to a virtual witch hunt.

Policymakers were not the only ones being attacked. Writers, teachers, intellectuals, and moviemakers are just a few of the vast number of Americans who came under the purview of an expanding state, which was increasingly concerned with how American openness, liberalism, and intellectual freedom potentially undermined American national security. Ideas, culture, and civil society were politicized in a new and dramatic way in the 1950s.

**Discussion and Research Topics**

1. Did the expansion of the state violate traditional American ideals of decentralization? Or did the character of state expansion conform to or modify established ideas?

2. Was the role of the expert elevated or “politicized” by the changing responsibilities of the state? Did the character and function of the university change? If so, how?

3. How did McCarthyism effect the operation of the foundations and think tanks?

4. What was the nature of the differences between intellectuals and bureaucrats?

5. How did the culture of politics in the state differ from the culture of politics in academic and artistic communities?

**Recommended Readings**

**ON “REDEFINING EDUCATION”**


**Recommended Readings**

**ON “THE ATTACK ON FREEDOM”**


Week 13

Beyond the New Deal

The War brought an Atomic Era, and few who did not live in those years can appreciate the age of terror ushered in by the bomb. But it also helped bring in a period of unprecedented affluence. This was perhaps the single most striking aspect of the post-war economy. Out of a severe and crippling depression and a global war, the U.S. emerged with a booming economy that promised to spread prosperity far and wide. In such eras in the past when Americans became confident about their own livelihood, they had been asked to concern themselves with the needs of others less fortunate; the post-war era was no different.

The post-war pursuit of domestic comity led to important initiatives in interreligious coalition building, in civil rights, in expanding the rights of women. All of these efforts were driven in part by reform groups, led by volunteers, and in time, assisted by foundations.

John Kenneth Galbraith and others wrote less than approvingly about the Affluent Society and its consumer culture. And Michael Harrington reminded Americans that there was yet another part of their nation, a segment less conspicuous, and less pride inducing. This Other America was “invisible”. People did not pay much attention to the poor, the needy, the disadvantaged, cried reformers like Harrington. Even unions ignored the transient farm workers who were often immiserated immigrants, paid abysmal wages and housed in coops. There were too many marginal Americans who lived at the edge of the economy and in the rush of so many Americans to maximize their own good fortune, these individuals were just so much road kill.

The extension of government into sectors heretofore deemed private was not ended, nor even seriously debated after the war. The New Deal policies of social security, unemployment insurance, graduated income tax and other policies of social welfare and mild income redistribution were kept, even after the proximate cause of the Depression faded.
Before his death FDR called for an extension of these policies and Harry Truman, too, called for keeping alive the spirit of the New Deal. But it was not until John F. Kennedy's New Frontier and, much more significantly, Lyndon Johnson's Great Society legislation that the public-private partnership took another quantum leap.

Under Lyndon Johnson, changes that had been set in place with the New Deal culminated in the passage of legislation that expanded the guarantees that the government was willing to make to its most needy citizens, creating a safety net of welfare, health assistance, educational opportunity legislation, and facilitating community mobilization. Much of this legislation grew out of the agenda promulgated by liberal philanthropic foundations. While there seemed to be broad consensus on making war on poverty, a minority complained about the antidemocratic assumptions of “social engineering” programs.

The statistical and conceptual underpinning for these policies came from the work that was done during the fifties and early sixties by a variety of private foundations. With the presidency of John F. Kennedy, intellectuals drawn from these foundations and from a circle of favored academics were brought into government, as a fresh version of the brains trust; others wrote policy studies and were brought into the circle of policy discussions by way of an emerging liberal network of reformers and advocates. The same mentality that sent a Peace Corps to spread the abundance of American know-how (and to firm loyalties to the U.S. in the midst of a Cold War) suggested that no society was safely perched above vast disparities in economic sufficiency.

Important new programs including the War on Poverty, Head Start, Job Corps, Vista, Medicare and Medicaid, Federal subsidies for Higher Education, Model Cities and Food Stamps, brought to fruition a liberal agenda that had been developed by reformers and volunteers, foundations and activists, ideologues and idealists, all of whom formed a vital third sector in the decade preceding the enactment of the Great Society. Many of these programs had subordinate agendas in addition to their immediate goals. One very powerful goal lying just below, and in some cases sharing, the surface of these new programs was the desire to empower the disadvantaged, to give them a voice, and a hand in their own futures. This too came out of third sector demands and advocacy studies calling for extending American democracy in a meaningful fashion. Others went further to demand full economic equality.
Given respect and salience by this new national turn, philanthropic foundations became adjuncts to government, thinking about new agendas, laying the groundwork and then lobbying for the passage of new legislation.

It was under Johnson also that Americans began to pay attention, on the federal level, to the challenge of subsidizing the expansion of Art and the Humanities. The historical relation of the private and public sector to the arts and humanities is long and complex. Philanthropy played the major role in supporting the arts through a variety of joint ventures with the public sector. Public support was erratic and small scale until 1965. Advocates of sustained and systematic federal support for culture in the 1960s included such influential philanthropists as John D. Rockefeller, III, August Heckscher of the Twentieth Century Fund, and the American Council of Learned Societies. In each case, foundations and private individuals played a role in helping to lay the intellectual and political groundwork for significant legislative departures.

**Research and Discussion Topics:**

1. The fifties have often been described as a conservative decade. How did foundations both feed this conservatism and challenge it with new ideas?

2. Chart the impact upon voluntarism and private-public partnerships of such phenomena as:
   
   a. McCarthyism  
   b. Civil Rights protest  
   c. Policy of containment and internationalism  
   d. Baby boom issues  
   e. Prosperity

3. Discuss the work that took place in the fifties developing and publicizing the ideas that would form the liberal agenda of the mid and late sixties.

4. What was the relationship between foundations and the emergence of powerful think tanks that did research and policy formation?
5. As the agenda for change took root a variety of volunteer organizations and pressure groups recognized the possibilities for greater salience and moved to lobby for the inclusion of their pet ideas or their interests in activist government policy. Discuss two such examples.

6. Discuss the origins of the Peace Corps and the models of voluntarism upon which it was based.

7. What were the goals of maximum community involvement in the Great Society supposed to accomplish? How? Did it?

8. Discuss the impact on art and artists when patronage shifts from private donors to the public arena, as for example in the case of the NEA.

Recommended Readings

ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE INITIATIVES


**ON CULTURE**

Of particular importance to NEA were two foundation reports: The Rockefeller Brothers Fund Panel study of *The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects* published in 1965, and *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, a Twentieth Century Fund volume by William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen.


Race and Cultural Politics in the 1960s

In an era of expanded government, the state turned to the issue of race relations. Reconstruction had not solved the central challenge of creating a basis for integrating freedmen and women into American social, economic and political life. Indeed, many of the former slaves and their families were left in a depressed condition that led to massive migrations north in the early 1900s. But relocation resulted in concentrated racial ghettos, that were often economically devastated and subjected to discrimination.

From the turn of the century on, elite philanthropic institutions like the General Education Board sought to integrate the South and southern Afro-Americans into the national cultural order by modernizing southern education. Beginning in the 1920s and 1930s, foundation-supported eugenicists used pseudo-scientific methodologies and data to argue for various policies and programs concerning blacks and immigrants.

Another, admittedly thinner, strand of reform opposed such racialist thinking and fought racial inequality and discrimination. This cause was a decidedly underplayed aspect of American reform. Nor were many of the better known reformers necessarily free of their own taint of racial feeling. Following WWII, however, this movement gained strength particularly when the war made clear the genocidal implications of extreme supremacist thought.

Foundations played an important role in studying the issue, in publicizing its terrible price, and in helping mobilize a full-scale reform effort. The Carnegie Foundation marked a new era in elite philanthropy and race politics when it funded Gunnar Myrdal's *The American Dilemma*. Myrdal's study focused on white Americans and argued that their conceptions, attitudes, and policies towards Afro-Americans contradicted the "American Creed" of egalitarianism, freedom, and opportunity. White American fear, loathing, and oppression of blacks, declared the
study, was irrational and generated a moral dilemma in the American mind and social order.

Myrdal's study made a major impact on the politics of race in the 1940s, a time when blacks were making important contributions to the war effort and white violence against blacks had increased. While Myrdal's study expanded discussions about race, it also circumscribed them. Myrdal's focus on the "moral" and ideological challenges of racism downplayed the role of class and economics in generating inequalities. He had an optimistic view, arguing that America was "progressing" toward a more open and democratic system of race relations.

The aftermath of the study helped anneal a civil rights coalition that had begun to form during the war. By 1954 this coalition, drawing upon the academy, foundations, and religious groups, had helped to reverse close to a century of social policy undergirded by the doctrine of "separate but equal." The coalition mounted a judicial challenge leading to the historic Supreme Court decision in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas. This turning point was followed by a decade of intense third sector civil rights activity, involving nonviolent protest, legal challenges, political mobilization, and a steady drumbeat of moral suasion that ultimately led to the passage of comprehensive reform legislation in 1964.

The Civil Rights struggle engaged the nation and served as a model for an insistent expansion of equality. It lead to greater assertiveness among America's many ethnic groups and to an expansion of political mobilization on the part of ethnic reform groups.

Elite philanthropy's evolving role in discussions about race is significant in part because it brought the power of established foundations behind an aggressive campaign to realize the promise of America as a free and just society. By virtue of its position in the class hierarchy, elite philanthropy's support for the struggle helped fortify the movement and give its liberal credo broad credibility.

**Research and Discussion Topics:**

1. Discuss the difference between state-based efforts to deal with the issue of racial inequality and the efforts of unofficial reform groups.
2. Process itself is often as important as results. In the Civil Rights movement the coming together of coalitions to effect public change created an internal discourse among activists and reformers, professors and protesters, public officials and the disadvantaged. This internal discourse ultimately spread to the media, to the streets, to the campuses creating a momentum for change that was far larger in impact than the limited ends of any one group of activists. Can this process be abstracted and replicated elsewhere?

3. Some have argued that by involving itself in issues of racial equity the state was pulled into a new sphere where its size and unwieldiness makes it inevitable that corrections will overcorrect, that melioration will overshoot the mark creating its own distortions and inequalities, that using a sledgehammer for delicate surgery will only result in a botched effort. Is this argument valid? If it is, could the changes that were needed have been addressed without state power? How do you create a calculus for all of these considerations?

4. Much of the early effort at ending segregation was aimed at the schools. Why? Was this a good tactic? What impact did it have on education and on the mixing of academic with social goals?

5. In the sixties the non-violent Civil Rights Movement made way for change. Discuss the basis for these changes and the role of voluntary groups in causing this. How did foundations react? How did private-public efforts, as perhaps signified by the Werner Commission Report, attack this issue?

6. Compare the process that brought change in the status and legal rights of women to the process that did this in the area of racial equality. Discuss two significant similarities and two significant differences.

**Recommended Readings:**


Introduction

Elite American philanthropy, typified by foundations and research institutes, is in a state of crisis. Critics from the left charge that elite philanthropy controls and protects ruling-class interests, while critics from the right use philanthropy's vitality as a means to justify state retrenchment and the abandonment of a host of social programs. The place of philanthropy in the evolution of the modern state, the development of social programs, and the organization of knowledge is ambiguous. Elite philanthropy aimed to provide national leadership by creating knowledge and expertise while maintaining the liberal ideal of a small state and privately constituted power. However, this system has not generated consensus among different groups of politicians, policy-makers, academics, and activists.

This historiographical essay on twentieth-century elite philanthropy in the United States is divided into four broad sections. The first charts historical changes, documenting the rise of foundations; the second focuses on the literature on foundations; the third on foundation-supported centers of expertise (the Social Science Research Council); and the fourth on recent issues in the field, which includes works on a range of philanthropic, knowledge-producing activities. Closely related to discussions about foundations and knowledge production are larger debates about the internal and external structure of policy formation and the evolving relationship between the state, expertise (scholars, universities, learned societies) and the private sector. This essay is in no way exhaustive, but aims to identify the broad contours of scholarly analysis and to illuminate the areas which warrant further research.

Foundations and Philanthropy in the Late 19th and 20th Centuries: An Historical Overview

by Ariel Rosenblum
In the nineteenth century, power, knowledge, and philanthropy were organized locally. Americans lived in agricultural communities in which they produced the goods that they consumed; political power was exercised through parties and the practice of patronage, which promoted local political participation; philanthropy was individualistic, ad hoc, religious, and utilitarian; knowledge was attained through the local community while universities and learned societies were the domain of elites. At the turn of the century, there was a shift from the laissez-faire, entrepreneurial, and competitive capitalism of the nineteenth century to the large-scale, corporate, managerial capitalism of the twentieth. Economic changes undermined the local nature of American communities, creating a national economic, intellectual, and political order. These structural changes at the turn of the century broadly included: labor segmentation; the rise of a professional middle class; the secularization of knowledge; the eclipse of the party system by the rise of a semi-bureaucratic state; and the demise of the small farmer and the rise of the large corporation. Relevant knowledge shifted from the farm to the modern university, where expert, utilitarian skills were institutionalized. The new role of the university is typified in the “Wisconsin Idea” which envisioned the state university system as a great civil service academy. It sought to expand enrollments and to teach practical, productive skills such as scientific agriculture, mining and manufacturing.

Elite philanthropy was also dramatically altered, shifting from an informal, personalized system to a more professionalized bureaucratic one. The establishment of foundations (at the turn of the century) and centers of expertise (in the 1920s) reflected both continuity with and change from the past. Nineteenth-century voluntarism was religious, typified by efforts to aid the sick and poor and missionary work to spread Western, Christian ideas. Elite philanthropy became oriented around the creation of the social sciences to generate “expert knowledge” which could be used to understand and confront the social crises of modernity: class stratification and conflict, poverty, commercial complexity, and economic specialization. This knowledge was secular and support was provided through the organization of scholarship, endowments to universities, the establishment of research institutes (such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research), the operation of grants, the creation of the modern philanthropic foundation (such as the Julius Rosenwald Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation), and support to research and reform associations like the American Economic Association. Elite philanthropy
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played a critical role in organizing knowledge that would shape political programs and legislation and it helped guide and direct the development of the modern research-university system.

Elite philanthropy also showed continuity with the past insofar as scientific knowledge took on an evangelical character, promising to eradicate "un-naturalness," "dysfunctionalism" and moral, physical, and social "disorder" through the relentless pursuit of expertise. A new class of intellectual reformers emerged who made the social sciences and an expanded, more sophisticated university system the new locus of intellectual authority, replacing the nineteenth-century ad hoc coalition of missionaries and activists.² The boom in the social sciences was the counterpart to the concurrent development of the natural sciences and technology. Both promised objective solutions to complex problems, and objectivity itself was fervently pursued. The evangelicalism of knowledge was not limited to the natural and social sciences. It was also evident in broader philosophical trends of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

While scholars agree on the general characteristics of social, political, and economic changes at the turn of the century, there is little consensus about how to conceptualize the relationships between these changes. For instance, what is the relation between the rise of the modern university system, the demise of party politics, and the modern state? Was reform championed by an emerging middle class? or by a declining elite seeking to salvage its own authority? Was reform a natural, logical response to the rise of an industrial, urban society? or was it disinterested benevolence? How did the institutional location of knowledge production shape the kinds of ideas and knowledge that was produced or the kinds of questions that were posed?

The character of reform and philanthropy are central to understanding the nature of political, intellectual, and economic changes. The following review identifies important works in the field of philanthropy.

Foundations

Meticulous, scholarly analyses of foundations are an essential starting point in speculating about the shape of elite philanthropy in the twentieth century. This survey of the literature on elite philanthropy, foundations, and centers of expertise is primarily concerned with the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies, which played pioneering roles in the establishment of foundations. Clearly other foundations
(particularly the Ford Foundation) have also been important, but that literature is largely undeveloped.

The literature on foundations began to emerge in the 1950s. These studies tended to be broad overviews written by foundation insiders and program officers. They paint the history of a particular foundation in broad brush-strokes, rarely engaging in the specifics of issues or examining relationships over time. They tend not to place foundations and philanthropy in the social, intellectual, and economic context in which they emerged and operated. The histories of Russell Sage and the Bolling Foundation are typical of this class of works. The most sophisticated insider work was produced in 1952 by the president of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), Raymond Fosdick.¹ This is a comprehensive work which still stands as the best introduction to understand the RF. These insider-studies are useful because they provide a sense of the broad contours of foundation programs and personnel.

In the 1950s and 1960s important contributions were made to the study of philanthropy and foundations by Waldemar Nielsen, Charles Bremner, Merle Curti, and Joseph Kiger.² Nielsen provides a broad overview of the history and organization of the big foundations; Bremner analyzes the broader contours of American philanthropy, charting its ideological and organizational manifestations and showing both continuity and change over time; Curti focuses more narrowly on education or technical assistance, but, like Bremner, organizes a diverse and complex literature. Kiger documents the proliferation of America's professional national learned societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He explains the differences between councils, institutes, academies, and foundations, describing their histories, programs, activities, functions, and membership. Kiger's historical survey of American learned societies is an essential beginning point to understanding the relation of philanthropy to the organization of knowledge. These studies help establish the parameters of analysis, however, they are not specific or detailed in any sense.

Over the last decade and a half, scholarly interest in foundations has expanded more qualitatively than quantitatively. The work of Stanley N. Katz, Barry Karl, and Ellen Lagemann best exemplifies the new scholarship on foundations and philanthropy. Stanley Katz and Barry Karl's seminal article “The American Philanthropic Foundation and the Public Sphere, 1890-1930” analyzes the Progressive Era transformation of philanthropy, illuminating the rise of industrial capitalism (man-
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manifest in the corporation) and the complex needs of a technological, urban society which undermined traditional forms of charity. They explain that central to the American political tradition is the repudiation of a large state and a celebration of individual responsibility and initiative. Katz and Karl assert:

it was a culture which would have been threatened down to its partisan and regional roots by any attempt to create a nationally unified conception of social policy. Into the gap created by this impasse stepped the modern foundation, a system of national philanthropy—privately devoted to increasing the welfare of mankind.

During this time, foundations, rather than the state, implemented programs of long-term support which guided and directed civil society. Foundations sought to meet the needs of the new national, urban, industrializing economy because the state itself was weak and small. The private organization of expert knowledge and planning fit within the liberal ideal of a small state and a vigorous private sector.

Ellen Lagemann’s Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching analyzes how the Foundation reorganized education along more scientific and bureaucratic lines, serving as a potent force in the centralization and standardization of education. In The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy, Lagemann skillfully analyzes a diverse range of Carnegie Corporation (CC) programs. She charts the changing institutional ecology of policy formation, documenting the process by which academics, foundations, and government bureaucrats formulate policy. She examines the significant shifts in the CC’s philanthropic history, and explores the CC’s continuing commitment to liberalism, illuminating the complexities of maintaining a democracy in a world in which expert knowledge is the basis of power. Robert Kohler’s Partners in Science is also important. Kohler focuses on the changing role of foundation patronage in shaping the character and location of scientific knowledge production by examining the evolving relationship between the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies and university-based scientists.

The existing scholarly literature on foundations only just begins to point to the ways that foundations have participated in shaping the institutional and intellectual environment in which public policy, science, edu-
cational expansion, and cultural support of the arts and humanities was institutionalized. These studies are important narratives about the organization, operation, and evolution of philanthropic programs. They document how these institutions functioned in a changing economic and social order. However, important questions remain unanswered: how were individuals recruited? What were their intellectual, class, religious, and institutional backgrounds? How was the rise of foundations and other elite forms of philanthropy linked to the emergence of corporate-capitalism and corporate-liberalism? How did foundation programs shape intellectual specialization and professionalization? How influential were foundations in shaping university programs or academic pedagogies? What is the relationship between the declining influence of the two-party system and the rise of expertise and civil service reform? A more serious consideration of foundations and philanthropy can provide a new vantage for exploring the nuances of twentieth-century American history.

The second category of literature that deals with philanthropy, knowledge production, and policy formation focuses on centers of expertise, in particular, those foundation-supported institutions which developed knowledge and built consensus among experts. These include institutions such as the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the Brookings Institution, and the Institute of Pacific Relations. Robert Kohler points out that initially philanthropists established independent research institutes like the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research. However, these institutions were hampered by significant administrative and intellectual dilemmas. In addition, foundations were increasingly sensitive to accusations that they were “controlling” knowledge. By the 1920s there was a shift away from independent research institutions and foundations began to support the creation of a second tier of knowledge-producing institutions. This second tier of institutions sought to organize and develop practical, relevant knowledge by organizing a broader range of experts and diversifying the locations of knowledge production. While foundation boards included university presidents and lawyers, this second tier of philanthropic institutions had a more diverse class, political, and intellectual composition: it organized an amorphous group of academics, intellectuals, practitioners, internationalists, and activists, and helped institutionalize the ideal of the free and independent scholar who arrives at the objective truth through intense scholarly inquiry. Universities were considered the logical location of expert knowledge. They were
considered objective and non-partisan. They could provide the knowledge necessary to re-make the social and economic order. Support for centers of expertise was part of the foundation focus on developing expert knowledge.

The literature on centers of expertise and knowledge production is more exhaustive and can be divided into three broad categories. The first is written by left-oriented scholars who argue that the foundations and centers of knowledge which they maintain represent the interests of the ruling elite. This school includes Donald Fisher, who argues in *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council* that the RF and CC-supported SSRC developed politically interested, social scientific knowledge which legitimated capitalistic relations and domination by the ruling elite. Fisher argues that in the first half of the twentieth century, America was in crisis (typified by poverty, unemployment, labor unrest, and racial tensions). Business and government needed expert knowledge about social forces if they were to maintain the liberal-democratic capitalist system. The SSRC, and the foundations which supported it, were “sophisticated conservatives” who tried to harness social scientific knowledge to preserve the underlying social structure. The SSRC promoted expertise in areas related to state policy and national management. Its committees included: personality and culture (which assembled statistics on poverty and unemployment, among other things), international relations, industry and trade, public administration, and consumption and leisure. The state and the SSRC had an interlocking directorate. For instance, foundation-funded social scientists participated in state agencies and committees such as the National Resources Planning Board and the President's Recent Trends Committee. Fisher employs a Gramscian analytical framework, using the concept of hegemony to explain the role of social scientific ideas in the organization of power and knowledge. William Minter and Laurence Shoup's *The Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy*, argues that the RF-funded and CC-funded Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is the central forum through which the state and the private sector work together in the development of foreign policy which is protective of U.S. cultural and economic hegemony. In *Who Rules America?,* William Domhoff uses C. Wright Mills’ concept of the power elite and argues that conservative members of the private sector, the state, and the academy form an interlocking directorate that formulates policies to benefit the ruling class elite. Edward Berman's *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and
Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy and Arnove's edited collection *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* similarly contend that philanthropy serves as a guise for imperialism and the maintenance of ruling class elites.11

Less overtly critical, Abigail Van Slyck's *Free To All: Carnegie Libraries & American Culture, 1890-1920* is a social and architectural history of the Carnegie library program, which was responsible for the construction of over 1600 libraries. The examination operates on two analytically distinct, but interrelated levels: one is on library design and the professionalization of architecture; the other is on culture and politics, focusing on how Carnegie grants reflected and altered existing social patterns. The operation of the Carnegie library program illustrates the intersection of philanthropy, architecture and ideology, with buildings operating as part of a larger "cultural landscape" and serving as sites of social and political debate. This work provides thirteen case studies of the Carnegie library program, documenting the architectural and social transformation of the library, the evolution of the Carnegie program, and the different ways that the library functioned for different groups (politicians, immigrants, children, librarians, the intellectual elite, and the philanthropists). In the first decade of the twentieth century, Carnegie joined the emerging library reform movement which sought to make the institution oriented toward public education. The library was to be oriented around public consumption and operation. It was to reach out to working-class people and be operated by both municipal officials and private groups. Of particular importance is Chapter Four entitled "Taking: Libraries and Cultural Politics Part II." This chapter focuses on women's associations and participation in town libraries, illuminating the intersection of two differently organized philanthropies: one composed of small-scale, local women's voluntary groups; the other of the large-scale, systematic, professionalized activities of Carnegie. Carnegie's library program shifted the cultural authority of the library from women to municipal officials, thus altering the established organization of cultural power. However, this shift did not decisively alienate women, as can be seen in the increasing and ambiguous role of female librarians, who helped shape the meaning and character of the library.12

The second category of analysis is by scholars who analyze foundations and their subsidiaries in more benevolent terms. Robert Schulzinger in the *Wise Men of Foreign Affairs: A History of the Council on Foreign Relations* casts the CFR as a forum in which concerned, educated elites struggle with complex foreign policy issues. According to him, no sinis-
Martin Bulmer's *The Chicago School of Sociology* is a detailed narrative which focuses on the internal development and logic of sociological ideas and the professionalization of knowledge. This meticulous analysis documents the individuals and ideas that built the discipline, but pays little attention to the politics of knowledge or how these ideas functioned in a larger shifting political climate. Despite this, Bulmer's skillful analysis is a critical starting point to understand the rise of the social sciences.

Robert McCaughey's *International Studies and Academic Expertise* is the only historical analysis of the rise of international studies in the United States. McCaughey argues that prior to the Second World War, international studies operated in a decentralized, openly public intellectual environment. However, the Second World War and the Cold War politicized knowledge and shifted international studies into the isolated university. McCaughey is nostalgic for the days of "openness" when an eclectic, informal group of missionaries and internationalists dominated the intellectual scene and he laments the three-headed demon: professionalization, specialization, and state intervention ( politicization). He criticizes the state and celebrates the private sector, implying that the former represents "politics" (read: propaganda) and the latter "freedom" (read: truth). John Thomas' *The Institute of Pacific Relations and Asian Scholars* examines the McCarthy investigations into the RF-funded center for Asian expertise. Thomas documents how scholars were persecuted and eventually pushed out of positions of authority.

The two dominant schools on the function of foundations/centers-of-expertise are thus defined along political lines, with the left arguing a causal link between foundation support of knowledge production and the maintenance of ruling interests, and the "center" school arguing that these institutions are benevolent and too often victims of narrow-minded state policy. Despite these obvious differences, the two interpretive paradigms share important assumptions and methodologies. For instance, both conduct general studies which assert, rather than demonstrate, the function and interests of philanthropy and foundations. This is due in large part to the broad scope of their works. For example, in *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy*, Edward Berman tries to assess the impact of the three largest foundations on foreign policy in only 200 pages. He does not conduct a close analytical study which would show differences or tensions between foundation officers (and affiliated academics) and
bureaucrats. Rather, he assumes that they are identical. In addition, he leaves many important areas unexamined. Related to this is the distinction between access to policy-makers and influence over/in policy-making. Similarly, Schulzinger casts foundation program officers, scholars, and government officials as a homogenous, undifferentiated group acting in concert.

In addition, both schools of interpretation narrowly focus on locating power and influence in specific spaces. Domhoff locates power within the foundations and other elite centers of expertise, while McCaughey locates it in the state, which victimizes both the private sector and free thought. The former assumes that corporations, elite scholars and the state all share common interests and seek to maintain ruling class hegemony. The latter, however, juxtaposes the interests and politics of scholars and the state and instead sees an historical shift in which the state becomes the locus of influence at the expense of the private sector. McCaughey laments the secularization of international knowledge, nostalgically resurrecting the “golden age” when missionaries were the primary sources of knowledge. Despite such fundamental differences, neither group meticulously examines changing relationships within centers of knowledge production and policy formation. Both schools assume that power is either located in one position or place, or that it moves from one specific location to another.

The third category refers to a more recent literature which deals with both foundations and centers of expertise. This literature addresses the complicated relationships among scholars, program officers, government bureaucrats, class allegiances and economic interests, and academic disciplines. It is distinguished from the established historiography by a number of factors: it looks outward at the relation of philanthropy to the development of the state, it conducts close historical analysis, it examines shifting relations among different groups rather than static, one-dimensional relations; and it illuminates the institutional ecology of policy-making. This literature focuses on the intersection of discrete social groups, such as scholars, artists, doctors, scientists, businessmen, social critics and government officials. This literature began to emerge in the 1980s and includes the work of Lagemann, Katz, and Karl.

The literature in this third section can be divided into two parts. One does not explicitly deal with philanthropy, but has a state-centered focus
which examines how the organization of authority shapes the character and success of reform movements. Important authors in this genre include Stephen Skowronek and Theda Skocpol.

Stephen Skowronek's *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920* examines the institutional development of the American state at the turn of the century. He contends that Progressive era state-building was shaped by external forces, such as the increasing demands and complexity of urbanization and industrialization. However, state expansion and reform was rooted in the established system of partisan politics and patronage characteristic of the nineteenth century. Skowronek provides a case study of civil service reform, the re-organization of the army, and the establishment of national railroad regulation. Of particular interest are the chapters on civil service reform and business regulation. The former was propelled forward by a coalition comprised of the American Social Science Association, the Civil Service Commission, and the Reform League, the latter by business interests and a rising group of professional economists associated with the American Economic Association. Reformers in learned societies, universities, associations, and political and activist organizations pioneered a more interventionist, activist state. They formed national coalitions of diverse interests and served as architects of reform. Skowronek's work is important for a number of reasons: he shows how the institutional organization of the state shaped the kinds of reform movements which emerged; he illuminated why some coalitions were successful and effective in solidifying reforms and others were not; and, in terms of the study of philanthropy, foundations, and knowledge production, he demonstrates the central role of the private sector, universities, and associations in pioneering reforms in the state. The relation between experts and the state is precarious and ambiguous; it does not easily fit a rigid category and framework.¹⁷

Theda Skocpol's works cover a broad range of historical periods and issues, ranging from women's organizations during the Civil War and the internal politics of the New Deal, to recent studies on national health care debates.¹⁸ Skocpol and her collaborators are pioneers in producing state-centered histories of social policy. She challenges the three prevailing explanations for the evolution and character of the American welfare state including: the “logic of industrialism,” which contends that government expands services as society becomes more complex; the assertion of “national values,” which argues that Americans’ commitment to liberalism (independence, small state) explains the limited
nature of public social programs; and the "preservation of capitalism," which claims that ameliorative programs are pioneered by conservative elites who want to save capitalism. Skocpol argues that many of these competing schools of interpretation have merit, concurring that social needs, ideas, and class are important factors in the rise of reform movements and the implementation of social policies. However, she contends that these explanations need to be incorporated into a more complex state-centered analysis that emphasizes the institutional, bureaucratic endowments, and social and historical context of reform. Like Skowronek, Skocpol places the party system, patronage politics, the federal system, and reform movements and coalitions at the center of the narrative. For instance, in Soldiers and Mothers Skocpol shows that women were able to help create a "maternalist welfare state" by forming a nationwide network of women's associations and successfully participating in the intense party competition of the 1880s. The institutional organization of the state was critical in shaping the kinds of reform which were developed.

Skocpol recently edited a collection of essays titled States, Social Knowledge, and the Origins of Modern Social Policies which analyzes the interrelations between knowledge production and the welfare state in a comparative history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The contributing authors contend that there are two important components of the rise of the modern state. The first is the separation of political power from landlords and capitalist entrepreneurs and its reconstitution in the hands of official actors who have some degree of autonomy in the state. The second is the rise of new groups of experts who shape government policy-making. These experts are professionally trained and located in academies, universities, and scholarly societies. They play a prominent role in the development of the social sciences and in connecting the social sciences to the state. The social sciences address the dilemmas of modernity and capitalist industrialization: the demise of local communities, class stratification, unemployment, and labor unrest. Social science knowledge provides the basis of modern social policies like unemployment insurance, pension programs, and education. Skocpol explains that:

in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the primary forces behind policy innovations were "third" parties (capital and labor are considered as the two main parties to many underlying conflicts). Experts, civil servants, intellectuals, etc. shape opinion and advise governments on social problems and social policies.
She explains that "looking at the emerging social sciences in relation to governmental policymaking enhances our general understanding of the cultural accompaniments and intellectual bases of social action."30 Expertise and the institutions in which it developed are central components to the development of the modern state.

Skocpol and the scholars she works with raise a number of points pertinent to the study of philanthropy, foundations, and knowledge production. One is how the location of knowledge-production shapes the kinds of knowledge which gets produced. Thus, whether a society is statist or non-statist makes an imprint on the intellectual organization and character of knowledge. The American intellectual community is constituted by a diverse range of institutions which include universities, learned societies, academies, educational television, and print sources like magazines and journals. In the U.S., the emergence and organization of the modern university system is central to the development of social programs. In addition, she points out how the peculiar character of intellectual movements and communities shapes government policy-making.

The second category of the recent literature deals more directly with philanthropy and centers of expertise. These texts focus on knowledge production and policy formation, but do not develop theories or paradigms based on broad general analysis. They do not assume that the ideas and interests of the foundations are the same as the interests of the state, nor do they cast foundation officers as apolitical and committed solely to the disinterested protection of intellectual freedom. Rather, these are close examinations of the process by which decisions about knowledge production or foreign policy formulation were made. Such examinations underscore the evolving relationship between the state and the private sector (foundations, centers of expertise, universities, and learned societies). These studies pose important questions about the changing shape of democracy, power, and authority. At the center of these discussions is the changing character of civil society and how different groups are brought into the policy process.

Exemplary works on philanthropy include Katz and Karl's work on foundations and policy expertise at the turn of the century and Lagemann's scholarship on the Carnegie philanthropies. Also in this category is James Smith's *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of a New Policy Elite*, which documents the proliferation of such institutions in the twentieth century and provides the first step in under-
standing the institutional ecology of policy formation. The first generation of policy experts emerged out of the Progressive era, and exhibited a typical faith in the social sciences' ability to discover the root causes of social events. In the 1920s, Herbert Hoover brought academic experts into the Commerce Department in order to make the state a positive force of liberal reform. These early policy experts operated in a private, decentralized world of foundation-supported research institutes and universities. The second generation of policy experts emerged during the post-World War II era when the institutional environment of policy formation was greatly expanded and complicated. The policy landscape was reconfigured by the rapid establishment of a host of research institutes all bent on shaping government policy. The third generation emerged in the 1970s and it was more explicitly organized around political issues.

Guy Alchon's *The Invisible Hand of Planning: Capitalism, Social Science, and the State in the 1920s* analyzes the evolving relationship between economic experts, the private sector, and the government in the 1920s and documents the formation of a new class of economic managers who created knowledge, institutions, and programs to help guide the economy. Michael Wala's *Winning the Peace: The Council on Foreign Relations and the Early Cold War* focuses on the process by which policy decisions were made, the method of officer recruitment, and the tensions which existed within the CFR, and between its members and the state.

Steven Wheatley's *The Politics of Philanthropy: Abraham Flexner and Medical Education* examines how philanthropy shaped the emergence of the modern American medical educational system by charting the career of Abraham Flexner, author of the infamous 1910 Carnegie Foundation Report which assessed medical education in the United States and Canada. Flexner played an important role in the early history of the Rockefeller Foundation, shifting foundation support from specific institutions to the management of "transinstitutional networks." Flexner's program emphasized grants to prestigious universities, a focus on research, and full-time enrollment of medical students. Wheatley's study of Flexner and the foundations from 1890 to 1950 provides a context for exploring the changing history of American philanthropy and its relationship to national policy-making and management. Wheatley concluded that philanthropy played a central role in shaping the institutional ecology of policy formation and in the transformation and function of American education.
Frank Ninkovich's *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U.S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950* is a somewhat romanticized critique of the politicization of cultural diplomacy. Like McCaughey, Ninkovich casts the pre-World War II era of international studies and cultural diplomacy as free and open. Despite the romanticism, he conducts a meticulous, rigorous analysis of the process by which cultural relations were transformed during the war and the immediate post-war era. This close reading of the relation between scholars and the state reveals how cultural diplomacy operated.\(^7\)

Ellen Herman's *The Romance of American Psychology* is also an important recent work.\(^6\) This book charts the rise and metamorphosis of psychology, showing how psychological expertise emerged within and among reformers, learned societies, and the university in the first decades of the new century, how it became connected to the state during the Second World War by framing policy issues and debates about the troops and the enemy, and then, finally, entered popular culture by shaping the public's conception of health. Herman shows that psychological knowledge and expertise was "politically flexible" insofar as it was employed by different groups in different ways. Herman documents the important role of universities, foundations, and learned societies in the development of psychology, and the ways in which, the expansion of the state during the war, re-shaped the institutional and intellectual character and function of psychology.

In *The Brookings Institution, 1916-1952: Expertise and the Public Interest in a Democratic Society*, Donald Critchlow examines the early history of the Brookings Institution. Like Skocpol he challenges claims that the research institution is simply a means to protect ruling class interests or corporate liberalism. Instead, he argues that it sought to bring order to the public policy process and it served as a mechanism to bring efficiency and expertise to the state, without significantly expanding state bureaucracy. He shows that Brookings had a strong antistatist bias.\(^7\)
Foundations and philanthropy have shaped knowledge production in the twentieth century and, therefore, require a central place in the political history of democracy. The historical relationship between universities, scholars, foundations, and the state provide a window into the evolving ecology of policy formation and the shifting alliances which have shaped twentieth-century America. The intersection of modern philanthropy, politics, and knowledge production provides much more than mere anecdotes about the twists and turns which brought us to the current status of our contemporary political and educational systems. Instead, it provides crucial insight into the peculiar character of the American state and the informal, decentralized institutions which hold the fabric of American society together.

Advocates of social welfare programs and participants in America’s philanthropic, educational, and cultural communities are currently in crisis. Recent assertions that the “era of big government is over” and calls for federal retrenchment often rest on unsystematic assumptions that a small state is inherently good because it promotes the development of civil society and that a large state is bad because it stifles volunteerism and activism by undermining individual initiative. Ideas about the relation of the state to reform, philanthropy, volunteerism, and the intellectual organization of the nation is frequently based on intuition and philosophy rather than empirical investigation. There is a persistent romanticization of the pre-New Deal era when communities were “self-sufficient.” This conception is dangerous for a number of reasons. One is that it ignores the fact that the state expanded during the Great Depression and in the following decades precisely because individual communities and philanthropy could not meet national social and intellectual needs. Elite philanthropy in the first half of the twentieth century played a central role in creating expertise and institutions to develop expert knowledge, which in turn was utilized in the development and implementation of modern social programs. Philanthropies were architects of state programs, but also served as service organizations, for example, receiving grants from the state to operate educational programs such as the Fulbright scholarship. Thus, the continuing (albeit changing) role of philanthropy throughout the twentieth century undermines any simplistic cause-and-effect relation between the expansion of the state, the complexity of civil society and philanthropy. In addition, romanticization of the pre-New Deal era obscures the extent to which the public and private sectors have historically operated social programs together.
Peter Evans is critical of recent debates about the character of the state. He asserts:

Sterile debates about "how much" states intervene have to be replaced with arguments about different kinds of involvement and their effects. Contrasts between "dirigiste" and "liberal" or "interventionist" and "noninterventionist" states focus attention on degrees of departure from ideal-typical competitive markets. They confuse the basic issue. In the contemporary world, withdrawal and involvement are not the alternatives. State involvement is a given. The appropriate question is not "how much" but "what kind."

Evans argues that states and other social and political institutions play an important role in economic and social development. He distinguishes two different ideal types: predatory and developmental states. The former undercut development by an exclusive focus on capital accumulation; the latter promotes development by being embedded in a concrete set of social ties that binds the state to society and provides institutionalized channels for the continual negotiation and renegotiation of goals and policies... A state that was only autonomous would lack both sources of intelligence and the ability to rely on decentralized private implementation. Dense connecting networks without a robust internal structure would leave the state incapable of resolving "collective action" problems, of transcending the individual interests of its private counterparts. Only when embeddedness and autonomy are joined together can a state be called developmental.

Private capital and philanthropy alone are incapable of providing the national leadership and centralization necessary for a host of critical social issues.

The systematic use of philanthropy as an analytical category to interpret how civil society functions, promises to re-shape our conception of twentieth-century American history. Philanthropy provides a relatively unexplored vantage point for theorizing about the interrelations of diverse kinds of activities and movements, and about the ways that seemingly disparate groups or individuals helped define the cultural and political character of an era.
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Alchon documents the formation of a new class of economic managers who created knowledge, institutions, and programs to help guide the economy. This class emerges from changes in the relationship between economic experts, the private sector, and the government in the 1920s. At the center of the evolving relationship were the American Economic Association, Herbert Hoover's Commerce Department, and the foundation-supported National Bureau of Economic Research. The new class of technocratic managers sought to coordinate business and government policies, resolve conflict between capital and labor, and expand the economy. Alchon argues that the new tier of economic experts emerged out of a corporate-philanthropic-intellectual edifice which sought to shift political power into the hands of experts, while at the same time shaping expert knowledge itself.


Through a joint biography of these three individuals, Cohen examines the intensification of American-East Asian relations and the process of policy formulation in the first half of the twentieth century. He charts the evolving (and often contentious) relationship between the formal and informal foreign policy apparatuses using the compelling careers of three men whose unique knowledge placed them in close proximity to the
policy architects. All three men worked in the private sector and, at varying times, had access to East-Asian policy architects in the state. Their careers illuminate the complex and shifting character of state-private sector partnerships. Most relevant to the study of philanthropy is the career of Roger S. Greene. Greene was raised in Japan by missionaries. He served in the State Department’s consular office (stationed in either Japan or Russia) until 1914. After becoming disillusioned with what he considered short-sighted government policies, Greene left government service and began a 21-year affiliation with the Rockefeller Foundation’s China Medical Board and Peking Union Medical College. He lived in China and developed close relations with Chinese and American intellectuals, entrepreneurs, educators, and government officials. American businessmen and members of the State Department’s Division of Far Eastern Affairs frequently consulted him about a multitude of issues concerning Asia. In 1935 Greene’s affiliation with the Rockefeller philanthropies was terminated, and in 1938 he became a professional lobbyist, often operating in elite Washington circles, and even shaping FDR’s foreign policies. Between 1938 and 1941 Greene worked with the Committee to Defend America by Aiding its Allies and the American Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression. During the war he served as consultant on medical affairs in China for the Division of Cultural Relations. Greene’s life is the story of one man’s impact upon the increasing tensions between nations. More importantly, however, his life illuminates the complexities confronting a state which looks to a contentious, fragmented private sector for advice and guidance. His life also points to the porous boundaries between the public and private sphere, revealing the constantly shifting influences on policy formation.

Gerald Colby and Charlotte Dennett provide an exhaustive history of Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller's economic and political activities in Latin America. The analysis has two foci. One is the intersection of Rockefeller's economic interests (primarily in oil and timber), influence in policy-making, and the particular strand of liberal foreign policy which emphasized cultural diplomacy. During the Second World War and throughout the Cold War, Rockefeller served in numerous powerful public and private positions. Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Rockefeller director of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA) which brought together business (such as United Fruit), the state, and scholars to operate cultural, educational, and scientific programs in Latin America, thus paving the way for U.S. hegemony in the region. Eisenhower appointed Rockefeller to the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, in which he organized and promoted U.S. banking interests in the region, served as an architect of the United States Information Agency and the Organization of American States, and was Governor of New York state. In the private arena he moved between various Rockefeller-related institutions, including Chase Manhattan Bank and Standard Oil. He also promoted U.S. business interests in Latin America by forming companies like the International Basic Economy Corporation. According to Colby's analysis, the Rockefeller Foundation served two functions: it provided a ready pool of privately-funded experts to the state; and it operated intellectual, cultural, and educational programs which would further Rockefeller's economic interests. The second main foci of the narrative is William Cameron Townsend and his Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) and Wycliffe Bible Translators. Townsend was a missionary who contended that the most effective way to convert "uncivilized" natives and assimilate them into the Christian, capitalist system was to learn their different languages, infiltrate their communities, and teach them the Bible in their native tongue. Townsend organized missionary expeditions into remote parts of Latin America and received substantial funding from both public and private institutions. The SIL was implicated in Cold War politics insofar as it served
as a vital source of information for the Central Intelligence Agency and the United States Information Agency and as a liaison between the U.S. and Latin American governments. The SIL gained access to remote Indian tribes and negotiated for the removal of their land, thus extending Rockefeller and the U.S. government's interests. This work documents the proliferation and intersection of seemingly different kinds of philanthropies (such as the Rockefeller Foundation and missionaries), and provides a lens to chart the expansion of the American intelligence establishment during the Cold War.


This is a history of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission (RSC) which sought to eradicate hookworm disease in the southern United States from 1909 to 1914. Hookworm disease manifested itself in symptoms of exhaustion, lethargy, and abnormal dietary habits (such as dirt-eating). The discovery of hookworm in the U.S. is credited to Charles Wardell Stiles, the son of a minister and a German-trained zoologist. While Stiles was researching hookworm, Frederick T. Gates (a Baptist minister) was organizing and systematizing John D. Rockefeller, Sr.'s philanthropy, playing a principal role in the establishment of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research (1901) and the General Education Board (established in 1903 and dedicated to southern education). The RSC was a combination of both institutions insofar as it supported research on hookworm disease, administered medicine, and operated an educational campaign (which included a lecture series on diseases and sanitation) to reform health habits in the South. The RSC brought together a diverse coalition of actors, including southern public and private health officials, school administrators, and northern “expertise” and philanthropy. It tried to strengthen southern local institutions, establishing laboratories and training researchers and health officials. The RSC was terminated in 1914 because of a combination of factors, including widespread criticism of Rockefeller philanthropy, questions about the RSC's effectiveness, the establishment of the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913 (which shifted its efforts to eradicate hookworm from the South to other nations), and the belief that too much philanthropic
support would undermine local initiative. Ettling's work documents conflicts among different groups participating in the RSC, showing how intellectual, regional, and philosophical commitments shaped the evolution of the program. He also provides biographical vignettes of Gates and Wickliffe Rose and others who played important roles in shaping the evolution of Rockefeller philanthropy. Finally, he illuminates the evangelical character of RSC architects, describing the secularization of religious ideology.


Donald Fisher provides a history of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) from its establishment in 1923 through the Second World War, particularly focusing on the inter-war years. It was initially funded by the Rockefeller philanthropies and the Carnegie Corporation. The SSRC promoted and coordinated social science research, serving as a center for the development of expert, utilitarian social scientific knowledge. Fisher argues that America was in crisis (typified by poverty, unemployment, immigration, labor unrest, and racial tensions). Business and government needed expert knowledge of social forces if they were to maintain the liberal-democratic capitalist system. The SSRC, and the foundations which supported it, were "sophisticated conservatives" who tried to harness social scientific knowledge to preserve the underlying social structure. The SSRC promoted expertise in areas related to state policy and national management. Its committees included: personality and culture (which assembled statistics on poverty and unemployment, among other things), international relations, industry and trade, public administration, and consumption and leisure. The state, the foundations, and the SSRC had an inter-locking directorate; for instance, foundation-funded social scientists participated in state agencies and committees, such as the National Resources Planning Board and the President's Recent Trends Committee. Fisher employs a Gramscian analytical framework, using the concept of hegemony to explain the role of social scientific ideas in the organization of power and knowledge.

This article is in large part a challenge to Lawrence Veysey's *The Emergence of the American University*, published in 1965. Veysey argued that, by 1910, the premiere American universities had all evolved into a standard type and that after this point, their concerns lay solely with maintenance and duplication, rather than with diversification and innovation. Geiger, in this piece, argues that, in fact, there was tremendous growth and development in research universities between 1910 and 1930. He concurs with Veysey that the American research university had become standardized by 1910, but argues, contrary to Veysey, that after 1910, and especially in the 1920s, these institutions significantly differentiated themselves from one another. In this essay, he seeks to explain how and why that process took place. Geiger holds that voluntary support, its sources and its object, in large part determined the personality of a research institution (along with students and faculty). Examining what he defines as the sixteen top research universities and university systems in the United States—California, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Columbia, Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Stanford, Chicago, M.I.T., and Caltech—Geiger shows how the nature of voluntary support changed after 1905, and how alumni fundraising became more important, followed by the support of large foundations. Further, he explores the role of World War I in shifting patterns of voluntary support. Geiger concludes that as voluntary support took on an increasingly important role in university funding, the character of each institution came to be shaped by the amounts which it received and the sources from which it came.


Roger Geiger examines the emergence of the American research university between 1900 and 1940. He explains that prior to the Civil War, the American university and college played a peripheral role in the organization and transmission of
knowledge. The curricula was focused on the classics, which looked backward, preserving and celebrating the past. At the turn of the century, philanthropists John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie promoted the development of American expertise by establishing independent research institutes, such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research. In the 1910s the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York were incorporated, and by the 1920s, they began programs to make the university, rather than the independent research institute, the center for the development of expertise. Foundations provided elite universities with funds for various kinds of grants and fellowships, research buildings, and the establishment of specific departments. In doing so, foundations helped transform the university from a peripheral institution oriented around traditional knowledge to a critical center for the development of expertise.


Dobkin-Hall analyzes the emergence of American nationality, which he identifies as the ability to conduct economic, political, and cultural activities on a national scale. He analyzes the private corporation and the historical process by which it replaced the family and community in maintaining the social fabric of America. A crisis of cultural and economic authority occurred in the eighteenth century when population growth and shrinking land availability undermined the established familial order. New England elites responded to the crisis by creating economic, cultural, and political alliances and nationalizing institutions which would codify American culture, such as universities. The analysis is divided into three sections. The first examines the peculiar and uneven development of the American colonies, explaining that New England's national outlook and ideology of community welfare allowed it to quickly and flexibly respond to cultural crisis. The second part examines the legal basis of nationality, focusing on changes in the means of production and the process of socialization. Dobkin-Hall examines the new for-profit and not-for-profit institutions which participated in
the nationalization of culture. The third section analyzes the Civil War, and the post-Civil War era, examining the solidification of national institutions and elites.


This is the first of a two volume series about the three John D. Rockefeller’s: JDR, Sr. (1839-1937); JDR, Jr. (1874-1960); and JDR, 3rd (1906-1978). This first book focuses on JDR, Sr. and Jr., while the second volume examines the five sons in general, and JDR, 3rd, specifically. The first book is divided into five sections. The first section is titled “The Rockefeller Legacy, 1889-1918” and it charts JDR, Sr.'s business and philanthropic activities and analyzes his religious and intellectual orientation. JDR, Sr. was a practicing Baptist and in 1891 he hired Baptist minister Frederick T. Gates to systematize and organize his personal philanthropy. Under Gates’ guidance, JDR, Sr. provided substantial grants to universities (especially Johns Hopkins and the University of Chicago) and Baptist organizations. When JDR, Jr. completed college at Brown University he apprenticed in the family business, mostly working under Gates’ guidance. JDR, Jr. helped divert funds to nonsectarian organizations, like the Children’s Aid Society and the Charity Organization Society. He participated in various civil reform issues and he helped form the Committee of Three, which tried to provide resources for immigrant girls at high risk. He also became a chief financial supporter of the Bureau of Municipal Research which sought to advance public administration and budgetary reform. JDR, Jr. also participated in the various Rockefeller philanthropic foundations like the General Education Board, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research, the China Medical Board, the Peking Union Medical Center, and the Rockefeller Foundation, among others. Part Two is titled “The Liberal Vision, 1918-1929” and focuses on JDR, Jr.’s idealistic aim to create cooperation and solidarity among Protestant churches by building Riverside Church and to create international peace through programs to increase cultural exchange and dialogue. The Rockefeller Foundation funded institutions like the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Institute of Pacific Relations, which sought to coordinate expert knowledge. The
Rockefeller Foundation also operated the International Health Division which helped institutionalize public health in many countries, especially Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Part Three is titled "The Third Rockefeller, 1912-1929" which focuses on JDR, 3rd's pre-professional and early professional years, particularly his access to expertise in international affairs. Part Four is titled "Depression and War, 1929-1943" and Part Five "The Ties That Bind, 1944-1952." These two sections chart the further evolution and professionalization of Rockefeller philanthropy and politics, showing both continuity and change over time. The scope and diversity of the Rockefeller's philanthropy is difficult to capture, but Harr and Johnson's biographies provide a coherent and exhaustive analysis.


Focusing on John D. Rockefeller, 3rd who made philanthropy the cornerstone of his career, this book completes the history of the Rockefeller family started in John Harr and Peter Johnson's definitive The Rockefeller Century. The authors assert that the Rockefeller conscience is "a civic and social conscience so well developed and so rigorously passed on from one generation to the next that it has no rival in American history." (5) The work documents the evolution and particular character of JDR's philanthropy, which began in the 1930s when he directed efforts to restore Virginia's colonial capital and apprenticed at the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), whose entrenched power structure initially stymied any attempts to exert leadership. In the 1950s, however, JDR's sphere of influence greatly expanded. Staff changes at the RF allowed him to place like-minded officials in positions of authority, thus transforming the RF. JDR's philanthropic activities in the 1950s and 1960s were diverse. Of particular importance was his instrumental role in the establishment of the Population Council, a private-sector, scientific organization that promoted research, international debate, and legislation on population-related issues. The Population Council received financial support from the RF, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, and other philanthropies. This institution helped catapult JDR into powerful public and private positions as well as international notoriety. He was also
instrumental in establishing the Asia Society, a cultural, non-political organization which sustained cultural relations between the U.S. and Asia. The Asia Society was established in the context of state investigations into the RF-supported Institute of Pacific Relations and state-infiltration of the Asia Foundation. JDR was also central to the creation of Lincoln Center and the establishment and operation of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards, which lasted thirty years and sought to support, advocate for, and improve public service. In the 1960s and 1970s JDR became interested in the youth movement, urban renewal, and the festivities surrounding the celebration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution. In the 1970s JDR provided leadership in efforts to define and develop expert understanding of the “third sector,” which refers to philanthropy and volunteerism in America. He established and helped direct the Filer Commission, which funded eighty-five separate research studies by scholars from many different institutions and universities to help evaluate the state, character, and function of the non-profit sector. The Commission issued a final report which evaluated the state and importance of corporate philanthropy and made numerous recommendations, particularly concerning tax laws. JDR was asked to serve in various public positions, but declined, believing that his rightful place was in the private world of philanthropy. Harr and Johnson provide a comprehensive and compelling account of JDR’s philanthropic and political activities, weaving in anecdotes about his private life.


This article represents an attempt to refute certain myths about the so-called Gilded Age in the United States. The late nineteenth century saw the flourishing of cultural institutions such as art museums, opera houses, and symphonies. Scholars have argued that the establishment of these institutions represented an attempt by the rulers of the American art world “to construct a genteel tradition, trying to force European cultural standards on an uncouth citizenry, using the new institutions they were founding as weapons in their struggle.” Through an examination of the movement in Boston for the establishment of a Fine Arts Museum, Harris argues against this depiction. The Boston Museum, one of the first public museums in the United States,
and the model for many later foundations, was, Harris argues, founded by a group of men interested primarily in educating the public. They followed through with their intentions by, at first, creating a museum of reproductions for study rather than one of masterpieces for examination and wealth. They created innovations such as printed guides to collections, lecture tours, and a museum library. The myth of the Gilded Age cultural institutions was, Harris argues, only a myth created in the early twentieth century, as the goals and tactics of museums changed and stressed wealth over education, and as American society became more suspicious of the leaders of Big Business.


Haskell examines the rise of the professional social sciences and the re-organization of knowledge between 1860 and 1920. This is a case study of the contentious relationship between the American Social Science Association (ASSA) and Johns Hopkins University. Haskell says the former is the "amateur" knowledge of the nineteenth century, while the latter is the "scientific," "objective" knowledge of the twentieth. Johns Hopkins' social science departments developed expert, "objective" knowledge about the organization of society, and in doing so, served as a center for progressive policy formation. Haskell's analysis does not focus on philanthropy explicitly; however, he does provide critical information about the intellectual and political context in which philanthropy functioned. Twentieth century philanthropy adopted the rhetoric and paradigms of the social sciences and sought to address the root causes of social ills. In doing so, philanthropists adopted the ideologies and methodologies that Johns Hopkins social scientists helped to institutionalize at the turn of the century.


Hawley focuses on public-private partnerships and their impact on national policy during the early part of the century. The public-private partnerships of the First World War provided a
model for organizing the bureaucratic structures of managerial elites in the 1920s. The informal institutionalization of these partnerships was predicated on the ideology of associationalism, which postulated that through voluntarism and cooperation the public and private sectors could develop coherent, effective national programs. Associationalism is rooted in the liberal ideal of the small state and a vigorous private sector, with the former relying on the latter's expertise, vision, initiative, and integrity. Herbert Hoover's activities as Commerce Secretary typify associationalism. He allowed the private sector to play a central role in the formulation of public policy, thereby re-making the domestic and international order along cooperative lines. Although Hawley does not explicitly analyze philanthropy, he illuminates the shifting relationship of the private sector, voluntarism and the state, demonstrating that an adequate understanding of the state requires a corresponding investigation of the complex, diverse private sector. Associationalism continued to be an important paradigm in the post-World War Two era, and remains so today.


This collection of eight essays analyzes different aspects of Herbert Hoover's activities as Commerce Secretary under the Republican administrations of Warren D. Harding and Calvin Coolidge. Particularly relevant to the study of philanthropy is Hoover's philosophy of associationalism, by which he sought to temper ruthless competition and create a more stable economic and political system by promoting cooperation between the public and private spheres. Associationalism's focus on voluntary cooperation allowed Hoover (and the reformist, progressive academics, businessmen, and government bureaucrats he surrounded himself with) to negotiate between liberalism's commitment to the small state and the economic and political need to create uniform, centralized national policies. In his essay "Herbert Hoover and Economic Stabilization, 1921-22," Ellis Hawley defines Hoover as a "corporatist manager" who tried to make the federal government a positive mechanism for reform while also limiting its size and scope. For instance, he used his public position to allow private individuals (like engineers, sta-
This collection of essays examines the shifting relationship between the state and the private sector, pointing to the central role of voluntarism and cooperation in Hoover's conception of an efficient economic and political system.


This book charts the rise, influence, and metamorphosis of psychological expertise. Psychological expertise emerged as part of the social sciences at the turn of the century. It was part of an intellectual movement emerging out of the increasingly professionalized university and receiving important funding from the Rockefeller Foundation. Psychological expertise was utilized by the government in both the First and Second World War. This role was greatly expanded during the Second World War. Psychologists operated in a range of policy-oriented occupations. Many worked in the field of "human management" and enemy morale (how could enemy soldiers be most effectively reached with demoralizing messages?), seeking to provide policy-makers with practical knowledge. Psychologists worked in the Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of Strategic Services, and the Office of War Information, among others. Clinical professionals became the best known wartime psychological experts for their efforts to identify and counter an epidemic of mental disturbance. Psychological expertise was used in debates about "national character," the roots of warfare, and the psychological consequences of bombing. Clinicians efforts to deal with soldiers anxiety and stress by providing self-help manuals and through the spread of psychoanalysis helped disseminate and "normalize" psychological discourses. During the postwar years psychology played an important role in the Cold War strategy. The Rockefeller Foundation, the Yale Institute, the Social Science Research Council, and other philanthropic institutes play a role in assembling, organizing, funding, and thus helping to establish the parameters of debate about psychology and policy. Psychologists' wartime service won them a place in the policy-making apparatuses during the Cold War. In the 1950s institutional and intellectual developments shaped psychology which allowed it to expand well beyond the boundaries of warfare and
outside the nurturing military environment in the 1960s. Between 1945 and the mid-1960s the U.S. military was the country's major institutional sponsor of psychological research. There were also sources of civilian federal support, like the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation. All types of work that psychological experts had done in WWII military were further institutionalized with the help of military funding. These include psychological warfare, intelligence classification, training, clinical treatment, and "human factors" (human relations). In the 1960s, psychological ideas and discourse entered popular culture, playing a role in the rise of self-help organizations and the women's movement. Herman's analysis demonstrates how psychology has been "politically flexible." That is, it did not function in a one-dimensional way, rather, it was appropriated by different groups and used in different ways. In addition, she illuminates the "blurring boundaries between intellectual, practical, and cultural communities." She shows how the process of state expansion occurred within the context of an expanded private sphere of psychological ideas.


In this biography of Herbert Hoover, Joan Hoff-Wilson argues that Hoover's career and political philosophy illuminates the increasingly important role of philanthropy and voluntarism in national policy-making. In the inter-war years, Hoover's career typified the philosophy, aims, and structure of the "associative state," in which the private sector played a central role in formulating national policies. He traversed private and public institutions, dedicating himself to integrating their distinct values, methodologies, interests, and individuals into a more coherent, uniform system. During the First World War, Hoover directed food relief programs in Europe unofficially for the United States government. He raised relief funds from American businesses, voluntary associations, media groups, religious organizations, and wealthy individuals. At this time he cultivated a political philosophy which he referred to as "cooperative individualism" and "cooperative capitalism." He contended that the laissez-faire system’s ruthless competition should be mediated by
cooperation, compromise, voluntarism, and charity. Philanthropy figured importantly into this political philosophy insofar as it was a private means of maintaining national and international cohesion. The good of the community (the philanthropic impulse), Hoover said, should bind together the private sector and the state. As Commerce Secretary and President, Hoover tried to put his ideas about associationalism into action, inviting the private sector (including foundations and research institutes) into government to help draft policy. He promoted collaboration among academic, business, and state officials, hoping to organize private and national policies along voluntaristic, cooperative lines. Hoover’s foreign policy programs also reflect this philosophy; he advocated an “independent internationalism” in which nations would voluntarily negotiate international issues rather than entering into coercive alliances and treaties. Philanthropy played two central roles in the career of Hoover and the larger social and political milieu in which he operated. One was intellectual and ideological: it provided policy-makers with a language of community service and responsibilities. The other was literal: large philanthropic foundations and institutes (like the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the National Bureau of Economic Research) played an important economic and structural role in providing the individuals and expertise to promote national collaboration, organization, and compromise.


This book examines the establishment of Chicago’s great cultural institutions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These institutions include the Chicago Art Institute, the Newberry Library, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, the University of Chicago, the Field Museum of Natural History, and the Crerar Library. Horowitz deals with the institutions themselves and their founders and trustees, made up primarily of a small group of Chicago businessmen. In addition, she examines the criticisms waged against the cultural philanthropists by Chicago Progressives, professional administrators within the cultural institutions, and the literati. Arguing that the cultural philanthropists engaged in their philanthropic endeavors in
order to achieve certain social goals, Horowitz examines the changing nature of those goals and the cumulative results of their efforts, up to the eve of World War One. The mission of the Chicago cultural philanthropists began as a way to purify their city of sordid and base influences and its bawdy image, and to generate a civic renaissance in Chicago. Under the influence of Progressive reformers and professional culture mavens (librarians, curators, etc.), their mission evolved into a form of cultural outreach to the poorer and more disenfranchised members of the Chicago community. By the Progressive period, the cultural philanthropists, who had established Chicago’s cultural institutions as bastions of the European tradition, in order to meet the needs of the business community and the middle class, were embracing a new perspective. Their tactics and priorities now included an openness to the new and willingness to support contemporary artistic endeavors, and a recognition of art’s value for the masses.


The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment sought to collect data on the evolution and effects of untreated syphilis in black males. The project began in 1932, operating in Tuskegee, Alabama, and involved the collaboration of the Alabama State Department of Health, the Tuskegee Institute (which was a black medical research and training institution), the Tuskegee Medical Society, and the Macon County Health Department. The experiment involved two groups of black male subjects: one was provided treatment, the other was not. While medical reports were presented in journals and at conferences and state officials sanctioned, funded, and operated the project, the actual subjects were not given information nor did they consent to be part of the project. The experiment was finally terminated in the 1970s and a full-scale investigation of its operation was launched. The participating institutions, doctors, and state officials were reprimanded, though, they continued to deny any wrong-doing. James Jones provides the institutional and historical context in which the Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment was established and evolved. In the 1920s and 1930s the scientific and medical establishments enjoyed tremendous confidence. Progressives hoped that expertise and reformism would eradicate social ills, such as
poverty, disease, racism, and class divisions. This era is also typified by association building in which private groups organized into coalitions and organizations and sought to reform society. For instance, the establishment and activities of the American Social Hygiene Association typifies the intersection of reform and expertise. Philanthropic foundations and public health officials saw medicine and science as a way to integrate, modernize, and improve American society. The South was a prime target of such reform because it was still considered underdeveloped. The Julius Rosenwald Fund established a program to provide medical services to black and white southerners. It operated in collaboration with various public and private agencies, seeking to reform health practices in the South by strengthening local institutions and networks. The Fund employed white and black staff members, relied on State diagnostic laboratory facilities, and extended medical facilities to rural, predominately Negro, Southerners. Alabama's inability to contribute sufficient funds to the program led to the termination of the project. In the late 1930s, the Federal government launched a nationwide syphilis campaign based largely on the experiences of the Rosenwald Fund. It was at this point that medical officials came up with the idea to isolate a group of blacks with syphilis, deny them treatment, and monitor the evolution of the disease. The organization and execution of the project involved the collaboration of diverse public and private groups, including state and private medical agencies as well as white planters who organized black subjects. Over time, the administrators of the program providing subjects with incentives, such as food, to undergo examinations. In addition, in exchange for the right to conduct an autopsy the program provided the family of the deceased with a burial stipend. Jones provides an important chapter in the history of American science, medicine, progressive politics and reform, and race relations.


John Jordan analyzes how technology and engineering shaped cultural institutions, reform politics, and mainstream liberalism in the first half of the twentieth century. Jordan explains that science provided a political and intellectual paradigm around
which a diverse coalition of actors mobilized. He begins with a discussion of rational reformers such as John Dewey (who argued that the development and dissemination of expert, scientific knowledge was essential to the proper functioning of democracy) and activist-oriented social scientists (who sought to discover the immutable laws of the social order as a basis for reform politics), documenting the rise of expert professional and technocratic progressivism. Jordan illuminates how social and municipal reform was steeped in the language of engineering and rationality. Chapter Six is titled "Scientific Philanthropy, Philanthropic Science" and Chapter Seven is titled "Social Engineering Projects: The 1920s." Both chapters analyze how the rhetoric and ideology of engineering was employed by large foundations who sought to scientifically study society and create rational programs of support. Foundations facilitated dialogue between social scientists and the state and established institutions like the National Research Council and the Social Science Research Council, hoping to develop expert knowledge and engineer a new social order. Jordan demonstrates how foundations helped bind the state, expertise, and the private sector together, each employing the machine as the paradigm of social order.


Kelves provides a history of eugenics (the study of heredity and the improvement of the human race) in the United States and Great Britain, from its conception in the late nineteenth century to the present. This study has two foci: one is the scientific and epistemological bases of the field, the other is how eugenics has been shaped by political and social ideologies. Eugenics emerged out of the ad hoc activities of such diverse groups as reformers, academics, social scientists, and other private sector activists. It was popularized through lectures, books, and pamphlets, and eventually it came to shape public policy on immigration, sterilization, women's rights, and other issues. Eugenacists were members of an emerging private, progressive elite who argued that social reform should be based on scientific expertise. In the early twentieth century research was conducted at the Cold Spring Harbor Biological Laboratory, which received philanthropic support from Mary Harriman. In 1918,
the entire establishment was turned over to the Carnegie Institution of Washington, which served as a critical center of eugenicist research. The Rockefeller Foundation also provided funding; however, it first required that eugenicists abandon its more explicitly racist doctrines. Kelves' history illuminates the intersection of progressive reform, philanthropy, science, and public policy, revealing the political character of "objective" research and the porous boundaries between the public and private sphere.


Joseph Kiger documents the proliferation of America's professional, national, learned societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He explains the differences between councils, institutes, academies, and foundations, describing their histories, programs, activities, functions, and membership. Kiger's historical survey of American learned societies in an essential beginning point to understanding the relation of philanthropy to the organization of knowledge.


Kohler illuminates the changing role of foundation patronage in shaping the character and location of scientific knowledge production. *Partners in Science* examines the evolving relationship between the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies and university based scientists. Kohler divides the history of this relationship into three broad sections. The first section examines the transformation of patronage from the nineteenth century *laissez-faire* system, in which individual patrons provided grants to individual scientists, to the twentieth-century system, in which large research institutes (such as the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research and the Carnegie Institution of Washington) controlled and directed funds for teams of scientists. The second section charts the partial eclipse of the independent research institute era by explaining how in the 1920s monies were channelled into building university departments. The International and General Education Boards' program of giving large grants to university science departments typifies the
1920s philosophy of "institution building." The third section focuses on the Rockefeller Foundation's natural science programs in the 1930s, which abandoned institution building for a system of supporting individual projects. Kohler examines how these evolving systems of patronage affected those who produced scientific knowledge.


This is a broad overview of the history of the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CC) from its establishment in 1911 through the early 1980s. This analysis has several foci. It explores the CC's continuing commitment to liberalism, illuminating the complexities of maintaining a democracy in a world in which expert knowledge is the basis of power. It charts the changing institutional ecology of policy formation, documenting the process by which academics, foundations, and government bureaucrats formulate policy. Finally, it examines the significant shifts in the CC's philanthropic history. The analysis is divided into three broad sections. The first, "Scientific Philanthropy," analyzes the 1920s program of large institution-building grants which sought to establish centers of public policy expertise. The second is "Cultural Philanthropy," which shows how the CC sought to promote and direct popular interest in culture by funding libraries, adult education centers, and art museums. The third section is "Strategic Philanthropy." In the post-World War Two era the process of policy formation became increasingly complex as new foundations, think tanks, policy centers, and government programs were established. Rather than implement programs itself, the CC instead sought to develop programs that would be followed by other institutions. Lagemann provides a deft analysis of both specific CC programs and the larger philosophical and political imperatives, masterfully weaving a complex, but coherent and engaging narrative.

Lagemann charts the impact of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) on the American educational system. She illuminates the role of the CFAT in reorganizing American education along more scientific and bureaucratic lines. The foundation was established in 1905 as a pension fund for college professors and went on to develop various insurance and retirement plans, making the teaching profession itself more financially secure and prestigious. Managers of the CFAT, such as Henry Pritchett, considered educational institutions to be a locus for the development of expert knowledge and a central means of maintaining governance. The CFAT was a potent force in the centralization and standardization of education, developing scientific methods for determining academic ability (standardized tests) and organizing grades levels. Lagemann provides an exhaustive analysis of the internal workings of a major foundation, illuminating the intellectual and democratic complexities of CFAT's aims and methods, and providing an important chapter in American political and educational history.


This book deals with charity and cultural philanthropy in Chicago from the mid-nineteenth century to the Depression. McCarthy charts the transition from active beneficence to monetary generosity over this seventy-year period, examining the prototypes of charitable giving which dominated Chicago over time. As cultural and social factors shifted in Chicago (and the nation as a whole), so too did the model donor. In the antebellum period, charity was expected of all Americans, a form of personal regeneration. Charity was carried out through home visits, wherein wealthy men and women would visit the homes of the poor in order to administer aid. In the Gilded Age, women found a more expansive role in charitable endeavors, as managers and social arbiters. Men organized large-scale, umbrella relief organizations, funded by revenues donated by
individuals and collected and solicited by the charitable women of Chicago through fund-raising drives. In the Gilded Age, as urbanization and consolidation took hold, Andrew Carnegie's Gospel of Wealth reigned supreme, and the concern for a disciplined labor force played a role in charitable endeavors. This was also the period in which Chicago's great cultural institutions were developed, under the control of the elite, for the benefit of themselves and those like them. This period was characterized by centralization and control (on the part of wealthy businessmen and donors). The children of the Gilded Age elites rejected the materialism and grandiosity of their predecessors, and stressed the needs of the poor and disenfranchised in their charitable endeavors. The notions of noblesse oblige were rejuvenated and redefined by the Progressives, leading to a renewed stress on home visits and the necessity of shoring up the family and administering aid to the poor in their home environments, instead of through institutions such as the asylum. The Progressive Era saw the rise of professionalization, the replacement of volunteers with social workers, and the transition to non-institutionalized care of the poor. In the 1920s, the elite gave more, monetarily, than ever before, but the increasing professionalization of charity work forced them to cede responsibility and control over charitable endeavors to the rising class of professional administrators. This development represented the culmination of the shift from active beneficence to monetary donations as the predominant form of charitable endeavor in Chicago and the country as a whole. Although the concept of civic stewardship has endured over time, the role and activities of the stewards have changed considerably in response to professionalization and social changes, such as urbanization.


This is a history of international studies from 1800 to 1966. Prior to the Second World War international studies was part of a decentralized, public arena, constituted by missionaries, traders, and charitable organizations, among others. The war, and the subsequent Cold War, politicized knowledge about different parts of the world, making it a tool in the development of domestic and foreign policy. This politicization resulted in the
shifting of international studies from an open, diverse community to an elite cadre of highly trained academics in the isolated university. The field was professionalized and bureaucratized, with university and political imperatives circumscribing the kinds of knowledge to be produced and identifying who could produce it. McCaughey illuminates the critical role of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in the development of academic international studies, which began in the 1920s and 1930s and accelerated in the post-Second World War era.


The Chicago Relief and Aid Society, composed of elite Chicago businessmen, was formed in 1871 to administer the donations, totaling five million dollars, to the city of Chicago following the Great Fire. Historians have argued that these men were motivated in their relief endeavors by philanthropic aims. Naylor argues that, while this was true, they were also acting with an eye to maintaining the base of their power and wealth. These individuals, argues Naylor, played the single most important role in laying the social foundations for rebuilding the city and they did so in the context of a widespread fear of anarchy immediately preceding, during, and following the Fire. Through an examination of the various committees which were under the umbrella of the Chicago Relief and Aid Society (for example, the Employment Bureau, the Transportation Committee, the Committee on Shelter, the Committee on Sick, Sanitary, and Hospital Measures), their tactics, and their actions, Naylor indicates that the Society acted out of larger concerns than solely an attempt to aid the destitute. He also demonstrates that the type of relief administered often differed according to one’s class status. Naylor concludes that Chicago’s elite was aware of and concerned with social disorder and class conflict “long before the outbreak of the first large-scale American industrial strife.”

David Noble analyzes the rise of the engineering profession at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, illuminating the interconnections of scientific technology, educational institutions, and corporate capitalism. While business required technological innovation in order to propel production forward, that advancement required financial investment in the form of laboratories and research. The history of the engineering profession illuminates how science and education were transformed into a means of capitalist production; Noble documents the rise of corporate-sponsored research in universities, the establishment of professional learned societies, and the transformation of high schools into centers of practical training for the technologically-based capitalist economy. He explains that philanthropic organizations like the Carnegie Institution of Washington and corporate charitable gifts to universities played a key role in the history of knowledge production, universities, and business. Philanthropy helped transform the American educational system into a branch of the corporate capitalist intellectual and economic infrastructure.


Ross argues that the emergence of the social sciences attempted to resolve a nineteenth-century crisis of cultural authority. This crisis was manifest in the declining influence of traditional bases of power (religion, class, gender, and race) and in the various political and social upheavals of the era. The social sciences, which emerged at the turn of the century, attempted to resolve the crisis by establishing power and knowledge on new bi-partisan, unbiased and stable grounds. Social scientists claimed to have expert knowledge about the proper organization of society and, therefore, a special claim to social power. Ross examines five social scientific disciplines (economics, psychology, political science, sociology, and history), illuminating their cultural, political, and intellectual function. The concluding chapters examine the establishment of foundation-funded research institutes, such as the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), which organized, promoted, and disseminated social-scientific
knowledge. These institutions served as critical centers of power, maintaining authority in elite arenas and shaping academic knowledge production and public policy. Progressive Era philanthropies both funded social scientific research and promoted its aims: to search for the root causes of social events and expand expert knowledge.


Rosenberg’s history of the rise of America’s hospital system is divided into two sections. The first section, titled "A Traditional Institution, 1800-1850," examines how medical care was organized in the antebellum era. There were few formal hospitals, and medical needs were attended to locally by families, neighbors, or the almshouse, which was supported by public and private funds. Almshouses were shaped by paternalism, stewardship, and a commitment to established moral norms. For instance, patients suffering from so-called lapses in morality (such as alcoholism and sexually transmitted diseases) would be isolated, fined, or forced to pay for medical services rendered. These institutions were public-private partnerships which addressed the community’s physical and moral needs. The second section, titled "A New Healing Order, 1850-1920," documents the rise of a new medical system premised on cash transactions, technical complexity, and a business orientation. Knowledge about medicine shifted from the private home and small community to the independent, highly professional medical institution. Doctors, rather than lay administrators, exercised authority. While public interest and funds continued to play a central role in how hospitals functioned, paternalism and stewardship were eclipsed by the secular, scientific focus.


Rosenberg argues that American economic and cultural relations in the first half of the twentieth century evolved within the ideological rubric of liberal-developmentalism, which postulates that the American ideal of the free exchange of goods and ideas in a decentralized, voluntary private system is a paradigm for the
international order. Prior to the 1890s, American international relations were largely conducted by people in the private sector, such as missionaries, philanthropists, investors, and traders. However, at the turn of the century America became increasingly involved in international affairs, and this involvement transformed the state-private sector dynamic. Rosenberg divides the history of this transformation into three sections. The first, which she calls the "promotional state," spans from 1890 to the end of the First World War. In this era the state aids American international entrepreneurs by enlarging the navy, erecting tariffs, establishing overseas banking bureaus, professionalizing the consular corp of the State Department, and helping to coordinate philanthropic activities. While the state defers to the initiative of the private sector, it nonetheless provides important aid. The second stage is the "cooperative state," which refers to the 1920s. Under the guidance of Herbert Hoover, the state both expands its activities in economic and cultural affairs and invites the private sector into government policy-making meetings. Particularly relevant to the study of philanthropy is chapter six, "Global Fellowships: The 1920s." This chapter analyzes the expansion of internationalist associations in peace, education, and relief, illuminating the rise of a new professional internationalist elite who bound together the state, private sector, and the international community. These associations include the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Rotary International, and the Rockefeller Foundation, among others. They epitomized the liberal internationalist ideology which envisioned the world organized around a decentralized, voluntary, private system. Rosenberg's third stage is the "regulatory state." During the 1930s government programs directed and promoted economic and cultural affairs, typified in government loan programs and the establishment of the Division of Cultural Relations in 1938. Rosenberg's succinct analysis provides an important chapter in American cultural diplomacy and demonstrates the centrality of the private sector and voluntarism in the history of the state.

Schulzinger provides a broad history of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), trying to evaluate its influence on foreign policy initiatives, illuminating social tensions between experts and the citizenry, and pointing to the role of non-government officials in how public policy emerges. The CFR was established in 1918 by an internationalist elite that was dismayed by the United States' rejection of the League of Nations and fearful about the rise of nationalistic policies at home and abroad. The CFR drew members from Woodrow Wilson's ad hoc advisory committee, the Inquiry, and from an informal group of New York bankers and lawyers led by Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt's former Secretary of State. The Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations provided most of the funding. The CFR brought together internationalist academics, businessmen, lawyers, and government officials to discuss world affairs and shape and guide public opinion and state policy. The CFR conducted a vigorous publications program, which included pamphlets, books and lecture series. It ran a program entitled "economic studies" which stressed the interdependence of the world's economies, and founded the journal Foreign Affairs, a staple for elite commentary on international affairs. Schulzinger's analysis presents the CFR as a benevolent, though slightly arrogant and self-important, collection of diverse elites, trying to formulate intelligent and sensible policy programs. It served as a locus for the development of moderate, "respectable" foreign policy conceptions. It was attacked by the public as elitist and condescending, by the right as a bastion of liberalism, and by the left as undemocratic and evidence of capitalist control over foreign policy.


Smith charts the rise of policy experts and institutes in the twentieth century, illuminating how they used academic expertise to shape public policy. The first generation of policy experts emerged out of the Progressive era, and exhibited a typical faith
in the social scientist's ability to discover the root causes of social events. In the 1920s Herbert Hoover brought academic experts into the Commerce Department in order to make the state a positive force of liberal reform. These early policy experts operated in a private, decentralized world of foundation-supported research institutes and universities. The second generation of policy experts emerged during the post-World War Two era when the institutional ecology of policy formation was greatly expanded and complicated. The rapid establishment of a host of government and not-for-profit research institutes, all bent on marshalling expertise and shaping government policy, reconfigured the policy landscape. These were the first "think tanks." Smith focuses on the emergence of this second group, analyzing their intellectual and political character. Finally, he briefly examines a third generation of policy experts who emerged in the 1970s and were oriented around explicitly political issues. Smith provides a coherent analysis of the complex history and politics of policy experts and think tanks, ably situating a close analysis of particular eras and organizations within a discussion of the larger complexities and ambiguities inherent in a democracy in an era of expertise.


This is an exhaustive biography of Edward R. Murrow (born 1908), who played a central role in the rise of radio and television broadcasting, serving as CBS's chief correspondent in Europe during the Second World War. He was the only major radio news personality to successfully become a part of the national shift to television, and won four Peabody Awards for excellence in broadcasting. While a college student at Washington State College, Murrow was active in the National Student Federation of America (NSFA), a nation-wide coalition of student governments established in 1926 which participated in a wide range of activities, from discussions about campus problems to sponsoring delegates to international student conferences in Europe. During his tenure as president of the NSFA (1930-31), CBS provided the NSFA with free air time and Murrow organized NSFA programming, selecting speakers on a wide array of topics from women's rights to the world struggle for markets; he operated polls on student opinions about disar-
mament and the League of Nations; and he advocated desegregating the annual student meetings. Murrow advocated the NSFA's joining the leftist American Youth Congress and emphasized student participation in world affairs. He continued such interests at the Institute of International Education (IIE), a pioneer in international exchanges between the U.S. and Europe, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. The IIE, established in 1919, was funded by the Carnegie Endowment of International Peace, and its Director, Stephen Duggan, was an expert in educational systems around the world who advised the Soviet government on the administration of its workers' colleges, and founded the departments of political science, education, and adult education at the College of the City of New York. Through his work at the IIE, Murrow became a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the American-Russian Institute (which promoted international understanding between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.). In 1932, Murrow negotiated with Soviet authorities to set up summer courses for visiting Americans in Moscow. The IIE and the American-Russian Institute collaborated in developing courses in Soviet literature, agriculture, economics, and Russian languages. Murrow also developed close ties with the League of Nations and the Institute of Pacific Relations. In the 1930s the IIE office in Germany served as an information headquarters which allowed a comprehensive network of individuals, Murrow among them, and groups to document and publicize the suspension of basic civil liberties and rising anti-Semitism. In the Spring of 1933, Duggan established the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, which provided refugee scholars with academic positions and provided small stipends in the U.S. Murrow played a central role in the Committee. In 1935, Murrow left the IIE and joined CBS, organizing its news programs and inviting diverse speakers like Cordell Hull and Earl Browder. In 1936, CBS sent Murrow to London where he assembled the CBS's infamous wartime news team. Over the course of the next nine years Murrow brought the war to the American public. In the early 1950s, Murrow became a target of McCarthy, which considered his activities with the American-Russian Institute and the IIE un-American. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed Murrow director of the United States Information Agency. Murrow's life and career illuminates internationalist associations in the inter-war years and charts the
philanthropy, the state, and the public sector, 1890-1970

transformation of American diplomacy and policy-making from a private world of foundations to the postwar expansion of state-run operations.


The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), and the small coterie of Asian scholars that it fostered, was implicated in the political turmoil of the 1940s and 1950s. The IPR was established in 1925; its organizers included officials of the Young Men's Christian Association, businessmen, and Ray Wilbur, president of Stanford University. The IPR was a non-propaganda, non-political institution which sought to promote cultural dialogue and understanding between Asia and the world. Participating nations included the U.S., China, Japan, New Zealand, and Canada. Funds were provided by individual nations, American foundations, and the business community. Initially the IPR was primarily concerned with cultural and economic issues, but in the 1930s and 1940s it addressed political conflict in the Far East. It operated the journals Pacific Affairs and Far Eastern Survey, published the Inquiry Series (which examined policy issues surrounding Sino-Japanese relations) and provided research grants to scholars of the Pacific region. IPR publications, grant recipients, and executives spanned a wide political spectrum. For instance, the IPR brought together successful businessmen, like Wilbur, and Marxists, like Frederick Fields. Asian experts at the IPR had ties to government officials (particularly in the State Department), newspapers, universities, and foundations, and thus participated in an inter-locking membership with policy-making institutions. The IPR's political character became the object of factious debate with the Sino-Japanese War, the growth of Chinese communism, and the early Cold War years. Beginning in the 1940s the IPR was attacked by the "China Lobby," a small group of businessmen who charged critics of Chinese Nationalism with communist sympathies. In the 1950s the IPR was investigated by the Tydings Committee (which was investigating communists in the State Department), the McCarran Committee (which tried to determine if the IPR itself had been infiltrated by communists), and during the hearings on tax-exempt foundations. The history of the IPR sheds light on several issues: the development of Asian studies
between the 1920s and the 1950s; how scholarship and politics intersected during the 1950s; how the postwar expansion of the state and shift in the political climate altered who participated in policy decisions; and the evolving relationship between the state, foundations, and foundation-supported centers of expertise.


This is a social and architectural history of the Carnegie library program, which was responsible for the construction of over 1600 libraries. The examination operates on two analytically distinct, but interrelated levels: one is on library design and the professionalization of architecture; the other is on culture and politics, focusing on how Carnegie grants reflected and altered existing social patterns. The operation of the Carnegie library program illustrates the intersection of philanthropy, architecture and ideology, with buildings operating as part of a larger "cultural landscape" and serving as sites of social and political debate. This work provides thirteen case studies of the Carnegie library program, documenting the architectural and social transformation of the library, the different ways that the library functioned for different groups (politicians, immigrants, children, librarians, the intellectual elite, and the philanthropists), and the evolution of the Carnegie program. In the nineteenth century the library was oriented around the preservation rather than the public use of books. One social function of the library was to maintain the elite status of the donors and trustees, typified by the existence of private rooms. Initially, Carnegie grants allowed localities freedom in design. However, over time grants increasingly had stipulations about library design and function. In the first decade of the twentieth century, Carnegie joined the emerging library reform movement which sought to make the institution oriented toward public education. The library was to be oriented around public consumption and operation. It was to reach out to the working class and be operated by both municipal officials and private groups. The Library was a site of public, rather than elite, culture. Chapter Four, entitled "Taking: Libraries and Cultural Politics Part II," focuses on women's associations and participation in town libraries, illuminating the intersection of two differently organized philanthropies: one is
of small scale, local women's voluntary groups; the other is of
the large-scale, systematic, professionalized activities of
Carnegie. Carnegie's library program shifted the cultural
authority of the library from women to municipal officials, thus
altering the established organization of cultural power.
However, this shift did not decisively alienate women, manifest
in the increasing and ambiguous role of female librarians, who
helped shape the meaning and character of the library.

Wala, Michael. The Council on Foreign Relations and American
Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War. Providence: Berghahn

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) was established in
1921 by a group of internationalist-oriented scholars, business­
men, and government and former government officials.
Members debated foreign policy issues and made policy recom­
mandations to the state. The CFR was funded by the Carnegie
Corporation, and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, among
others. Wala tries to evaluate the CFR's influence and role in the
development of American foreign policy by conducting a close
analysis of its activities from 1945 to 1950. He examines several
committees, including those focused on Russia and Asia, and
documents the CFR's internal strife about how to interpret
complex events, showing the diversity of "expert" opinion. He
challenges scholars who cast the CFR as a central architect of
foreign policy, instead contending that it functioned within a
complex of policy-making institutions. Wala employs a "corpo­
ratist approach" which refers to the "system of societal commu­
nication of interests." This system sees different groups collab­
orating to develop consensus, thus obscuring the influence of
one group or set of concerns over another. The corporatist
approach complicates the interpretation of policy-making by
focusing on the diverse inter- and intra-institutional voices on
policy, the precarious ways that decisions are made, and the
complex factors that control access to policymakers in the state
and the ability to actually shape policy. The CFR emerges from
Wala's critique not so much as an architect of policy, but as a
"listening post" for foreign policy attitudes, a research institu­
tion, a pool for the recruitment of State Department officials,
and a center for the development of policy recommendations.
Wala criticizes scholars like Robert Schulzinger and Laurence
Shoup for providing overly general histories of the CFR, and basing their conclusions on assumptions and speculation rather than close scholarly analysis.


Joseph Wall provides a comprehensive, celebratory biography of Andrew Carnegie, meticulously documenting his familial, cultural, and ethnic roots, charting his rise to power, and illuminating the economic exploits which made Carnegie the quintessential robber baron. Carnegie's United Steel and railroad ventures were at the forefront of the economic reorganization of America in the last decades of the nineteenth century. He is a symbol of the incorporation of American industry at the turn of the century and epitomizes the mythological American who is able to succeed based on merit and work rather than privilege or nepotism. The last section of the book, "The Deed," focuses on Carnegie's philanthropy. Carnegie articulated his conception of philanthropy in a short essay entitled "Gospel of Wealth" in which he contended that the wealthy were trustees of the poor and that personal wealth should be distributed with an aim to stimulate, rather than inhibit, independence and individual initiative. Carnegie's early philanthropic activities were characteristic of the nineteenth century in which individual gifts were provided to individual institutions. At the turn of the century, however, Carnegie began to systematize his philanthropy. He established large trusts (foundations) which operated with specific, rational programs of support and boards of trustees which would evaluate competing proposals. The first such foundation was the Carnegie Institution of Washington which was established in 1901 and the first president was Daniel Coit Gilman. The Institution sought to further expert scientific knowledge by conducting research and providing grants. Another foundation was the Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching which was initially aimed at establishing a pension program for university scholars, but went on to play a central role in the reorganization and systematization of the American university system, typified by the introduction of standardized testing. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace sought to promote international understanding and peace by funding international conferences, exchange programs, and International
Houses at several universities. Most importantly, however, was the establishment of the Carnegie Corporation of New York which was an all-purpose foundation established in 1911. The Corporation sought to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge by aiding technical schools, institutions of higher learning, libraries, scientific research, and useful publications. Carnegie was responsible for the establishment of numerous other foundations both domestic and abroad as well as individual grants. Wall's biography provides an overview of the chronology and individuals involved in the evolution of Carnegie giving, which played an important role in the changing landscape of American philanthropy.


Steven Wheatley examines how philanthropy shaped the emergence of the modern American medical educational system by charting the career of Abraham Flexner, author of the infamous 1910 Carnegie Foundation Report which assessed medical education in the United States and Canada. At the turn of the century, medical education was fragmented; no uniform system bound together the nation's 155 medical schools. Flexner advocated eliminating all but 31 medical schools, establishing structures of authority and licensing, and maintaining the connection between research and practice. Flexner played an important role in the early history of the Rockefeller Foundation, shifting its support from specific institutions to the management of "transinstitutional networks." Flexner's program emphasized grants to prestigious universities, a focus on research, and full-time enrollment of medical students. Wheatley's study of Flexner and the foundations from 1890 to 1950 provides a context for exploring the changing history of American philanthropy and its relationship to national policymaking and national management. American philanthropy has played a central role in shaping the institutional ecology of policy formation and the transformation and function of American education.

This dissertation explores the changing nature of Quaker philanthropy in Philadelphia from 1680 to 1799. Abend identifies two traditions of poor relief operating during this period. The first is the Puritan tradition, whereby the poor were separated into categories of worthiness and unworthiness. According to this position, those in poverty were expected to act submissively and to work for their relief. The second was the Quaker tradition in which the poor were all seen as worthy recipients of aid, and involvement in philanthropic giving was seen as a potential route to salvation. Abend examines the development of these positions on charity in England and the implementation of the Quaker system in Philadelphia. She highlights the Quaker dominance over Philadelphia's public and private relief efforts and the acquiescence of Philadelphia's non-Quaker population to this Quaker control. A major component of Quaker philanthropy, and according to Abend, an extremely important contribution to American philanthropic history, was the dual system of poor relief which the Quakers implemented. Philadelphia Friends taxed themselves to provide public poor relief, and at the same time, provided relief for members of their own religious meetings so that their co-religionists would not have to resort to public relief. Quaker leadership of Philadelphia poor relief (and all other Philadelphia cultural and political institutions) lasted until the middle of the eighteenth century, at which point the American Revolution forced changes in Quaker participation in public life, including charitable endeavor. Unlike other historians of the Society of Friends, who argue that the French and Indian War was the pivotal event in the history of Quaker charity, Abend argues that the American War for Independence had a greater impact on Quakers' role in poor relief. During this time, the Quakers lost their elevated and respected position in Philadelphia society, due to their pacifist leanings. After the War, poor relief and philanthropy received much support in Philadelphia but the Quakers no longer controlled the organizations, societies, and apparatuses through which charity was administered. A new figure emerged: the non-Quaker, secular humanist who engaged not only in poor
relief, but also in broader reform efforts. Quakers ceded their role as the arbiters of charity to this new group of leaders.


In this book Robert H. Abzug analyses the emergence and development of antebellum reform, beginning with early nineteenth century New England. During the first two decades of the century, evangelical forces flourished. Influential leaders like Timothy Dwight and Lyman Beecher recast Calvinist notions of good and evil into new dramas. More emphasis was placed on free will, more faith in the individual's freedom to resist evil. Reform efforts took their place in the cosmic drama; voluntary societies became, in Lyman Beecher's words, "a sort of disciplined moral militia." (45) Domestic and missionary societies spread rapidly to combat "vice and licentiousness," and old problems—such as intemperance—now became dramatized as central issues in a Cosmic battle of Good against Evil. Temperance reform became a moral crusade of cosmological significance, and in 1835 the American Temperance Society claimed over a million members. As Evangelicalism spread, many associations lost touch with their institutional moorings, and many reformers cast off religious alliances altogether to engage in spiritual experimentation. Radical reform schools such as abolitionism, feminism, phrenology, and communitarianism, became suffused with a religious ardor of their own. Abzug's study is important because it elucidates the eschatological dramas that suffused even the most seemingly secular or "trivial" areas of antebellum reform.


The 1830s and 40s were difficult years for the Harvard Divinity School. Assailed from liberals and conservatives alike, weakened from shrinking funds and a dwindling staff and student body, one would hardly perceive the school as a powerful force for change. In this essay, however; Gary L. Collison illustrates how "the loudest voices in an era of bitter controversy...are often
misleading," and how the Divinity School, far from lapsing into inertia, "actually maintained a tenuous dynamism," with the students actively engaging themselves with the pressing issues of the day. Drawing primarily from the recordings of the Philanthropic Society of the Harvard Divinity School (1831-1850), Collison explores the students' involvement with temperance, bible, missionary and peace societies. During the 1830s, as the student body became increasingly radicalized, issues like child labor, prostitution, and abolition made their way onto committee agendas—often against the wishes of senior faculty members. During the 1840s the students also demonstrated an interest in social experimentation. They may have criticized Brooke Farm, but by 1847 the Society "was considering anti-capitalist resolutions in almost every way as radical as Fourierism."(228) Overall, Collison effectively captures the vitality and independence of the Harvard Divinity School during its most precarious years.


Using Cincinnati as a case study, Fairbanks seeks to illustrate the transition in emphasis and redefinition of low-cost housing reform in the United States in the early twentieth century. He traces the development of Cincinnati's housing reform movement, including the role of charity societies, Progressive housing legislation, and the efforts of the Cincinnati Better Housing League. Fairbanks identifies a shift from a concentration on improving tenements and inadequate housing, to one on improving the community as a whole. He argues that this latter emphasis was part of a larger concern, among urban planners of the 1920s, with community-building and comprehensive planning. By the 1920s, both housing reformers and urban planners were stressing the importance of these two expedients, along with zoning. The emphasis of both groups shifted from improving tenement conditions to improving existing communities through such measures as educational initiatives, parks, clubs, and activities, and building new communities which would best uphold their civic ideal.

In this book, Charles Foster examines the emergence of the "united evangelical front" in England and the United States during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He points out the close ties between British and American evangelical organizations during the 1820s. Picking up from their British connections "first hand experience," the jobbers, importers, and merchants in Boston and New York City played crucial roles in expanding the movement in the United States. Despite its ties to England, America's evangelical movement developed distinct characteristics of its own. The role of the clergy as articulators of the movement was more pronounced. Also different was the frequent merging of the "role of spokesman...with the role of political leader...perhaps because of a greater fluidity in the society of the United States." (140) For example, Samuel Bayard, the founder of Princeton Theological Seminary and the New York Historical Society, was a prominent New York lawyer and judge. Overall, there emerged in the United States a distinct coalition of lawyers, judges, politicians, businessman and clergy. Taking full advantage of the emerging railroads and other technological developments, these people coordinated the activities of benevolent associations throughout the country. Holidays like Anniversary Week in New York City, and Ecclesiastical Week in Philadelphia, proved highly effective in bringing together people from various organizations. The 1830s also saw the rise of the "convention circuit" as an effective fundraising tool. In the Fall of 1830, the American Sunday School Union held its first national convention, successfully assembling together "200 delegates from fourteen states and territories"—this at a time when the United States "could boast only three hundred miles of railroad track." (147) The Union's success set other groups organizing, and by 1834 an evangelical convention circuit "was in full swing." Overall, Foster provides a useful look at the agendas and activities of America's evangelical movement, and the effective fundraising and administrative strategies it employed.
Abolitionist opinion in antebellum America spanned a wide range of attitudes and ideas. Focusing on the first generation of "immediatist" abolitionists, Lawrence J. Friedman explores the diversity and factionalism that permeated the movement. He examines the insurgent radicalism of William Garrison and his associates, the "temperate" immediatism of the Lewis Tappan Circle, and the "half-way abolitionism" of moderates like Lyman Beecher and Horace Mann. Friedman traces these differences to their specific social contexts, specifically the intimacy circles or "sanctuaries" of these different abolitionist schools. He focuses on the three most prominent networks: the Boston Clique, the Lewis Tappan Circle in New York City, and the Gerrit Smith faction in upstate New York. Despite their hostility to slavery, differences between these groups ran deep, particularly in their attitudes toward politics, benevolent associations, and churches. The Boston Clique tended to distrust established churches; the radicalism of its members generally alienated them from other benevolent associations. The Tappan Circle, in contrast, was deeply evangelical, and "derived deep comforts from the fellowship of missionaries within the benevolent society movement."(69) Of these factions only Gerrit Smith's group seriously embraced party politics, in this case the Liberty Party in the 1840s. All of these groups had their own internal tensions and power struggles, and Friedman discusses the social rituals that emerged to "contain" them. He explores how the "social dynamics" and "personal idiosyncrasies" of these circles affected the impact of such pressing issues as the "woman question," race relations, violence, and the preservation of anti-slavery societies after the war. Friedman's study captures the social and psychological complexity of abolitionism; he shows how the movement permeated the lives of those who embraced it.


Griffin examines organized social reform in the nineteenth century through the lens of social control. American moral stewards
in the antebellum period—trustees to the Calvinistic stewardship tradition—used religion to combat social upheavals, and the breakdown of American homogeneity in evidence during this period. These men were members of the wealthy elite, usually of the patrician classes. They condemned as evil every practice in which they did not indulge and viewed men with different ideas as ungodly. Through various associations (American Bible Society, American Tract Society, American Peace Society, American Antislavery Society, American Education Society, American Home Missionary Society), the trustees attempted to exert control over all members of American society. They approached their task through two methods: moral suasion, and compulsion (through law). They nationalized their program, through auxiliaries and agents, and eventually through the Republican party. Their goals and methods found their way through the Civil War and into the Gilded Age, as the combination of morality by persuasion and morality by coercion became permanent characteristics of American life.


In this article, Joan Underhill Hannon charts the decline of public relief in New York State from 1820-1860. There is an ironic twist to the “generosity” referred to in the title, for indeed the period under discussion “stands out as a period of....unique stinginess” in the history of public relief. Throughout the first two decades of the nineteenth century the generosity of New York’s public relief system “differed little” from the general national standards of the time. The next three decades, however, saw a marked decline, with New York City “leading the way.” Hannon provides statistical data charting the rapid decrease in New York City’s benefit-earnings ratio after 1820. In terms of generosity, New York’s public relief system had peaked early in the century. “As early as 1810-1814 annual expenditures per poorhouse resident in New York City reached 27 percent of the annual earnings of common labor.”(819) By 1823 spending had fallen to 16%. And by 1835-39, the ratio outside New York City had fallen to less than 12%. Decline in public relief accompanied an increase in the number of poorhouses in New York State, which by 1824 “was a leader in the poorhouse movement.” With the decline in the popularity of
poorhouses after 1850, the “generosity” of outdoor relief accordingly rose, but only to a limited extent. The benefit-earnings ratio in the 1850s was far below that which prevailed in the early decades of the nineteenth century.


A major movement toward poorhouse relief flourished in New York State from the 1820s through the 1840s. The origins and goals of the movement have long been a matter of debate, and in this article Hannon critiques the influential interpretations that have emerged. One argument perceives the poorhouse movement as a cost-effective response to an increase in pauperism concomitant with urban and industrial growth. Other arguments place more emphasis on the reformist agendas of urban elites. Hannon herself inclines toward the latter interpretation. “The social control literature,” she argues “captures quite well the language of the poorhouse movement.” (241) However, she goes on to argue that urban elites did not and could not totally dominate relief policy. Legislation passed during the 1820s largely left the choice between indoor and outdoor relief in the hands of local relief officials—who could be, but were not always, of the elite ranks. Their decisions proceeded from cost considerations as well as perceptions about the poor, and did not always coincide from the views of urban social reformers. These local officials made the decisions, however, and so “it was their assessment of relative cases and their view of poverty...which mattered.” (251) Hannon also analyzes the decline of the poorhouse movement, which she attributes to the gradual increase in the number of able-bodied recipients. This phenomenon seriously undermined some of the original precepts of poorhouse relief—namely that the poor comprised a separate, morally depraved class of people.


In this article, Heale explores the emergence and development of nonsectarian charitable associations in New York's cities in
The antebellum period. Although associated philanthropy was the primary organizational form of charitable giving throughout the nineteenth century, the scope and nature of philanthropic enterprises, Heale argues, changed in relation to both time and place. Using New York state as a framework, he attempts to explore the changing nature of charity in the United States. Charity organizations in the cities of New York adapted to changing social factors, such as urbanization, immigration, and acculturation. Heale includes examples of charity associations and their enterprises, both general (ladies benevolent societies, orphan asylums, savings banks), and specific (Children's Aid Society, Five Points House of Industry, Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor). He concludes that associated philanthropy began as a technique, in urban areas, for distinguishing between the deserving and undeserving poor but evolved, by the end of the period, into an instrument of acculturation and, sometimes, social control.


This study takes a close look at the Unitarian intellectuals and clergymen who dominated Harvard College for the first two thirds of the nineteenth century. Heavily influenced by the Scottish moral philosophy of Francis Hutcheson and Thomas Reid, and specifically their theories on innate human benevolence, Harvard Unitarians contributed a great deal to American philanthropy. They joined bible, temperance, and peace societies, and outlined programs for prison and legal reform. They also gave considerable attention to the plight of the urban poor. In 1826 the American Unitarian Association established a full-time ministry in the urban slums of Boston. Under the leadership of Joseph Tuckerman the ministry attracted a great deal of interdenominational support. To combat alcohol addiction Tuckerman set up an innovative outreach program of home counseling. His emphasis on physical, moral and psychological rehabilitation prefigured later developments in the emerging profession of social work. Not all Harvard Unitarians, to be sure, were as active and energetic as Tuckerman. Ardent social critics, these intellectuals could also be undeniably elitist, and their dismissal of politics and fear of social conflict often under-
mined their calls for change, particularly their calls for the erad-
ication of slavery. Disdainful as they were toward the institution,
their hatred of conflict alienated them from the more radical
abolitionist schools. Those less willing to compromise, such as
William Ellery Channing, ran the risk of upsetting the conserv­
avive, wealthy sectors of Boston society, precisely those people
upon whom Unitarian philanthropists depended for funds.
Divided over the slavery issue, Unitarian consensus eventually
dropped, as did their influence in the university and in Boston
society at large. For a while, though, they were quite influential,
and Howe’s study illuminates their contribution to antebellum
philanthropy and social reform.


Urbanization and industrialization, and their attendant processes,
led to a tremendous transformation of the United States in the
nineteenth century. Boston’s philanthropists and charity work­
ers feared the breakdown of their community and the destruc­
tion of traditional relationships. Their charity endeavors in the
late nineteenth century reflected their concerns. Huggins looks
at the deeply conservative element in the efforts of charity
workers to address the problems of their time. He examines the
voluntary associations in Boston from 1870 to 1900, as they
attempted to organize to insulate traditional community and
character against social disintegration. The charity organizers,
he argues, used the model of the traditional, idealized New
England town, with its Protestant value system, in their philan­
thropic efforts. Thus, the charity organizations which came out
of this process were informed by an effort to protect Protestant
values, such as thrift, self-control, self-discipline, and temper­
ance. In their efforts, these reformers faced a paradoxical prob­
lem: the progress to which they professed a commitment made
a return to old community forms impossible. Huggins examines
Boston’s associated charities and charity organization societies,
highlighting the trend toward rationalization and scientific
approaches to charity; he also explores the shift from volun­
tarism to professionalization in the field of social work. He
argues that the emergent social worker, although working under
the guise of science, was actually continuing the tradition of
Protestant moral reform; and that moralism and sentimentality
were central to the social worker’s mentality in regard to the poor. Huggins concludes that the charity efforts of the nineteenth century, and their legacy in the social work profession of the early twentieth, failed because they concentrated on morality and social uplift of the poor, rather than attending to the real problem—economic inequity.


Michael Katz’s social history of American welfare begins with the rise of the poorhouse during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Considered the “cutting edge of welfare policy,” poorhouses, by the Civil War, had spread “throughout most of the settled regions of the country, north and south.”(15) Most philanthropists and politicians endorsed these institutions, and overlaps in public and private funding were common. The state often took over institutions founded by philanthropists, and voluntary associations routinely inspected state-run institutions. “Almost everywhere complex funding and administrative arrangements blurred the boundary between public and private.”(46) Concomitant with the rejection of poorhouses was a rejection of the traditional mechanisms of outdoor relief, which many blamed for eroding the work ethic and fostering dependency. In the 1860s and 1870s philanthropists and clergymen launched a concerted attack against it. Outdoor relief, however, with its intricate social network of local merchants, manufacturers, physicians, and ward politicians, proved quite resilient, and efforts to abolish it were only partially successful. Katz explains this attack on outdoor relief and commitment to poorhouses as part of the general bureaucratization of social reform. Of particular interest in this engaging study is Katz’s discussion of Catholic charity. Rejecting what he sees as the “Protestant coloration of the history of American social reform,” he points out the large number of orphan asylums, hospitals, and homes for young women established and run by Catholics. He goes so far as to postulate that “the Catholic Church spent a greater proportion of its resources on charity than did Protestant denominations.”(63)

Through the lens of social control, Lubove examines the ideas and attitudes of New York housing reformers during the Progressive Era. He traces the development of housing reform from voluntary efforts through the city planning efforts of the early twentieth century. While these reformers differed sometimes in approach, they all viewed housing reform as a technique of social control—a way of reducing class and ethnic conflict, and inculcating the tenement dweller with middle-class values. Lubove concentrates on voluntary and legislative approaches to housing reform in New York City. He examines the social thought of reformer Jacob Riis, who went beyond the limited aims of the tenement reformers by advocating reform of the entire tenement neighborhood, not just of the tenement house itself. Central to Lubove’s narrative are the ideas and approaches of reformer and legislator Lawrence Veiller who, he argues, was the father of organized, Progressive housing reform. Lubove also examines the shift from voluntary reform to professionalized, bureaucratized reform, including the emergence of social work as a career. Lubove concludes that the significance of Progressive housing reform is threefold: it highlights, as exemplified by the work of Jacob Riis, the need for combined attention to housing and neighborhood; it engendered a technically proficient, well-organized housing reform movement, as spearheaded by Veiller and his drive for effective restrictive legislation; and it led to the early urban planning movement, as indicated by adherence to zoning programs, and the City Beautiful programs of the early twentieth century.


Through an examination of urban social reform and reformers in Boston from 1880 to 1900, Mann attempts to place the reformer within the liberal tradition. Mann defines the liberal as one who refuses to accept the status quo, believes that “tinkering with institutions could bring out the good and suppress the evil of men in society,” and is dedicated to improving the position of disadvantaged groups. Mann uses the terms ‘liberal,’ ‘social reformer,’ and ‘progressive’ synonymously. The central
question of the book concerns “how Bostonians attempted to square the ugly facts of inequality with the noble ideal of equality for America as a whole.” Through an examination of reform and reform movements from various backgrounds and social groups (Protestants, Jews, Irish Catholics, feminists, trade unionists, intellectuals), Mann demonstrates that reform thinking can be traced to the reformer’s sensitivity to evil, which in turn can be traced to his or her position and role within the larger community. Thus, Protestant reformers, for example, approached philanthropic and charity efforts via the Social gospel, while intellectuals did so through scientific rationalism. Although the various reform groups in Boston used diverse means, they all met on the common ground of American egalitarianism. Mann’s purpose is threefold: to demonstrate that the liberal tradition continued in Boston throughout the nineteenth century; to prove that the roots of modern liberalism can be found in the city as well as the farm; and to trace the origins of reform sentiment to the character of a community, especially to the kinds of people in the community. He sees the last quarter of the nineteenth century as the seed bed of modern America. It was during this time that reformers transformed the spirit of reform to deal with the problems of modern, urban-industrial culture. In so doing, they prepared urban Americans to support Progressive politicians.


This anthology represents an attempt to examine charity from the standpoint of the recipients of aid rather than the donors. It is, as its editor explains, “a social history of charity from below.” Each of the essays deals with philanthropic endeavors in a particular nineteenth-century city in Western Europe or the United States. The contributors acknowledge and explore the difference between the aims of charity, as envisioned by its donors, and its uses, as understood by its recipients. They approach their studies along four main themes: “the extent of urban poverty; the survival strategies of the urban poor; the place of charity in those strategies; and, finally, the degree to which the need for charity was superseded at the end of [the nineteenth century] by the emergence of the modern welfare
Mandler provides an introduction in which he explores the general themes expanded on by the other contributors to the volume. His introduction is followed by seven essays. Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly look at the poor of Antwerp and the ways in which they used the socially coercive tactics of the philanthropic bourgeoisie to their advantage. Lynn Holien Lees examines welfare policies and the family in London. Rachel Fuchs’ essay deals with aid to poor, pregnant women in Paris, while Nancy L. Green investigates Jewish philanthropy in the same city. Bruce Bellingham explores child abandonment and foster care in New York City. Ellen Ross looks at London housewives and their utilization of charity. And finally, Michael B. Katz describes and analyzes the experiences of a New York City woman with the Charity Organization Society in the early twentieth century.


During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries Methodism spread rapidly across the country, soon becoming the largest Protestant sect in America. In this book Donald G. Matthews explores the confrontation between this highly popular church and the institution of slavery. The relationship between Methodism and slavery was defined largely by context. New England Methodists were more likely to speak out against slavery than their southern counterparts, many of whom owned slaves. Even in New England, however, criticism of slavery was often cautious and low-keyed. Nevertheless, there had always been abolitionist currents of dissent within the church. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, had proclaimed slavery “one of the greatest evils that a Christian should fight.”(5) Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke, the most vocal Methodist evangelicals in eighteenth century America, were rabid abolitionists. Their early efforts to abolish slavery failed however, and thus began a long process of “acquiescence, compromise, and conscientious moral struggle.” In the South, abolitionism gave way to evangelism and conversion, and during the 1810s and 1820s, Methodist missionary societies flourished. Thousands of slaves were preached to, black pastors were ordained, and church membership soared. Some Methodists, however, spoke out
against slavery. Many endorsed the American Colonization Society. Particularly interesting is the story of Methodist abolitionism, which emerged primarily in New England and Western New York, especially in Utica. A minority in the church, the abolitionists were vocal and influential. They established abolitionist societies and set up their own newspapers, such as The Wesleyan Anti-Slavery Herald and Zion’s Watchman. Orange Scott, La Roy Sunderland, and George Storrs, three of the most active and influential abolitionist preachers of the day, traveled widely, lecturing and writing and “vigorously [assailing] ecclesiastical authoritarianism.” In 1838, Scott claimed there were 50,000 abolitionists within the Methodist church—“probably as accurate an estimation as possible.” (168) Abolitionists, however, came up against a great deal of resistance, and like the rest of the country the Methodist church became increasingly torn with internal disputes. In 1844 the church divided over the slavery question. Overall, Matthews does a superb job elucidating the tensions and power struggles that emerged as Methodists grappled with the issues of slavery, colonization, and emancipation.


In this article, Mohl counters the common historiographical notion that early America was a land of great plenty and little want, full of people of the middling sort, and that the problem of poor relief did not emerge until the 1830s. Rather, he argues, poverty was quite pervasive among early Americans. Mohl points to colonial relief expenditures, the overcrowding of institutional facilities, the proliferation of private benevolence and mutual aid, and occasional preventive measures in his attempt to prove the existence of widespread poverty in eighteenth century New York City. Mohl traces the efforts to alleviate poverty from the legal codes modeled after English statutes through the efforts of private individuals and ad hoc organizations, to the associative pattern of private philanthropy which became more pronounced after the Revolution. Although there were efforts, on the part of the municipality as well as private individuals, to alleviate the problems of the poor, poverty remained a significant problem throughout the century, and one which was closely linked to urbanization.

In April of 1810, Congress passed legislation requiring post­masters to deliver mail and to open their offices to the public all days of the week—including Sunday. Within months, a coalition of Presbyterian and Congregationalist ministers drew up petitions to repeal the law and protect the “sacredness of the Sabbath.” In October, the Pittsburgh Synod of the Presbyterian church called for federal legislation to ban altogether any sorting or transporting of Sunday mail. Thus began a movement that would soon spread from the northeast to “widely scattered parts of the country,” a moral crusade that would cut across regional and sectional lines, enlisting the support of such notable figures as Lyman Beecher and William Ellery Channing. Often slighted or dismissed by historians, Sabbatarianism, John R. Richard argues, should be taken seriously as a reform movement. He points out its effective petitions and propaganda strategies, particularly in 1828, when over one thousand copies of Lyman Beecher’s “address” were circulated in pamphlet or newspaper form—an astonishing quantity for its time. By 1831, over nine hundred petitions had found their way to the House and Senate, and the General Union of the Promotion for the Christian Sabbath, an organization funded by Josiah Bissell Jr., had established auxiliaries in twenty-six cities and towns. “Taking full advantage of the postal system and the evangelical press, the first ‘mass media’ of the United States,” the Sabbatarians “successfully [united] thousands of Americans in a common cause.”(56) Many abolitionists would later adapt the movement’s strategies to promote their own crusade. A provocative study, Richard ably explores the causes, consequences, and strategies of this interesting movement, as well as the anti-Sabbatarian movement it fostered.


In this book, Anne C. Rose argues that Transcendentalism was not simply an intellectual movement, but a social one as well. The traditional focus on Transcendental individualism has generally obscured the movement’s preoccupation with and com-
mitment to social reform. The Transcendentalists were indeed social reformers. Scornful of mainstream politics, they established, throughout the 1830s and 40s, their own newspapers, voluntary societies, schools and communities. Rose traces their commitment to social reform to the evangelical Unitarianism from which Transcendentalism emerged. The Second Great Awakening had signaled a burst of reform initiatives from within the Unitarian church, and by the 1830s, prominent ministers like William Ellery Channing were soon writing on social issues, lecturing to reform societies, and "moving religion out of the Church and into the sphere of voluntary associations."(52) The Transcendentalists were the most radical proponents of Evangelicalism, and by the 1830s many rejected the church altogether and struck out on their own. Focusing on the reform activities of Orestes Brownson, George Ripley, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Elizabeth Peabody, Margaret Fuller, and Bronson Alcott, Rose's study spans a whole array of Transcendentalist projects, such as the Green Street School, the Alcott House, the Hopedale and Fruitlands Communities, and the Brooke Farm project, launched by Ripley in 1840. She examines the antislavery efforts of Theodore Parker, who participated in the Underground Railroad. Overall, she effectively captures the movement's social dimension. Criticism of the Transcendentalists' rejection of mainstream politics has too often minimized their significance as social reformers. "To work outside established channels," however, "is not to abandon serious reform."(219)


This book examines the emergence and rapid spread of almshouses, penitentiaries, and orphan and insane asylums during the Jacksonian era. Philanthropists generally were unanimous in their support of such institutions. Only within carefully structured environments, so they thought, could the sick be comforted and the delinquent reformed. The boundaries between delinquency, illness, and homelessness, however, were generally vague and confused, and Rothman suggests that reformers promoted these institutions as the ideal social panacea for poverty, delinquency, and other complex social problems. To these developments Rothman contrasts colonial mechanisms for dealing with the poor, sick, and dependent elements of society.
Focusing on such specific eighteenth-century communities as the Virginia parishes, as well as the family-oriented almshouses founded by Quakers and other Protestant churches, Rothman points out the colonial “dependence upon informal mechanisms and informal households” to provide relief. Rothman is, to say the least, ambivalent towards the emergence of these later, larger institutions and to the ideals which fostered them. He points out their sustained popularity even after they devolved from “reformist to custodial institutions.”(278) He argues that “by incarcerating the deviant and dependent and defending the step with hyperbolic rhetoric, they [the reformers] discouraged—really eliminated—the search for other solutions that might have been less susceptible to abuse.”(295)


During the eighteenth century, the New England ministry was clearly different from other occupations. It was a “public office,” closely intertwined with that other “sacred” profession, the magistracy. Working solely within the confines of the New England town, ministers deemed themselves “stewards” of public virtue, called to inculcate in the townspeople those habits of obedience and deference so essential for social and political stability. In this book, Donald M. Scott examines how these roles and perceptions of the ministry changed during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He begins with the emergence of electoral politics in the 1790s, and the “increasing incompatibility of interests” between ministers and politicians. Uneasy with the competitiveness and factionalism of the electoral system, the New England ministry disentangled itself from politics and struck out on its own. A new sense of “moral citizenship” emerged, embracing all Christians, everywhere. Seminary students at Andover and Oneida were called to “evangelize the nation and convert the world.”(87) An elaborate, wide-ranging network of benevolent associations accordingly emerged, absorbing the energies of an increasingly mobile profession. During the 1840s concerted attempts would be made to restore the capacities of the local church, but never again would church functions and services be as locally defined as they had been during the eighteenth century. The emergence of highly
organized charitable institutions had clearly enlarged the boundaries of the profession. Various services, once the province of the local minister, "were now performed by specialized institutions...unconnected to the local churches and conducted by clergymen with no pastoral position or responsibilities."(153) For many clerics, such as Henry Gallaudet, with his Hartford School for the Deaf, and Charles Loring Brace, with his Children's Aid Society, charity in itself had become a vocation and a full-time job.


Focusing on the years 1838-1845, Gerald Sorin presents a series of biographical sketches of high ranking radical abolitionists in New York State. Drawing from a variety of primary New York and national anti-slavery sources, Sorin ranks Henry B. Stanton, Joshua Leavitt, Lewis Tappan, William Jay, Theodore S. Wright, Samuel Ringgold Ward, Henry H. Garnet, Samuel E. Cornish, Charles B. Ray, and James C. Jackson as New York's "ten high ranking abolitionist leaders." Through his analysis of the lives and careers of these people, Sorin sets out to discredit the "tension-reduction theory of political radicalism."(ix) The radicalism of New York's abolitionist movement did not, he argues, spring from emotional frustration wrought by economic dislocation. These radicals were not merely "inert objects wafted about in a public domain by external forces." Rather, they were empowered by "intelligent vision" suffused with the ardor of religious revivalism. Those unwilling "to work inside the gates of the city" saw the elimination of slavery as only one aspect—albeit a crucial one—of major, widespread reform. "Many saw or came to see American society and its institutions as basically corrupt and in need of restructuring."(126) Sorin critiques the "bad press" so often given to radical abolitionism. Intense radicalism, he argues, need not be a "symptom of personality disturbance" but rather a "symptom of maturity and health."

In this book, Jay P. Dolan explores the philanthropic activities of New York City’s Catholic communities during the first half of the nineteenth century. Due in part to Protestant “proselytizing” and prejudice, Catholics generally felt alienated from antebellum reform movements. They responded by establishing charitable institutions of their own. Like Protestants, American immigrant Catholics had a rich tradition to draw from; “they reconstructed a pattern of benevolence that scarcely different from the old country.” (140) As in Europe, parish societies provided the outlet for charity and relief, much of which helped support hospitals, orphanages, and other charitable institutions. Dolan discusses the work of various Roman Catholic religious orders, such as the Irish Sisters of Mercy, and the Sisters of Charity—who founded St. Vincent’s Hospital in 1849. Many Catholic benevolent societies, such as St. Vincent de Paul, assisted immigrants. In 1849, Irish nuns opened The House of Mercy for the care of newly-arrived immigrant girls. The Ladies Society of Charity taught women domestic trades and helped them find work. Catholic churches, particularly Irish parishes, also participated in the Temperance Movement. The New York Catholic Temperance Association, founded by Father Varela in 1840, boasted 5,000 members within a year of its establishment. An informative study of antebellum Catholic philanthropy, Dolan’s study demonstrates how Catholic charitable institutions both overlapped and distanced themselves from other (Protestant) reform movements of the time.


Engaging in a comparison of German and English middle-class and working-class participation in voluntary associations, Eisenberg attempts to explain the division of proletarian and bourgeois democracy in Germany in the 1860s and 1870s. More specifically, she attempts to determine whether the breaking away from the Vereine and the establishment by the
working-class of political-party independence, was a consequence of various differences with the bourgeoisie or whether the Verein itself was an arena for conflict. Eisenberg defines the verein as a voluntary organization, with limited goals, and a democratic structure, whose activities are undertaken as ends in themselves rather than as an effort to exert influence on people outside of the organization. She includes, by merit of this definition, associations such as choral societies, reading groups, welfare societies, and educational associations, and excludes voluntary associations such as trade unions, political parties, and cooperatives. Eisenberg examines the development of voluntary associations in England and Germany; the relative importance of such associations for the middle-class and the working-class in each country; the relation between the two classes in the Workers' Educational Association (Bildungsverein)—one specific type of verein—and its relations with the larger society. She concludes that what scholars have called "the premature emergence of social democracy" in Germany was a consequence, and not a cause of, class conflict. She attributes this conflict to the character of the voluntary associations in Germany, which were all middle-class in character and scope. England as well, she explains, had verein-type organizations, also middle-class-oriented, but there were a variety of other organizations available to the English working-class. This condition allowed for class cooperation, as diverse associations promoted the organizational differences between the two classes rather than forcing the working class to adhere to middle-class organizational techniques.


Jentz argues that artisan traditions, imported from Germany, served as a resource for building modern working-class institutions. He supports his thesis by providing three examples of what he calls "German artisan culture"—workers' associations, the mutual benefit society of Chicago's German bakers, and the tradition of tool ownership among Chicago's German skilled furniture workers. German workers' associations, formed in Germany after the German Revolution of 1848-1849, were
transplanted in America, serving as social institutions and mutual benefit societies. Membership in these organizations was mixed, including artisans, small-business owners, and lower-level professionals. Their stated purpose was to provide their members with fellowship, education, and general uplift. The Bakers' mutual benefit society provided similar services to its members. These two organizational forms, along with the tradition of shared tool ownership among furniture makers, served as the institutional precursors to the organized labor movement in Chicago and other American cities.


Keil examines change and continuity in Chicago's Northwest Side, a German immigrant neighborhood. He includes discussions of population and resident structure, and of industrial, commercial and occupational structures. But two-thirds of his study is dedicated to an examination of German immigrant institutions and voluntary associations, including lodges, clubs, churches, mutual benefit societies, saloons, and neighborhood networks. Keil indicates that the lodge system—an American organizational form, not a German one—was embraced by a great many of Chicago's German immigrants. Lodges provided mutual benefits to their members, organized social activities within the neighborhoods, and served recreational functions as well. An explicit goal of the lodges was to preserve German culture and language. Perhaps as a result, virtually all of their members were German-born. Very few second-generation German-Americans joined the German lodges. Lodge members represented the wealthier segment of the German immigrant population. Those immigrants who couldn't afford lodge membership received aid when needed from informal community networks, Chicago charity associations, and neighborhood churches. Indeed, the German churches did a good deal of philanthropic work within the community, sponsoring and organizing non-lodge affiliated mutual benefit societies and charitable associations.

Kessel examines German churches, and to a lesser extent, educational institutions in Frederick County, Maryland in the eighteenth century. Members of several German denominations coexisted on the Maryland frontier (Lutheran, Reformed, Sectarian), but most of the settlers shared a deep connection to their respective religious institutions. While sustaining German cultural forms, these settlers stepped into the void of religious authority caused by "frontier conditions and the absence of an established German church . . ." They developed "traditions . . . that are now established patterns in American Protestantism;" patterns including: "voluntarism; congregationalism; denominationalism; a large measure of independence from European churches; and adherence to the doctrine of separation of church and state." Despite a certain degree of dependence on churches in the homeland, the slowness of communication fostered independence. Settlers established an organizational base for their churches in the colonies, in the form of synods. These synods served as administrative bodies for the churches, and also as mutual benefit societies, providing their congregants with social services, counseling, poor relief, communications links with family members, and medical aid. By the 1740s, settlers, in an effort to maintain their cultural heritage, established German parochial schools, with instruction in German. Through these schools, they inculcated their children with German cultural values, as well as German-influenced religious ones. This was true of the various denominations. The centrality of religion to the settlers' lives was sustained through various colonial wars as well as the American War for Independence.


Metress examines the measures taken to care for the Irish-American elderly from colonial times to the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935. Although he focuses on the elderly in particular, his examination deals with the aid options open to the general Irish-American population. Metress argues that dur-
ing the colonial period and the early republic, Irish immigrants were viewed with disdain by “native” Americans. Although public assistance to the poor was available in the form of almshouses, the Irish were either refused admission or chose not to enter such institutions. Rather, they depended on kinship and community ties for their needs. Irish Americans developed their own mutual-aid and charitable organizations to care for their compatriots. With the tremendous influx of poor Irishmen and women after 1840, these ethnic organizations couldn’t cope with the needs of the Irish and Irish-American community so many were forced to depend on public assistance. After the 1850s, urban political machines provided public welfare services for their Irish constituents. These services augmented ethnic charitable organizations, fraternal organizations, and mutual aid societies. Together with the Catholic church, such associations handled the needs of the elderly as well as the general Irish poor until the first part of the twentieth century. Older Irish Americans could also rely on publicly-subsidized private homes for the aged but most depended on community resources and family ties. With the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, the government took over much of the responsibility for the poor and the aged formerly claimed by ethnic associations. Metress claims that the Act spelled the death of American ethnic charities and mutual aid societies as many of their functions were assumed by the state.
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In order to continue the work begun in September 1986, with funds generously made available by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Center is making plans to expand its work in the study of international solidarity in practice. In particular, the Center can utilize the experience of one of its associates, Dr. Carol Fishman, who recently returned from six months of fieldwork in Grenada.

Dr. Fishman's work there is aimed at enhancing public understanding of the role of solidarity in the context of international cooperation, with particular emphasis on the role of non-governmental organizations in promoting solidarity. The Center encourages individuals and institutions interested in the study of solidarity to participate in its activities through the submission of proposals for research, conference sponsorship, and the publication of findings.